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ABSTRACT

The goal of this research is to begin a discussion in the ASL/English interpreting field about how personally held motivations and values impact the decision making process. From the decision to enter this field to the decisions an interpreter makes on a daily basis, values are central to understanding that process. The first step in this analysis was to collect data from current interpreters and interpreting students to see what motivational values are prioritized within professional communities. This data was collected through an online questionnaire made available through multiple social media websites that support various ASL/English interpreting communities. Through statistical analysis of the results of this questionnaire and the coding of one short answer question the following questions are addressed: What motivational values do ASL/English interpreters prioritize? How are these values expressed when interpreters are asked to articulate the reasons for pursuing a career in this field? Do participant’s demographic characteristics (e.g., native language(s), educational background, ethnic identity, and specialized work settings) relate with prioritization of motivational value types?

The results showed that the sample prioritized the motivational types of self-direction, benevolence, and universalism most highly. Some possible reasons for this value prioritization will be explored as well as sub-populations with the sample that diverged from this motivational value system.
The hope is that by examining the findings of this data, practicing interpreters and interpreting students can begin to explore their own individually held values and how conflicting and congruent values are expressed and assessed within their practice.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

My journey to this topic began with an interest in studying issues of social justice in the work of an ASL/English interpreter. I had noticed that some interpreters included an analysis of social system’s inequities within their work; others had no desire to pursue or discuss the topic and saw social issues as a topic irrelevant to their practice. I wanted to research reasons for these varied perceptions of an interpreter’s role and impact within these social issues. I had an instinctual feeling that it all began with each individual’s reasons for pursuing this type of work. This led me to the topic of motivational theories, which later led me to the topic of values. At that point, I knew values—and specifically motivational values—was the path I’d like to take for this research. It is my belief that an interpreter’s path into this field and reasons for pursuing this line of work has a profound impact on his or her daily practice. This research hopes to provide a framework for us to examine how motivational values may impact the decision making process of an ASL/English interpreter.

In the field of Signed Language Interpreting, values are discussed in various contexts such as values expressed in our formulation of codes of conduct (Cokely, 2000), interactions with consumers (Bienvenu, 1987), and decision making analysis (Dean & Pollard, 2013). These discussions about values are still too removed from the interpreter’s practice and decision making analysis. Organizations and groups tend to discuss shared program values, such as an academic department’s “statement of values,” but how often do we articulate our individually held values or those within a smaller professional
community (a group of interpreters employed within the same setting) and assess the way in which they impact our practice? The purpose of this research is that through the framework of Schwartz’s Motivational Value Theory (Schwartz, 1994, 2012; Schwartz et al., 2001) and the analysis of a data sample of 298 participants who are currently employed ASL/English interpreters and/or students in an interpreter education program, we can engage in a more in-depth discussion about some of the implications that values have in the decision making process of our practice.

This research will examine how values might relate to various aspects of the interpreting practice and the background of the individual practitioner. These aspects include the decision to become a signed language interpreter, the specialized settings an interpreter chooses to work in, language backgrounds, and ethnic identities. Examining the relationship values have with each of these characteristics can lead to a more meaningful discussion about which values are prioritized in various interpreting communities. This research employs the Schwartz (1994, 2012; Schwartz et al., 2001) Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) to provide quantitative data to examine these value types and trends within our field.

One of the first decisions an interpreter has to make is to pursue this field as his or her occupation. Collecting data about the values within a sample of interpreters and interpreting students who have already made the decision to pursue this line of work provided the opportunity to explore possible relationships between specific values and the choice to pursue interpreting as an occupation. This data led to an examination of the relationship between values and longevity in the field of ASL/English Interpreting.
Participants were asked to explain their reasons for pursuing this occupation, with the goal of assessing responses for values expressed within the responses.

The data presented in this research is descriptive. The primary limitation is that it is meant to provide merely a foundation for further research into the topic of motivational values in the field. Further research will be needed to more fully examine the relationship between these motivational values and the decision making process in an interpreter’s practice.

**Research Questions**

What motivational values do ASL/English interpreters prioritize? How are these values expressed when interpreters are asked to articulate the reasons for pursuing a career in this field? Do participant’s demographic characteristics (e.g., native language(s), educational background, ethnic identity, and specialized work settings) relate with prioritization of motivational value types?
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The definition of values varies from researcher to researcher. It is generally accepted that human values have five components:

A value is (1) belief (2) pertaining to desirable end states or modes of conduct, that (3) transcends specific situations, (4) guides selection or evaluation of behavior, people, and events, and (5) is ordered by importance relative to other values to form a system of value priorities. (Schwartz, 1994, p. 20)

This research will utilize an instrument and model that is based on a more specific definition that will be described within this review of literature.

Why Values?

Values have been a point of discussion and debate for centuries, usually around the topics of ethics and morality. A scientific approach to the study of values, axiology, emerged in the 1960s (Hart, 1971). The topic of values has been widely researched across many disciplines because it is a complex concept that includes a dynamic interplay of many socio-cultural and psychological factors. As Cheng and Fleischmann stated,

Literature from psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, and political science has suggested that values may underlie and explain a variety of individual and organizational behaviors. In the field of psychology, values have been found to be related to personality types (Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960). In sociology, values have been thought to be useful for describing society’s collective consciousness (Durkheim, 1960). In organizational behavior, values
influence corporate decisions on strategy (England, 1967) and organizational commitment (Ponser & Schmidt, 1993). In political science, values serve as significant predictors of attitudes toward governmental policies, political parties, and institutions (Schwartz, 2007). (Cheng & Fleischmann, 2010, p. 2)

Currently, there is little to no research exploring values expressed and prioritized within various ASL/English interpreting communities. If values are such a central part of an individual’s psychology and behaviors, then researching how they are expressed and prioritized could provide insight into the interpreter’s process.

Numerous research studies supported the idea that values are at the core of the decision making processes, whether one is consciously aware of how and when these values are acquired and then expressed in action or not (Cheng & Fleischmann, 2010; Dean & Pollard, 2013; Rokeach 1970, 1979; Schwartz 1994, 2012). According to Rokeach,

Values serve as critical for selection in action. When most explicit and fully conceptualized, values become criteria for judgment, preference, and choice. When implicit and unreflective, values nevertheless perform “as if” they constituted grounds for decisions in behavior. Individuals do prefer some things to others; they do select one course of action rather than another out of a range of possibilities; they do judge their own conduct and that of other persons. (Rokeach, 1979, p. 16)

The goal of this research is to make the values within the field of ASL/English interpreting more explicit and more fully conceptualized, leading to a deeper level of reflective practice, which can come in the way of journaling, debriefing, case
conferencing, group supervision, and other possible methods employed for analysis of the interpreter’s decision making process. This research can lead to a greater awareness of some of the values that are most highly prioritized within various interpreter communities.

**Values and Occupational Choice**

Although each researcher defines values differently, research supports a significant relationship between values, occupational choice, and occupational satisfaction (Ben-Shem & Avi-Itzhak, 1991; Brown, 2002; Wat & Richardson, 2007). According to Brown (2002), “Cultural and work values are the primary variable that influence the occupational choice-making process, the occupation chosen, and the resulting satisfaction with and success in the occupation chosen” (p. 49). The field of ASL/English interpreting has yet to explore which values might correlate with occupational choice and satisfaction.

For many interpreters, occupational choice is often decided during a person’s college career. According to the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Center’s website, there are approximately 140 Interpreter Education Programs in the United States, 44 of which are Bachelor’s degree programs, the remaining of which are mostly Associate’s degree programs (National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers, n.d.). Currently the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) provides the only national certification in ASL/English Interpreting and requires a Bachelor’s degree to sit for the National Interpreter Certification (NIC) performance exam (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2015a). The number of interpreter training programs housed in academic settings, as well as the growing need for national certification to work in many
professional settings, implies that many interpreters chose this profession at some point during their educational career.

Values have also been shown to have a significant effect on a student’s course of study (Wat & Richardson, 2007). Previous research has demonstrated a correlation between values and the choice to pursue a career within in a “helping profession” (Ben-Shem & Avi-Itzhak, 1991), such as teaching, as well as the long-term satisfaction within that field (Wat & Richardson, 2007). This research will provide data to examine any similar relationship between the choice to pursue interpreting (also considered a helping profession), longevity in the field, and personally held values. In addition demographic information will be collected about participant’s educational background to examine any possible correlations between education levels, and Interpreter Education Program completion to explore these possible correlations.

**Professional Values**

One purpose of this research is to examine prioritization of motivational values within a sample of professional ASL/English interpreters and students in an interpreter education program. This will allow for examination of the interplay between the individual value systems and the prioritization of values within the entire sample. A value system is defined as “the ordering and prioritization of ethical and ideological values that an individual or society holds” (Macedo, Sapateiro, & Filipe, 2006, p. 112). Rokeach (1970) described it this way: “A person’s value system may thus be said to represent learned organization of rules for making choices and for resolving conflicts – between two or more modes of behavior or between two or more end-states of existence” (p. 161). The discussion of this research touched on how the values of interpreter’s national...
organization, Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf (RID), may conflict or support the values prioritized and expressed by the individual interpreter, as well as how various populations of ASL/English interpreters may have conflicting value systems. These conflicts are part of the human experience, but the literature has not yet examined how conflicting values are assessed and resolved within the practice of ASL/English interpreting.

Dean and Pollard’s (2013) Demand Control Schema is a framework for exploring ethical decision making in the profession. Dean and Pollard (2013) recognized that values do play a role in an interpreter’s decision making process: “Regardless of whether one’s approach is deontological or teleological, ethical diligence requires the inclusion of values as part of any sound decision making process” (p. 89). In the practice of interpreting, the interpreter constantly has to weigh various options in the many decisions being made during an interpreted interaction, usually with very little time to process that decision. Demand Control Schema is a framework for analyzing the decision making process. Within this framework, demands are defined as “a factor that rises to the level of significance that will, or should impact the decision making” (p. 4). Controls are defined as possible responses to a set of demands (p. 15). The demands an interpreter identifies as most stressful and the control options an interpreter is willing to employ can be articulated in terms of which values he/she is choosing to prioritize. Dean and Pollard further suggested that “gaining insight into how one manifests and juggles competing professional values on the job is something that many practice professions consider a central element to practicing ethically” (p. 132).
An example of this may be an interpreter who employs the control option of providing explications within a lecture course, because he or she is prioritizing the values associated with helping and supporting that student’s success and comprehension with course content and feels that taking the time to explicate on concepts will aid the student in comprehension of that material. In contrast, another interpreter may value the consumer’s autonomy and independence above supporting successful comprehension of course material and might only employ the previous control option if the Deaf consumer communicates a need or request for the explication. This is just one example of how an ethical decision can be articulated as prioritization of competing professional values within that setting. In other words, “the many potential values that interpreters manifest through their day-to-day practice decisions is an area that needs more research and scholarship because it is apparent that interpreter practice reveals more than values related to the conduit role” (Dean & Pollard, 2013, p. 92).

The relationship between ethical decision making and values has been studied with the fields of counseling, accounting, and business management (Ametrano, 2014; Glover, Bumpus, Logan, & Ciesla, 1997; Karacaer, Gohar, Aygun, & Sayin, 2009). Ametrano’s (2014) work emphasized the need for counselor educators to explore how a student’s personal values shape their interpretation of their professional code of ethics. Ametrano used work samples for a class assignment to show how student’s identifications of ethical dilemmas were shaped by that student’s values. Karacaer et al. (2009) showed a statistically significant correlation between an auditor’s ethical decision making process and values using Rokeach’s value theory: “three of Rokeach’s terminal values (a comfortable life, pleasure, and self-respect) were significantly correlated with
manager’s propensity to fraudulently misstate their company’s financial statements” (p. 55). Glover et al. (1997) examined the relationship between ethical decision making and the values of achievement, fairness, and concern for others, including demographic information in their analysis. Their research did show that gender, years of experience, and the value of achievement correlated with a higher chance of making more ethical decisions.

From this research one can conclude that values have an effect on the choice to become an interpreter, a person’s general behavior, and the ethical decision making process. It also seems clear that research about value prioritization within the field of signed language interpreting is needed to push the discussion forward from an abstract and philosophical concept to one that has true application in the professional practice of ASL/English interpreters. Expanding the research on the topic of values and occupational fit within the field of interpreting would be of great benefit to the profession. This data will lead to a better understanding of the professional community and a more productive analysis of how an interpreter’s values impact practice. This research can serve as a foundation for exploring this topic in our field. This may also lead to a better understanding of which values might correlate with the longevity and satisfaction for interpreting as a career choice.

**Schwartz Value Theory**

Understanding the topic of values requires examining the interplay between societal/cultural values and the individual. Schwartz (1994) defined values as “desirable transsitutional [sic] goals, varying in importance, that serve as a guiding principle in the life of a person or other social entity” (p. 21). His definition includes both the individual's
goals and how that person relates those goals to the society and cultures in which he or she lives. Each of the 10 motivational value types (which will be marked with italics) within his model balance that dynamic process of self-and-society differently. For example, someone who scores high in the value type of *conformity*, prioritizes the ability to adapt and adhere to group norms; Alternatively, someone who scores highly in *self-direction* places more value on the ability to think and function independently from the group (Schwartz, 1994).

There are many studies and inventories related to values. Cheng and Fleischmann’s (2010) meta-inventory of values compares 12 values inventories that had been thoroughly researched and tested for reliability. One of the theories and inventories discussed was Schwartz’s Motivational Values Theory and an inventory based on that theory, the Schwartz Values Survey (SVS). As shown in Table 1, Schwartz’s model was developed to show relationships between a list of Rokeach’s 36 essential values, which are categorized into 10 value types (Cheng & Fleischmann, 2010; Schwartz, 1994, 2012).

