

Gallaudet University Department of Interpreting and Translation
2018-2019 Colloquium Lecture Series
Dr. Miako Villanueva
December 7, 2018

This Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided to facilitate communication accessibility and is not a verbatim record of the proceedings.

Dr. Keith Cagle

Good morning and welcome to the second talk as part of the Colloquium Lecture Series for this academic year. How many students do we have in the audience from the BAI program? Could you stand and be recognized?

This side of the room, thank you. Do we have any students in the Master's program? Oh, I guess they're busy with their final exams. And do we have any doctoral students in the interpreting program? Two? Wonderful, thank you! Welcome everybody to students, faculty, staff and visitors. Welcome again to the Colloquium. The Colloquium is sponsored by the Department of Interpretation and Translation and the Center for the Advancement of Interpreting and Translation Research. I would like to extend a special thank you to Dr. Brenda Nicodemus who has worked very diligently to make all the arrangements for the lecture series, despite the fact she is on sabbatical leave. She did all of this from New Mexico and I want to thank her for those efforts. I'd also like to thank the two interpreters working with us today, Jackie Lightfoot and Jennifer Vold. And also like to thank our CART provider, I do not know where the CART provider is as they are providing captioning remotely, but thank you nevertheless CART provider for providing captions today.

I wanted to point out that beyond Dr. Villanueva's presentation we will have two more presentations as part of the Colloquium Lecture Series in the spring. The first one of the spring will be by Dr. Robyn Dean who will discuss ethics in the field of interpreting. She's from NTID and will be speaking on February 8. On April 12 we will have our own Paul Harrison talking to us about his dissertation work, which has to do with interpreting in the workplace. So please do mark your calendars for February 8th and April 12th. I see some of you have already marked your calendars which is wonderful.

Two more people just came in during the opening remarks and just in time. One of them is Marc Holmes, who is one of our doctoral students and is also a staff interpreter at GIS. Marc, can you say hi? I wanted to point out who Marc was because if you would

like CEUs, Marc is the person you need to see, so you can approach him after the lecture concludes.

Also, after Dr. Villanueva's lecture, we will have Dr. Dani Hunt ask some questions of Dr. Villanueva if she isn't too exhausted from her remarks. We should wrap things up here at 11:30 and we'd like to invite you over to the cafeteria for a lunch after the lecture today. It'll be on the second floor. Additional good news is that we have people on campus today from the Center for the Assessment of Sign Language Interpretation. This is a separate organization that was started by RID. There are 16 people on campus this weekend to talk about the certification that will now be offered through CASLI instead of through RID. So you will have the opportunity to meet them over lunch and the CASLI President is none other than our speaker today, Dr. Miako Villanueva. And to double check my notes I think I covered all of the housekeeping items.

With that, I would like to formally introduce Dr. Miako Villanueva. She was born in Wisconsin, then moved to California and Hawaii, and then moved eastward to Arkansas and westward again to Colorado. It was in Colorado that she became involved with the Deaf community at Pikes Peak Community College in Colorado Springs, Colorado. She earned her AAS in Interpreting. And then earned her BA in Interpreting, excuse me in Psychology, with a minor in German. As a Psychology major, she became intrigued with where language happens in the brain and how it might be the same or different between Deaf and hearing people. While in Colorado, she started working at the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind as a dorm supervisor. She worked there for four years having created an immersive learning experience for herself to learn American Sign Language. In 2002, she came to Gallaudet University for her Master's Degree in Linguistics and continued on to earn her PhD, also in linguistics from Gallaudet University. Her area of specialization within linguistics is cognitive linguistics, which she applies to her instruction, interpreting, and assessment work. In her spare time, she likes to travel the world. I remember that last year she ended up circumnavigating the entire globe in one trip which I thought was astonishing. She has been to Indonesia, Nigeria, Ecuador, and Hong Kong, just to name a few. She has traveled for to give presentations and is very well regarded at an international level for her work. She is currently an associate professor in the Department of Linguistics. And she also continues her interpreting practice off campus. With that, I would like to extend a warm welcome to Dr. Miako Villanueva and her talk Community Based Participatory Research in Interpreting Studies.

Dr. Miako Villanueva

So it's just a little odd as I look around the room. There is no one in the center of the room and you're all sitting on the sides. Could I encourage a few of you to sit a little more in the front of the room for me. It makes me feel more comfortable and it's more engaging. I feel quite detached when there is no one to look at in the center of the room. Oh, that's much better. Perfect and that's your first warm up activity.

Obviously there will be a lecture, officially, but you guys don't get to just -- this will be an engaging presentation. I have questions for you to contemplate and respond to. So that was your first element. These will all be posted later but when I ask a question and you go to respond, please bear in mind there is video equipment working as well. I also want you to consider the question I'm asking and I will mirror your responses so they can be captured on the video as well. So yes, it's participatory. It's not fully dialogic but is absolutely participatory. There are times I will want your ideas and input so please keep that in mind.

Thank you, Keith for that lovely introduction and summary of my background. Before I dive in there are a couple things I'd like to recognize. The first being that today is December 7th. Keith mentioned that I lived in Hawaii for a time. December 7th, 1941, is the bombing of Pearl Harbor. I don't believe I could go ahead with my presentation personally without recognizing the impact of the date December 7th.

If you go to Pearl Harbor you will see the memorial that's established there for the ship that went down. The USS Arizona was bombed that day. And in the bombing, it sank to the harbor. The harbor was not particularly deep at that point so where the boat rests is visible and it is still there. The memorial in white is built on the water on the top of the USS Arizona which you can see here. I know it's a little bit difficult to see the actual ship and if you look at the outline this is the front of the ship and you can see the shape of it extending backwards to the top left of the slide. The memorial in white was built over the top of the ship as it rests on the bottom of the harbor. As you go through the memorial there are parts of the floor where you can look down into the water and into parts of the ship. That's a remarkable part of history that is right there and visible when you go through the memorial. And you can see the surface of the water and the parts that remain of the ship underneath as your walking across.

