NCIEC
Power & Privilege: Deaf and Hearing Interpreters' Experiences
February 29, 2016
6:00 p.m. CT

>> Williamson: Perfect. Thank you. Appreciate that. All right. Maybe I'll let you guys introduce yourselves, and as I said -- rather, before we begin, I want to acknowledge that these are both my friends, my mentors. I am beyond honored to welcome them, and for them to share their work with us this evening. Thank you so much. And I'll see you again shortly, during the question and answer section. Until then, I'm going to minimize my screen and hand it over to you.

>> Thank you, Amy.

>> Thank you, Amy. All right. We're ready to begin. You can see the title of our presentation. So, go ahead and advance to the next slide, please. We always like to begin with gratitude, to thank all of those who are involved within our study. Each time we learn more information about interpreters because of the people who participated both Deaf, hearing interpreters, all those who are involved in our studies. We want to give a large show of gratitude for those individuals for sharing their perspectives with us. We'd like to thank NCIEC for hosting tonight.

I know the beginning was a little awkward, but hopefully it will be smooth sailing now. Thank you for all you've done in inviting us here tonight. This evening, we have two fantastic interpreters with us. They're actually here in the room with us, so thank you both for your work this evening. Thank you for putting up with us and the issue. And actually, we have Cat, who is our technical assistance and support. Thank you for your work this evening.

And, again, to those who are here streaming through the webinar, thank you so much, both here in America, Canada, all of our friends, welcome and thank you so much for coming and participating.

>> We are both very excited to be here, and also looking forward to welcoming our international visitors who are watching as well. Go ahead to the next slide, please. I have to admit,

this is the first time I've done a webinar. Deb, having done this before, is a bit more skilled. If you see me fumbling a bit with advancing slides, I guess that's why. I know that all we have here is a camera plus four or five people as our audience, but we're so happy to be able to connect with all of you.

As you see here, we have an outline for the webinar. We'll move through each point. In the interest of time, we want to move along a little bit quicker. So, with that, I'll just show you that outline and then move on to the next slide. So the next slide, great. Carrie, thank you. I'll give you a moment to read what's here. So, Deb and I talk about interpreters. And we talk about interpreters in the sense of any interpreter regardless of language, if they're Deaf or hearing, we're talking about any interpreter in fact

We talk about a specific type of interpreter. We will specify if we're talking about Deaf or hearing interpreters. Otherwise, you'll note that it's about all different types of interpreters. In this study, it originated because Deb had been solved in another study with Len, and we began to notice that there continued to be questions that arose. And we were very interested in the questions, around the topic of power.

Given that, we decided to engage in our next study. And Len, Deb, and myself gained some information -- I guess I should back up. Deb and I began working and researching this topic to the further the rest of the study that had been done earlier. And that's actually seen on the next slide. Carrie, would you mind advancing to the next slide?

>> Russell: During that previous study, the three of us had been researching and looking at almost 2,000 interpreters in North America who had answered our survey. And we saw oftentimes discussion of power, and different perspectives, be it from the Deaf interpreters or the hearing interpreters, and how they viewed the concept of power differently, what their experiences were with power, and certainly within the legal realm. And by legal realm, we don't mean court only.

Now, legal can be more broadly defined. That previous study seemed to show that hearing interpreters were often in control, and they were the ones who decided whether or not a Deaf interpreter came into the setting, and they were the gatekeepers. They were often the first point of contact, so we saw that theme come into play again and again in our research. And we wanted to investigate that more deeply. Through our survey, we did see these patterns, but we weren't able to dialogue with those interpreters. So, this is our followup. If you wouldn't mind advancing to the next slide.

>> Shaw: So I really wanted to look at decision-making and how it was that interpreters went about making decisions, and

how those decisions actually impacted or influenced what happened. What you see here are the four questions that we were really considering. They're not really questions that we asked our subjects, but questions that we considered prior to beginning the study. How was it that interpreters went about decisions, and how did the decisions impact them and the results. Issues of power arose between Deaf and hearing interpreters when they worked together. So, on to the next slide.

>> Russell: All right. The next slide, what you'll see is how we went about setting up the study. You can see that it is a qualitative study. We used a technique called purposeful sample, which means we're taking information from experienced interpreters, looking at their experience, looking at their perspective. These interpreters are experienced so they have a rich amount of information and data to share.

We didn't give definition to the term power, but instead, we let the data lead us. This is called grounded theory. What was interesting was we wanted to see what their experience was, what their daily life was like. So we wanted to see what they had been trained to learn, or rather they had been trained, but we also wanted to look at what they had experienced as well. We started with 16 participants, and with an online survey. That helped us get a better idea of what they were experiencing, and what their education and training was, and so forth.

It took us 16 participants, 15 were interested in being involved in a further dialogue, so we formed focus groups. Those focus groups happened online using ASL, or a signed language. Both of our universities, my university, the University of Alberta, as well as Gallaudet University, approved this study. So, we'll talk a little bit more about the approach and methodology. We can go on to the next slide.

>> Shaw: Here on this slide, you get a sense of who we included in this. It was mentioned that we used purposeful sampling in our study. We identified people who met a number of criteria. They had to be nationally known, either in Canada, here, or the United States. These individuals had to be nationally certified. The system is a bit different in Canada versus the United States, so we wanted to recognize each certification system. We wanted to have individuals who were Deaf, CODAs, and hearing, with over 15 years experience in the legal field.

