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Abstract

Signed languages have received increased recognition in recent years. Profound misconceptions about signed languages and signed language interpreting continue to be pervasive. Organizations such as the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters and the World Federation of the Deaf are working to advance the training of interpreters around the globe. The same resources are not available in every region. In this study the author reports on the experiences of an Arabic/Jordanian Sign Language (LIU) interpreter through a single case study exploring her reported experiences. The participant is an adult woman and experienced interpreter. Data regarding the participant’s experiences were gathered through a questionnaire, an interview, and notes taken during the interview. The data were classified into three categories: Interpersonal Relations, Interpreting Paradigms, and Professional Standards. Findings suggest multiple ways in which Arabic/LIU interpreting in Jordan is paralleling the course taken by American Sign Language (ASL)/English interpreting when developing as a profession in the United States. For example, very little education or training is currently available to LIU interpreters, though there is evidence of improvement underway, and most interpreters enter the field because of language fluency gained through a Deaf family member rather than through formal training. The author contends that additional research on the topic should be conducted to determine if the experiences reported here are common to interpreters throughout Jordan and recommendations are made for future research directions relating to Arabic/LIU interpreting and the Deaf community within Jordan.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Motivation for the Study

In the United States interpreters working between English and American Sign Language (ASL) have myriad resources available for professional development: a professional organization with regional chapters, multiple sources of formal and informal continuing education, the influence and support of the Deaf community, federal laws that support the field, and professional networks available at local, national, and international levels (RID, 2012; WASLI, 2010). While there is still much work to be done in the United States to improve the profession of ASL/English interpreting, interpreters in other countries often cannot access the resources their American colleagues enjoy. Organizations such as the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters (WASLI), as well as individual interpreters, strive to support interpreters working between signed and spoken languages internationally (WASLI, 2010; Hall, personal communication, 2012). This process requires time, resources, and commitment.

As an interpreter I am devoted to increasing professionalism in my field both nationally and internationally, and this study was borne out of my desire to support the development and improvement of resources for my colleagues worldwide. High quality training, mentoring, and certification allow interpreters to provide effective services for their Deaf and hearing consumers, and through this study I seek to support the implementation of such resources globally. The Middle East was selected as a first step in this international focus because I have a personal connection with the region. As an undergraduate student I studied Arabic and spent a term abroad in Tunisia. I met a Deaf Tunisian who signed Langue des Signes Française (LSF or French Sign Language) and was struck by the fact that he had acquired LFS rather than Tunisian
Sign Language. This interaction sparked my interest in signed languages that were native to the North Africa and Middle Eastern regions and the interpreters that worked in these languages.

The study’s focus was narrowed to Jordan based on previous research on signed languages in the Middle East. Little has been published on signed languages in the region, the majority of which reports on the linguistics of Israeli Sign Language. Jordan was selected as the focus of this case study because research regarding the relatedness of LIU and other Middle Eastern signed languages had been conducted and I found evidence through my research and personal communications that attempts were being made to increase the professionalization of Jordanian Sign Language (LIU)/Arabic interpreters (Al-Fityani & Padden, 2010; Padden, 2010; Hendricks, 2008; Andrew, personal communication, 2012), and this study focuses on the field of interpreting rather than the linguistic structure of LIU.

This study serves as an initial step toward documenting the conditions of interpreters in Jordan, and identifying ways in which the international professional community can support them. Before appropriate support can be offered an accurate view of the current state of Arabic/LIU interpreting in Jordan is necessary. The case study methodology used here allows in-depth examination of the reported experiences of one Arabic/LIU interpreter in Jordan.

**Definition of Terms**

Visual languages are often referred to as *sign languages*, as is evidenced by the names of languages including American Sign Language and British Sign Language. However, we do not refer to English or French as *speak languages* but as *spoken languages* (Maroney, personal communication, 2012). Likewise, I will refer to these languages as *signed languages* in this study. The term *sign language* will only be incorporated during direct quotes where an author or speaker included it in their original communication.
The term, *sign language interpreter* is used by the participant of this study to describe an interpreter whose working languages include a signed language such as LIU. In most cases within this study the specific working languages are listed (e.g., Arabic/LIU interpreter). However, when a signed language interpreter is referred to in this study it does not refer to an interpreter working between two signed languages, but one working between a signed and spoken language.

Throughout this study the terms *the interpreter* and *participant* are used interchangeably to refer to the interpreter on which this case study is based. These terms reflect this individual as a professional and highlight her invaluable contribution to this study. For reasons of confidentiality the participant will be referred to by the pseudonym *Jana*.

The term *Deaf* is used in this study to describe individuals who identify with the cultural values of the Deaf community, use a signed language as their primary mode of communication, and have some degree of hearing loss. Hearing loss may be moderate or profound. The word Deaf is capitalized to respect these individuals as a unique cultural group. The term *deaf* with a lowercase “d” will only be included in direct quotes in which the author wrote the word in this way.

The term *paradigm* was used by Thomas Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* to include “the source of the methods, problem-field, and standards of solution accepted by any mature scientific community at any given time” (1962, p. 103). In this study the term *paradigm* is used specifically to describe approaches to the task of interpreting. Here it is used to mean the values and beliefs held by an interpreter, or professional community of interpreters, that guide how they approach professional endeavors.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

As previously mentioned, there is currently little research on LIU, and nothing that could be located that focuses specifically on interpreters that work in LIU. However, research from other disciplines and topics related to this study are presented here. Primary areas that inform this study are disability rights in Jordan, controversies over signed languages, interpreter education and training, and interpreting paradigms. Due to the varied audiences for which this study is intended, some readers may already be acutely aware of information presented here. While hopefully the entire review of the literature would benefit readers, it is recommended that Part I (Jordanian culture, Disability rights in Jordan, and Controversies over signed languages in the Middle East) may be of primary interest to Western readers or those unfamiliar with the country of Jordan. Part II (Interpreter education and training, Interpreting paradigms, and Case conferencing) may be of primary interest to Jordanian readers or those intimately familiar with conditions for the Deaf community and interpreters within Jordan.
Part I

Jordanian culture

The country now known as المملكة الأردنية الهاشمية (al-Mamlakah al-ʻUrdunyyah al-Hāšimiyyah), or The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is a Middle Eastern nation with a constitutional monarchy bordered by Syria, Israel, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia. The official language
of Jordan is Arabic, although English is widely spoken (CIA, 2013). Arabs make up 98% of the population, and the majority of Jordanians are Sunni Muslim (CIA, 2013).

Britain had a defining role in the creation of Jordan and in establishing the Hashemite family as leaders (Held, Cummings, & Cotter, 2011; Cleaveland, & Bunton, 2009; Smith, 2008; Wilson, 1987). The Hashemite family has ruled Jordan since it’s independence from Britain in 1946 and has cultivated relationships with both Western and surrounding nations. The current monarch King Abdullah II continues this trend and commitment to foster relationships with Arab nations and Western nations (Held, Cummings, & Cotter, 2011). These factors make it easier for professional interpreters in the West to interact with Jordanians on the topic of interpreting, where in other nations linguistic or political barriers might pose more difficulties to the professional dialogue.

Hofstede (1984) studied the effect of cultural values on the perceptions of quality of life and labeled various cultures by four descriptors. These were power distance, individualism, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1984). Individualism was polarized with collectivism and masculinity was polarized with femininity. These descriptors are now widely used when discussing cultures (Alkailani, Azzam, and Athamneh, 2012). However, Alkailani, Azzam, and Athamneh (2012) contend that in his later research Hofstede generalized findings from some Arab countries as being true for all Arab countries, including Jordan. They disagreed with Hofstede’s approach and conducted a study specifically focusing on Jordan.

Alkailani, Azzam, and Athamneh (2012) show that Jordanian culture is similar to other Arab countries in that it is collectivist and masculine, but differs from them in the areas of power distance and uncertainty avoidance. The authors explain that “in collectivist societies, people emphasize cooperation and relationship building, trustworthiness, solidarity with others and
being conservatives” (Alkailani, Azzam, and Athamneh, 2012, p. 77). A masculine culture is described as one in which gender roles are clearly delineated and success demonstrated by accumulation of wealth is highly valued (2012, p. 74). The authors point to the influence of Islam and the history of the Arab world prior to Islam as the primary factors for these cultural characteristics (2012, p. 77). In contrast to other Arab cultures, the authors found that Jordan has a low power distance, meaning that youth is prized and people in high-status positions try to understate their power. The authors also found that Jordan has strong uncertainty avoidance, meaning that the culture values competency and expertise and is highly structured (2012, p. 77). These descriptions suggest a vibrant culture that identifies in some ways with the culture of other Arab nations and in some ways with Western nations. These unique aspects may contribute to the diverse ties that Jordan has been able to maintain.

Disability rights in Jordan

It should be noted that the Deaf community in the United States has fought long and hard not to be considered disabled and it is not my intention to label any Deaf or hard of hearing person as such. Hendricks (2008) elucidates that due to the importance that Islam has traditionally placed on being able to recite the Quran in Arabic, Deaf people who use a signed language like LIU may face prejudice: “people with a disability that prevents them from learning and speaking Arabic well, such as the deaf, are more stigmatized than, for instance, blind people or those that miss a limb” (p. 5). Considering this view of deafness as a disability and its potential impact on the field of interpretation, this section describes the contemporary circumstances related to disability rights in Jordan.
Employment

The rights of people with disabilities in Jordan have increased over the last few decades, especially with respect to legal rights and employment, though reports indicate that there is still a long way to go before equality is reached. In his article *Jordan and Disability Rights: A Pioneering Leader in the Arab World*, Rutherford (2007) praises Jordan for its longstanding support of people with disabilities. He relates how Jordan has been hailed as a leader in the area of disability rights in the Arab World. Jordan received the Franklin Delano Roosevelt International Disability Award in 2005 in recognition of its work toward the United Nations World Program of Action Concerning Disabled Persons’ goal of, “the full and equal participation of the world’s 600 million people with disabilities in the life of their societies” (Rutherford, 2007, p. 26).

Rutherford (2007) describes how the Jordanian royal family has played an integral part in this focus, passing legislation similar to the Americans with Disabilities Act only three years after it was passed in the United States. In 2007 the legislation announced the goal “to reduce the unemployment rate among people with disabilities from the current 40% to the national unemployment rate average for all Jordanians by 2015” (Rutherford, 2007, p. 29). The author quotes Prince Mir’ed as saying, “My family said you can’t call yourself a prince and sit and enjoy the privileges without giving something back,” and other members of the royal family seem to agree (2007, p. 28). They have been involved in work with the blind, people with mental disabilities, and those with physical disabilities for many years (2007). In 2006 His Majesty King Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein established a committee by royal decree to address public understanding and stereotypes related to people with disabilities. This committee created the National Strategy for People with Disabilities (NCHR, 2010).
Jordan is credited as the first Arab nation to create legislation specific to the rights of persons with disabilities with the Persons with Disabilities Care Law (no. 12) of 1993 (Callard, F., Sartorius, et al., 2012). In 2007 Jordanian officials signed the United Nations’ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and the Optional Protocol that sought to illustrate the rights of people with disabilities and to establish a plan of execution in addressing these rights (CRPD, 2007; Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008). It was ratified a year later, and Jordan replaced the Persons with Disabilities Care Law (no. 12) with Disabled People Rights Law (no. 31) to align with the CRPD and also created the Higher Council for Affairs of Persons with Disabilities (HCAPD) (Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008).

Notable outcomes of this change include a shift from a caring paradigm to a legal one, seeking for persons with disabilities to be fully incorporated into society without hindrance or prejudice (Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008). Law (no. 31) specifically addresses issues of accessibility, including the provision of signed language interpreters in order to integrate persons with disabilities, “enabling them to reach all facilities of public services” (Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008, “Second Subject,” para. 7). Specifically, this law addressed the right for individuals with disabilities to work—requiring that businesses employ a certain number of people with disabilities depending on their size1 (Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008). A new government policy in Jordan also declares that people with disabilities are allowed to vote “with the aid of personal assistants rather than verbally, ensuring them greater ballot secrecy and electoral success” (U.S. State Department, 2010, p. 108). This change is especially noteworthy for those that would utilize Arabic/LIU interpreters for the voting process.