To understand this research and survey results requires an understanding of Schwartz’s Motivational Value Theory as well as the development of the test instrument employed in this study, the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ). Schwartz based much of his theory on the work of Rokeach (1973). Schwartz grouped Rokeach’s 36 essential values into 10 motivational value types: *power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity* and *security* (Schwartz, 1994, p. 22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Items That Represent &amp; Measure Them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Social status and prestige, control and dominance over people</td>
<td>Social power, authority, wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards</td>
<td>Successful, capable, ambitious, influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself</td>
<td>Pleasure, enjoying life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life</td>
<td>Daring, a varied life, an exciting life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>Independent thought and action-choosing, creating exploring</td>
<td>Creativity, freedom, independent, curious, choosing own goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection of the welfare of all people and of nature</td>
<td>Broadminded, wisdom, social justice, equality, a world at peace, a world of beauty, unity with nature, protecting the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact</td>
<td>Helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture and religion provide the self</td>
<td>Humble, accepting my portion in life, devout, respect for tradition, moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses or norms</td>
<td>Politeness, obedient, self-discipline, honoring parents and elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Safety, harmony and stability of society, of relationships and of self</td>
<td>Family security, national security, social order, clean, reciprocation of favors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208)
Schwartz wanted to develop a model that not only grouped values into types but also showed the dynamic relationship between values and how values compete or complement each other within an individual’s experience. Through development of his initial inventory, the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS), he developed a circular model to show this motivational continuum, which was divided into the 10 motivational value types (see Figure 1; Schwartz, 1994, p. 21). Using Smallest Space Analysis (SSA), he developed a two-dimensional model to show relationships between all the values measured in this inventory, concluding that “circular arrangement of the values represents a motivational continuum. The closer any 2 values in either direction around the circle, the more similar their underlying motivations, and the more distant any 2 values, the more antagonistic their underlying motivations” (Schwartz et al., 2001, pp. 521-522).

Conformity and tradition share a portion of the circular model, because they share the motivational value of “subordination of self in favor of socially imposed expectations” (Schwartz, 1994, p. 24).

His model also divides the 10 value types into four categories of “higher order values”: Openness To Change (Self-direction, stimulation, hedonism), Self-Transcendence (universalism, benevolence), Conservation (conformity, tradition, security), Self-Enhancement (power, achievement, hedonism). So each value type and higher order value falls within this circular continuum: “Although the theory discriminates among value types, it postulates that, at a more basic level, values form a continuum of related motivations” (Schwartz, 1994, p. 24).

The four “higher order values” are composed of two opposing dimensions (see Figure 1). The first dimension is Openness to Change (self-direction and stimulation)
versus Conservation (security, conformity and tradition): “This dimension opposes values emphasizing own independent thought and action and favoring change (self-direction and stimulation) to those emphasizing submissive self-restriction, preservation of traditional practices and protection of stability (security, conformity, and tradition)” (Schwartz, 1994, p. 25). The second dimension is Self-Enhancement versus Self-Transcendence: “This dimension opposes values emphasizing acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare (universalism and benevolence) to those emphasizing the pursuit of one’s own relative success and dominance over others (power and achievement)” (Schwartz, 1994, p. 25). *Hedonism* shares motivational values with both higher order values of Openness to Change and Self-Enhancement, which is why it has a dotted line outlining the value type.
One application of Schwartz’s framework especially relevant to the work of ASL/English interpreters is the “application to intergroup relations” (Schwartz, 1994, p. 40). In this section, Schwartz discusses the application of Rokeach’s work toward the study of how value types correlate to an individual’s preparation to interact with someone from another cultural group, the “out-group,” which may involve working with people with differing values from your own. Rokeach’s research (as cited in Schwartz 1994) seems to show Self-Transcendence” types should correlate positively with readiness for “out-group contact” (p. 41). This theory would also imply that Conservation value types would correlate negatively to readiness for out-group contact.
Some interpreters will consider American Deaf culture as their own and therefore not approach it as a member of the out-group. Interpreters who identify with American Deaf culture are typically Children of Deaf Adults (CODAs) who grew up with a signed language as their first language (L1) and who identify strongly with American Deaf culture. Williamson (2015) discussed the lack of data on interpreters who have Deaf parents, noting that the Registry of Interpreters from the Deaf does not collect this information (p. 6), neither do they collect data on their members’ L1 or native language(s). However, there was a needs assessment conducted by the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Center that did include this demographic data: “Of the 1,878 total respondents, 208 (11%) identified as having at least one deaf parent (NCIEC, 2014)” (Williamson, 2015, p. 6). This leads to the conclusion that most practitioners in the field of ASL/English interpreting are non-native, with ASL as their second language, (L2). Therefore, for most interpreters, learning American Sign Language involves contact with a cultural group different than their own, American Deaf culture. The entry-to-practice competencies for ASL/English interpreters state this goal: “Recognize and respect cultural differences among individuals by demonstrating appropriate behavioral and communicative strategies both while conversing and while interpreting” (DOIT Center, n.d., p. 4).

The interpreting community will benefit from an increased understanding of where the field falls on this continuum of motivational values, assessed through the application of Schwartz’s model and inventory on a large sample of interpreters. If an individual prioritizes value types that fall within the Conservation higher order, how does that impact the ability to work with cultural groups that are different than his or her
own? While this research will not directly answer this question, the hope is that it will lead to a discussion about this topic and eventually further research to explore this possible correlation more.

**Pan-cultural Baseline of Values Priorities**

Schwartz (2012) noted that throughout many years of administering various instruments to evaluate value systems throughout various parts of the world, there was a recurring structure in the prioritization of almost every sample collected. He found that across samples “benevolence, universalism and self-direction values were ranked as most important” (p. 14) and “power and stimulation values were ranked as least important” (p. 14). Table 2 shows the typical ranking of data samples collected across societies. The results from this research will explore the extent to which a sample of ASL/English interpreters and students diverge from or adhere to this trend.

Table 2

*Pan-Cultural Baseline Ranking of Value Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Value Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Universalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Schwartz, 2012, pp. 15-16)

The data collected will not only provide the opportunity to see the motivational value system of the entire sample, but to look at how those systems may vary within various sub-populations in the sample.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to utilize Schwartz’s (1994) motivational values theory and model to examine how these 10 motivational value types are prioritized among a sample of working ASL/English interpreters and interpreting students. This data will be used to examine some of the implications these values have on the field of ASL/English interpreting. The following questions will be addressed: Which value types are more highly prioritized than others? Do some value types show a relationship with the setting that an interpreter most often works? Do some value types show a relationship with an interpreter’s social, linguistic and educational background? Are these value types expressed when participants are asked for their motivations for entering the field?

Participants

The only criteria for participation in the online questionnaire was that participants be a currently employed ASL/English interpreter and/or a student in an interpreter education program and be at least 18 years of age (see Appendix A). This criterion was explained in the consent form at the start of the survey, and the first response within the survey inquired about years of interpreter experience or student status. If a respondent did not respond as either having interpreting experience or being a student they were exited from the survey. Links to the survey were distributed through various email lists and through Facebook groups that were specific to interpreting (RID, Discover Interpreting, Interpreters and Translators of Color, various local chapters of RID).
Risk and benefits were clearly described within the consent form at the start of the survey (see Appendix A). Minimal risk was involved because no identifiable information was collected and respondents could choose to discontinue their participation at any point within the survey without penalty. If respondents felt uncomfortable with any of the questions, they had the option to close the browser and the previous responses would be removed from this research. All together there were a total of 366 responses; after eliminating incomplete surveys from the data 298 surveys were collected. Some respondents skipped one or two questions, but if they continued to the end of the survey after that point their completed responses were used in this research. Therefore, the total number of responses is slightly less than 298 for some demographic and open-ended questions. The benefits to participating in this survey were to contribute to the body of research within the ASL/English interpreting field and for participants to have the opportunity to reflect upon their own personal motivational values.

Data Collection

Data was collected entirely through an online questionnaire, which was administered through the principal investigator’s Survey Monkey account. Respondents completed these surveys from various locations through their own internet connections. All data was stored through a password-protected Survey Monkey account that only the principal investigator could access.

The survey was first made available to collect responses on May 26, 2015. On that day, it was posted on several Facebook interpreting group pages and personal Facebook pages of colleagues of the principal investigator. The survey remained open to collect responses until June 19, 2015. All responses were saved within the Survey...
Monkey account that was only accessible to the principal investigator. Several email blasts were sent out during that time. Most responses seemed to originate from two posts through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID), which has a total of 24,151 followers (https://www.facebook.com/RIDInc?fref=ts, as of August 25, 2015) on Facebook. All data was saved exclusively on Survey Monkey until the survey closed, at which time it was transferred to the personal laptop of the principal investigator for data analysis.

All questions were developed by the principal investigator with the goal of examining possible relationships between specific demographics and motivational value types. All but one of the demographic questions were multiple choice to aid the numerical analysis of the results. Most questions did have an “other” option, where the participant could self-identify ethnic identity, hearing status, gender identity, and so on. Categories for responses were developed with the goal of being as inclusive as possible of the diverse identities within the profession, with an understanding that including all of them would be impossible. The one demographic question that was open-ended asked respondents to identify his or her native language(s). The principal investigator opted to make this an open-ended question because this is a survey of a field composed of professionals and students that are fluent in a minimum of two languages, many of whom grew up using more than one language in their homes.

With the permission of the author, Dr. Schwartz, the primary investigator obtained access to the PVQ female and male inventory, which was then converted into a format that was administered through Survey Monkey. All the language of the original inventories was maintained with the exception of a gender-neutral version. Realizing that
not all people identify within a gender binary of male or female, the principal investigator obtained permission from Dr. Schwartz to develop a gender-neutral version (personal communication, March 24, 2015). The language of the inventory was changed so all gender pronouns (he/she, him/her) were changed to say “this person.” Dr. Schwartz approved these changes and requested that the gender-neutral version only be offered as a choice to those who expressed the need for an alternative option (personal communication, March 24, 2015). Therefore, the gender-neutral version of the PVQ was only offered to those participants who responded as neither “male” nor “female” on the question about gender identity (Appendix A). Those participants (altogether there were four) were then asked to choose which version they would feel most comfortable taking and all four chose the gender-neutral version of the inventory.

Data Analysis

The first step in data analysis was to remove incomplete survey responses from the collective data. The final part of the questionnaire was the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ); any incomplete responses for that portion were deleted from the records. The responses for the PVQ were assessed in a method instructed by the inventory’s author, Dr. Schwartz (personal communication, February 11, 2015). This involved centering all the values for the inventory. Schwartz (2012) instructed: “To measure value priorities accurately, we must eliminate individual difference in use of the response scales. This was calculated by subtracting each person’s mean response to all the value items from his or her response to each item” (p. 12). When looking at the data from the PVQ, numbers range from positive two to negative two, even though it was a Likert scale with corresponding number responses of zero to four (see Appendix A). Zero
was the numerical value assigned for responses that marked “not at all like me” and four was the numerical value for responses marked “very much like me.” Therefore numerical values in this research show how far the response was from that individual’s overall mean for the inventory. For example; if an individual’s responses were: 1, 3, 4, 2, 2, 3, 4, 0, 4, the mean of all those responses would be 2.55. Then each response would be the initial value subtracted by that mean: -1.55, .45, 1.45, -.45 and so on. After all of the PVQ responses were centered, the mean for each of the 10 value types was calculated for each respondent. Those means for each value type were then compared to identify each respondent’s top value type, the value type most highly prioritized.

Each demographic question was then analyzed to compare value types within that specific demographic. This was done by taking the mean for each value type of each respondent and then comparing means across demographic sub-groups. This process was repeated for each item from the questionnaire and each sub-group within that item. Not all comparisons showed a possible relationship with value types and were therefore not included in the findings of this research paper.

There was one open-ended question for qualitative analysis: “Please briefly describe your reasons for pursuing a career in interpreting.” The principal investigator coded the responses to this question with a corresponding value type from Schwartz’s motivational value model, as shown in Table 1 (See Appendix B for responses and codes). Grounded theory was employed for the analysis of this data (Gay, Mills, & Airisian, 2005). The question was designed to assess values being expressed in participant’s responses. Axial or analytical coding was employed to compare responses to the description of each value type (Merriam, 2009). The principal investigator examined
utterances within a response and interpreted which set of values most closely matched the values that respondent was expressing. Values expressed in this response were then compared to the values types that were ranked highest in participant’s PVQ results. 

Responses to the open-ended question ranged from two words to several sentences; utterances were then matched with one of the 10 value types. As with most qualitative analysis, this process depended entirely on the interpretation of the researcher. The coded value types for the responses were then compared with each respondent’s top value type to calculate how many value types expressed in the open ended response matched that respondent’s top value type from the PVQ. These codes were also compared with respondent’s demographic information to identify any other possible relationships.

Portrait Values Questionnaire

There were many factors that went into the choice to use the PVQ for this research. Bardi and Schwartz (2003) developed a study using Schwartz's Value Theory to measure the correlation between value types (a set of values that often overlap and align within an individual’s experience) and specific behaviors. To do this they developed a behavior item for each of the values associated with each motivational value type. While there are limitations to their methodology (relying exclusively on self-reports of behavior and observations from peers and romantic partners) they do conclude that there is a statistically strong correlation between most of the ten value types and the identified behavior items. We can conclude that values do impact behavior. Therefore collecting this data about value types can lead to a discussion about ways in which these values may influence the interpreter’s behaviors in a professional setting, and their impact on the interpreted interaction.
Schwartz has implemented various values inventories in many countries around the world to support his theory’s reliability (Brandi & Schwartz, 2003; Cheng & Fleischmann, 2012; Schwartz, 1994, 2012; Schwartz et al., 2001). Initially Schwartz developed the Schwartz Values Survey (SVS), and later he developed the Portrait Values Inventory (PVQ) (Schwartz et al., 2001). This is a shorter inventory than the SVS and questions are phrased in a way that eliminates abstract thought required for responding to the SVS. Schwartz et al. (2001) explored the use of the PVQ and supported its validity in populations of varying nationalities. The results from the PVQ were compared to the SVS and showed that the PVQ is a reliable instrument for measuring value types (Schwartz et al., 2001). The PVQ asks respondents to read a description of another person and judge how similar they are to that person/portrait; it is designed to be more accessible to people with less practice at abstract thought, which is required for responding to the SVS (Schwartz et al., 2001). The PVQ was chosen for this research because it is easier to administer online and to a broader audience.

Another appeal is that the PVQ assesses value types without explicitly mentioning values. Some people do find the idea of values frightening because it can incite judgment, and as Rokeach (1979) mentioned, “We must never lose sight of the fact that values are continually used as weapons in social struggles” (p. 26). This means that some participants may be more open to answer each item truthfully instead of worrying about how their responses may be perceived by their interpreting colleagues.

Limitations

There are limitations related to underrepresentation within certain demographics in this data, although the proportions of ethnic and gender identities do parallel that of
Another limitation is the number of completed responses, 298. A response rate is difficult to calculate because the survey was posted at several social media websites and it is impossible to know how many of any particular social media site’s “followers” view any particular post within a set timeframe. However, 298 is roughly 1.2% of those following RID’s Facebook page as of August 2015 (https://www.facebook.com/RIDInc?fref=ts). This research can only address those included in this sample and may not reflect the values across the entire field of ASL/English interpreting. Another limitation is that the principal investigator designed a short survey in hopes that more responses would be possible because it would require less of time from participants, in keeping with the goal of casting a wide net and collecting as many responses as possible to have data that may be more generalizable to the entire population of ASL/English interpreters. This meant that demographic questions were limited to those the principal investigator hypothesized would show a relationship with values, but clearly some of these demographics did not show a strong relationship with the value types being assessed.

