

Look-Pause-Nod: A Linguistic Case Study of a Deaf Professional and Interpreters Working Together

2

Jemina Napier, Andy Carmichael, and Andrew Wiltshire

THE ART and science of sign language interpreting (Stewart, Schein, and Cartwright 1998) has been discussed in the literature for many years and has characteristically focused on the presence of interpreters at communication events where deaf people are seeking access to some kind of information. Discussion has often concentrated on key areas such as educational interpreting (Winston 2004), medical interpreting (Metzger 1999), legal interpreting (Russell 2002), and community interpreting (Harrington and Turner 2001). In terms of power dynamics, the deaf person is not in a position of power or authority in these discussions. He or she is characteristically the student, patient, defendant, or witness. The deaf person in those situations is not the expert; rather, he or she is relying on the expertise of others.

Several authors have discussed these situations and have acknowledged the power dynamics at play in different situational contexts as well as the importance for interpreters to recognize the inherent communication and discourse protocols in those contexts (see e.g., Metzger 1999; Wadensjö 1998). Previous literature has suggested that it is the interpreters' role to empower deaf people in these situations (McIntire and Sanderson 1994); that interpreters have to acknowledge that linguistic and cultural mediation is necessary (Mindess 1999); that the communication event has to be managed by the interpreter (Roy 2000); that the interpreter has to choose a translation style that suits the client, the context, or both (Napier 2002; Pollitt 2000); and that the interpreter has to be extremely skilled and competent at what he or she does to get it all right (Napier, McKee, and Goswell 2006).

Community interpreting in general is a difficult challenge, regardless of the languages being used (Pöchhacker 2003). Spoken language interpreters working in the community often use the consecutive mode (Gentile, Ozolins, and Vasilakakos 1996) whereas sign language interpreters typically work simultaneously. Spoken language interpreters usually use the simultaneous mode in more formal settings such as conferences. This approach is challenging because of pressures on short- and long-term memory and cognitive processing requirements (Jesse et al. 2000; Liu, Schallert, and Carroll 2004; Moser-Mercer 2000). The simultaneous approach presents a different challenge to sign language interpreters because it involves using two different language modalities (Padden 2000).

The majority of work on simultaneous sign language interpreting has focused on interpreting from the spoken word into a signed language, usually for a monologue, and in an educational context (Cokely 1992; Davis 2003; Marschark et al. 2005; Siple 1996). In these studies, the interpretation output has been for a deaf audience, where deaf people are relying on the expertise of others to access information—much like in many other community settings.

The notion of the deaf professional is an emerging concept. There exists a new class of deaf people (Padden and Humphries, 2005) who are completing university studies and working in various professional roles such as educators, lawyers, advocates, and business managers. These deaf people have different needs when it comes to working with interpreters (see Campbell, Rohan, and Woodcock this volume). They still need to be empowered, but in a different way. They need to be empowered so they can control the communication event. They need to be empowered so they can better understand the interpreting process, to work with interpreters as a team to achieve effective communication. Interpreters also need to be empowered with information and knowledge so the interpreting outcome is positive for the deaf professional.

When working with deaf professionals, interpreters are required to work in situations where the typical interpreting dynamic is reversed. An interpreter's work is typically unidirectional from a spoken to a signed language for monologues (Cokely 1992; Napier 2002) or bidirectional in dialogic situations (Metzger 1999; Roy 2000). Deaf professionals still use interpreters in these situations. However, the inherent requirements of their work means that deaf professionals regularly give formal presentations at conferences or seminars. Therefore, interpreters in those situations are required to work unidirectionally from a signed language into a spoken language, that is, to provide voice-over.

Conferences present interpreting challenges because of the complexity of texts (Baigorri-Jalón 1999; Messina 1998; Moser-Mercer, Kunzli, and Korac 1998; Seleskovitch 1978). The linguistic features of formal signed presentations have been identified (Napier 2006; Roy 1989; Zimmer 1989), and voice-overs need to reflect the appropriate register of such presentations (Roy 1987; Shaw 1992; Zimmer 1992). Therefore, the relationship between interpreters and deaf professionals is crucial (Cokely 2005; Liedel and Brodie 1996).

The key to a successful working relationship between a deaf professional and interpreter is teamwork. Typically, the literature refers to teamwork in the context of two interpreters working together and the strategies they use for supporting each other (Cokely and Hawkins 2003; Davies 1987; Fischer 1993). Interpreters who work together regularly become familiar with each other's strategic preferences and therefore work more effectively as a team. Deaf professionals and interpreters can also benefit from a similar teamwork approach.

A deaf professional will typically work with a preferred interpreter on a recurrent basis. Regular contact affords the opportunity to develop strategies for working together as a team and, thus, to build a relationship based on familiarity and trust. Over time, the team will develop communication tactics to ensure that a

signed presentation can be voiced-over as effectively as possible. These strategies have been referred to in the literature (Hodek and Radatz 1996; Hurwitz 1986), but no qualitative linguistic studies have been conducted to provide evidence of the actual strategies used.

This chapter presents a case study of an Australian deaf professional and two interpreters who work together regularly. The strategies used by this team for a particular seminar presentation are analyzed and discussed using discourse analysis. These strategies have been developed over time, and the purpose of this chapter is to present evidence of how these strategies are established and used in context. The study involves the discourse analysis of a videotaped seminar presentation, where both the deaf professional and the interpreters were filmed. The analysis focuses on the use of key discourse markers as communication strategies for achieving clarification and controlling the pace of the presentation, in particular, the use of pauses, nods, and eye contact.

This chapter covers three stages of teamwork: preassignment, *in situ* (during the assignment), and postassignment. First, the preparation strategies are described. Second, discussion focuses on what strategies were actually used during the presentation and interpretation, with transcriptions of the data to provide specific examples. Third, retrospective reflections of the experience are presented, with comments from the deaf professional and interpreters to elucidate.

DISCOURSE: MARKERS, CUES, AND INTERPRETING

Discourse refers to extended samples of spoken, written, or signed texts and to the way that language is used in different sorts of social situations. According to Witter-Merithew (2002), "Defined simply, discourse is the way we talk about what we choose to talk about" (177). The relationship between language, communicative interaction, and context influences discourse (Hymes 1972). Discourse analysis focuses on the analysis of utterances in context, which have led to the identification of various types of discourse, or "forms of talk" (Goffman 1981). The key distinction between different discourse types is (a) whether they are planned or unplanned and (b) the level of formality (Schiffrin 1994). These distinctions influence the type of communication that takes place and the ensuing interaction. Research on sign language discourse has found that there are similarities between discourse types and conventions used in signed and spoken languages (Metzger and Bahan 2001). Signed languages do appear to have formal and informal language use (Zimmer 1989; Russo 2004), although established discourse genres tend to be more influenced by the dominant spoken language in formal settings such as university lectures (Napier 2006). Identification of discourse features in signed languages tends to focus on eye gaze (Martinez 1995), eye blinks (Padden 1976), nonmanual features (facial expression, eyebrow, and cheek movement; head, shoulder, and body movement) (Bahan 1996; Baker and Padden 1978), mouthing (Gee and Kegl 1983), patterns of footing shifts (McKee 1992), spatial shifts (Winston 1995), and prosody and pauses (Gee and Kegl 1983).

