

Gallaudet University Department of Interpreting and Translation
2018-2019 Colloquium Lecture Series
Dr. Robyn Dean
February 9, 2019

Dr. Keith Cagle

Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the third Colloquium Lecture. Happy everyone made it this morning. So by show of hands, how many of you are from the Department of Interpretation and Translation? In any of our programs at the PhD, Master's, or Bachelor's level? Great, thank you for coming. And welcome.

I would like to extend a warm welcome to faculty, staff, friends and visitors. Welcome again to the 3rd lecture in our colloquium series. The colloquium is co-sponsored by the Department of Interpretation and Translation and the Center for the Advancement of Interpretation and Translation Research - CAITR. So for that I would like to extend a special thank you to Dr. Brenda Nicodemus and her committee for coordinating the colloquium and inviting all of the speakers and making the needed arrangements.

The intention of the colloquium is to seek out new research and to invite those researchers to present their findings to our community here to continue elevating our knowledge and advancing our field. I do want to be sure that everyone marks their calendars for the next and final lecture of the academic year, which is on April 12th. The presenter will be none other than our own Paul Harrelson who is a faculty member in the DOIT. So again mark your calendars for April 12th.

As is customary, our lecture this morning will be filmed and archived. So if you would like to access the presentation again, please do visit the CAITR website and look for the archived videos.

Do we have any special guests in the room today? Seeing none I would like to extend an early thank you to Jen Vold and Jackie Lightfoot for interpreting our presentation this morning and I would like to thank our CART provider who we can't see at the moment but she's obviously out there working providing captioning for us today.

I know some in the room want CEUs. Marc Holmes from GIS will process the CEUs. He couldn't be with us this morning but Brenda Nicodemus has the forms so if you have any questions or if you just need to sign up for CEUs please see her at the close of the presentation this morning. We do intend on ending promptly at 11:30 the presentation will end at 11 but we'll allow a half an hour for question and answer which will be kicked off by Dr. Steven Collins who will serve as our respondent and he'll talk with Dr. Dean for a bit but he won't make her talk too much and then at 11:30 we hope you join us at our DOIT luncheon over in the cafeteria we'll be meeting on the 2nd floor and there you'll have an opportunity to chat with Dr. Dean and get to know her a little more. So many of us are familiar with the Demand-Control Schema I assume many of you are

familiar with. It's also referred to as DCS. Do you know who it is that authored the Demand-Control Schema? Dr. Robyn Dean is one of the co-authors. The other co-author is Dr. Bob Pollard and here is a small world comment here Dr. Pollard and I used to work with each other at the at Mental Health Center when we were very young and now my old friend ended up co-authoring the Demand-Control Schema with Dr. Dean.

A bit about Dr. Dean she was born right here in Washington D. so welcome back to your native birthplace of Washington DC. Her father worked in the hotel industry and so she ended up moving to several different states across the use because she grew up living in these hotels that her father would work at so she lived in Colorado and New York State. She attended a Baptist church that had a Deaf ministry when she was about 11 or 12 years old and that's where she began her entry into the signing community. She got her bachelor's degree from Maryville College in Tennessee, which has an IEP where she continued to pursue her interests in American Sign Language.

I should correct myself it was actually in a theater program which she was part of when she was 11 or 12 which is where she first started learning sign language. After earning her bachelor's degree, she earned a Master's in theology which is a surprising bit of her educational background for me. After that she went to Scotland for her PhD, which she earned from Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh. Her PhD is in interpretation and translation. At the conclusion of that program, she went to NTID to work in their Interpretation and Education Department - ASLIE. She's been there for several years now.

And in her spare time she likes to go hiking in the Rocky Mountains in Colorado and also in the Catskills in New York. So that's what she likes to do in her spare time. Today she'll be talking to us about "Deconstructing Descriptive Devices for Ethical Guidance". So I for one am very interested in seeing what she has to say and with that I would like to welcome Dr. Robyn Dean to the stage. Robyn?

Dr. Robyn Dean

Well, thank you. Now, I will explain a little bit more why I chose this particular wording for my topic but please hold for that. We'll -- that will come a little later in the presentation. So this picture you see in front of us, and thank you Keith for your comments by the way is taken of the City of Rochester from one of the bridges. One day I was with my son who at the time was about 8. We're driving along. And I happen to look over the bridge and it was just around sundown, which was absolutely gorgeous. All of the buildings looked like they were on fire lit by this glorious red-orange glow, which I thought was wonderful and I said, honey, look. Look at the skyline. My son, he heard the intonation in my voice, realized I was excited about it and he said, oh, wow, Mom, where is it? Is the skyline behind those buildings? And I laughed. I said, oh, honey, skyline means all of the buildings that you can see in front of the sky. And he said, oh.

Well, come to find out years later I realized my son actually had a correct definition.

When we look at the etymology of the word skyline, it actually originally referred to the horizon. That place where the earth and the sky meet. So his interpretation of skyline was literal. My interpretation was figurative.

