6

Academic and Educational Interpreting from the Other Side of the Classroom: Working with Deaf Academics

Linda Campbell, Meg J. Rohan, and Kathryn Woodcock

SIGN LANGUAGE interpreting in universities and other postsecondary educational institutions typically involves the facilitation of classroom communications between Deaf or hard of hearing students and their hearing instructors. The interpreter can prepare for the classroom, laboratory courses, and student-instructor meetings by learning the course material and compiling technical signs that are associated with the material that generally is clearly defined by the classroom syllabi (e.g., Caccamise and Lang 1996). But there are two sides to every university classroom: one side concerns the student; the other concerns the instructor. What are the guidelines for interpreters who are working in universities, not at the student side of the classroom but at the academic side? The Deaf person in this academic role will have academic responsibilities other than teaching, and interpreters will have little or no experience or understanding of these often complex, high-level roles. At present, there is little or no direction or publications for interpreters who work with a Deaf academic.

Two types of settings are relevant to the Deaf academic who is working in mainstream universities. *Educational interpreting* involves facilitation of communication between an academic instructor and hearing students (or deaf students not familiar with sign language) within the particular context of a course. For interpreters who have experienced interpreting from the students' side of the classroom, the familiarity of the situation may be deceptive when they are interpreting from the academic's side of the classroom. The dynamics may involve one-on-one student meetings that may vary from oral examinations to academic counseling to investigations of cheating. *Academic interpreting* involves facilitation of communication in situations outside of the classroom. These activities do not generally involve students. This category, too, involves a wide variation of communication situations that may include staff meetings, conferences, data gathering in a wide

The authorship on this chapter is alphabetical. We wish to acknowledge all of the interpreters and fellow Deaf colleagues who have discussed their experiences with us. We are fortunate to have worked with numerous wonderfully flexible, committed, and expert interpreters who have shown us the real meaning of interpreter-academic teamwork. Correspondence concerning this chapter can be directed to the authors by e-mail: Linda Campbell (linda.campbell@queensu.ca); Meg Rohan (m.rohan@unsw.edu.au); Kathryn Woodcock (kathryn.woodcock@ryerson.ca).

variety of research settings, or formal and informal celebrations with colleagues, other professionals, or the general public. These communication situations generally are high level and are likely to involve very specialized knowledge, not only of content but also of implicit social rules. Academic interpreting resembles the interpreting that takes place in business environments in which the Deaf professional also has high status.

Both educational and academic interpreting may be required not only by the fully qualified Deaf academic but also by graduate students (i.e., those who have already completed an undergraduate degree and who are studying for either Masters or Ph.D. degrees and serving as instructors in courses). The distinction between the two types of interpreting is necessary because interpreting strategies that work in the context of educational interpreting will not necessarily work or be appropriate in the context of academic interpreting.

The way in which Deaf academics, their colleagues, and their interpreters work together can vary according to the inclusiveness and acceptance of sign language and Deaf culture within their working environments. From the perspective of Deaf academics and interpreters, there are different types of university environments, which we have labeled in the following way: "Deaf" (e.g., Gallaudet University) in which Deaf students, faculty, and all members, whether hearing or Deaf, adopt or espouse Deaf cultural norms; "Deaf-ready" in which support services have been formally established to accommodate Deaf students and in which Deaf faculty may be valued as role models (e.g., California State University-Northridge); "Deaf-aware" in which Deaf students and faculty, because of the nature of the academic field, will find others within their academic unit who are aware of deafness at least on a professional level, even though the university as a whole may or may not be very accommodating.

In the mainstream, apart from institutions in which there is prior familiarity with deafness, there is a distinction between "Deaf-receptive" environments (in which there is little or no experience of deafness among students, staff members, or faculty but in which an attitude of receptiveness is backed up by efforts to learn and provide accommodations) and "Deaf-oblivious" environments (in which there is little or no awareness either professionally or socially of deafness, Deaf students, Deaf staff members, or Deaf academics). Interpreting strategies in each of these environments will differ, particularly because interpreting in Deaf-oblivious and Deaf-receptive settings may come with unique challenges not seen at Deaf-ready or Deaf universities. The focus of this chapter will be on the unique challenges that will be faced in the Deaf-oblivious and Deaf-receptive settings.

One obvious challenge, relevant to all university settings, is the massive difference in the knowledge base between the interpreter and the Deaf academic. Nowadays, there are few academics in mainstream universities who do not hold doctorates. Thus, the Deaf academic will have knowledge and experience in at least one educational and professional setting that is likely to far outstrip the knowledge and experience of the interpreter. Furthermore, Deaf academics in Deaf-oblivious or Deaf-receptive settings tend to specialize in topics not related to Deaf studies; this specialization may mean that the academic-interpreter knowledge gap might be wider

in these settings. An interpreter who works with a Deaf academic who specializes in any component of Deaf studies may have an easier time than interpreters in other settings because the interpreter is likely to have a background that includes knowledge of Deaf culture and sign language linguistics (and because of the inclusion of Deaf-related subjects, the academic may be located in Deaf, Deaf-ready, and Deaf-aware universities, there will be greater awareness generally).

Apart from the advanced subject knowledge, the Deaf academic and his or her hearing colleagues also will have far greater knowledge of the often ever-changing institutional expectations and procedures, acronyms, important people, and social rules. Although some interpreters may find the knowledge and experience gap intimidating because there is virtually no way to change the disparity, simple recognition and acknowledgement of the gap's existence is the first step toward transforming potential intimidation into opportunities for challenge and enrichment. For the flexible, ambitious interpreter, the rewards are many: a diverse working week, the opportunity to work with a high-performing Deaf professional, and the acquisition of unique, in-depth knowledge and expertise—not to mention the satisfaction that can be derived from doing a successful job at an advanced level.

The authors of this chapter are three Deaf, female academics who hold doctorates and who work in mainstream universities in which there are no Deaf colleagues or students in the same department. Although similar in terms of use of sign language and preference for sign language in communication with colleagues and students, the authors have three different experiences of deafness: Deafness since birth, deafness after growing up as hard of hearing, and deafness that occurred over the past five or so years. Their professional fields are also very different: human factors engineering (ergonomics), psychology, and environmental science. Two authors currently are members of Deaf-oblivious environments, and one works within a Deaf-receptive environment. One author works in Australia, and two work in Canada; there are some important differences in the structures, promotional pathways,[1] expectations, and protocols within the universities in these countries. As a result of these differences, the term *academic* is used in this chapter because, although in North America it is appropriate to use the term *professor* regardless of actual promotion status, in Australia the title is reserved for those who hold full professorships.

The focus in this chapter is on interpreting for Deaf academics in mainstream universities that can be classified as Deaf-receptive or Deaf-oblivious, a group of institutions that includes the majority of universities in North America, Australia, and other countries. However, some of what is discussed may be relevant to interpreting for Deaf academics who work at Deaf, Deaf-ready, and Deaf-aware universities; interpreting for Deaf students, especially graduate students (e.g., Masters,

1. In North America, the promotion path starts at assistant professor, then associate professor (usually promoted with tenure), and finally, full professor. As a result, most academics in North American universities are referred to as professors (or even as "profs" by students) in recognition of their unique and respected positions in North American society. In Australia, the promotion path is somewhat similar to the British system: lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor, and then professor; all but those who hold professorships are generally referred to as "Dr." (or as "Associate Professor" in writing where that title is appropriate).

doctoral students); interpreting for course instructors (e.g., part-time lecturers who are not involved in research or service); and interpreting for staff members (e.g., administrative staff members, laboratory technicians, and caretakers).

