

11/19/2011 DC-S and the Dialogic Work Analysis - Part II

>>> Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to the third webinar in this series on demand control schema. I'm Amy Kroll. I just want to do housekeeping items before I turn it over to Robyn. First of all, as you can see, we have our interpreters on the screen. In order to see them best, pick fine color or fine gray from the drop down menu on the window. There is also a captioning occurring. You can open up that window going to the toolbar and selecting the closed captioning icon. If you have any technical issues throughout this webinar, these use the chat function, we have members from the National Clearinghouse ready to assist you guys. And also use the chat function to ask questions of the presenter. You can ask questions any time, I will be gathering the questions for Robyn, that appropriate time they will get asked. I will be asking Robyn the questions, she will be responding, we will streamline the presentation a little bit. You have been looking forward to seeing Robyn, but we had issues with streaming the interpreter, we felt that was important before the system is more complex. That is all of the house keeping items I have more after the session is over. I want to turn it over to Robyn, she is coming to us from Scotland today. So, Robyn, the floor is yours.

>> Great. Thank you very much, Amy. Hello, everybody from Scotland, where just -- about an hour ago I actually did hear a bagpipe playing just out my window. So, I thought that was quite interesting. I thought I would

share that with you, it doesn't happen all of the time, that's not what people all do here in Scotland, but that was kind of interesting. In the session, we're going to be putting together all of the various skills that we've been talking about at the webinar and also working on in the listserv for those of you who have not seen the videos from past sessions or have been apart of them live, this third session may seem a little bit confusing if you haven't been up to speed, but I encourage you, if you have not seen the first two, to take a look at those and hopefully, the information that we talk about here will fit nicely into place. We're going to be using -- both the PowerPoint that you see in front of you, as a visual as well as the packet that Amy sent out to you earlier. Of different examples. So, I'll be toggling back and forth between the PowerPoint, as well as the packet.

Before we jump into this third session, I want to make sure that we remind everybody where we have been. In the first presentation, back in may, I did ant overview of all of -- DC-S encompasses. And in the second presentation, which was really a follow up to the listserv activities. We talked about the practical skills how to identify and articulate demands and controls and we also started teach a new set of skills, the demand constellations and values. In this third session what we're going to be doing is in essence putting it altogether and asking the questions, so what? That is, what is the point of all of us. What is the usefulness, etc. That's what we're going to be talking about today.

Again, just to make sure that we're all on the same page, in the first presentation, I designed it in a way if you recall where I asked us to embrace certain conceptual frames and as a result of embracing those conceptual frames we would have to abandoned others. The first couple of things I asked us to embrace was the this idea that interpreting is best needs as a practice profession. I asked us to embrace the idea that jobs could be understood as interactive and dynamic. That is, that they involved demands, that which the job is asking of you and controls that which you as the interpreter bring to bear in response to demands of the job.

In other words, having this interactive view is a much more strategic and -- empowering view than it is to perceive work as happening to you. I wanted to emphasize in the first session, as I did as well in the second session, that this is meant to be a taxonomy. It is meant to help us organize our thoughts and be on the same page about what we're talking about so that we can have constructive conversations.

I also -- also asked in the first presentation that we embrace the understanding of what that means to be professionally responsible, which is really a conversation about values. What would that mean? It would mean that we would have to be responsible for effective execution of professional values. Which is actually quite accomplish thing. Because -- professional values is not a list of dos and don'ts. Professional values are a more fluid approach to understanding contractual factors and then regulating and

compelling behaviors based on those values. Of course, the behaviors may very well look different context to context, but the values behind them are still the same. That was a very different conversation to have, I mean, certainly context-based decision making is not a terribly unique conversation to have in the field. But how do we understand the values that in essence create a valuable book end to context decision making. One of the problems with context based decision making it can be dismissed or criticized as what we call ethical relativism in the ethics world. You can justify any behavior by pointing to something in the context. But we want to be accused of that is in an ethical way, we want to make sure that we book end, it is the best word that I can think of or best analogy that I can come up with, book end the other side of that conceptually based decision making was an understanding of sanctioned values. So, we talked about that theoretically and practiced that on the -- listserv, a complex thing for us. Because it a new conversation to have.

Of course, in the first presentation. Throughout this idea of -- of abandoning and embracing and the challenges that presents, I suggested contracts based in DCS that would help us in that process of embracing and abandoning. Then, we followed up the proposed contracts on the listserv, what does it means to identify and articulate demands and controls. What does it mean to demand and articulate consequences as relates to values and how do we understand professional responsibility in this idea of --

[No audio]

>> Hi, everybody, this is Amy. It seems like we have lost Robyn momentarily. I'm sure that she will be back.

>> I'm right here, Amy.

>> Great. Thanks, go ahead. Robyn.

>> I don't know why that happened. So, in essence, we have put the ideas and things all together in a contract of a decision making tool, which we refer to as DCCRD. Which is, demands, controls, consequences and resulting demands. So, now we move into -- the topic of so what?