In addition, we wanted individuals from Canada and the United States. We selected 16 individuals, all of whom had participated in these online focus groups. Please advance the next slide.

>> Russell: You can see here this shows how many individuals were Deaf, how many individuals were CODAs, showing some of the

variance within the focus group. We had three people of color, three from Deaf families, five who grew up using a signed language. In Canada, we had one Deaf individual, two hearing, and one of those two was a CODA. In the United States, we had one Deaf individual, four hearing individuals, one of which was a CODA.

Again, as we looked at the dialogue, we took the data, which was over four hours, and next we'll show you what we discussed within those focus groups. So, next slide, please.

>> Shaw: We had eight questions that we provided to the participants in advance so they had an opportunity to review the questions and consider what their comments were going to be. You don't see eight questions shown here on the slide, but I think basically the questions covered each of these points and we asked about a number of these areas. We did not provide a definition of power to see how they brought up issues of power. We also didn't give definitions to a number of categories, they just simply emerged.

We asked about positions of power. We wanted to see if they had an opportunity to talk about it. We had four hours of discussion. People were easily able to talk about issues of power. We also wanted to give you an idea of some of the results first, and then we'll talk a little bit more about those results and come back to the results later on as well. So, next slide, please.

On this slide here, you see a number of different themes that emerge. There were five things that you see listed here. These were themes that seemed to be the most important ones that emerged from the data. And from this we're going to talk about four different categories. We'll be getting to that in just a moment. We wanted to get a sense of how people conceptualize the task of interpreting, how much did they understand about what they did as an interpreter, what was required of them.

We also noticed the interpreters talked about -- well, they talked a lot about their own personal sense of self, their sense of agency, when they had no control and no agency and were not able to make decisions. That's another area that emerged. We talked about the idea of training. That was something we heard quite often from our focus group participants. Issues of power also came up, not only power, but issues of privilege as well.

Another emerging theme that we heard quite often. In addition, people talked about the need to want to continue this kind of dialogue and engage in dialogue with colleagues so they could continue to develop further. We're going to be talking next about four different categories, and we see a lot of overlap in these categories. They're not mutually exclusive, but rather, they overlap quite extensively.

We'll again with each of the four categories. I want to remind you we're not specifically focused on the courtroom. When we talk about legal settings, it could be educational legal settings, medical legal settings, so we're really broad in our definition. Just to clarify, you see that many of these decisions don't only apply to legal settings. They're decisions that interpreters make in their everyday life, so these ideas can be generalized to other contexts. So, let's go on to see those four themes.

>> Russell: In considering the results, as we begin to show you the information and what the comments were from our focus group, we want you to start considering what these results mean. It shows that interpreters do have awareness of power, and they do also understand the concept of privilege. And with that knowledge, they can use both power and privilege in a positive way to advance the community within the legal realm, or they -- use their power and privilege, and that will have a negative impact on the Deaf community and the consumers.

These results show interpreters, both professional and in their personal lives, use both power and privilege. And it seems that interpreters, as they discuss these concepts with the awareness of diversity and power -- when they really analyze this in-depth, they realize how it impacts their decision-making process, and it can do so in a positive way. Let's go ahead and go to the next slide.

>> Shaw: Actually, if you could advance two more slides, Carrie. That's the one we need right there. Thank you. What you see here are the four categories that emerged, again, from all of the comments, four hours' worth of data. We're going to look at each one of these. And the next slide, we're going to look at conceptualizing the task, how people understood the task of interpreting.

>> Russell: So you can see here that when conceptualizing the work of interpreting, what we're talking about is how the interpreters understand the context of their work, what they need to do before, during, and after the assignment, what considerations are at play, and when conceptualizing the interpretation, they have to consider how they are going to influence the stakeholders within the legal realm.

We'll see some quotes related to these categories in a moment. We'll go ahead and go on to the next slide. So within conceptualization of the work, we have several subthemes that came into play. People talked about what it means to interpret, and what that looks like. So is it meaning-based interpreting, or are we going from form? So how does one work within the two languages for meaning-based interpretation?

What are people trying to do with language within that

context? Next you'll see the issue arising, or the subtheme arising, of teaming. What does it look like to effectively work with your co? Unfortunately, you'll see issues of what it looks like when it's not a successful teaming experience. People talked about how they made decisions, about whether or not they were qualified for the work, when and how they accepted a job or did not, what they did to prepare for the job before going to the assignment, and how they talked with Deaf consumers or the hearing consumers.

How did they educate individuals about interpreting, and what they role was. So you can see these different subthemes here, all of them within the realm of conceptualization. Going on to the next slide.

>> Shaw: If you could advance one more slide. We're going to be showing you a number of quotes now, and I think we've chosen 20 or 25 quotes. Again, this is from four hours of conversation, so we've carefully selected these quotes. And hopefully they will demonstrate each of these categories. The quotes are in English, and we will translate them into American Sign Language. And hopefully we'll do that accurately, right, Deb?

This particular quote talks about how you go about using strategies. Talking about qualifications, talking about what the job actually requires of you. So it's not just about the interpreter coming in and interacting with the environment, but rather knowing what's happening in the environment and how to make sure that the job functions effectively following the protocols and the goals of that particular setting. So the next slide.