Research shows that in fact children, as they progress through to adulthood, start with more literal use of language. And become more figurative as they get older. So is that a good or bad trajectory? It remains to be seen. Are you familiar with the word trope? Typically that word comes up in looking at the idea of commonalities of theme or looking at stories which have a particular trope. But the term actually means -- has a little broader definition. Tropes are the studies of linguistic figurations. And why we use figurative terms. So different kind of tropes emerge. The word trope comes from Greek. So when Keith mentioned my theology degree, perhaps this is where it originated with that fascination with the Greek language. But trope from Greek means to twist or to turn.

So when you hear a person talking and then they say -- with the use of a trope, it means the information some way is a twist or a turn in how that language is being used. So perhaps a friend of yours is telling a story. And they say, I completely died when this thing happened. That's called hyperbole. And when you hear it, you know it's something serious. But you have no expectation that the person actually did die because of how it's used.

There are some other famous tropes. The most famous of all being metaphor. We use metaphor in language all the time and in figurative language in general. So again as a child progressing through to adulthood, in adulthood we depend more on figurative language and metaphor. I think it's perhaps because we're a little lazy in our thinking. If we want to tell a story, we don't necessarily want to explain absolutely every detail so we'll say well, it's like this other situation. And that's a good enough comparison for the person listening to understand. It's an efficient way of using language. So you want to use the most efficient amount of energy to give a person the understanding of what you're trying to convey. And when that can be done by a metaphor, it can be an efficient way for relaying that content.

Now, this quote comes from Anthony Pym. I love him. He's a translation theorist. A bit of a tough guy. He was he was -- a tough guy he's actually Australian. And in one of his chapters which he calls "Return to Ethics" he is critical of the field of translation towards overreliance on the use of metaphors in its language. But it's interesting. Because his actual critique of the use of metaphor in language uses metaphor. He says allegiance to heroes in sociology.

So he says stop using metaphors by using a metaphor, which I just think is an interesting irony. So when we look at sociology, sociolinguistic, and fields of this very kind, we recognize that they are quite intriguing in general for interpreter and translation practitioners to look at. And we see how metaphor comes up. Those fields look at typically behaviors and behaviors that are of interest get notated. And then we look at those behaviors and label them. Sometimes by the way of metaphor to describe those

behaviors.

Now, the slide that's possibly a little dry but really does describe my objectives for this morning. So when we look at T&I it refers to translation and interpretation, FYI. So when you see that abbreviation, that's what I'm talking about. Now if you see this objective you recognize there's only an hour for this discussion so I won't be going into innate steps in all of these topics. We'll be touching on them and at the end if you have further desire for interest, I can recommend you some references just for further reading.

Now a couple of points about the signs that I'll be using in this presentation for literal I'm borrowing this sign from British sign language which reflects the concepts of true or being true or accurate or correct. So that's the sign I use for literal. I like that particular sign because it helps when you compare it with the sign that I'll use for figurative or abstract. Like the literal meaning for the BSL sign and the figurative production of the sign for abstract. And I also like the ability to modify the term for abstract in ways that we'll get to. So again, these are the signs I'm using to convey the concepts of literal and figurative using words.

So who uses this kind of language on the figurative side- often poets, scholars, philosophers- but the study of this figurative use started in the times of Aristotle and Plato. Then in the 1930s other people started using metaphor as a trope if you're interested in that topic they got thinking of the impact that it has in the terms of figurative terms on our thinking. So when we use metaphor, we look at psychology, we look at science, philosophy. All of those fields who are now engaging in metaphor. It used to simply be a reflection of the beauty of the language and ways of using it. But it's actually far more complex than that. And that's what we'll get to.

So is there anything wrong with literal and figurative language per se? It depends on your view of the world. This is the positivist frame and it's comparison. So if you look at the concept of the world in your positivist view you think you are looking at the world and you have a realistic view of what it is and you can explain and describe it.

In contrast, the constructivists say no the world is only constructed through the way in which we think about it and that's constrained by our use of language. That's how we construct our understanding of the world. Here is a quote by Gibbs. Now, earlier I said perhaps it's lazy thinking that leads us to use metaphor. But in a way in which a person wants to describe something, sometimes a metaphor can be helpful. When someone is ready for it. Sometimes it fits better in helping advance someone's thinking. But look at the word constraints.

That sounds like it should be a concern if it constrains your thinking. So the book was published in 1941 and has had nine subsequent re-publications the last being in 1992. This is an incredibly popular text. It's written in a way that -- it's written in a way that lay people can understand in terms of its language use and it talks about language and its influence on behavior and action.

And it sounds as though the word should be simple. It has a simple meaning and it can be conveyed but it often has additional connotations behind it and that's what Hayakawa has looked at. So this slide it's a simplistic summary of the Hayakawa text, the interrelation between thought, language, and action. Let's take a look at how that impacts interpreting. By examining the word role, r-o-l-e, do you know where the term role emanates from? It actually emanates from the word roll r-o-l-l.

Roll with two Ls was used in assigning characters in a play because there would be a script that came in a rolled up form of paper so when an actor was assigned a character, it would be accompanied by a script, which they would unroll, read through, check their lines, and follow. Now they would follow with quite strict adherence. Not deviating from the script. Why? Because it may impact other characters and what their scripts are. That was the reason for following the script and the roll.