As I was thinking about my topic today, of research, and how we research the interpreting field in particular I want to tie us back to what has come before us. As we look at the surface we need to consider the foundations of our work and I see this memorial as a metaphor for that. We're connected to the history that has come before us, much the same as the ship connects to the history and the memorial allows us to

commemorate that. So I would like you to keep that in mind as we consider participatory research today.

So Keith has actually already gone through several parts of my background but there are a few pieces I'd like to expound upon in terms of who I am, how I got to where I am and why I'm here. So my journey in the Deaf World started in Colorado, in Colorado Springs. I lived there for college. I was at a private institution. I was attending Colorado College. My major was Psychology and I was minoring in German. I was already intrigued with the idea of language communication, meaning, how people communicate with one another in a global sense. Not particularly in terms of linguistics but just in a global sense. So taking a class in neuroscience and there was a very thick tome that we were reading and there was one small paragraph that talked about language studies and when you have an MRI what parts of the brain are activated. So I had looked at language activation centers for hearing people where speech is reflected in the left hemisphere near the speech center of the brain was activated when you are listening to spoken language. Maybe auditory processes.

That made me wonder what happens in Deaf people when they are using sign language. This paragraph continued and Deaf people use sign language and the expectation is that the front of the brain is what would activate because we are looking at space in three dimensionality. There is activation there but most of the activation takes place in the exact same tissues of the brain as spoken language. So regardless of modality the same part of the brain processing language. At that time there were no other studies and I was involved in the Deaf World in particular and I look at this small center in my small college and as luck would have it we had an ASL class. It wasn't a class you could take through as a major or minor it was offered on Tuesday nights once a week for a few weeks. But I was lucky enough to have a remarkable instructor.

This is Jeannette Scheppach. She was my first ASL teacher. She graduated from Gallaudet many years ago. She is Deaf. She taught fingerspelling, numbers, some of those basic ideas in sign language and once a month, for a more in-depth discussion on the totality of the ASL experience, the ASL culture of humor, comedy of technology which was limited to TTYs at the time, and the idea of Deaf schools and the whole entirety the Deaf experience. So I learned to recognize words and make parallels in signs, but also also that cultural element she delivered was really remarkable. Now I was minoring in German, so for four months part of our requirement was to go to Germany, live with a family and live with the language when I came back from that I wanted to do the same thing with American Sign Language. I wanted to find a Deaf family and live with them for four months and, unfortunately, that experience doesn't exist. However, there was a Deaf school quite close. So as part of my work, I

graduated from college and went to work for four years as a dormitory supervisor at the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind. And that's really where all of my language acquisition came from, that natural language environment.

So ASL classes were being offered at the community college and I was encourage to the take those as well. The person advised me although I could learn the language in the environment I was in at the School for the Deaf, in order to get the more cognitive pieces of language of syntax and grammatical structure and learn to recognize them and not just use them in a ASL class would be a good place to do that I did that and continued from the ASL classes to an ITP program and got my associates degree in interpreting and that was at Pikes Peak Community College.

Now I will just put in a disclaimer. I am 100% a nerd. I absolutely love the idea of language, of analysis, of thoughts. It's not something I can stop at any time. I'm always looking for further, richer, deeper information that led me here to Gallaudet in 2003 where I started my masters program, my doctoral work, and I have been here since. So that shows you a sense of my connection to the community, how I got engaged and stayed engaged, and where I am now. So when I lecture and a person talking about research, all of those things come with me as part of the framework through which I look at interpreting at the community, at participatory research, and the whole of today's lecture topic.

Now you may be familiar with the concept of community based participatory research referred to as CBPR and that kind of research happens. We are going to apply similar principles of CBPR as it's applied to the medical field but we have a few different pieces behind it that -- how I reframe it in terms of how I apply it in the interpreting world. It started with the healthcare world and healthcare field and looking a community health, looking at the needs of people in the communities, how hospitals can work more effectively with the community to provide services. It's quite remarkable. They've done some lovely work with CBPR in that context, but I frame it somewhat differently as I take the principles of CBPR and apply them to interpreting. So I'm taking elements of it out and providing it in a slightly different lens.

Let's start with the overarching question. What is interpreting? Obviously you can sit there and have explained to you. No, I'm asking literally, what is interpreting? Now is your chance. What does it mean to you? And short answers, please. I will be repeating it for the audience. Working between two languages. Sure. Anyone else have a response? And short answers are good. Listening to one language and putting it out in spoken English to sign, or vice versa. Sure. It's cultural mediation. Certainly. It's looking at both modalities, sign and spoken, and working between them as necessary. And

working between two sign languages at times. Question from the audience, are you talking about interpreting in general or interpreting with sign languages in particular is concerned? Response, yes. I love being able to say that. I really mean both.

Interpreting words and meaning. Looking at a comment and making meaning of it and putting it into another language. Connecting two groups. Translation in real time. We can think about the difference between translation and interpreting in that manner, yes. Simultaneous and consecutive, yes. Nice. Hold that thought.

One way we tend to think of interpreting is as technical profession. Meaning competence in two languages, knowing the words between them and knowing the ethical practices. And other elements that makes it a technical profession. There's also another way of understanding interpreting which as a practice profession. It's not enough to simply know both languages and know ethical practices. You also have to give considerations to your members of the constituent groups with whom you are working and recognize the human interactions that you are working with at that time. That needs to be recognized in the field as well. So if you think about interpreting and we are talking about research about interpreting, this is what we need to consider. We are part of a holistic enterprise, working to connect people in a broader understanding of what interpreting is, and what it impacts.