There are also limitations with the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) itself. It is an inventory composed of 40 items designed to quickly evaluate the 10 value types within the Schwartz Motivational Values Theory (Schwartz et al., 2001). Some respondents expressed difficulty responding to the questions because they recognized that multiple values were being addressed with in one item. Therefore, results do not isolate Rokeach’s 36 essential values prioritization of the participants but rather show their average responses to each item that corresponds with one of the 10 value types.
The principal investigator for this study conducted a pilot of the PVQ on a group of Interpreter Education Program (IEP) students to see which value types emerged as more highly prioritized and to explore how these students would engage with topic and results. Ideally there would be a way to administer the survey to a large population and also provide them all with their results, so they could benefit from an increased understanding of their value system. Access to the software and technology to be able to calculate responses and provide those to a large number of respondents was not practical within the scope of this project.

The reasons the PVQ was chosen was largely due to the extensive testing reliability and validity it has undergone (Cheng & Fleischmann, 2010), across multiple cultural groups and geographic regions. It was initially developed as a way to measure and compare value types across cultures. The responses have shown a strong statistically correlation with the Schwartz Motivational Value Theory (Schwartz et al., 2001). The strength of this methodology is that it applied a widely accepted instrument that can reliably measure value types within a sample of ASL/English interpreters. This data will provide a way to talk more concretely about the abstract and theoretical concept of values. While it is widely accepted that values have a significant impact on ethical reasoning, decision making, career choice, and behavior, there has yet to be a quantitative way to measure values within the ASL/English interpreting community. This research provides an example of how this framework could be more widely used within the field to evaluate and discuss how values impact an interpreter’s practice.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

One of the goals of this research is to assess the prevalent value types within a sample of ASL/English interpreters. Before deciding on using the PVQ for this research the principal investigator did pilot the inventory to a group of IEP students. Within that group, benevolence had a strong majority for the top value type. As shown in Table 3 this sample of 298 interpreters and interpreting students, benevolence did not rank as the top value type, but it was very close second, with a centered mean score that was .02181 below the top ranked value type of self-direction. As shown in Figure 3, these self-direction, benevolence, and universalism are adjacent to each other on the Schwartz Motivational Values Model allowing for more congruency, and less chance of conflicting or competing motivations. Self-direction is categorized within the Openness to Change higher order, and benevolence and universalism compose the Self-Transcendence higher order. The overall mean scores for these three values types were prioritized higher than the rest of the value types in almost every grouping based on the demographic questions. There were a few exceptions to this trend, which will be more closely examined throughout this section of the paper.

Security was ranked fourth and positively rated, but lower than universalism. This rating may be due to the fact that according to the Schwartz Motivational Values Theory, security values do conflict with all three of the top ranked value types in this sample. The security value type falls within the Conservation higher order on Schwartz’s Motivational Value Model. This would imply that many of the interpreters sampled do try to uphold
these values but do not prioritize them above *self-direction, benevolence* and *universalism*. So, while having a sense of security, stability and reciprocity in their lives may be valued these will not supersede the desire to uphold the values of creativity, freedom and independence, associated with *self-direction*.

Table 3

*Overall Ranking of Value Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Centered Mean</th>
<th>Value Type</th>
<th>Definition*</th>
<th>Items that represent and measure them*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.123</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>Self-Directi</td>
<td>Independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring</td>
<td>Creativity, freedom, independent, curious, choosing own goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.949</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact</td>
<td>Helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.673</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection of the welfare of all people and of nature</td>
<td>Broadminded, wisdom, social justice, equality, a world at peace, a world of beauty, unity with nature, protecting the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Safety, harmony and stability of society, of relationships, and of self</td>
<td>Family security, national security, social order, clean reciprocation of favors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.147</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms</td>
<td>Politeness, obedient, self-discipline, honoring parents and elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.052</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself</td>
<td>Pleasure, enjoying life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.771</td>
<td>-0.347</td>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Excitement, novelty and challenge in life</td>
<td>Daring, a varied life, an exciting life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>-0.555</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Personal Success through demonstrating competence according to social standards</td>
<td>Successful, capable, ambitious, influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.566</td>
<td>-0.587</td>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self</td>
<td>Humble, accepting my portion in life, devout, respect for tradition, moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.243</td>
<td>-1.313</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources</td>
<td>Social power, authority, wealth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*“definition” and “items that represent and measure them” are taken directly from Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208)
Overall Ranking of Value Types

Figure 2 shows the centered means for each value type in rank order. While there is a slow but steady decrease with the remaining value types of conformity, hedonism, stimulation, achievement, and tradition. There is a steep decrease of -0.725 between the ninth and tenth (lowest) ranked value type of power. This data would suggest that this sample had strong negative reactions to the items in the questionnaire that corresponded to the power, implying that most of those sampled do not prioritize the value associated with power: social power, authority and wealth. Within the sample of 298 respondents only one reported power as a top value type, and that respondent had three values types equally ranked as the top value type with self-direction and conformity.

The lowest mean score for any item on the PVQ inventory was question number two which stated (from the female version): “It is important to her to be rich. She wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.” The mean centered score for this item was -1.95403, and this question does correspond with power. The highest mean score for an item on the PVQ was number three, which states (in the male version): “He thinks it is
important that every person in the world be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.” This item had a centered mean score of 1.274161 and corresponds with universalism.

All of the items on the PVQ related to universalism were very highly rated with the exception of item 40, which states (in the gender neutral version): “It is important to this person to adapt to nature and to fit into it. This person believes that people should not change nature.” Therefore if this item had not been included on the PVQ, universalism would have been ranked second, above benevolence but below self-direction. These data suggest that if the values associated with nature were separated from the values of equality and social justice then the universalism would have been ranked higher within the sample. In fact, Schwartz’s most recently developed inventory does distinguish between values of equality and natural environment (Schwartz et al., 2012, p. 669).

Comparing these results with the baseline Schwartz (2012) provided for samples collected worldwide (see Table 4), this sample does differ in several ways. In the baseline sample self-direction is ranked third, which is a probably the most substantial difference. The second major difference is that stimulation is ranked seventh within this sample but ranked ninth in the baseline.
Table 4

*Pan-Cultural Baseline and Sample Ranking of Value Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Baseline Value Type</th>
<th>Interpreter Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>Universalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 shows how the sample prioritized each of the 10 value types on the Schwartz’s motivational continuum. Each rank is included within the portion of the model that occupies that value type. Figure 3 also shows that the higher order type of Self-Transcendence is highly prioritized within the sample. *Self-direction* is the only value type within the higher order of Openness to Change that is ranked within the top five, but it is ranked number one. This would imply that as a whole, the sample group upholds values that support the needs of the group but will also feel a strong sense of conflict when the group needs conflict with the need to be independent, creative and free.
Demographics

The responses to demographic questions are included in the results. It is important to understanding the demographic composition of the group and the cultural perspectives that most heavily influenced this data.

![Figure 3. Ranking of Value Types on Schwartz Model](image)

![Figure 4. Participant Gender Identity](image)
Figures 4-10 show the demographics of the respondents. According to the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) membership survey (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2014), these numbers do closely reflect the overall demographics of the field of ASL/English Interpreting in the United States. RID’s annual report from 2014 reported 87.3% women (this survey had 88%) and 87.71% as Euro/Caucasian (p. 58), this survey had 89% identifying as White/Caucasian (see Figure 4).

**Geographic Regions**

The geographic regions represented in Figure 5 follow the regional boundaries as determined by the United States Census Bureau (U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, n.d.). The western region was dominant. This is may be due to the fact that the principal investigator lives in this region and therefore had more connections to various interpreters and interpreter organizations that served this region. There may have been lower reporting from other regions due to the time differences. Most Facebook page posts were done in the afternoon during Pacific Standard Time, which would have been in the later evening for most people that live in the eastern section of the United States.

*Figure 5. Participant Geographic Residence*
Figure 6. Participant Age

Figure 6 shows distribution of respondents’ age groups. The age group of 26-35 years was the most represented at 36%, with 23% of respondents in the age group of 36-45 years old. This higher representation of respondents between the ages of 26-45 may have been due to the fact that most distribution of the survey was done through social media. According to Pew Research Center, people in age range of 18-49 years old that are internet users use a social media website most often (Pew Research Center, 2014).

Figure 7. Participants Identity in Deaf Community
Figure 7 shows the distribution of responses to the question “How do you identify within the Deaf community?” The majority of respondents identify as hearing at 84%; this cultural perspective will be most dominant in all responses. Value types within each of the demographic questions of education level, hearing status, age, geographic region and gender identity were assessed, although when compared with the results for the overall sample, no significant differences were presented.

**Figure 8. Participant Education**

Figure 8 shows the distribution of responses to question 8 (see Appendix A). These results show that 76% of respondents had some education beyond a high school diploma. Those who have completed a Bachelor’s degree were the largest group represented.
Figure 9. Participants Interpreter Education Program Background

Figure 9 shows the number of respondents that had completed an Interpreter Education Program (IEP). This demographic was fairly evenly distributed with 45% not having yet completed and IEP and 55% responding that they had completed at least one Interpreter Education Program.

Figure 10. Participant Native Language(s)

Question number six was an open-ended question asking respondents to write-in whatever language(s) they identified as “native” for themselves. This question was left
open-ended, because the researcher was aware that for many bilinguals choosing one native language can be difficult. Researching a field that is composed of bilingual people, it was important for the participants to self-identify their own native languages, instead of having a prescribed list of options. Figure 10 shows that “native English speaker” dominated the responses at 83%. Significant differences were found in two of the value types within these categories, which are shown in Figures 11 and 12.

The greatest differences in value types based on native language were shown in the value types of *benevolence* and *conformity*. Respondents that identified English as one of their native languages scored much higher in *benevolence* than those who did not. This suggests that native English users prioritized the values of helpfulness, honesty, forgiveness, loyalty, and responsibility above those who did not identify English as one of their native languages. Overall, the sample group negatively rated the value type of *conformity*, but among respondents who identified a native language that was neither ASL nor English, *conformity* was much more highly prioritized. The respondents that rated *conformity* highest identified Spanish as one of their native languages and one respondent who listed Cantonese as his/her native language.

![Benevolence by Native Language](image)

*Figure 11. Benevolence by Native Language*
Table 5 shows mean responses by value types and settings respondents reported as the one they most often work within. The top mean for each setting is highlighted in gray. Figure 13 shows the distribution of settings within the sample. Educational settings are most represented with a total of 49% of respondents choosing K-12 or Post-Secondary Education as their primary work setting.

**Figure 12. Conformity by Native Language**

**Figure 13. Participant Work Settings**
Table 5

*Participants Settings and Motivational Value Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>K-12</th>
<th>Post-Secondary</th>
<th>VRS</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Medical</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>0.660833</td>
<td>0.889683</td>
<td>0.731757</td>
<td>0.967857</td>
<td>0.850926</td>
<td>0.778731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-1.46972</td>
<td>-1.38677</td>
<td>-1.27275</td>
<td>-0.90119</td>
<td>-1.3466</td>
<td>-1.16405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>0.591389</td>
<td>0.671429</td>
<td>0.668694</td>
<td>0.932143</td>
<td>0.641049</td>
<td>0.70908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-0.55167</td>
<td>-0.53095</td>
<td>-0.72095</td>
<td>-0.31786</td>
<td>-0.36204</td>
<td>-0.57948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>-0.36833</td>
<td>-0.64603</td>
<td>-0.62635</td>
<td>-1.24643</td>
<td>-0.72315</td>
<td>-0.6653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-0.0975</td>
<td>-0.06931</td>
<td>-0.13761</td>
<td>-0.1869</td>
<td>-0.09969</td>
<td>-0.19391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>0.7275</td>
<td>0.699206</td>
<td>0.806081</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.55463</td>
<td>0.819776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.04286</td>
<td>0.258784</td>
<td>-0.81786</td>
<td>-0.13056</td>
<td>-0.09067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>0.095833</td>
<td>0.004762</td>
<td>0.085811</td>
<td>-0.13929</td>
<td>0.09537</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>-0.41972</td>
<td>-0.38677</td>
<td>-0.66914</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>-0.24784</td>
<td>-0.11928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14 shows the relationship between value types and each setting/specialization represented within the sample. Those who selected the legal setting were the smallest group within this demographic with only seven respondents. Legal interpreters reported much lower ratings for *conformity* and *tradition* than those of other settings. Those who selected the legal setting also showed higher ratings for the *stimulation* value type. Legal interpreters also had higher score for the *universalism* value type, which was approximately .223 above the next highest mean for this value type.
Figure 14. Settings and Value Types

K-12, Video Relay Service (VRS) and Community interpreters ranked *benevolence* as the top mean response and Post-Secondary, Medical and Legal ranked *self-direction* as the highest mean. Legal and Medical interpreters both ranked *universalism* as the second highest score, while all other settings ranked it as third.

Another point of interest were the results for VRS interpreters within this sample. Video Relay is a setting in which an interpreter works in a call-center that is managed by a private company referred to as the ‘provider’. The purpose of VRS to provide access to telecommunication services for deaf and hard of hearing people that depend on American Sign Language for communication. A hearing and deaf or hard of hearing caller will connect through a VRS provider. An interpreter is connected via a video phone to the deaf caller and through a telephonic connection with the hearing caller. The value type of *conformity* was higher for VRS than it was for any other setting. It was the fourth-ranked value type of this group with *benevolence, self-direction, and universalism* ranked as
first, second and third respectively. *Achievement* is also ranked lower for this setting than all others.