Why do we need decision making models? Or why do we need taxonomies in general? As I mentioned earlier. Taxonomies help us organize our thoughts and they help us manipulate our thoughts in ways that are standardized. So, we can have constructive conversations. Unfortunately, all practice professions recognize that ethical codes cannot accomplish ethical decision making for us. Oftentimes ethical codes present for practice professions values that will likely come in conflict with one another. When values of the profession come in conflict with one another, I believe that I have already mentioned this in the first and second presentation. When values come into conflict with one another, you need to have a way of thinking through decisions where you can in essence prioritize one demand over another and be able to justify that.

What would like you to do now is take a look at the very first quote in

your packet. It is a quote from -- from the field of psychology. It says, that ethics codes cannot do our questioning, thinking, fielding and responding for us.

Such codes can never be a substitute for the active process by which the individual therapist or counselor struggles with the bewildering always unique constellations of questions, responsibilities, context and competing demands of helping another person. Ethics must be practical and ethics that are out of touch with the practical realities of clinical work with the diversity and constantly changing nature of the therapeutic adventure are useless. Of course, this comes from psychology, but the piece that is applicable to us is the recognition that a code of ethics original professional conduct can only do so much. They can give us a list of values, but in the end, we have to struggle can, because of the constantly bewildering, changing, constellation of questions, responsibilities, else, because of that reality, we have to have a decision making model that will help us through that process.

So that's an answer to the question, partly, so what? What else will answer the question so what? Let's go back to this analogy of a book end. If context based decision making is one book end and values, excuse me, let me say that again, if the context is one book end and the values is the other book end, then we have a way of both compelling and regulating interpreters behaviors.

Similarly, think of the book end of interpreting as a practice profession. I would also like to suggest that if we claim interpreting as a practice profession and then fore has more in common with teachers, lawyers, physicians, social workers and quite frankly, then it does with the people who do what we do in a booth very far removed from the social dynamics of a conference, if we have more in common with the practice professions, then the other ethical book in that has to be put into place is the institution of reflective practices. That's, the willingness and the rigor to think about and talk about your work with your colleagues.

We have used the term in the past, as I did briefly talk about it last time, of supervision and case conferencing. I'm still here, I'm just changing something, one second], please.

If a person has been able to spend enough time in reflective practice, listening to their colleagues and having the values of the profession operationalized in the decisions that get made amongst their colleagues, then that decision making process and the op-- optimization, I can't say that word, of values becomes an internalized process. Then supervision leads to self-supervision. So, in supervision, it is the job of the facilitator or the supervisor to help people to internalize this decision making process for themselves so that's when they are out there working in essence, they are being supervised by that own, by their own continuous process. By that idea that has, the voices in their head that has been instilled by the other

colleagues within their groups.

The ones that we've been studying in the webinar, the decision making process is the DCCRD process. So we have been trying to breakdown this DCCRD process to get people to understand it well enough so that they can internalize it, and then help other people internalize it as well.

In the last or first session, I believe, I talked a little bit about reflective practices and said that all practice profession utilize them. There are different names associated with reflective processes, but they can all be distilled down to talking about your work with the company of others, with your peers for the purpose of improvement. Which, of course, is an ethical construct. It idea that you would in the company of your peers share your ideas, hear feedback, so that you can begin to defuse the responsibility of the decision making amongst the group, not just yourself.

Also, in the session that I talked about this -- I mentioned this quote from Coakley, who in essence is suggesting this very thing, though, in his article, he doesn't particularly talk about supervision or reflective practice directly, but in essence, this quote is propelling the profession to consider this as an ethical mandate. He says, the voices that we make and the actions that follow from those choices can uphold or deny the dignity of other people. Can advocate or violate the rights of other people. Can affirm or disavow the humanity of other people. Given the potential consequences of our choices and the result of actions, it is reasonable to

expect that we constantly reexamine those consequences, values and beliefs that understand score and shape the decisions that we make and the actions that we undertake. Again, the only way that we can do that in a sound, ethical way is in the company of our peers.

So, the so what of -- this decision making model, DCCRD, is so that we empower people with a decision making tool fully aware that a list of rules of dos and don'ts are not going to -- help them in their decision making process within the varying context and amongst the varying different people that they work with.

The other so what is that this process, this decision making process that they walk out to work with, has to first be instilled in them through a process of reflective practice. So that they reflect on practice and then they reflect in practice.

From here on out, we're going to be using the packet, the PDF packet that has examples in combination with the PowerPoint. I'm also going to stop at points to take some questions during this. I'm going to be using case examples and these case examples have been chosen because I'm trying to illustrate the specific DC-S and the Dialogic Work Analysis skill. Some part of the DCCRD process. We're not processing cases. I know that by sharing cases can be a little bit provocative, because people will want to say, well, I don't know why they did that or I have an idea of what else they could have done, but you're not actually processing the case, we're merely looking at

the case to see if we can figure out what skill set is needed or required as a result of that case. So, if you have questions, as I'm going through these examples, go ahead and time them in. Because I will stop when I get done looking at demands and controls and the examples associated with those to see if there are questions again about how, DCS. The skill set that we're talking about is understood through that cause. So I will pause for questions and answer them before we move into the next skill set, which will be building demand constellations.