I am a cognitive linguist at heart. So when I think about what interpreting is, here is how I look at it. I take it back a level and I think about what communication is between any two people. How does that work? One of the responses earlier to my question was "working between two languages." That brings up the question of what is language? You need to consider that first because that will influence how we consider research and that's how we progress with it. So if we are looking at meaning, look at a word in isolation. Does it have meaning by itself or does its meaning come from the constructions and social entities around it? The more broadly we think about this, the more influence it will have on how we select research, how we consider research, what interests us, and what we believe is important to build a foundation for future research. We can't just jump into research without thinking about all these broader questions beforehand because they are what form the framework and foundation for our approach. Really, all of these things are interpreting. All of this is incorporated within that task. So if you think about this, which part do we typically research? And which parts do we typically not have a particularly strong research foundation in? This is how we can look to expand and strengthen the framework and foundation of the research we have so we are looking at the entirety of what interpreting is. If you think about what interpreting is, that's one part. But there's an additional piece.

Again, this is not a rhetorical question. The question is why do we interpret? Seriously, why do we do it? Because intuitively we somehow want to make information clear. I think it's a human need for clarification. Sure. For connections. Going back to communication, and when there are language barriers, interpretation then becomes a need to clarify that communication. We hope to gain effective connections between the interlocutors. So is it to their benefit or our benefit? One benefit may be that they understand one another. Certainly, that's what they would gain. Increased their network, certainly. And then regarding the question who benefits, both the interpreter and interlocutors may benefit.

So we are there to perform a task. It's not that we are just there to help out of the goodness of our hearts. And we are not just there for the money, but nonetheless there is financial gain. So I see it as sort of a puzzle and how we fit all of the pieces together. And the goal is for both people to get it and then both people get what is going on, I feel good about that, having accomplished that task. As we look through what makes these two people have an equivalent experience. Yes, it's definitely a benefit in having that approach. I have a similar approach. When something goes well, the linguist in me, the cognitive linguist in particular, which can't stop thinking about language and effectiveness of communication and absolutely applies to the interpreting task, and I love getting to play in that space. Not playing with the interlocutors but to play with what I'm doing and challenge myself, stretch my skill set in new and interesting ways. So I definitely benefit from the task of interpreting. In a different way, but nonetheless I benefit as do the interlocutors in that exchange. And one response that increases people's network that increases our own network too. As we get into community places and spaces that we wouldn't if we weren't interpreting, we get to see and experience remarkable things from that perspective.

The people participating benefit, but we as interpreters may also benefit. When we think of things that we might want to do differently the next time that increase our own proficiencies, that is also a benefit. And other than that, we may feel good about the task we have done and the connection to people we have been able to make, assisted by our presence. But, I think it's about making us better as practitioners and that is the real benefit. Yes, but it's also the people participating in that conversation the benefit is largely toward them but we are gearing up our activity. And hopefully the next interpreter will benefit also if I do my particular task and my particular way that there is a benefit there for the next interpreter who comes along.

Really, everybody benefits in that scenario. From different perspectives but nonetheless, everyone benefits. And when we think about interpreting research, we have to contemplate how we do it everything we discussed to date relates to the

question, how do we do interpreting? How do we do research? How do we find out what's going on in this broad space in which we work? How do we look at understanding in a broad way. How do we think about all of that as an impact? And then when we look at research and consider the research question, think about what we typically research. Do we think about these questions as the foundation for guiding our research questions? Or do we look more at the translation task and the decision making that happens. Do we look more at ethics? When we contemplate research we have to keep in mind the entirety of the discussion we just had about what and how we do it and what the end goal of the research is to support because that set of decisions that you make will impact the research that you create and the impact it has in our community.

So I've pulled a few specific quotes from Dennis Cokely's work – an article he wrote specifically in 2005 related to positioning as an interpreter. How we are positioned and how we see ourselves within the Deaf community and how it impacts the interpreting community. Originally interpreting was very much community based and on its pathway to a professionalization, Dennis Cokely did a retrospective in 2005 and I pulled a few quotes from that to exemplify the shifts our field has undertaken since that time.

The first interpreting tests in the U.S. were developed in 1972. There was a push at the time to increase the number of interpreters, to look toward professionalization, et cetera and that was the result. Our idea was established originally under the auspices of NAD including sharing office space in 1964 and then it broke off in 1972, looking for funding for sustainability, et cetera, and looking at the testing enterprise. So that's when they set up testing certification for interpreters. But if we look at Dennis Cokely's article we have to consider what the basis was for that approach to testing. What was the research behind it? As we looked at professionalization of interpreting, we also have to look at the research that were supporting the moves we were making.

In 1974, just two short years after testing was developed, the National Interpreter Training Consortium was developed, the NITC. And their goal was to train people to become interpreters. Six universities around the nation held a three-month training course for people who had never interpreted before, with the goal of equipping them to accomplish that task in three months.

You may think three months? Absolutely impossible to ask. And as we look back now on that, might think it's quite remarkable, but consider what we are doing in the present time. What are the differences in our approach? In particular, to this last part of the paragraph. Interpreting in its origins in the U.S. was very much the Ceaf community oriented space. That's how interpreter was developed. Deaf people would look around at people who are coming into the space and Deaf people were gatekeeping

interpreters entree into the community. And that's what Dennis Cokely speaks about when he says that perspective that practitioners got that experiential education. Does testing as we had it and have it now equal that experiential education? I think not.

So in 1970s, we didn't have the equivalent education or credentialing that equated with the experiential approach with the Deaf community what we have now, we certainly have more than we used to. I don't think there is any doubt about that. But do we yet have level of rigor and strength of foundation that's research based that gives us what we are doing in terms of the ability to screen people into the field? I don't think we do. The research base for the linguistic part I would say we still have some and some research out there in linguistics, obviously, I have been part of it but we have a lot more work to do is work on the brain process and translation theory and that's also there. But where is the research about community based interpreter who has grown within the community? That part seems to be missing. We don't seem to be looking at that approach, nor the impact that absence of that approach has on our field. So if we are looking at the holistic enterprise of interpreting, there are pieces missing in that foundational study. Those are the pieces we have left to research and their absence has an impact.

