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Abstract

This paper discusses the auto-ethnographic action research project that I conducted with the goal of improving my work as an interpreter and therefore reducing the “readiness to work gap” in my own professional practice. This action research project contained two different approaches with the goal of leading to self-improvement in my interpreting ability. The first approach involved working with a mentor to create goals that work toward the improvement of specific aspects of my interpreting process. This was typically done by selecting a source text that would lend itself to practice working towards a specific interpreting goal. With limited mentoring opportunities in my region, this was mainly done through sharing recorded work samples synchronously and asynchronously with mentors over FaceTime, Google Hangout, Email, and over the phone. The second part of this project involved intentional practice in my work place through the documentation of both social and performance aspects of my interpreting practice. The documentation of these aspects of my interpreting lead to questions about my role as an Educational Interpreter and allowed me to keep track of how many times I intentionally worked towards the interpreting goals I created with my mentor.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

Entering a new work environment is often stressful because you need to adapt to a new culture. This stress, or hesitancy is amplified when you are entering the workplace as not only and outsider, but also as a novice. Hesitancy, stress, and lack of belonging are the emotions that I was feeling in September of 2017. I had recently moved away from where I did my Interpreter Education Program (IEP), where there was an abundance of newly trained and experience interpreters, and came to a place where trained interpreters are a scarcity. Upon starting work for a school district with one of the largest magnet programs for students needing D/deaf and hard of hearing services in the state, I realized that not only was I the first interpreter to be hired in this district with formal training, but also the understanding of the role of an educational interpreter was limited.

After starting working in this setting, I became more aware of the wide spread need for interpreters in mainstream education, as well as the complicated ethical decisions and specialized skill required for working in this setting. These are things the interpreter, interpreter supervisors, and various other staff members should all be made aware of. Upon this realization I began to ponder if interpreting education and training programs are adequately preparing their graduates for working as K-12 interpreters. If the answer to this question is no, how can new interpreters fresh out of school work towards developing their skills as a practitioner post-graduation.

When asked to undertake an action research project related to my work as an interpreting practitioner, I immediately thought of looking into working on improving specific aspects of my American Sign Language (ASL) production. A few weeks before this project began, I received scores from the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) exam, and I received a
3.4, when I was shooting for a 3.5 or higher. The EIPA has four domains that the graders rate you on. These domains are: grammatical skills, which looks at use of prosody, grammar, and space; sign-to-voice interpreting skills, which looks at the ability to understand and convey the sign language user; vocabulary: which looks at ability to use a wide range of vocabulary, and accurate use of fingerspelling and numbers; and finally one’s overall abilities, which includes the ability to represent a sense of the entire message, use appropriate discourse structures, and represent who is speaking (EIPA rating system, 2018). On this performance exam, as previously stated, I received a 3.4, which is classified as intermediate. For the categorical breakdowns of the scores and feedback I received for each domain, reference Appendix F. I was disappointed with this score, however with the detailed feedback that I received from the graders I was able to set up goals to improve my practice with the assistance of mentoring.

After reading the feedback that I received from the EIPA graders and upon further reflection on my interpreting practice I decided that I wanted to start by working on improving my use of space as well as my use of classifiers. Each week I gave myself one or two aspects of my interpreting practice that I wanted to improve. Then over the course of the week, I tried to intentionally practice these features while working at my K-12 interpreting job, as well as when filming a supplementary work sample for my mentor. Then, my mentor and I would meet synchronously to discuss how my workweek went, the work sample itself, and goal setting for the following week. While going through this process I worked with three different mentors, and expanded my goals to include working on ASL sentence boundaries, depiction, lengthening my décalage time, discerning when to use listing over contrastive structure, ASL sentence structure, reducing English mouthing, and facial expression.
Work samples with my mentor was the first part of my action research, and the second part was focused on my work as an interpreting practitioner in the K-12 setting. I wanted to see if logging specific features of my interpreting practice during work post-assignment would help me to be more intentional in my interpreting. I also was interested in logging tasks that educational interpreters do, that an interpreter in a different setting would not. Lastly, I wanted to journal about my experience collaborating with both consumers and colleagues.

**Study Limitations**

Limitations to this study are primarily related to data collection. For 29 days I collected data on my interpreting practice at work. These 29 days were consecutive and were near the end of the school year. Because of this, standardized testing was happening, changing the duration and order of classes. After looking at the school’s testing schedule, I noted even with different length class periods throughout the week, at the end of the testing schedule all classes received the same amount of class time. For this reason I decided to keep the data I collected during this timeframe, however I chose not to collect data on the time spent interpreting in the testing periods. This is one example of how my interpreting schedule varied, another example is that on three separate occasions during data collection the school district had me drive to different schools in the district to interpret for various meetings, thereby altering my data collection on those specific days. Since all of the data collected was at the end of the school year, I am not able to gage if there was a difference in my interpreting practice from the start of the year to the end of the year.

Another limitation of this study is that the majority of the data collection that happened in this setting was self-documented post assignment. This means that there is a definite possibility that the data that was collected was not all of the data present in my work. To try to decrease this
discrepancy as much as possible I would add data into my log during breaks in the interpretation, and after each class period. I also tried to have the team I would occasionally work with document data, but with her lack of experience providing feedback on interpretations, she found finding data points while simultaneously watching my interpretations too overwhelming to do consistently.

**Theoretical framework**

By reflecting on my work and interactions as a K-12 interpreter, I will be able to not only more effectively tailor my practice to better suit consumers, but also influence future expectations among colleagues of the behavior and practice of interpreters. Since I completed my research in one setting, the variables in the setting stayed relatively consistent throughout my study, making it less likely that the data collected was be skewed by inconsistent environmental demands. In the setting where I am conducting research, I am both a participant in the environment as well as a researcher. Because of this I collected data using an immersed participant ethnographic and auto-ethnographic approach. Ethnography is inductive and holistic, requiring dedication from the researcher to complete the study over a long period of time, in my case 29 days, it also requires full immersion into the environment or culture the researcher is studying and all research is conducted on-site (Angrosino, 2007 as cited in Sangasubana, 2011 , p.567). In ethnographic research, there are three forms of data collection: observation, interviews, and archival research, while auto-ethnography focuses on promoting self-reflection, narrative writing, and qualitative inquiry (Chang, 2016). With this in mind, I will be focusing on making observations of the setting, culture, and participants, as well as reflecting on my interactions. During this process, I kept a journal and teaming notebook to log and keep track of data collected on my practice as well as my observations and feelings post-assignment.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The “Gap”