![Years of Interpreting Experience](image)

**Figure 15.** Participant Years of Experience

Figure 15 shows the years of experience working as an ASL/English interpreter. Six to 10 years was most represented in the sample with 23% of respondents. One to 15 years of experience composed 55% of the sample group. Again, this representation may be due to the demographics that typically use social media websites most often.
### Table 6

**Value Type and Years of Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Type</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>1-5 yrs.</th>
<th>6-10 yrs.</th>
<th>11-15 yrs.</th>
<th>16-20 yrs.</th>
<th>21-24 yrs.</th>
<th>25-29 yrs.</th>
<th>30+ yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-1.411</td>
<td>-1.510</td>
<td>-1.498</td>
<td>-1.131</td>
<td>-1.279</td>
<td>-1.041</td>
<td>-1.032</td>
<td>-1.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-0.347</td>
<td>-0.399</td>
<td>-0.600</td>
<td>-0.497</td>
<td>-0.864</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>-0.680</td>
<td>-0.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>-0.509</td>
<td>-0.548</td>
<td>-0.673</td>
<td>-0.683</td>
<td>-0.536</td>
<td>-0.646</td>
<td>-0.591</td>
<td>-0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-0.293</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>-0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td><strong>0.815</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.798</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.812</strong></td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-0.343</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td><strong>0.149</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the centered mean responses for each value type within each of these groups. The top value type for each group is highlighted in yellow. *Benevolence* ranked as the top value type for those with 10 years of experience or less. While *self-direction* ranked as the top value type for those with 11 years or more interpreting experience. Highlighted in gray is group score for the value type of *security* for those with 30+ years of experience. There was a significant increase in this value type within this population.
Figure 16. Years of Experience and Three Value Types

Figure 16 is a line graph representing the top three value types of *self-direction*, *universalism* and *benevolence* as they related to years of experience. *Self-direction* seems to almost follow an asymptotic pattern, increasing over years of experience and then maximizing at 16-20 years and falling slightly from there. Pre-Service interpreters had a significantly lower rating for self-direction than another other group. The trend line for the value type of *benevolence* (dotted gray line) also shows a slow decrease with years of experience.
Figure 17. Participant Ethnic Identity

Figure 17 shows the distribution of responses for question seven, regarding ethnic identity. As shown, the ethnicity of “White/caucasian” is most heavily represented, with 89% of the respondents. Again, this trend does closely match the data from RID’s 2014 annual report among the membership within that national organization (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2014, p. 58).
Table 7 shows the centered mean score for each ethnic identity of each value type.

The top value type for each category is highlighted in gray. As you can see, this data shows the greatest variation in top ranked value types as well as the distribution of scores throughout each ethnic identity. Those who identified as Asian/Asian American and Hispanic/Latino ranked conformity as their top value type. This is major deviation from all other groups that have been examined. Within the entire sample of 298 ASL/English interpreters, conformity ranked fifth and was negatively rated, meaning it was rated below an individual’s mean score for all questions.
Figure 18. Ethnic Identity and Value Types

Figure 18 is a graphic representation of the scores for all ethnic identities with the exception of those that selected “other” for this question. It is also interesting to note that both “Asian/Asian American” and “African American/Black” groups positively rated the value type of security, which was negatively rated within the overall sample group.

Motivations For Entering Field

Question 10 asked participants to respond to the following prompt: “Please briefly describe your reasons for pursuing a career in interpreting.” Responses were coded by one of the 10 value types. The principal investigator evaluated each statement and assigned one or two value types. As with any qualitative data analysis, this process was subjective and required interpretation of both the value types and the responses.
Figure 19. Response to Question 10 coded by Value Type

Figure 19 shows the distribution of coded value types to the responses for this item. *Hedonism* was coded most often. This was due to the number of responses that referenced an “interest,” “love,” and/or “enjoyment” of languages, communities and people. These types of responses were most common among respondents. Here are a few examples of these types of responses: “Fell in love with languages as a child. Thought this would be a brief career until I found what I wanted to do, but instead fell in love with interpreting” (respondent #1); “Love of ASL and communicating with Deaf people, as well as great satisfaction in facilitating communication through interpreting” (respondent #72); “I enjoy learning languages and learning about different cultures” (respondent #97), and “Love the Deaf community and ASL. I feel I am right where I belong when I am signing/interpreting” (respondent #203). There are many more variations of these type of responses that express the pleasure derived from using the language of ASL and interacting with the Deaf community. Ultimately, these were coded as *hedonism*, which is
defined as “Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself” (Schwartz, 1994, p. 22), because they are focused on a sense of joy and fulfillment that is focused on oneself. In the overall sample responses for the PVQ, *hedonism* was ranked sixth and given a negative rating, meaning it was rated below most respondent’s average response.

The second most frequent code for these responses was the value type of *benevolence*. These responses most often referenced the value of providing communication access and a needed service to the Deaf community. Here are some examples of these types of responses: “I enjoy filling a need that bridges a communication gap of, often, life altering proportions. I am challenged to put myself aside and put others and their need above myself with integrity, creativity and constant learning” (Respondent #16); “The fulfilling nature of serving people through language access, the strong support of community, and the challenge of working with two ever changing and evolving cultures and languages and the dynamics between them” (Respondent #91); “I had a Deaf classmate in college, and lack of accessibility was a huge issue. Wanted to make a difference” (Respondent #242).

Coded value types for responses to this prompt were also compared with each respondent’s top value type as measured by their responses to the PVQ. The total numbers of each code and the number of responses that matched the respondent’s top value type (TVT) is shown in table 8. Those responses coded as *benevolence* had the highest percentage of a matching top value type within the respondent’s PVQ. Out of 56 responses to question number 10 that were coded with *benevolence*, 21 also had *benevolence* as the respondent’s top value type as measured through their responses to the PVQ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded Value Type</th>
<th>Frequency of Code</th>
<th>Alignment with TVT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 10 was designed with the goal of identifying various responses people give when asked why they decided to become an interpreter and to examine a possible relationship between these responses and the 10 value types. The challenge with this approach was that respondents were asked to give a brief response; therefore responses ranged from two words to several sentences. And some responses were very difficult to code with one of the 10 value types. Those responses that referenced a family connection to the field (either having family members who were Deaf or having family members who were interpreters) were coded with either the value type of conformity or tradition, because the researcher interpreted these statements as expressing a sense of loyalty, obligation and/or honor to that part of their family and those expectations.

Another challenging response to code was respondents that referenced a career change. These type of responses described starting out in one (mostly Deaf-related) occupation and for various reasons deciding to change career paths and pursue interpreting. Ultimately, the principal investigator decided to code these as self-direction,
because they expressed what could be interpreted as a sense of control of the direction of his or her career path.

There are several other examples of repeated themes that were found in these responses that were not easily matched with a value type. As discussed in the results section, responses that expressed enjoyment and interest were the most common in this sample. To code them as *hedonism* seemed like an appropriate approach, but there may also be a dynamic between cultural and societal expectations for these types of questions about occupational fit and choice. One response that came up the most within this code referenced a general love, interest, or pleasure derived from working with languages and cultures, which was worded many different ways. Of the 109 responses that were coded with *hedonism* (which will be referred to as *hedonistic responses*), 72 reference a love, interest and/or enjoyment of language and/or culture (which will be referred to as *hedonistic/language response*). The 72 *hedonistic/language responses* were further sub-coded to identify patterns in these responses and in the demographics of these respondents. Twenty-eight of those *hedonistic/language responses* had a top value type of *benevolence* from the respondents’ PVQ results, which was the most common top value type within this group. *Hedonistic/language responses* were sub-coded in one of four ways: a comment that referenced enjoyment of: American Sign Language (ASL), language in general, working with Deaf people or the Deaf community, or the interpreting process.

There were a total of 92 utterances within these 72 responses, because some respondents identified more than one of these sub-codes within the response, such as respondent #77 who said, “The love of sign language and deaf friends,” which was sub-
coded with both a reference to ASL and to the Deaf community. Table 9 shows the
distribution of comments within these four sub-codes.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Code</th>
<th># of comments</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASL Specific</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language in general</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf community</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hedonistic/language responses were also cross-referenced with respondent’s
native language use. All of the hedonistic/language responses except for three, a total of
69, listed English as their only native language. One respondent listed both English and
ASL as native languages, another had ASL listed as the native language and the third
listed Chinese/Cantonese as the native language.

Other demographic information was assessed for participants that were coded as
hedonistic/language responses. Nearly 60% (43 of the 72) had 10 years or less of
interpreting experience, making it the majority of this group. Gender was also analyzed
among the hedonistic responses; of those 109, 104 identified as female and five identified
as male. Within the group hedonistic/language responses four were male and 68 were
female.

There were many interesting trends discovered throughout the analysis of these
responses. The goal of this research and the acquisition of this data is to begin a
discussion about how these values are expressed in the professional choices and ethical
decision making process of an ASL/English interpreter. The following section will explore some of those implication and discussions further.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Several findings of interest and points of discussion require further discussion. The value types that will be discussed are self-direction, benevolence, and universalism, which were most highly prioritized, as well as power, which was given the lowest priority within the overall sample. Demographic populations within the sample that diverged from the overall sample’s value system will also be examined.

Self-Direction

The value type of self-direction is measured in items relating to “Creativity, freedom, independent, curious, choosing own goals” (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208). Many responses to question 10, which asked respondents to describe their reasons for pursuing a career in ASL/English interpreting, referenced enjoyment and fulfillment derived from the variety of work, consumers, and challenges. There were also several responses that described the desire for flexibility in their schedules and work. While creativity was rarely mentioned in responses to this prompt, there were many responses that addressed an enjoyment of the interpreting process. While interpreting is not often described as creative process there is some research that suggests it is; Horváth (2010) for example, found that “most of the interpreters who participated in the survey consider their job creative and anything but reproductive” (p. 153).

Self-direction values were the most challenging to identify in the open-ended responses to question number 10 (reasons for becoming an interpreter). One possible reason for this difficulty is that they could be the underlying value for statements that refer to flexibility, a change in career or academic paths, enjoyment of challenges, and a general interest in language, culture, and the interpreting process. This addresses one of
the limitations to this methodology of trying to identify a value type with one short answer response. It would seem that a more in-depth response would be required to examine how these values truly impact the decision to become an ASL/English interpreter.

Dean and Pollard (2013) discussed some possible values that seem to justify the conduit model of interpreter. The conduit or ‘machine’ model is one where the interpreting process is viewed as mechanical, taking meaning from the source language and transferring it into the target language, such that any work beyond that role is outside the scope of an interpreter’s practice (Frishberg, 1990). Dean and Pollard suggested:

It is hard to know for sure but it seems reasonable that values such as consumer ‘autonomy’, ‘agency’ and/or ‘self-determinacy’ might underlie the conduit role. These terms convey a respect for the ideal that all people have their own autonomous power and should be allowed to act, exercise their free will, and be able to make decisions for themselves. (Dean & Pollard, 2013, p. 91)

These same values may also be linked to self-direction, as it applies not only to the interpreter as an individual but how it may affect the perception of the consumers’ values. An interpreter may also perceive the value in their work based on a ideal that it provides consumers opportunities to exercise their own independence and autonomy. Another area of research could explore how these values impact an interpreter’s perception of the consumers’ values.

As noted in the results section, self-direction was more highly prioritized by more experienced interpreters. It was ranked as the top value type for interpreters with 11 or more years of experience, while those with less experience had benevolence ranked
above *self-direction*. It is possible that these values are encouraged and strengthened over the course of an interpreter’s career. Over time an interpreter may prioritize the values of creativity, freedom and independence (associated with *self-direction*) more highly.

Another possibility is that these values could correlate with longevity in this field, implying that interpreters who prioritize these values will have a greater chance of long-term success and satisfaction in the field. A longitudinal study would be needed to examine how the prioritization of these values affects an individual interpreter’s ability to stay in the field and find satisfaction in his or her work. Bontempo, Napier, Hayes, and Brashear’s (2014) study on personality traits in signed language interpreters found that “if a sign language interpreting student, or an interpreter, has good general mental ability, and rates highly on self-esteem, conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness, they are in a strong position to succeed in this profession” (p. 36). *Self-direction* values of freedom and independence are very similar to what Bontempo et al. (2014) referred to as the personality trait of “openness” in their study. As Dean and Pollard (2013) indicated,

> It takes more time and exposure to various work contexts before you develop a confident grasp of how professional values tend to be expressed in your most common practice decisions. This insight is particularly important in teleology, where meta-principles (referred to as “tenets” in the NAD-RID Code of Professional Conduct), like respect, can look very different in one context versus another. (Dean & Pollard, 2013, p. 132)

This time and exposure to the variety of the demands a working professional interpreter confronts may be another possible reason for a stronger prioritization of *self-direction*. As
an interpreter gains more exposure and experience to this variability, it may encourage the values of flexibility, independence and creativity.

**Benevolence**

Based on the principal investigator’s experiences administering this survey on smaller sample sizes previous to this research, where a large proportion of that pilot group had *benevolence* as the top value type, it was expected to be highly prioritized within this sample group as well. An understanding of the history of the profession of ASL/English interpreting also supports some *benevolence* values. The profession was founded largely by family and friends of people who were Deaf who stepped into the role of interpreter because they saw a need and knew they had the language skills to meet that need (Ball, 2013). This prediction was validated with *benevolence* ranked as the second highest value type. Many respondents prioritize the values that interpreters provide a needed service and find value in supporting the communities in which they live. Schwartz (2012) found that in most sample groups, *benevolence* is the most highly prioritized value type. That would imply that *benevolence* is highly regarded value type across many cultures and societies because it is vital to supporting the health and prosperity of any community.

There is an important point of discussion around the value type of *benevolence* and how it might impact the decision making process of an interpreter. When viewing values through the lens of Dean and Pollard’s (2013) Demand-Control Schema, they may be expressed in the resulting demands (possible demands that may occur as a result of a control option the interpreter has employed) a practitioner or student will seek-out or work to avoid. Dean and Pollard stated:
It is our experience that many interpreters tend to conjure up resulting demands that involve a consumer being angry or upset with them when they first begin to engage in discussions of hypothetical controls and resulting demands. (Dean & Pollard, 2013, p. 133)

Could this avoidance of causing anger or discontent from consumers also be a manifestation of the values related to the *benevolence* value type? If the priority is to be of service, support, and help, then feelings of discontent from consumers could be seen as devaluing to the interpreter. This may also result in the setting an interpreter will choose to work in, seeking out work that validates his or her values and provides opportunity to be viewed as a welcomed support service by community members.

If the motivational values of this work are centered on providing a needed service and help, it can—if not carefully monitored—become a paternalistic and oppressive relationship, in which the interpreter is acting as the benevolent helper and expecting consumers to respond as grateful recipients of this service. As Hoffmeister and Harvey (1996) described, “The Altruism Decision” (p. 78) is a common motivation for hearing people working with the Deaf community. This motivation comes from recognizing a need in the Deaf community and feeling compelled to help; this motivation can also lead to cognitive dissonance or what Hoffmesiter and Harvey referred to as the “Idealization and Betrayal Posture” (p. 85). Cognitive dissonance and the feelings of betrayal come from feelings that a person’s help is not desired or appreciated by some members of the Deaf community. The stress of confronting this cognitive dissonance and feelings of betrayal can also lead to a higher rate of burnout.
Understanding the demographics of this sample and the influence that the majority culture has on this value system is another important point of discussion. As Figure 12 shows, *benevolence* was a lower priority to those who did not have English as one of their native languages. Could the prioritization of *benevolence* also correlate with a cultural disconnect between the interpreter and Deaf consumers? Are the values of being “helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible” (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208) most heavily emphasized in the dominant, hearing, Caucasian culture and coming from a position of dominance and power?