The third bullet point, the initial instructional premise, is interesting. When they established a three-month training program for interpreters, what was their premise? What were their goals behind this three-month training? What did they expect people to come out at the end of the training? Now we have training programs all over the U.S. Associates level, Bachelors level, Masters level and PhD. But what is our initial instructional premise behind the current training? Do we have an instructional premise? Someone said certification as an end result. Yes, but that's a scary response.

Obviously we want well qualified interpreters. We want quality interpreting services. We want to understand what interpreting is and what to train effectively and we want to measure success. All of those elements absolutely part of what we want but it has to begin with an initial instructional premise and that I believe is absent or at the very least not clear or every entity has its own and there's no cohesion within the field of what that would look like. What is the statement of our instructional premise that guides interpreter training? I can't say that we have one. And what does that mean for us as a field? What kind of tweaks and revisions do we need? What impact is that lack of standardization have? Now I'm not saying that we need a mission statement. That's not my point by any stretch, but when we look at the how and why what it is they are thinking and the curricular content and course content, what is the research basis behind it and what is our instructional premise? Because that undergirds the entire process.

And again, I go to this last bullet point. The experiential education that interpreters are coming up within the Deaf community does not yet have an equivalent in the formalized training and credentialing system that we have. Language learning in the classroom has limitations. You don't augment that with real world conversations with Deaf people in the community. And as I travel around the country giving presentations I look at those who are learning ASL as an L2 and they look at a particular topic for a particular task. So let's say they gotta do something about real estate, they study everything about buying a house, all of the intricacies involved in that exchange of property. But the students are terrified that deaf person will go off piece and start talking about some other topic outside of real estate in that environment and Deaf people are absolutely going to talk about topics outside of real estate in that environment. I guarantee you they will talk about other things. I absolutely see that. So if we know that to be true in the real world, what kind of language foundation do we need to give students so they are ready when Deaf people talk about something that's off topic? How do you predict they will talk about? We had a conversation earlier about football. So if they're going to talk about last night's football game, that's not my "wheelhouse," but I do know enough about how Deaf people talk and football to be able to be part of that conversation and the language doesn't scare me. So that comes from the community grown interpreting perspective and the kinds of elements we are looking to include in the formalized curriculum and how do we do that? Do we throw out the current curricula that we have and replace it? Maybe not. But where is the balance and what does it look like what can we include in that experiential approach? What can we not include? What measurable and what's not? And therefore what are the decisions that should guide what we include in our curricula.

When we contemplate best, or at least better, practices, what can we pull? We look at the Black community and many of their interpreters are raised within that community. High percentage of them much higher percentage than for white interpreters. What are the best practices within the Black community that we can look at that they are looking at? It might not be perfect but there are elements of that that are working and giving those interpreters a foundation that's missing for other interpreters. Looking at Mormons, they are bringing up Deaf interpreters within the Mormon religious base. Bringing them in and actively and consciously training them in that setting. Again, what are the best practices that we could take from? It may not be a perfect system but again there are absolutely elements that are incredibly successful that we could pull in from groups like Mormons, from the Black community, et cetera, and that's what we need to be looking at and researching so we can articulate them.

So we looked at research and what it is and what we should contemplate but let's look at research in a little more depth. Research is what? Answering questions. Statistics. Gathering data. Analyzing said data. Coming up with more questions. Literature reviews. Getting an understanding of what's already out there. Improving our approaches to the work. Applying that to interpreting. Sure. Making new discoveries and providing analysis of them. Structured inquiry.

Going back to review what has been and looking at the research that already exists. Sometimes repeating that research to see if the results are different. Approaching the same question with a different approach. A different community or a different time span, sure. Often it's about one person having a particular idea and looking for other research work that supports their idea. A somewhat solo undertaking. It's planting a seed that germinates further.

In the ideal world we have research that engages conversation that catalyzes discourse. So why do we do it? To improve on a situation where a problem exists. To sate curiosity. To change our thinking. Paradigm shifts. To solve problems. To validate the human experience as to validate that for Deaf people. And what do we hope to gain? Information? Knowledge? Encourage further research and improve the experience with interpreting? To evolve and change? To create more efficient transitions? To look at the overarching questions by answering a smaller piece?

And who benefits from this research? I'm looking at a previous question as to why we do it and where we do it. Sorry, you are jumping ahead of my presentation but I see your point. The expectation of the Deaf community in research is that it's typically white deaf research. In the field that's what we have seen and looking in the community in the white deaf community. But let's look at the black deaf community. There is little research on them. So that's a real absence, so that's an important question I wanted to put in somewhere. The idea of where we do the research. And that last audience members' comment relates directly to this next piece which is how we do it. We contemplate the idea of research such as problem solving.

Typically, traditionally how we have done the research hasn't been about solving problems. We've looked at a problem and come up with some research, submitted a publication, and left it there. It hasn't actually gone back to where that problem exists. So where and with whom research is undertaken is a really important part of this question. So thank you to the audience who brought up the question of where we do it.

When we contemplate the research paradigm that we have now in the academy, we have research for the sake of research. Research for its own benefit. Learning for the

sake of knowledge and information that then stays in a silo. It's not being sent back out to the community to solve problems. And that's about the current design. Now that can change and I would encourage all of us to do that, it sort of today's thought. But we have to look at the design of research so we can change the impact it then has.

In 1995, Ernest Boyer gave a presentation to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was talking about research and he suggested that we look at the scholarship of engagement as a paradigm behind research. He gave a history on research and how it impacts the academy in the U.S., and what the implications of that have been. Research got to the academy and started off originally as training of the American people with this new idea of democracy to be sure that the people understood what it was, what the rights to vote was, and all that citizenship entailed. The university in the early days was intended for that kind of citizen education. Then it was very much attached to the defining an agricultural round with land grant universities all attached to the approaching specific agricultural problems that would assist farmers and farming in their community. Universities were the places where their research happened and went straight back out to those agricultural spaces. And think about the space race. Everyone was eager to get to space and hit the moon. Universities were engaged in looking at the science and technology behind making that possible. So it was all related to very cogent needs at the time of the people who are living in those spaces. But as Boyer continued to address the idea of the last 50 maybe 75 years the idea of research has changed. The academy has gotten little more elitist, the engagement with the community for whom the research is supposed to be beneficial has lessened and he mentioned this shift which is why he started advocating in '95 the scholarship on engagement.