First of all, these cases that you have in front of you are coming from all over the U.S. I did not want to choose a set of cases that was only Rochester-based, because I didn't want them to be identified. The interpreters have given their permission for use. As you may see from your packet, some of the details of the cases have been blocked out to protect the details as they are in print, but I will actually say out loud, so you can -- follow along what, what the content is that has been blacked-out.

So I will be supplying the details here. All right. So if you look at the packet in front of you, it's number 1. Identifying and articulating demands. First, let me say how I get these cases. I usually, I get them through supervision, but I usually ask people when I want them to present a case. I ask them to bring a case that they still think about it. I ask them to give me a case where a decision was made where they still ponder the decision and wonder about whether it was the right thing to do. I ask people

not to bring cases that are extreme, because extremes don't make good examples. Certainly, we can all be empathetic about the more, you know -- extreme situations, but they don't, they are not therapy helpful for supervision. So, the first example is going to be an example about how people have a hard time merely presenting a case. This first example is showing that interpreters really don't know how to talk about their work in constructive or confidential ways, mostly because no one has ever taught us how. Actually, sometimes the benefit in supervision is merely just reframing and structuring the case.

Talking about it any further, sometimes isn't necessary, because what was really convoluted or complex or something they were still thinking about, was because they didn't have it well understood and framed in front of them. The example that you have in your packet, where I have a before and after. So, I asked this deaf interpreter, I was leading a deaf interpreter decision group. I asked the interpreter to tell me about the case. He went up to the board and wrote out what you are seeing in front of you. Which is, it is a case about where is the key for the safe box that the patient wanted to tell certain people, but didn't want other involved? Of the family had physical and verbal fights over the key issue. Also, the patient had breathing problems when it came to emotional issues. So when he got done writing I said is that it. He said that is it not about what you see after is what myself and the group was really able to pull from him, when we said,

actually, if you could take us step by step, if we were there, what was unfolding in front of us. I want to go through the case and show you the complexity of the case that actually gets revealed. You can look at it by the sheer, the fact that it takes up the entire second page or the second page and onto the third page. That -- once a person has the chance to unpack the case, so many more details come out.

Now the case we're seeing in front of you and the case that was structured at the end. It was not this linear. It was obviously, not this detailed --

[No audio]

All right and -- we're continuing.

So, this was a hospital inpatient room. The patient was a hearing man in this 50s whom was paralyzed from the neck down because of a car accident that happened about three days prior. He could not use his voice, because he was incubated and on a breathing machine. He could only move his lips and his eyeballs. The patient is of normal intelligence and didn't have any cognitive dysfunction due to the accident. The family meeting was to designate who was to get possession of the key to the safety-deposit box and where the key was hidden. The family in the room included the patient's mother. The wife, the son, the brother and the sister.

Others in the room included a lawyer, a life insurance agent and a nurse who monitored the machines. There were also security guards for the standing

outside of the door incase there was trouble in the room. The deaf interpreter, known here at DI, deaf interpreter was called to work with the hearing interpreter known as HI. To read the lips of the hearing impaired man. The deaf interpreter was going to rely the message in sign language word for word what he was lip reading to the hearing interpreter who would voice it into spoken English. Interpreter met with the lawyers and patients outside of the patient's room to discuss the rule for communications, which is that the patient, the hearing man would designate who takes possession of the key and where it key was found. The deaf interpreter would read his lips and interpret what was said in sign language. The patient would blink his eyes to confirm the message. The lawyer and the interpreter stood at the Ed of the bed of the patients on the left side. The deaf interpreter sat on the right side of the patients at his midsection. The nurse was also near the head of the bed. The family members stood in a semi circle at the foot of the bed. The patient said that his mother should get possession of the key. The brother walked over to the mother and yelled no. The son walked over and started calling and fighting. The nurse called for there security guard. The family was arguing. The patient could hear all of this and -- see them becoming physically aggressive. The hearing interpreter would say to the deaf interpreter. Now, the deaf interpreter would have his back to the family. She would tell him what happened in the room, for example, the brother punched so-and-so in the eye. Each time the hearing interpreter

would comment, the deaf interpreter would turn around to see what was happening behind him. The patient would say without facial expression, Joe, (bleep) you, the deaf interpreter would sign. The members of the family would come up to the deaf interpreter and tell him he was a liar. They would have to keep them from yelling at the deaf interpreter and the authors. The patient was there to confirm what he said each time. The deaf interpreter felt comfortable with his work. Since he read was confirmed by the patient. After 45 minutes of the this. The location of the key was never revealed. The Laurel ordered everyone out of the room, including the interpreters. They left and never debriefed with each other. The deaf interpreter was never called back after that. Again, you can see just from a significant difference between the before and the after and how much more details came after that. Interesting the deaf interpreter who presented the case, said the reason that he wanted to present the case, what was bothering him the most about this, he was mad at himself because he kept turning around to see what was happening behind him. Which, of course, supervision, we were able to affirm for him, that being careful with your own safety seems like a good idea, but that was the reason, he wanted to process it for lots of reasons. But that's the thing that stuck with him. See how much data is available to us. How many more opportunities to talk about decisions made. Quite frankly, even the learning about a potential kind of job an interpreter could be called into do. Which is interesting. I was also a hearing interpreter

in a similar job, many, many years back. It is important that other people in the room recognize that this is the kind of job that they could be called into.