In interpreting, the “readiness to work gap” or the “school-to-work gap” is often discussed. The gap refers to the imbalance between the skill level and ASL fluency of graduating interpreters and the skill required to enter the interpreting field and become certified (Cogen & Cokely, 2016, p. 2; Resnick, 1990, Wilbeck, 2017, p.1; Witter-Meritew & Johnson, 2004, p.12; Volk, 2014). Smith, Cancel, and Maroney (2012), also defined the “gap” by saying that it is, “the difference between the academic environment, where pre-professional interpreters learn foundational theory about the profession, and the working world in which the theories are put into practice.” They also discuss a second “gap,” which refers to perceived skill verses the actual skill level of an interpreter. Smith, Cancel, and Maroney (2012) go on to say,

These two “gaps,” in perceived skill-level and readiness-to-work, and in theory versus practice create a challenging dilemma for the new interpreter. They can no longer rely upon the supportive, safe environment of schooling and academia, and yet they have not set up the necessary supports and confidence for working in authentic settings. A bridge is needed.

This “gap” was originally identified as a crisis by Resnick (1990, as cited in Wilbeck, 2017, p. 5) and since then has been written about in the field of interpreting by a variety of academics. Within these articles there have been many recommendations that are intended to address this “gap” and minimize it. Resnick (1990, as cited in Wilbeck, 2017, p. 5; Ruiz, 2013, p. 5) recommended continuing mentorship post-graduation, internship, and extended supervision. All in the hopes to better prepare students for entering the interpreting field. Cogen and Cokely’s (2016) list of recommendations to close the gap include:
Improving ASL fluency outcomes for program graduates, enhancing program involvement with the d/Deaf and DeafBlind communities, hiring Deaf interpreters as interpreter educators, conducting a study of job types and associated risks, aligning program goals with lower-risk job types, and providing structured post-graduation pathways into low-to-increasingly-higher risk jobs. (p.25)

The “gap” has been identified, discussed, and solutions have been offered up to the interpreting community, but change can only happen when either interpreting education and training programs recognize the “gap” and utilize these recommendations to remedy the current “readiness to work gap” or the recent graduates take this “gap” on as their responsibility and actively work to shrink it within their own practice.

Western Oregon University has started to take steps to identify this “gap” in their own Interpreter Education Program graduates by collecting test results from both RID-NAD National Interpreter Certification (NIC) examination and the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA), as well as collecting qualitative data from graduates, who expressed the need for additional support as they transition into the workforce (Smith, Cancel, & Maroney, 2012). To address their graduate’s desire for post-graduation support Western Oregon University set up an initiative called Professional Supervision for Interpreting Practice (PSIP). This is an initiative that I have personally been a part of for the past year. As a part of PSIP, recent graduates participate in monthly group supervision where Dean and Pollard’s (2001) demand-control schema (DC-S) is used as a guide for recent graduates to have constructive and non-evaluative discussions about their interpreting practice; all with the goal of sharing knowledge among colleagues to improve one’s interpreting practice. To supplement supervision, PSIP assigns each recent graduate with a mentor to work with throughout the year in a one-on-one
capacity (Smith, Cancel, & Maroney, 2012). Being a part of PSIP for the past year has given me a structured environment where I can work on reducing the “gap” in my own professional practice through supervision and mentoring. Not every new graduate is privy to a program like this, however they can still work towards improving their interpreting practice through reflection, intentional practice, supervision and mentoring.

**Reflective Practice**

Regular reflection, in the form of goal setting and intentional practice, can lead to more effective interpreting. In one study on athletic training, “improvement of performance was uniformly observed when individuals, who were motivated to improve their performance, were given well-defined tasks, were provided with feedback, and had ample opportunities for repetition” (Ericsson, 2000/2001, p.165). This study also noted that improvements could be made as long as a time constraint of one hour was maintained. An hour was decided upon because for college students, this is the amount of time they could maintain concentration while making active efforts to improve their performance on the field. “The concept of deliberate practice also accounts for individual differences in the maintenance of expert performance” (Krampe & Ericsson, 1996 cited in Ericsson, 2000/2001, p.165). Interpreting is a job that requires, “complex, social context judgments and skills are crucial supplements to one’s technical abilities” (Dean & Pollard, 2009), and because of this interpreting is considered a practice profession (Dean & Pollard, 2004; 2009). Reflective or intentional practice in the field of interpreting is often done when interpreters look at their own cognitive processes. Think Aloud Protocol (TAP) is one tool that interpreters use to do this. A TAP is a tool used for performance assessment after the interpretation is completed. It often looks like a stream of consciousness where the interpreter talks through their thought processes and the decisions they made while interpreting. However,
what typically happens when preforming a TAP is that the interpreter verbalizes resulting thoughts rather than strategies they employed during the interpretation (House, 2000 cited in Ericsson, 2000/2001).

Reflecting upon one’s work is a key part of practice for interpreters, and should not be forgotten. When interpreters reflect on their actions:

We may reflect on action, thinking back on what we have done in order to discover how our knowledge-in-action may have contributed to an unexpected outcome. We may do so after the fact, in tranquility, or we may pause in the midst of action to make what Hannah Arendt (1971) calls a 'stop-and-think.' (Schön, 1987, p. 26)

Without reflecting upon our actions we may never realize how different parts of our interpretation can unknowingly impact the consumers and the interaction that is happening. When interpreters take time to reflect and see how our linguistic choices and actions impact the work, we will become more aware of our own impact. "Whatever the case may be, the interpreter will impact the message by the decisions she made when constructing the target text, whether she is aware of it or not, whether it is intentional or not" (Janzen, 2008, pp. 185). This is an important concept for interpreters to learn because just by being present in a situation as a third party, we are already impacting the communication. This makes it all the more important for interpreters to reflect on the decisions they make, discern if they were effective or not, and come up with an action plan for the next time a similar situation arises. Cokely (2000) describes why examining our work as interpreters is imperative:

The choices that we make, and the actions that follow from those choices, can uphold or deny the dignity of other people, can advocate or violate the rights of other people, can
arm or disavow the humanity of other people. Given the potential consequences of our choices and the resultant actions, it is reasonable to expect that we constantly reexamine those values, principles, and beliefs that underscore and shape the decisions we make and the actions we undertake.

Cokely (2000) goes on to say, that ethical practice is purposeful action-focused reflection. Without reflection Cokely no longer sees the interpreter’s work as ethical. Two ways we can effectively examine our work as interpreters is through mentoring and supervision (Dean & Pollard, 2009).