So we recognize the system currently is not set up for the scholarship of engagement. We were the practitioners and we can change the system with the manner in which we are researching and tie it back to the problem and the people we are concerned about. There is no award given for this yet, but nonetheless I think it's incredibly important and value in the scholarship of engagement approach. It undergoes what we do and how we do it and make the research relevant. It's not research for the sake of research. The research to answer and address a need. So we need to shift the academic paradigm so it goes back to the scholarship of engagement approach that Boyer spoke about. That's the paradigm that I think is important.

Boyer has an article that came about as a result of the presentation. It's a fairly easy read. It's maybe 10 pages and honestly I have gained so much from it. I highly recommend it to you all. Well worth reading and engaging with.

Typically we think about research as discovery. Some of your responses address that kind of thing. Looking at new findings. And that is part of the goal of basic research. That Boyer said it's insufficient. Boyer's premise is that it's a full way of interaction. When we look at the question of where we invest our time and energy for research, most of it is in the discovery quadrant. When we look at the energy that is accounted for cross disciplinary studies and cross disciplinary conversations, benefits are wonderful but discovery ends up typically in publication and not in sharing dissemination information and that's not solving the problem that originally the research question was designed to address. There is no sharing these days. The academic system is not set up for it and doesn't recognize it as part of the professoriate. So we need to look instead at discovery and then the next pieces of the paradigm that Boyer outlines and they are the outline of better and more effective practice in the iterative process that will continue in research and application.

This topic is becoming a hot topic. We know that integration is a hot topic here on campus. We often talk about interdisciplinary work, and it's not about restructuring the entire university but it's about person to person exchanges. The way the university functions will be a result of how individuals share information, not the other way around. We don't just create an infrastructure and then expect people to follow suit. The university also follows what's happening on the ground in person to person exchanges. Think about what departments you mostly -- sit within and who you talk to. How often do you talk with people of other fields? Do you talk with artists about interpreting research? Where are the times and places that you make those connections even though you aren't really within the system that encourages it? We need to make those interactions happen.

Around sharing, I address publications mostly saying in academia but how is it sharing? Who is it shared among? Among academics but not shared within the community. As an example of that, trying to get work outside of linguistic journals, I often travel the country offering workshops on linguistic topic called depiction. They're primarily attended by interpreters, linguists, ASL teachers and in a fairly recent workshop, an attendee asked me to define depiction because they never heard of the term. It was new to them and I was struck because the term was not new it was introduced in Scott Liddel's book which was published in 2003 and I was taken aback because I didn't want to say it's been around for 15 years because it would sort of place them -- but who really is at fault for that information not having been shared? Is it their fault or the academy's fault? I say the onus is on us to make sure our work is shared within the community and why I do workshops. We need to question how it is that we share information and what is the best way of sharing information with the community. A good example of one of the novel ways of sharing information comes from Raychelle Harris. She publishes articles

in video so they are available in ASL. Well produced videos. Citations are available in text on the videos and makes them available for YouTube. She engages those who watch her videos in academic discussion through the comment section and I just read or watched one of her recent publications which was really fantastic. I highly recommend it and came across it on Facebook. I want to find academic research publications on Facebook. Because that means it's out there. It's in the community. I don't mean it's the only avenue for making sure that information is available to the broader community, but I know my work, for example, has never been shared on Facebook. How do we shift how we define publication and dissemination?

This brings me back to the importance of the community. It brings me back to the quote I shared earlier from Dennis Cokely. Again, at this very moment we are living at time where the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf and National Association for the Deaf are more divided than ever. And what's our response? As individuals? As interpreting practitioners and researchers? What is it that we can do to address this broader issue? What do we have in our meaningful research base that can address this issue?

I re-read Cokely's article in preparation of today's talk and was struck by how timely this publication was. Keith mentioned CASLI in my introduction and that CASLI was a development of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf and will be meeting here on campus this weekend and will be joining us for lunch. This group has undertaken an enormous task. Traditionally how interpreters proved themselves was how they practiced over time and we replaced that with certification which is just a snapshot of someone's performance in one moment in time. How do we think about what that means? We can develop a test, a test that's standardized but a standardized test is not enough. A test should only be one component of a broader certification measure.

If a test is only one component what would the other components be and how can our research contribute to the defining what those other components should be and in identifying the gaps and identifying what we are really missing when we are testing certain skills and not others and then again brings me back to the real question. Which is not rhetorical. And someone else in the audience today is on the board of CASLI and we are really trying to figure out this question at this very moment. It's not something in the abstract. It's not something that RID in some far away place is doing. It's something that we are doing right now in this very moment real people working on this real issue.

That brings me to my last piece. What will this look like if the research is truly participatory? Again, think about that divide of research and publications and academia on one hand, and practitioners on the other. What is happening in each of those realms and why does that divide exist. As one example, in interpreting research a study was

conducted on cognitive fatigue and when you start to see the effects of cognitive fatigue it was identified that you start to see an increase rate in errors at about 20 minutes. The way that this played out among practitioners was that we should just switch every 20 minutes. Really? Are we going to work according to a stopwatch and just say, well, after 20 minutes regardless of all of the factors we are going to switch because the research says that 20 minutes is when fatigue sets in and that's when you should switch. It is true that those researchers found that effects of cognitive fatigue set in at about 20 minutes, but we can't contextualize those findings. You have to take a second and really understand how to interpret research.