Interactional sociolinguists such as Goffman (1981), Tannen (1984, 1989), and Gumperz (1982) have argued that relationships are constructed through discourse. Research has predominantly focused on the investigation of naturally occurring interactions in relation to the purpose of a language event and has found that people adapt their communicative style depending on the person with whom they are talking. Gumperz (1976) and Ochs, Schegloff, and Thompson (1996) have identified dialogic turn-taking structures (the use of openings, closings, asides, and interruptions), and Goffman (1981) distinguishes between different kinds of monologues (in the form of lectures) and states that people use certain footing shifts (such as pausing and intonation) in delivering a lecture to involve the audience in the presentation.

Drawing on Goffman's (1981) work, McKee (1992) found that particular eye-gaze and body posture cues are used as footing shifts in American Sign Language (ASL) formal lectures, in a way that is similar to how English speakers use pausing, intonation, and so forth. Roy (1989) discussed the use of certain discourse markers to mark a shift into new topics (episodes) and subtopics. In addition, Bahan (1996), Baker and Padden (1978), Metzger (1998), Metzger, Fleetwood, and Collins (2004), and Padden (1976) have analyzed the interactional strategies of ASL users and interpreters for getting attention and holding the floor, for example, with the use of eye gaze.

Research on turn taking has identified various cues that are used by interaction participants to signal turns (Lerner 1993, cited in Van Herreweghe 2002). For example, the next speaker in a spoken English multiparty discourse can be selected by saying that person's name or by gazing in that person's direction and maintaining eye contact. One of the most common methods to yield a turn for speakers in this context is by using a person's name (Lerner 1996). Participants also use syntactical features, duration of pauses, and shifts in intonation patterns to control turn taking (Wennerstrom and Siegel 2003).

Martinez (1995), Dively (1998), and Coates and Sutton-Spence (2001) have conducted research on turn taking in sign language, looking at openings and closings as well as pausing in conversations. In two-party conversations, a deaf signer holds the floor by not making direct eye contact with the receiver (looking into middle distance). One strategy used to indicate a turn is for the receiver to increase the size and quantity of head nodding. The current signer has the power to allocate the next turn through use of eye gaze (Van Herreweghe 2002).

Typically, the notion of interpreting cues has focused on the prompts that interpreting teams use to support each other when working. Cokely and Hawkins (2003) have conducted the only empirical study that identified strategies used by interpreters to request support when working from ASL into English. These cues include body leans and tapping, head tilts and shakes, eye gaze, and specific verbal requests. They found a discrepancy between stated preferences and actual strategies used.

To date, no wide-scale formal research has been carried out on Australian Sign Language (Auslan) to identify the use of discourse markers or conventions of interactions in Auslan. However, a small-scale basic study carried out by Thornton (2003) for the purposes of developing a curriculum to teach Auslan verifies that

Auslan discourse types and forms of talk are very similar to those identified for other signed languages.

Therefore, the case study discussed in this chapter is the first study using discourse analysis to present linguistic evidence of discourse markers used as cues between a deaf presenter and an interpreting team as a communication strategy. Although specific to Auslan-to-English interpretation, the strategies outlined can be applied by signed language interpreters worldwide. The study adopts an interactional sociolinguistic approach to the discourse analysis by recording and analyzing a naturally occurring text—in this case, a presentation in Auslan—and the resulting interpretation into spoken English.

METHOD

In order to detail the case study, we will begin by discussing the context and procedure for the data collection.

The Context and Participants

Andrew, in his role as Community Liaison and Projects Officer for Deaf Australia, was invited to be one of five presenters at a seminar hosted by the Disability Studies and Research Institute (DSaRI) at the University of New South Wales in Sydney. The other four presenters were a disability studies academic, a disability organization representative, a care person, and an advocate. The audience of fifty to sixty people was made up of much the same demographic as the presenters in addition to government representatives. DSaRI is a collaborative and cross-disciplinary initiative of several universities, disability organizations, industry groups, and researchers and promotes a social perspective on disability research.

The seminar was titled “Disability in Australia: An Audit.” The stated goal of the seminar was to “provide an audit of where we are in Australia, seeking to utilize activists and scholars in the area of disability to explore disability today, and the prospects for tomorrow. Whether we call it oppression, apartheid, or any other name, this seminar will provide an audit with regard to where Australians with disabilities are now in Australian society. What are the key trends, challenges, opportunities, and frameworks? The focus is on how ‘disability studies’ is responding, and how our policy, research and scholarship should respond into the future.”

Andrew (AW) requested that Andy (AC) and Jemina (JN) be booked as the two interpreters to work with him at the seminar. It was decided that the event would be an ideal opportunity to film naturalistic discourse and interpretation as a case study for analysis. Permission was sought from the seminar organizers to film AW’s presentation, which was granted.

Procedure

Three stages of the interpreting assignment were filmed: the preparatory briefing session before the assignment, the presentation and interpretation, and the post-

assignment debriefing session. Discussions in the pre- and postassignment sessions were held in Auslan.

The data comprised fifty minutes of film, which can be divided into three texts. The first text contains fifteen minutes of preparatory discussion. The second text is limited to twenty minutes of AW presenting in Auslan, with the two interpreters also in-vision so the voice-over could be heard and so the interactions between the interpreting team and the presenter could be seen. The third text contains fifteen minutes of debrief discussion.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The process of analysis involved transcribing the data for each of the three stages of study.

Transcription

Texts 1 and 3 were translated into written English to provide data tokens as qualitative evidence for discussion, with clear delineation of turns taken and by whom. Analysis of Text 2 focused on the use of pauses, nods, and eye contact as discourse markers that were used as cues for controlling the communication and flow of information. A transcription system was developed to adequately gloss the Auslan lexicon and syntax, the English voice-over interpretation, and the discourse markers used by the presenter and both interpreters. Metzger (1999) and others have suggested that effective transcription systems adopt the structure and layout of musical scores. We have adopted a musical score system, layering the transcription with three lines: AW’s Auslan gloss and discourse markers, AC’s English interpretation and discourse markers, and JN’s cues. Nine key themes were identified through the presentation: (1) introduction and orientation, (2) intertextual reference, (3) personal recount, (4) Deafness as difference, (5) deaf community experience, (6) hypothetical scenario, (7) Australian Association of the Deaf, (8) concerns and collaboration, and (9) conclusion. The transcription is divided by themes and by the stanzas within each theme, to make qualitative data tokens easily identifiable. A description of the transcription conventions can be seen in Appendix A.

Preparation Meeting

The briefing meeting functioned as a form of preparation for all three participants for the assignment, but most of all between the primary interpreter (AC) and the deaf presenter (AW). The discussion established the genre of the assignment as a panel discussion and went on to posit the possible physical and sightline needs between the interpreters and presenter, with acknowledgment of a potential problem because other users may be present, as seen in Figure 2.1.

This possible problem was an important point to bring up to ensure that AW, as the deaf professional, could clearly access the interpreter and to establish that he was the primary client. Following on from this point, the time and structure of the seminar was discussed, with negotiations about break times.