**Universalism**

*Universalism* was rated and prioritized very highly in the overall sample results. As mentioned in the results section, the lowest ranked *universalism* item from the PVQ was related to environment care and conservation. The values of equality, social justice and broad-mindedness were very highly rated by this sample. There are examples of how these values are expressed in the Code of Professional Conduct (CPC) that was established and is maintained by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) and the National Association of the Deaf (NAD). *Universalism* seems to align well with the ideal of equality and communication rights as expressed in the CPC: “The American Deaf community represents a cultural and linguistic group having the inalienable right to full and equal communication and to participation in all aspects of society” (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2005, p. 1). It is also expressed in RID’s vision statement: “Its members recognize and support the linguistic rights of all Deaf people as human rights, equal to those of users of spoken languages” (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2015b).
In more recent publications, Schwartz has further refined his values model and theory to include 19 value types, in which universalism is divided into three sub-categories of “concern, nature, and tolerance” (Schwartz et al., 2012). Judging by the PVQ results from this sample, it would seem that ASL/English interpreters would highly rate the subcategories of concern and tolerance, and prioritize nature much lower.

Schwartz discussed this further:

This contrasts with the in-group focus of benevolence values. Universalism values derive from survival needs of individuals and groups. But people do not recognize these needs until they encounter others beyond the extended primary group and until they become aware of the scarcity of natural resources. People may then realize that failure to accept others who are different and treat them justly will lead to life-threatening strife. (Schwartz, 2012, p. 7)

Power

Another point of discussion revolves around not just the value types that were most highly rated and prioritized within this sample but also which were rated and prioritized the lowest. All items in the PVQ that measured power were given a low rating in the overall sample. The greatest difference in any two consecutively ranked value types was between Tradition (ranked ninth) and Power (ranked 10th), with a drop of .7257. As noted in the results section, there was only one respondent in the entire sample that ranked power as the top value type, and it was tied with two other value types. What is it about these values of “Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources” (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208) that incite such a strong, negative reaction from most respondents in this sample?
Schwartz (2012) mentioned that cross-culturally power is typically ranked last. It seems to be human nature to resist the values of dominance and control, but each value type represents “a universal requirement for human existence” (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208), whether it be for survival, acceptance, or adaptability (Schwartz, 1994, p. 21). There is a need to recognize the ways these values do support the survival and success of all humans, including ASL/English interpreters: “Still, they have some importance because power values help to motivate individuals to work for group interests” (Schwartz, 2012, p. 15).

It is hard to know where the origin of this negative perception to the values of social power and dominance derives; it is most likely a result of the environments in which people are raised. It leads to a discussion about whether a strong, negative reaction to these values is healthy for a community. In a field that values social justice and equality, as identified in the value type of universalism, is it possible that this aversion to power values could actually prevent someone from fully recognizing the power dynamics within an interpreted interaction? If an individual is actively working to avoid any resemblance of these values, could it cause a type of “blindness” that would prevent that individual from full awareness of the power and dominance he or she actually may possess and express? This research cannot adequately address these questions, but the goal is to begin a discussion about how the prioritization of these values impact the practice of an ASL/English interpreter. Awareness of these possible blind-spots within the practice of any interpreter can hopefully lead to more thoughtful reflective practice about how each of these values impact the decision making process.
Specializations

The data showed some variation between settings or specializations where the respondents most often worked and mean value type scores. This was expected because the variety of demands that each of these settings/specializations present can be unique, therefore possibly attracting and retaining a specific set of values from the interpreters that are employed there. Values are expressed not just by an individual but also by an organization or entity (Rokeach, 1970, 1979; Schwartz 1994; Schwartz et al., 2002), therefore the settings or organizations an interpreter works within also prioritize values based on its goals. One purpose of this research was to begin to explore the relationship between the values of a setting/work environment and those of the individual interpreter that works within that setting.

One of the most intriguing sets of data was regarding those who selected the legal setting as their primary work setting. Unfortunately there were only seven respondents that choose this setting, so the data is far from conclusive. Legal interpreters work under unique ethical boundaries as part of the judicial system (National Association of Judiciary Interpreters & Translators, n.d.; Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2000). It would be a beneficial discussion to explore what values might be more highly prioritized within legal settings. In particular, these interpreters were unique in their prioritization of stimulation values (excitement, novelty, and challenge; Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208), which were given equal priority to the values of benevolence (preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact; Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208).
Video relay settings (VRS) are also governed with unique ethical standards and policies that are set by the providers and the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2007). This setting has an unusual set of demands for an ASL/English interpreter because of these standards and the technology that connects interpreters to the consumers. One question to discuss and explore in these data results is how VRS interpreters prioritized conformity more highly than other settings. Do the values of conformity (restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms; Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208) correlate with longevity in this setting, or does this setting attract interpreters that prioritize those values? One could assume that interpreters who prioritize these values will more easily comply with the standards and policies given to them by their employers and the FCC. It is also a setting that often emphasizes the ideal of customer service and keeping Deaf callers content with their VRS provider’s services and therefore supporting the fiscal success of that company. Interpreters who are more likely to contain impulses that violate social norms might be more inclined to support that type of approach in their interactions with customers.

Underrepresented Populations

One of the limitations of this research is the lack of diversity in specific demographics. This is not a challenge isolated to this research study, but a challenge across the field, because of the dominance of particular cultural groups and demographics within ASL/English interpreting. When examining ethnic identity, the data seem to show a strong relationship between cultural backgrounds and prioritization of values within this sample. This data showed a strong variation in the prioritization of some value types.
based on ethnic identities, such as Asian/Asian American and Hispanic/Latino respondents ranking conformity as the top value type. This prioritization of conformity may also be a reflection of collectivist cultures, in which the needs of the group are prioritized above the needs of the individual (Brown, 2002).

The findings showed variations of prioritization of value types based on ethnic identity as well as native language(s). Conclusions based on this data are not possible because of the small number of respondents that identified as neither White/Caucasian nor with English as a native language. At the same time, it does seem evident that the prioritization of values in this sample does reflect the majority cultural perspective of White/Caucasian, hearing, native English speakers. As a group that values equality and social justice, it seems a discussion about how minority cultural values may conflict or interact with the majority cultural values would be an important endeavor. Looking at Figure 1, Schwartz’s values model, it is clear that the value type of conformity (the top value type for those that identified as Asian/Asian American and Hispanic/Latino) falls within the Conservation higher order value type and is on the opposite side of the circular model as self-direction (the top value type for the overall sample). This would mean that an individual would often have to choose between the values of self-direction (freedom, creativity, independence) and the values of conformity (politeness, obedience and self-discipline; Schwartz, 1994). People who prioritize conformity values above self-direction values are also more likely to be accepting and to comply with social norms (Schwartz, 2012, p. 16); therefore, if the field has established social norms that align with self-direction values, it is possible that someone who prioritizes conformity above self-direction values.
direction will follow those norms as a way to preserve social order and peace with his or her professional colleagues.

Awareness of possible conflicting values and a reflective practice that is inclusive and accepting of diverse value systems within various cultural groups can lead to a work environment that promotes greater diversity in the profession. It can also lead to a meaningful discussion with practicing interpreters and interpreter students about the experience of being raised with values that at times conflict with the majority culture and professional colleagues. As well as a discussion about how the community of ASL/English interpreters can foster a work culture that recognizes the contributions of all value types, not only in collegial relationships but in consumer-interpreter relations as well. As Brown (2002) stated,

Researchers have not looked at the relationship between individuals' cultural values and values held by people in their work places as factor in occupational outcomes. Posner (1992) and Meglino, Ravlin and Adkins (1989) did find that job satisfaction was related to congruence between individuals' work values and those held by people in the workplace. (Brown, 2002, p. 10)

This presents a challenge for the field to recognize how cultural backgrounds impact professional values and to encourage interpreter education, training, and recruitment that support diverse value types. Understanding how cultural backgrounds impact value systems, and therefore the choice to become an interpreter and the interpreter’s practice, can support the goals of developing a professional culture that is more inclusive of cultural groups that are currently underrepresented in the ASL/English interpreting field.
It is important to note that conformity values do aligned well with benevolence values. According to Schwartz (2012),

Benevolence and conformity values both promote cooperative and supportive social relations. However, benevolence values provide an internalized motivation based for behavior. In contrast, conformity values promote cooperation in order to avoid negative outcomes for self. Both values may motivate the same helpful act, separately or together. (Schwartz, 2012, p. 7)

This might be part of the reason why those that do prioritize conformity values might be drawn to the field of ASL/English interpreting. They could view providing communication access as one that promotes the “cooperative and supportive social relations” that Schwartz (2012) mentioned above.

Schwartz (2012) also found that self-direction values tend to be prioritized below conformity in respondents who come from larger families with seven children or more. This survey did not collect information about respondent’s family size but this could be another reason why these respondents prioritized conformity values above other value types, because Schwartz’s (2012, p. 15) research has shown that those from large families have learned to prioritize the needs of family and harmony amongst family members above their own needs/desires.

**Motivations for Entering the Field**

After assessing the data gathered from question 10, “Briefly describe your reasons for becoming an interpreter,” there are clear limitations in the methodology of trying to reference motivational value types within these responses. A question more specific to values may have been more applicable to this research question, however the prompt was
designed to be vague. One of the goals was to explore some of the most common responses and try to identify themes and see if there was a correlation with the values prioritized through the PVQ.

While the process of coding these responses with value types was very subjective and challenging, it could point to a possible incongruence between the reasons people give for pursuing this field and the individual’s motivational values. The reasons for this disconnect could involve many variables and are beyond the scope of this research project. Some of this disconnect may be due to a societal/cultural expectation to give a response that expresses the joy or pleasure one derives from the work, hence the large portion of responses that were coded with *hedonism*. It may also be a result of the responses most often heard then perpetuated in the interpreting community, such as the comment referenced above about having a “love for the language and culture.” It is what people have heard and accepted as a “good” reason, and then it becomes their own response without in-depth reflection about their own process to choosing this path.

The fact that almost 96% of respondents that gave a response that referenced an enjoyment of ASL, language, culture, the Deaf community and/or interpreting had English as their only native language, and that 94% were female provides some insight into this perspective. This leaves a lot of questions to ponder as a professional community that is composed of mostly non-native ASL users (Williamson, 2015). What does it mean to “fall in love” with a language and/or cultural group? What values are we expressing with this response? One could conjecture that it does prioritize the values of *hedonism*, “pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself” (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208). Are many interpreters drawn to this field because of sense of enjoyment derived from using
signed language? How does this impact the interpreting process, if there is a greater focus or attention to ASL than English? How does this impact your work if one views ASL, which is probably the L2, as a source of fascination and joy? It also seems that most interpreters that gave these responses had 10 or fewer years of experience. Is it possible that this attraction to the language and to the community is something that has a negative correlation with years of experience? Another possibility is that this motivation negatively correlates to longevity in the field. This research does not have the data to adequately address these questions and theories, but it may be a worthy research topic for future study.

These *hedonism* responses may have more to do with the path these interpreters took to choose the occupation, than it does about their motivation within their practice. Considering that most interpreters are learning ASL in an academic setting, it seems natural that their reasons for choosing interpreting as a course of study and eventually an occupation would have been based on which courses they enjoyed most, which turned out to be ASL and/or Deaf studies courses.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

One of the major findings of this research was how the motivational value types were ranked within the large sample, showing *self-direction*, *benevolence* and *universalism* values are most highly prioritized. Variation within value systems in sub-populations were also explored, such as Latino/Hispanic and Asian/Asian-American ethnic groups that ranked *conformity* above other value types. *Conformity* stands in opposition with the values of *self-direction*. There is a lot more research that can be done to more adequately explore the experience of ethnic minorities who practice as ASL/English interpreters. This data also demonstrated that there seemed to be relationship between years of experience and the value types of *benevolence* and *self-direction*. Most novice interpreters (fewer than 10 years of experience) prioritized *benevolence* above *self-direction* values, while the opposite was true for those with 10-plus years of experience.

The goal of this research is to provide some data that can lead to a discussion in the field of ASL/English interpreting about the impact that motivational values have on an interpreter’s practice. Values are expressed in each decision that is made, starting with the decision to pursue this profession. This data is also meant to provide preliminary data that can be expanded upon through further research. Further research could explore how these value systems directly impact an interpreter’s practice.

Through further research an interpreter’s value system can be assessed through an inventory like Schwartz’s and then components of their practice could be observed to try
to identify how an individual’s value system is expressed throughout a work sample. This could lead to concrete behavioral items, similar to those Bardi and Schwartz (2002) developed to correlate value types with interpreter actions and explore how those actions impact the interpreted interaction.

Another point of interest would be to explore how values are expressed during an interpreter’s post-assignment reflection. What ethical dilemmas did he or she perceive and how do these value types correlate with the demands that cause the greatest amount of stress for each interpreter? Power was shown to be the least prioritized value type. Is there evidence of this devaluation of power in the way an interpreter perceives his or her effect on an interpreter interaction? Could this aversion to any perception of power values actually be causing some harm for the consumers of that interaction?

Another area of further research could focus on how the topic of values using Schwartz or another theoretical framework can be incorporated into an interpreter’s reflective practice. If values are assessed, shared, and then referred to during case conferencing, supervisions, and/or debriefings starting from the time an interpreter goes through a training program, this may lead to deeper connections between personally held values and an interpreter’s daily practice. Theoretical models like Schwartz’s can be implemented to give students and faculty a framework to conceptualize the complex interplay of the professional’s values and the ethical decision making process.

Inclusion of values within the reflective practice of an interpreter may also lead to a decrease in horizontal violence in our field (Ott, 2012). Each of Schwartz’s motivational value types relate to a human need for survival, connection, and happiness, one value type is not better than another. If we practice reframing ethical dilemmas under
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this framework it may lead to greater empathy and understanding for why some practitioners prioritize values differently within different context. A greater awareness of value prioritization may allow more interpreters to assess ethical dilemmas beyond a deontological perspective (right versus wrong), which can lead to a practice that requires greater critical thinking and openness to change. This ability to empathize with the perspectives of others may encourage greater support within communities of practice, but also improve an interpreter’s ability to understand the values being communicated by the consumers of the interpreting services.