Think about how that impacts how we work using the role as r-o-l-e. Does that sense of script constrain our thoughts and our decisions? As we say in research, this is an empirical question. Does the way we talk about things impact our behavior? It's led to some of my PhD research, which I'll talk you through. So about 75 interpreters took a webinar on ethics. I was not involved prior to that time.

Before the webinar started, the interpreters had some required reading. They had six scenarios to respond to. What would you do in this given scenario? And why? So that was their homework prior to taking the webinar. They saw that, filled it out and answered it and I said for my PhD I said "can I take these responses and analyze them?" I was given permission and that's what I proceeded to do. Three of the scenarios had a fairly obvious right answer, which was thou shalt do nothing.

The other three scenarios had the opportunity for interpreters to make a decision to act as an appropriate response. So the interpreters when they thought the response was to not do anything, they gave their responses and their reasoning why and then likewise for scenarios in which they could act gave their responses with their rationale. Interesting. There were about 13,000 words used to describe the inaction and about 12,000 words used to describe their rationale for action. But 87 times -- excuse me; but the word role was used 15 times in their responses for taking action. Half of that time the word role was used in response to saying they had to step out of role in order to effectuate that action. So the interpreters thought they had to cease the role of interpreter in order to effectively make a decision to act in a given scenario. So maybe there are some connections between the idea of role of interpreters and this concept of following a script.

So let's hold interpreting for a moment and go back to the concept of metaphor. So there are two components, the tenor or topic and the vehicle. The mechanism. So the example I have here is from Shakespeare. All of the world is the stage and all of the men and women merely players. So the idea of all of the world's a stage, world is the tenor. Stage is the vehicle. The men and women are secondary tenors. And the exits

and entrances are vehicles. That's how the metaphor is used.

So you can see that metaphor can be used in a couple of different ways. When we say interpreters are a bridge between Deaf and hearing people, that concept of being like a bridge is a comparative. When we say something like the interpreter is not really there, it is -- the metaphor is being used as substitution. And look at the actual sign we use for metaphor. The movement used in the creation of that sign looks like it is only limited to the concept of substitution. When we're talking about metaphor as a comparison, we actually use signs like comparison or parallel but the sign that we have decided to use for metaphor really is limited only to the idea of substitution. So as you go through your reading on metaphors, you find there are proponents of the idea and detractors. Let's take a look.

So when you're trying to explain something, and you know someone has been through a similar experience, you can use that similar experience to help them understand the new scenario. That's a way of using metaphors that can be effective. Or when you're trying to convey something and you use a different metaphor to help them understand the original concept that can also be a useful way of using metaphor. And it's also useful in other ways. Perhaps the community thinks about something in one particular way and another person does not know this. But you use a new metaphor to try to illuminate. That can also broaden their knowledge and provide a new perspective into things that were already known.

That said there are detractors possibly even more than there are proponents of the use of metaphor. This is some of their research. There are those who believe that the use of metaphor restricts our language by limiting the conceptual space we're using in the linkages it makes with the use of language. Has anyone heard about or been engaged in cancer treatment and typically what you have seen is somebody saying they are fighting cancer or that they are going to beat cancer or someone lost the battle with cancer.

That's a very military conflict style of metaphor. So if I'm in the hospital, and I'm told I have cancer, probably I'm going to feel at times really tired or worn out...maybe helpless. And therefore I may think I'm losing the fight, I'm can't fight anymore. I'm not going to win the battle. But maybe in actuality that's not true. I'm simply tired but my body is perhaps doing a really good job of boosting immunity and other elements to combat cancer. But we have this very militaristic view and we assume therefore that we're losing a battle.

Specific to sign language, let's talk about how metaphors arise. Any time you open a journal or an article, typically there's some element of history of interpreting services. Ball State University, 1964. Inaugural meeting, et cetera.

We talk about the helper model, the conduit model and that progression, right? It seems the reason we keep adding to that historical repository is as Ricoeur said it can sometimes be a positive use of metaphor to help change the thinking of a particular field

so maybe that's a good use of metaphor. But we say interpreters are not just conveying language. We are also members of the team. We throw in that new metaphor to see if that changes our behavior or our thinking.

But again, is that actually what's happening? As we articulate all of these progressions within our field of the roles and the metaphors we have used to describe our work, is it helpful? And as we continue to add to those metaphors for how we describe our work within the field and that list gets ever longer, I'm going to show you just a few of the metaphors we have used from translation and interpreting field and some of their scholars.

How they have used metaphors repeatedly throughout the field of study of translation and interpretation. Now, remember Pym and his statement? Are we paying undue allegiance to heroes from sociology? All of these authors I just mentioned are in the field of translation and interpretation. But all of their backgrounds are in sociology, sociolinguistics, and the journals that they publish in are about communication, sociology, and sociolinguistics.

So we see an ever increasing number of metaphors used to discuss and describe our work. Now one of the reasons that we use metaphors is because yes, we're cognitively lazy but the other reason is when we enter a new experience, sometimes people use metaphors as a shorthand to help people understand a situation. So if someone has never worked with interpreters before, a quick way that we can describe our work is to use a metaphor versus saying, well, in 1964 we had a meeting at Ball State University and then go through the entire history. So it makes sense that we use metaphors with outsiders.