**Mentoring**

A large component in improving one’s practice is self-motivation and having specific goals; however, feedback and an expert’s perspective, in the form of mentoring, can also be invaluable. Mentoring is the coaching of less-experienced practitioners by more experienced or expert practitioners (Hetherington, 2011). While mentoring can focus on interpreting performance and honing skills, it can also entail being a role model (Bontempo, Napier, & Hayes, 2014). Building a sense of trust with a mentor is also important when sharing work.

While not directly related to the idea of sharing work as interpreters, brave spaces are environments that promote the idea of creating a space where an individual feels comfortable enough to be uncomfortable and discuss challenging issues free of judgment (Arao & Clemens, 2013). In their work, Dean and Pollard (2001, 2009, 2013) mentioned that interpreters do not feel like they can talk about their work. However according to the Registry of interpreters for the Deaf’s (2005) Code of Professional Conduct, the tenant on confidentiality states, “share assignment-related information only on a confidential and ‘as-needed’ basis (e.g., supervisors, interpreter team members, members of the educational team, hiring entities).” Many interpreters
see the word ‘confidentiality’ and choose to keep details about their work to themselves in order to maintain it. Whereas, as a professional interpreters should see confidentiality through its root word which is, to confide. When this is done, confidentiality can be maintained through sharing work and experience with colleagues with the understanding that all information shared is done so in confidence (Curtis, 2018). Having a setting that promotes learning through mutual respect and trust leads to successful mentoring with specific feedback without the mentee feeling personally judged or ridiculed.

**Supervision**

Supervision is a common practice in the mental health field, and is often defined as an “oversight by one’s boss” or other such punitive concepts…aimed at furthering the effectiveness of one of the professional’s work” (Dean & Pollard, 2004 cited in Smith, Cancel, & Maroney, 2012). It has also been defined as, “An intentional interaction between two or more practitioners, the goal of which is to engage in reflective practice, ensure quality services for consumers, and support the wellbeing of the practitioner” (Curtis, 2017, p. 5). During my IEP, graduate studies, and participation in PSIP, DC-S has always been used. DC-S is used in the field of interpreting because the work of interpreters involves the interaction of both demands and controls (Dean & Pollard, 2001). According to Dean and Pollard (2001), demands are, “Requirements of a job, which may include aspects of the environment, the actual task being performed, and other factors that “act upon” the individual” (p. 2), while controls are defined as, “Resources the interpreter has at her or his disposal or a response the interpreter offers in light of assignment demands” (p. 14). A commonality in the literature on supervision is that it happens with the goal helping the practitioner, the consumers they work with, and the profession as a whole. Dean and Pollard (2009) also explained why case conferencing is important for interpreters in four principles:
1) Interpreting is a practice profession where the dynamics of the relationships matter greatly and, therefore, our impact on deaf and hearing consumers must be attended to.

2) There are multiple ethical and reflective decisions in response to any given assignment demand which fall along a liberal-to-conservative spectrum.

3) Behavioral and translation decisions must be considered from a teleological or consequences-based viewpoint where positive and negative consequences are identified and evaluated.

4) An interpreter’s role is always understood in conjunction with responsibility and, accordingly, professionals must continually respond to the consequences of their decisions – even if that decision was to do nothing.

By convincing interpreters of the importance of regular supervision, we will continue to move our profession forward.

**K-12 Student Success**

Academic success is impacted by whether or not the parents of the D/deaf child provide access to language at home. With a reported 92% of D/deaf children being born to two hearing parents, many D/deaf children do not have access to competent language models in either sign language or English (Smith, 2013). This means that when D/deaf children reach school age they may not be fluent users of any language. Use of sign language at home is one contributing factor related to student success, severity of hearing loss, and the age of intervention is also important (Smith, 2013). The premise for mainstreaming D/deaf and hard of hearing children into hearing classrooms is to give all students regardless of hearing ability the same quality of education. However, D/deaf and hard of hearing students are not included in classes the way their hearing
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peers are. Inclusion does not happen without full integration into a classroom setting (Schick, 2004 cited in Smith, 2013).

D/deaf students’ linguistic competence, academic achievement, and peer relationships are often dramatically impacted by the skill level possessed by the interpreters they work with throughout their time in mainstream classrooms (Cogen & Cokely, 2016, p. 9). Student’s needs are varied and their academic and social success is tied with the quality of services they receive. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2006 cited in Cogen & Cokely, 2016, p. 9), “approximately 87% of d/Deaf children are enrolled in mainstream education.” Even with K-12 education being known as a high-risk interpreting setting, school districts’ perception of interpreters as paraprofessionals in conjunction with a lower salaries leads to hiring under qualified and novice interpreters. Part of the reason K-12 interpreting is high-risk is because of the role and responsibilities associated with being an educational interpreter.

The educational interpreter is a member of an educational team that has a federal obligation to educate a student with special needs. As a related service provider, the educational interpreter has legal responsibilities to support a child’s education, providing the student access to the general curriculum. These legal responsibilities define a very different scope of practice for the educational interpreter than for the adult community interpreter. (www.classroominterpreting.org cited in Patrie & Taylor, 2008, p.8)

Social Capitol Among Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students

Research shows that minorities are more likely to need additional support when it comes to building relationship networks needed for academic success, and yet this is something rarely addressed when discussing supports needed for a child’s education (Cohen & Steel, 2002; Olivia & Risser Lytle, 2014; Stanton-Salazar, 1997, 2001). Building relationships and relationship
networks is known as social capital (Olivia & Risser Lytle, 2014). “Placing a deaf or hard of hearing child in an environment where participating in basic conversations is a daily struggle precludes any healthy development of relationships” (Olivia & Risser Lytle, 2014, p.25).

Increased problems with D/deaf students and social capitol is on the rise with more deaf students getting Cochlear Implants (CI) and being placed in mainstream educational settings (Wilkens & Hehir, 2008 cited in Olivia & Risser Lytle, 2014). Olivia and Risser Lytle (2014) conducted a narrative research study where they asked D/deaf and Hard or Hearing adults to reflect on their experience in mainstream education. Many of the stories told by participants were related to their personal experience with social capitol. Many of the participants reflected on how most of their peer relationships with hearing students were challenging, limited, and brief in duration. In this study, 25% of the people surveyed reported that they had a hearing friend in school (Olivia & Risser Lytle, 2014). One participant in this study said,

I felt like I had to pick out friends who would be willing to put up with my Deaf voice and hang out with me, and my choices were limited. It takes really kind people and open-minded people to be willing to hang out with Deaf people during middle school years and be willing to have one-on-ones and repeat what others are saying. (Olivia & Risser Lytle, 2014, p. 28)

Many participants shared similar stories about how they were unable to choose friends, but rather had to be let into groups. While some were grateful to have a friend, this power imbalance often lead to feelings of resentment because the D/deaf or Hard of Hearing individual often felt that their friendship needs were not being met. On the other hand, “K– 12 interpreters were often major influences in our participants’ lives. Their roles often veered from the act of interpreting, as they became tutors, assistant teachers, and therapists, as well as friends” (Olivia & Risser
Lytle, 2014, p. 82). It is common for k-12 interpreters to take on multiple roles (Smith, 2013), however, interpreters are not meant to be the primary connection for a D/deaf student. It is the interpreter’s role to bridge communication so that D/deaf and hearing peers can develop relationships.