>> Russell: You see this quote here. Interpreters are talking about how they establish a team. So, that includes interpreting as well as talking about what it means to be a successful team. And it would seem this interpreter was talking about the practice of whether or not they want to work within that setting, and they have to then choose the right people to work with for that to be a successful interpretation.

So, again, it falls under conceptualization. How does one understand one's work?

>> Shaw: Next slide. This particular quote comes from a hearing interpreter who was working with a Deaf interpreter in a police setting looking to the Deaf interpreter to lead that setting. So that way, not only does it allow the Deaf person to take the lead, but it also allows the police officer to understand more about the Deaf person in that role, and mentions feeling a bit intimidated. Remember, when we're talking about these quotes, we're getting them from a person's contextual reference. So what you're seeing here is not intended that the interpreter feels a sense of dispowerment, but rather, is

leading in this way to form an effective team between the Deaf interpreter.

>> Russell: Right. This is a nice quote. It shows the interpreter is predicting the impact on the hearing consumers, considering what the impact on the police will be, what their view of the Deaf person might be. For example, if the police officer is always seeing Deaf people as those who are being arrested, right? You now have a Deaf interpreter taking the lead, and what that impact might be, that the police officer now understands that this is someone of equal power.

Moving on to the next slide. Looking at these quotes, the first one on the slide, the interpreter is talking about standing one's ground, being confident. If it really requires the Deaf interpreter, then you wait. You wait until a Deaf interpreter arrives. If no Deaf interpreter arrives, you do not proceed. That awareness, that level of awareness, looking at the context, understanding what is needed, having respect for the work, having respect for the Deaf individuals involved in that legal setting.

Now to the second quote. This one really emphasizes two different things at two different levels of awareness. When we were researching, we found that consecutive interpreting, interpreters say it's requiring, they need to use it in these settings. But the interpreter was able to justify the use of consecutive interpreting. It's not just the textbook answer, "you have to do consecutive interpreting," but they were able to justify why, what the impact is on the setting, on the consumers.

Again, we have that overlap of power.

>> Shaw: So we've seen a couple of different examples in these quotes of people's comments explicitly talking about what it is that they're required to do in order to have the work be done effectively. Now you're going to be seeing different kinds of perspectives of individuals expressed through their quotes. So, next slide, please. In this quote, the person's talking at not needing to prepare because they've been involved in this kind of setting for over 20 years. So even with that involvement, feeling preparation was unnecessary.

So we talked about specific kinds of preparation being unnecessary, because already having a sense of what was going to be required of them. So really understanding a specific case, the people involved, logistics around it. This, again, reflects a different way of conceptualizing our work from what we've seen thus far. This ties into the second category, and that's sense of agency, or sense of having no agency. And, again, we'll talk a little bit more about what it means to have a sense of agency. So, next slide, please.

>> Russell: For us, when we really looked at the data, we realized that what people were talking about was their sense of being able to make decisions for themselves knowing that they could be the initiator, that they could take responsibility for their actions, that they could show that if they were to make one decision, they understood the impact of that decision. If they were to make another decision, they understood that another result might be the case.

So it was critical thinking at a deeper level, being able to understand what your actions would do and then acting on that. To the next slide.

>> Shaw: I wanted to add, too, you're going to see some examples where interpreters came to realize where they'd been undertaken a certain practice that they wanted to change. Their own decision-making, their own way of working was realized to be ineffective. A new change was necessary, and they were able to adapt to that new change and make it happen. Here you see in idea of an interpreter showing up and wondering whether the people are seeing, and how that makes a significant impact, be it the way you approach the room, the way you're dressed, the way you work with other people, that influences people's perception of the interpreter, as well as all of the other Deaf and hearing people in the setting.

One thing that's not here on the slide but we intended to put here was a quote we had from an interpreter who was African American. This individual said, when they enter the courtroom or any kind of a legal setting, very often people would see them not as a professional. That wasn't the first expected role that they might have. They felt the person was the defendant or court reporter, even though the interpreter was wearing a business suit.

So, coming into a setting, there was more than with a person who was white. And so her sense of agency had to be heightened. She had to have an ability to come into a situation and articulate as a professional what she was doing there to change people's perception of who she was, and that's all done through her actions, how she was able to demonstrate that sense of agency, and needing to have it a bit more heightened, and her conceptualization of the task and what it meant for her to be in that setting, also, was raised and heightened.

>> Russell: We see here the second quote. Again, we have an interpreter who conceptualizes the work. They understand they need to go to the assignment and interpret, but they understand the responsibility of educating others. If they are educating other individuals about what they need and do, then they understand that the impact in the future will be more positive. So that person accepted that responsibility for their own

professional -- for educating others for their own profession.

And, again, this interpreter was really focused on what the standards were. This wasn't someone who was just showing up and doing their job and leaving at the end of the day. They were accepting the accountability, prepared, willing to take the time to explain to others what their role was, to explain to others in the courtroom what it meant to be an interpreter, to interpret consecutively, how they needed to educate individuals on Deaf/hearing teams and so forth, so it shows a heightened sense of agency.