But do we need to use those metaphors within our own field? Do we not understand our own work? Is that why we have to use metaphors? And if so, that's problematic. Do other professions use metaphors to describe their work? Let's take a doctor, for instance, at times, they function as a journalist because they report on things. At times doctors also function as a teacher if a patient doesn't understand their treatment or their medication, so doctors do, at times, work as teachers. And sometimes if a patient is feeling unwell or feeling down, they might soothe them, and in that way, function like a chaplain. And sometimes when patients get better, doctors are seen as healers.

But they don't use these terms. Because regardless of whether you're a doctor or a nurse, if you're a provider in general, they know that their job entails these different behaviors. But in our field it's not uncommon to see workshops with titles like the Role of an interpreter in a medical situation. And we fret and worry about how to function in this new setting. So if I as a dual interpreter see a workshop with the title of the role of an interpreter in fill in the blank setting, medical, legal, education, et cetera, and we fret about what to do in all of these situations, why is that? We don't see that same level of concern in other fields. It's because we're not using role in the literal sense. We use the word role in a figurative sense. Here is the first bit of evidence for that claim.

To step out of one's role. You can tell right away that this is figurative because you are not literally stepping anywhere. So that makes it obvious that we're not using this in a literal way. We mean it figuratively. But other fields, people in other fields, when we use this term, interpret it in a literal way. They might say "no, please don't step out of your role." Because they are interpreting it. They are understanding it literally. So you would say, oh, well, I'm doing something like not using first person language to refer to myself I'm going to use it the way the Deaf person uses it. If we were to use role in a literal way then we should be able to substitute it with a synonym with another meaning of role in a literal sense so if you tell yourself I can't use the word role I'm talking with Robyn I can't use the word role I know she's going to get upset I have to use another word that means the same thing. What's a good synonym? Someone in the audience do you have a suggestion? Actually when I was talking with the students earlier thing morning they struggled with it, too, and a lot of their examples were figurative but then we came down to a synonym function or purpose.

And that seems to fit. If I substitute the word role with the word function, that leads us to a more literal understanding. So at our very core, our function is pretty simple. We tell one person what another person said in another language. And that's it. That's the essence of our role. Yet we hem and haw about how our role changes in different settings. But really our essential function is the same no matter where we're working. We tell one person what another person said in another language. That's it. But that's the literal interpretation of it. And we don't use it in that sense. We use it in a figurative sense. Here is an example of how role is used in our field. Sounds pretty figurative.

Here is another. Remember what I just said, our essential function is to tell one person what another person said in another language. Is that a burning issue? It can't be. Obviously the person is using role in a figurative way. My point in presenting these examples is that our figurative use of role is not how other people define role. Here are some examples. Literally we can say that role refers to one's function. But figuratively it seems like what we're referring to are acceptable behaviors in a given context, medical, educational, et cetera.

Now, we understand the reason for all of the hemming and hawing and fretting over what an interpreter does in different settings and how to behave ethically and to consider what is best for the people involved in the interaction. Of course we'll struggle with that. But role is not the right word to describe what it is we're struggling with. And Dr. Roy already cautioned about this in 1993. She said that perhaps metaphorical language has (of course using metaphor in this cautioning) said that we may have limited our own ability to understand the interpreting event itself and the role of the interpreter in a given setting. Now, I just co-authored a book chapter, recently published. And in this chapter, we don't focus explicitly on metaphor. And nor do we say that we should discontinue the use of all metaphor. That's not my intention.

My point here is to help people understand what it is that they really mean behind the metaphor and get down to the literal language and then we can say, why not use that literal language?

Why do we use the word skyline, going back to my earlier example? But this presentation is a little different. I want to address not only why it is that metaphors are concerning. But why it is that figurative language is problematic in our field. In the book chapter we list a number of tropes that we use. And we have prototypes of what we use in our field. If you would like to see it, I'm happy to send you this chapter.

Now, when Brenda invited me to come give this talk, it was August. She asked what my talk would be about. So I thought about it for a bit. And my new obsession is metaphor and figurative language so I told her the topic for today because I was -- as I said, I love Pym and his work, if I were to give a title as of two weeks ago for today, this is what my title would have been.

So starting from an understanding of how we use the word role and how that has led to further abstractions in language we see how we have led ourselves down a slippery slope and where it has landed us. My concern is that this use of language impacts our thinking and it does not actually help us, it does not help advance our field. An additional concern is there's currently an increase in supervision and discussion of reflective practice. In 2001 when Bob Pollard and I published our first article we said we need supervision in our field and we need reflective practice. This was 2001. After which we made a series of other publications, each time we refer back to our initial call for supervision that we made in 2001. Only within the last three or four years have I finally started to see people refer to be in supervision. And it's been surprising to me. Because while I've been calling for it and I've been having supervision sessions and I've been creating people who can lead supervision sessions a person who I have never met is telling me that they are in supervision.

So it's great, I'm happy to see this positive response to the need for supervision and reflective practice but what's concerning is when you gather a group of interpreters to talk about their work and ask them to analyze more deeply their decisions their behaviors, the intention is good. But if the language that we're using is still functioning on the figurative level, we're never going to get to that literal meaning. So it's not actually going to change behavior, which is concerning.