This brings me back to the question of what research really is...How do we interpret the findings? What does the data mean? What does that finding of an increased rate of errors at 20 minutes, 20 minute really mean for me? Maybe I'm a morning person and early in the day I can actually go for about 40 minutes on a good day without having too much cognitive decline and then maybe by the end of the day, I'm like over it and tired and I need to switch every ten minutes with my colleague. And then what would that mean for the consumer? How does research about turn taking between interpreters affect consumers. It's actually hardly any research on that. We largely decide when to switch according to how long of the presenter is going to speak for, according to an own interpreters own intrapersonal demand but we don't have much research on what the decisions mean for interlocutors and what it means for us as practitioners and community members and as consumers.

Van de Ven published a model of a research method. I will show you the model in a moment and then talk about the components he identified. Along the top half he identified research design and theory building. So both of those have to do with academic realms and has to do with the study context so the research problem, purpose and perspective. At the bottom, he identifies the need to formulate the problem and in order to situate a problem we need to engage with those who experience and know what the problem is while we are conducting the research. We will make this interactive again. have to make sure that everyone in the audience is awake. How do you engage the problem when we are formulating our problem. Any ideas? Do I sit in my office and come up with problems? I can. I have a laundry list of problems. It's easy to come up with issues. What else?

Ask Deaf people. Point out an observation of yours and ask if it's something that they can relate to. Ask them whether a proposed research question would have relevance to their real life. Essentially, have a conversation and make sure that it's ongoing, that it's a daily conversation.

I actually was just talking with a person, who happens to be Deaf, and we were talking about fingerspelling and they commented that it's an annoyance that interpreters can't fingerspell well. So they can't produce it well and they often can't understand it well. Both is true and what do we do with that information. As an interpreter I might understand a fingerspelled item differently than how I understand it when I'm not engaged in the active interpreting. Could you do an activity where you practice your receptive skill for fingerspelling by writing down every word that you see fingerspelled in a presentation? You could but is that necessary for overall comprehension? Not necessarily, but as an interpreter I do need to get every letter. I do need to get every word. There is a different level of processing going on and there are different expectations. Imagine I were just to present you with a string of numbers and expect you to remember every single number without writing it down. How much can you retain? What's real, what's a real expectation? Sometimes we understand fingerspelling by using context and we use what are cloze skills. I brought up all of this in that conversation with a Deaf person. And she went from simply complaining about not complaining, but remarking at the fact that fingerspelling is an issue with interpreting to then being able to talk about it at a more thoughtful level.

I think one of the issues is that we don't address this well in our instruction for L2 learners. It's something you have to get from the Deaf community. The L2 instruction and deaf community are so divided. And we also don't teach the Deaf community how to work with interpreters so it goes both directions and I think it can only be resolved with applied directional engagement, but it has to be mutual. This is a really great point and that ties into Van de Ven's point about problem solving. That we can't undertake this work on our own. It has to be done in a collaborative fashion.

Related to what you mentioned about having a conversation with a Deaf community and when deaf people don't know how to work with interpreters, we then shift the fund of knowledge and the value to what the academy offers but then we devalue what it is people from the community know. So I think people have a shared responsibility in resolving that issue.

The conversation that just happened between the audience members exemplifies the attention between problem formulation and theory building. One person's talking about problem formulation and another is addressing theory building and another person wants to jump to research design and think about how we can test for those issues. How do you bring that information back to the deaf community and back to the interpreting community and back to all of those who have a stake in the problem? You need to engage the intended audience to interpret meanings and uses. You can't identify a problem and solve it in a vacuum. At the beginning, in the middle and at the

end the community is a part -- needs to be a part of our research process and engagement needs to be genuine and comprehensive. I see a couple more hands up but I'm going to move through my slide and we will have more time at the end for Q&A.

I also want to point out Van De Van's segment here about research design that we need to develop process model theory by engaging methods, experts and people providing access information. Again, this is an area of engagement -- and we have fantastic examples of this. Paul Harrelson's dissertation work employed critical incidents technique which he engaged with Deaf community members and conducted a qualitative study about their experiences in the workplace so he established a clear set of experiences of Deaf people and he used that to guide his research design. It was entirely premised on the experiences of the deaf community. Dr. Pamela Collins has also done research on a part of the interpreting process, specifically around schedulers and how their scheduling processes affects interpreting. This is a different part of the community and it impacts how we understand interpreting in terms of the community, interpreters and also schedulers. And addresses how we define interpreting. Whether we think of it as a broad process and as something specific. Yi Hin Chan is currently conducting a dissertation study in conjunction with the Deaf community in Hong Kong even though she is a researcher here in the United States, she has made sure to maintain community connections and have Deaf people from Hong Kong be a part of her committee so they are not academics, they are not American, they are part of her doctoral or her dissertation committee as consultants and they will be a part of her study or her research throughout the entire process. So my point in bringing up these examples is that no one person is doing this comprehensively but there are certainly examples of many people doing parts of this. So it's important to think about engagement around all four areas of research activity.

The more engaged, the better the society will be. Our society at large and our society of interpreters and the deaf community. Giving work strictly in the ivory tower does not benefit our reality, our society and I'm not just preaching to the choir I know that many of you are already in the field of interpreting but I talk about this same thing in the linguistic department where we understand these things as guiding principles for our research in the linguistics department. I was talking with a student who has graduated and is now working in interpreter training program. One of their students at the end of the semester painted this and gave it to the teacher. They said that this teacher taught them about engagement. It meant a lot to me because it is a consequence of how I chose to offer instruction in my classes and in turn how one of my students interacted with the community. Highlighting the value of community based participatory research. Thank you.

Dr. Danielle Hunt

Thank you for a marvelous presentation. Brought several questions to mind for me. I know time is limited so I will have a few remarks and then if any audience members would like to address questions I would ask them to line up on the side of the stage that I'm on.

Let's talk about Dennis Cokely's work and his article in particular in 2005. I see some great ideas from that publication that I think are relevant today regarding the research itself. He talks about rear of practice. And you also talked about the idea of home-grown interpreters. That relationship between those two experiences exist. between academia and the community approach. So if we look at those raised in the community and those who have come into the field more by the academic stream, and we contemplate the idea of gate keeping, now in my own research I did a little piece of gatekeeping as one element of my own particular thoughts. So when we look at training and want to be more inclusive of engaging with the community and yet at the same time recognize that impacts the way we gatekeep and looking at interpret training on an academic training. What are your thoughts?