**K-12 Interpreter Role**

With the possibility of Deaf and hard of hearing students entering mainstream education without fluency in a signed or in a spoken language, the interpreter suddenly becomes the first adult language model for that child (Smith, 2013). This is a tremendous responsibility. Because of this, it is that much more important for K-12 interpreters to examine their practice. When interpreters look at their interactions with students, teachers, and why they make the decisions they do, the interpreter can gain valuable knowledge that will help them to maintain an ethical interpreting practice.

One of the more challenging aspects of K-12 interpreting is discerning what is the role and responsibilities of the interpreter and what should be left to the classroom teacher (Smith, 2013). One reason why many interpreters struggle with this is because the role of the K-12 interpreter often changes based on the age of the child and whether or not they know how to use interpreting services. The idea that over time the interpreter’s responsibilities shrink as the
student’s responsibilities grows is widely attributed to Dennis Davino’s (1985) model: *Inverted Pyramid of Responsibilities*.

This model was originally distributed as a handout during a meeting, and has been used in interpreting literature to help define the role of the K-12 interpreter ever since. In this handout, Davino (1985) says the role of the interpreter is, “to provide communication support for the student. Interpreters should not be involved in activities such as page turning or answering the student’s questions directly.” He then goes on to discuss that elementary aged students need more support from the interpreter, but as students grow older responsibilities should gradually shift from the interpreter to the student.

According to the *EIPA Guidelines of Professional Conduct for Educational Interpreters* (Schick, 2007), the role of the interpreter is to:

- Interpret information from: Teachers, peers, as well as environmental sounds, worksheets, and tests
- Facilitate communication between deaf and hearing people
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- Include supplemental information into the interpretation due to lack of understanding because of a difference in culture, language, or experience. This should not interfere with the teacher’s lessons
- Discern whether or not an assignment is appropriate for her skill level

This document also emphasizes that the interpreter should not protect students from being disciplined, prohibit students from making mistakes, and should not do work for students (Schick, 2007).

**Working with Students with Cochlear Implants**

When it comes to consumer matching multiple factors need to be taken into account. This is because, “Deaf students have diverse needs requiring a high degree of flexibility in the interpersonal, instructional, and communication expertise of teachers, interpreters, and other support personnel in the schools” (Stewart & Kluwin, 1996, p. 33 as cited in Smietanski, 2016, p.10). Deaf students in the K-12 setting have varying levels of hearing, signing, and English ability, and often work with the same interpreters regularly. These factors cause interpretations to be individually customized instead of signed with a general audience in mind. With the current rate of approximately 80% of deaf children being implanted with cochlear implants (CIs) (Humphries, Kushalnagar & Mathur, 2012, p.1, Humphries, Kushalnagar & Mathur, 2014, p.32), there is a growing number of D/deaf individuals entering mainstream educational settings. With the increase of D/deaf children with CIs entering more hearing classrooms, interpreters need to be willing and able to adjust their practice in a way that supports the language needs of the student. Linguistic choices are not the only thing that comes into play when consumer matching, "Adjusting for cultural considerations is just what is needed for both participants to interact successfully. This reduces the need (perceived or real) for interpreters to attempt to educate
participants about each other’s cultures” (Janzen, 2008, p. 186). Cultural considerations are extremely important to keep in mind while interpreting in an educational setting, since you are interpreting between both peers and teachers.

Conclusion

The “readiness to work gap” can be reduced when Interpreter Education Programs recognize the “gap” and utilize the recommendations that various academics have compiled, or when recent graduates take responsibility for their post-graduation skill level and start to work on developing their practice outside academia through mentoring, supervision, and intentional reflective practice.

Role ambiguity is something that many interpreters struggle with since the role and responsibilities of an educational interpreter differ from that of a community interpreter (Smietanski, 2016). Educational interpreters abide by both RID’s Code of Professional Conduct and the EIPA Guidelines. Since Davino’s 1985 model: *Inverted Pyramids of Responsibility* became a part of interpreter education there is also the added factor of gauging how and when responsibility should be shifted to the D/deaf or hard of hearing student. While the EIPA Guidelines emphasize that interpreters need to facilitate communication between D/deaf and hearing people (Schick, 2007), they are vague when it comes to whether or not it is appropriate for interpreters to encourage social capitol amongst students. In this action research I will discuss my attempts to bridge the “gap” in my interpreting practice, as well as exploring educational interpreter boundaries and interactions.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Like many other qualitative studies, which focus on an individual or specific populations, this research would be challenging to be considered generalizable. The research and action plan for this project have been developed with my specific interpreting in mind. However, the general approach, the way I collected data, and conducted this action research project could be potentially transferable to another individual hoping to improve their interpreting practice or EIPA score. Whether or not this would be a successful template for their own practice focused action research would be determined by their self-motivation, and utilization of mentoring and intentional practice. This action research project was conducted over the course of 29 days in a mainstream educational setting, as well as with a mentor synchronously. Self-documented data was collected on my interpreting practice in the mainstream middle school where I primarily worked, as well as through the creation of work samples and discussions with mentors on my practice. The participants in this study are myself, the mentors I worked with, and the language facilitator who collected data on my interpreting practice once within the scope of my research.

The majority of data collection in relation to the work that took place with mentors and intentional practice happened through video recordings, in the form of either work samples or TAPs. Work sample source texts were chosen by either myself, or one of the mentors with whom I worked. All source texts were chosen with the weekly goal in mind. When work samples were filmed, both myself and one of my mentors would review the recordings and make notes of aspects of the work we wanted to discuss at our next meeting. When synchronously working with a mentor on the work samples and weekly goals, the notes that were taken were done so with the intent of utilizing them to inform the following week’s interpreting goals. When discussing the work samples we would discuss the consumer, how I felt during the work sample,
the strengths and weaknesses found in the work sample, all while primarily focusing on
discussing the goal of the week. For a selection of the work samples I also performed TAPs.
These TAPs were aimed to be a stream of consciousness where I would review my interpretation
while filming myself and discussing my interpreting process in relation to Colonomos’
Interpreting Process Model (1992). TAPs were also used to find ideas for how I could more
effectively divide my mental energy along Colonomos’s Model.