Despite this progress, however, many are concerned that efforts to date are insufficient to

---

1 For businesses with 25-50 employees, at least one employee must be a person with a disability; For businesses with over 50 employees, at least 4% of the work force must consist of persons with a disability (Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008).
achieve these goals of integration (NCHR, 2010; Azzeh, 2012). The NCHR (2010) explains that Disabled People Rights Law (no. 31) is not explicit enough regarding types of discrimination or what punishments will result from violating the law. This results in the law not being adhered to or enforced (NCHR, 2010). Reports from the U.S. State Department echo these concerns (2010; 2011). The 2010 Introduction to the State Department Report on Disability Human Rights states that, “discrimination on the basis of gender, disability, and social status is not specifically prohibited” in Jordan legally, and that “citizens and NGOs universally reported that persons with disabilities faced problems accessing education, transportation, and other services, particularly in rural areas” (US State Department, 2010, p. 108). In 2010 Judith Hermann, a U.S. State Department Special Advisor for International Disability Rights, visited Jordan and shared that there are still serious deficiencies in Jordan’s provision of services to persons with disabilities (Othman, 2010). Hermann articulated her view of the situation in Jordan thusly:

In my view, existing policies, provision and legislation will only contribute to disabled people's empowerment if the following factors are in place and are prioritized: There is a need to support to [sic] disabled people to promote their self-organization and self-advocacy, increased access to financial and other resources - for individual disabled people, groups of disabled people, and also for service providers, and promotion of a social model of disability among disabled people, society in general, service providers in government, voluntary and private sectors and, of course, among those western NGOs and international agencies that are still working and will continue to work with disabled people in Jordan. With these factors in place, and with co-ordination and collaboration, disability policy and provision in Jordan could be greatly improved. (Othman, 2010, para. 10)
There is much work yet to be done for Jordan to realize the goals set out in the National Strategy for People with Disabilities. In her 2012 article Azzeh writes that from the perspective of activists, “little tangible progress has been made in advancing the rights of [persons with disabilities]” since 2008 (para. 3).

**Education**

The Jordanian government has also taken steps toward advancing disability education, though the success of this venture to date is also debated (Azzeh, 2012). By the 1980s the University of Jordan was, “the leading regional specialist” in educating students with disabilities (Rutherford, 2007, p. 31). Rutherford states that Jordan was also the first Arab country “to adopt the partial inclusion of disabled students enrolled in resource classrooms” (2007, p. 31). Not only has Jordan trained people in special education but it sent those who completed specialized training to countries such as Saudi Arabia where people, “do not like direct contact with the disabled” (2007, p. 32). Rutherford (2007) explains that, “the National Strategy for People with Disabilities announced February 7, 2007 calls for increasing enrollment of children with disabilities from the current 57% to more than 80% by 2015 by redesigning school buildings, introducing Braille curricula, and bringing in other educational tools for students with disabilities” (2007, p. 30). Arabic/LIU interpreters would presumably fall under the “other educational tools” (2007, p. 30) category. However, in a 2012 article from *The Jordan Times* Azzeh questions the quality of this education. She quotes an activist as explaining that, “teachers are allowed to pass students with [other] disabilities in all the scholastic years, provided that their disabilities are the cause of their learning difficulties… this is why some Tawjihi graduates with disabilities cannot spell their names” (2012, para. 10). She also writes that, “teachers are allowed to fail students with hearing impairments over and over again on the pretext that they
need more time to absorb the taught material” (2012, para. 9). The 2011 report from the U.S. State Department stated additional concerns, including that “educational accommodations were more readily available at the university level than in elementary and secondary schools” (US State Department, 2011, p. 8).

**Deaf population in Jordan**

Hendricks’ (2008) expresses concern that Deaf individuals may face additional prejudice compared to persons with another disability. Though there is no legal distinction between types of disabilities, society’s perspective is not necessarily legally dictated and these individuals do indeed face significant prejudices (Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008; Azzeh, 2012).

Statistics on the Deaf population in Jordan vary widely. The 2004 census of the Department of General Statistics indicated that 17.84% of Jordanians with disabilities were classified as having a “hearing disability” severe enough that they could only communicate with others through a signed language or the use of hearing aids (Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008, “Classification of Main Disabilities,” para. 4). According to these statistics hearing loss is considered the second most common disability in the country, though not all people classified as having a hearing loss are necessarily part of the culturally Deaf community. However, this is clearly a significant portion of the overall population.
Hendricks’ (2008) research into census information suggested that there were 60,000 Deaf people in the country, which he admitted seemed to conflict with the information he found that 1% of the nation was Deaf. In 2012 Joshua Project, a Christian non-profit organization that publishes demographic information by country, published statistics stating that 20,000 people in Jordan are Deaf and use a signed language to communicate. While the statistics range widely from 1% to nearly 18% of the population, the point remains that if Jordan is serious about increasing employment and education for people viewed as disabled, the nation will need to provide more signed language interpreters to provide Deaf citizens access to these areas.

Regarding education for Deaf students, Al-Majeed Al-Majali, and Faddoul (2008) state that there were approximately 800 Deaf students in Jordan. In order to provide access to education for the Deaf populace in Jordan a great number of interpreters must be trained and hired. Anecdotal evidence reported in this study’s results indicates a dearth of qualified interpreters available to provide these services. While no formal training is currently being offered for Arabic/ LIU interpreters, the staff at The Holy Land Institute for the Deaf (HLID) are seeking to change that (Andrew, personal communication, 2012). Despite the fact that interpreter training is not the main focus of HLID, Brother Andrew shared:
We are in the process of developing training curricula for sign language interpreters. Eventually we hope to have enough material and trained qualified personnel to be able to include the subject as a minor and later on as a major in one or two of our local universities (personal communication, 2012).

Until adequate training is provided for interpreters in Jordan, the rights of Deaf people residing there will be substandard and inferior to those of their hearing peers.

**Controversies over signed languages in the Middle East**

Recognition or dismissal of a local signed language significantly impacts the interpreting profession, influencing attitudes of those hiring or educating Deaf people and interpreters. Arabic is the official language of Jordan. However, the right to use a minority language appears to be protected under the constitution. Article 6 (i) of the Constitution of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan states that, “Jordanians shall be equal before the law. There shall be no discrimination between them as regards to their rights and duties on the grounds of race, language, or religion” (1952). Legally, the use of LIU should be respected throughout Jordan. Currently many people throughout the world are ignorant of the fact that signed languages are legitimate full languages and not a system of coding or mime² (Petitto, 1994).

Misconceptions hearing people in the region have about signed languages may prove to be an obstacle that could make it difficult to standardize training for interpreters in the languages that Deaf people actually use. Hendricks (2008) argues that signed languages in the Middle East are related. She rejected the long accepted method for comparing similarities in spoken languages to determine relatedness of languages, and adapted wordlists for the study from one created at the University of North Dakota (Hendriks, 2008). This work may influence the status

---

² This statement refers to naturally evolved signed languages (such as LIU and American Sign Language), not systems created to manually represent spoken languages (such as Signed Exact English or Française Signée).
of Middle Eastern signed languages and influence future work examining the possibility of constructing a unified signed language across the Arab world despite later studies that suggest the languages are not related. Brother Andrew of HLID disagrees with this goal, explaining:

> There have been efforts to create a "new" unified Arabic Sign language by choosing words and expressions from various regional languages and local dialects for a standard lexicon, which has, of course, nothing to do with linguistics and is really rather silly

(Personal communication, 2012)

Al-Fityani and Padden (2010) addressed the issue of a government agency attempting to create a standardized signed language for the Arabic speaking world out of already existing signed languages by studying the linguistics of signed languages used in the region. In contrast to Hendricks’ (2008) study the authors conducted lexicostatistical research on Jordanian Sign Language (LIU), Kuwaiti Sign Language (KSL), Libyan Sign Language (LSL), Palestinian Sign Language (PSL), and Al-Sayyid Bedouin Sign Language (ABSL) to determine the likelihood of these languages being historically related. Their results showed that these languages were distinct and most likely do not share a common origin (Al-Fityani & Padden, 2010). Padden (2010) admits that, “the presence of iconicity in sign languages confounds historical analysis to some extent” since unrelated languages may appear to use similar signs (p. 24). Despite the iconicity of signed languages the authors insist that attempting to standardize languages that are historically unrelated can be hazardous and damaging. Br. Andrew agrees, contending that the attempt to create one pan-Arab signed language is, “in effect a futile, linguistically rather irresponsible, and from the point of view of the [Middle Eastern] Deaf communities useless, undertaking” (personal communication, 2012).
Part II

Interpreter education and training

Even in the absence of controversies, creating formal education and training for interpreters is difficult. The state of signed language interpreter education internationally is extremely diverse (Napier, 2009). The United States has “been a pioneer in various aspects of [signed] language interpreting as a profession,” (Winston & Cokley, 2009, p. 267) in being the first to establish a national professional organization and certification standards, and with the creation of various federal laws. Nevertheless, signed language interpreting in the United States has only been recognized as a profession for approximately 50 years (RID, 2012).

The international professional interpreting community in many places is even younger. Okombo, Mweri, and Akaranga (2009) point out that spoken language/signed language interpreting is not a new phenomenon and has been taking place for as long as Deaf people have been on the earth. However, this type of interpreting has not always been recognized as a profession and adequate education and training has not always been available. For example, at the time of Okombo, Mweri, and Akaranga’s study in 2009 no formal Kenya Sign Language (KSL) interpreting program existed in Kenya, although informal trainings had been taking place since the 1990s and KSL dictionaries had been printed for individual study. In Kosovo the first formal training program was launched in 2005 (Hoti & Emerson, 2009). In Brazil the first formal interpreter education program available at a university began in 2008 (Müller de Quadros & Stumpf, 2009). Many countries currently do not have any formal resources for signed language interpreters (WASLI, 2010), and when resources are available they may not be accessible to those in outlying or rural areas (Annarino & Hall, 2013).

Even in the United States, which many countries look to as advanced in the profession,
interpreter education is not offered in many areas. Guam and Saipan, US territories in the Pacific Rim, are an example of this. Annarino and Hall (2013) write that these areas are home to “an estimated deaf population of 130 served by thirteen non-certified interpreters” (para. 3). The interpreters are regarded as “student aides” rather than interpreters, and they earn 8 to 11 USD an hour in primary and secondary educational settings, and 25 USD per hour interpreting in legal settings, providing little incentive for people to pursue a career as an interpreter (Annarino & Hall, 2013). These interpreters are unable to access the same resources available in the mainland US, such as formal interpreter education programs, due to the lack of availability of high-speed internet access in Guam and Saipan (Annarino & Hall, 2013). This results in the interpreters being isolated from professional communities in the US in multiple ways (Annarino & Hall, 2013). According to Annarino and Hall, “Without a formal interpreter education program, interpreters are “trained” by their peers” (2013, para. 5).

The Western Region Interpreter Education Center (WRIEC) has recognized this lack of training and is acting at both the systemic and the individual level, in an attempt to provide effective professional support and development for the interpreters in Guam and Saipan:

We believed that recognition of interpreters as professionals had to be demonstrated at the administrative level… interpreters would see a change in job title, job description and pay. To achieve this, we engaged the Guam and Saipan Departments of Education, the Guam School Board and University of Guam CEDDERS in dialogue around these topics (Annarino & Hall, 2013, para. 9).

WRIEC’s approach can serve as a model to individuals and organizations seeking to support the interpreting profession nationally and internationally. Working at the individual level, Annarino and Hall engaged the local interpreters in long-term training that supported their cultural values,
acknowledging, “interpreters would require a training program of scope and sequence that infused Island values. The effort would entail the provision of additional support and resources, as well as a sense of community” (2013, para. 10). Hall personally provided training to interpreters by traveling to Guam and checking-in from the mainland United States between visits (2013). Beyond basic linguistic and interpreting theory training, the authors recognized that it was critical for these interpreters to feel they were a part of a larger whole and to feel connected to their colleagues:

We knew, though, that training was only one piece of a bigger puzzle. In order for interpreters to understand and respect the profession of interpreting, they needed to be connected to “the profession.” They needed to feel welcome by their professional peers (Annarino & Hall, 2013, para. 13).

In order to accomplish this, Hall asked state affiliate chapters of RID to consider sponsoring interpreters from Guam and Saipan financially so they could attend the 2012 RID Regional Conference in Hawaii (2013). Affiliate chapters from Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Sacramento, and San Diego all stepped-up to sponsor interpreters’ for the conference. Additionally, the Washington state chapter provided free membership for the three interpreters, and the Idaho chapter offered free access to their professional development webinars and contributed resources for a lending library in Saipan (2013).

In the article, Hall states, “What we helped foster in these interpreters was a sense of identity as interpreters, whether or not their school districts would acknowledge it” (Annarino & Hall, 2013, para. 25). This is one example of how interpreters privileged with available resources can support interpreters with limited resources. Hall invested a great deal of time, effort, and money into supporting interpreters in Guam and Saipan. In many regions interpreters
In 2003 the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters (WASLI) was established to support Deaf communities and interpreters worldwide (WASLI, 2010). WASLI offers support and resources for nations that desire to establish professional organizations, interpreter training, and international collaboration (WASLI, 2010). On WASLI’s website president Debra Russell writes, “Each country has its own unique experience in relation to interpreting, and by sharing your experience you help others to see possibilities for our shared profession, and how we can work collaboratively with Deaf organizations worldwide” (http://www.wasli.org, 2010, “Home Page,” para. 3). Despite WASLI’s passionate commitment to support interpreters worldwide, at the time of this study the only information on their website that relates to the community in the Middle East is a page on membership cost and an outline and registration information for a conference that was to take place in Qatar September 25th-27th of 2012 entitled, “Together for a Better World for all.. [sic] Including Persons with Disabilities in Development.” If Jordan is to continue to lead in the area of equal rights for its citizens (Rutherford, 2007), establishing formal education and training for Arabic/LIU interpreters would be a powerful next step.