I'll give you another example remember that book cover I showed you, language and thought in action by Hayakawa? He describes levels of abstraction in the book. So we can speak at increasingly more complex levels of abstraction. And I think that's where we have gotten ourselves in the field of interpreting. We started at a very low level of abstraction. But we've gotten ourselves into a very deep level. I'll show you a series of statements and thoughts that reflect what I mean. Just read from the bottom up.

The final statement here is at the highest level of abstraction as we work our way up the list we're getting to decreasing levels of abstraction. At this point does anyone in the room have any idea what the actual behavior was yet? We don't. Yet we have already progressed through three levels of abstraction going from the most abstract to being less abstract. But you still don't know what the literal behavior was. Let's continue. Is

this better?

Perhaps you still don't know exactly what it is that I did. Let's say that I had made this decision. I show up in supervision. And I say, well, you know, I'm an ally, that's the role of an interpreter. I function as an ally in the Deaf Community. How as a supervisor can you, or how can another interpreter help me uncover what it is that led me to make that decision? When we speak in levels of abstraction, we hide what it is we're actually thinking. Now, someone might disagree. Maybe someone's interpretation of this point about interpreters being allies might be something they agree upon.

Who was it? Gibbs I believe that said metaphors must be understood, interpreted, and appreciated in the same way. You must have common ground. Do we all have common ground? We probably don't. And that's the point of what I'm saying about my concerns about gathering a group of interpreters in a supervision session. And then talking in abstract levels. Or abstract terms.

So continuing with examples of figurative language and interpreting, remember I said starting from how we understand the word role and how it's led us down a slippery slope, let's look at the types of tropes that this understanding has given way to. Have you heard an interpreter say, I'm not really there? This is abstract figurative language. If in a supervision session someone were to say, well, it's like I'm not really there, the person facilitating that session has to get that person to uncover what they really mean by that.

So from my experience listening to interpreters talk about their work and how I reframe it to get them to really uncover what they mean is by asking questions like when is the statement really used. I've seen it's often used to justify inaction or challenge action. So I'll say something like it seems like you really value non-interference. Is that always the best decision to make in every scenario? I also bring up how that statement of I'm not really there could be interpreted by outsiders. It could indicate that you're abdicating all responsibility beyond simple message transfer. And I understand the desire to respect a person's autonomy.

But in other fields when they study the concept of autonomy they will of course point to the importance of autonomy but they elaborate upon it. If we want to adopt the use of the term autonomy, then we also need to adopt the ways in which you need to think about it, apply it, what concerns come along with it. We discuss it in more length in the book chapter I just mentioned. Has anyone heard this phrase used before? It's not uncommon to have an interpreter say, oh, well, I'm another adult in the classroom.

Now, returning to the previous trope of, I'm not really there, it indicates that your sole responsibility is to transfer a message. Yet this trope states just the opposite. It seems to indicate that interpreters do have responsibility beyond message transfer. So these two tropes are quite contradictory. Now, in the educational setting where there are many minors, of course a core value is the concern and safety for the minors. If you're an adult in that setting, then you have more capacity. And as such, have an obligation to

be concerned for their welfare. This is a way that other people in other fields can understand what we're talking about.

But if you just say, I'm another adult in the classroom, you can use that phrase to defend any decision that you might make. You could say well I decided to take over what was going on in the classroom because I'm another adult. What? Has anyone heard this one? I'm a person first. Is this literal? Or figurative?

What this implies is that for an interpreter to be able to intervene or protect someone, you have to disregard who you are as an interpreter, then you can become a person. And only then can you take action. So that intimates that interpreters in the interpreting field do not have a concern for other people's welfare that you have to completely abdicate your responsibility as an interpreter in order to carry out a responsibility that places concern for someone's welfare.

Very simply what should replace it could be just two values that we see in a number of other fields that have existed for decades and centuries. One, to do good, beneficence, two to do no harm, non-maleficence, when you say I'm a person first, you can just say that in that moment the value of beneficence and/or non-maleficence took the highest priority and that will make sense to outsiders.

A new article that I'm writing addresses this concept very directly. I won't go into much detail here. I'll just very briefly list some of the topics that I cover in that article. Again, common phrases. We seem to really love that term boundaries. Think about the way in which we sign boundaries. Or the ways in which we sign boundaries. What do you really mean by a boundary? And when you ask people this, most people don't have an easy answer. They don't actually have a way of defining what it is that they mean by boundaries.

Another term that we use often is neutrality. Is this a value that other professions share? It is, however their definition of it differs. What neutrality really means is that as a professional I am neutral to the situation which means I cannot take direct advantage or benefit from the outcome of that interaction. But the way in which we use neutrality is figurative. We interpret it as being non-emotional. Not invested. Not creating an impact. And that sort of leads to a bit of a cold, unemotional, unfeeling appearance of being very neutral and being, as I said, unengaged, un-invested. And if the interaction is not going well, you just say, well, it's not my concern, I'm just neutral.