Note that the terms *client* or *consumer* are not used with respect to the Deaf academic. The authors believe that the client or consumer of the interpreter services is the university, which includes not only the Deaf academic but also all of his or her hearing colleagues and students. Thus, the authors regard the interpreter (or interpreters), the Deaf academic, and his or her hearing colleagues and students as a team that works to establish effective communication.

WHAT DO UNIVERSITY ACADEMICS DO?

Although many people are unaware of what the academic's job entails, it is vital that interpreters have clear understanding of the goals and structure of academic positions to be effective. For example, although students may believe that their instructor only teaches courses, the academic who is employed into a full-time academic position must perform duties in three basic areas: research, teaching, and service. Typically, although academics essentially are their "own bosses" (in terms of deciding when, where, and how their work is carried out), academic hierarchies are grounded in peer assessment. This feature of academia makes effective communication between Deaf academics and their colleagues critically important.

Unlike the conventional employment situation, academics essentially are interviewed, assessed, and hired by their peers. Academics frequently are hired into what are referred to as tenure track (or "continuing") positions. Tenure is an important feature of many universities because academics are granted security from dismissal without cause, as well as an in-principle guarantee of academic freedom to express considered opinions freely and to conduct controversial research. An analogous example in North America would be the senior partner positions in law and accounting firms. As an aside, an increasing number of North American academics serve in renewable, limited-time contracts without eligibility for tenure, and although they are expected to perform in terms of research, teaching, and service, their workload often consists mainly of teaching. In North America, tenure-track positions are appointments made after a protracted probationary period of often five or six years duration whereas, in Australia, the probationary time generally is shorter, but the steps to promotion can be arduous.

At the appropriate time, the academic will make a case for receiving tenure by submitting documented evidence of his or her achievements and progress during the probationary period. An interview in which details of research, teaching, and service are examined by a committee of peers also may be required. Obtaining tenure is a milestone and establishes the academic's status. However, assessment of performance does not end. For many, receiving annual salary increases, merit awards, or indeed promotion to a higher academic rank requires additional submissions of research, teaching, and service accomplishments. Furthermore, in addition to peers assessing an academic's performance, the academic also is involved in assessing his or her peers' performance.

Deaf academics' career successes are predicated on their colleagues' assessments, and Deaf academics also must be able to assess their colleagues' progress fairly. As a result, interpreters working with a Deaf academic must be aware that more than just the formal presentations and classroom teaching are integral to the Deaf academic's successes. Also critical are the day-to-day interactions and the Deaf academic's handling of various situations that include the Deaf academic's colleagues because these may figure even more highly in their colleagues' assessments of their achievements.

What Is the Interpreting Task?

It is the authors' belief that successful interpreting in the academic setting requires a shift in focus. The shift is from a sole focus on the Deaf academic's needs to a focus on open and clear communication among all participants in the communication setting. This broader focus requires the interpreter to be there not only for the Deaf academic but also for the hearing people (i.e., students, colleagues, research participants, and general public). This shift in focus may be difficult in Deaf-oblivious environments in which many may have a fixed view that the interpreter is there solely for the Deaf academic.

Nevertheless, many of the challenges the interpreter will face will concern the Deaf academic's professional subject matter. There will be many occasions when it is simply not feasible to fill the gap in the interpreter's subject matter knowledge through preparation nor possible for the interpreter to gain advance warning of the highly specialized terminology or technical concepts. At these times, teamwork is the key.

For example, consider the teamwork required when the interpreter does not immediately understand a concept being discussed. In the authors' experience of effective interpreters, the interpreter will transliterate the content and look to the Deaf academic to feed back the meaning so a sign can be negotiated. For example, the Deaf environmental scientist who carries out research on contaminants may be in a situation in which a long list of seemingly complex chemical names is discussed by a visiting speaker. It would be very unlikely for a contract interpreter to have learned these names or understand the meaning of the names, so the interpreter would simply sign what he or she hears the speaker saying, and the Deaf environmental scientist's knowledge and awareness of the science makes it possible for her to readily fill in the gaps and rapidly feed the interpreter the appropriate acronyms or signs if they are to be used again.

Interpreting when speakers use acronyms may be especially difficult because people's use of these short forms may be idiosyncratic, or the acronyms may form words that are completely irrelevant to the topic. Not knowing the acronym may block effective interpretation, so the interpreter needs to work with the Deaf academic to overcome the difficulty. For example (and this is a real example), perhaps a speaker uses the acronym *CATEI* (Course and Teaching Evaluation and Improvement, pronounced "cat eye") in the context of discussing teaching evaluations, and although it makes no sense to the interpreter, the interpreter signs CAT-EYE with a

questioning look. If the acronym was to be used again, the Deaf academic might sign back TEACHING EVALUATION FORM so the interpreter could understand the communication and therefore continue more easily. Contrast this situation to another (again, a real situation) in which teamwork did *not* occur: The acronym QUBS (Queen's University Biological Station, pronounced "cubes") was used in the course of a meeting. The interpreter paused her interpretation to try and place "cubes" in the context of the meeting and, therefore, could not continue with the interpretation. Instead of telling the Deaf academic what she heard, the interpreter prevented the academic from providing immediate feedback that would restore effective interpretation.

Even if the interpreter signs or fingerspells incorrectly, the Deaf academic will more than likely have the knowledge to understand what is meant. For example, a speaker may be describing the parts of an amusement ride that would "properly" be signed differently depending on the structure of the specific ride, but the interpreter is not familiar with the ride. As long as the interpreter has fingerspelled or signed the name of the ride and the name of the part, the fact that it has been gestured in a structurally incorrect direction will not interfere with the Deaf academic's understanding.

A further complication arises when a spoken word such as *field* has multiple meanings (and therefore has associated multiple signs). This word could refer to a field of wheat, field work that that is carried out when doing research, a field of study (biology, engineering), a variable field for entering data in a computer program, a perceptual frame (e.g., field-dependent, field-independent), among other meanings. If the interpreter picks the wrong meaning, the Deaf academic can clarify the context if necessary. Likewise, there are situations in which there are multiple English words for a single sign that does not have a complementary facial grammar to make a distinction in meaning (e.g., WATER might mean water or aquatic). Teamwork and preparation are essential.

Anyone watching the academic-interpreter dynamic will note that there is constant communication between them, with the academic and interpreter continually signaling their understanding or need for clarification to each other. The key to this teamwork of collaboration and mutual respect and rapport is trust. Just as the Deaf academic needs to trust the interpreters, the interpreters need to trust the Deaf academic. So long as the interpreter is keeping up with content, she or he should trust the Deaf academic to understand even when the material seems impossibly complex. Common to the three authors is this instruction to interpreters: "Just go with it, keep feeding it to me."

For a Deaf person to have secured an academic job, she or he will have developed a certain degree of robustness. The Deaf academic's career will not collapse if interpretation becomes manual transliteration at moments, and she or he will "back-fill" the concepts at the earliest opportunity. There may be many occasions, too, when the Deaf academic has dealt with concepts only in writing and has not had much call to discuss them in sign language. As a result, the spontaneous solution used in a signing situation may be a point of learning for both the Deaf academic and the interpreter, and as a result, new signs may be negotiated or existing

signs may be adapted. However, some interpreters may find it disturbing if the Deaf academic does not express the concept in a standard way. For example, impromptu signed English might be satisfactory to the Deaf academic given the situation but be distressingly unsatisfactory to the interpreter. Again, teamwork is the solution. If the interpreters openly share with Deaf academics which concepts they find hard to interpret and what components they find unsatisfactory from their professional linguistic perspective, then the Deaf academic and interpreter can jointly determine the best interpretation.