Figure 2.1. Positioning of interpreters.

Turn

5. AC: So that means that for most of the time you'll be sitting up the front with the other panel members? You won't be sitting in the audience?
6. AW: I think so, yes.
7. AC: OK this means that me and Jemina can sit in the front row the whole time and won't have to move?
8. AW: That's right.
9. AC: Well that makes it easier.
10. AW: The only thing is that occurred to me is that [X] will be there, so how will she see you? We can sort it out when we get there . . .
11. AC: Maybe if we're sitting in the front row, we can arrange for her to sit in a position on the side where she'll be able to see the interpreters . . .
12. AW: Yes, somehow . . . it'll be fine.
13. AC: Yes, we can work it out.

Figure 2.2. Voice-off strategy.

Turn

22. AW: I'll use a nod at the beginning to cue you when to switch your voice off at the beginning, as that's relevant to . . .
23. AC: So the voice-off part is obviously your way of making a point . . .
24. AW: Yes.
25. AC: To make the audience a little uncomfortable and emphasize the point about access? Put them in the shoes of deaf people for a change?
26. AW: That's exactly right!

AW provided a copy of an outline of his paper for the interpreters to read before the assignment. All three discussed and agreed why and when voice-off was to occur. A head nod cue was established to resume the voice-over. AW specifically wanted to make a point in his presentation, and the interpreters' agreeing to the voice-off strategy empowered him to make his point rather eloquently, as seen in Figure 2.2.

A strategy that AC and JN often use is to ask for the big picture, the purpose and goals of a presentation (no more than three or four key statements). That information assists them in understanding what message the presenter wants the audience to take away, enabling a more accurate and equivalent interpretation (see Figure 2.3).

The next key point of discussion focused on the parameters of filming for the purpose of the study, establishing that AW would decide whether it was necessary to announce the purpose of the filming. One of the most important aspects of the briefing meeting centered around agreeing on discourse markers and cues that would be used during the presentation, including holding cues, nodding, eye contact, and waving. Among other things, these discourse markers and cues would ensure that the content of the presentation could be segmented to ensure a smooth flow of delivery in English. Both AW and the interpreters took the opportunity to clarify what works for them. AW stated clearly that he would like to pace the presentation, and the interpreters established cues for pacing and monitoring. Figure 2.4 illustrates how the team established the look-pause-nod technique.

Figure 2.3. Purpose and point of presentation.

Turn

27. AC: OK fine, that's clear. All these notes are really clear. So in summary, what would you say is the goal of the presentation? How would you like the audience members to feel, to take on board at the end of your presentation? Just a few basic points . . .
28. AW: Well the main thing I want to show . . . because it's in the [name of university] environment, I want to encourage people to collaborate more closely, to use their common sense and work more together, get a better understanding of one another. To find solutions to apply to identified problems. So although deafness is an issue, it's more about language and access. Because we are deaf we have specific language needs. So if there's a problem, how can people work together—that's the bottom line. Also I want to make a point about your university work, Jemina. At the bottom of the first page you'll see that I've made a reference to Macquarie University and the fact that they've established something new, which is relevant to our community [reference to the PG Diploma in Auslan/English Interpreting], but also benefits the university, so I wouldn't mind getting some more details from you later if that's okay.
29. JN: OK no problem.

Figure 2.4. Establishing look-pause-nod technique.

Turn

33. AC: In terms of our cues for each other, do you mind if I use the sign for HOLD to ask you to wait? Normally you're pretty good at looking at me and if you see that I'm still voicing over, you pause and wait until I catch up . . . so we can just do it the way we've done it before.
34. AW: Yes, and also I think it will be a little more paced. Because I'll be referring to my notes, I'd like to try and give one "chunk" at a time, which will help pace the presentation . . .
44. AC: So for our strategies, in summary, I will rely on you to look at me and see if I'm still voicing over, and you can slow down the speed of the presentation as you see fit. But if I'm in trouble and I've misunderstood something, I might give you a little wave to get you to look at me . . .
45. AW: That'll be a first—you not understanding something! I'd be interested to see that happen! (laugh)
46. AC: (laugh) That's very kind! Is that OK?
47. AW: Yep.
48. AC: Great. Thank you.
49. JN: Can I suggest two things—firstly, even though Andy's going to be doing the voice-over, I'll be backing him up, so actually the three of us are working as a team. You're very good at looking at the working interpreter to see if they're still voicing over, and pausing appropriately if you see that he's lagging behind. But if Andy's focused on the voice-over, then it might be me that indicates to you to slow down or to HOLD, to allow him to catch up . . .
50. AW: Perfect!
51. JN: And I'll refer to your notes to check where you're at in your presentation, so I'll be monitoring by listening to Andy's voice-over and by watching you.
52. AC: I've often found that one of the . . . if there's a PA with a microphone, then it's better for the second interpreter to cue for pace and HOLD, etc. because the first interpreter actually has a microphone in their hand, so it's difficult then to sign to the presenter. But if there's no microphone, then I'm comfortable to do it myself.

Figure 2.5. Establishing pausing strategy.

Turn

36. AC: Ah! That's relevant to my next question. Are you planning to use any visual aides? Any overheads?
37. AW: No.
38. AC: Just a straight presentation?
39. AW: Yes, but I'll try and be as dynamic as possible.
40. AC: OK, so at the point where you give the Web-site address, can you stop to give me time to say it clearly "www.aad.org"—or even repeat it. Normally that's what people do. If they're giving an address or phone number, normally hearing people will repeat it to make sure that people have time to write it down. So that's definitely one area where we'll need to communicate with each and check that all's OK before moving on.
41. AW: OK, great.
42. AC: It really depends where I'm at before you get to that point. If I've got a long lag, I'll need to speed up to catch up! OK?

Following on from this discussion, AC also took the opportunity to establish the use of pausing as a strategy to allow for lag time and for the presentation of certain information in a culturally specific way. AC clarified with AW that if there would be no visible representation of the Australian Association of the Deaf Web-site address, then he would need to adopt the "hearing way" of giving Web-site addresses (see Figure 2.5).

Finally, Figure 2.6 shows that in specifically requesting that extra-linguistic information be provided to him, AW established another form of communication between himself and the interpreting team, one that would empower him as the presenter and enable him to maintain control of the floor.

By applying discourse analysis to the interactions between AW and the two interpreters, it is possible to determine when, how, and why the pauses, nods, and eye contact were used as communication strategies to ensure a smooth and culturally appropriate presentation and interpretation.

Figure 2.6. Requesting extra-linguistic information.

Turn

53. AW: Also if there's stuff going on in the background, comments, or talk that you feel is positive or negative, can you let me know?
54. JN: OK. And also while Andy is voicing over, if I hear any comments from the audience like laughter or comments like "No way!" then I'll feed them to you. You'll probably be able to get a sense of the audience reaction anyway by looking at them, but if I hear anything specific, then I'll feed it to you so you can gauge the reaction to your presentation.
55. AW: That would be perfect. For example, if there's noise up the back, and you feed it to me, then I can say something . . .
56. AC: Yeah! Teachers at school always say things like "are you having a private joke? Is there anything that you'd like to share with us?!"
57. AW: Yeah something like that.
58. JN: OK great.
59. AC: Great, thanks.
60. AW: Thanks.