Okay. I'm going to go on, if you have questions about this case and the examples about the differences between how people think about their work and what is on their mind. The process that this could bring them to, with the demand categories and having people in the room pullout information. So, please ask your questions, otherwise I'm going to move on and pause for questions at the end of the next example. In the next example we have --

A scale 2 problems. If you remember the demand control schema rubric. We call this demands and one of the things we try to get interpreters away from is the use of strong and judgmental language. Because it doesn't provide us with information, but the interpretation of the events. It doesn't provide us with the information. I actually gave this example in the last session, when I was talking about how to build constellation of demand, now I'm actually going to use it to show you, actually, quite a lengthy case. It has --

[No audio]

It's a lengthy case. It has -- it has a lot of -- of, words. But there is not a lot of information. What you instead have is the interpreter's. I'm going to pause here. Is everything okay technologically after that last kickoff? I assume it is because I'm overseas. Yeah. I don't see the video

as well. I'm going to hang on.

>> This is Amy, we're working on the video, it will just be a couple of minutes. Robyn, do you want to wait or continue, but the interpreters will come back up as soon as I can get them.

>> Amy just said that the interpreters, the video --

[No audio]

Ah, just to be -- clear, we're trying to fix the video. So, for the interpreters if everybody would just stand by. Actually, since -- if we still have captioning for people to read the case by themselves as we're waiting for the video to come up. I have also wrote that in the chat section.

All right. It appears that we're all back up and running. Thanks for your patience. So, in that example 2, the only thing that is blocked out is something quite simple, the first blocking out of that case is the -- the using specific names of bridges and the second blacking out the sentence, the full sentence says, lucky for me, the deaf client was very patient and understood that the phone was crackling and a challenge. It is interesting, I didn't have to blackout much of this case, because there is not much information really about the case.

As you can see, her experience is really being processed through her own interpersonal demands. Which is very common, because usually people bring a case that stirred up for them a lot of emotions. But even still, even when

this cases stir up a lot of emotions for you, we have to be able to report or talk about them in a way that still gives us details. So, this is, this is a good example of a case where we would have to -- process it to try to help this interpreter -- ah get a handle on what she was dealing with. What were the actual demands. Actually, on top of what was actually happening in the context was her own internal stuff.

The third example, I'm actually not going to spend time on, it is actually taken from a new book chapter that Bob and I have out, called "beyond interesting," which is the PDF of that can be made available to you. Those of you in our second section of the listserv discussion, I sent this article out already, but if you're interested in following up to find out the example of the clinician, I would be happy to send you that PDF. I think Amy also has a copy of the PDF. You e-mailed Amy, she could send you that copy. Interestingly enough. I'm going to stop after that to answer questions. When it comes controls. Interpreters are pretty good at that.

That doesn't actually take a lot of work from me as the facilitator or the supervisor, with the following exceptions. First of all, interpreters usually know what they did, because it is observable. They are mostly able to talk about and identify what they did. Perhaps the only thing that they may need help with when it comes to that is getting very specific. If they say I talked to the teacher, I might have to intervene at some point and say, what did you talk to the teacher about and say, what was the conversation.

In order to get the control spelled out in the very specific way, but mostly my focus usually end up having to be in showing them in the case where there was an opportunity to do something, but they did nothing. If you remember when you do something or do-nothing, we still call that a control decision. But people are not likely to voluntarily say, so I did nothing, as they are presenting the case. They likely go through and the only time they did something, they articulate that. So, my focus in classrooms or excuse me, classrooms and supervision sessions is to highlight opportunities where somebody could have done something, but choose not to. Again, that choice might have been perfectly fine, but that needs to be articulated.

Also what doesn't come out terribly naturally, what I refer to and in your packet under preassignment controls. Controls are not so actions but characteristics of the interpreter as well. I like to make sure that people understand that they bring something or, on the flip side of that perhaps don't bring something to a situation that is outside of the technical skill aspect. It might be a personal characteristic. Patients, energy and excitement, bubbly personality, whatever, I might have to point those things out. I also like to point out when somebody has a positive working relationship or an established repour with the death or hearing perjury. That is an important control to recognize. That person might be able to behave in a certain situation that another interpreter might not be able to do because of the quality of the relationship. Or somebody might be more

likely to -- behave or employ a control because of the expectations of the consumers.

So, those are examples, both demands and controls. Articulating and identifying demands and controls in a rife life situation, even we have been doing them in rather artificial situations. Of course, there are many, many more examples of this. Hopefully, these highlighted how that played out in real life. I'm going to pause, if there are not burning questions because of our sort of 5 minute delay, I would like to be able to go, but if somebody had a question about how those cases are examples of the demands and of skill set, please, please speak up now.