>> Williamson: Next slide. There's a lot of text here, but I hope most of you have already read this particular quote. Whenever there's a Deaf person, a CDI normally would be called in. This particular Deaf person had a graduate degree. It was assumed a Deaf interpreter would not be needed for this individual. But the Deaf person said they wanted a CDI. This was kind of a new experience for the Deaf person who, through dialogue, was able to understand a change to practice, that they wanted to have natural native signing.

So, educational level did not determine as to whether or not a CDI would be used. This was an example of a CDI accepting something new and changing their behavior and their way of thinking about the work. The conceptualization of how the work would work as a result of this experience changed for the future. All right. So, next slide.

>> Russell: Again, we know that this is quite a bit of text. This is a great example of an interpreter who's been trained, who's working in the legal setting, saying that I know I should do X, Y, and Z, but I've not yet had that experience. So they understand the concept. They know what it is they should do, but they were saying, admitting, that in the last two years, they've not ever done that. Knowing what one should do, that textbook answer, but not really experiencing it, not actually bringing it forth, not doing it.

The second quote really emphasizes that comparison. You know what, I'm happy the way I am. It's been working thus far. You have to be able to stand -- correction to the interpretation, you have to be able to stand your ground. If you think a CDI is needed, then that's what you get. So it comes back to that conceptualization. Are you feeling pressure from the police officers to get the job done, or from the Deaf person saying you're good enough, I don't need a CDI?

If this interpreter understands what is needed, they are confident and they continue to wait until the CDI arrives.

>> Shaw: Next, we're still talking about agency, but not necessarily a person having agency or a sense of agency, but a lack of agency. And so we're going to now be speaking of the

opposite of what we've seen thus far. So, next slide, please. This is basically the opposite of what we've just talked about, not being confident about decision-making, not feeling there's a sense of ownership or ability to take initiative and make decisions.

And as a result, not really establishing good, positive rapport and relationships with others. And so we're going to look at now a couple of quotes from this particular perspective. So, next slide, please.

>> Russell: So you see the first quote. Maybe some of you feel the same. You just can't prepare. But if you look a little deeper, I question that. Is that true? Interpreters often will say, "no one gave me any information." But what is it that interpreters do to try and garner that information? What kind of language does one use? Look at the passive language in this quote. I'm stuck, I can't get it, they won't give it to me.

There's lack of agency. You can't meet with the lawyer except for just a few minutes beforehand, but there are other interpreters that say, yes, in fact, you can. This interpreter has a lack of agency. They feel as though they can do nothing. But, again, when you look at that, maybe that's their experience within the legal setting. But do we accept that as the norm, as the status quo?

>> Shaw: And that ties directly in with the second quote you see here on the same slide. Again, going back to this sense that I've done it this way for 20 years, this is the way I've done it, and I don't need to have preparation. Perhaps the interpreter doesn't need preparation, but the situation changes with each setting. Coming in with a preconceived idea can cause issues.

>> Russell: Going on to the next slide.

>> Shaw: Looking at these quotes, it's kind of interesting, actually. A person who withdrew themself from the case because the team wasn't working out as to be expected, so they left the setting. We're talking here about agency. This person maybe feels helpless and has no sense of what to do, has no strategies to follow on. This is an example of that, but also ties into conceptualization of the task, and once again, the notion of power comes up here.

And we'll talk a little bit more about that when we get to that section, but this person feeling as if they have no other option but to walk out.

>> Russell: Notice the second quote. The courts are the ones who decide who is qualified and who's not. That's not my responsibility. But if it's the courts who are selecting the interpreters and the teams, will that teaming then be successful? Again, emphasizing that lack of agency. "I can't do

anything about it." The third quote, there are times when I have no say over what a court will or won't do. There's nothing I can do. It's out of my control.

"There's nothing I can do." That really shows lack of analysis. If you look at the other quotes from the other interpreters.

>> Shaw: So the third category relates to training. And we have a couple of different subthemes within this category that you see here. And also a couple of quotes that tie into ethical decision-making and training, and most of this came to training as it relates to working with a team, but as well, specialized training for legal settings. And then, again, here you see this idea of team practices and how the teams working together effectively. Let's take a look at the quote on the next slide.

>> Russell: Here in this quote, we've labeled this as continuous training. And it also shows that the interpreter themselves are aware of power, diversity, which means they realize that some problems cannot be solved on their own, that sometimes you need to continue to go to bat, perhaps with an organization or agency, perhaps if there's a policy, that you will always have a Deaf interpreter there, then that would mean that you'd have successful interactions.

So this person is thinking outside of their own realm of power, how it is they can incorporate and work collaboratively with others.

>> Shaw: So what the system can do to help. Let's go ahead and go to the next slide. Unfortunately, this is not something we heard just once, but a couple of times as we reviewed all of the data. Interpreters quite often sharing this same idea, where hearing and Deaf interpreters will be working together, and hearing interpreters will make certain decisions and take certain actions. And, again, it comes back to conceptualization of the work and how people conceptualize the idea of working together.

And clearly, we can see power dynamics. If the Deaf interpreter is asking for clarification and getting a refusal, the Deaf interpreter doesn't have a recourse to make sure that's an effective interpretation. So the Deaf interpreter's conceptualization of the interpreting task is now influenced. We're going to look at a couple others as well. The next slide goes right into the issue of power.