In Situ

Here we present a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the second stage of the study *in situ*, that is, the seminar presentation and interpretation and the subsequent communication and interaction between AW and the interpreters. Table 2.1 provides a summary of the occurrence of the key discourse markers that were a focus of the study: the pauses {Pause}, nods {Nod}, and eye contact {Look}.

The {Pause} marker was used only by AW and was used primarily to monitor AC's voice-over. He would mark an episode of information by pausing to look at AC and see where he was in the English interpretation. If he saw that AC was close behind, he would typically continue with the next episode. A specific example is presented in Figure 2.7.

More commonly, the {Pause} marker was used in combination with the {Look} marker. The {Look} discourse marker also was used only by AW. After pausing, if AC was further behind in his translation, then AW would characteristically maintain eye contact with AC for several seconds to continue to monitor the voice-over {Look}. When he received a cue from AC {Nod} that he had completed the interpretation, AW would proceed with the next episode (see Figure 2.8).

Table 2.1. Occurrence of Discourse Markers

	Presenter (AW)	Interpreter 1 (AC)	Interpreter 2 (JN)
Pause	78		
Look	38		
Nod/Sig	10	28	34

Figure 2.7. Marking an episode.

Stanza

3.1

DIFFERENT DIFFERENT DIFFERENT DIFFERENT PEOPLE// SOME EXCELLENT CAN
going to the local shop is like going to a foreign country. You meet all these fascinating and interesting

3.2

LIPREAD COMMUNICATE GREAT// OTHER NO SHOCK DEAF RUNAWAY! WHAT?! {Pause}
people. Sometimes you can lipread them, sometimes you can't. Some people are petrified of the fact
that you're deaf and run away, and some find it the most interesting and fascinating thing of their day!
{Nod}

3.3

GIVE-YOU ONE EXAMPLE// WHEN ME FIRST ARRIVE AUSTRALIA AFTER 28 YEARS
I'll give you a really good example. When I first moved to

Figure 2.8. Example of pause-look-nod.

Stanza

3.4

ESCAPE BACK MELBOURNE HOME CITY {Pause} {Look}{Nod}
Australia after 28 years of not being in my home city of Melbourne {Nod}

ME GO FOR JOB

Figure 2.9. Receiving a cue to continue.

Stanza
 5.1
 COME FROM HEARING FAMILY OR MAYBE DEAFENED LATER LIFE WELL [Pause][Look]
 plus of deaf people are born to hearing parents [Nod] from hearing families, or they become hearing impaired themselves later in their life.
 [Sig]
 5.2
 S-O NOT SAME ACCESS DOUBT DOUBT// WHY WITH FAMILY
 So they don't have the same access to information

Alternatively, AW would continue to pause until receiving a cue from JN (coded as {Sig}) that AC had finished, as seen in Figure 2.9.

AW would also use the {Nod} discourse marker to signal that he was satisfied that the last episode was complete, and then he would move on to the next episode of the discourse, as seen in Figure 2.10.

Throughout the presentation, there were clearly observable visual cues being used for communication between AW and the interpreters. For example, AC often used an open palm hand to reflect that he was still interpreting the question that AW had just posed to the audience, thus providing visual affirming feedback. JN often used a "thumbs up" gesture to reassure AW that all was going well. JN frequently used nodding as a signal to reassure AC that his voice-over was going well and accurately representing source text, occasionally with a signed YES or GOOD as concrete affirmation, as seen in Figure 2.11.

The paced presentation enabled AC to unpack the culturally bound concepts in his English interpretation and to deliver in a professional manner (appropriate to public speaking), thus lending dignity and gravitas to the presenter's message, examples of which can be seen in Figure 2.12.

Another strategy for effectively conveying culturally bound information was demonstrated when JN assisted AC by finding the written quote from Martin Luther King for AC to read verbatim (as previously agreed) so the quote would be read accurately with appropriate prosody and intent (as seen in Figure 2.13). This strategy was also used by AW as an opportunity to acknowledge the interpreter and to inject humor during the slight delay in searching for the piece of paper.

Figure 2.10. Moving between episodes.

Stanza
 4.2
 SOMEONE CALL MY FAMILY DEAF D-Y-N-A-S-T-Y!! ME LITTLE-BIT [Nod] OK
 of what's called... I'm one of the "lucky" deaf people. I'm a fourth generation deaf person, you know.
 [Sig]

Figure 2.11. Observable visual cues.

Stanza
 3.19
 BRING-IN INTERPRETER EVERYTHING WILL OK PROCEED BOOK INTERPRETER [Pause]
 qualified for, for the position and all I would have needed to have done was to book a competent interpreter for communication to have been enabled. [Look]
 [Sig] YEAH

 9.9
 STILL WORK D-O FUTURE [Pause] THANK YOU [Pause] [Look]
 long as we contribute to the disability movement and the rich diversity of the area, things will hopefully get better. [Nod]
 [Sig] GOOD

Figure 2.12. Unpacking culturally bound concepts.

Stanza
 5.6
 LANGUAGE // HOW COMMUNICATE [Pause] [Look] MAYBE WHAT I SAY (POINT),SIGN
 OK, that's the bottom line! OK? Now because they don't work, as a group, we've developed a
 5.7
 LANGUAGE MY WHEELCHAIR! [Pause] [Look]
 language that we can access, and that's how we communicate. It's as simple as that, and maybe, you know, I guess, you know, in a sense, I mean in an allegorical sense, our sign language is our wheelchair. You know, when you're trying to make a comparison to other
 [Sig]

Figure 2.13. Martin Luther King quote.

Stanza
 2.0
 WANT QUOTE M-A-R-T-I-N L-U-T-H-E-R K-I-N-G HAVE LINE LINE LINE [Pause] [Look]
 I'd like to quote Martin Luther King, if I may... (AC turns to JN who reaches for paper)
 2.1
 INTERPRETER ENGLISH D-O-M-I-N-A-N-T (POINT) READ FIRST LANGUAGE! [Pause]
 I'll just get the interpreter to just get to the relevant point because his dominant language is English so he needs to read off the page! [Nod]
 2.2
 PEOPLE NOT GET-ON WITH EACH-OTHER WHY? FEAR EACH-OTHER [Pause][Look]
 Martin Luther King said "People don't get along because they fear each other."
 2.3
 [Nod] SECOND PEOPLE FEAR EACH-OTHER WHY? DON'T-KNOW EACH-OTHER
 [Pause][Look]
 People fear each other because they don't know each other.
 2.4
 DON'T-KNOW EACH OTHER WHY? DON'T-KNOW HOW PROPER COMMUNICATE
 And they don't know each other because they have not properly
 2.5
 WITH EACH-OTHER [Pause]
 communicated with each other.
 [Sig]

Debrief Meeting

Typically, when AW and these two interpreters work together, they have an informal debriefing session to review the assignment and interpretation. In this instance, however, it was agreed that the three participants would have a more formal debrief meeting to discuss and acknowledge the communication strategies used during the presentation and whether preagreed cues were used.