All right. Seeing nothing, I'm going to go ahead and move on to some examples of what the means to build demand constellations. From cases benefit only from an examination of one controlled decision. I would not say the deaf interpreter case, even though that's the decision that he wanted, or the situation that he wanted to talk about regarding his desire to look behind him, so he didn't get physically heard, um -- but the case that we just went through, the case of the interpreter working in a situation over a teleconference, where she was unable to hear and understand what people were talking about. That actually is an example that I used last time of a demand constellation. It is interesting to me, that in that case, the think that the interpreter says at the end of the case, is a significant demand. She says at the very end, if you look back in your packet under

example number 2. It is literally the last sentence, she said what helped in some ways, the deaf client referenced me I have to be here, the boss is forcing me I don't really want to be here. Which is actually quite a big deal, the fact that it comes at the end of the case is very interesting, but also, of course, very telling about her decision making. Because, really -- the demand constellation I would want to emphasize with her, that should have been a continuous concurrent demand, which any demand that presented itself. The fact that, you know, the deaf professional is disinclined or not wanting to be there. That's a motivation issue and an investment issue. Therefore the interpreter should consider that part of a piece of making her decision. That's a unique way to build a demand constellation. Usually the way that we built a demand constellation. The main demand is obvious to us and we flesh out the country weren't demands. In this the case, the were current demand is significant and any other demand should have been coupled with that.

But let's take a look at the second example. I will go ahead and read this along. This is an employee training. It was early in the morning. It had been going on for a couple of days. This interpreter was 6 months at her current full-time job. The teamer working with her sat in the way back. Could be seen, but it was not terribly intimate communication between her and her teamer. She had a good relationship with her teamer, good repour. There were two deaf people, one early and one arrived late. It was an ice breaker that started before the second person arrived. It is that ice breaker that

uses toilet paper, where you are supposed to pullout as many squares as you think you will need. That's what you're told. Then you have to say something about yourself for every square that you pulled out.

So, on purpose of the instructors are kept vague. So, you will pull off one or 25. The people who pulled out 25, will have to say 25 things about themselves. Perhaps you are familiar with this one. So, the first deaf person pulls off four. The second deaf person arrives and the interpret were arrives the second deaf person the plan behind the task and gives it away. Likely she has a relationship with the person. The deaf person is going to be last in the horseshoe, when it comes to saying things about herself. The hearing people are saying various things. Some of them are off of the wall, some are not off of the wall. One of the hearing women in the group admitted to having gastric bypass surgery it comes to the deaf person, the one that arrives late. She said, I'm worried about my dog. I sent her to get spade this morning, but the interpreter misses the finger -- spelled word dog and says, I'm thinking about getting my tubes tied. The interpreter is saying I can't believe that she is saying this. The people respond, no. No. No. She would not do that, you're so wrong. The deaf person picks up on the response and the comments of the hearing people and asked the interpret were what did you say. The interpreter voices out loud, there may be a problem with communication here and tells the deaf person what she says. I teamer jumped in and says, I thought her dog. The deaf person joined in and said,

no. No., it is my dog. The interpreter said I didn't have my coffee. She is not getting her tubes tied, her dog is getting spade this morning. The room exploded in laughter. The leaders can we get a new interpreter in a joking way. There are two more squares of toilet paper and the deaf person says basically things about herself. The second deaf person says no big deal. The group moves on from there, no incidents during the rest of the day. Interestingly, she did not see the deaf person again until interpreter for her before she was stepping down from a job. She double checks. She was not going to assume that she was right and ask the question. This interpreter had been there every day of the training at this point with a different teamer. Talked with the deaf person at the lunchtime and apologized for the mistake. She replied, it happens, it is just fine. So the interpreter made the decision at this point, this case really sort of pulls out for us -- this one control.

This decision to go ahead and say what you think you saw. The important concurrent demands in this case that needs to be identified. This is an icebreaker. Other people have shared private information. The hearing women before her side gastric bypass surgery. There are differing cultural values between deaf and hearing people. There are things taboo in hearing cultural, not in deaf culture. A developed relationship or a repour over the two days.

As a result, this interpreter was valuing letting a deaf person say what she thinks the deaf person wants to say. Without judgment, without checking

and without potentially putting it back and say are you sure that you want to say this. She decides to go with it. So, that's a good example of a case where a demand constellation really has to be flushed out. Because the things that I mentioned are not identified in the case. I, well, icebreaker is identified, but the fact that -- these are cultural values that are true about deaf people versus hearing people, that there has been this developed relationship. It is an ice breaker and lighthearted. All of those things are important to recognize. The reason why we do this, interpreters can easily tell you what they did, but not why they did it. That's be true, the way that Malclom Gladwell talks about it from a personal level that we can make decisions personally and not really know why we've made them.

Donald Schon in his book, Donald Schon, The Reflective Practitioner. Talks about how professionally people make decisions all of the time without really knowing why they have done them. I'm going to pause there and see if there are any questions about, again, the real life application of these skill sets that we've been learning and taking about. How they play out.

Okay. Amy, can I just and a quick question. I'm under the -- impression that I'm going to be speaking, I'm not going to be able to do the math, but for another. I'm not going to say, 10:15 my time, that is 20 minutes from now? Is that true that I should be top stopping in 20 minutes for questions and follow-up?

>> Yes. Yes.