In some situations, the to-and-fro teamwork may not be so easy because of the high cognitive load experienced by the academic at times. She or he simply may not have the available resources to instantaneously process or respond to the interpreter's needs because of the immediate situational requirements. For example, an academic, lecturing about a complex statistical concept, will be focused on communicating the topic and will have a lowered ability to acknowledge the interpreter, who may transmit audience or room-relevant information. Thus, although able to take in the transmitted information, the academic will be unlikely to provide immediate acknowledgement to the interpreter as having done so. The relationship between interpreter and academic must be such that both the Deaf academic and the interpreter can see—even from almost imperceptible cues—whether the information has been received or whether it needs to be repeated. This ability calls for a great deal of judgment on the part of the interpreter, who must decide whether or not to interrupt the academic's train of thought.

Ideally, to build specialized interpreting expertise in an academic field, funding would be made available to enable regular and staff interpreters to attend research seminars when not interpreting, observe how other academics or graduate students conventionally present research to the field, or audit courses that cover the basics of the topics (at least two universities are considering this option at present). These initiatives reduce the input needed from the academic, which means the academic can put greater energy into participation rather than into efforts to gain simple access to the situation. Another possible strategy for Deaf academics is to assist interpreters to develop their own files of research materials, both in plain layman language and in scientific terminology, for reviewing and accumulating necessary concepts. Of course, Deaf academics are also likely to use a strategy of compiling a "go-to list" of freelance interpreters who have successfully worked with them in the past rather than rely on the all-comers booking of an agency; over time, this go-to list increases the likelihood that the interpreter has prior contact and experience with the subject.

There are no clear guidelines yet in the area of educational interpreting from the teacher's perspective or in the area of academic interpreting. Furthermore, it is paramount that interpreters working in the academic setting are honest and forthright about any errors in interpretation that may arise. Mistakes made by both the Deaf academic and the interpreter will undoubtedly occur, especially because of the lack of clear guidelines and tried-and-true methods. Open discussion of interpreting errors can enable the interpreter-academic team to sort out the gaps and consider improvements for the future. The dynamic nature of the

interpreting task with the Deaf academic highlights the need for discussion, collaboration, and teamwork.

IN DETAIL: THE THREEFOLD DUTIES OF THE UNIVERSITY-BASED ACADEMIC

The threefold duties of the academic are research, teaching, and service. Each of these duties and the associated interpreting challenges now will be described in detail.

Research

Research is usually more valued than teaching at many mainstream universities. Contrary to popular perception, research work usually does not involve hours of lonely laboratory work. A considerable amount of interaction with other colleagues is involved in arranging collaborations; the collection of data; supervision of graduate students; and presentations of results at local, national, and international conferences. Once hired, academics must establish their research programs by applying for and receiving money with which to conduct their research. Granting agencies sometimes interview their applicants. The academic must also set up a laboratory, employ research assistants, look for research partners, conduct research, and publish papers. Although the academic will also set up courses and get involved in service duties, research generally demands more attention. Research may take the academic to very different environments and may involve a wide variety of people. For example, academics frequently carry out research overseas or off-campus at diverse locations such as corporations, construction sites, or even amusement parks. Furthermore, the academic is expected to attend conferences to keep abreast of advances in his or her field of research and to network with other colleagues, an expectation that comes with its own unique set of challenges for the Deaf academic (see Woodcock, Rohan, and Campbell 2007). The interpreter needs to be flexible enough to respond to the communication opportunities in these many and varied contexts.

Attendance at research conferences is vital to academic careers. Conferences not only provide a venue for gathering feedback about ongoing research and finding out about other research but also provide opportunities for networking and collaboration. When presenting at conferences, academics must create a positive image, one that not only supports self-advancement but also productively represents their universities, provinces, and countries. Thus, preparation for conferences is critical and time-consuming for all university academics, and preparation time for the Deaf academic is compounded by the need to arrange for interpreters. Interpreters should keep in mind the time burdens and the additional stress on Deaf academics when they request or even insist on advance materials or information about the conference, especially because these materials may or may not be easily available (e.g., Woodcock, Rohan, and Campbell 2007).

It goes without saying that interpreter preparation is essential to successful communication, especially for the more complex situations that are likely to arise

in the research-relevant setting. It is sometimes possible for the interpreter (or interpreters) to obtain relevant material before those situations. For example, they may be able to (a) review a conference proceedings provided on CD or abstracts posted on the Internet, (b) read previous meeting minutes, (c) discuss concepts with the Deaf academic, or (d) even meet with others who could assist in assimilating the key concepts of the research or topic to be discussed. Academics often can describe to interpreters the types of concepts that are most likely to be discussed at a particular scientific meeting or an upcoming departmental seminar. However, it is not always possible to anticipate everything that may come up. Event organizers often do not have advance materials, and sometimes obtaining these from presenters is simply not possible because many speakers literally prepare lectures in the airplane en route. In addition, there can be no preparatory materials for questions from the audience or other meeting participants that must be understood and answered.

In view of the time pressure Deaf academics may be under, sometimes it may be helpful if the interpreters contact organizations directly to obtain preparatory materials. However, to avoid creating lasting misperceptions this task needs to be handled very carefully, keeping in mind the necessity to distinguish between interpreters' needs and the Deaf academic's needs as a peer and colleague of the other participants. If the interpreter takes the initiative without prior consultation with the Deaf academic, the contact may not be well received and may have negative consequences for the Deaf academic. For example, one of the authors recently experienced the repercussions of an interpreter's request for advance material, which was perceived by personnel at an organization as unreasonable or badgering. Even a seemingly innocuous framing of the request may be misinterpreted. For example, "I need this material to provide access to Dr. Jane Deaf" or even "The interpreters need this material for preparation" may be taken badly. Irritation or misperceptions may also be translated into negative attitudes toward the Deaf academic, who is very likely to have an enduring concern about avoiding having his or her presence being associated with additional workload. Thus, interpreters always should consult with the Deaf academic before making any contact with organizations or individuals; the academic may prefer to make the initial contact or pass along contacts for key people in the organization who already know the Deaf academic and who would be comfortable with the request. In any event, any requests for advance materials and other preparatory information need to be made not only with sensitivity to "standard" knowledge and attitudes concerning deafness but also with sensitivity to others' time constraints and the constraints on the providing of preparatory materials.

Teaching

Although research is often more highly regarded than teaching, it is important for academics to demonstrate effective teaching skills. At many universities, academics design and prepare the syllabus and the delivery of classroom lectures to classes that may contain as few as ten or twenty or as many as 1,000 or more students,

and their teaching role may also include facilitation of practical work or small group tutorials. Academic teaching also involves motivating student interest, establishing a supportive and inclusive learning environment, and responding to student questions or concerns. It is important that the academic retain authority and establish a good rapport with the students in a classroom, and each Deaf academic will have strategies that work for particular situations (e.g., see Rohan 2008). Interpreters who are voicing for the Deaf academic need to maintain a clear professional delivery that upholds the academic's authority without transferring classroom authority to the interpreter.

The Deaf academic will want clear feedback about what is happening in the classroom and where (e.g., students talking in a large lecture theater; students having difficulty hearing because of construction noise outside; intensity of laughter after sharing a joke). Transacting this feedback is another area in which trust between the interpreter and academic is required. Although the interpreter may provide the Deaf academic with information, in a teaching situation, the Deaf academic may or may not immediately act on the information. For example, she or he may ignore the waving hand or the talking student. Imagine, for example (and this is a real example) that an interpreter gives the academic the information that one student is continually making comments throughout a presentation. The interpreter may be frustrated that the academic does nothing about this situation, but perhaps the academic knows that the students in the room have all their lectures with this student present (and so are accustomed to ignoring him), and everyone (but the interpreter) knows he has a serious impulsivity problem. In the actual situation, the academic had decided to ignore the commenting and speak with the student alone during a break. Instead of trusting that the academic had a solution, the interpreter expressed her frustration by folding her arms and refusing to continue because the commenting was annoying her. In another similar classroom situation, the interpreter turned around and independently told the student to be quiet.