AW expressed overall satisfaction with respect to his presentation, noting that at one time he lost his place going from the Auslan presentation to looking at the audience and back to his written paper, but he also acknowledged that the inherent breaks because of the previously agreed segmentation strategy alleviated the above issue and augmented his performance generally (see Figure 2.14). This strategy also gives the audience time to digest each major concept, which can be very important if the audience is a naïve hearing group (i.e., never before encountered deaf people, the deaf community, and deaf culture).

The discussion then progressed to recognizing the mutually advantageous strategies of teamwork. Pausing to look at his written notes gave AW the opportunity to control the pace and structure of the presentation but also allowed AC to catch up and shorten or eliminate his time lag. All three agreed that eye contact and nodding cues gave AW control over pacing.

JN's holding intervention (see Figure 2.12, stanza 5.7) was dissected. It was used because of AC's lengthy time lag, but because of AW's familiarity with AC's style, he had already noticed and paused (see Figure 2.15).

The nodding and eye contact used by AW and AC to manage the pace and time lag was acknowledged as a subtle and effective strategy. This system of cues has been built up over time and is likely unseen or unnoticed by other participants, making the presentation look and sound professional.

One clear aspect of teamwork that was recognized was in relation to the register of AW's presentation. Both AW and AC realized only in situ that the other panel presentations would be very academic and different from what AW had initially

Figure 2.14. Benefits of inherent breaks.

Turn

- 69. AW: There were a few points that got a little messed up, because I was working my way through the presentation, and there were points that I just remembered so I just kept on going, but then when I looked back at the paper, I'd lost my spot, so I had to figure out where I was. But those pauses helped a lot because Andy would nod when he was done, so that gave me time to think about what to say next . . .
- 70. AC: Yeah I've worked with other deaf people who have said that they appreciate it when the interpreter is behind, then they pause to allow the interpreter to catch up, but can also use it as an opportunity to refer to their notes. It's a good excuse to read the next bit and prepare before they start signing again. So it looks like the presenter is being very generous and respectful to the interpreter, but actually they need those pauses, too, and it's mutually beneficial!
- 71. AW: Yeah you're right, it is mutually beneficial. I did feel that benefit. Also, I felt the use of pausing and nods worked well . . .

Figure 2.15. Interjection.

Turn

- 72. AC: Yeah, and we used a lot of eye contact. Like you would skim the audience, but you'd always come back to me and make eye contact. But you had to interject once didn't you Jemina?
- 73. JN: Yes, just once. Because your time lag was so far behind that Andrew had finished signing one segment and moved on to the next one, and you were still behind . . .
- 74. AC: Can you remember why?
- 75. JN: Yes because you were filling in the English—something Andrew had conveyed very succinctly in Auslan needed unpacking into English to match the higher register, so you were getting further behind. So I used the HOLD sign to allow you to catch up, and also I think you had already noticed Andrew, so when you saw me use that sign you were prepared for it and you paused immediately.
- 76. AW: Yeah, I did, I paused deliberately.

planned, so AC confessed to working extra hard to interpret culturally bound deaf issues and concepts into an academic style English. JN added that AC had mirrored vocabulary used by other presenters—a common strategy used by competent hearing presenters to contextualize and make their message more resonant to the audience (when appropriate of course!). See Figure 2.16 for details.

Figure 2.16. Mirroring vocabulary.

Turn

- 77. AC: The only other problem I had, and I think you had the same problem . . . When you were watching the other presentations you soon realized that yours was very different. So on the hop you decided to pick it up a lot more, and you apologized that yours wasn't as academic . . .
- 78. AW: Yeah that's the one negative . . .
- 79. AC: Well you tried to turn it up a notch and change the paper "in" the paper! Plus, I was very aware of that, so tried to use a much higher register of language, so we worked together to raise the bar, because I think that we both realized at the same time that the other papers were much more formal whereas yours was more experience-based—like a narrative . . .
- 80. AW: A narrative, yes, you're right.
- 81. AC: And that's a big influence from Deaf culture.
- 82. AW: Yes it is . . .
- 83. AC: So as an interpreter, I had to add stuff, I had to work a lot harder. I was getting a culturally specific narrative and I was trying to change it to make it more theoretical and objective . . .
- 84. AW: More academic, yes . . .
- 85. JN: It's interesting that Andy used words that other people had already used, like *paradigm* and *deficit*, so that when you signed something, Andy matched exactly what you said, but used their academic terminology, using language they had already used, so that links with what we were just saying about making the paper more academic. When this is finished, I'll transcribe the whole thing so that you can see what it's like.
- 86. AW: OK great.

Debrief Meeting

Typically, when AW and these two interpreters work together, they have an informal debriefing session to review the assignment and interpretation. In this instance, however, it was agreed that the three participants would have a more formal debrief meeting to discuss and acknowledge the communication strategies used during the presentation and whether preagreed cues were used.

AW expressed overall satisfaction with respect to his presentation, noting that at one time he lost his place going from the Auslan presentation to looking at the audience and back to his written paper, but he also acknowledged that the inherent breaks because of the previously agreed segmentation strategy alleviated the above issue and augmented his performance generally (see Figure 2.14). This strategy also gives the audience time to digest each major concept, which can be very important if the audience is a naïve hearing group (i.e., never before encountered deaf people, the deaf community, and deaf culture).

The discussion then progressed to recognizing the mutually advantageous strategies of teamwork. Pausing to look at his written notes gave AW the opportunity to control the pace and structure of the presentation but also allowed AC to catch up and shorten or eliminate his time lag. All three agreed that eye contact and nodding cues gave AW control over pacing.

JN's holding intervention (see Figure 2.12, stanza 5.7) was dissected. It was used because of AC's lengthy time lag, but because of AW's familiarity with AC's style, he had already noticed and paused (see Figure 2.15).

The nodding and eye contact used by AW and AC to manage the pace and time lag was acknowledged as a subtle and effective strategy. This system of cues has been built up over time and is likely unseen or unnoticed by other participants, making the presentation look and sound professional.

One clear aspect of teamwork that was recognized was in relation to the register of AW's presentation. Both AW and AC realized only in situ that the other panel presentations would be very academic and different from what AW had initially

Figure 2.14. Benefits of inherent breaks.

Turn

69. AW: There were a few points that got a little messed up, because I was working my way through the presentation, and there were points that I just remembered so I just kept on going, but then when I looked back at the paper, I'd lost my spot, so I had to figure out where I was. But those pauses helped a lot because Andy would nod when he was done, so that gave me time to think about what to say next . . .

70. AC: Yeah I've worked with other deaf people who have said that they appreciate it when the interpreter is behind, then they pause to allow the interpreter to catch up, but can also use it as an opportunity to refer to their notes. It's a good excuse to read the next bit and prepare before they start signing again. So it looks like the presenter is being very generous and respectful to the interpreter, but actually they need those pauses, too, and it's mutually beneficial!

71. AW: Yeah you're right, it is mutually beneficial. I did feel that benefit. Also, I felt the use of pausing and nods worked well . . .

Figure 2.15. Interjection.