**Interpreting paradigms**

Interpreting between ASL and English in the United States has been recognized as a profession for nearly 50 years (RID, 2012). As the profession emerged and interpreters began to discuss their work with one another the idea of *interpreting paradigms* entered into the professional dialogue, sometimes referred to as “philosophies” (Humphrey & Alcorn, 2001, p. 8.1) or “models” (Gish, 1990, p. 89). Interpreting paradigms are ways in which interpreters approach the work of interpreting and are influenced by a variety of factors. This section describes the most common paradigms discussed in the field, which were used in the qualitative
analysis of this case study: Helper, Conduit, Communication Facilitator, Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural, Ally, and Designated Interpreter (Gish, 1990; Humphrey & Alcorn, 2001; Hauser, Finch, & Hauser, 2008; Kushalnagar & Rashid, 2008; Campbell, Rohan, & Woodcock, 2008; Hauser & Hauser, 2008). American Sign Language/English interpreters and interpreting students will be acutely familiar with these paradigms as they are frequently discussed professionally and in interpreter education programs.

**Helper Paradigm**

Gish (1990) provides an overview of the Helper Paradigm. This label refers to the interpreting approach most prevalent in the United States prior to the establishment of RID, when interpreting was not recognized as a profession and the majority of people providing interpreting services were family members, people in the social services, and members of the clergy (Gish, 1990). The nature of interpreting exchanges during this time usually occurred in private settings, and interpreters working from a Helper Paradigm desired “to help Deaf people communicate in their interactions with hearing people” (Gish, 1990, p. 89). Gish suggests that underlying this paradigm is the pathology “that Deaf people [are] somehow lacking, and that hearing people [have] to help make up for perceived ‘deficits’” (1990, p. 90). While she concedes that this belief may be less prevalent in interpreters who are children of Deaf adults (CODA), interpreters working from a Helper Paradigm often spoke for Deaf individuals without consulting them (Gish, 1990). This sometimes led to interpreters being intimately involved in communication exchanges at the expense of the involvement of the Deaf individual for whom they were interpreting (Gish, 1990). Gish explains that at this time, “no Code of Ethics existed, and no formal standard of behavior for the relationship between interpreters and clients was defined” (1990, p. 89). Humphrey and Alcorn state that interpreters operating under this
paradigm, “may move out of the role of interpreting to advise, teach, or cajole Deaf and hearing clients” (2001, p. 8.3).

**Conduit Paradigm**

The Conduit Paradigm is the antithesis of the Helper Paradigm and was most utilized in the United States when interpreters were first striving to be identified as professionals (Gish, 1990). In an attempt to establish a professional role, interpreters operating from the Conduit Paradigm distanced themselves from the interaction as much as possible. This included not engaging in “professionally polite exchanges” with consumers (Gish, 1990, p. 92). Most strikingly, this paradigm did not acknowledge the differences in Deaf and hearing cultures or the differences between the languages in which interpreters worked (Gish, 1990). This led to a “denial of accountability for the interpreted interaction” (Gish, 1990, p. 92) where interpreters fell prey to believing the “conduit metaphor” that the meaning conveyed by communication lies within the words themselves (Reddy, 1979, p. 286). This paradigm is characterized by interpreters approaching the work mechanically, often describing the interpreting process as similar to a “machine” or “telephone” (Gish, 1990, p. 91) by which messages are passed exactly as they were sent. There is a dehumanizing aspect to this paradigm in which interpreters seek to be “invisible” (Gish, 1990, p. 91). Interpreters operating under this paradigm focus on the “verbatim transmission of words/signs…being sure to sign every word spoken and to speak every sign produced” (Humphrey & Alcorn, 2001, p. 8.5).

**Communication Facilitator Paradigm**

Following the Conduit Paradigm, the Communication Facilitator Paradigm developed in the United States during the 1970s. While similar to the Conduit Paradigm, interpreters operating under the Communication Facilitator Paradigm championed interpreter education and
training as vital for the advancement of the profession, viewing interpreters as professionals with “specific communication roles and requirements” (Gish, 1990, p. 93), for which they may strongly advocate (Humphrey & Alcorn, 2001). This included meeting with consumers prior to beginning an interpreting assignment to discuss the interpreter’s role, responsibilities and logistics of the specific interpreting setting. However, even with a push for interpreter education, Gish states that during this time “interpreters were still operating from an intuitive base rather than from research-based strategy” (1990, p. 93).

**Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural Paradigm**

The Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural Paradigm developed as push-back against the more impersonal Conduit and Communication Facilitator Paradigms (Humphrey & Alcorn, 2001). This paradigm is marked by increased responsibility for interpreters to serve as mediators connecting two different cultures as well as two distinct languages (Humphrey & Alcorn, 2001). Rather than pass along messages in the exact form as they were articulated—as in the Conduit Paradigm—interpreters operating from this paradigm strive to produce interpretations that are “equivalent in intent and meaning to that of the original message” while being culturally appropriate (Gish, 1990, p. 94). The Bi-lingual/Bi-cultural Paradigm views language and culture as indivisible and recognizes that interpreters must be well versed in each language and culture they work between in order to interpret successfully (Gish, 1990). Despite the fact that these paradigms are often discussed as a linear progression moving from one paradigm to another (see figure below), contemporary professional interpreters utilize different approaches to the work depending on the situation and operate under different paradigms when appropriate.
Ally Paradigm

Campbell, Rohan, and Woodcock (2008) describes the recently emergent Ally Paradigm, which includes consideration of power dynamics and oppression and allows Deaf people to take a more active role in advocating for themselves. Interpreters operating under this paradigm examine their own capacity and tendency to oppress Deaf people and strive to avoid doing so (Campbell, Rohan, & Woodcock, 2008). This paradigm supports the idea of interpreters advocating for Deaf individuals when necessary. However, it also holds that Deaf people are capable of advocating for themselves, and recognizes that not allowing them to determine if they want to address a situation or not is another form of oppression. Thus, interpreters operating under the Ally Paradigm let Deaf people take the lead in advocating for themselves if they so choose.

Designated Interpreter Paradigm

The recently acknowledged Designated Interpreter Paradigm is an approach used when interpreters work with a Deaf professional such as a doctor, lawyer, or professor (Hauser, Finch, & Hauser, 2008). Interpreters working with Deaf professionals often do so in close proximity for extended periods of time, resulting in developing rapport that differs from other interpreting
situations (Hauser, Finch, & Hauser, 2008). Kushalnagar and Rashid (2008) describe that most of the interpreted exchanges Deaf people have experienced involve the receipt of a service, not the provision of one. In these situations Deaf people are in a “powerless capacity” (Kushalnagar & Rashid, 2008, p. 43). In contrast, in the Designated Interpreter paradigm Deaf professionals take the lead in determining logistics of the interpreted events, as they are the experts on the subject matter (Hauser, Finch, & Hauser, 2008).

The roles of each party are unique compared to most interpreted situations. Campbell, Rohan, & Woodcock explain that Deaf professionals “must be considered a part of the interpreting team” when interpreters are not erudite in the subject matter, as is often the case in Deaf professional-Designated interpreter partnerships (2008, p. 104). Designated interpreters are afforded special liberties in this unique trust. Hauser and Hauser clarify that, “Designated interpreters are a part of the deaf professional’s team; therefore, they sometimes have the license to share their observations and opinions on professional matters” (2008, p. 17). This working relationship requires profound trust and continuous communication between both parties in order to work together successfully (Hauser, Finch, & Hauser, 2008).

**Case conferencing**

In the United States the Code of Professional Conduct provided by the national organization for ASL/English interpreters includes a tenet requiring interpreters to “adhere to standards of confidential communication” (RID, 2005, tenet 1). This standard is important for professionals who interpret personal details from consumers’ lives. Due to respect for this tenet many interpreters feel uncomfortable discussing aspects of the interpreting work with their colleagues even when it does not injure a consumer and when an interpreter is in dire need of support. Dean and Pollard (2001) contend that the various demands interpreters experience
while working and their belief that their options for potential recourse are constrained endanger both the physical and emotional health of interpreters and contributes to the shortage of interpreters. In a later work the authors explain that interpreting does not only consist of linguistic demands as many outside the field suppose, but that it is a “practice profession” (Dean, & Pollard, 2005, p. 1) like law or medicine that requires practitioners to make ethical decisions with no clear cut answers.

Dean and Pollard (2009) propose a method of case conferencing for interpreters in which professionals can alleviate stress by discussing the work in a confidential manner with colleagues and they can receive the support necessary for demanding professions without compromising the consumers with whom they work. This method is referred to as Demand-Control Schema Supervision or simply Supervision. This approach to case conferencing and processing the professional demands of interpreting is gaining ground in the United States and has been incorporated into multiple interpreter education programs (Dean, & Pollard 2011).

This method proposed by Dean and Pollard (2001; 2005; 2009; 2011) includes classifying the demands of an interpreting assignment into four categories, listing possible responses to a demand, considering the consequences of the action, and identifying the resulting demand(s). The four categories into which demands are sorted are Environmental, Interpersonal, Paralinguistic, and Intrapersonal. After a practitioner confidentially breaks down a situation into the appropriate demands a primary concern is identified. The practitioner and other professionals participating in the case conferencing interaction then share possible options that could be used to respond to this main demand. When a control option is chosen for further consideration the group lists consequences of the chosen response and any addition demands that result.
This method has not been universally accepted amongst interpreters in the United States. Interpreters who entered the field before this approach to case conferencing was proposed may not have had exposure to Demand-Control Schema Supervision. Some practitioners are even opposed to this method. However, with the spreading of this approach to case conferencing, interpreters are now able to consider and discuss the work that they do in a way that was previously unavailable to them. Reflecting on professional choices and experiences and brainstorming options with colleagues assists practitioners in handling the stress they encounter professionally and helps prepare them to provide the best services to consumers as possible.

Such an approach to discussing the work of interpreting may be especially useful for interpreters with a collectivist culture that values input from the group.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Purpose

As an initial step in raising awareness about the experiences of interpreters, and by extension the Deaf community, in Jordan, this study examines the self-reported experiences of an Arabic/LIU interpreter in this region. This topic is relevant to the state of the field in Jordan, the Middle East, and globally. The question this study addresses is what are the reported experiences of an Arabic/LIU interpreter in Jordan.

Research Setting

This research is centered on an Arabic/LIU interpreter in the nation of Jordan. No limitations were set for where in the country the participant must live or work. Relying solely on self-reported experiences through online interactions with the participant, it was beyond the scope of this study for the researcher to personally observe interpreters in Jordan. Future studies would greatly benefit from such observations and must plan for the financial and logistical necessities for such observations. The nature of online interaction will be described in full in the Data Collection section.

Participant

Online searches through organizations and institutions associated with the interpreting field and Deaf communities internationally, as well as networking with colleagues identified potential participants. These interpreters were contacted via email to explain the study and ask if they were interested in taking part in this research (see full email text in Appendix C). I did not have any prior relationship with the potential participants. The participant for this case study was selected because she met the following requirements:
1) The participant must be an adult.

2) The participant must be an Arabic/LIU interpreter.

3) The participant must have a minimum of 10 years of interpreting experience.

4) The participant must be female, in order to avoid any cultural difficulties in working with a female researcher.

5) The participant must agree to participate in the study and sign a consent form.

6) The participant must be able to communicate with the researcher in such a way that both parties understand one another.

As this serves as an exploratory case study, the participant was not required to have any other qualifications, such as a specific degree, age, or experience interpreting in a specific setting (e.g., education or legal settings). For this initial study interpreting in any setting or combination of settings was accepted.

**Risks and Benefits**

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Western Oregon University. The participant for this study signed an informed consent form (see Appendix D) which made clear that she could cease her participation in the study at any time. I emphasized that participation in the study was voluntary and the participant could choose not to respond to any question if she felt uncomfortable. Identifying information was kept confidential so as to minimize potential risk to the participant and all data are saved in a password-protected computer only accessible to the researcher.

Through this study, the participant had an opportunity to share about her experience in a validating way free of judgment or evaluation from the interviewer. She was able to discuss the
interpreting field and provide insight for the global profession of interpreting. The profession as a whole will benefit from the information about the state of the profession in Jordan, as WASLI currently has no such information available on their website for this region. This information will provide the global profession with information necessary to determine how best to support interpreters in the Middle East and what further research should be conducted.

**Data Collection**

The data for this case study were collected in three ways. The first data source used was a questionnaire designed to collect background information from the participant (see Appendix A). The participant completed the questionnaire over a month’s span, which allowed time for her to ask clarifying questions and to answer each question as fully as she desired.

The second data source was a semi-structured interview (see Appendix B for interview questions). The interview questions were developed after the questionnaire data had been analyzed to enable follow-up questions expounding on information gathered through this first data source. Upon IRB approval of the interview questions, the interview was conducted via Skype and recorded with Camtasia. The participant voluntarily answered questions via Skype. The interview, just under two hours long, was transcribed by the researcher to facilitate the analysis process.