So while we use the same word, we're operating with two different definitions. Another common one is what about the interpreter who comes after you? Has anyone heard this question yet? Someone will say, well, if you make this decision, what about the next interpreter? How will that affect them? You better not make this decision because of this future hypothetical person. So you might be in a given situation and you think that there's an action you should take that might deviate from the norm but in considering all factors, you make this decision. And then an interpreter will say, oh, but what about the next interpreter? Therefore, I won't deviate from the norm because I

want to make sure that I don't put this next interpreter in a bad situation. Again in the article I address each of these at more length in the article.

In summary, the issue is that linguistic configuration such as metaphors and precisely and deceptively construct the meaning of things in our work which impacts how we think, feel and behave. So since 2005 I've been leading supervision sessions and teaching others how they can lead supervision sessions. Your first job is to identify when people use figurative language and ask them to tell me more about what they mean. Now, people don't like being pushed back in this way. Remember what I said earlier. We like to express ourselves in efficient ways. People like to listen to others in more efficient ways because we are cognitively lazy. We like to express and understand information in the most efficient way possible.

But in a supervision session, we have to first remediate how we use language. Not just have people talk for the sake of talking. Because if we do, then we're just continuing to use abstract language. If you would like more information or if you would like the PowerPoint, or the document that I'm currently working on which will hopefully soon be published as an article, which, again, outlines a number of figurations or complaints that we use as interpreters, I can send that to you.

Again, my underlying point here is not just to look at the language but how we can remediate it. If you would like to get this information, please go to our Web site and click contact us. I don't publicize our Web site or book as often as I think I should and Facebook reminds me of the fact that I should be doing more to promote our material. Look at that I wrapped up at 10:59 just in the nick of time. Thank you so much.

Dr. Steven Collins

Let's give Dr. Dean a round of applause. Thank you so much for an outstanding presentation and now I'm thinking about my own language and make sure I don't speak in abstractions or make sure that I can be as literal as possible. I don't actually don't know how to describe myself. I imagine some of you have questions in the audience I'll give you time to think about what you would like to say and I'll get started with a few comments.

In the world of interpreting, with hearing people and Deaf people, and when we think about role, we often think about advocacy and as someone who works particularly with deaf-blind people, what are your thoughts -- excuse me because I am someone who works with deaf-blind I would like to know your thoughts on Deaf interpreters working with deaf-blind people and our roles as advocates or allies?

Dr. Robyn Dean

So I've been working with Deaf interpreters and teaching them how to conduct supervision, as well. And sometimes we come across some different ways of approaching the work from their deafness as hearing perspective but again there's the

concept of literal and figurative language to address regardless of the modality. So sometimes Deaf interpreters will say this is me in 20 years. Meaning that I make a decision to do something. And I say why. I realize that's because that's what I want to be doing in 20 years. So that concept of figurative language still exists in sign languages but I think is somewhat requires a little more exact and concise language to help us improve how we're talking about the work and so that's something I working on with Deaf interpreters in supervision. With Deaf-Blind people..hmmm. So my concept is looking at the idea of role versus responsibility. So what's my responsibility? Is it to advocate? Is it to guide? Is it to add environmental information? For example, if I'm responsible for that so be it.

I think when I look at the idea of role to take on or discard a role that varies according to the situation that's problematic but instead if we look at the decision making as emanates from our sense of the responsibilities in that setting, I think that's a more effective dialogue for us to undertake. When we look at the field of ethics we look at the conflict of values and when values are incompatible. So perhaps we can look at it as the idea of values. I might want to do X and Y, but if I do X it might actually disrupt value Y and that can be an approach to conceiving the dialogue. So if there's a DeafBlind person who needs something, we can make a decision. Maybe we follow whatever is they want, or maybe our value is to satisfy their need. maybe it's also to convey to them what is going on at the room at the time. so there's competing potential values there- which one is more important in that moment? Which one do we prioritize?

So I think my concern again with the word role is that most of the time we actually mean responsibility, and that we should far more clearly articulate the two and their differences. If I saw a workshop saying Roles and Responsibilities of X scenario, often I'm contemplating the issues in that scenario as well. Because role to me really, we almost often mean responsibility. But that's again a level of abstraction that we need to contemplate in terms of how that impacts our behavior. So language impacts the thought, which impacts the decision, that's where I believe it lies.

Dr. Steven Collins

That's a really good segue into how we understand boundaries which you brought up earlier and how our responsibilities relate to boundaries.

Dr. Robyn Dean

I think the question often comes up to say where is your boundary but they say what would you do, how would you do it, people say boundaries are somewhat malleable so I think we use it for some of those reasons, as well.

Dr. Steven Collins

Certainly. With that I would like to open the floor to the audience for your comments and questions. Please line up here to my left if you have anything.

Audience Member

I would like to start by saying thank you for coming to campus. I really appreciate your presentation. And thank you, Dr. Collins, to the Department of Interpretation and Translation for making this open to the community, I really appreciate that. So Dr. Dean, good morning.

Dr. Robyn Dean

Good morning.

Audience Member

I'm a legal interpreter. I serve as a mentor and a facilitator for a Community of Practice under the University of Colorado Project CLIMB. This is for legal interpreters who come from minority backgrounds. So I would like to bring up the topic of race. The program is designed for interpreters of color and for minority cultures, including interpreters who are CODAs like myself and for Deaf interpreters.