>> Russell: So, going back -- looking back at the quote that Risa just mentioned, you have two hearing interpreters. Do they understand how they just stripped the power of the Deaf interpreter? Do they understand how they've misused their own power within the courtroom? So these are some of the subthemes we've been talking about this evening. When interpreters have

awareness of their own power, they can then influence the situation in a positive or a negative way.

The quote that we just showed shows how it influences and impacts the situation in a negative way. We'll show you a few more quotes. We'll go ahead and go on to the next slide.

>> Shaw: This quote is really about just a general understanding of the system, and using my power within that system if I'm aware and understand the system well enough, I can navigate effectively. And that's a positive use of power in this instance. It could become more of a negative perspective depending on how you see it, but, again, it's about a person's ability to navigate through that system, and having an awareness and understanding of what that entails, and being able to make certain decisions within that context.

>> Russell: Perhaps you remember the quote that we just brought up to the interpreter can't get the prep, they're unable to. Maybe the interpreter doesn't know the system well enough to be able to navigate through it and find the information, or where it is they can get that. That's conceptualization of the task. Again, these are all overlapping, not mutually exclusive. We'll go ahead and go on to the next slide.

So, as Risa just mentioned, you can use your privilege and power in a positive way, or in a not-so-positive way. Right? As an interpreter, within the courtroom, I can request that a particular case be moved along on the docket. So that means that maybe I can get to another job or another place. What happens to the Deaf person? Maybe they want to sit and actually learn from other court cases, seeing what other people do, take advantage of that learning experience.

So if we actually have them move them up in the docket, we cut off that experience and that learning opportunity. That's a lost experience for the Deaf person. So who has the power in this situation? The interpreter does. The courts will often respect what the interpreter is asking. Okay, great, we'll save some time, save some money, the interpreter will leave early. But, again, how does one use that power? It can be very difficult to navigate that.

>> Shaw: Next slide, please. So we have two different perspectives of power on this slide, and in one quote, you see the person constantly assessing and reflecting on their work to make sure they're doing what they should be doing, and seeing how they can adjust accordingly, so assessing their qualifications and you see the other categories of agency, conceptualization, and power displayed in the quote.

If you look at the second quote, this person says, I come in, do my job, leave and that's about it. Very different perspective, saying there's nothing that they can do to

influence the work that they do in that setting. The point here is that everything we do has a charge to it. There's nothing that's neutral. I always am bringing some kind of a positive or negative influence on everything I'm involved in. Even if a person is coming in, doing their work and leaving, they have an influence. As to whether or not that is positive or negative, that's to be decided.

As we move on to the next slide, being very much aware of the time right now.

>> Russell: You have the PowerPoint at home. You're able to read through the other quotes we have here. But this one is talking about, from the Deaf perspective, hearing interpreters often are the ones who are in control. They are the gatekeepers. How, when, if the Deaf person should be brought into the situation. Which is really unfortunate. That happens again and again, that theme came up again and again in our data, that the hearing interpreters control when the Deaf interpreters are invited into the arena.

So you have the hearing perspective that hearing interpreters are often calling CDIs into the courtroom, but the Deaf perspective is that that's not the case. So the Deaf perspective is they're not actually being called into these situations. We have a conflicting perception of what's actually happening. We'll go ahead and go on to the next slide.

>> Shaw: Again, in this example, we see the hearing interpreter's conceptualization of the task, and the Deaf interpreter's conceptualization of the task being very different and at odds with one another. Having the Deaf person come into a situation where the four hearing interpreters are meeting with the attorney, not being able to get caught up, very oppressive to the Deaf interpreter and using their privilege, power, or whatever it is, that can really wreak havoc of the interpreting team. In the interest of time, we're going to move along a little bit more quickly. Let's go on to the next slide.

This next quote is very similar to that previous one. So, just take a look at that. Similar concept here about who gets the information and when that information is communicated and received. Where is the teamwork? Where is the ability to work together when one person gets the information and the other doesn't? And again we see displayed here issues of power and oppression. We're not moving quickly through these quotes because they're not important. It's quite the opposite. They are most impactful. We hope you take an opportunity to review them later. Next slide, please.

>> Russell: So, again, we see two different perspectives. The Deaf interprets are saying that the hear the interpreter is unable to analyze their own skills and decide when a Deaf

interpreter is appropriate. The Deaf interpreter feels that, yes, a Deaf interpreter is needed, whereas the hearing interpreter feels that they're fine. Maybe that's been their practice all along, the but the Deaf interpreters view is different. How can we bring the Deaf interpreters in if the hearing interpreter doesn't feel that they need them? Again, they are the gatekeepers.

>> Shaw: It's not just an attitude, but it's reflected in language, who is assessing the language, what language is being assessed. Maybe there needs to be input and feedback on the assessment that needs to be done by multiple people. Where is the power in terms of who does the assessing of to the language and how it's navigated? Conversation is the most important part of what that is. So, let's take a look at the next slide.

I think this is a similar one, so let's move past this to the next slide. We've already talked about this.

>> Russell: That's right. Next slide.

>> Shaw: Honestly, this was so very impact. And more than one person articulated this same thing. We also had people agreeing with this comment, and very much supporting it. So this kind of thing is something that we saw pretty often. As a Deaf person, I see the power imbalance. And, you know, you can't walk in life without seeing that disparity and inequality. People of color see race. They live race on a daily basis. And people who are white simply don't see race at all in their life, in their world.