Dr. Miako Villanueva

My thoughts are going back to my discussion about testing, and that there's a parallel. We think that testing equates to certification, and certification equates to qualification. But we know that is false. We absolutely know that passing that test in no way means that you are ready and qualified for every situation in which interpreting is requested. I think the same thing applies to interpreter training programs. I think that the academic training of interpreters is great. It's a great undertaking. But a program can only be what a training program can do. At the end of your training program, it doesn't mean that your training overall is complete. And that mentality is dangerous especially when you think I graduated from a program at Gallaudet University. The practitioners know when recent graduates are not ready but they think they are ready. And I think that we're lying to ourselves, to each other, to the profession, to the deaf community. How can we be honest about what training is and what it is not? That while training encompasses many valuable things does not mean you are ready for everything. That your degree is not the only credential of value but that many other elements of who we are and what we are prepared for is a part of being honest. And it doesn't mean we are saying the training is not enough or that it doesn't have value. It's just a statement that it offers some tools, some tips, and skills. It further develops areas that you will need as a baseline before you can start practicing in the community. But we also need to be real about what an interpreter needs to do on their own and in order to enhance their skills

through experience. And that begins with an open and honest discussion that recognizes this false equation that we have between testing certification and readiness that we need to be open to the fact that gatekeeping encompasses many things. And not just for accomplishment of an academic degree.

Dr. Danielle Hunt

You're right, further conversation is important, not just internal reflections but also with our colleagues, practitioners and the community at large. Because we are all stakeholders in this undertaking.

You mentioned Raychelle Harris' recent work. It's wonderful idea to present academic coursework via video and it's sort of academic and yet available to the public and I think it's really innovative way to approach the dissemination of research. And I think it's a great article. But if I am an academic researcher, how can I not only engage with stakeholders in the Deaf community and interpreting community, but at the same time then really disseminate what those everyday practices are to working interpreters. I mean what's the engagement with them as well, that has to be considered?

Dr. Miako Villanueva

Two thoughts in response to that. One as a practice profession, it is critical that when we teach and train also understand that this is practice and those who teach and train need to continue their practice so it can't be that you strictly teach or strictly interpret and I understand that it's more tempting to do one over the other because it's not easy to wear multiple hats. And I'm saying this as linguist I teach linguists in Gallaudet but I can't teach linguistic in isolation, separate from interpreting. I need to stay involved with what's going on in the interpreting community to be connected with those real world issues. And then in the other direction, I can't fully understand what's important for us to research as linguists without understanding what's important from interpreting. So I think that the "classroom" real world relationship is important, and then dissemination is another thing that we need to question. Publications strictly in academic journals that stays in the realm of academia is of no practical import to broader society. How do I ensure that the information gets to the community in a format that is available, readily available for people in a variety of formats, that could includes online sources, going out in person and giving workshops. So we need to understand the dissemination more broadly than just publication in academic journals.

Dr. Danielle Hunt

Thank you. I have one more question before we go on to the audience. When we contemplate the idea of social justice and the push for what we call “gray literature” which is a concept that, if you’re not familiar with it means a person who is not actually an academic or not connected with an academic institution isn’t, for example working here at Gallaudet, but is nonetheless undertaking research in a particular community in a field of interest. How do we gain from that kind of endeavor and bring it into the field of what we call academia.

Dr. Miako Villanueva

Really nice to see this shift towards inclusion, inclusion of different types of knowledge not just academic knowledge. So I'm glad to see the shift and we need to keep it moving because it's not something that is being generated from within the system. It's external and we need to keep that momentum going. Now that brings me back to Boyer's point in his article that we are culture shift happens many of those shifts have not been from academic research. One example he gave was a book called *Silent Spring*. This had to do with destruction of the environment and this didn't come from academia. It came from popular culture. It was a bestseller. And that book shifted how we thought about environmental protection. You can see a dramatic shift in how we understand global warming and our climate after the publication of *Silent Spring*. So how we engage those sorts of voices in the discussion are critically important. And there are a number of ways in which we can include different voices by disseminating information in different parts of society. So that your ability to share information doesn't end at publication, but it continues beyond that and make sure that you are interacting with your readers, with those that are interested in your work so you are not just presenting people with what you found but instead you are looking to use your research as a way to engage in conversation and ask for their thoughts and reactions and make sure that engagement is reciprocal and -- this might be a dangerous metaphor but talk about engagement. The way in which we sign it has a connotation of bringing together two sort of diametrically opposed entities that there is academia and society. But it's a false binary. It's not an either/or. There are a lot of people in all kinds of spaces including in between and so how we push for that inclusion in the non-academic end of the spectrum is just as important for how we push for inclusion on the academic end of that spectrum.

Dr. Danielle Hunt

Great, now we have questions from the audience and will start with Sherette, anyone else who would like to ask questions can come up to the side of the stage.

Sherrette Estes

Thank you Miako for a wonderful presentation and when we look at this idea of engagement, I mean I definitely consider myself to not be an academic, but I do my own mini research projects sometimes. I sit and contemplate things and see what it has an impact on. So my wife is in academia. I talk to her and my friends and I have an internship group with whom I converse. And sometimes it's hard to talk about this kind of thing without considering the credibility and risk. I love Raychelle's blog. I thought it was remarkable. If I did that there is a risk, based on who I am. And I think a lot of my fellow practitioners might feel the same. Because in this field, we love to talk about what we do know and what somebody else hasn't done correctly. That element of risk exists. And even if I have all of those multiple credentials, et cetera, that's part of credibility. But if I don't have them, what happens to risk? What happens to the thoughts that I've got. I assume there's some parallels in the academic institutions as well with how we talk to other disciplines and we know how to write, et cetera. But when you come forward with that in publication that's also a set of risk among your peers. So how do we get over that fear of being willing to bring our thoughts forward in that avenue?