The third data source was notes taken during the interview. These consisted of the researcher’s observations noted during the conversation, such as the participant’s affect or demeanor when discussing a given topic. All data, including the questionnaire responses, the recording of the interview, and the transcript of the interview, are saved in a password-protected computer and are only accessible to the researcher. The following section describes the process used in analyzing the data sets.
Data Analysis

The data in this instrumental case study was analyzed using qualitative methods described by Merriam (2009) and Yin (2008). The questionnaire data was analyzed to identify preliminary categories through an open coding (Merriam, 2009) process which identified predominant terms, topics, and themes. These themes and the concepts that were identified as needing further exploration informed the development of the follow-up interview questions.

After conducting a preliminary open coding of the interview transcript to acquaint myself with the data, I followed the design explained by Yin (2008) of creating a case study database in which the data from both the interview and questionnaire were compiled and analyzed together. The notes taken during the interview were consulted, but not included in this coding process in order to focus on data provided directly from the participant. I analyzed that data as a whole using an open coding approach, in which themes were identified and noted from the data itself to create categories. I then used axial coding (Merriam, 2009, p. 180) in order to group the codes and refine the categories. In order to substantiate the themes identified through the coding process I used exclusionary coding to ensure that my final classifications could be supported by the data itself.
The data was coded and categorized into the following themes:

**Figure 3.1: Coding Categories and Subcategories**

**Interpersonal Relations category**

The Interpersonal Relations category was subcategorized into three codes: Hearing Consumer Relations, Deaf Consumer Relations, and Collegiality. The Hearing Consumer Relation code includes descriptions of interactions that the participant reported with hearing consumers as well as comments she has heard hearing people say regarding interpreting. This code also included remarks she made regarding her opinions of hearing consumers and her perspective of how they view Deaf individuals. When an interaction depicted that an approach to the work of interpreting was the primary focus of a comment the remark was coded under one
of the Interpreting Paradigms subcategories. Remarks about the interlocutors for whom she interprets that did not include how she interacts with them were included in the Logistics section. This code refers to general interpersonal relations with hearing consumers.

The Deaf Consumer Relations code represents consumer relations with Deaf individuals distinct from the actual task of interpreting. Data coded in this subcategory refers to general interpersonal relationships with Deaf consumers, not relationships during an interpreted event. As with the Hearing Consumer Relations code, comments made that demonstrated an approach to the work of interpreting rather than a primary focus of relations with Deaf consumers were coded in the Interpreting Paradigms category.

Finally, the Collegiality code deals with relationships between interpreters. This includes social and professional interactions as well as dispositions toward other interpreters. Again, this subcategory included comments regarding relations with colleagues independent of the interpreting task.

**Interpreting Paradigms category**

Remarks that appeared to align with one of the six interpreting paradigms described in the Literature Review were coded according to each paradigm as distinct subcategories. Comments coded into this subcategory include those that describe approaches to the task of meaning transfer between languages and of interpersonal interactions related to the interpreting work itself. The participant was not aware of these labels for interpreting paradigms but her comments show evidence of various perspectives influencing interpreters’ work in Jordan.

**Professional Standards category**

The Professional Standards category was subcategorized into four codes: Logistics, Requirements, Training, and Finance. The Logistics subcategory represents facts shared about
interpreting in Jordan related to the settings, the interlocutors, the environment, and the logistics of the work. This includes topics such as transportation, team interpreting, and scheduling.

The Requirements subcategory was used to code statements regarding regulations or legislation in Jordan related to interpreting. This included requirements from the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities and stipulations for people employed professionally as interpreters. Data was also coded into the Requirements subcategory for statements regarding the insufficiency of current regulations. This subcategory was originally included under Logistics, but was later separated in a distinction between how interpreters function day-to-day and the actual legal requirements to interpret in Jordan.

The Training subcategory relates to comments the participant made regarding the education and training of interpreters to interpret. Descriptions of how people currently begin working as interpreters are included in this subcategory. Statements about desired education and training that is lacking are also included in this subcategory.

The Finance subcategory was originally included under the code Logistics. However, when analyzing the data this concept arose frequently and in diverse context. It was therefore concluded that the topic of money should comprise its own subcategory. Data coded into this category refers to interpreter income and wages, or lack thereof.

**Identifying patterns**

Data was separated by code and a word-count was performed on the responses from the participant to indicate the amount of conversational space the participant gave to each theme. All speech from the interviewer, as well as questions clarifying the intent of a question or the interviewer’s understanding, were omitted from this analysis. The following chapter provides graphs and tables to visually represent the amount of conversational space given to each theme.
These graphs are not meant to provide quantitative proof of the importance of a certain thematic category. Rather, they are intended to provide readers a broader view of the data as a whole since the participant’s responses are not shared in full in this study for reasons of confidentiality (responses include many identifying remarks).

**Additional analysis**

During the data analysis phase of this study I performed an additional exclusionary coding of the data focusing on demands and controls based upon the DC-S model by Dean and Pollard (2001;2005; 2009). I used the codes of Demand and Control to determine how often the participant’s comments indicated something she would have to respond to (Demand) and how often she was taking action to do something (Control). This additional coding provided the opportunity to understand the data in comparison to the experiences of interpreters in the United States. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to conduct an in-depth DC-S analysis of the data. Future researchers may be interested in using this approach to examine power dynamics and the nature of the demands of Arabic/LIU interpreting work.

**Limitations**

While case studies enable researchers to deeply understand one person’s experiences, the information gathered is not necessarily generalizable to an entire group. The findings of this study are only evident of one interpreter’s views and experiences, but may serve to inspire future research on interpreting between LIU and Arabic and the experiences of interpreters in Jordan.

This project was limited in that the data are based wholly on self-reporting without any direct observation data. However, given the exploratory nature of the study, the goal was to learn about the experiences of an Arabic/LIU interpreter from the interpreter herself. The compilation and comparison of multiple data sets supports the validity of the findings. Future
studies may include additional data sources to enrich the analysis and provide a more comprehensive description of the state of the interpreting profession in the Middle East.

It could be argued that some of the data could be coded into different subcategories than those they were classified into for this study, due to the qualitative nature of the coding. Consistency was supported by the fact that all of the data was coded by a single researcher through a constant comparison method in which the data was recoded multiple times in order to refine the categories and subcategories used here.
Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

Findings

This chapter presents the findings from this study by category and subcategory. As stated in the Methodology section, data from both the questionnaire and interview were combined in the coding process. Data from notes taken during the interview is presented in descriptions of how, from my perspective as the researcher, a given comment was expressed. These findings present comments and responses from the participant, referred to here as Jana (a pseudonym), about her experiences and perspectives on Arabic/LIU interpreting in Jordan. They are not necessarily indicative of the experiences or views of other interpreters in Jordan. Figure 5 illustrates the proportions of conversational space devoted to each identified theme, and the following sections elaborate on each theme.

Figure 4.1: Combined Coded Data
Interpersonal Relations

Over one-third (38%) of the themes identified from the combined data focused on interpersonal relations. The majority of the comments in this category regarded relations with hearing consumers, with only slightly less discussion regarding relations with Deaf consumers. Commentary related to interactions with other interpreters was also common, but less so than that related to consumers.

Hearing Consumer Relations

Out of the 5,774 words from the combined data that were coded, 796 of them were coded in this subcategory, making up 13.70% of the total data. This theme was the second-most prevalent following the code of Logistics. This theme was identified twice as often in the interview as it was in the questionnaire. Of the data in this subcategory, 234 out of 1,067 (22%) words were from the data collected in the questionnaire and 562 out of 4,707 (12%) were from data collected during the interview. Data coded as Hearing Consumer Relations makes up 13.79% of the total data.

The data in this subcategory demonstrates a wide range of perspectives held by hearing consumers about Deaf people. Jana explained that most family members of Deaf people “are really supportive” and advocate for their rights, and that there are others who view Deaf people as disabled and do not think they are capable of attending school, holding a job, marrying, or having children. Jana has commonly been asked questions such as “What’s the use?” regarding a Deaf person being present in university classes (at times by professors during class). Jana believes that when she began interpreting at the university “no one liked [her]” because they did not understand what she was doing and helping non-interpreters understand her professional role has been difficult. Professors who have no knowledge of LIU or Deaf culture have advised her
in how to interact with Deaf students. For example, when Deaf students were not watching her interpretation during class the instructor stopped lecturing and said, “You don’t care? Please tell them to look at you. You’re wasting their time. You’re wasting the information.” During the interview she explained the improvement of the situation by smiling and stating, “Only it’s okay because they almost understand now.” Professors who have taught Deaf students come to accept them. Jana shared that professors respect the hard work shown by Deaf students, which often exceeds that of their hearing peers, and that now these professors come to “expect them to work hard and adapt to their community,” and enjoy having them in class.

Jana still faces frustration as she has witnessed and experienced widespread discrimination toward Deaf people. Many hearing people refer a Deaf person using slurs or terms such as “mute” or someone, “who lost his ears” instead of simply referring to them as Deaf. When recounting these situations Jana admitted that, “at the beginning [of her career she] used to cry a lot about that.” In the questionnaire she reported that some people, “are absolutely in ignorance, and that’s the hardest thing in [her] job.” She wrote that it is, “such a waste of time when [she has] to explain every thing about [her] job” to a court official, police officer, or other professional. She also feels frustrated when hearing people without any knowledge of the Deaf community attempt to explain Deafness or signed languages to others, especially in written publications. During the interview Jana calmly affirmed, “It’s not their fault but they shouldn’t write about something they don’t understand.” Jana explained that things have improved somewhat and now most people have some knowledge regarding Deaf people and signed languages.

Over the years Jana has also experienced varied reactions toward herself and her work. Some people she meets are amazed at the skill of interpreting, asking questions such as, “Wow,
it’s so hard isn’t it?” or “Do they really understand every word you sign for them?” Some people have claimed that God will surely send her to heaven because she is doing such a nice thing. Jana also recounted painful incidents where students made comments about how she would likely put her husband’s eye out when she got married because she was “playing with her hands,” and that, “maybe she will never get married because she is working with crazy people.” As a child of a Deaf adult (CODA) and an involved member of the Deaf community such remarks about Deaf people hurt her deeply. She added that due to cultural norms, “Of course I couldn’t say a word because they were men, not girls.”

**Deaf Consumer Relations**

Data in this subcategory refers to comments made about interpersonal relationships with Deaf consumers. This subcategory appeared in the data slightly less often than the Hearing Consumer Relations subcategory. In total, 771 out of 5,774 words were coded in the Deaf Consumer Relations subcategory, making up 13.35% of the overall data. However, in contrast to the Hearing Consumer Relations subcategory, the majority of these comments were made in the interview rather than in response to the questionnaire. Only 39 of the 1,067 (3.66%) words in the questionnaire referred to Deaf Consumer Relations, whereas in the interview 732 out of the 4,707 (15.55%) words coded in this subcategory.

As previously mentioned, Jana is a CODA. Having a Deaf parent no doubt contributed to her appreciation that Deaf people are capable of succeeding in all aspects of life. According to Jana, the situation for Deaf people in Jordan has improved considerably. She revealed that in the past, “they used to live alone. They used to live like nobody cared about them [or understood] them—even their families.” She says now it is much easier to have relationships and communicate with Deaf people. Academically, Jana explains that it is best when Deaf children
study at Deaf schools where they are taught by Deaf teachers. Now that Deaf students are studying at the university level and majoring in Special Education she states that they “can have their lives, like anybody else.” They can be a part of educating the next generation of Deaf students. Jana insists that Deaf adults with this education “go to work, they get married, they have kids, you know, they live just like any hearing person.”

During the interview Jana indicated a significant appreciation for the Deaf community:

For me, in my life, my work, um, I love Deaf people really. I’m not just saying that. If you ask here in Jordan they will say, “Oh [Jana], she’s almost Deaf”…Most of the Deaf people here when they first meet me say, “You’re Deaf?” so I say, “No, I’m an interpreter, I’m [Jana]” “Oh [Jana], we heard about you a lot, you are such a nice person…Ahlan wa sahlan”.

These comments signify high praise for an interpreter and display an intimate connection to the Deaf community. Jana noted another reason that Deaf people often request that she interpret for them is, “because [she signs] just like a Deaf person.”

Jana explained that requesting an interpreter in Jordan generally involves a Deaf individual contacting an interpreter and paying them directly. The primary exception is in a university setting where the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities provides interpreters. If for some reason the Deaf person is unsatisfied with an interpreter’s skill, she says the Deaf person can look for someone else. Jana shared that a Deaf person may state something to the effect of, “I’m sorry, there is not good communication—or communication—between us, I have to let you go.” In cases where the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities has provided an interpreter, the Deaf individual may appeal to the Council and
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explain that the interpreter’s skills are insufficient and a replacement is needed. Jana holds that the “Deaf person is the one who’s in charge” in these interactions. She also explained that replacing an interpreter is difficult due to scarcity of available interpreters. She told one story about a girl who unsuccessfully requested that a female interpreter replace her male interpreter because she was studying “health and physical training” and she did not want to wear hijab⁴.