So the privilege and the opportunity that you have is one not to actually have to see and live that ism, that racism. So when these disparities occur between Deaf and hearing people, as a hearing person, I may not recognize that, because my lived experience every day does not incorporate that experience, whereas the Deaf interpreter it's just the opposite. It's a living, breathing experience for them. And so really, to see the hearing person's perspective of what it might be like for a Deaf person to just walk in their shoes, if you will, and to be able to take in their experience and respect that narrative even though it's not part of the hearing interpreter's lived experience. So this is a good example of that being portrayed in this quote.

>> Russell: Precisely. And in respect of time, we're going to go ahead and trying to wrap it up so we leave some time for questions and answers. And really, we just want to show what the study results showed. We have different perspectives when it comes to Deaf and hearing interpreters. We saw many issues arise in regards to training. We saw the importance of self-reflection and analysis. We saw what happens when people have those positive experiences, and we also saw when people had no idea

exactly what to do. They just up and left. They felt stuck, they felt helpless, and they didn't know what to do.

It seems that the sense of awareness, of power, and privilege comes into play in each decision that we make. And then those decisions have an impact on the hearing and Deaf people within the setting.

>> Shaw: Going on to the next slide. Actually, I think the next three -- next one, and then one more, please. Great. We wanted to really talk about how this can be applied to interpreters as well as interpreter educators, and many others as well, but specifically to these groups. And speaking more specifically to interpreter educators. How do we as educators model these kinds of conversations, and how often do we model the un-packaging and assessment that has to happen in terms of understanding everyone's perspective?

As teachers, we really need to do that kind of modeling, and mentors and supervisors as well, whatever your position might be. As interpreters, work together. We sit down together and make sure we see each other's perspective, to hear each other's experiences and assess our own accordingly at a very deep level, and that kind of modeling really comes to this idea of the work itself. How is it that we look at the task of interpreting, and how can we do that without seeing the overlay of power, and how that as well ties into all of the isms, racism, sexism, we interpret in a society, we're involved in situations where interpreting is happening.

In those settings, decisions are made that will influence the interactions, the conversations, and the confluences and outcomes of those interactions. And so that's why it's so important for us to think about how we insert ourselves into those settings. And not doing so can cause a lot of concerns. We saw this as being one of the most important things, how we model this behavior, how we talk about this behavior. It was easily seen in these dialogues that these kinds of conversations were most impactful to interpreters in their work, and that's the most important thing from our study.

>> Russell: We've begun thinking about the fact that as we teach legal interpreting, we teach the different techniques. We teach what needs to be done, what needs to be known, but we need to take a step back and talk about power and privilege at a deeper level, and how they overlap, before we begin talking about the techniques and the approaches to interpreting. Maybe we should take a step back and really consider these concepts.

It's very interesting, because with these focus groups and the discussions that took place, we realized that it was the first time that they had the opportunity to talk about this in-depth, power and privilege, even though they had been working

in the field -- rather, in the legal field for over 15 years, they were eager for more discussions and dialogues, because often, we don't have a place to talk about this.

We don't have a forum. We should talk about what we should do the next time we see each other, what we will do, but do we have these discussions about power, privilege, and isms? Do we really?

>> Shaw: At the onset, Deb said, why don't we look at what interpreters pout down as their footprint, how do they leave their mark. The more we talked about that and conducted our research, and looked at all the data, I think that's exactly what we're seeing in people's comments. What is the mark that we leave as interpreters, the footprint we leave. Having said that, we want to thank you all for watching. We do have some time remaining where we can take your questions. So, Amy, I think you're out there somewhere. You can rejoin us.

>> Russell: We hope you are.

>> Williamson: I'm here. Thank you so much. Carrie? All right. If you could advance. Go ahead with some references in your PowerPoint, make sure we show that. Deb and Risa, thank you so much. I know you're both willing to be contacted afterwards, I have your emails there. We're going to go ahead and accept questions now from our audience members. Go ahead and write those in your chat box. Right now I see no questions. So I'll take this opportunity, then.

When we began the webinar, you were talking about your research and the findings. And that this really could apply to any setting in general. And I would agree, I would agree with that, but I wonder, what's unique about the legal setting and how interpreters that are studying a power and privilege, how does that come into play within that setting?

>> Shaw: Deb, if you want to take it, or . . .

>> Russell: Sure. Thanks for asking the tough questions first, right, Amy?

>> Williamson: Sure. And also to let you know, there are a few other questions as well.

>> Russell: Okay. The legal setting really requires us to understand the multiple perspectives, the impact system of power. And we see oftentimes through these quotes that interpreters feel that lack of agency, that they feel that the system has the power and oppresses them, and they are unable to act. I think that's one of the differences.

>> Shaw: And if I could add as well, you know, I think that because it is a legal system, we know that it already is built to oppress minorities and many others. It's inherent within the way it operates. And so if interpreters are added, it's sometimes worse than what's already there and present within

that system. So, you know, there's no way for people to rise above that system. It just creates even more oppression, again, just because of the system being as it is.

　　>> Williamson: Okay. So we have a few questions for you. And you should be able to see them. I know right now you're not able to.