Both situations posed a serious problem for the academic and her relationship with the students. Obviously, teamwork had failed. The interpreter should have trusted the academic's judgment, but the academic perhaps should somehow have also found a way to communicate that the situation was under control. However, in those circumstances, it was difficult to give more than a nod of acknowledgment because the academic was trying to maintain her train of thought to provide a coherent, dynamic, and interesting lecture. In that case, both the interpreter and the Deaf academic should have waited until after the classroom to discuss the problem and ways to resolve it next time.

In some situations (e.g., in Deaf-oblivious universities), Deaf academics may also be dealing with students who have never worked with an interpreter before. Interpreters often need to use good judgment and a great deal of flexibility in responding in such situations. For example, imagine that a (hearing) student for whom English is a second language and who has never worked with an interpreter before unexpectedly wants to talk to the Deaf academic about a distressing personal issue. The student, inexperienced in using an interpreter, will have an expec-

tation of eye contact with the Deaf academic and may be uncomfortable continuing without it. If the academic and the interpreter have had no previous discussion about the way to deal with this situation, they will have to decide what to do in situ. One solution might be to adapt the interpretation flow and position the interpreter behind the student. In fact, in the actual situation this scenario describes, the interpreter, realizing that the Deaf academic had to maintain rapport with the student, waited until the brief moment when the academic looked at her to give, not the exact translation, but the gist of what was being said. This strategy required a great deal of trust and teamwork.

Often, students in a classroom will ask inappropriate questions or exhibit distracting behavior. It is the Deaf academic's responsibility to manage the classroom, so the Deaf academic and the interpreter need to work out their preferred strategies beforehand. For example, the academic may prefer not to deal with deeply personal questions during lecture time and may instruct the interpreter to cease translation and sign "DEEP PERSONAL" if such a situation arises so the academic can very quickly interrupt the student to say, "Please see me later about this one." However, other Deaf academics may be very uncomfortable about using this strategy and prefer to deal with all questions directly. Again, interpreter-academic trust and communication is the key.

Part of teaching involves evaluating student presentations and oral exams. Unlike business settings in which the interpreter can and often should assimilate linguistically awkward utterances into smooth interpretation, it is important that the interpreter not "improve on" a student presentation to render it more coherent. If it is incoherent, the Deaf academic needs to see its incoherence so the mark given reflects this problem. A somewhat similar problem—appropriate level of translation—may also arise when voicing the academic's questions in presentations and oral exams. The purpose and tone of the question (which often is to challenge the presenter and evaluate how the speaker fields the challenge) needs to be reflected in the interpreter's voice inflections; the interpreter needs to be familiar with the appropriate tone and perhaps model the intonations used by other academics who may be involved in the presentation or examination. It goes without saying that if the interpreter's intonation does not reflect the academic's intentions and, instead, indicates either some confusion or a need for clarification, then the academic's authority may be undermined (and stereotypes of deaf intellect may be made salient), not only to the student but also to other academics who may be present. It is important for all involved to work out strategies in the event of confusion during interpretation.

The Deaf academic-interpreter teamwork can be very complex, and in a university setting, the Deaf academic and the interpreters must also incorporate hearing colleagues' and students' participation. The interpreter's input is not only valued but also integral to the Deaf academic's understanding of the situation and its requirements. It is often appropriate for interpreters to provide feedback on the success of classroom positions as well as effectiveness of lectures and communication strategies. For example, it is necessary for the academic to know whether the class is restless, broken up into groups talking among themselves, or obviously

focused on the lecture so the academic can make changes to recapture student attention or so the successful strategy can be used in future lectures. With the benefit of this situational feedback (which is more immediately accessible to hearing academics), the Deaf academic can make improvements to the timing of the lecture points to enhance the pacing and emphasis on key concepts.

Physical positioning of interpreters and the Deaf academic is less straightforward because the interpreters are working for both the entire class and the Deaf academic. The ideal position can be influenced by a wide range of considerations, including classroom layout; type of class or type of course material; sound quality; microphone availability; sight lines; and whether the students are Deaf, hard of hearing, hearing, or a diverse group. Although the most automatic position for the interpreter is in the front row, that position establishes sight lines that many hearing students perceive as excluding them. As an example of practical teamwork, it was an interpreter who suggested that for a hearing audience, an ideal position in large classrooms with auditorium-style seating is a few rows away from the Deaf academic, in approximately the center of the room. That position allows the interpreter to hear the class's responses and maintain good eye contact with the academic, and the academic can direct his or her gaze into the midst of the student seating area.

In an effective interpreter-academic team, information will go in both directions about the efficacy and successfulness of strategies being used and will include discussion about ways to improve communication between students and the Deaf academic. The interpreter may need to solicit specific feedback from the Deaf academic rather than wait and hope for feedback because the academic may not always be aware of what information arising from on-site interpretation needs to be passed on for improvement of future interpretation.

Service

Service is a broad term that includes administrative work, sitting on committee and board meetings in the university as well as in scholarly societies and related community activities, contributing to the community through application of research, and attending to public concerns within fields of expertise. It can range from staff meetings and university governance meetings to interview, merit, or promotion panels. Service also can include consulting and public outreach as well as community work that can involve educating laypeople or designing interventions for improvements in community enterprises or responsibilities. For example, the psychologist may speak at a corporation about interpersonal effectiveness, the engineer may consult with a public utility about ergonomics and safety, and the environmental scientist may work with the community to improve a contaminated site. Participation in such activities not only contributes to successful job reviews but also provides the academic with opportunities to inform teaching, to keep up to date with current research, to identify partners for collaborative work, and to make significant contributions within and outside academia. Networks built or fostered through committee and public service can help the academic to become

known to others across the university who might later be participating in decisions about budget allocations for research and teaching. As a result, the role of the interpreter has critical importance.

Success with interpreting in meetings often depends more on the effectiveness of the meeting chair than on (hearing and Deaf) members or the interpreter. An excellent meeting chair may avail him- or herself of the presence of the interpreter to insist on good protocol that is too often sacrificed. For example, good protocol requires that participants speak one at a time, that all participants have an invitation to speak, and that breaks are timely. The authors have had exemplary experiences with interpretation in which the interpreter formed a strong teamwork bond with the chair/secretariat while maintaining the interpreter-academic teamwork relationship.

The Deaf academic who wants to chair meetings effectively will plan the agenda with the interpreters in mind and will structure the meeting to ensure that all participants have equal quality of interpretation. Again, this planning will require feedback from the interpreter. In these situations, success is more attainable if the same interpreter is booked for meetings of the same type. For example, the same interpreter may be booked for the twice-monthly faculty meeting. As a result, the interpreter not only will have the opportunity to become familiar with regularly used acronyms of terminologies but also will become more familiar with meeting participants (so names rather than identifications such as MAN-WITH-GLASSES can be used). In addition, the interpreter can use better judgment about which (hearing) person to interpret if meeting participants all talk at once. Greater familiarity between the interpreter and meeting participants may make it more likely that the chair or other meeting participants will speak to the interpreter about the meeting logistics before the occasion (of course, there needs to be consultation with the Deaf academic before these discussions happen, again, to avoid potentially undermining the academic).