![Figure 3.1 Intentional Practice Diagram](image)

The above diagram in Figure 3.2 is an Ishikawa Fishbone diagram (Ilie, 2010) that I
created with my research topic in mind. This is a kind of causal diagram that depicts the causes
of a specific event occurring. In the case of my research, the event, or goal, is the result of my
hypothesis and the causes listed (found in blue boxes) are the things that need to happen in order
for the event to take place. For each cause listed there are also two to three sub-causes. One of
the main causes listed was “Data Collection” which entails meeting with mentors, completing
work samples, and TAPs. The remaining five causes in this diagram are related to ASL.
production. The sub-categories for these are either activities that need to be done to practice this skill (see ‘Depiction’ in Figure 3.2) or things that need to be incorporated into my interpreting practice to improve these as interpreting goals.

Over the course of this action research process I worked with three different interpreting mentors. I worked with these mentors consecutively and not simultaneously. This was not an intentional part of my research, but instead something that happened because of availability issues. Two of the three mentors I worked with were deliberately chosen by the internship coordinators in Western Oregon University’s (WOU) Entry-Level Interpreting Masters of Arts (ELMA) Program because of their skill and experience levels. The third individual that I worked with was a mentor who was chosen for me by WOU’s Professional Supervision for Interpreting Practice (PSIP) Program, for both their skill, and mentoring training.

The second part of this action research project consists of the data collected during my work as K-12 interpreter. Information was collected on both social aspects and performance features in my interpreting work. A week before data collection started I took note of different social aspects of my work as an interpreter, as well as performance features in my work that I planned to focus on during the day and when working with mentors. In Appendix B through E you can view the first draft of the log that I used to collect data, as well as the revised log that contained more ASL features to document.

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion

In this section I will discuss the data that I collected during both parts of my action research project. When discussing the data collection on my practice in my work place, I will go through the different categories that I collected data as well as my findings from both the social and performance aspects of my interpreting practice. The categories of research that were
established for this part of my project were developed after a week of reflective journaling and
discussion with my mentor. The first draft of the data collecting tool used in my work place can
be found in Appendixes B and C and the final draft that was used for data collection can be
found in Appendices D and E. The second part of my action research project will also be
discussed in this section, and will focus on how goals for my interpreting practice were
developed through sharing and discussing work samples with a mentor.

**Work Related Data Collection**

In the social category I collected information on every time I: Suggested that a student
direct their question to a teacher, suggested directing a question to a peer, reminded a student
about their FM (Frequency Modulation) System, practiced reading a clock with a student,
reminded them to say thank you to someone, and suggested that the teacher ask the student a
question instead of the interpreter. In the performance category, I collected information every
time: a team feed was offered and accepted, background information was added, a classifier was
used, depiction used, listing was used, and when contrastive structure was used. For the ASL
features I documented every time a new feature was implemented, meaning that I did not
document every time a single classifier was used to represent the same thing, but rather each
introduction of a new classifier.

For the social aspect of my interpreting practice, I found that I suggested the students
direct their questions to the teacher and to their peers the most frequently, followed by reminding
one of the students to use her FM system, see Table 4.4. I found the social aspect of my
interpreting practice particularly interesting to document because with it being my first year of
K-12 interpreting I often found myself wondering if what I was doing was within my role and
was appropriate. I ended up discussing my data collection and my intrapersonal feelings about it
with the Teacher of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (TODHH) and she thought that everything I was doing was appropriate and also helpful information for her. The TODHH came to work with the students that I interpret for halfway through the school year, so she had not known that the students still struggled with reading clocks, or that one of the students forgets about using her FM. With this information the TODHH was able to incorporate reading clocks into a lesson plan, as well as reminding the student with the FM to give it to her every day at the start of their time together.

Table 4.1 Social Aspects Data Collected Over 29 Days

When I was looking at all of the data that I collected during this research process I noticed that I documented the social aspect of my interpreting practice less and less as time went on. To see if this was perceived or real I ended up looking at the number of times I suggested that the students should ask the teacher their question by grouping the data into weeks. In table 4.5 you can see that during weeks one I suggested this to the students thirteen times and in week two fifteen times, whereas during weeks five and six I only made this suggestion a total of ten times. Over the course of this research I have found that with modeling and suggesting behavior
students who have limited to no experience working with interpreters can begin to better understand the working interpreter-consumer relationship.

Table 4.2 Number of Times the Interpreter Suggested Asking the Teacher the Question

With my data being divided daily as well as by class period, I decided that the easiest way to get a comprehensive look at the ASL features I documented was by finding the average use of a specific ASL feature daily in each class period (see Table 1). When looking at this table I was initially surprised by some of the low averages. However, when I began to factor in that often classes have time for independent work, watching films with captioning, as well as group work, which may or may not need interpretation, the more this data began to make sense to me. I think it is also important to note that with my data collection happening at the end of the school year, activities like group work and watching films increased toward the end of my data collection, reducing the amount I was interpreting and therefore the data collected.
Table 4.3 Average Daily Use of ASL Feature in Specific Class Period

One interesting part of reviewing the data collected was coming across a time where I had the opportunity to interpret the same video to the same consumers twice with a month separating the two instances. In Table 4.2 you can see that on April 10th, I self-reported that I set up and utilized three different classifiers during a video clip on cells (Nye et al., 1994), whereas on May 15th I self-reported using eight different classifiers throughout the same clip. This change in classifier usage could have happened because of a number of reasons: I had heard the video before, so I was more comfortable with the source text and had more mental energy to allot to composing the target message; I had more experience using my data collecting system by the second interpretation and was able to remember more of the specific classifiers I used; or over a month of documenting my work I became more intentional in my usage of classifiers. I cannot be sure what exactly caused the change in my interpretation, however as I have looked back at the work samples I have done and redone with my mentor I have seen similar patterns. This leads me to believe that hearing the source text before and increased intentionality in my practice lead to these changes.
During another science video, data on my practice was collected and logged by both the team language facilitator, as well as by myself. This was the first time I had asked my team to assist me with a live data collection. As a team, this person has had limited formal ASL education and has not gone through an IEP. After I had interpreted the science video on solar panels and renewable energy (Nye, Zack & Kaplan, 2012), I noticed how few pieces of data were collected specifically in the classifier category. After noticing this, I wrote down every classifier I remembered using and the function of it in my notebook. In Table 4.3 you can see that I reported using 13 classifiers and my team had recorded only noticing two classifiers used. After seeing the discrepancy between the data I collected and the data the team I was working with collected, I decided to forgo asking this person to assist me with data collection for the rest of my project. I also decided to talk to this individual after this experience and they reported feeling quite overwhelmed and was unsure how to go about collecting data.
With the goal of this research being to become a more cognizant and effective practitioner, I have found this action research project to be quite successful. Through the process of consistently documenting data on my practice, and by journaling about my work experiences, I have noticed an increase in my ability to work with intentionality and in my ability to more accurately recall the decisions I make in my interpreting practice. The reason why I started to do data collection on my interpreting practice at work was because I felt like I was maybe doing too many things outside the scope of the interpreting role. However after making note of whenever I would do something that I would not classify as interpreting, I realize that many of the things that I was doing was related to modeling educational interpreter and consumer dynamics. After looking back at all of the data I collected, I was able to see the documentation of the social aspects of my interpreting practice decrease over time, while the ASL features documented increased as my research continued.