And an issue that we have on a social level is that we don't have enough interpreters in the legal setting who understand issues that come along with race and oppression, which is why the program was formed and I'm in the inaugural cohort. And we discuss the Demand and Control Schema a good deal in our work so giving you were presenting today I wanted to come and understand from the source more about what defines DCS and it helps me to understand how you interpret ethics and decision making. So is your intention in this to have interpreters understand how we understand our white hearing privilege? What are your thoughts on that?

Dr. Robyn Dean

So within DCS we talk about controls that can arise. The constructs rather. DCS requires self-reflection to understand what your own controls are and most people say decisions and options and I would say that's part of it but that's not the whole story because I bring who I am into that scenario, as well. So in my introduction let's say -- it says I grew up in hotels for example. I felt rich growing up. I thought we must be wealthy.

When my father finally passed away I thought, oh, shit, I guess we are not rich we were looking to the Social Security Office and getting income that way. It was quite a difference. But anyway, my point being we have to reflect on our internal bias. I think the use of metaphor can make bias worse because it keeps the dialogue and discussion at a figurative level.

There are also the intrapersonal demands to consider. Well, actually let me continue with the controls momentarily. I think about who I am, what I bring. I'm a white woman,

et cetera.

So I come into that situation and if there is a person from a minority background it is automatically and potentially an incompatibility. We have to consider those concerns and then consider what we do in that scenario. To increase the controls I bring to the scenario, do I start a conversation, do I look out, do I turn down that job opportunity? All those are possibilities.

And then, as I said, there are the intrapersonal things that may come up as a demand. Things that may interfere with or inhibit my work in that setting. And then probably the most important concept in the whole Demand and Control Schema is my thought world, because that very much influences what goes on. If I talk to an interpreter who has been in that job, I say what do you think is going to go on. If I said instead What's your thought world? It might be somewhat limited. They may say it's a patient, they're a little bit nervous. And I often see the struggle to describe that thought world piece of it. I think it's because people throw different pieces into the scenario and then say these are all the possibilities that may arise.

The caveat to that is you don't want to be overly bound by any predictions that the other interpreter may have given to shape that setting. You want flexibility to go into it your way. So sometimes you may go in and what you heard is actually quite different. Maybe you're misunderstanding. Emotional content that arises, et cetera. It's around your thinking. So if we start thinking perhaps we can think instead what did we just learn about the interaction and the reaction to it. That may more effectively inform our thinking.

So there's that thought world concept plus our beliefs about that thought world when we go into a given scenario and we believe we know exactly what's going on. Where is the evidence for that. Is what I predicted actually going to happen? How do I tell if it does or does not? And what limitations am I placing on it? So if we could improve interpreters' inherent sense of curiosity, I think that could be remarkable. I think an issue I see with interpreters is that they're making determinations and decisions without necessarily asking any questions. If instead they came into a given scenario and said okay I have a decent sense, but let me see if I can validate that.

When we look at people of color, the experiences they've had, what their lives look like, we can be told and taught that. Like what we may hear about hearing people. That from the Deaf perspective, hearing people don't usually understand the Deaf world or their thought process, etc. That certainly may come into it. But in consideration should also be what are we teaching and how are we teaching it. So if we would like people to understand the multiplicity of what that existence looks like, it's important to not just go in but go in remaining curious, and look for ways to validate the experience.

It's also the idea of self-supervision that may come into this. That as a part of the Demand and Control Schema could also help continue that conversation. So when we look at the idea of thought world, sometimes the wording can be a little bit different but if

we're overly relying on DCS because we're trying to promote it as a way of thinking, we need to instead think of the concept, yes, within the Demand and Control Schema as part of the model, certainly. But as we look at the world around us, and we look at ways to fill in, and ways to make those relevant I think that kind of conversation might help with the work that you're doing.

Audience Member

Thank you.

Dr. Steven Collins

Are there any further questions? Again, if anyone else would like to ask a question or share a comment, please do come down to the front.

Dr. Danielle Hunt

I was really struck by a lot of what you said in your talk. And it's certainly got my mind racing. One thing that struck me was the difference in figurative language and literal language. And our own Code of Professional Conduct. We, as a community, are starting to change that language. And I think we are pushing back on our IDs, statements of beliefs, values, so I would like to know your thoughts on that. (Could the speaker please use the microphone that was just used for the question?).

Dr. Robyn Dean

Goodness. So first, I think people tend to look at codes of ethics and professional conduct as something that's simply ethics written on a piece of paper.

There are a multitude of codes of ethics that exist in the world that are dealt with quite differently. Most of those ethical constraints are in other industries for outside people, and are simply saying this is what we think. Sometimes we say we have something articulated in writing because the interpreter previously did something wrong and we now want to alleviate that particular thing. Like the interpreter shall not use drugs do you remember seeing that in one of the drafts of the CPC that an interpreter should not show up using drugs? You think surely it's not necessary but sometimes those elements are put in there to try to remediate past behaviors.