After sharing this story Jana stated that in general “interpreters work with the [sic] both genders, [and] don’t have a problem.”

The understanding that Deaf people can choose which interpreters to request leads Jana to feel confident about her reputation. When responding to a questionnaire item about interpreter assessments Jana wrote that if a Deaf person requests an interpreter again it is because, “last time [she] did [her] job perfectly.” She continued on to explain that her assessment is her “reputation as a good interpreter” in the Deaf community.

Jana shared that what she believes Deaf people most desire from interpreters is for them to “be honest,” try their best, and not to replace a Deaf person’s words with their own. She also explained that Deaf people generally respect interpreters who work in professional settings and they do not highly regard interpreters that work at Deaf clubs. In the latter setting individuals are collecting money for the Deaf community instead of interpreting. Jana does believe that attending Deaf clubs is important for interpreters. It is a place to get to know the Deaf community and become familiar with their language use, which can vary from city to city. She explains that the language is constantly evolving and Deaf people will often decide to “make new signs for the same word” and share them in that environment.

⁴ In this instance, a headscarf.
Collegiality

Jana’s comments about how interpreters interact and feel about one another were coded in the Collegiality subcategory. Combined data for this subcategory consisted of 629 words out of 5,774 (10.89%) of the total data. This theme appeared slightly more often in the interview than in the questionnaire. From the questionnaire, 75 words (7.03%) were coded in this subcategory, whereas from the interview data, 554 words (11.77%) were coded into this subcategory.

The data in this subcategory suggests that interpreters primarily work in isolation, often due to the scarcity of interpreters in the country, and that there is not consistent support for all interpreters. Other interpreters often ask her for advice about the work—both logistical and ethical—and she does her best to assist them. She said, “if they have problems they can come to me and talk to me about it and if I can solve the problem I solve it and if I can’t we just talk about it and do our best to solve it.” Unfortunately, the same support is not always available for Jana. When asked what support she receives to cope with the emotional demands of interpreting she responded, “Professionally, there is no one. Personally, I have my friends. That’s about it.” Support was also not provided by local spoken language interpreters despite the similarities of their work. She stated that signed language interpreters in her area work harder and longer than spoken language interpreters and they receive “less respect” from them. She has also had less than encouraging interactions with signed language interpreters from other nations. In one story, Jana expressed her mortification at being publicly scolded by an interpreter from France for her actions when she had received no prior exposure to another approach. While interpreting she had been attempting to get the Deaf consumers’ attention and the French interpreter reacted immediately:
He said to me, “Please don’t do that. You are a sign language interpreter. You have to keep signing. If they look at you or they don’t, it’s their problem. It’s not right to tell them, ‘Please look at me.’ Don’t do that to them.” It was really embarrassing. When she recounted this incident I noted that Jana’s vocal inflections indicated distress in recalling this interaction.

Additionally, the data indicates that collegiality among interpreters is full of tension. Jana explained that interpreters attempt to discuss issues with one another to improve their skills and the field as a whole. She also described that interpreters often experience antagonistic competition rather than supportive collaboration between colleagues. During the interview she explained that this competition is primarily between interpreters who have been working less than five years and interpreters who have been working about 25 years. She shared that the interpreters with five years of experience complain that the other group is too old, ignorant of “interpreting strategies,” and cannot “keep up with” new things. They also make derogatory remarks about the other group such as, “He’s about to die” to emphasize their view that someone is an “old time” interpreter. Interpreters with 25 years of experience are also harsh toward the new generation of interpreters. Jana stated that they often make complaints that new interpreters, “are so young,” that they do not interpret everything that is said, that they “don’t have enough experience,” and “they don’t have the right” to work in certain settings. Jana stated that the primary judgment of each group toward the other was that, “they are not good enough.” Interestingly enough, Jana shared that the interpreters with 15 years of experience were left alone by both groups and were not the targets of these complaints and competition.

Jana admits that when she began interpreting she believed that other interpreters did not like her and were “jealous” of her due to a concern that she was threatening their income by
taking jobs they could have booked. The primary us-versus-them competition that Jana has
directly experienced relates to education. She has received a higher education and believes that
it is an important factor contributing to Deaf people hiring her to interpret. She says that her
education contributes to her general world knowledge (sometimes referred to as extra-linguistic
knowledge) and states that, “if you are educated and you know…many things about the
culture…then you can interpret about, let’s say, 98% maybe of the information” in a given
setting. Interpreters with less education “try to say bad things about” interpreters with more
education, according to Jana. While she acknowledged these struggles her demeanor remained
positive and she summed up her description of these issues by stating: “If interpreters don’t like
me it’s their problem, but most of the time I have a good relationship with interpreters.”

**Summary of Interpersonal Relations data**

This category represented 38% of the total coded data, the highest percentage of any
category. The subcategories coded for this section focused on the populations with whom the
participant works and interacts professionally. The table below provides a breakdown of the data
used in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Relations</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>% of Combined Data</th>
<th>% of Questionnaire Data</th>
<th>% of Interview Data</th>
<th>% of Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Consumer Relations</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>21.93%</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf Consumer Relations</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>13.35%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>15.55%</td>
<td>35.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
<td>11.77%</td>
<td>28.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Interpersonal Relations Summary of Data
Interpreting Paradigms

Responses were coded for this category when they indicated an approach to the task of interpreting that closely aligns with one of the interpreting paradigms described in Chapter 2. Jana was not aware of these labels as they are not widely discussed in Jordan as they are in the United States. Less than one-third (27.54%) of the themes identified from the combined data focused on interpreting paradigms. The majority of the comments in this category aligned with the helper paradigm, followed by the conduit paradigm and the bilingual-bicultural paradigm. The other three paradigms were present in far less of the data than these first three. Figure 7 illustrates the percentages of the data that aligned with a given interpreting paradigm.

Interpreting Paradigms Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpreting Paradigms</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helper Paradigm</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Paradigm</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual-bicultural</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Facilitator</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Interpreting Paradigms Category

Helper Paradigm

Data for this theme was identified more than twice as often in the questionnaire data as it was in the data from the interview. Data with this coding makes up 16.68% of the questionnaire, with 178 out of 1,067 words. The interview data was coded with this subcategory at a smaller
percentage of 7.33%. Only 345 words out of 4,707 were coded Helper Paradigm from the interview data. The combined data shows that this subcategory consists of 523 out of 5,774 (9.06%) words.

Data in this category suggests a desire to help Deaf people, as described in the literature review. Jana reported that in her early years as an interpreter she worked full-time without pay, “because [institutions] wouldn’t really accept the idea that Deaf people need an interpreter and the idea that Deaf people need to go to university.” When explaining the beginning of her interpreting career in the questionnaire she wrote, “I helped Deaf people in every occasion and any time they asked for my help as a volunteer…but I still volunteer where and when ever [sic] I feel like I'm needed.” Although Jana is now employed as an interpreter she shared that at times she goes without compensation when hired by a Deaf person directly. She recorded that, “most of the Deaf people in our community are poor so I don’t really take money most of the time.”

Jana shared that if Deaf university students do not attend to her interpreting she feels compelled to get their attention. She described the situation this way:

Most Deaf people they get bored after maybe 13 minutes and they start talking to each other. And that’s embarrassing ya Allah⁵…Most of the time I stop signing and I tell the [presenter]…“Please excuse me a minute, I need their attention” and I say to the group, “Can you please look at me I’m telling you something important. You have to learn about it, you have to know the information. Please look at me.” Then say to the teacher, “Please go on.”

Jana shared that she has taken this approach in multiple settings and situations, although she is not always confident in such action. This choice is consistent with the Helper Paradigm in that it

⁵ “dear God”
Translator involves an interpreter taking responsibility for the interaction and for instructing the Deaf students on appropriate behavior during an interpreted event.

This data was coded into this subcategory due to the researcher’s perception that it represented an approach to the work congruent with the Helper Paradigm. Jana explicitly used the word “help” five times in the questionnaire to describe her relationship with Deaf people for whom she was interpreting, including an explanation that her frustration with hearing people asking her questions while she was trying to work was that it would, “confuse the Deaf person [she was] going to help!” She only used the term “help” once during the interview and did so in a different context.

Conduit Paradigm

For this subcategory, 403 words out of 4,707 were coded from the interview. This represents 8.56% of the coded interview data. This subcategory did not appear at all in the responses to the questionnaire. When combining the data sources this subcategory represents 6.98% of the total coded data.

The data in this subcategory suggests an emphasis on interpretation at the lexical level that transcodes every word from the source message word-for-word into the target message without focus on the overall meaning or intent. Jana related that interpreters “have to sign the exact words” that someone speaks, and vice versa. She explained that if a Deaf person signed the equivalent of, “you are stealing from that place” it would be inappropriate for an interpreter to voice “He says that maybe you are taking money from [that place]” as an interpretation. Jana shared that she often sees interpreters “change the words” someone has said in this way and she believes “that’s really wrong.” Regarding interpreters who do this, Jana explained:
…really I despise them (laugh), uh, the Deaf person [signs something, and] the interpreter will say, “Oh ok, I will say that” and he will change the words. He, like, deleted some words and he put another word, he deleted some sentences and he put another sentence in, from his mind! And he didn’t say to the hearing people that he was putting his ideas in and in my opinion that’s wrong.

Conversely, Jana approaches interpreting with the conviction that, ‘Basically, you can’t interfere with the question or the answer. Because if you interfere someone will say you’re not being honest [and] you will lose respect. You have to keep the same words the same.”

In order to interpret with this approach Jana makes sure to visit the Deaf clubs in both Amman and Zarqa, as variations in signing exist between the two communities. She stated that interpreters, “have to know every new word they sign and memorize it so when [interpreters] see the word [they] understand, ‘Oh, I know that sign, it means blah blah blah’” and they are able to interpret it correctly. She shared that knowing “every word” is vital for interpreters and that if someone is unable to go to a Deaf club they can also socialize with Deaf people through “Facebook, or email, or video calls.” This emphasis on including every word in an interpretation indicates working from a Conduit Paradigm which values transmitting information verbatim, as would be done by a machine.

**Communication Facilitator Paradigm**

The data for this theme appeared almost three times as often in the interview data as it did in the questionnaire data, with the data from each source making up a small percentage of the overall data. The questionnaire data was coded with this subcategory 1.41% of the time, at 15 words out of 1,067. The interview was coded with this subcategory 3.74% of the time, at 176
These data suggest actions of advocating for a specific ‘role’ and communicating boundaries as an interpreter. Throughout both the questionnaire and the interview Jana communicated that she often feels the need to explain what it means for her to be an interpreter. She mentioned that she has attempted to set up meetings with hearing faculty to explain her position. Whenever possible Jana takes the opportunity to talk with hearing consumers and describes the process to them so that they understand what she is doing. She said: “I start explaining that I am a sign language interpreter and that person is Deaf and so they can’t hear you. I have to sign for them. I will sign everything you say.”

After the French interpreter told Jana that it is not interpreters’ responsibility to get the attention of people for whom they are interpreting she modified her approach. When an instructor was flustered by her (lack of) action in this situation she appealed to him by saying: Please don’t tell me [to get their attention]; it’s not my business. If you keep telling him ‘please look at [her]’ I’ll sign it. It’s not my problem. I just keep signing and if they want to look at me they will look. If they don’t want to look they won’t. So please don’t embarrass me.

Jana strives to make sure everyone in the situation is clear about who is speaking/signing and what is being said so that no one is “confused.” This is consistent with the Communication Facilitator Paradigm under which interpreters may advocate for and explain the role of the interpreter to consumers and strive to help consumers understand the interpretation process.

Jana joked about the pervasive idea that interpreters should volunteer their time “for helping human kind,” and then explained that expecting people to interpret without receiving
remuneration is “wrong.” She perceives interpreting to be a difficult professional career worthy of respect. She acknowledged that she thinks it is inappropriate for people to assume she does not need compensation. This aligns with the Communication Facilitator Paradigm in which interpreters view themselves as professionals and strive to urge others to view them in this way.

**Bilingual-Bicultural Paradigm**

This subcategory appeared in 8.18% of the interview data, at 385 out of 4,707 words. No data in the questionnaire responses indicated a Bilingual-Bicultural paradigmatic approach to interpreting. In total this subcategory is comprised of 385 out of 5,774 (6.67%) words from combined data sources.

Data in this subcategory suggest respect for Deaf people as belonging to a cultural minority, recognition of Deaf culture, and cultural mediation. Jana’s frustration with prevalent misperceptions about Deaf people led to her endeavor to educate hearing people. She was disturbed when Deaf people were referred to by any other term and began educating hearing people, “to call them ‘Deaf people,’ that’s all, there’s no other word to say about them. It’s ‘Deaf people.’” Jana attributes this to inaccurate information being propagated and taught about Deaf people. She shared that in Jordan they “don’t have enough studies about sign language, interpreting, or Deaf people. I don’t know why.” Regarding the information that is available, she explained, “When you go to the university and study about Deaf people, they would say that Deaf people are aggressive. They are not. Um, there are different sorts of Deaf people.”