Turn

72. AC: Yeah, and we used a lot of eye contact. Like you would skim the audience, but you'd always come back to me and make eye contact. But you had to interject once didn't you Jemina?

73. JN: Yes, just once. Because your time lag was so far behind that Andrew had finished signing one segment and moved on to the next one, and you were still behind . . .

74. AC: Can you remember why?

75. JN: Yes because you were filling in the English—something Andrew had conveyed very succinctly in Auslan needed unpacking into English to match the higher register, so you were getting further behind. So I used the HOLD sign to allow you to catch up, and also I think you had already noticed Andrew, so when you saw me use that sign you were prepared for it and you paused immediately.

76. AW: Yeah, I did, I paused deliberately.

planned, so AC confessed to working extra hard to interpret culturally bound deaf issues and concepts into an academic style English. JN added that AC had mirrored vocabulary used by other presenters—a common strategy used by competent hearing presenters to contextualize and make their message more resonant to the audience (when appropriate of course!). See Figure 2.16 for details.

Figure 2.16. Mirroring vocabulary.

Turn

77. AC: The only other problem I had, and I think you had the same problem . . . When you were watching the other presentations you soon realized that yours was very different. So on the hop you decided to pick it up a lot more, and you apologized that yours wasn't as academic . . .

78. AW: Yeah that's the one negative . . .

79. AC: Well you tried to turn it up a notch and change the paper "in" the paper! Plus, I was very aware of that, so tried to use a much higher register of language, so we worked together to raise the bar, because I think that we both realized at the same time that the other papers were much more formal whereas yours was more experience-based—like a narrative . . .

80. AW: A narrative, yes, you're right.

81. AC: And that's a big influence from Deaf culture.

82. AW: Yes it is . . .

83. AC: So as an interpreter, I had to add stuff, I had to work a lot harder. I was getting a culturally specific narrative and I was trying to change it to make it more theoretical and objective . . .

84. AW: More academic, yes . . .

85. JN: It's interesting that Andy used words that other people had already used, like *paradigm* and *deficit*, so that when you signed something, Andy matched exactly what you said, but used their academic terminology, using language they had already used, so that links with what we were just saying about making the paper more academic. When this is finished, I'll transcribe the whole thing so that you can see what it's like.

86. AW: OK great.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented a case study of an Australian deaf professional and two interpreters who work together regularly. The communication strategies used by this team for controlling the pace and delivery of a seminar presentation in Auslan and the resulting interpretation into English have been analyzed and discussed using discourse analysis, with a particular focus on the use of pausing, nods, and eye contact as discourse markers. It was found that the presenter and both interpreters used each of these discourse markers strategically to enhance the presentation, primarily, as a method for empowering AW to be in control of the presentation.

These strategies have been developed over time among the three authors and have been presented as a case study as evidence of how these strategies are established and used in context. The presentation of the preparation meeting, *in situ* presentation and interpretation, and debrief discussion, has highlighted the importance of negotiation, agreement, familiarity, confidence, and trust between deaf professionals and interpreters.

Strategies such as the providing of the Martin Luther King quote beforehand make it easier for interpreters by enabling them to read the quote directly rather than voice from a potentially overly literal sign language translation. This type of approach ensures high levels of accuracy in the English interpretation. The briefing enabled familiarity with the context so contextual information could be incorporated into the interpretation as necessary.

Although the case study presented the strategies used in a monologic presentation, they can also be applied to other contexts—in particular, the collaboration between the two interpreters to empower AW and meet his needs. For example, shortly after this assignment was filmed, JN and AC worked with AW at a round-table discussion meeting with approximately twenty participants. The majority of interpreting required was from English into Auslan. Talk often overlapped and was fast and technical. The meeting was formally chaired, and participants were asked to put their hands up if they wished to speak; however, this protocol was not always achieved, and frequent interruptions resulted. To allow AW to intervene quickly and at the appropriate time, the interpreters used the following strategies. Interpreter 2 was on standby to voice-over if necessary—meaning that AW could interrupt, even if Interpreter 1 was still signing the previous contribution of another speaker. This strategy allows deaf professionals to participate more easily without issues of time lag “embarrassment” that occurs when a deaf professional tries to interject but loses the opportunity because conversation has already moved on, which results in the point being lost. Interpreter 2 gave audience feedback and communicated when it was appropriate to intervene. This teamworking strategy has been previously discussed by Mitchell (2002) who acknowledges the importance of interpreters and deaf people working together to ensure equal participation in multiparty conversations.

The findings of the study in this chapter demonstrate that interpreters and deaf professionals can work effectively together and can communicate to ensure high

standards in interpretations, which lead to empowerment. These strategies can be applied by deaf professionals and sign language interpreters universally—regardless of the signed or spoken languages involved or of the occupation of the deaf professional. The following recommendations suggest helpful ideas for ways that deaf professionals and interpreters can work together:

- We recommend that a deaf professional select a pool of interpreters with whom he or she can work regularly. This approach is an effective way to build up the necessary trust and relationship for incorporating strategies such as those outlined in this chapter. Interpreters booked on an ad hoc basis by agencies will not be able to incorporate these strategies on short notice unless the interpreters are very accomplished.
- At the deaf professional's invitation, “cross over the line” and ignore typical protocols of role boundaries to work closely together. Nevertheless, acceptable boundaries still need to be established, even if they are slightly different (see Cook 2004 for a discussion of ethics and role boundaries in these professional contexts).
- It is advisable for deaf professionals to make the effort to meet interpreters before conference presentations to provide a briefing on the context, the gist of the presentation, the key points, and so forth. A useful mnemonic to remember as a guide to discussing presentations is based on the four P's suggested by Eighinger and Karlin (2003): the People, Place, Point, and Purpose of the presentation. This strategy benefits not only the interpreter but also the deaf professional because the effect of the presentation will be more powerful, with a more accurate and seamless presentation, ultimately leading to self-empowerment. The professional is thus in a stronger position to control the presentation. The deaf professional also needs to make the goal of the presentation clear so the interpreters can ensure effective contextual force and intent.
- Deaf professionals and interpreters should work together as a team to ensure that communication strategies can be implemented appropriately.
- In any given situation, a “lead” interpreter should be nominated (as discussed by Cokely and Hawkins 2003). This interpreter will lead any briefing or debriefing sessions, plus will take responsibility for negotiation on-site, for example in relation to obtaining papers, position, lighting, provision of water, and so forth. This approach prevents too many interpreters from requesting information from various people and establishes the key point of liaison between the deaf professional and event organizers.
- Interpreters should decide clearly how they will work together and should check their preferred methods for prompting and support.
- It is recognized that there is a need for training for both deaf people and interpreters on how to work together, especially in this emerging area of interpretation. With an increasing number of deaf people working in professional jobs, the needs and demands of working with interpreters will change. The issue is not about deaf people *using* interpreters, but *working with* interpreters.

- We have stressed the importance of professionals and interpreters working closely together to empower the deaf professional. However, we would like to emphasize that, in addition, it is in the deaf professional's interest also to empower the interpreters—providing them with the information, agreeing on strategies, working with them as a team. By empowering the interpreters, the deaf professional is then empowering him- or herself.