I think that is a place that our field is a little mired in- people become overly dependent on the CPC. So when we're looking to try to make a pithy description of what it is we're doing, they refer to the code. But if you do research into other concepts within other fields, including interpretation and translation, but elsewhere and find out what they mean by the tenets they have encapsulated. Yes some of it is about bad behavior they don't want to see reflected. But the CPC doesn't talk about good stuff it's pretty much trying to prescribe behaviours it doesn't want to see. But what about the good things we do want to see, where is that articulated in our Code of Ethics? Maybe it's time to look

at that part of it. Looking at the example of a standard of care in practice professions that's quite separate from the Code of Professional Conduct in those industries. The Code of Professional Conduct is for outsiders to read. But for the internal practitioners, they are looking at things like standard of care. Now RID has, what are they called, the Standard Practice Papers. I wrote one about mental health interpreting, and what it should look like-- what it looks like when it's done effectively, and things to think about for mental health- interpreters in mental health settings. And I don't know, maybe RID as an entity was right and I was wrong, but they wanted a far more shorter abbreviation for people to read and get a quick understanding, but as a Standard Practice Paper, to me, that's not what it should be. It should have more people included, internal/external stakeholders, et cetera, and be written that way.

And if you look at the medical interpreting Standard Practice Paper, and the mental health, medical is perhaps one page, perhaps two, and the mental health one is at least four in small font and single spaced. Because I wrote it for interpreters. But the medical interpreting Standard Practice Paper was perhaps written for external people who are not practitioners to read and understand, so we've got some re-aligning to do there.

Dr. Steven Collins

Thank you. Any other comments or questions? One person from the back.

Audience Member

Hi I would like to go back to the first person's comment. One of my biggest frustrations is around interpreters of color in the community and the issue of cultural competence, and how interpreters behave in different cultural contexts. I think the Code of Professional Conduct has always been written from the perspective of a white -- from a white European perspective with very little attention paid to what people in other cultural situations expect. What the community expects from an interpreter.

So without being too figurative, what the community expects our role to be. How the community defines the role of an interpreter. Thankfully I've lived long enough and worked in this field for long enough that I have interacted with many members of the Black Deaf community, the black African community, the black hearing community, as well as white hearing people, white Deaf people. And I mean, to say the white hearing community or Deaf Community is almost counterproductive because we know that there's so much diversity in what people bring to a given situation.

So I've come to see how my breadth of experience with different cultures has influenced my decision making. But I still find myself frustrated when I work with another interpreter who is white and you seem to understand in your discussion the role of an interpreter when another person challenges the decision that I have made based on my understanding of the given situation and the given culture, based on 35 years of experience in this field. So it's always challenging and interesting. So I think the issue of cultural competence for me is one that has been very frustrating for decades.

Because for other people, it seems that there isn't always a shared value about what to do in a given situation. Or what not to do. I'm not sure if that's a -- there's a question in that. Just wanted to share that comment.

Dr. Robyn Dean

The point boils down to the idea that interpreters seem to follow scripts without really thinking it through.

Audience Member

Because they can't.

Dr. Robyn Dean

Right. And when we come into a scenario where perhaps they don't have a script. They sometimes think if I have a script to follow, that's an ethically appropriate decision. But sometimes it's about maintaining norms and schemas. Kohlberg's theory the six stages of moral relativity, moral development, I think it's along those lines of perhaps they are at the fourth stage of thinking. They think what am I supposed to do in this scenario. Can somebody tell me because I don't know. And if you come along and have a solution they think great, I'll adopt that script.

So when you get down to Kohlberg's other levels, to 5 and 6, it requires different levels of thinking. So it requires saying yes there are these sets of rules. But these rules are made for the majority. And if those rules are not applicable to this given context, then that's not the right set of decisions to make. I need to step back from that and look at the rationale behind those rules. So that I'm applying them in the right place.

My PhDs showed that interpreters tend to get stuck at Stage 4. That's where they say -- terminology- survey is not quite the right word but the instrument that are administered to try and tease out where they come from and looking at the descriptions of Stage 4, 5 and 6 most interpreters who responded really are right there at Stage 4 and they are not progressing. They are looking for the right answer. You know the play Les Miz, Javert the policeman, he thinks that way. He's at Stage 4, very black and white. He wants to know what the rules are. And he wants to follow them very much. But Jean Val Jean, that character comes in. And is always looking at why things are happening. He's much more Stage 5, Stage 6. So he thinks that -- he looks at the rules and he says they don't apply to me, they weren't made for me so therefore I'm not following them because that's not a judicious response for him. So it's about figuring out what the rules are, for whom they apply, and modify behavior accordingly.

So your example of bringing in another interpreter who may be at Stage 4 in their thinking, regardless of their ethnic origin, the the stage of thinking might be what is the conflict if you are at a deeper level. Maybe that's a consideration.

Audience Member

Thank you.

Dr. Steven Collins

Any final questions or comments before I wrap up? Seeing none, I would like to offer another round of applause. Thank you so much for answering our questions. Again, everyone is invited to the cafeteria. To chat a bit more with each other and to chat with Dr. Robyn Dean. If you're familiar with the campus, we're going to move to the back of campus, we'll be on the second floor of the cafeteria. And another reminder, do mark your calendars for the April 12th presentation by Dr. Paul Harrelson. Enjoy the rest of your day and your weekend. Take care. Thank you very much.