Further research is also needed on the relationship between the values prioritized within particular work environments, good occupational fit, and sense of satisfaction for interpreters working within that environment. This data did support a possible relationship between value systems and the settings in which an interpreter works, such as VRS interpreters’ prioritization of conformity and legal interpreters’ prioritization of stimulation. Research shows that job satisfaction in any profession requires an alignment of personal values and work environment (Brown, 2002; Watt & Richardson, 2007). Every practitioner would benefit from assessing the values of the work environment and finding how they align or conflict with his/her own personal values.

The results from the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) showed a different value system than those expressed when respondents were asked to describe their reasons for entering this field. This is another potential area for further research. Is this a reflection of a change of values throughout an interpreter’s training or is this a reflection societal expectation that everyone have a response that expresses joy and pleasure that is derived from the work? If the sample as a whole most highly prioritized self-direction,
benevolence and universalism values, then why aren’t more of those values being expressed when asked to articulate their reasons for becoming an interpreter? These are questions that require much more research. They are also questions that require each interpreting practitioner and student to examine introspectively.

The title of this research is “Are we here for the same reasons?” Naturally, the answer is no. We can learn a lot from taking the time and energy to examine why it is an interpreter chooses this profession and how those motivations impact his or her perceptions of the work. The motivational value system of each individual is entirely his or her own and the way each individual prioritizes those values within specific contexts will be different. The hope is that with this framework, to examine each interpreter’s unique motivational value system and the experiences that shaped that structure, there can be a more honest assessment of how these values are impacting the decision making process.

With an understanding that there are no “right” or “wrong” values, just different motivations that cause someone to prioritize one value over another. An interpreter can examine multiple topics, like social justice, within his or her practice. The human experience is composed of moments where we must choose between competing values; how an interpreter choses which value will be prioritized in which moment is a subject worthy of further study.
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APPENDIX A: Consent Form and Survey

Interpreter Values

Dear Colleague,

I am a student in the Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies program at Western Oregon University under the supervision of Dr. Elisa Maroney. I am conducting a research study seeking to collect data on the types of motivational values held by ASL/English Interpreters and to understand correlations between interpreter’s personal values and interpreting practice. The results of this study will be used in my master’s thesis, and may be used in reports, presentations, or publications. The benefits of participation in this survey are contributing to a study that will increase the field's understanding of the values held within the profession and hopefully lead to a discourse on the implications these values may have in the work.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve taking an online survey. By clicking on the 'Next' icon below, you are indicating your consent to participate in this study. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study. You may withdraw from the survey at any time while responding to the questionnaire. You can simply close your browser and the responses you have submitted will not be collected.

You must be 18 or older to participate in this study. You must be a currently practicing ASL/English interpreter and/or a student pursuing a degree in an Interpreter Education Program.

The risks associated with participation in this survey are very minimal. Your responses will be anonymous and no personal identifiable information will be collected. The data collected from this survey will be saved in a secure location that only I will be able to access. If at anytime you feel uncomfortable with the questions, you may close your web browser and discontinue participation in this survey.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact me, Audrey RamirezLoudenback, via email at: loudena@wou.edu or my graduate advisor Dr. Elisa Maroney at maronee@wou.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Institutional Review Board at (503) 838-9200 or irb@wou.edu.

Thank you,

Audrey Ramirez-Loudenback
Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies Student
Western Oregon University
### Demographic Questions

1. How many years have you been an ASL/English interpreter?
   - I am a pre-service interpreting student
   - 1-5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - 11-15 years
   - 16-20 years
   - 21-24 years
   - 25-29 years
   - 30+ years
   - I am not an interpreter.

2. How do you identify within the Deaf Community?
   - Deaf
   - Deaf of Deaf
   - Coda
   - Late Deafened (Identify as Deaf)
   - Hearing
   - Late Deafened (Identify as hearing)
   - Hard of Hearing (Identify as Deaf)
   - Hard of Hearing (Identify as hearing)
   - Other (please specify)

   - West
   - Northeast
   - Midwest
   - Other (please specify)
   - South

4. In which setting do you most often work?
   - K-12 Education
   - Legal
   - Post-Secondary Education
   - Medical
   - Video Relay
   - Theatrical
   - Community
   - Religious
   - Other (please specify)
   - I am a pre-service interpreting student who is not yet practicing in any settings.

5. Please indicate your age:
   - 18-25
   - 26-35
   - 36-45
   - 46-55
   - 56+

6. Which language(s) do you consider your native language(s)?

7. With which ethnic group do you most identify?
   - American Indian/Native American
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - Asian/Asian American
   - White/Caucasian
   - Black/African American
   - Pacific Islander
   - Other (please specify)

8. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   - High School
   - Vocational Program/Certificate
9. Have you completed an interpreter education program?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I am currently in an Interpreting Program

10. Please briefly describe your reasons for pursuing a career in interpreting:

11. What type of Interpreter Education/Training Program did you complete?
   - Certificate
   - Associates
   - Master’s
   - Other (please specify)

12. What type of Interpreting Program are you in?
   - Certificate
   - Associates
   - Bachelor’s
   - Master’s
   - Other (please specify)

13. What is your gender identity?
   - Female
   - Male
   - Other (please specify)
14. Please choose which one version of the following inventory you would feel most comfortable completing. The only difference in each of these versions is the gender pronouns within each description.

- Female
- Male
- Gender Neutral

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

**How much like you is this person?** (on a scale of Very much like me; Like me; Somewhat like me; A little like me; Not like me; Not at all like me)

1. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to him. He likes to do things in his own original way.
2. It is important to him to be rich. He wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.
3. He thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.
4. It's very important to him to show his abilities. He wants people to admire what he does.
5. It is important to him to live in secure surroundings. He avoids anything that might endanger his safety.
6. He thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. He always looks for new things to try.
7. He believes that people should do what they're told. He thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.
8. It is important to him to listen to people who are different from him. Even when he disagrees with them, he still wants to understand them.
9. He thinks it's important not to ask for more than what you have. He believes that people should be satisfied with what they have.
10. He seeks every chance he can to have fun. It is important to him to do things that give him pleasure.
11. It is important to him to make his own decisions about what he does. He likes to be free to plan and to choose his activities for himself.
12. It's very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for their well-being.
13. Being very successful is important to him. He likes to impress other people.
14. It is very important to him that his country be safe. He thinks the state must be on
   watch against threats from within and without.
15. He likes to take risks. He is always looking for adventures.
16. It is important to him always to behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything
   people would say is wrong.
17. It is important to him to be in charge and tell others what to do. He wants people to do
   what he says.
18. It is important to him to be loyal to his friends. He wants to devote himself to people
   close to him.
19. He strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the
   environment is important to him.
20. Religious belief is important to him. He tries hard to do what his religion requires.
21. It is important to him that things be organized and clean. He really does not like
   things to be a mess.
22. He thinks it's important to be interested in things. He likes to be curious and to try to
   understand all sorts of things.
23. He believes all the world’s people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among
   all groups in the world is important to him.
24. He thinks it is important to be ambitious. He wants to show how capable he is.
25. He thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is important to him to keep up
   the customs he has learned.
26. Enjoying life’s pleasures is important to him. He likes to ‘spoil’ himself.
27. It is important to him to respond to the needs of others. He tries to support those he
   knows.
28. He believes he should always show respect to his parents and to older people. It is
   important to him to be obedient.
29. He wants everyone to be treated justly, even people he doesn’t know. It is important
   to him to protect the weak in society.
30. He likes surprises. It is important to him to have an exciting life.
31. He tries hard to avoid getting sick. Staying healthy is very important to him.
32. Getting ahead in life is important to him. He strives to do better than others.
33. Forgiving people who have hurt him is important to him. He tries to see what is good
   in them and not to hold a grudge.
34. It is important to him to be independent. He likes to rely on himself.
35. Having a stable government is important to him. He is concerned that the social order
   be protected.
36. It is important to him to be polite to other people all the time. He tries never to disturb
   or irritate others.
37. He really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to him.
38. It is important to him to be humble and modest. He tries not to draw attention to himself.
39. He always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. He likes to be the leader.
40. It is important to him to adapt to nature and to fit into it. He believes that people should not change nature.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpreter Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVQ IVF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Select the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

**16. How much like you is this person?** (on a scale of Very much like me; Like me; Somewhat like me; A little like me; Not like me; Not at all like me)

1. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to her. She likes to do things in her own original way.
2. It is important to her to be rich. She wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.
3. She thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. She believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.
4. It's very important to her to show her abilities. She wants people to admire what she does.
5. It is important to her to live in secure surroundings. She avoids anything that might endanger her safety.
6. She thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. She always looks for new things to try.
7. She believes that people should do what they're told. She thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.
8. It is important to her to listen to people who are different from her. Even when she disagrees with them, she still wants to understand them.
9. She thinks it's important not to ask for more than what you have. She believes that people should be satisfied with what they have.
10. She seeks every chance she can to have fun. It is important to her to do things that give her pleasure.
11. It is important to her to make her own decisions about what she does. She likes to be free to plan and to choose her activities for herself.
12. It's very important to her to help the people around her. She wants to care for their well-being.
13. Being very successful is important to her. She likes to impress other people.
14. It is very important to her that her country be safe. She thinks the state must be on watch against threats from within and without.

15. She likes to take risks. She is always looking for adventures.

16. It is important to her always to behave properly. She wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.

17. It is important to her to be in charge and tell others what to do. She wants people to do what she says.

18. It is important to her to be loyal to her friends. She wants to devote herself to people close to her.

19. She strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to her.

20. Religious belief is important to her. She tries hard to do what her religion requires.

21. It is important to her that things be organized and clean. She really does not like things to be a mess.

22. She thinks it's important to be interested in things. She likes to be curious and to try to understand all sorts of things.

23. She believes all the world’s people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among all groups in the world is important to her.

24. She thinks it is important to be ambitious. She wants to show how capable she is.

25. She thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is important to her to keep up the customs she has learned.

26. Enjoying life’s pleasures is important to her. She likes to ‘spoil’ herself.

27. It is important to her to respond to the needs of others. She tries to support those she knows.

28. She believes she should always show respect to her parents and to older people. It is important to her to be obedient.

29. She wants everyone to be treated justly, even people she doesn’t know. It is important to her to protect the weak in society.

30. She likes surprises. It is important to her to have an exciting life.

31. She tries hard to avoid getting sick. Staying healthy is very important to her.

32. Getting ahead in life is important to her. She strives to do better than others.

33. Forgiving people who have hurt her is important to her. She tries to see what is good in them and not to hold a grudge.

34. It is important to her to be independent. She likes to rely on herself.

35. Having a stable government is important to her. She is concerned that the social order be protected.

36. It is important to her to be polite to other people all the time. She tries never to disturb or irritate others.

37. She really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to her.

38. It is important to her to be humble and modest. She tries not to draw attention to herself.
39. She always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. She likes to be the leader.
40. It is important to her to adapt to nature and to fit into it. She believes that people should not change nature.

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Select the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

17. How much like you is this person? (on a scale of Very much like me; Like me; Somewhat like me; A little like me; Not like me; Not at all like me)

1. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to this person. This person likes to do things in their own original way.
2. It is important to this person to be rich. This person wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.
3. This person thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. This person believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.
4. It's very important to this person to show this person’s abilities. This person wants people to admire what they do.
5. It is important to this person to live in secure surroundings. This person avoids anything that might endanger this person’s safety.
6. This person thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. This person always looks for new things to try.
7. This person believes that people should do what they're told. This person thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.
8. It is important to this person to listen to people who are different. Even when one disagrees, this person still wants to understand them.
9. This person thinks it's important not to ask for more than what you have. This person believes that people should be satisfied with what they have.
10. This person seeks every chance this person can to have fun. It is important to this person to do things that give this person pleasure.
11. It is important to this person to make this person’s own decisions about what this person does. This person likes to be free to plan and to choose this person’s activities for this person’s self.
12. It's very important to this person to help people. This person wants to care for other’s well-being.
13. Being very successful is important to this person. This person likes to impress other people.
14. It is very important to this person that this person’s country be safe. This person thinks the state must be on watch against threats from within and without.
15. This person likes to take risks. This person is always looking for adventures.
16. It is important to this person to always behave properly. This person wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.

17. It is important to this person to be in charge and tell others what to do. This person wants people to do what this person says.

18. It is important to this person to be loyal to one’s friends. This person wants to be devoted to the people they are close to.

19. This person strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to this person.

20. Religious belief is important to this person. This person tries hard to do what this person’s religion requires.

21. It is important to this person that things be organized and clean. This person really does not like things to be a mess.

22. This person thinks it's important to be interested in things. This person likes to be curious and to try to understand all sorts of things.

23. This person believes all the worlds’ people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among all groups in the world is important to this person.

24. This person thinks it is important to be ambitious. This person wants to show how capable this person is.

25. This person thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is important to this person to keep up the customs this person has learned.

26. Enjoying life’s pleasures is important to this person. This person likes to ‘spoil’ one’s self.

27. It is important to this person to respond to the needs of others. This person tries to support those this person knows.

28. This person believes one should always show respect to this person’s parents and to older people. It is important to this person to be obedient.

29. This person wants everyone to be treated justly, even people this person doesn’t know. It is important to this person to protect the weak in society.

30. This person likes surprises. It is important to this person to have an exciting life.

31. This person tries hard to avoid getting sick. Staying healthy is very important to this person.

32. Getting ahead in life is important to this person. This person strives to do better than others.

33. Forgiving people who have hurt this person is important to this person. This person tries to see what is good in them and not to hold a grudge.