In one situation after asking an instructor if he was open to her opinion on the textbook used in the class, Jana shared that the textbook contained erroneous information. She believed the information to be so misleading that she was inspired to tell the instructor:
You talk about Deaf people like they are some kind of animal, or some kind of mission. You don’t understand; you don’t know. So you need something or someone to explain what they see, what they feel, what Deaf people really need, what Deaf people really want.

Fortunately, in this situation the instructor was open to such information.

Jana granted that in some situations, “especially in the court,” it was necessary to use words appropriate to the setting in an interpretation even though they were not the exact words that a Deaf person signed. She explained:

I don’t know if you have the same situation in America but most of the Deaf people here they use [crude] or not good words. They don’t say [everything] politely, so you have to switch to that word and make a better paraphrase. You have to paraphrase…to give it to the hearing in a better way.

Jana clarified that her reason for using this approach was to prevent a situation where someone “might misunderstand” the content or intent of what was being communicated. This indicates approaches to the work that align with the Bilingual-Bicultural Paradigm in that it is assumed that providing the information in exactly the way it was presented will not result in the original intent being understood. Thus, adjustments are made that maintain the intention of the original message and present the information in such a way that it can be readily understood by a person with a different culture. This does not involve changing the meaning of a message, but in conducting the necessary mediation for two parties with different cultures to communicate clearly without cultural misunderstandings.
Ally Paradigm

This subcategory appeared the least in the data with only 11 words (0.23%) of the coded data from the interview comprising this subcategory. No data in the questionnaire responses indicated an Ally paradigmatic approach to interpreting. This subcategory represents only 0.19% of the total data, with 11 out of 5,744 words.

Data coded into this category suggests the belief that Deaf people can be independent and advocate for themselves and that interpreters should not always take on that role. The data comprising this subcategory consists entirely of two sentences that Jana uttered during the interview. The first was part of a story Jana explained wherein hearing people asked her for assistance any time a Deaf person tried to interact with them. She exclaimed that “[they] don’t need [her] for everything.” The second occurred when I briefly explained interpreting paradigms to Jana and asked her directly about her own approach to interpreting work. Her reply was: “It depends on the situation.” These comments align with an Ally paradigmatic approach to interpreting in that they acknowledge that various approaches are necessary and interpreters do not need to always manage an interaction or situation. The first comment also aligns with this paradigm in that it acknowledges that Deaf people can function independently and do not always need an interpreter.

Designated Interpreter Paradigm

This subcategory was also not identified in the responses to the questionnaire. It represents 77 out of 4,707 words (1.64%) of the coded data from the interview. When the data sources are combined this subcategory represents 1.33% of the total coded data.

Data in this subcategory suggests a co-constructive approach to interpreting where the interpreter and Deaf consumer are on equal terms. As Hauser (2008) writes, in these situations
interpreters “sometimes have the license to share their observations and opinions on professional matters.” I acknowledge that arguments could be made to code this data in the Helper Paradigm subcategory—Hauser (2008) himself admits a fine line between these paradigms. The way in which the information was provided during the interview led me to perceive this data as representative of a Designated Interpreter Paradigm and not a Helper Paradigm.

Jana elucidated that in some situations she would consult with a Deaf consumer prior to the interpreted event as to whether or not she may participate by sharing her thoughts. She would proceed to do this only if the Deaf consumer “approves.” In such a situation she then clarifies with the hearing consumer when she is sharing her own ideas. She explained that when this happens, “you have to declare that, “this is my sentence, this is my idea; this is his idea, this is his sentence.’ So, make it clear.”

**Summary of Interpreting Paradigms data**

The data in this category comprises 27.54% of total data coded in this study and therefore contains the smallest amount of data of the three categories. This category focuses on values based approaches to the work of interpreting. The table below provides a visual representation of the data coded in this section.
Interpreting Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpreting Paradigms</th>
<th>Total Word Count</th>
<th>% of Combined Data</th>
<th>% of Questionnaire Data</th>
<th>% of Interview Data</th>
<th>% of Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helper Paradigm</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>9.06%</td>
<td>16.68%</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
<td>32.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Paradigm</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
<td>25.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Facilitator Paradigm</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>12.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual-Bicultural Paradigm</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
<td>24.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ally Paradigm</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Interpreter Paradigm</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Interpreting Paradigms Summary of Data

Professional Standards

Just over one-third (34.43%) of the themes identified from the combined data focused on professional standards. The majority of the comments in this category were classified in the Logistics subcategory, the largest subcategory in this study. A significant amount of the comments in this category related to training, fewer comments related to finance and a small amount of the data related to requirements for interpreting in Jordan.

Logistics

Unsurprisingly, this code was used for the largest amount of data. Due to the interviewer’s unfamiliarity with interpreting in Jordan and the purpose of this study to learn about Jana’s experiences, it is understandable that a significant amount of data would be provided in this subcategory. Data was coded with this theme at a higher rate in the questionnaire data than it was in the data from the interview. With 227 out of 1,067 words, it was used for 21.27% of the coded questionnaire data. With 650 out of 4,707 words, it was used.
for 13.81% of the coded interview data. In total this subcategory was used for 15.19% of the combined coded data, with 877 out of 5,774 words.

Data in this category includes facts about Jana’s professional life and details about working as an interpreter in Jordan. Jana has been interpreting for more than 10 years. She primarily interprets between Arabic and LIU, although when English is the spoken language being used she works between English and LIU. She works with adults in multiple settings, including postsecondary, legal, medical, and community environments. On average Jana works between 27-33 hours a week, although she said this fluctuates. She also explained that interpreters who work in Amman, where the population is concentrated, can work a larger number of hours each week, while those in rural areas may work very few simply due to a lack of available jobs. Additionally, Jana shared that sometimes she is requested to interpret two jobs occurring close to the same time and located far from each other. She expressed a desire for a “center or organization that would be responsible” for scheduling in order to minimize these issues.

The university students with whom Jana works all study Special Education. She said that this area of study focuses on people with disabilities, referred to as “impairments” or as “handicapped.” Because no specialized Deaf Education degree exists in Jordan, these students’ studies include information about blind people and those with mental and physical disabilities. Generally, Jana works with a four to eleven students a term.

In Jordan, Jana explained, the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities provides interpreters for Deaf university students. It is this council that contracts interpreters to work at a university. When a Deaf student needs an interpreter, the council contacts, hires, and pays the interpreter.
Jana revealed that there are only 25 Arabic/LIU interpreters in the country of Jordan and that these few interpreters must “carry the full burden” of interpreting throughout the nation. This means that they cannot accommodate every request. Jana said this is an improvement from 15 years ago at which time she estimated that there were only “four or five” in the entire country. While explaining that this recent increase is positive, Jana plainly states: “We don’t have enough interpreters.”

Notwithstanding the improvements Jana wants to see regarding interpreting within Jordan, she declared that Jordan is “way ahead” of other countries in the region. She explained that Jordan is, “much better than any place in the Arab area.” She said that Jordan was the first country to graduate Deaf students from a university, and now a Hard of Hearing student has attained a master’s degree. She disclosed that, conversely, in nearby Palestine, Syria, Iraq, and Iran, Deaf students are only educated until the sixth or seventh grade. According to Jana, sometimes students from these locations come to Jordan to continue their education.

Jana shared that Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait “keep sending a request for [Jordanian] interpreters” to come interpret in their countries. Jana said this is due to the level of professionalism of Jordanian interpreters and explained that the Arabic/LIU interpreters now working in Saudi universities are Jordanian. Jana also mentioned that the efforts to create a unified Arabic signed language “has been declined.”

**Requirements**

Data for this subcategory was coded more often in the questionnaire data than it was in the interview data. At 34 out of 1,067 words, this subcategory represents 2.81% of the coded questionnaire data. With 70 out of 4,707 words this subcategory represents 1.49% of the coded
interview data. Combining the data sources shows this subcategory used for 104 out of 5,774 words, for a total of 1.8% of the coded data.

Jana noted that four years ago the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities began to “care about interpreters.” She explained that the council conducted research to “collect information on sign language skills.” The council then created an exam for interpreters and provided licensure. Jana recounted that the council provided a “license for signing” that is required to interpret in any government ministry or organization. Interpreters without this license are unable to interpret in government sponsored settings. Jana stated that the progress the council has contributed to the field of interpreting is “still insufficient.”

**Training**

This subcategory was identified more than twice as often in the questionnaire data as it was in the interview data. The coded data from the interview was placed in this subcategory at 8.82%, with 415 out of 4,707 words. The coded data from the questionnaire was categorized under Training at 19.49%, with 208 out of 1,067 words. This code was used for 10.79% of the combined total data, with 623 words out of 5,774. Jana took courses “at various centers that teaches [sic] sign language” for two years before formally starting to interpret. She says there is no interpreting program in the region. When asked about what kind of mentoring was available to interpreters in Jordan, Jana responded, “I'm trying to be realistic here, so… nothing yet and nothing soon.” Jana did share that she herself teaches LIU courses and works with people interested in becoming interpreters. She described that she takes them on as volunteers and trains them as interpreters. Regarding the way most Jordanians learn to interpret she explained, “it's insufficient and it needs a lot of work” and added that she wishes people could study interpreting “as a specialization at university and [take] a full program of practicing before we
send [them] to the field.” Jana explained that currently, “Most interpreters are um, interpreting because they have um, Deaf parents, that’s all. Not because they are educated or have a [sic] principles to be good interpreters.” Jana informed me that most interpreters take a few LIU classes at a Deaf club and then apply for work. She said that people usually hire these new interpreters, merely saying, “Oh, you are interpreter, that’s good,” but in Jana’s opinion, “it’s not so” professional.

Regarding her hopes for the future of interpreter education in Jordan, Jana shared: “I want it to be more professional. I want it to be more practical.” She explained that she felt like she needed information about “how to act or what to wear” in certain settings and she wished her own training had been different. She especially mentioned that she wished she had been taught about “structure” and “ethics” before she began interpreting instead of having to “discover” these things on her own.

Jana shared that she craved mentorship when she entered the field. She said:

Back then I hoped that I’d have someone who’s older than me and, um, know the most sign language and know the most Deaf people and I could start to talk about my work with. I needed…a specialist in that kind of work, but I didn’t find anyone.

She says that professional support is still unavailable to her and no formal case conferencing or method for discussing work with colleagues is in place.

When Jana has experiences like she did with the French interpreter who told her not to get Deaf consumers’ attention when interpreting it “makes [her] feel really embarrassed.” She divulged that, “This kind of information I really…(pause)…I don’t—the first time [I heard it] I [thought] maybe that’s wrong, maybe that’s right, I don’t know...You see, we need that kind of information, really.” When recounting stories about students not attending to her interpreting she
confided, “I don’t know what I have to do.” She explained that without support she currently has to approach problem solving the “hard way:”

My problem is that I learn the hard way. Like, I have a problem. I try a solution. Maybe it will work, maybe it won’t. Maybe it will make the problem go, maybe it will make the problem bigger. So that kind of learning is the hard way, really.

Jana is presently seeking more education and training because in her own words: “I need to be more professional!”

**Finance**

Data was coded for this subcategory slightly more often from the interview data than from the questionnaire data. This code was used for 5.34% of the coded data in the questionnaire, with 57 out of 1,067 words. With 327 out of 4,707 words, it was used for 6.95% of the coded interview data. In total, this subcategory represents 6.65% of the combined coded data, with 384 out of 5,774 words.

Jana clarified that for work at the university she is paid by her supervisor and when interpreting in other settings (including the court) Deaf people must pay for interpreting services, in which case interpreters “take less money.” Regarding wages for interpreters, Jana shared that “sometimes we go and work for the whole day only for seven dollars,” although occasionally if a lucrative company hires an interpreter they may pay as much as 15 JOD per day (about the equivalent of 21 US Dollars). Jana shook her head when explaining this and said that these wages were “not enough.” Interpreters who did not accept compensation from Deaf people for interpreting services earn less. Jana explained that most interpreters work part time. These part time interpreters “don’t have a good salary” and struggle to earn an adequate income.

---

6 1 Jordanian Dinar = 1.41304 US Dollars (http://www.xe.com/currencyconverter/, 2013)
The issue of salary is an important one. Jana believes it prevents people from becoming interpreters at all. During the first years of her career when she was not compensated, a hearing family member pleaded with Jana:

Stop working with Deaf people. I hate them. I hate them a lot. Don’t work with them. They do not pay you. You just go and help them for free…you work as a volunteer and you never get paid so stop doing that. Go and find another job. Go and work with mental disorders or maybe learning disabilities or with blind people. Go work with in [sic] any other [population]. Go work with those people, [Deaf people] don’t pay you.

Comparing her experience as a new interpreter to that of a staff interpreter she explained, “now isn’t really much better but now you get paid.” Jana believes that if the pay rate for interpreting were to increase more people would respect it as a profession and want to be a part of it. She expressed, “If people around here, um, know that interpreters they have really good salaries…I think everyone will respect that, because it’s a brilliant, honorable job, I don’t know, I love interpreting.”