All Deaf academics likely fight hard to be accepted by their colleagues as a peer and not to appear "needy" or imposing. Neediness may be perceived if attempts to follow participants' contributions result in confusion or if the interpreter requires clarification to effect a translation and therefore interrupts for a repetition of the communication. It may be the case that the Deaf academic would prefer to miss a communication than to have the interpreter ask for clarification or—and this is the authors' strong preference—that the interpreter signal the academic to ask for clarification. It may also be the case that those not accustomed to interpretation may view the interpretation lag as somehow an uncalled-for interruption; this situation needs to be handled with great sensitivity.

In Deaf-oblivious settings, the chair and other participants may show no recognition of the need for one person to speak at a time. If the Deaf academic expects this situation, then she or he may direct the interpreter beforehand to focus on specific people and not to be concerned about others. Again, if it happens without warning that everyone is speaking at once, the interpreter may quickly signal that this situation is happening so the Deaf academic can decide what to do. For example, the academic may quickly indicate the person on whom to focus.

Alternatively, the interpreter may simply be asked to remember what happened and relay this information after the situation. Such postmeeting debriefings are often very important for understanding the ever-present departmental politics that may be unfolding. The Deaf academic loses the opportunity to watch meeting participants' faces and body language because of the need to focus on the interpreter; the interpreter needs to take in this important information to transmit later. This need for debriefing has implications for interpreter booking times; it may be advisable for the Deaf academic to extend the booking time for any meeting to brief the interpreter before the meeting, debrief or review the meeting when it has finished, or both.

It needs to be acknowledged that some academics place a higher priority on service than on teaching or research and opt for a career in university administration. Most presidents and principals of significant universities are former academics, and there is no reason why the Deaf academic could not climb the administrative ladder at mainstream universities. This path would start with undertaking successful initiatives on campus and chairing meetings, which may lead to promotions. Obviously, for a Deaf academic to progress in this way requires high-quality interpretation and teamwork, with a good balance between actively participating and not imposing, but again, this challenge is one that can be turned into an enriching experience for everyone.

WHAT MIGHT THE DEAF ACADEMIC WANT FROM INTERPRETERS?

The Deaf academic is often attributed the same level of abilities or proficiency or competence as the interpreter displays. For example, if the interpreter obviously is having difficulty understanding the communication or is flustered, then hearing people, even those who have familiarity with interpreters, may assume that the Deaf academic has limitations (or the Deaf academic could assume the same about an hearing colleague struggling with an unfamiliar interpreter!). Many interpreters have already established their own repertoire of strategies for dealing with those situations, and although many Deaf academics generally take responsibility for educating others about the role of interpreter, what the interpreter does can have a significant and long-lasting effect in the workplace. Certain key characteristics of successful interpreters, described in the following sections, can play an important role in preventing these exasperating situations.

An Ally

First and foremost, it is important for interpreters to be flexible and to show good judgment in dealing with novel situations. To facilitate a climate of open communication within the academic settings, Deaf academics need interpreters to recognize the complexities of academic situations. In addition, interpreters will recognize that although they are working directly with the Deaf academic, they are also working for all those with whom she or he is interacting, whether or not this

collaboration is acknowledged or understood. This attitude will have a significant influence on the successfulness of the interpreting.

The interpreter who is an effective ally will be flexible about stepping out of his or her usual practices so the Deaf academic can have access not only to the "official" information but also to the background incidental comments and information that may otherwise be missed. Overheard conversations can be important in enabling academics to stay secure within their networks and to remain in the loop of information. Kale and Larson (1998) have pointed out that some Deaf people request that interpreters relay information acquired informally and environmentally and "keep their eyes and ears open all the time" (4) whereas others may find this request to be controversial. However, this strategy may be absolutely necessary for understanding the complex relationship and communication situations encountered by the Deaf academic because it often gives context to subsequent interactions. The interpreter needs to understand the Deaf academic's "agendas" so the interpreter can give the academic potentially relevant information that is occurring in the background, even if it is negative. It is important to understand that this strategy would not entail the interpreter being asked to spy and eavesdrop around campus; it would entail asking the interpreter to ensure transmission of the between-the-lines information as well as the actual "lines" by passing on the ordinary everyday information that the academic's hearing colleagues pick up informally and unofficially.

The information from the interpreter might also enable the Deaf academic to have greater insight into the "politics" of a situation, especially when the Deaf academic may not be able to see the speaker. For example, imagine a meeting in which the person sitting next to the Deaf academic was rolling his or her eyes and sighing at the comments being made by another participant. Unless the interpreter transmitted this information, the Deaf academic would have missed valuable data needed for full access to the complicated (and ever-changing) political environments that often exist in academia. In addition, without such information, the Deaf academic may not be able either to adjust his or her contribution to take into account changes and fluctuations or successfully respond to a particular person outside a meeting.

Kale and Larson (1998) also raised issues of interpreter professionalism in terms of the way interpreters interact with people other than their Deaf colleagues. They give the example of an interpreter taking her leave of a Deaf person, saying, "See you on Monday" within earshot of a hearing colleague. This comment effectively disclosed to the hearing colleague that the Deaf person had a meeting on Monday. From the Deaf academic's perspective, this type of comment may be perceived as a privacy violation only if, for example, the Monday meeting was of a personal nature or was a meeting to which the colleague had not been invited (and which may cause an upset in departmental politics). However, unlike Kale and Larson's example for an occasional contract interpreter, a similar comment may not apply to a regular interpreter who is well-known around the department. If the Monday meeting is also to be attended by the hearing colleague, there would be no difficulty. Indeed, if the interpreter is regarded as an agent of the collective (e.g.,

the meeting or the department) rather than of only the Deaf person, then it would be appropriate to extend the comment to others present. The attitude that the interpreter is an agent of the collective very obviously departs from the now-rejected helper model of interpreting (see Bar-Tzur 1999) and is moving toward an equity structure. In that sense, this attitude also departs from the dynamic duo model of Kale and Larson (1998) and is closer to an ally model (which is preferred by the authors).

Another situation highlights the extent to which the success of the Deaf academic can be dependent on the competence, sensitivity, and flexibility of the interpreter. One author became deaf when already in her academic job and started out by being dependent on interpreters for guidance about how best to negotiate various situations—this dependence occurring at a time when she did not have a confident grasp of sign language. How many interpreters could cope with this situation? Further, how many interpreters could then adjust once the deaf person had developed greater expertise and individual preferences about style or techniques or approaches?

Regular interpreters need to be conscious that both the Deaf person and the situation evolve, grow, and change over time. One interpreter disclosed, after three years, that interpreting for one Deaf academic was effortful because it had to be signed English; ironically, the academic thought the interpreter was fine except she used too much signed English! The interpreter's assumption reflected a preference long predating that assignment, to a time when the academic's receptive skills were less developed; the assumption had been reinforced by the academic's expressive skills, which did not correspond to receptive preference (common among deafened people, as discussed in Woodcock and Aguayo 2000). The interpersonal context of the situation also changes. For example, the Deaf academic may earn tenure and, in turn, may feel more secure; the academic department may elect a new chair; new research students join the team; an old familiar course in the academic's teaching load may be replaced by a new one; or the academic may set his or her sights on promotion. To be an effective ally, the interpreter will need to keep up with and respond to these changes.

Appropriate Comportment and Attire

In interpreting for the Deaf academic, one important guideline for the interpreter may be to ensure that focus is on the Deaf academic, not the interpreter. Consider the sore thumb model of interpreting (e.g., national workshops led by Gary Sanderson, cited in Bar-Tzur 1999) that suggests there is simply no way around the conspicuousness involved with interpreting. Being conspicuous can be awkward, but it can also be handled to the benefit of the Deaf academic. Two main elements of success with respect to this issue are looking the part and dealing graciously with the problem of interpreter-as-conversation-piece.