>> Okay. Good. All right. So the next topic that we're going to give examples of is a way from structure and into analysis. What we've done up until this point, really is -- yes. Analysis to which degree, there is really kind of a blurry line between structure and analysis. Mostly what we're doing is just scaling using this contact, demand and controls and demand constellations. Using those contracts we are really just structuring what happened. What did happen. Now becomes the time for analysis of what did happen, but also the suggestion of other things that could have happened. Or other realities about the case that now become hypothetical and open for discussion. Opportunities for this person to think about other things, etc. Not that they have not been thinking with things up to this point. This structuring should not be dismissed as unimportant, it is actually quite helpful to people and sometimes, like I said, we only do this basic piece of the case and end there, that is really the, the most helpful part of the process.

The next section on your packet is called number 4 consequences and values. This has been for the listserv people who have been with me, a real challenge. I have appreciated the perseverance of the people who stayed with me through this process. Because the discussion of consequences and their -- associated values is not an easy conversation to have. Because I would suggest and having been doing recently for my PhD work. Literature studies of sign language and spoken language literature and values is not something

that we talk about our value based decision making is not something that we talk about directly. I think there are lots of things that values that we talk about indirectly that we can assume or interpret as values. But it is not a direct part of the contract that we use when we talk about ethics. So it has been a bit of a struggle. So, hopefully, these examples will highlight for you yes. The direct application. But hopefully, further define what we mean by consequences and what are the implied values of consequences.

First of all, has you might know in the DCCRD process. We talk about positive and negative consequences. What you have in front of you is actually an expert from our textbook, which I'm actually sending it to the graphic designer tomorrow. I'm having separation anxiety, it has been done for two weeks, but I can't send it off. This is taken from our, our, our textbook and. I'm not going to read it out loud, because you can read it to yourself. I'm going to summarize what it says. We don't mean when we say positive and negative consequences. We don't mean something good happened by positive and bad by negative. Really, the contract of resulting demand is the contract that is used for what happened next. Consequences is a very different way of talking about positive and negative consequences, talking about values. When the interpreter made that decision, what was she going for? What was the -- the tended effect]? The negative is what's the natural forfeiture of that? Again, I know I have gone through this before, but I'm

going through it again, because it is a, it is a tricky concept. I think it takes practice to understand it.

So, let's, let's go back and take a look at the decision the interpreter made to go ahead and voice what she saw that deaf person sign about -- getting her tubes tied, versus having her dog spade what she was going for was fluid, uninterrupted communication. Okay? Which is a value of ours. It is not as if she necessarily the person -- that she had a mistake. She didn't necessarily think I have mistaken this. She thought she understand it just fine. She just could not believe that the deaf person was saying out loud. Her mind was stopping her. Not maybe I made a mistake. It was not an issue of accuracy, she was trying to, what she was going for was fluid communication. Uninterrupted communication. Okay. Letting people interact as they naturally would. What was forfeited was -- this potential comfort with the taboo subject that was being put out there.

All right. Let's look at some examples. If we want to, we can return to the tubes tide example if people want to. Because that actually has some. When you look at the other control decision, which she employed in another job of the deaf woman of checking with her saying are you sure that you want to say this. Yes. They are going for accuracy. But they are forfeiting, again, the opportunity for the person to say what they want to say without somebody being suspicious or double check it or have it put back in your face saying did you say this. There is a judgment to it, but my initial reaction

is that you would always check, but my reaction is, I guess when you check, you cannot avoid negative consequences in interpreting decisions.

All right. If you move into your next page in your packet, it says, my page, it might be a little different, because I added some things to yours, but it says here, from a technical perspective focus of interpreting, here is what we know about values. The list of values under there, are not just from the RSA, but they are a complications of lots of different interpreting related organizations spoken and sign language, distilled down to some of the more common overlapping values. Those are accuracy, neutrality, fidelity or truthfulness. Confidentiality and then -- these last two, which are sort of flimsy, if you ask me, respect for consumers and I believe that we talk about colleagues, respect for consumers and colleagues and then professionalism. Which, of course, is I think those two categories, you know, what respect looks like and professional. Looks like is obviously being left up for interpretation.

Now, one of the ways, I think in the first presentation that I asked us to think about this conduit role or this evaluation of the visibility that we sort of had in the profession for centuries, really, if you look at spoken language, this idea that the interpreter is not really there, is a conduit, stayed with us for a very long time. If you look at the literature, there is a lot of arguments against this mentality, but it is something that is still pervasive. In the first presentation I suggested that we look at the

visibility in different ways and instill it to the value level. What invisible and the conduit role, I'm using the terms interchangeably is getting at is this idea of autonomy. Agency, self-determinacy and what I will call laissez-faire. Again, because I have always done this in the first session, I don't want to spend too much time on this, but the idea of them are these ideas that this person is another person, separate from me and has the ability to make the decisions about their life that they choose to make.

Lots of practice professions have this kind of value. All right? Medical profession, you can leave against medical advice. You have a right to make a decision about your own healthcare. Okay? So, that's not a change think out there. Now, I want to use this term, laissez-faire, that is used in business, as you might be familiar with. Let the people be, let the markets be. Don't interfere, right. This lack of interference. I'm going to use the idea of laissez-faire to flush out the visibility in a value based way.

So if we could then, we could add autonomy, agency, self-determination and laissez-faire to the list above it. It is a fair disarrangement of the values that seem to emerge in our profession. Now what would it mean to actually add to our technical understanding of interpreting, which is what we have been doing so far. What would it mean to add a practice profession focus?