**Summary of Professional Standards Data**

The data in this category represents 34.43% of the total data coded in this study. This category focuses on professional standards and expectations for Arabic/LIU interpreters working in Jordan and also includes details about the work settings of the participant. The table below provides details about the data coded in this category.
Table 4.3: Professional Standards Summary of Data

**Summary of findings**

Data from this study was coded and classified into thirteen subcategories within three main categories. The Interpersonal Relations category consisted of 38.03% of the total coded data. Data from the Interpreting Paradigms category represented 27.54% of the overall coded data. Finally, the Professional Standards category was comprised of 34.43% of the total coded data in this study. Data from the notes taken during the interview is not included here, as it was not articulated directly by the participant herself. The graph below delineates between data obtained from the questionnaire and data collected through the interview.
Figure 4.3: Interview and Questionnaire Data Comparison
Discussion

The purpose of this case study is to share the reported experiences of an Arabic/LIU interpreter in Jordan and consider them as a first step toward understanding the nature of the field in this region and how the international interpreting community can support Jordanian interpreters. Since no previous research has been published on this topic, this study is intended to provide data to begin a scholarly conversation on this subject. The data from this study is representative of the participant’s perspectives only and is not necessarily generalizable to all interpreters in Jordan. However, this information provides insight into the experiences of one interpreter and paves the way for a deeper understanding of the Arabic/LIU interpreting field in Jordan.

The data in this study were classified into the three categories: Interpersonal Relations, Interpreting Paradigms, and Professional Standards. In practice these areas are interrelated and each of them influence interpreters’ decisions at every moment. Data were classified into subcategories based on what I, as the researcher, believed to be the primary motivation or influence behind a comment. It is important to note that while I attempted to maintain as much objectivity as possible, it is impossible to eradicate subjectivity completely. Also, I am an American researcher and as such this study represents my understanding of the data from an American perspective.

Throughout the data Jana depicted tension between colleagues. She particularly mentioned competition between interpreters with five years of experience and interpreters with twenty-five years of experience, and educated and non-educated interpreters. This is interesting in light of research describing Jordan as having a collectivist culture where “people emphasize cooperation and relationship building” and “solidarity with others” (Alkailani, Azzam, &
The fact that Jordan is also described as a masculine culture that values competitiveness could contribute to this tension (2012, p. 77). If interpreters are viewing colleagues as rivals with whom they must compete to succeed rather than part of an in-group to which they belong competition would naturally result. Alkailani, Azzam, and Athamneh write that identity in collectivist cultures is “based in the social network to which one belongs” (2012, p. 73). They state that co-workers can comprise one of these social networks. According to Jana, though, most Arabic/LIU interpreters do not work with their interpreting colleagues, which could influence who interpreters consider to be their co-workers. This could contribute to interpreters viewing some colleagues as outsiders and the division of interpreters into smaller in-groups with similar experiences (e.g., five years experience, twenty-five years experience, educated, and non-educated). This could prevent the cohesive development of the profession in Jordan and possibly discourage others from entering the field.

Additionally, working in isolation from other interpreters could inhibit interpreters from feeling connected to colleagues as a larger whole. If interpreters are identifying with the in-group of their individual families and not at all with interpreter colleagues, finances may play a role in inspiring competition between interpreters. Jana explained that Arabic/LIU interpreters are not paid well and that work is not available in all areas. The financial burden of working long hours for a small amount of pay may induce interpreters to view their colleagues as a threat to their families’ financial stability. The cultural values of success and accumulating wealth (Alkailani, Azzam, & Athamneh, 2012) could contribute to this concern and influence competitive behavior.

In 2012, Joshua Project published statistics that 20,000 Deaf people resided in Jordan and utilized a signed language to communicate. Hendricks’ (2008) published statics that were much
higher, suggesting the number of Deaf people in Jordan at the time of the study was 60,000. According to Jana there are only 25 working interpreters within the nation of Jordan. When considering this ratio it is striking that competition over work would exist amongst interpreter colleagues. Jana described that when she began working other interpreters were concerned that she could take potential income from them by booking interpreting jobs. This seems surprising in light of the statistics. Jana reported that there are not enough qualified interpreters in Jordan and that Deaf people often go without services or are forced to rely on unskilled interpreters. Both the National Strategy for People with Disabilities and Law (no. 31) seek the full integration of people with disabilities into society. If any of the 25 interpreters in Jordan are concerned about job security and competition from colleagues it stands to reason that multitudes of Deaf people are not interacting with society in ways that require interpreters—meaning integration and equal access is not occurring—or that requests for interpreters to be present are being refused. This phenomenon should be investigated further; a needs assessment may bring to light the extent of this issue.

The possibility that Arabic/LIU interpreters may not identify with their colleagues is concerning in light of Annarino and Hall’s (2013) conviction that interpreters must feel connected to the profession in order to respect it. This idea could have consequences for Deaf and hearing consumers if interpreters do not feel invested in the quality of the interpretations they produce or in standards for the profession that ensure the quality of interpretations for all consumers.

Interpreting Paradigms are used within this study as a framework to discuss the ways in which the work of interpreting is approached. They are not intended to be used as definitive labels for Jana’s actions. It is paramount to remember that the approaches to interpreting in
Jordan are likely different from those in the US, as the cultures in each nation differ significantly. Interacting with the collectivist culture of the American Deaf community (Mindess, 2006) within the larger individualist culture of the United States may be very different than interacting with a collectivist culture (if the Deaf community in Jordan is indeed shown to be one) within the larger collectivist culture of Jordan. This could create additional tension, stress, and division within the group.

The data suggests that at times Jana was fluctuating between paradigms searching for the right answer in her efforts to serve her consumers well. The data suggests some dominant ideas/approaches in Jana’s work as well as doubts about the appropriateness of using them. This aligns with previous research that people from collectivist cultures often do not feel confident in decisions made individually (Guess, 2004).

The Demand-Control Schema work of Dean and Pollard (2001; 2005; 2009; 2011) could be especially beneficial for interpreters in sharing possible solutions to issues experienced in the field and to foster professional rapport where interpreters can support one another and feel confident in decisions through seeking collaborative solutions. Demand-Control Schema case conferencing (Dean & Pollard, 2001; 2005; 2009; 2011) could also assist interpreters in recognizing the myriad of choices at their disposal instead of trying to find a single right answer for a given situation. This type of professional discussion appears to complement collectivist cultural norms and provides a place for professional community among interpreters who generally work in isolation. Receiving support from experienced practitioners through a framework such as Demand-Control Schema case conferencing could provide powerful validation for Jana and interpreters like her. Interpreters from the international community could also engage in such case conferencing with Jordanian interpreters in order for them to feel
“[welcomed] by their professional peers” and to provide diverse perspectives and ideas (Annarino & Hall, 2013, para. 13).

Jana’s explanation of including her own comments during an interpretation when appropriate may be a result of her collectivist culture. If interpreters view the Deaf and hearing consumers with whom they work as part of the in-group to which they belong they may be more likely to adopt a designated interpreter paradigmatic approach where they believe they are a part of the interaction and have license to participate as an equal member. Further research could examine the motivations behind taking such an approach and in what situations this is most common. Perhaps this is an interpreting paradigm already present in Jordan due to the collectivist culture. Interpreters in the US must be wary of presenting our own practices as if they are ‘the right answer’ and will automatically be suitable for Jordanian interpreters. Aspects of the interpreting paradigms discussed in the US may be applicable and appropriate for interpreters in Jordan and others may not. It would be ethnocentric for Western interpreters to assume that what is effective in the communities with which we work would therefore be effective in Jordan for the mainstream hearing and Deaf communities there. Ideally, Arabic/LIU interpreters and Deaf stakeholders will create their own paradigms that align with professional and cultural standards in their country and we in the West will be able to learn new ways to view the work from our Jordanian colleagues.

Jana’s stories depicted a shift in approach to the same interpreting situation after interaction with a colleague. At first, Jana described that her reaction to Deaf students not attending to her interpreting was to ask the hearing speaker to pause while she regained their attention (an action most closely aligning with the Helper Paradigm). After the interaction where a French interpreter advised her to interpret regardless of consumer attention Jana modified her
approach. She continued to interpret regardless of whether students attended to her or not. Jana continued with this approach when an instructor asked her to get the students’ attention. She then briefly explained her professional boundaries to the instructor and asked the instructor to drop the issue (an action that closely aligns with the Communication Facilitator Paradigm).

It is interesting to note that Jana followed the advice of a colleague despite the interaction being unpleasant. In fact, Jana followed the advice of a colleague when it directly opposed the request of a hearing consumer with whom she was working. This may demonstrate a respect for colleagues regarding professional matters that supersedes respect for hearing consumers acting as authority figures in a given setting. With both approaches Jana chose to prioritize her interpreting approach over the hearing presenter’s priority. When operating under an approach more closely resembling the Helper Paradigm she chose to stop the speaker and tell him\(^7\) when to proceed. When operating under an approach more closely resembling the Communication Facilitator Paradigm she chose to explain to the instructor why she would not acquiesce to his plea and requested that he stop telling her to get students’ attention. No mention was made in the data of Deaf consumers offering advice for approaching this situation.

Jana’s interaction with the French interpreter could also suggest that a lack of education regarding ethics in interpreting causes Jana to feel insecure in her professional decisions and that she is eager to be advised by colleagues with more experience, education, or training. Jana mentioned that she had desired a mentor in the field but none was available. This experience may also cause Jana to accept information from experienced interpreters over her own opinions, especially if they are presented in a black-and-white right-or-wrong dichotomy. Jana’s actions may also indicate that she values professional interpreters as an in-group to which she belongs.

\(^7\) The gender of this instructor was not specified in the data.
and she made this shift in her interpreting approach because she was “motivated by norms and duties imposed by the in-group” (Alkailani, Azzam, & Athamneh, 2012, p. 73).

A noteworthy amount of the data was coded into the Conduit Paradigm subcategory. This data suggested a deep desire of Jana’s to represent Deaf people accurately, and not censure or change what they have intended to communicate. Many of her actions appear similar to those seen in interpreters operating under a Helper Paradigm. However, Jana’s motivation does not seem to match the pathology “that Deaf people [are] somehow lacking” (Gish, 1990, p. 90). Jana emphasized throughout the data that Deaf people were capable of doing anything. It appears that the only area where she really believes that they need assistance is in communicating with hearing people who do not know LIU.

Jana’s response of “It depends…” when asked about her approach to interpreting likely resonates with ASL/English interpreter readers, to whom such a response is so common that it has become something of a professional inside joke. This brief comment alone indicates that Jana is aware that she must analyze a myriad of factors in any interpreted situation before making a decision about how to proceed, and that these decisions are not made lightly. From this statement, and others, interpreters in the international community can recognize a colleague who experiences the same issues and demands as interpreters throughout the globe. She is, however, experiencing these things with significantly less support and fewer resources than many of her international colleagues.

Jana stated that she believes there is a direct correlation between interpreters’ salary and the number of people willing to enter the field. She holds that if the compensation was increased so too would the amount of people who desire to become interpreters. At the same time, without
formal education or credentials, such as a university degree, it is difficult to prove the professionalism of a field—particularly if training has not been standardized.

Article 23 ii (a) of the Jordanian constitution states, “Every worker shall receive wages commensurate with the quantity and quality of his work” (1952). According to the United Nations Statistics Division (2013) the average per capita income for Jordanians in 2010 was 3,146.83 JOD. This equates to daily earnings of 12.11 JOD for a five-day workweek or 10.09 for a six-day workweek. Jana reported that interpreters working in a university setting are paid 7 JOD a day, well below this average. The International Labour Organization’s website lists the monthly minimum wage in Jordan for 2011 at 150 JOD (http://www.ilo.org/dyn/travail/travmain.sectionReport1?p_lang=en&p_countries=JO&p_sc_id=1&p_year=2011&p_structure=1, 2013, “Level,” para. 1). If interpreters work five days a week and are paid 7 JOD per day for a four-week month, they would earn only 140 JOD. If these statistics are correct this certainly does not satisfy the statute presented in Article 23 ii (a) of the constitution (1952).

The idea that interpreters’ work deserves little compensation is disheartening, but not new. It is not even a phenomenon unique to signed language interpreters. Currently, the UK is dealing with the ramifications of a decision to contract all court interpreters through a single low-paying interpreting agency to save money, a decision that has been costly and detrimental to their legal system (Fitchett, 2012). Administrators and officials responsible for determining the wages of interpreters likely misunderstand the work of interpreting and are not intentionally providing inappropriate wages. In such a situation research may need to be presented to these officials in order to provide them with a fuller understanding of the requirements of interpreting.
Education and training may also play a role in raising both the prestige and remuneration for interpreters. Jana explained that currently interpreters take very brief courses in LIU, but receive no education specifically for interpreting. She said that interpreters are trained on-the-job or possibly by a more experienced interpreter like herself. This training process does not provide any proof of competence or skill to outside professionals and can contribute to the myth that the only requirement to interpret is to be bilingual. As such, interpreters may struggle to be recognized as professionals or members of a practice profession (Dean & Pollard, 2005) in which interpreters must respond to a myriad of challenges and determine the best course of action at every moment and where there in no one way to approach the work. Their lack of interpreting education may also separate them from the international interpreting community in that they would be unfamiliar with the professional discourse of interpreting and therefore would struggle to participate in the larger professional dialogue. This kind of professional isolation could lead to the continuation of a vicious circle in which interpreters are not viewed as professionals and are therefore compensated poorly, and are therefore not viewed as professionals, etc.