Interpreters work in many different environments, and most are aware of differing dress codes and that the way they look can reflect on the Deaf academic and other colleagues at various events. Furthermore, most Deaf academics are

willing to discuss possible levels of formality for particular interpreting situations. Academics' work can include situations that range from cocktail receptions to classroom and conference lectures to work at lakes and roller coasters. As a result, it is the academic's (or the event organizer's) responsibility to give the interpreter information about the social and safety considerations affecting wardrobe choices. If specialized equipment (such as safety footwear or eyewear) is needed, then it is the Deaf academic's responsibility to sort out this information in advance with the interpreter (or interpreters). When traveling and working with freelance agency interpreters, most Deaf academics would not mind corresponding briefly by e-mail ahead of time about the particulars of the assignment.

One of the authors, who is at a Deaf-oblivious university, routinely books one particular interpreter for official university occasions, less on the basis of language skills than for his ability to convey to the hearing participants that their Deaf colleague is actively participating and suitably involved in the occasion. Often, a Deaf academic, in an effort to conserve mental and physical energy for other high priority agenda items, may not pay complete attention to the interpreter. It may also be the case, especially at official functions, that speakers have very little to say but use a great number of words. Rather than draw attention to the Deaf academic's reduced focus or cease signing until the speaker actually says something that is possible to interpret, interpreters could reduce their interpretation efforts (and conserve their own mental and physical energy for later). Using such an approach, neither the interpreter nor the Deaf academic would appear disinterested, disrespectful, or wasteful to others. To make this strategy possible, the Deaf academic would need to discuss the meeting topics, formal and informal agendas, and topic cues with the interpreter (or interpreters) before the occasion and would need to establish an agreed means to alert each other of an increase or decrease in attention.

The other phenomenon to deal with is the interpreter as conversation piece. Although this curiosity may result in competition for people's attention to the Deaf academic's intellectual participation in the event, the slight compensatory advantage is that professional acquaintances may be developed from curious inquiries or other comments about interpreting (e.g., "They look so beautiful signing up there"; "It must be so challenging for the interpreters to sign all that scientific terminology" or "My niece, cousin, brother's sister-in-law knows a deaf person and I always wanted to learn sign language"). The object is to graciously parry these inquiries or comments while directing attention back to the Deaf academic.

One of the authors learned from a new professional acquaintance that he had expressed polite interest in the interpreter's role while sitting next to the interpreter at a conference meal, and the interpreter had abruptly cut him off and resumed conversing with another interpreter—even though the interpreting needs at that moment were being handled by a third interpreter. Closing off to small talk may give the impression that a Deaf academic is like an untouchable celebrity arriving with an entourage. The colleague who has been rebuffed by the interpreter after he or she has asked simple questions such as "Is this your first time at this conference? Oh, an interpreter? How does that work?" is unlikely to go on to speak with

the Deaf academic through that interpreter or even through any other communication avenue. If the Deaf academic is present but in the middle of another conversation, a gracious and effective strategy could be that the interpreter responds in a way that leads toward involving the academic at a suitable opening. Quite frequently, the Deaf academic has already acquired skills in redirecting those inquiries in a more professional direction and thus can provide both hearing and Deaf colleagues with a new networking opportunity.

The interpreter may also encounter deafness or sign language questions outside the company of the Deaf academic; these inquiries also require appropriate, gracious responses. The interpreter's standby response to questions about the Deaf person, "I'm not sure, it's best to ask her" may apply well to this situation. Interpreters have also effectively improvised with brief factual responses such as "some Deaf people speak and some don't." If the interpreter can field these questions briefly, then it does allow the Deaf academic to keep the focus of the conversation on the academic purposes of the event and the merits of the Deaf academic's or his or her colleagues' work. However, if the Deaf academic is present, the interpreter should turn the conversation so the academic can monitor or steer it. A machine model of interpreting is not being recommended here. Instead, the recommendation reflects the belief that the purpose of participation and interpretation is diminished if the focus is drawn to the interpreter and not to the interaction among the Deaf and hearing colleagues.

Supportive and Respectful Attitude

Most interpreters have a great deal of experience with situations in which the Deaf person has the lower authority status in a meeting with hearing people (e.g., doctor appointments, school meetings, students taking courses). In bigger cities with large Deaf communities, interpreters' experience is changing, but not all interpreters are used to working in a situation in which the Deaf person has a high social status within hearing culture. Adjustment to the Deaf academic's high status and strong language skills may be required.

Many Deaf academics have experienced moments in which the interpreter did not select the appropriate high-status voicing, demeanor, or body language when facilitating communication, and the resulting choices have led to loss of respect from others. In scientific and academic research, confrontation and debate are common features, and scientists can be very competitive. Deaf academics, like their hearing academic colleagues, must express assertiveness and expertise in highly competitive situations to convey confidence and maintain the respect of others. As a result, many Deaf academics will have had experiences where the interpreter, thinking that he or she was enabling intercultural communication between Deaf and hearing cultures, attempted to tone down their directness inappropriately (e.g., Mindess 1999). However, interpreters may be unaware that scientists and academic researchers have a culture that encompasses behavior and communication patterns not observed in the general hearing culture and, by their efforts to modulate directness, the interpreter may be causing the Deaf academic to appear unsure and

unconvincing. In other words, the Deaf academic and the interpreter are simultaneously operating in three cultures (Deaf, hearing, and academic).

Typically, Deaf academics are aware of cultural norms and attempt to be sensitive to cues in all three cultures (but not always, if important overheard comments are missed), so the interpreter must follow the Deaf academic's lead. Clarification and open communication about what the interpreter is hearing and what the Deaf academic knows is essential before, during, and after the interpreting situation. The need for openness and discussion about interpreting situations as well as the need for showing assertiveness (either through their signing or through speaking with a strong voice) may present a challenge for some interpreters.

Kale and Larson (1998) reported a colorful anecdote in which Herb, a Deaf professional, responded with a non sequitur as a result of an attention lapse in a meeting. Through debriefing, the majority of Deaf people suggested that the interpreter might have cued Herb to his impending gaffe whereas most hearing people thought that the interpreter should confine himself to linguistic content and allow Herb the freedom to humiliate himself—just as hearing people have that freedom. Although Deaf people certainly are entitled to fail and should not be protected from challenges that pose that risk, the authors do not believe that this situation falls in that category. The reasoning for this belief follows.

From the perspective of ergonomics, it has been recognized for some years that interpreters are at risk of repetitive motion and cumulative-trauma, soft-tissue injuries. In longer assignments, teams are now the norm. Unlike the interpreters who generally rest in alternate twenty-minute shifts, Deaf people, who are in the minority during a meeting consisting of hearing people, do not have any opportunity to rest. (Although it can be argued that academic meetings should have built-in breaks to allow for rest, there are many situations when breaks are just not possible). Like watching a computer screen, the task of watching an interpreter can be no less fatiguing than the task of producing of those signs. Even with adequate contrast and no glare—the ideal so rarely achieved—continuously watching the interpreter in one position creates static posture in the neck. Hearing people in those situations (as well as Deaf people attending meetings with other Deaf people) have the luxury of shifting positions and tuning out for brief periods without any breakdown in communication flow. For the Deaf person, varying viewing distance by looking elsewhere could relieve the visual and muscular fatigue but could result in missing information.