REFERENCES

- Bahan, B. 1996. Non-manual realization of agreement in American Sign Language. Ph.D. diss., Boston University, Massachusetts.
- Baigorri-Jalón, J. 1999. Conference interpreting: From modern times to space. *Interpreting* 4: 29–40.
- Baker, C., and C. Padden. 1978. Focusing on the non-manual components of ASL. In *Understanding language through sign language research*, ed. P. Siple, 27–57. New York: Academic Press.
- Coates, J., and R. Sutton-Spence. 2001. Turn-taking patterns in deaf conversation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5(4): 507–29.
- Cokely, D. 1992. *Interpretation: A sociolinguistic model*. Burtonsville, Md.: Linstok Press.
- . 2005. Shifting positionality: A critical examination of the turning point in the relationship of interpreters and the Deaf community. In *Interpreting and interpreting education: Directions for research and practice*, ed. M. Marschark, R. Peterson, and E. A. Winston, 3–28. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cokely, D., and J. Hawkins, J. 2003. Interpreting in teams: A pilot study on requesting and offering support. *Journal of Interpretation*: 49–94.
- Cook, A. P. 2004. Neutrality? No thanks. Can a biased role be an ethical one? *Journal of Interpretation*: 19–56.
- Davis, J. 1987. Team interpreting as an approach to the supervision of practicum students. In *New dimensions in interpreter education: Curriculum and instruction: Proceedings of the 6th National Convention of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers*, ed. M. McIntire, 111–16. Chevy Chase, Md.: RID Publications.
- . 2003. Cross-linguistic strategies used by interpreters. *Journal of Interpretation*: 95–128.
- Dively, V. 1998. Conversational repairs in ASL. In *Pinky extension and eye gaze: Language use in Deaf communities*, ed. C. Lucas, 137–69. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Eighinger, L., and B. Karlin. 2003. The feminist-relational approach: A social construct for event management. In *The critical link 3: Interpreters in the community*, ed. L. Brunette, G. Bastim, I. Hemlin, and H. Clarke, 37–50. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fischer, T. 1993. Team interpreting: The team approach. *Journal of Interpretation* 6: 167–74.
- Gee, J. P., and J. Kegl. 1983. Narrative/story structure, pausing, and American Sign Language. *Discourse Processes* 6(3): 243–58.
- Gentile, A., U. Ozolins, and M. Vasilakakos. 1996. *Liaison interpreting: A handbook*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. 1976. *The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- . 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrington, F. J., and G. H. Turner, eds. 2001. *Interpreting interpreting: Studies and reflections on sign language interpreting*. Coleford, U.K.: Douglas McLean.
- Hodek, B., and J. Radatz. 1996. Deaf professionals and sign-to-voice interpretations: Chaos or success? In *A celebration of the profession: Proceedings of the 14th National Convention of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf*, ed. D. Swartz, 140–51. Chevy Chase, Md.: RID Publications.
- Hurwitz, A. 1986. A study of two factors related to effective voice interpreting. *Journal of Interpretation* 3: 53–62.
- Hymes, D. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. In *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*, ed. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, 33–71. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Jesse, A., N. Vrignaud, M. M. Cohen, and D. W. Massaro. 2000. The processing of information from multiple sources in simultaneous interpreting. *Interpreting* 5: 95–116.
- Lerner, G. 1996. On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: 'Second person' reference in multi-party conversation. *Pragmatics* 6(3): 281–94.
- Liedel, J. A., and P. Brodie. 1996. The cooperative dialogue model: Redefining the dynamics between deaf professionals and interpreters. In *A celebration of the profession: Proceedings of the 14th National Conference of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf*, ed. D. Swartz, 97–104. Chevy Chase, Md.: RID Publications.
- Liu, M., D.L. Schallert, and P. J. Carroll. 2004. Working memory and expertise in simultaneous interpreting. *Interpreting* 6: 19–42.
- Marschark, M., P. Sapere, C. Convertino, and R. Seewagen. 2005. Educational interpreting: Access and outcomes. In *Interpreting and interpreting education: Directions for research and practice*, ed. M. Marschark, R. Peterson, and E. A. Winston, 57–83. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martinez, L. 1995. Turn-taking and eye gaze in sign conversations between Deaf Filipinos. In *Sociolinguistics in Deaf communities*, ed. C. Lucas, 272–306. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- McIntire, M., and G. Sanderson. 1994. Bye-bye! Bi-bi! Questions of empowerment and role. Paper presented at the A confluence of diverse relationships. In *A confluence of diverse relationships: Proceedings of the 13th National Convention of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf*, ed. L. Shaw, 94–118. Silver Spring, Md.: RID Publications.
- McKee, R. L. 1992. Footing shifts in American Sign Language lectures. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Messina, A. 1998. The reading aloud of English language texts in simultaneously interpreted conferences. *Interpreting* 3: 147–61.
- Metzger, M. 1998. Eye gaze and pro-nominal reference in American Sign Language. In *Pinky extension and eye gaze: Language use in deaf communities*, ed. C. Lucas, 170–82. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- . 1999. *Sign language interpreting: Deconstructing the myth of neutrality*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Metzger, M., and B. Bahan. 2001. Discourse analysis. In *The sociolinguistics of sign languages*, ed. C. Lucas, 112–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Metzger, M., E. Fleetwood, and S. Collins. 2004. Discourse genre and linguistic mode: Interpreter influences in visual and tactile interpreted interaction. *Sign Language Studies* 4: 118–37.
- Mindess, A. 1999. *Reading between the signs: Intercultural communication for sign language interpreters*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Mitchell, T. 2002. Co-working and equal participation. *Deaf Worlds* 18: 66–68.
- Moser-Mercer, B. 2000. Simultaneous interpreting: Cognitive potential and limitations. *Interpreting* 5: 83–94.