**Work Samples and Mentoring**
As previously stated, the areas of my practice that I focused on during this action research were special organization, which grew to include discerning when to use listing over contrastive structure, incorporating more depiction and classifiers, clearer ASL sentence boundaries, lengthening my décalage time, and increased ASL non manual markers and facial expression. When performing TAPs, and meeting with mentors these areas of focus have continued to both be identified as being improved as well as remain prevalent features in my work that still can be improved upon. In a typical action research fashion, I have been working towards my goal and hypothesis in an ever-evolving way.

The first work sample I completed was done to give my original mentor a sense of what my signing currently looked like. After we both reviewed this work sample, it was decided that my second work sample would be me utilizing the same source text, but focusing on lengthening my décalage time and include more depiction and use of classifiers. During the week, to get practice on how to incorporate these features successfully in my work, we decided that I should watch different videos of Deaf storytellers to get a feel for how native signers utilize these features in their own work. After watching a few of the videos I still felt quite uncomfortable with using depiction and classifiers to the extent the Deaf storytellers were, so I decided to practice copy signing along to one of these videos so I could feel the difference between my current interpreting style and that of the Deaf storyteller. The following week we met again and discussed my second work sample, the amount of classifiers and depiction used were dramatically increased compared to my original work sample. The incorporation of these elements in my work contributed to increasing the likeness to the source text by including more tone, personality and the narrative storytelling features. Then the work samples and the way that my mentor and I analyzed my interpretation slightly changed when I stated to work with my
second mentor. My mentor selected a Khan Academy (2009) video about viruses for us both to interpret and share with each other. Our goal was to focus on using realistic classifiers with the goal being to introduce a new concept. We swapped work samples and were able to discuss both our process and the work we produced. The third mentor, with whom I am ended this action research project, also has a different style of mentoring. Her style of mentoring was more hands on, whereas my previous two mentors wanted our sessions to be entirely mentee lead. Together we identified the need to add a goal of having clearer sentence boundaries between utterances. This is something that neither of my previous mentors noted in my work, but after reviewing past work samples, I noticed that this was a feature in my work that was inconsistent and made my interpretations feel rushed. Working with a variety of mentors has allowed me to increase my flexibility when it comes to addressing my hypothesis and working towards my goals.

The hypothesis related to this section of my action research project was: if I come up with an action plan to strengthen the weaker aspects of my interpreting, I can improve as a practitioner and retake the EIPA receiving a score of a 3.5 or higher. With where my research currently stands, I believe I am well on my way to reaching this goal. I have observed that once I identify an aspect of my work, I am able to intentionally focus on it as a part of my interpreting process. I am still working on increasing my stamina related to my intentionality with keeping the goals within my process. When I started creating work samples that were aimed at a specific goal, my work samples were 20-30 minutes long. However, my most recent mentor and I decided to shorten the length of the work samples I produce, and eventually build them back up in length after my stamina increased. This idea also can be tied back to the athletic study mentioned in the literature review. Progress towards a goal when using intentional practice can
only be achieved when time constraints are used to best accommodate the practitioner’s ability to remain fully focused (Ericsson, 2000/2001).

After working through this action research project I can identify more intentionality in my practice, as well as awareness of my interpreting strengths and weaknesses. This knowledge allows me to better allocate the mental energy I have within specific areas of my interpreting process. When I go back and watch the first work sample I completed for this action research, I see that my sentence boundaries are rushed, if there at all, depiction and classifiers are used sparingly, and my use of space and décalage times are not consistent. The awareness of these trends in my work along with my motivation to improve as a practitioner, have encouraged me to stay on top of my goals and as a result I have noticed improvements in my day to day interpreting as well as within the work samples I have created. While this action research is technically over, I cannot say that I have improved my practice to the point where I no longer feel the need to intentionally practice and work towards my goal of getting a 3.5 or higher on the EIPA. However, I do notice more intentionality in my work and as a whole my work samples are clearer and more ASL features have been incorporated from when I started this project. I plan to continue my action plan and working with mentors up until I retake the examination, and hopefully after I take the test as well.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

While the mentoring I have participated in for this action research was primarily mentee driven, I found that the second and third mentors I worked with were more likely to take part in leading our discussion. This is something that I really appreciated because while I am comfortable identifying parts of my work that I need to improve, I appreciate sharing responsibility with mentors when it comes to brainstorming professional development and work
sample ideas. As a new interpreter, my experience with professional development and work sample ideas are limited, and I appreciate having more opportunities to experience a wider variety of intentional interpreting practice. In future mentoring relationships I now know how to better articulate what kind of relationships work most effectively with me and my process. Mentoring is something I hope to continue to do throughout my career as an interpreter, so experiences like these are invaluable.

As an interpreter, I learned that I am able to take feedback form the mentors I worked with and implement strategies we discussed together to improve specific area of my practice while working. I was also made more aware of how my current job of working in a K-12 setting with students who have Cochlear Implants have affected my default style of interpreting. If I do not make a conscious effort to sign using ASL’s grammatical structure I have found myself immediately shortening my décalage time and signing in a way that more closely follows the speaker. Since I interpret in this fashion five days a week, I have found it to be beneficial to my practice to create work samples with ASL as my target language. Especially since when I take the EIPA again, I would like to take the ASL test and not the Pidgin Signed English (PSE) form of the assessment. Having a real audience, in the form of a mentor, for these practice videos has helped me to stay aware of my tendency to fall into a more English-like form of signing and has encouraged me to continuously practice my ASL production. I have also noticed that I am task and goal oriented, making the practice of setting up weekly goals effective and in line with how I tend to complete tasks.