An important contributing factor to acknowledging Arabic/LIU interpreters as professionals is the status of LIU. In her dissertation on The History of American Sign Language Interpreting Education Dr. Carolyn Ball explained that ASL/English interpreting education was only supported after ASL was proven to be a legitimate language (2007). She explained, “If a language had status then its interpreters also had greater status” (Ball, 2007, p. 20). Jana mentioned that opportunities to study LIU were lacking, and it was not available at the universities. She also described that Arabic/LIU interpreters receive less respect than spoken language interpreters in Jordan. This could be a result of general assumptions about LIU and a
lack of understanding of the languages’ validity. The perceived status of LIU could also influence the status of the Deaf community within Jordan.
Chapter 5: Summary and Recommendations

Summary

This study is a qualitative single case study with the aim of gathering data on an Arabic/LIU interpreter in Jordan and is intended as an initial step in researching interpreting in Jordan. The purpose of this study was to collect in-depth information from a participant in order to inform future studies on this topic and to initiate a scholarly conversation regarding Arabic/LIU interpreting by drawing attention to this population of the interpreting field. Since no research was available in Arabic/LIU interpreting this study focused on the reported experiences of the interpreter participant.

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Western Oregon University prior to commencing. Data was collected though a questionnaire, semi-structured interview, and research notes taken during the interview. Unfortunately, direct observation was not possible for this study. Data collected from the participant was analyzed and classified using an open coding approach followed by axial coding to refine the identified categories (Merriam, 2009). The data was classified into three overall categories with thirteen subcategories. A word count analysis was also conducted to provide the reader with an overview of the conversational space that the participant devoted to each theme. This information was presented in graphs and tables within the Findings section. The information regarding word counts was not intended to provide evidence of the importance of a topic, but to provide readers with an understanding of the data as a whole and of the data provided in each category. The participant’s responses are not included in full in this study due to identifying information that could pose additional risk to the participant. As stated previously this study was conducted by an American researcher and therefore is presented from an American perspective.
The data suggests that the participant’s experiences are similar in many ways to past and present experiences of interpreters working between signed and spoken languages internationally. The participant describes working with two communities in which a stark power differential is present, resulting in the oppression of one group (the Deaf community). She also describes the interpreter population as being primarily comprised of CODAs who are fluent in LIU but have not received advanced education or training specific to interpreting. The participant’s accounts of relationships between colleagues suggest evidence that competition may be present among Arabic/LIU interpreters in Jordan. The data also suggests that the lack of formalized interpreter education may impact interpreter confidence and professionalism as well as the way interpreters are viewed by mainstream society. The participant suggested that the low pay interpreters receive may also hinder people from entering the field.

**Recommendations**

Several steps could be taken in response to these findings. To address changes in professional standards at the systemic level I recommend that additional research focusing on the legitimacy of LIU and the culture of the Deaf community in Jordan be conducted and presented to the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities and possibly to universities within Jordan. It is only with such research regarding ASL that ASL/English interpreting began to gain legitimacy and recognition as a profession (Ball, 2007, p. 20). Some research regarding LIU has already been conducted (see Hendricks, 2008; Al-Fityani & Padden, 2010; Padden, 2010) but specific studies examining the legitimacy of LIU as a full and natural language may need to be presented. Also, societal views of Deafness may need to be studied and addressed in order to increase opportunities for Deaf people in Jordan and for Arabic/LIU interpreting to be viewed as a practice profession (Dean & Pollard, 2005) instead of a service profession.
Partnerships with the World Federation of the Deaf (WFD) and WASLI could also prove to be powerful agents of change at the systemic and administrative level in Jordan. One of WFD’s purposes is to assist countries in meeting the requirements of the UN CRPD (http://wfdeaf.org/, 2013). The fact that Jordan signed and ratified the CRPD and passed legislation to align with it demonstrates a desire to make changes (CRPD, 2007; Al-Majeed Al-Majali, & Faddoul, 2008). The fact that not all the necessary changes have been made several years later (Othman, 2010; Azzeh, 2012) may be due to confusion about how to bring these changes to fruition. The WFD could support the government and the Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities through that process.

In response to the data related to collegiality I recommend support from the international interpreting community to foster a feeling of belonging to a collective profession among Arabic/LIU interpreters. This could include dialogue with interpreters in Jordan, participation in Demand-Control Schema case conferencing (Dean & Pollard, 2001; 2005; 2009; 2011), provision of resources, and mentoring. An important distinction to make here is that I recommend the support of Arabic/LIU interpreters to assist them in creating their own professional culture, not recreating the professional culture of Western interpreters in Jordan. Such an approach would not serve interpreters or the Deaf community in Jordan. Furthermore, I suggest that Demand-Control Schema case conferencing (Dean & Pollard, 2001; 2005; 2009; 2011) for Arabic/LIU interpreters could serve to standardize interpreting methods and approaches, counter tension between colleagues, and foster a supportive professional community.

Concerning approaches to interpreting, an important voice is missing from the data here: that of Deaf stakeholders. Jana described not feeling confident in what she should do in certain
situations and expressed a desire for information on interpreting ethics from other interpreters. I recommend that in conjunction with resources from the international interpreting community that Arabic/LIU interpreters discuss these issues with Deaf stakeholders so that their perspectives and preferences can be recognized. The data does not address whether or not these discussions are already taking place. If they are already occurring, they should continue to be part of the professional dialogue so that Arabic/LIU interpreters are able to make informed decisions regarding their interpreting choices.

Regarding further research, I recommend that additional studies be conducted with larger populations of Arabic/LIU interpreters in order to substantiate what aspects of this data can be generalized to a larger group and what aspects may be unique to the participant. As previously mentioned, I recommend that research be conducted on the legitimacy of LIU as a language and on cultural aspects of the Deaf community in Jordan. Additionally, I recommend that a needs assessment be performed regarding Arabic/LIU interpreters in Jordan to verify and document the necessity for a greater number of qualified interpreters. This could also serve to increase the status of Arabic/LIU interpreters in Jordan and serve to demonstrate the need for interpreting education programs. Moreover, as Arabic/LIU interpreters in Jordan strive to move forward in the professionalization of their field it could be useful to research interpreting within collectivist cultures. Much of the research on interpreting between signed and spoken languages has been performed in individualist cultures and some of this information may not be applicable to interpreters in collectivist cultures. Ideally this research would be performed by or in collaboration with Jordanian researchers.

I am hopeful that the information presented in this study will serve to initiate scholarly dialogue about Arabic/LIU interpreting in Jordan. Additional research is needed to gain a fuller
understanding of Arabic/LIU interpreting. I look forward to watching the continued development of this nascent professional community and learning from my Jordanian colleagues as they determine the best practices for interpreters working with hearing and Deaf communities in Jordan.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Questionnaire Questions:

1. How long have you been signing?
2. How long have you been interpreting?
3. Please describe the training you received in signing and in interpreting.
4. What spoken and signed languages do you use?
5. What languages do you most frequently interpret between, and in which direction (e.g. LSF to French, Arabic to LIU, English to BSL, etc.)?
6. What is your job, title, and how do people perceive your job?
7. Describe the logistics of your work (scheduling, payment, skill assessment, etc.).
8. How many hours a week do you interpret?
9. Where and for whom do you interpret?
10. What do you think your culture and community in general think about interpreting between a signed and a spoken language?
11. Do you think that interpreters who work in a signed language and a spoken language have the same status as interpreters who work between two spoken languages?
12. What challenges do you face as an interpreter?
13. How do you associate with other interpreters?
14. Do you belong to an international professional organization (such as the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters), or an organization in your country?
15. What are the cultural attitudes towards Deaf people in your country?
16. What mentoring opportunities are available for interpreters in your country?
17. Are you involved in teaching or mentoring new interpreters in any way?

18. What, if anything, do you wish was different about your training?

19. How did you become an interpreter and is that experience common in your region?

20. What do you think about formal training for signed language interpreters, such as that offered through a university program?
Appendix B

Interview Questions:

1. Describe the community in which you work.
2. What training would you want to participate in if it were available to you now?
3. Describe the interaction you have with other interpreters.
4. What kind of feedback do you get from or give to other interpreters?
5. How do you talk about your work with colleagues?
6. Can you expand on that? (To be asked as necessary)
7. Describe the competition between interpreters who work between a signed language and a spoken language in your area?
8. What happens if a Deaf person and an interpreter do not understand each other or if an interpreter does not have the skills for a particular job?
9. Who can request another interpreter (the Deaf consumer, the hearing consumer, the interpreter? Does this ever happen?)?
10. Describe when you have experienced vicarious trauma where you are emotionally effected by a situation you interpreted. How do you process these feelings?
11. Have you ever participated in “Supervision?”
12. What professional support would you like to receive if it were available?
13. What do you think Deaf people think of interpreters in your community/country?
14. What do you think Deaf people want from interpreters in your community/country?
15. What is your perspective of interpreting between signed languages and spoken languages internationally and in your country?
16. What role, if any, does gender play in interpreting (for example: Do women interpret for men or must men interpret for men? What about situations where a woman and a man need an interpreter to communicate?)?

17. In the questionnaire you mentioned that it has been four years since the Higher Council for Affairs of Persons with Disabilities has paid attention to interpreters. How has interpreting changed in your country since that time?

18. I noticed in your questionnaire responses you mentioned, “helping Deaf people.” I am curious about this phrase because in America the Deaf community does not like to be viewed as needing “help.” Please explain what that means to “help Deaf people.” What is the attitude toward interpreters in Jordan and what is the normal relationship between a Deaf person and an interpreter?

19. In interpreting programs here students discuss different interpreting paradigms, some of which are the “helper,” “conduit,” “communication facilitator,” and “ally.” From what kinds of paradigms do interpreters in Jordan work?

20. Describe any cultural issues in your country that would influence the establishment of interpreter education programs in Jordan.

21. What else can you tell me about your experience interpreting between a signed and a spoken language in your country?
Appendix C

Email sent to potential participants:

Hello,
My name is Erin Trine and I am currently a student in the Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies program at Western Oregon University. For my thesis I am conducting a study on interpreting between signed and spoken languages in the Middle East and would like to know if you would be willing to participate. Participation would consist of answering a questionnaire online and allowing me to interview you regarding your interpreting experience. The interview can take place via a program such as Skype, over the phone, or via email. Your name and all identifying information will be kept confidential. If you would prefer to have an interpreter present for the interview that can be arranged. Please let me know if you have any questions you would like me to answer before you make your decision to participate in an interview. You can contact me via email at etrine@wou.edu or by phone at (phone number is not shown).
Thank you for your time,

Erin Trine

 هل انت بحاجة إلى مترجم؟
إذا كنت بحاجة إلى مترجم شفوي ، فسنتوفره لك مجانًا.

The Arabic jpeg image translates to: “Need an interpreter? If you need an interpreter one will be provided for you free of charge.” This jpeg was retrieved from:

http://www.hhs.state.tx.us/aboutHHS/NeedAnInterpreterLanguageTransPoster.pdf.
Appendix D

Consent form:

Consent for Participation in Interview Research

I volunteer to participate in a research project conducted by Erin Trine from Western Oregon University. I understand that the project is designed to gather information about interpreting between signed and spoken languages in the Middle East.

1. My participation in this project is voluntary. I understand that I will not be paid for my participation. I may withdraw and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

2. I understand that most interviewees will find the discussion interesting and thought-provoking. If, however, I feel uncomfortable in any way during the interview session, I have the right to decline to answer any question or to end the interview.

3. Participation involves being interviewed by Erin Trine from Western Oregon University. I will have an opportunity to share information not covered in the interview questions if desired. Notes will be written during the interview. An audio and/or video recording of the interview and subsequent dialogue will be made if applicable. If I do not want to be taped, the interviewer will agree not to record the interview. I understand that this may mean that my interview may not be included in the published study.

4. I understand that the researcher will not identify me by name in any reports using information obtained from this interview, and that my confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure.

5. I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Western Oregon University. For research problems or questions regarding subjects, the Institutional Review Board may be contacted at 1-503-838-9200 or irb@wou.edu.

6. I have read and understand the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

8. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

____________________________ ________________________
My Signature               Date

____________________________ ________________________
My Printed Name Signature of the Investigator

For additional information contact:

Erin Trine
(phone number not shown)
etrine@wou.edu

This form was adapted from the Occidental College Informed Consent Form For Adult Subjects retrieved from: http://www.oxy.edu/x8554.xml on February 8, 2012.