　　>> Shaw: I can't right now.

　　>> Williamson: You should be able to look at those in a moment.

　　>> Shaw: We'll take a look at them later.

　　>> Williamson: One of the questions is asking about the focus group. When you're looking at the Deaf interpreters, did they feel oppressed, and if so, what did they do? What was their response within those settings that they felt oppressed, did they have a lack of agency, and did they just passively accept it, did they push back? What was their response?

　　>> Shaw: Some of them did nothing. Some of them left. Some of them had no response. And maybe having no response one time, maybe the next time they would learn and push back. People spoke about earlier on in their career not knowing how to address the issue, but then as they progressed along, they were able to speak back and, again, facing this issue time and time again, the frustration of continually having to deal with the same issue created a lot of frustration, just because of the amount of time.

　　So there was a sense of these interpreters feeling both unable to respond to the situation, but also it's one that occurs so very often and is unresolved.

　　>> Russell: When talking to this group, the Deaf interpreters, my sense was that many of them at first when they began the discussion with the hearing interpreters -- so, initially, they would want to talk about it. But then they would get pushback from the hearing interpreters. They were resistant. And once that resist tense was gone, they continued to talk, but, if the resistance remained, they stopped the discussion. If the hearing interpreter resisted each time, they weren't interested in having a conversation, which meant that influenced the conceptualization of the work.

　　If those two people are working together or teaming in the future, are they going to be to have a discussion and resolve these issues? It seems that that wouldn't be the case. So that resistance from the hearing interpreter, the Deaf interpreters would react to that. If it continued, they would stop trying. They needed to first see how the hearing interpreters would respond to them, right.

　　>> Williamson: Sorry, I see a lot of questions coming in. There's another question that is asking about the focus group,

you had Deaf and hearing individuals, those who signed, those who were CODAs, those who came from signing families. What was their educational and training background? And the second question relating to that is, how did that then influence their court work, how they conceptualized the work, and the sense of empowerment that they had.

>> Shaw: Remember, we're talking hear about two separate countries. So the training is very different accordingly. Here in the United States, interpreters -- all of those who were in our groups had taken a lot of training, both Deaf interpreters and hearing interpreters had taken a lot of specialized legal training throughout their career. In Canada, the interpreters there had a lot less training than those in the United States.

And I think that's one reason why Deb and I had this category about training, because we saw these issues emerge in both countries. So more training actually would result, you would think, in more strategies. That simply makes sense that you'd have opportunities to converse with other interpreters, whereas if you had less training, that would result in less strategies. So, after training was provided, a couple interpreters spoke to us and said they started to pursue more training.

I remember one person saying they were talking with in the focus group. As a result of that conversation, it changed the way they behaved. Others said, because they took more training, they were able to reflect about what they talked about in the focus group, and that resulted in positive change. Yeah, definitely, training results in positive change.

>> Russell: The key here is dialogue. Definitely. Many of these individuals in the focus group were learning from each other, whether they had training or no training, or limited training, I should say. They were learning from each other. And from that came change. The dialogues were the catalyst for change. That resistance faded. And from that, then, more discussion ensued and changes happened. If you're not going to discuss it, how can the changes come to be?

>> Williamson: All right. So, if you have hearing interpreters who want to work with Deaf interpreters, you have that desire. However, there are no Deaf interpreters in that location, they are not qualified, or they are not available. The other question is, if you have a Deaf person who doesn't want -- it seems that no one wants to work with them -- rather, if the Deaf person doesn't want a Deaf interpreter there and the hearing interpreter does want a Deaf interpreter to team with them, how do you work that out?

>> Russell: Well, several participants talked about the lack of qualified Deaf interpreters in the area. And then you talk about if a hearing interpreter doesn't request a Deaf

interpreter, then we're never going to expand that pool of Deaf interpreters, right? So we need to take the first step, which is mentoring. We expand that pool of Deaf interpreters. And if, in fact, the Deaf community can then see the Deaf interpreters working in a variety of settings within the community, they will begin to then accept Deaf interpreters.

But if they don't have Deaf interpreters there, if the hearing interpreter is not qualified, then they're asking for the Deaf interpreter. Sometimes the hearing interpreter needs to explain the Deaf interpreter isn't here for you, they're here for me. That comes back to power and privilege. And also, saving face, right? Oh, I don't need to work with a Deaf interpreter, I'm just fine. But is that really going to be a successful interpretation if you don't team with a Deaf interpreter?

>> Shaw: That ties into the way interpreters perceive their work. If they see it as just being there on a particular day or time, and they're eligible because no one else will do it, they may choose to work alone. Maybe it requires two hearing interpreters and they choose to do it on their own because no one else is available. Or maybe is requires four interpreters, and two choose to do it on their own because of scarcity.

It's about how we conceptualize what needs to be done and the sense of agency when we talk about the work itself. Sometimes it is about me and my skills, but it also is about the job requirements in. What is necessary for this job to be effective, and then use that as a way to negotiate.

>> Russell: We talk a lot about technology and the use of technology. So VRI within the courtroom settings. So, not many people brought that up. However, in Canada, many of them do work remotely. And sometimes that means in a legal setting, you will require a Deaf interpreter to be working remotely. So, VRI is an option. It's not a perfect solution by any means, but it is potentially an option.