One of the reasons I started down this path for my action research project was the “readiness to work gap” that I have been able to identify in my own work. The setting I live and work in lacks trained interpreters and professional development opportunities, meaning that I have had to
make them myself. When I decided that I wanted to reduce this “gap,” this realization lead me to believe that I needed to come up with specific goals and find interpreters that were willing to work with me in a mentorship capacity, while utilizing tools like email, Facetime, Google Hangout, and YouTube. I hope that this action research project can help interpreters in similar situations feel less overwhelmed by the prospect of being in an environment similar to mine, as well as providing examples of how one can continue to develop as an interpreting practitioner even if local professional development and mentoring is limited or not an option.

During this school year I was able to work with three different D/deaf students, who all had varying levels of experience in mainstream education at the point of our meeting. One student in particular that I worked with was experiencing being in a regular classroom environment instead of the special education room for the first time. This student is highly social and loves to make people laugh, however when she was placed in a class where she was the only Deaf student she would become timid and would not interact with anyone other than myself or the teacher. After noticing this I started to hone in on a few students that sat around her that I thought she would get along with. Every day I would make sure I was interpreting the conversations these students were having during instructional breaks, as well as suggesting that when she was confused to maybe reach out to one of them for help. After a few weeks she began to start conversations with these students and would often make jokes and sassy comments to them during class that I then had to try to stealthily whisper interpret to them without the teacher noticing. She also began to make other friends without my modeling or suggested conversation starters and began to thrive socially in all of her classes. Encouraging relationships in this way was something that I was unsure about doing since it is not discussed in the EIPA Guidelines, however after researching social capitol I am satisfied with the decision I made.
While still discussing navigating the role of the education K-12 interpreter, I am going to take a moment to discuss my experience with working with consumers and the TODHH to set up expectations and guidelines when giving presentations. This spring two of the students I worked with had to give a presentation on solar panels to their science teacher. The day before the presentation happened I went through the entire presentation with them to practice signs for concepts they had limited experience with. On the day of the presentation the teacher would go to each lab group and have the students quickly run through their presentation for her. The students had one laptop set up and looked at as they tried to make it through their presentation. After about a sentence the students gave up trying to remember signs for what they were talking about and ended up finger spelling all of the words on their slides. The use of finger-spelling instead of using signs, was not something I was mentally prepared for. I often had to have the students pause their presentation so I could ask for clarification, and had to heavily rely on the practice we had done the day before to help me predict the words that were being finger spelled. Fingerspelling takes considerably longer than signing ASL or PSE and the teacher was able to see the shift in their signing and that they did not understand the information they were trying to talk about. After this experience I did some journaling and approached the TODHH to talk about what had happened. As a result of this, the TODHH, myself, and the “language facilitator” set up several role plays in sign language where we demonstrated an interpreter interpreting presentations. The first role play showed the presenter using fingerspelling halfway through their presentation, and one of the other role plays showed the interpreter misinterpreting the presentation because of vague and unclear language usage. The TODHH then took a few minutes to discuss the importance of understanding what you are signing and how presentations will always go more smoothly when the interpreter and consumer work together before and during a
presentation. This experience allowed TODHH and I to work towards our common goal of the
students better understanding how to work with interpreters. At the beginning of the school year,
I do not think I would have participated in this kind of role play because I might have seen it
being outside my role as the interpreter. However after looking at research on interpreter role in
educational k-12 settings, I now feel that this kind of activity is within the bounds of the role of a
k-12 educational interpreter.

If I were to do this kind of action research again, I would potentially want to come with a
way to better quantify my data, as well as possibly making it into a longitudinal study. While I
took data on my work sample with the intent of it informing the kind of goal I wanted to set up
the following week, I did not take data and compare it from work sample to work sample. If I
were to do this study on a larger scale I would want to try to do things like finding my average
décalage time for each work sample I produced and see if I was able to lengthen it, or just try to
figure out if there is a way to qualitatively compare my work sample progress across the board. I
do see this as being something that could be quite challenging, especially when the work samples
I completed as a part of this study varied in length, register, and topic. If I tried to quantify my
data this is something that I could try to more closely regulate, but at the same time I thought one
of the more successful parts of my action research was selecting various kinds of source texts
that would encourage intentional use of the weekly goal. As for the data that I collected while
working at my job site, I think that data collected would be more accurate if a willing team with
experience in analyzing interpretations was able to log data instead of relying on self-reported
post-assignment data collection.

I have read quite a bit of research on the role of educational interpreters, but I have yet to
find anything on what interpreters can do when they accept a K-12 job and realize that they are
one of the only, if not the only interpreter to go through formal training. I hope that this action research project can help interpreters in similar situations as mine to feel less overwhelmed, and provide them with ideas of how to continue developing as a practitioner with limited resources.

With research on the profession of interpreting still emerging, I think there are ample opportunities to do research on self-lead professional development post-graduation. Ever since I left the city, I have had to push myself to seek out resources and mentoring relationships with the goal of improving my practice and thereby reducing the “readiness to work gap” within my own professional interpreting practice.
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APPENDIX A: Consent Form

INT 635: Action Research

“Ever Since I Left the City:” An Auto-ethnographic Action Research Project on Ethics and Interpreting in a K-12 Setting

Western Oregon University, MA in Interpreting Studies Program

Halle Hamilton, B.A., Principal Investigator:

hahamilton12@wou.edu or 925-353-8215

Who is eligible to participate?

Those who can participate in this study are individuals who are working as interpreters in conjunction with the Principal Investigator.

Consent to Participate in a Study

You are invited to take part in a research project. This form will tell you about the study. You may ask the Principal Investigator any questions that you have. When you are ready to make a decision, you may tell the Principal Investigator if you want to participate or not. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you decide to participate, the Investigator will ask you to sign this statement and will give you a copy to keep.

Why is this action research project being done?

The purpose of this study is for the Principal Investigator to learn how to adjust their practice and ASL production to better match Deaf Consumers, while staying within the bounds of the role of an educational interpreter.

What will I be asked to do? When will I be asked to complete these tasks?

If you decide to take part in this study, we will ask you to:

- Allow the use of the interpreting teaming note book in the study.

The notebook will remain in a locked office when it is not being used by either the participant or the Principal Investigator. Participants will have the opportunity to further fact check and make error corrections before the action research study is published. Once the participant agrees the data reported from the notebook is accurate, the original, notebook will be destroyed within two years of publication.