34. It is important to this person to be independent. This person likes to rely on this person’s self.

35. Having a stable government is important to this person. This person is concerned that the social order be protected.

36. It is important to this person to be polite to other people all the time. This person tries never to disturb or irritate others.
37. This person really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to this person.
38. It is important to this person to be humble and modest. This person tries not to draw attention to this one’s self.
39. This person always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. This person likes to be the leader.
40. It is important to this person to adapt to nature and to fit into it. This person believes that people should not change nature.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpreter Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank You</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for giving your time to this project!
**APPENDIX B: Question 10 Responses and Coding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Please briefly describe your reasons for pursuing a career in interpreting:</th>
<th>TVT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fell in love with languages as a child. Thought this would be a brief career until I found what I wanted to do, but instead fell in love with interpreting.</td>
<td>VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developed a passion for the language and culture</td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I fell in love with the language, found a tutor and started to learn Sign Language. I was fortunate to have it become a career that I continue to learn in everyday.</td>
<td>Hedonism, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I fell into it after high school, more or less, but I continued pursuit of higher education of linguistics (BA) and interpreting (MA) because I enjoy the work and the people I get to work with. I feel that I provide a critical service for a community that requires linguistic interaction, and that is very fulfilling work for me.</td>
<td>Benevolence B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>passion for ASL led to passion for interpreting. it's what I feel I was born to do.</td>
<td>Hedonism B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Love the language</td>
<td>Hedonism H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I love the Language of ASL</td>
<td>Hedonism C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I was good at it and people would pay me to do it.</td>
<td>Achievement SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My mom is Deaf so seeing the barrier she faces to communicate with others, with only having limited ASL skills.</td>
<td>Universalism SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>It just sort of happened! Found out I was good at it and wanted to continue interpreting!</td>
<td>Achievement H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Inherited</td>
<td>Conformity SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I learned ASL through a deaf roommate of mine and then was proposed the opportunity to interpret. I fell in love with it and made it my career.</td>
<td>Hedonism H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Love of the language.</td>
<td>Hedonism SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fluent in the language and love kids</td>
<td>Achievement U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I feel like it is what I was born to do.</td>
<td>Achievement B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I enjoy filling a need that bridges a communication gap of, often, life altering proportions. I am challenged to put my self aside and put others and their need above myself with integrity, creativity and constant learning.</td>
<td>Benevolence C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Spent 16 years in corporate society while interpreting on the side &amp; decided to pursue it full time.</td>
<td>Self-Direction C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>It was a natural progression since I was raised by my grandmother who is Deaf.</td>
<td>Conformity U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deaf family sparked an interest at an early age. I'm part of a nationwide translation project with my church, working to translate the service books into ASL. It just seemed like that was what I was supposed to do. It is a career I have become passionate about and love doing every day. There is no other career I could imagine still loving every day. Learned to sign as a child. I was an interpreter before I had ever heard the word. Fell in love with signing.

I was a customer care representative at Purple Communication, INC. I discovered my soft skills with Deaf consumers. I realized that I can do more than sitting in an office all day. And I get more opportunities to volunteer my time for Deaf community when I was IPP student at American River College. I wanted to work with children. Started in speech therapy studies then audiology leading to interpreter

I'm fascinated with Deaf culture, of which I became involved with later in my life. I enjoy the interaction, and ability to provide a service to a group of people who have long been underserved and oppressed because of hearing people's ignorance about the culture. Gives me flexibility. I have a wide range of skills and knowledge and it challenges me and provides me plenty of opportunities to facilitate successful communication interactions.

I learned ASL to be able to chat w/my neighbor. When I realized that Interpreting was a true profession, I applied for college. Up until five years ago, I did not want to be an interpreter. I disliked being "forced" to interpret for family when I was a child. As an adult, I used ASL often, but not in any serious capacity and I still had that memory of childhood interpreting. Five years ago I was at a fork in my life and didn't know what to do. I sat down and wrote all the things that I enjoyed and settings where I would enjoy working. I then scored them on a highest to lowest rating, forcing myself to not have ties. Signing was my second highest, and I knew that I wanted to have signing a part of my career. I researched in-depth all the careers I could have with ASL and I realized that I did enjoy interpreting. I decided to pursue it more to see if it was truly something I wanted to do and so far, I have more reasons than I did for wanting to continue interpreting.

I felt it was my calling and once I started practicing interpreting it was affirmed. I enjoy the challenge

A Deaf person suggested it and I lacked direction in my life. I wanted to stay in the Deaf community. Fortunately I ended up falling in love with interpreting.

I enjoy working with people and being involved the Deaf
Originally, I found a passion for American Sign Language. Then I continued to pursue a career because interpreting, translation, and language analysis became my passion.

I love people, ideas and language and the creative process involved when making connections and building bridges between them all.

I enjoyed the language and brokering communication between two individuals. It felt like a creative job without office walls.

I started college as an Education Major. I was placed in a dorm specifically for ASL majors and began to learn the language because there were 3 deaf people in the hall. I quickly fell in love with the community and changed my major to interpreting.

I have a love for languages, and a passion for this field of work. Looked like a really great job!

languages fascinate and challenge me. I love working within the Deaf community and all the challenges interpreting presents me with.

Love being able to continue working on my skills everyday. Enjoy human interaction on numerous levels.

I love working with language

For me it was a natural progression from learning ASL. I wanted an opportunity to relocate and this enabled that.

Wanting to learn ASL then kept up with the program and got into interpreting It all fell into place

I enjoyed ASL classes in high school and also have extended family members who are deaf. My passion for the language and their encouragement helped me choose my career.

I was drawn to the field when I was in the 7th grade. Motivated to learn to sign to have direct communication with a student who had just been (singly) mainstreamed in my school.

I met 12 deaf students on a bus as a senior in high school & realized I could make a better living as a teacher of the deaf/interpreter than as a dancer/choreographer. Interpreting was like "dancing with my hands."

I started taking ASL courses in high school so, when I graduated, I knew I wanted to pursue a career that would involve the use of ASL. An instructor at a community college encouraged me to enroll in an ITP.

I had exposure to sign language in Elementary School that sparked my interest. I was then considering majoring in Deaf Ed. I took some ASL classes at a local community college during my senior year of high school. I really fell in love with the language and realized interpreting would be a better fit for me instead of teaching.
Was captured by ASL at an early age. Have always loved language. I planned on pursuing a career in Special Education, and took a sign language class. I have always been fascinated with languages, and thought it would help with my career. I have a sibling with a cognitive disability. I switched to Deaf Ed. as well as interpreting. I then dropped Deaf Ed.

I love that the setting is so fluid and unpredictable. I love learning new languages and the process required for interpreting between two languages. Additionally, I enjoy being an advocate to a minority group, as well as being an option of equal access for them.

Encouragement from the Deaf Community had a big impact on my pursuing a career in interpreting. ASL was a general interest and once I started working as a paraprofessional in a residential school for the Deaf, I developed a passion for signing and interpreting. Once I received training in the field, I realized that I have strong skills and felt that the career choice would be beneficial. I enjoy working between Deaf and hearing individuals to provide access to communication. While I mainly work in the EdK12 setting, I have branched out in VR settings and would like to continue pursuing opportunities in the community settings as well.

I enjoy helping others and challenging myself with learning a new language and how to "play" with it.

Aligns with personal values, giving back to my home community, allows me to be effective and professional

I started out as an audiologist, when raising a family I needed employment that I could work at part-time.

Love languages

I took an ASL course my second semester in college and fell in love with it!

I met a friend of mine who is Deaf when I was in middle school. Since then I wanted to become an interpreter. I enjoy the work and the challenging nature.

I felt I could provide good service

I fell into it; I'd always loved sign language. A Teacher of the Deaf saw me sign, explained the extreme need (overseas Dept of Defense, private school), studied with all materials available after I was recruited, but before I began working. I made up for my lack of education by doing independent research until returning to US where I was able to take formal classes and finally made (adult, Deaf) friends who took me under their wing as I got certified and beyond certification. I love not having to pick "one field" in which I work. I'm a life-long-learner and this career requires that dedication. I enjoy the relationships I've made because of this career and have
had my life opened to communities/cultures I didn't realize existed. I LOVE being an interpreter and have been a trained mentor for ~10 years. I look forward to my state getting a BA degree so I can advance my formal education.

68  Was attending a college with a program for deaf students and the beauty of the language intrigued me,  Hedonism  SD

69  In the beginning it was because I was facinated by the language. Once in college I got to know and fell in love with the people and culture.  Hedonism  B

70  I took ASL in college to fulfill my foreign language requirement and fell in love with the teaching methodologies employed by my instructor.  Hedonism  SEC

71  Love of ASL and communicating with Deaf people, as well as great satisfaction in facilitating communication through interpreting.  Hedonism  SEC

72  I love the language and cultural negotiation,  Hedonism  B

73  Interpreting was something that came natural to me as a CODA and I felt a strong pull to give back to the community which I was raised. I received encouragement and affirmation from the Deaf community that this was the right field for me so I pursued a degree in ASL to have a more deep understanding of the language and cultural events which have led to oppression or empowerment.

74  First, because ASL is a beautiful language. Second, I also want to help provide access to communication.  Benevolence  H

75  I worked as a teacher of the deaf and did some interpreting on the side. After 9 years as a classroom teacher I moved to interpreting full time.  Achievement  SD

76  The love of sign language and deaf friends  Hedonism  B

77  Grew up interpreting, wanted certification to be recognized as a professional. After certified, have been able to use my credentials to better serve the ASL community in a variety of settings.  Conformity  B

78  Involvement with Deaf community  Benevolence  SEC

79  I'm able to work in my native language everyday and provide equal accessibility for those who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing.  Universalism  SD

80  In the beginning I was shocked I could get paid for something that was my first language now I truly enjoy working with the community.  Hedonism  U, STIM

81  I find beauty in ASL, not only the language but the culture that comes with it. I've been surrounded by a great Deaf community and other people who share the same interest as myself and I couldn't have found a better group of friends. I love the culture so much and I'm excited to be able fix the bridge of communication between the Deaf and hearing worlds.  Benevolence  U, B, STIM
85 Felt natural to enter in.
86 Had language and culture after MA program at Gallaudet. Needed a job and sought out mentoring.
87 Deaf parents, God guided
88 I want to work with international linguistic rights.
89 The usual, Fell in love with the Deaf Community.
90 Interested in the language and culture.
91 The fulfilling nature of serving people through language access, the strong support of community, and the challenge of working with two ever changing and evolving cultures and languages and the dynamics between them.
92 It was a career choice at the time I needed an option quickly. I have chosen to remain in the field because it supports a community I care about and I find it rewarding.
93 Wanted to work in education and found interpreting very fulfilling
94 It's my passion.
95 I was interacting with deaf people at a time when there were no professional ASL interpreters; my friends would often ask "What did they say?).
96 It fell in my lap, really. Just wanted to learn sign language because I thought it looked cool (typical hearing kid, right?). Picked it up pretty well, and one thing lead to another.
97 I enjoy learning languages and learning about different cultures
98 I enjoy working with people, and wanted a field where I could do something different everyday.
99 Initial interest in spoken languages led to studies in ASL. I felt a connection to ASL and Deaf culture. I wanted to be able to use the language every day and interpreting seemed a more satisfying way to to stay involved than other opportunities.
100 I went back to school at 40 with many college credits but no degree. Had always been fascinated with ASL and friend's daughter born deaf, cochlear implant no sign language = disaster.
101 I had learned some sign language as a child. Then while in high school, I found a brochure for an ITP and thought it would be something I would enjoy. At that point I knew nothing of the career, nor had I ever met a deaf person.
102 I did not originally intend to pursue interpreting as a career. I discovered it as a career later after working with Deaf and Hard of Hearing adults for several years.
103 Learned signs from deaf couple. They attended TSD in the 1930s. In the 1970's, no ITP programs. BEI was new. Deaf and BEI wanted certified interpreters, so we studied with the Deaf, took any workshops that were available. We tested in front of table of live
evaluators watching bad videos on a small TV. Wow!

Certification was required to continue employment

Grew up interpreting for Deaf parents in the 50's when there were no electronic devices yet available, it was just part of growing up in the Deaf community. When interpreting became a viable livelihood, I had been interpreting already for many years, so it was the next natural step in my life.

Deaf friends

I thought it would be a great opportunity to work as an ally to an oppressed linguistic and cultural minority, plus I liked using my hands to create language and it also was a great way to have a performance aspect (as I have a theatre background) in a different type of way

--wanted a service-oriented profession --wanted to be able to help lots of different people --wanted to be able to travel --wanted a challenging and dynamic profession --found out that ASL was an rocking cool language and was thrilled it was an actual job --loved the variety of the interpreting jobs available

Early exposure to interpreters "planted the seed." The process fascinated me as a child, and it still does.

I was an exchange student at a Deaf School in High School and connected with Deaf Culture there.

Always enjoyed getting to play with other languages...that was the initial draw. Now...enjoy the variety of topics, people, locations, etc. as well as the language and culture mediation.

Initially, an interest in learning different languages. Since then, the variety of people and settings, plus the flexibility in scheduling.

Started as a hobby, but then got very tired of office work and applied to a school for the deaf and soared from there.

"Fell into it". Was recruited by University 4year ITP program Interpreter Director.

Very interested in the language for along time

Found the language and the culture interesting. Also like the variety of work settings and the constant opportunity to learn new things

I began learning ASL in high school and my ASL teacher recommended to me that I pursue interpreting and I thought I would give it a shot and ended up loving it.

Feel in love with the language and the people. I was already interpreting for friends and they suggested I become an interpreter

Began working in Mental Health field in college. Worked for 10 yrs at a school f/t Deaf and became an interpreter instead of a counselor

Achievement  SD
Benevolence  C
Conformity  SD, U
Universalism  SD
Stimulation  U, B
hedonism  U
Benevolence  B
Hedonism  U
Stimulation  SD
Achievement  SEC
Conformity  SD
Hedonism  SD
Stimulation  C
Hedonism  A
Hedonism  C
self-direction  SD
I am a former deaf education teacher that experienced burn out. Interpreting was a natural transition.

I enjoyed the language and didn't have any other plans after graduating high school.

I owed it to the Deaf people who shared their language and culture with me.

I enjoyed learning to sign and then met an interpreter who said she loved her job. I too wanted a job I could love.

Love of the language; interest in education.

My mom is a hair dresser. She had Deaf clients growing up, they taught us ASL. Then, later in life, I knew I wanted a degree. I needed foreign lang credits so I took ASL. That was the only class I was truly excited about. I even loved learning about linguistics. My Deaf professor said I should continue on to interpreting. I never really decided to pursue it, I more just fell into it.

I learned ASL growing up and felt a responsibility to use my skills since the interpreter pool is so limited in number vis a vis the need. Also, I love it and to be frank, it's a way to support my family. There is always work available and it pays well.

I was good at it and enjoy it.

I view interpreting as ally and solidarity work. I felt that I could contribute values, as an ally, that would be beneficial to the interpreting community.

Met 2 deaf sisters when I was in elementary school I fell in love with Sign Language.

I grew up with Deaf friends and loved the language and wanted them to be included.
Fell in love with ASL during college, ended up changing major to interpreting because I thought it sounded like an interesting job.