Dr. Miako Villanueva

To that I say definitely just one hundred percent, yes. I don't have a neatly packaged answer to that. What I can say is that taking risks requires bravery. And you have to know that it's worth it. I'm an academic and publish in academic circles and those circles protect me by having peer review processes. And another layer of protection is that if that publication is not seen by broader society, then I'm kept insulated from outside eyes critiquing what I published in this academic journal. In the academic world there are, I don't know, a systems, rigorous systems, a tradition of publishing a certain way simply because it's always been done that way. And this may seem tangential to the question you just asked but my point is that traditions have been built around ensuring that certain people don't have access to the information. That academic journals are meant for certain eyes and academic conferences are still conducted in such a way that only academics are expected to attend. Presenting in classroom is an "engage from the stage" model. This is all based on traditions established decades if not centuries ago of attendees, at conferences or students in classrooms not having access to information and this is why the role of professor was needed because that's professor needed to deliver the information that was only available in academic circles to a broader audience. When we as academics open up that information to broader society we start

to put our own existence at risk. So there is a fear here. Even from academics. Credentials and having credentials is still a question even in academia. Is just having a PhD enough? I will say that having a PhD is not enough. It means you have a skill! Certainly you have a certain body of information but what does it mean for real implications of your research? I was in one discussion group on Facebook and not to overly promote facebook here. But in this discussion group, topics have come up around interpreting being a safe space. There's another Facebook discussion group called ASL THAT and I love the discussion because it's about linguistics but it's a non-academic linguistics discussion. This gets to your point about people who don't have the paper credentials but who nevertheless have experiential credentials. So I see how discussions in that Facebook group formed my work as a linguist and I then bring some of what I know from the academy to that Facebook group. So we need real people, individuals, to really put their necks on the line and take that risk, to use your words. As an interpreter I see the situation but I see a given situation come up repeatedly and I want to talk about it, I want to bring it up even if I don't have a PhD behind my name or some other form of credential that may give me credibility. How can I frame a conversation in way that elevates the discussion? And the more people that can participate in that discussion, the better. We just have to be honest about who we are when we bring that up.

Janis Cole

Sherette's question, to that I would simply say, Amen! And also to Miako's response, because it does take bravery. In the interest of time I will try to formulate my thoughts in a shorter form. I think video is important. Molly Wilson has done a topic on bypass. Have you seen that? It's a beautiful video. And it's about the homegrown experience. Growing up within the community and she, Molly Wilson is a CODA, she has a three-minute video but I see the argument that she made and it's really good and all of the rest of you should see it. I recommend it. Now back to research. Academic based, this is where we research is happening and the tension that exists. Thank you very much for all of your discussion.

Do we need to revisit the curricula with which we teach interpreter training? I have been training for 20 some years and seen all over the country. Does the issue lie there? Is it the course work we are offering in the curriculum? Some of it is remarkably old. If that's the problem, how do we go back and redo the curriculum and how do we get radical about the transformation we might then need? To be honest, I think having the conversation for years and I think a lot needs to change and I agree with you there. But how is my question. And then when we look at research, I think people oftentimes are a little afraid of it. So it's important to have people who are deaf engaged in research

around interpreting. Obviously that's a blanket statement and it's also important to get more deaf people involved in the research itself. It's not enough to research a topic and then walk away. I think it's really, really important that we start the conversation with ourselves and maybe this isn't question maybe it's more of a comment that I'd like to offer. Thank you very much for your delivery and the points you made.

Dr. Miako Villanueva

Thank you. And I do want to respond to the curriculum part of what you just said. Remember I mentioned that in 1974 six universities offered three month interpreter training programs. Where we are now at the point where our interpreter training programs have certainly grown but they all grew from that. We have not ever fully scrapped what we started this in 1974. So we are still working on some things that grew out those three month training programs. I also wanted to talk about the bypassing videos that you brought up where it's a conflict and address the curriculum. Research from people like Amy Williamson and Sue Isakson which they look at heritage language and they look at possibilities for what a curriculum could look like for deaf interpreters and it might need to be curriculum that is entirely separate from current curricula which are primarily designed for hearing non native signers so they attend programs that are not designed for deaf interpreters. Programs are not designed for people who are already fluent in ASL because in many cases our interpreting programs include language learning with interpreting and I consider myself lucky that I had the blessing of working at a School for the Deaf and I had 4 years to immerse myself in the language so by the time I reached an interpreting program I could actually focus on interpreting. I didn't also have to learn language fundamentals. And in hindsight, only in hindsight do I realize how lucky I was and how much of a blessing that was. So what if we created a program where is was designed for Deaf interpreters? What would we teach about interpreting, where would we start? What would that curriculum look like? What if we addressed hearing interpreters whose parents are deaf, what would a curriculum for these interpretes look like? And then revamp curricula designed for hearing L2 learners of ASL and only then could that inform what interpreting really is -- once its removed from language learning. So we can actually focus on teaching the skill of interpreting. We aren't there yet. It hasn't happened so far. But there are people in the community who are pushing for that. But as I said, we don't have the research to back that up yet.

Thank you everyone for your attendance.

I would like to recognize that there is -- there was one person of color who came to ask a question but you said at the time had run out. So I think -- when a person kind of comes up in the room and not included in the discussion, I just want to throw out the

fact that we recognize that point in the larger space about talking about interpreting. Thank you. I appreciate the comment. I agree However, time has run out. I would like to again thank Miako for her wonderful presentation and say we are offering lunch on the second floor of the cafeteria. The financial considerations are on your own but you can attend that and continue this discussion that we've had since the presentation has concluded. There are also CEUs available if you sign the CEU paperwork and see Marc Holmes. And March 1st-3rd in New Hampshire there is a event happening in New Hampshire for interpreters of any persuasion of any background. It should be a great weekend and we can revisit this concept of engagement and promises to be a remarkable event. So please do come. And New Hampshire will be sending out better advisement toward that event. Thank you again. This concludes our presentation.