When a Deaf person is concentrating particularly hard on making sure to miss nothing, he or she will blink less, resulting in dry eyes becoming even more tired. Thus, the interpreter must be aware of the Deaf academic's need to make a few discreet excursions from full concentration to get relief from this strain. Ideally, the interpreter will not draw attention to those excursions by reducing signing speed (or similar strategies) but will be aware that there may be an upcoming need for clarification. Indeed, Kale and Larson (1998) suggested that the cues of errors that might be associated with excursions from full concentration could be couched discreetly as "clarifications" of the preceding utterance. It could also be intercepted preemptively. It is helpful for the interpreter (or interpreters) and the Deaf academic

to agree on strategies before the event so the interpreter knows when and how to recapture the Deaf academic's attention. Summarizing key points to allow the Deaf academic to ask the speaker to repeat and clarify is usually sufficient.

In meetings, one difficulty often encountered is the timing and style of interruptions. It is the case at many academic meetings that people constantly speak over each other; consequently, it is difficult to get a comment in, especially if those involved in the meeting are not making any allowances for the interpreter and Deaf academic (a common experience for academics in Deaf-oblivious environments). Deaf academics will have different strategies designed to suit each interpreter and situation. For example, a Deaf academic could raise a hand and wave it to attract the chair's acknowledgment. In academic meetings, the interpreter also must be skilled at knowing *what* to interpret, or *who* to focus on, and this knowledge requires prior preparation and discussion.

In less Deaf-receptive environments, it also can be problematic for the interpreter to gain clarification from a speaker. Knowing how or knowing when *not* to ask for clarification is important. For example, in a Deaf-oblivious environment in which the Deaf academic is the only Deaf person at a formal gathering, it is rarely, if ever, appropriate to ask for clarification. When in doubt, the interpreter always should, in situ, ask the Deaf academic what she or he wants to do. It is possible that the missed information was obvious within the vernacular of the field, is of no consequence, or can be something that can be followed up after the event. It may be appropriate, for example, for the Deaf academic, *not* the interpreter, to ask for the clarification.

On-Site Situational Flexibility and Commitment

Sometimes, particularly in research settings because of the spontaneous nature of exploration, opportunities arise that have not been planned. Deaf academics often have an open-ended work day. The interpreter's ability and willingness to be flexible is valuable, especially if the Deaf academic is doing research off-campus; such research frequently has indeterminate time frames. Occasionally, interpreters leave abruptly at the end of booked time. Although there are many reasons why this practice cannot be avoided and is understandable, people will still be dismayed if no prior warning was given and the business is far from completed. When Deaf academics' colleagues are involved (e.g., in faculty meetings, visiting speaker lectures, professional development opportunities), interpreter time flexibility may also be of paramount importance. There may be misinterpretations of the Deaf academic's behavior if she or he leaves an occasion before it has ended, and there may be no opportunity to explain. Furthermore, inability to continue may be interpreted by peers as meaning that the Deaf academic cannot be relied on.

Obviously, Deaf academics need to know any time limitations in advance so they will be able to make every effort to ensure that the meeting organizers also understand in advance that there are uncontrollable limits. It is helpful to know in advance whether flexibility exists for the interpreter's booked time so the Deaf academic and hearing colleagues can make efforts to manage the booked time ac-

cordingly. For example, if interpreters' time is booked through a central office on campus, the interpreter can provide feedback on the booking procedures, how he or she deals with the booking manager (and any difficulties), and discuss whether the Deaf academic should book extra time for given situations. The Deaf academic can then communicate with the interpreter, the central booking office, or both what the need is for additional flexibility for certain events. Over time and with feedback, the academic may learn that certain interpreters can never have this flexibility and should not be booked for that type of assignment.

Deaf and hearing colleagues commonly complain about having interpreters cancel bookings at the last minute. Although medical or family emergencies should and must take precedence over a typical academic meeting, cancellations affect not only Deaf academics but also everyone working with the Deaf academic (for example, what if the Deaf academic were to chair an urgent meeting or be scheduled to teach a large class that cannot be cancelled?). Most interpreters are very responsible individuals who take pride in their work and take their obligations seriously, and if any cancellations occur, those interpreters will do their utmost to find a replacement. However, the negative effect of last-minute cancellations, no matter the reason, is indisputable. The authors recommend that to reduce the number of necessary last-minute cancellations, interpreters, Deaf academics, and universities should use the block-booking strategy and book interpreter time in advance for blocks of time that are typically busiest parts of the working week. By booking a block of time, the Deaf academic will avoid situations in which the interpreter may cancel a one-hour booking with the Deaf academic in favor of an afternoon's booking somewhere else (which has happened to many Deaf academics). It is also recommended that interpreters understand and respect the vagaries of academic work pace and organize with the academic on a week-by-week basis to see whether the booked times need to be adjusted. One strategy is for the regular interpreter (or interpreters) to routinely provide the academic or a booking manager with a weekly timetable of availability.

Some Uncomfortable Realities

This section covers certain uncomfortable realities that the authors have observed frequently, realities that have had real and direct effect on the successes of Deaf academics, hearing colleagues, and interpreters. Many of the realities listed below can be very difficult to resolve in real life, but they must be honestly acknowledged and solutions must be worked out whenever possible.

The Deaf academic often must negotiate the booking and payment of interpreters. In Deaf-oblivious or even in Deaf-receptive environments, this negotiation often is extremely difficult—for the academic and for the interpreter. Unfortunately, situations in which direct (and relatively hostile) questioning of the interpreter have ensued are all too common. Particularly with respect to payment, both the academic and the interpreter need to remain calm but clear and direct about why payment should occur in a timely way while respectfully acknowledging the questioner's concerns. One of the authors discovered that lack of timely payment

can be viewed as a form of indirect discrimination, especially if payment is slow to a freelance interpreter who then may not accept bookings as a result of that slow payment. What she has said to questioners, and what she has encouraged interpreters to say, is "I'm sorry that you are upset. Unfortunately, I don't make the laws, and unfortunately, nonpayment is viewed as a form of discrimination under antidiscrimination laws. If you would like to talk with someone about this situation, here's the number for the Office of Human Rights." The payment issue is unlikely to go away, and the interpreter and the Deaf academic need to handle it sensitively while maintaining a strong stance for everyone's rights. Insensitive handling may have consequences for the Deaf academic's reputation or standing within the academic community.

Bar-Tzur (1999) distinguished between being an ally and being an advocate, pointing out that the ally model required the interpreter to avoid oppressing but not actively fight the oppression by others as long as the Deaf person is aware of it. Most Deaf academics are all too aware that many of the experienced difficulties (particularly during the processes of hiring) have been close to or are way past the boundaries of equity rights. At those moments, the Deaf academic may not be able to immediately assert his or her rights for equitable access or may have strategically decided to attempt to make changes from within or through use of other tactics rather than through direct confrontation. This decision sometimes does not sit well with interpreters who may not be fully acquainted with the Deaf academic's situation and strategy. Interpreters may not agree with the academic's strategies, but the authors believe that interpreters should voice their concerns either before or after a potentially problematic situation and are obligated to respect the Deaf academic's wishes. One of the authors has experienced an interpreter challenging an offender, even though the author had requested—because the probability of bad behavior had been predicted—that the interpreter stay quiet regardless of such behavior. This action not only spoiled the Deaf academic's planned corrective strategies but also violated the interpreter-academic trust relationship.