Most codes of ethics in the practice professions, I'm saying most,

because I haven't looked at all of them, but my assumption is that most if not all, have -- a value of what they call nonmilitants, which is the same thing as do no harm, but not just do no harm, but a value, of do good things. Right? Do good. So, we have actually have do no harm in our preamble. I don't understand why it is in our preamble and not in the code of ethics or professional conduct, I don't know, but I think that would be an interesting thing.

So, in essence, when I work with people on their cases I see these set of values as what we can work with. What, what is evident out there in decision making? So, as I mentioned, as we started to operationalize these values in decision making, it was a very challenging -- listserv. I want to thank all of those people who stayed with me on it. Who allowed me to use examples that are here in your home or here in your packet from their homework. Because this is, this is -- again, a hard thing to do. So what I'm going to do is give you examples from the listserv, from the different homework. We're going to go back to the dissection. One of the benefits of sticking with one case or one picture analysis is that you really get to know it and understand it and you come up with really good things after you spend a lot of time with it. So, even though people think thought the big again. It is actually beneficial to keep returning to the same case, because it becomes more complex, it is hypothetical, it becomes more complex as people begin to add into the very real nature of what this very hypothetical case

sets forth.

All right. So, in this example, the, the, the demand is that a group member says, if you remember, the pig dissection, a deaf kid is the leader of the dissection and the hearing kids in the small group working together are there to advise him in his process. So the demand is, the main demand is that the group member says I don't think that's right. In relation to what the deaf student is doing. The control decision of the interpreter is to say, do you want me to interrupt and tell him? Okay?

Now, again, what are the positive consequences? What is the interpreter going for some listen to these, you notice these are not positive consequences like necessarily good things happen. They are morally getting at what the interpreter was likely going for and the values being preserved as a result. Of the first bullet point. The deaf student is allowed, remember we're defining allowed as an opportunity. The deaf student as an opportunity to focus on this current work. Okay? Which is really that value of laissez-faire. Let's people do what they are choosing to do in the given moment. The interpreter makes the hearing student his comment may be related to the deaf student. So, the interpreter is respecting the consumer. Make sure that you inside, if you say this, it is going to be relayed, so that reminder. Giving them the benefit of the did you tell. The hearing group, moving onto the third bullet point. The third hearing member may not have heard his comment. He gave him a chance to keep his intention. Again, this

is nice work. The next bullet points is saying that the hearing students are reminded it is possible for the deaf student to be aware of every comment they make. That goes back to respect and professionalism as well. Okay? I actually think that respect and professionalism have to be better defined for us, but regardless. There they are.

Now, what are the negative consequences. Again, what was forfeited. What value of ours was -- de-prioritized as a result of that decision? The interpreter calls attention to her presence and impact on communication. The deaf student is not given full access to all comments made around him in realtime. Remember, we're not saying she is not going to tell them, it is happening in realtime, that has to be clear. The engagement has been established. Okay. So, so -- education -- or, or people may think, I can always talk in front of the interpreter she will not always relay stuff, but a negative precedent has been established, that goes against our traditional rules of engagement. The natural flow has been interrupted. Okay. Hopefully, you are able to see how the positive and negative consequences are being stated as information, as, as discussion or a-- pointing to -- this dish of values.

Okay. Let's look at another example. Demand, the deaf student looked up from the specimen and says, where's the teacher. The interpreter points to where the teacher is, the control decision. Okay. What's the positive decisions. What is the interpreter going for, The student gets the

information that he desires immediately. Okay. Other positive consequences. The hearing students are not interrupted. Okay. Negative consequences. The natural engagement between hearing and deaf students is intercepted and diverted to the interpreter. Okay?

Again, what you should be hearing from the positive and negative consequences, there may be more, I'm just pulling out examples from our use here, you could probably come up with more positive and negative consequences, but again, they are not necessarily a -- that's reason to do it, that is reason not to do it. It is more an idea of what values are we prioritizing in a given moment, because values are going to come into conflict with one another. That is par for the course for a practice profession. Let's look at this other example. Demand, the teacher walks up to the interpreter and says, how's it going. The interpreter smiles and interprets the question and gestures to the group to respond. What are the positive consequences, the interpreter gives the student has chance to answer the teacher and give the help that they need. Interpreter does not remind the teacher to question the student. I'm not hearing a value here, education, education of consumers, which you could call that respect for consumers or professionalism, but I think education of consumers is something that we do pretty frequently. We be more evident of that as a value. Then the negative consequences are -- continuing onto the second bullet point. The teacher's inquiry is not addressed. The teacher's attempt to engage the

interpreter is deferred. Okay. Notice nobody is saying anything like the teacher gets mad at the interpreter or says why didn't answer you question. If those were to happen, but if they would, those would be called resulting demands. Okay. They would not be called consequences, because again they are trying to frame for us an issue of prioritization or de-prioritization, values that come into conflict with one another.

In light of -- our time, I'm going to go quickly -- through the last few examples. The concurrent demands are listed for you. I'm going to skip reading those. You can certainly read those on your own. I'm going to move to the positive and negative consequences and talk about what the implied values are. I will pause to see if there is any questions. Again, because this is the trickiest piece of trying to get -- people's decision making -- brains to this place.