- Moser-Mercer, B., A. Kunzli, and M. Korac. 1998. Prolonged turns in interpreting: Effects on quality, physiological and psychological stress (Pilot study). *Interpreting* 3: 47–64.
- Napier, J. 2002. *Sign language interpreting: Linguistic coping strategies*. Coleford, U.K.: Douglas McLean.
- . 2006. Comparing language contact phenomena between Auslan/English interpreters and deaf Australians: A preliminary study. In *Sociolinguistics of Deaf communities*, ed. C. Lucas, 39–78. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Napier, J., R. McKee, and D. Goswell. 2006. *Sign language interpreting: Theory and practice in Australia and New Zealand*. Sydney, Australia: Federation Press.
- Ochs, E., E. Schegloff, and S. Thompson. 1996. *Interaction and grammar*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Padden, C. 1976. The eyes have it: Linguistic function of the eye in American Sign Language. In *Language and communication research problems*, ed. K. Williams, 407–11. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- . 2000. Simultaneous interpreting across modalities. *Interpreting* 5: 169–86.
- Padden, C., and T. Humphries. 2005. *Inside Deaf culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Pöchhacker, F. 2003. *Introducing interpreting studies*. London: Routledge.
- Pollitt, K. 2000. On babies, bathwater and approaches to interpreting. *Deaf Worlds* 16: 60–64.
- Roy, C. 1987. Evaluating performance: An interpreted lecture. In *New dimensions in interpreter education: Curriculum and instruction. Proceedings of the 6th National Convention of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers*, ed. M. McIntire, 139–47. Chevy Chase, Md.: RID Publications.
- . 1989. Features of discourse in an American Sign Language Lecture. In *The sociolinguistics of the Deaf community*, ed. C. Lucas, 231–52. New York: Academic Press.
- . 2000. *Interpreting as a discourse process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Russell, D. 2002. *Interpreting in legal contexts: Consecutive and simultaneous interpretation*. Burtonsville, Md.: Sign Media.
- Russo, T. 2004. Iconicity and productivity in sign language discourse: An analysis of three LIS discourse registers. *Sign Language Studies* 4(2): 164–97.
- Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to discourse: Language as social interaction*. Oxford, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Seleskovitch, D. 1978. *Interpreting for international conferences*. Washington, D.C.: Pen and Booth.
- Shaw, R. 1992. Determining register in sign-to-English interpreting. In *Sign language interpreters and interpreting*, ed. D. Cokely, 71–98. Burtonsville, Md.: Linstok Press.
- Siple, L. 1996. The use of additions in sign language transliteration. In *Assessing our work: Assessing our worth, Proceedings of the 11th National Convention of the Conference of Interpreter Trainers*, ed. D. M. Jones, 29–45. Arkansas: Conference of Interpreter Trainers.
- Stewart, D., J. Schein, and B. E. Cartwright. 1998. *Sign language interpreting: Exploring its art and science*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tannen, D. 1984. *Conversational style*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- . 1989. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornton, D. 2003. *Auslan discourse*. Sydney, Australia: Deaf Education Network.
- Van Herreweghe, M. 2002. Turn-taking mechanisms and active participation in meetings with deaf and hearing participants in Flanders. In *Turn-taking, fingerspelling and contact in signed languages*, ed. C. Lucas, 73–106. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

- Wadensjö, C. 1998. *Interpreting as interaction*. London: Longman.
- Wennerstrom, A., and A. F. Siegel. 2003. Keeping the floor in multiparty conversations: Introduction, syntax, and pause. *Discourse Processes* 36: 77–107.
- Winston, E. A. 1995. Spatial mapping in comparative discourse frames. In *Language, gesture and space*, ed. K. Emmorey and J. Reilly, 87–114. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- , ed. 2004. *Educational interpreting: How it can succeed*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Witter-Merithew, A. 2002. Understanding the meaning of texts and reinforcing foundation skills through discourse analysis. In *Proceedings of the 17th conference of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Orlando, Florida, August 2001*, ed. C. Nettles, 177–96. Silver Spring, Md.: RID Publications.
- Zimmer, J. 1989. Toward a description of register variation in American Sign Language. In *The sociolinguistics of the Deaf community*, ed. C. Lucas, 253–72. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1992. Appropriateness and naturalness in ASL/English interpreting. In *Expanding horizons: Proceedings of the 12th National Convention of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf*, 81–92. Silver Spring, Md.: RID Publications.

APPENDIX A

Transcription Conventions

Know (conventional orthography)	Spoken English words
KNOW	English representation (gloss) of an Auslan sign
I-ASK-YOU	English words separated by a hyphen when more than one English word is used to gloss meaning of an Auslan sign
T-R-U-E	Letters in the English word separated by a hyphen when an English word is finger-spelled
(NEG)	Indicates head shake at end of utterance to negate statement
(POINT)	Indicates referential indexing
BUOY-1/2/3/4	Use of “buoys” (indexing) for lists, indicating first, second, third or fourth finger
[X]	Author comment or de-identification of person or place
//	Indicates end of Auslan “sentence”
...	Noticeable pause in spoken text
{Look}	Presenter makes direct eye contact with Interpreter 1 and holds contact for several seconds, sometimes glancing to Interpreter 2
{Nod}	Presenter makes deliberate nod to indicate next episode; or Interpreter 1 makes deliberate nod to indicate comprehension or signal to continue

Turn	The turn taken in the conversational interaction by each participant, and the place of their turn in the interaction (e.g., 5 = the fifth turn taken in the conversation in English transcription).
Stanza	Parts of the translated/transcribed text of Auslan presentation and resulting English interpretation providing data tokens for discussion.
{Sig}	Interpreter 2 nods to signal to Presenter that episode is complete, to affirm to Interpreter 1 that voice-over content is accurate, or both
{Pause}	Deliberate pause by Presenter in monitoring Interpreter 1's voice-over and use of time lag (usually in conjunction with {Look})

Source: Adapted and further developed from Napier (2002)

Line 1: Deaf presenter's Auslan gloss and visual cues (AW)

Line 2: Interpreter 1's English voice-over and visual cues (AC)

Line 3: Interpreter 2's visual cues or signs (IN)

Example:

HELLO HOW YOU ALL TODAY?

{Look}{Pause}{Nod}
Hello, how are you all today? {Nod}
{Sig} GOOD

Attitudes and Behaviors of Deaf Professionals and Interpreters

Poorna Kushalnagar and Khadija Rashid

THIS CHAPTER looks at how attitudes and behaviors shape the relationship that develops between deaf professionals and their interpreters. Deaf individuals have a long history of working with interpreters; however, most such interactions have been with the deaf person in a "powerless" capacity as a child in school, a patient in a hospital, or a client receiving mental health services rather than as a professional. Such repeatedly shared experiences undoubtedly have shaped and solidified the attitudes and behaviors of *both* deaf individuals and interpreters toward each other. The upsurge in the deaf professional class, as more deaf people become doctors, lawyers, professors, and pharmacists, has challenged this dynamic and predicates the need for those two groups to interact with each other on a different basis, one that recognizes that the deaf individual in this case possesses a larger degree of power and authority. In this chapter, we examine how attitudes develop and discuss ways in which deaf individuals and professionals can change their attitudes and behaviors toward a better and more rewarding working relationship.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF DEAF PROFESSIONALS

The rise of large numbers of deaf professionals is a relatively recent phenomenon. The first significant group of deaf professionals was teachers, who were much in demand in the nineteenth century when schools for the deaf were being founded all over the United States. Sign language was the popular method of teaching in those schools, and deaf teachers had a natural advantage in ASL, so by 1858, more than 40 percent of teachers at public schools for the deaf were themselves deaf (Gannon 1981). However, in 1880, the International Congress on Education of the Deaf met in Milan, Italy, and banned the use of sign language in educating Deaf children. That action led to a precipitous decline in the demand for deaf teachers, so by 1927, only 14 percent of teachers at deaf schools were deaf, even though the number of schools in existence had increased almost twofold in that interim (Gannon 1981).

We wish to thank Candace McCullough, Raylene Paludneviciene, and Ila Parasnis for providing feedback on the content of the manuscript. Many thanks to the following interpreters for sharing their perspectives and experiences: Cindy Barnett, Edwin Canel, Chris Grooms, and James Virgilio. Most of all, we acknowledge the Deaf professionals whose shared experience was crucial in the development of the modified scenarios discussed in this chapter.