>> Williamson: That's great. All right. Our final question for the evening. So, within the focus group, you talked about a minimum amount of experience, 15 years in the legal setting. But it seems that many of them had more than that. So I wonder if some of them -- if some of the tension comes from all those years of experience. You know, they've been fine for the last 15-20 years working in the court as they have. They haven't needed to work with a Deaf interpreter as their team, and so I wonder if those who had, perhaps, less experience, if you were to talk with those interpreters, if they would be more willing to work with Deaf interpreters, if that came up, if there was perspective in regards to the years of experience as compared to those who are newer in the field. Did you see that come up?

>> Shaw: That's a great question for another study, to

replicate this particular study using a younger group of interpreters. It would be fascinating. Not just that, but --

>> Williamson: If I may clarify.

>> Shaw: What was that?

>> Williamson: I wanted to clarify. I don't mean younger, I just mean less years of experience in the court. I wasn't actually talking about age.

>> Shaw: I guess I call them young, but, right.

>> Williamson: I know, I know. I didn't mean to interrupt. Sorry.

>> Shaw: That's fine. I agree. Really, because the years of experience, just interpreting in general, is one thing. But think about the age at which you started interpreting. If a person started interpreting as a part of the community, maybe they were a CODA, or perhaps they grew up with Deaf people and were interpreting but they never called it interpreting at the time, or it could be someone who later just kind of becomes an interpreter during the machine model.

I hope we're back to the community base, where we look to interpreters to be invited, but that may have an influence. Maybe discussions of power would be different. I'm not certain, but, that is certainly a potential.

>> Russell: Right. And again when you're talking about what it means to be qualified, right? Who is the most qualified? Typically, someone with a minimum of 15 years experience. That might not be the case. Perhaps you have someone with five years of experience who has a broad array of work experiences. So what does it mean to be qualified? And, again, here in this discussion, we didn't talk about that. It didn't come up, but does more experience -- does that experience perhaps prohibit those newer interpreters coming into the field?

Are we not welcoming them into the field as we should be? So, there are certainly different issues related to that question.

>> Williamson: Right. Different levels of gatekeeping, certainly. Different ways that that comes into play. So, many different factors that influence, you know, that sense of agency and everything else that you talked about. Many things to consider. Thank you so much.

>> Shaw: Thank you.

>> Williamson: Carrie, we'll go ahead and advance the next slide, please. All right. So, continuing the conversation. Both presenters are willing to continue this discussion of these concepts. Next slide.

>> Shaw: While you're advancing the slide, we wanted to again thank all of you who are watching and viewing this, and your different groups out there. Thank you, and please feel free to contact us. Thank you, Amy, and Carrie. Thanks to both of you,

and all of the folks who are running behind the scenes, including interpreters who are still working right now.

>> Williamson: Yes, thank you, everyone, for your time. Absolutely. And as you see, we have the next slide, thanking all the individuals at Gallaudet, technical assistance, the CART provider, just everyone. Thank you so much. The myriad of people that went ahead and logged in to watch that webinar, we're grateful for the opportunity to disseminate this information. We'd like to thank everyone. Go ahead and advance to the next slide.

So we have our upcoming webinar, that will be April 11th. Continuing on the theme of power and privilege. We have Erica West Oyedele. She will be presenting some of her research for her master's, Black Narratives and Culturally Competent Services. We look forward to that webinar, and we will be making an announcement on that soon.

>> Shaw: Very much looking forward to that.

>> Williamson: As am I. All right. Going on to the next slide, please. All right. In the chat box, Carrie already explained how you are to obtain your CEUs, so this evening we will be sending out an email. In that email, there will be an evaluation. Please fill out the evaluation. And at the bottom of that evaluation, it will ask for your RID number. That member number, then, we will compare to those who actually registered and logged in.

And if you did actually log in and fill out the evaluation, then you will, in fact, receive your CEUs. Sometimes the process can take a little bit longer with 140 participants, so please be patient with us. We should be done within a month to six weeks. And we'll have your CEUs for you. And they will show up on your transcript on the RID website. If you are participating in a group this evening, in that email that we're sending out this evening, there will be an instruction sheet on how you can each receive your CEUs.

You'll have to fill out some paperwork with your name, RID membership number. You don't individually have to fill that out. If you are watching as a group, you would just sign and register with that one particular registration sheet. And I think that's about it. The webinar, again, was recorded. We did actually make it happen.

>> Russell: Yes!

>> Williamson: It did happen, yep. So we will be uploading that. And it'll be available sometime next week. When it is ready, we will send out an email and let you know that it's up. And you can watch it again at your leisure. Some information about our webinar and resources is right here at www.interpretereducation.org. I want to make sure that we thank

our funders, going on to the next slide. The Consortium Centers are funded by grants from the U.S. Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services, and so forth. Thank you, Debra. Thank you, Risa. We really appreciate your time, your experience, your expertise.

   >> Absolutely, we enjoyed it.

   >> Williamson: Thank you.

   >> Yes, and please continue to dialogue with one another.

   >> Absolutely, absolutely.

   >> Williamson: And without further ado, goodnight, everyone.

   >> SKSK.

   >> Williamson: Yes, SKSK.

   [End of Session, 7:35 p.m. CT]