Okay? All right. So in the, the main demand in the first grade classroom, if you remember, you have the first grade classroom at reading time, another one that we use pretty frequently, the boy who is passing out candy, if you remember from our past sessions, a hearing boy who is passing out candy. The control decision of the interpreter, she gives him the I see you look. The list of demands. She looks at him and gives him the evil eye. What are the positive consequence, she addressed the behavior. Okay? Notice it doesn't say that the kid puts the candy eye. That's not, that would be a resolution, if you would. It is only just what the interpreter was going

for and what she was going for or he was going for was to address the behavior. The negative consequence is that the interpreter asserts herself into a position of authority. Now, the implied values -- that are -- either compelling or restraining her, the ones that are being de-prioritized in this example, laissez-faire or letting people be themselves, self-determinacy, is the one that is being de-prioritized. What is being prioritize evidence in this moment, is what you might, I guess, call professionalism, when you're in an environmental, that is an expectation of the environment, working within that environment, we would call that professionalism, again, I think we should have to call it different, but for right now, that's what I would call that.

And just a couple of more and then open it up for questions. The main demand in the next example, the teacher using face expresses to correct hearing child's behavior. So, the teacher puts up her index finger to a hearing child to just signal him quietly about his behavior. The interpreter actually signed something and she may interpret I need you to sit still. Okay. She interprets the guest are gesture in a much more overt way. The positive consequence is that the visual gesture is cricked to the meaning and made distinct from the story. The teacher is reading the story and puts her finger up can be confusing, but if it is a separate comment, that distinction is made. Another positive consequence, that comes from the demands, the deaf students early correction is situated in the context of his

classmate. We are saying that the deaf student has engaged in a similar behavior. So, if the deaf student is also squirming around. The interpreter flushes that out, the deaf student is able to see the correction in context. The negative consequence is additional information was relayed then what was said. It is outside of the teacher's purview and time and attention are taking away from the story. Okay?

So, what is being, what are the values that are being de-prioritized here? It is fidelity, truthfulness and, right. But what is being valued here is accuracy. Making sure that there is clarity in the information. The last example, the deaf student signs with one hand and the interpreter choose these use her closure skills and uses consecutive interpreter. What is the positive consequence of doing that. The deaf student is able to maintain his current position and train of thought. The main consequence there is a delay in the real time response. She is waiting for more information and a precedent is establish for the rules of engagement of the interpreter. So, the deaf student things that's signing from here on out with one hand will be fine. I would suggest that accuracy is being de-prioritized in this given decision, but laissez-faire, letting the child be who he is being prioritized. Okay. I'm going to pause here now and see if anybody has questions about pretty much anything at this point.

All right. I'm not seeing anything, but if you are typing, don't worry, I will --

[No audio]

>> This is Amy, it seems that Robyn has dropped out. We will give her a minute so she can get back in. It seems like Robyn is taking time to get back in. While we are waiting for her to join us, we will look at messages for us. Just as a reminder today you can earn CEUs for today. Professional -- can be awarded for your participation today. If you are watching this webinar, once you X out of the system, a survey will come up and by filling out that survey and provide your information, you will get CEUs for today. If you are watching it in a group, you can either individual do the survey or the e-mail that I sent out yesterday, there was a group sign in sheet. Either way you can submit a request to get CEUs. Please fill out the satisfaction survey, we try our best to make sure that this is event is what you need and want. Robyn mentioned a listserv that has been going on. There will be a continued listserv after today's webinar, it starts Monday. We bumped it up, normally we wait about four weeks before we start the listserv, but due to the holidays we wanted to get the listserv in, it will start Monday. The best thing to do, if you want the participate is e-mail me and I will add you to the listserv. The tight turn around and waiting for documentation and things like that, it will be easier if you can e-mail me and I will add you to the listserv. You should have my e-mail address, because I e-mailed you. For the listserv, you can earn 1.0CEUs for participation. There are specific things that you need to do to meet that.

I will send out information pertaining to that. Our next webinar will be February 23rd. We're going back to a Thursday night at 6:00 p.m. mountain time. We will have a new presenter at that time that will continue on this theme. There are three more webinars related to the demand control schema and how it can be enthused in curriculum for IEPs. Our new presenter and Robyn will be coming back next year to finish up this topic. Registration for that webinar will open six weeks before. You will all get e-mails on that. Let me check and see where Robyn is at the moment. There does look to be two questions. What I will do if Robyn doesn't come back on before we end, I will e-mail her these questions and then e-mail the re-- response out to everybody, so, those can be answered. All right. It looks like we may have washed Robyn, but we trust that she is safe over in Scotland. Again, tonight, I just want to thank you for joining. Robyn for presenting. Our two interpreters, Kirk and Arlene and our captionist, Carrie O'Brien. Also the members from the Clearinghouse. All right I'm just reading something. Oh, just another question. So that is all, go ahead and let everyone go. Have a good rest of your Saturday. Look for an e-mail with these questions and responses. Have a good night, everybody.

[Event concluded]

Ending time-2:25.