My career of choice and degree was Deaf education and I taught briefly at a Deaf school before realizing I wasn’t organized enough to be an excellent teacher but still wanted to work with the Deaf community.

Enjoyed the people I was meeting in the deaf community and a fun hobby became a fun job

Initially, I was drawn to interpreting because of the visual nature of ASL. As I learned more about the field I was intrigued by understanding and conveying the thought-worlds of two (or more) individuals and seeking to accreting convey the goals and intentions of each party involved.

I love the language, I love the work and I enjoy helping people.

Was laid off from defense industry and was encouraged by Deaf community to become an interpreter because of lack of interpreters in the area.

Have an affinity for languages and working with people

Already had the language from growing up with Deaf parents

I enjoy working with young deaf children and young adults.

Took ASL 1 as a humanities credit, fell in love with the language and culture.

I started interpreting church because I saw a need and then moved into community interpreting as a career

Highly motivated by a performer who visited my high school twice. I loved how the language come to life.

At first an interesting diversion from deaf education in the evenings and became a fascination

I liked Deaf people, was learning to sign and there was a job open at a local high school interpreting in a new program for the Deaf. I was not very well prepared

interest in languages, flexibility in career choices

I went to an elementary school that had a Deaf program. That is what first sparked my interest in sign language and deafness.

Live of language and want to help people

My eldest child was born with a syndrome which made walking, talking and virtually everything extremely difficult. While he is not deaf, it was suggested to me by a speech therapist that he would benefit from me learning some signs to teach him how to indicate his basic needs. I took a class, then another and fell in love with the language. I went on to get an A.A. In Interpreting in an ITP. My son went on to learn to talk.

Just felt led to it.
As I was taking ASL classes at a local community college, my instructor encouraged me to become an interpreter because I picked it up so quickly. I was fascinated by it and couldn't get enough.

I love language and I love people. I fell in love with the Deaf community at a young age and knew I wanted to be apart of it somehow. Interpreting found me. I am honored that someone will trust me so much to allow me to be a part of their personal lives.

Pursued Music therapy as an undergrad, picked ASL as foreign language, Fell in love with interpreting. viola!

Enjoy the variety of assignments, challenging environments. Working with a variety of people. Love the language.

It was thrust upon me. I did teach ASL for many years but my heart is in interpreting. When you can see the other person "get it!" It's such a good feeling. When you see others getting that equal access is such an amazing feeling.

My parents are deaf and I feel a strong connection to the Deaf community.

I learned about interpreting at camp as a teenager and it seemed like an engaging, fulfilling career. It has been.

I found the course work in the interpreter training program challenging and interesting.

Learned it as a missionary for my church

I had grew up with Deaf kids in my neighborhood. I was interested in the language and the people. I did not realize that it was a job until I heard about the ITP in 1985.

I love sign language, Desf culture, and Deaf people. ASL is my absolute favorite thing to do.

I fell in love with ASL in high school. I feel that everyone should have equal access to communicate with whom ever they want to. I think it is important to bridge both the Deaf and hearing worlds by interpreters.

Love the language

I become an interpreter to empower deaf children and adults in their day to day lives.

I was originally drawn to the flexibility and variety that an interpreting career could offer me.

Deaf uncle > took ASL in HS > took ASL as an elective in college > didn't know/think I could make a living off it > 25+ years later, I still am...

Deaf community need CDIs since majority of hearing interpreters do not invest in the deaf community in ways where immersion of language and culture is fostered.
I am a 3rd generation interpreter. I signed before I spoke. This is just the family business and I love it.

I was interested in facilitating communication.

Took ASL in highschool and enjoyed the linguistics of it, so I continued into college.

Love of ASL, fostering and preservation of Deaf community, challenging and creative work everyday.

As a teenager I entered the Deaf Community at my church and went with the flow.

Just kind of "fell into it" as a youngster at the church where I "grew up".

Deaf friends, love languages

Love for ASL

This is my third career where I just happened to fall into while teaching at a College. At the time, I was leaving one career and searching for another.

I started studying ASL in high school and began looking into careers involving ASL and Deafness. I honestly fell into interpreting and found it to be a perfect fit. Couldn't be happier!

I saw the need for more CDIs and decided that in addition to training interpreters, I should become one myself.

Interest in the technical implications of practicing language interpretation and fascination with the healthcare industry, coupled with the ability to work in a service-based profession.

I had a career in telecommunications for 38 years, but began interpreting part time about 12 years ago with the intention of becoming a full time interpreter when I retired from my first career. That's what I have done. I have been working full time as an interpreter since January 2014 after retiring at the end of 2013 from my telecom job.

Love for Languages

I never intended to! I knew how to sign, and because of that, kind of fell into it

Grew up around it from age three. By 4th grade I knew that is what I wanted to do. Traveled nation wide with deaf theater group, then went to RIT and was mentored by the best all the while working. I knew that I knew I was where I belonged. 25 years later still where my soul connects.

My parents are Colombian, I grew up interpreting for them. Then in Jr High school, I had a Deaf friend who started my passion for ASL. Both of these influences led me to interpreting.

It seemed like a good fit for me. I love communication!
My mom told me it would be a good job :)

Love of language. Mother a professional translator. Seemed to be good at it. Father hard of hearing but never knew of a deaf community. Witnessing all his anger and frustration

Love the community and it's language. Access is important.

Loved the language and had some deaf friends

I had Deaf friends in high school and loved the language and the people. I felt a divine calling

Pretty much the only job in the world that satisfies my thirst for knowledge on a daily basis. Knowing ASL was pretty helpful in steering me into this direction but after working as an interpreter I realized that this job is a perfect fit for me.

Love the Deaf community and ASL. I feel I am right where I belong when I am signing/interpreting.

I loved ASL since I was 5. My friends mom taught me, borrowed books and movies in elementary school, took it as my language in high school, then decided to follow what I loved since I was 5.

I was/am fascinated by all forms of communication.

Deep resonance with the Deaf community, language and interpreting process.

It found me. I was not interested in becoming an community interpreter just wanted to be able to interpret at church. My love for the Deaf community, the pleasure and satification I received reach day is beyound measure.

I love ASL because it's so vibrant. I also love helping people and providing a service.

My involvement in the Deaf community since my undergrad years, attendance at Gallaudet as a special undergrad student back then, and the need for interpreters....so got certified.

I always wanted to learn ASL. This was a career I could learn and use ASL for. I did not know this was a career until in college for deaf education. I switched majors to Interpreting.

Interest in ASL and Deaf Community.

I love the language. There is nothing like work using what you love.

Friends who were deaf

Enjoyment of the language and interpreting

Took ASL as my high school language, did a unit on interpreting and haven't looked back!

Because the Education department wouldn't transfer any of my credits from other institutions, so pursing a degree in Elementary Ed. was no longer a viable option. My ASL teachers had encouraged me to become an interpreter, so I decided to go this route.

I wanted a job that I would enjoy and would pay the bills.
I enjoy the challenge of moving a message from one language to another, with all of its implied & overt meaning in tact.

I fell in love with the language when I was 15- when I took my first ASL class.

I enjoy the mental challenge of taking the meaning in one language and expressing that same meaning in another language.

I love having a challenging career involving language. I was interested in the complexities of interpreting, the uniqueness, and always engaged and learning and exposed to new things.

Ultimately I wanted to be a certified and qualified interpreter who makes communication access available for the Deaf in my community to worship/participate in church services. I volunteer most Sunday's and I do enjoy it. I think it was a love of the Deaf community that made me choose interpreting I like being able to break down those communication barriers.

I met a deaf person at work and started taking sign language classes. I thought about maybe going into speech pathology until I took Deaf Culture and that's when I knew I wanted to interpret.

Deaf friends growing up. Love of culture and language.

I enjoyed my sign language classes and thought it would be a good fit.

Just kinda fell into it.

I fell into it after spending time learning ASL and hoping to pursue Deaf theatre.

Love of language & culture, upbringing emphasizing the need for accessibility (family member with physical disability, hearing).

It has been my desire from a young age to pursue interpreting. I first realized this goal in the spoken language field and later in ASL.

DEAF friends encourage me.

Family business. My parents were interpreters of spoken languages.

As someone with a Deaf sibling, I want to interpret to further improve relations between hearing and Deaf individuals.

From the moment I met my first Deaf person (neighbor) I knew I wanted to learn ASL and somehow incorporate that into a future career but wasn't sure what. After working and volunteering in a few Deaf schools and Deaf camps in both NY and Massachusetts, I learned what interpreters were and what they did. From that point on, I made interpreting a goal I wanted to achieve.

I love the language and I love Deaf people. Honestly, it was the easiest thing I could do to earn a salary commensurate to my college educated (and non Deaf Community) peers but I've also done it for barely a livable wage (when working as a staff interpreter for a school district) so I love my job for more than money and wouldn't
do anything else.

237 Early exposure to ASL (hs classes) found myself easily picking up conversational skills. Enjoyed learning the linguistics in college. Now I learn something new every day

238 Facilitate communication

239 I wanted to be part of bridging the gap in communication between Deaf and hearing people. I learned ASL from Deaf friends and wanted to do what I could to make things in the hearing world accessible to them. I also appreciated all the experiences being an interpreter afforded me.

240 Former work with deaf people

241 When I started my ITP I knew nothing of the Deaf world, I picked up the language pretty easily and stuck with it. Now my passion for equality drives me to continue in the profession.

242 I had a Deaf classmate in college, and lack of accessibility was a huge issue. Wanted to make a difference.

243 I saw a need for quality interpreting in a special education setting. Kids in Special Ed who are deaf are often deemed priority for behavior skills and their language needs are neglected.

244 Because it is a challenging and interesting career that allows you to be a part of the community around you.

245 It was like linguistics (my original major) but we got to use language every day in addition to discussing it. I got to college already knowing ASL and having Deaf friends.

246 After trying a few other fields after my BA, interpreting felt like I had come home

247 I enjoy the process

248 Met a woman I wanted to talk to. Took one ASL class and still couldn't talk to her. Took ASL 2. Then Deaf culture. I was intrigued but not sure where I was headed. Now term for 5 years love my work. Happy ending, I can talk to that woman.

249 I feel in love with the language of ASL after having a Deaf classmate who had an interpreter during all of our classes. This never left me and I decided to go back to school and learn this language. I then found interpreting and knew I would enjoy it and that it would be a great "fit" for me.

250 I liked the language, liked the idea of being employed, and enjoy interpreting.

251 Love language

252 Happened by a happy accident of meeting a deaf person... And it goes from there.
My reasons for initially pursuing interpreting are that I loved the language and culture and was encouraged by a professor who saw potential in me.

I always wanted to be a teacher and when, at age eleven, I discovered sign language, I decided I wanted to teach deaf children. I got a degree in education, but got a full-time job as an educational interpreter before getting a teaching job and decided to stay with it.

I enjoy working with a different language.

I had a talent for it

I didn’t know about the field of interpreting until my high school teacher (a retired interpreter), thought I should look into the field in-depth. That is exactly what I did, I learned about the field and went to college to learn and grow as an interpreter; because I was intrigued by ASL and the process of interpreting. Now being an interpreter, I continue the pursuit of my education and my world knowledge to better support not only me the interpreter, but for the clients I work for both deaf and hearing.

I enjoy interpreting. Glad to get paid to do what I love. I started in ASL because of my son with autism.

Starting learning ASL, then became interested in interpreting.

MA Degree in linguistics from Gally. Wanted a career that was more social/collaborative than linguistics researcher or professor.

I love that it's always challenging. That I will always have something to work on. I love the language and the experiences/perspectives I now have from learning and experiencing ASL. I love Deaf people, and I want to help make their lives a little easier. I want to be able to go home at night and feel good about how I made someone's day easier.

It seemed interesting and paid well.

Deaf friends and family and lack of qualified interpreters on Puerto Rico

I loved studying other languages and cultures. The more I learned, the more I that it could become a career. I also wanted to be able to use ASL for ministry.

Love language. Love people interaction. Love variety and emotional work.

To provide a service and to be an ally and advocate for the Deaf community.

At the time I fell in love with the language and wanted to sign with my friends in private in front of people. Nothing altruistic

I discovered I had a knack for Sign Language.

I had an aptitude for the language and I was fascinated with Deaf culture
Encouraged by interpreter trainer while taking sign language classes.

After getting a degree in Deaf Education, I realized I enjoyed interpreting more.

Personal fulfillment in engaging in a vocation that I find meaningful, the work is fun and always challenging, I am a language and culture nerd so I love the work which makes me better at it, I believe it is worthwhile work to be part of the process that connects people and allows people to be included and engaged in all aspects of society.

I was already learning ASL and enjoyed it. When I found out that you could make a career with lots of variety out of interpreting, I decided to go for it!

love languages

My college was one of the few at the time that had a BA in interpreting. I started taking classes in ASL and never stopped.

I love ASL and I love being able to connect people who couldn't communicate.

I love language and the ability to connect people. I love the variety the job offers and how I can play a role in helping others communicate.

Being a former Linguistics major, I was very interested in the interpreting/translating process between languages.

As a child, I saw my brother's interpreter and I always knew that was what I wanted to pursue as a career.

I fell in love with ASL.

I have always been fascinated by the idea of a language on my hands. I love learning ASL and I feel like the best fit for me career wise is interpreting.

I have a Deaf daughter (grown), and I became interested in interpreting after I learned enough sign to enable me to handle the responsibility.

My Deaf friends thought that I would be a good candidate for becoming an interpreter. I wanted to work on being an ally and bridging the Deaf and hearing communities.

I enjoy being a part of successful human interactions.

I was a teacher of deaf kids with other disabilities and was asked to interpret PTA mtgs and IEPs and realized I liked interpreting and took some classes and started doing it!

I realized how much I enjoyed the Deaf Community and pursued learning ASL. Interpreting was the next logical step for me.

It's my one skill

I backed into it, and then liked it.
I was first exposed to ASL at home via my older sister, a sped teacher. Later, I took ASL as my foreign language in high school. I became passionate about the language and community, and my teacher encouraged me to pursue my interests by studying interpreting.

I had high success in ASL classes and interpreting seemed like a good fit for me.

Having been someone who has always felt like they had difficulty expressing themselves properly, or feeling like their voice wasn't heard, I have always acted as a mediator for other people. I often help others clarify even in English conversations "I think she meant..." I have been interested in sign language since TLC's 'Unpretty' video and I have a big heart for people and doing what I can to make others' lives easier.

I love language and the complexities of interpreting. I also am fascinated by cultures and love the Deaf community.

Fell in love with the people and language.

I met my first Deaf person when I was 10 and fell in love with the language.

It's a calling