Will there be any risk or discomfort to me?

Participation in this study is confidential. You will not be identified in the published version of this work. There will be no physical risk of any kind. You may experience stress, mental fatigue, or frustration.

What will happen if I suffer any harm from this research?
If you experience stress, you are advised to utilize counseling services. You may withdraw from the study at any time. If you withdraw from the study, all data related to you and the interview will be deleted. Once you have approved the final version of the interview, earlier versions and drafts of the interview will be deleted. Only the final version will exist. However, once this final version is accepted, the participant will no longer be able to withdraw.

**Will I benefit by being in this research?**

This research will supplement previous research done on the role of educational interpreters and consumer matching. As well as aiding new interpreters in situations where they end up being the only formally trained interpreter at a school or district, by providing examples to continue professional development when in an environment without interpreting mentors.

**Who will see the information?**

Participation for this study is confidential. You will not be identified in the published version of this work. However, the action research study will be published and available publicly.

**When will data be collected?**

Data for this study may be collected until February 1, 2019 at the latest.

**Can I stop my participation in this study?**

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate if you do not want to. Even if you begin the study, you may withdraw from the research at any time without penalty. If you chose to withdraw, all data collected related to you will be deleted and will not be used.

**Who can I contact if I have questions or problems?**

Halle Hamilton, Principal Investigator - hahamilton12@wou.edu or 925-353-8215

Dr. Elisa Maroney, Faculty Advisor- maronee@wou.edu or 503-838 -8735

**Who can I contact about my rights as a participant?**

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Western Oregon University Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the WOU Institutional Review Board at any time regarding the study at 503-838-9200.

**Will I be paid for my participation?**

There will be no compensation for your participation in this research.

**Will it cost me anything to participate?**

There are no out-of-pocket costs.
I agree to take part in this research.

__________________________________________________      __________________
Signature of person agreeing to take part        Date

__________________________________________________
Printed name of person above

__________________________________________________         ________________
Signature of person who explained the study to the    Date
participant above and obtained consent
EVER SINCE I LEFT THE CITY

APPENDIX B: Data Collection Key Draft 1

Datum/Date: APRIL 9-13 KEY

Classes:
- Math - M
- English - E
- World Geography - WG
- Reading - R
- Family and Consumer science - FCS
- Science - S
- Math - M2
- Physical Education - PE

Social Consequences:
- Suggest Talking to Teacher - STT
- Suggest Talking to Peer - STP
- Reminder about FM - FM
- Reading Clock Practice - RCP
- Reminder to say Thank you - TY
- Suggest Teacher asks student - STS

Performance:
- Use of team - T
- Addition of background Information - BG
APPENDIX C: Data Collection Chart Draft 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>WG</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Datum/Date: 4/9/18
Datum/Date: Key

CLASSES:
- Math - M
- English - E
- World Geography - WG
- Reading - R
- Family and Consumer Science - FCS
- Math - M2
- Physical Education - PE

Interpersonal/Social Consequences:
- Suggest Talking to Teacher - STT (related to asking questions)
- Suggest Talking to Peer - STP
- Reminder about FM System - FM
- Reading Clock Practice - RCP
- Reminder to Say Thank You - TY
- Suggest Teacher asks Student - STS

Performance:
- Use of Team - T
- Addition of background information - BG
- Use of Classifier - CL
- Use of Depiction - D
- Use of Listing - L
- Use of Contrastive Structure - CS
## APPENDIX E: Data Collection Char Draft 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datum/Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Characters
- STT
- STP
- FM
- RCP
- TY
- STS
- T
- BG
- CL
- D
- L
- CS
APPENDIX F: EIPA Assessment Overview

Candidate: HALLE HAMILTON
Date: 6/16/2017

Stimuli Materials Selected: Secondary A; ASL A

Assessment Scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman I</th>
<th>Roman II</th>
<th>Roman III</th>
<th>Roman IV</th>
<th>EIPA Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

The candidate may want to develop and implement a Professional Development Plan focusing on the following linguistic and/or interpreting features:

** Top-down processing (from pragmatic to prosodic to lexical), is a key strategy for keeping your interpretation clean, accurate, and well-structured. Listen longer (before signing) and focus on the why (pragmatic drive) and how (prosody/intonation) of the narrative. Focusing on why someone is talking is the best focal point to guide the interpretation.

** Spatial organization (building a visual scaffold for your interpretation), particularly in incorporating classifiers, is an area identified for further development. This will assist with your ability to accurately render a 'model representation' of a specific topical focal point. Continue to develop familiarity with a variety of classifiers and be sure to label classifiers with either a sign or fingerspelling.

** Increase the intensity of facial and spatial grammatical representations. Emerging skills are apparent, but the overall effect is subtle.

Please Note:

This evaluation is for the grade level and language/sign system noted above. This evaluation does not imply skills at other levels or using another language or sign system. This evaluation may not accurately reflect an interpreter's performance for grade levels other than that indicated. A re-evaluation would be recommended when changing grade levels or target sign system or language.
APPENDIX G: Interpreting Student and Coach Contract

Internship goals

Personal: I would like to increase my self-care by working out at least three times a week, spending time with friends outside of work, and reading at least two non-interpreting books a month.

Professional: I would like to improve my ASL spatial mapping as well as increasing my use of classifiers.

Educational: I want to develop a presentation that I can use in a workshop my school district has requested I do on ethics, professionalism, and the role of a K-12 Interpreter. I would like this presentation to be informative without being overwhelming as well as interactive.

Internship activities

• Weekly meetings with coach
• Attending class supervision sessions
• Monday-Friday interpreting at a middle school from 7:30 am- 3:00pm
• Journaling/ field notebook updates
• Logging hours of internship activates
• Working towards goals listed above, this may include creating work samples with coach, or completing work discussed with coach in weekly meetings.

Performance benchmarks

Personal: I will start the term by working out three times a week for thirty minutes and by the end of the term I will have increased my workout duration to one hour.

Professional: Source text that will be either chosen by me or by my coach will be done at least monthly. These work samples will be shared before the weekly meeting to allow for discussion and synthesis. At the end of the term I will review the first work sample I created with the intention of working towards my goal and comparing it to the final work sample I created.

Educational: The workshop will be held sometime this term. Two weeks before the work shop I will give the presentation I have developed my coach to get their feedback on the information I am including, and will make changes based on their recommendations. Then during one of our meetings I will update them on how successful the information was received, and how I felt in general about the experience. If possible I will also try to record my presentation so I can review after the fact.