Although most Deaf academics are aware of their capacity to assert their rights, their focus must remain on their work and potential to contribute—and not on possible equity violations. Often, it is best to immediately resolve the situation through leading by example and then selecting the right time to approach the offender when he or she may be more ready to accept feedback. Open criticism of those who may not be aware of the significance of their actions often generates negative responses or backlashes. The interpreter also must be honest with the academic about what is going on—even when it is deeply negative or offensive. For example, in a meeting in which two students were being challenged about a cheating offence, an interpreter did not immediately transmit that the student storming out had said deeply offensive words about the Deaf academic. The delay in relaying the information actually undermined the response to this offensive behavior. The essential message here is this: Interpreters need to convey as much information as possible about communications and about the contexts of communications, and if interpreters are uncomfortable about any features of these situations, they need to discuss it with the academic in private and let the Deaf academic

decide on the most appropriate course of action. Resolving these uncomfortable moments in tandem with the Deaf academic is the essence of being an ally.

Another uncomfortable reality concerns the relationships among interpreters. Earlier, it was mentioned that sometimes a Deaf academic may prefer an interpreter who projects an appropriate appearance of professionalism over one with superior linguistic expertise. High-quality interpretation is very much valued by all Deaf academics, but often the Deaf academic must choose interpreters based on other factors that include considerations of attitude and comportment. In certain situations, Deaf academics may choose interpreters who have the most adaptable attitude and willingness to work as a team over more highly qualified interpreters who have a more business-like approach and strict nonnegotiable beliefs about what interpreters and their clients should and should not do. However, despite the Interpreter Code of Ethics and interpreter confidentiality, Deaf academics may be concerned about interpreter backlash if they appear to favor one interpreter over another. Furthermore, Deaf academics may need to face the difficulties of teaming particular interpreters together. For example, it may be the case that two interpreters had previously been in a romantic relationship or that another two interpreters had had a falling out over a difference of opinion or that some interpreters play one-upmanship games in the guise of interpreter teamwork (e.g., one interpreter may continually correct the other or break train of thought in some other way). These internal politics potentially result in not being able to get the best possible interpretation for a given situation.

Those concerns unnecessarily compound the Deaf academic's workload, and they affect hearing colleagues because difficult interpreter relationships affect the quality of service for everyone in the room and reduce the total availability of interpreters in the community. It adds stress for everyone because of the added layer of work required to manage relationships between Deaf and hearing colleagues. Interpreters need to openly recognize those issues and work with one another as well as with Deaf and hearing colleagues to bypass those concerns as much as possible given the situation.

The last uncomfortable reality that will be discussed concerns interpreter qualification. Many interpreter training programs (ITPs) that provide specialization in professional fields such as legal and medical interpreting may have their focus on providing training in the translation of high-level English into sign language rather than on translating high-level communications in sign language into English. As a result, many graduates from accredited ITPs and specialized certification programs, no matter how effective their skills as an interpreter, are not sufficiently prepared to interpret sign language into advanced English in high-functioning situations. This reality compounds the difficulties facing the Deaf academic, the academic interpreters, and their hearing colleagues because Deaf academics must adhere to a very high standard of English (or the national spoken language). Therefore, high standards of communication in both spoken and sign languages are essential for successful academic interpreters.

Solutions are required not only with respect to preparing interpreters for the ever-increasing number of high-level professional situations but also with respect

to the need for greater clarity in descriptions of interpreting assignments so interpreters are aware of the level of skill required. For example, the assignment description "meeting, near Maple Street and Elm Avenue, 9:00 to noon" does not specify the level of sign language–spoken language communication or the level of the skill requirements needed for effective interpretation. The communication level of spoken language is not always taken into consideration either in the awarding of qualifications or by interpreter booking services, and as the number of Deaf academics and professionals increases, we hope that more training and certification programs will start to consider this aspect in their curricula.

CONCLUSION

Educational interpreting in university settings typically involves the facilitation of classroom communication between Deaf and hard of hearing students and their hearing instructors. Topics are clearly defined by the course syllabi, so educational interpreters can focus on learning the course material and the associated technical signs. Academic interpreting—working with a Deaf academic—is not so straightforward. In the university context, academics' very demanding jobs incorporate research, teaching, and service, with tenure or promotion dependent on success in at least two of these three areas. Academic interpreting often involves high-functioning situations and a varied schedule, so the interpreter may find the work very rewarding. But there is pressure. The effectiveness of the interpretation can have direct implications for the Deaf academic's success, particularly in Deaf-receptive and Deaf-oblivious university settings. At the same time, to attain their positions, Deaf academics will have had to develop adaptability and resilience. They will not fail simply because the interpreter uses an incorrect sign or has no idea of the meaning of what he or she is signing—as long as the interpreter (a) enables the academic to keep up with the content and (b) promotes a good social rapport between the Deaf academic and the professional environment. Although sometimes the interpreter will not feel fully knowledgeable about the subject matter, the Deaf academic will understand and play a support role in two-way communication before, after, and during the assignment to allow the interpreter to feel more comfortable. In other words, the Deaf academic must be considered a part of the interpreting team in situations where interpreters are out of their depth.

As in other work (e.g., Bar-Tzur 1999; Kale and Larson 1998), the benefit of teamwork in achieving effective interpreting has been highlighted. However, a complex task has been described that is distinct from the dynamic duo concept. This task necessitates teamwork—not only between the Deaf academic and the interpreter but also between the interpreter and the academic's hearing colleagues and students. This teamwork approach indicates an ally model. Although Deaf academics know how to do their work, their work does not always know how to deal with them! However, Deaf academics and their hearing colleagues are unlikely to want the interpreter to play the role of a bilingual-bicultural educator, and interpreters should not have to take on this role in addition to their interpretation duties in high-level academic settings.

A great deal of learning is required, not only for interpreters new to academic settings but also for the Deaf academic's colleagues. The interpreter's willingness to learn, to be flexible, and to be adaptive are essential prerequisites for success in educational interpreting from the instructor's side of the classroom and for success in academic interpreting. The need for learning, flexibility, and adaptiveness emphasizes the importance of inclusiveness and teamwork on the part of all participants and not just on the part of the Deaf academic and the interpreter. The arrival of a Deaf academic in the Deaf-oblivious setting is a novelty and can be a source of confusion. Understanding the adjustment that those in these settings need to make is necessary to transform the work group toward a Deaf-receptive setting. Because there are few other workplaces in which Deaf academics can practice their chosen careers, Deaf academics in these environments often moderate in their workplaces the advocacy that they might otherwise practice in the outside community; these academics do not want the interpreter to be an advocate any more than they want the interpreter to be a helper or a machine.

It will be important to all Deaf academics and their hearing colleagues that their interpreters become comfortable and enjoy the professional challenges of working in an academic environment. Deaf academics and their hearing colleagues will thrive with interpreters who are willing to trust them, collaborate with them, and be their allies.

References

Bar-Tzur, D. 1999, March. *Integrating the interpreting service models.* Available: http://www.theinterpretersfriend.com/misc/models.html (accessed on November 6, 2007).

Caccamise F., and H. Lang. 1996. *Signs for science and mathematics: A resource book for teachers and students.* Rochester, N.Y.: National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Kale A., and H. W. Larson. 1998. The deaf professional and the interpreter: A dynamic duo. Paper presented at the Eighth Biennial Conference on Post-Secondary Education for Persons Who are Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing, The Center on Deafness, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Available: http://www.pepnet.org/confpast/1998/pdf/kale.pdf (accessed December 5, 2007).

Mindess, A. 1999. *Reading between the signs: Intercultural communication for sign language interpreters.* Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Rohan, M. J. 2008. Just another lecturer? Mainstream university students' response to their deaf lecturer. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Woodcock, K., and M. Aguayo. 2000. *Deafened people: Adjustment and support.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Woodcock K., M. J. Rohan, and L. M. Campbell. 2007. Equitable representation of deaf people in mainstream academia: Why not? *Higher Education* 53: 359–79.