Western Oregon University
Digital Commons@WOU

Graduate Theses, Action Research Projects, and Professional Projects

Graduate Studies and Research

11-29-2022

A Deaf Interpreter’s Experience with DCS Supervision: A Dialogic Autoethnography

Daniel Gough

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/theses

Part of the American Sign Language Commons, Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, Counselor Education Commons, Critical and Cultural Studies Commons, Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Disability Studies Commons, Discourse and Text Linguistics Commons, Educational Methods Commons, Educational Psychology Commons, Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Ethnicity in Communication Commons, International and Intercultural Communication Commons, Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons, Language and Literacy Education Commons, Social Influence and Political Communication Commons, Social Justice Commons, and the Typological Linguistics and Linguistic Diversity Commons

Recommended Citation

Gough, D. (2022). *A Deaf Interpreter’s Experience with DCS Supervision: A Dialogic Autoethnography* (master's thesis). Western Oregon University, Monmouth, Oregon. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/theses/225

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies and Research at Digital Commons@WOU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses, Action Research Projects, and Professional Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@WOU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@wou.edu, kundas@mail.wou.edu, bakersc@mail.wou.edu.

A Deaf Interpreter's Experience with DCS Supervision:

A Dialogic Autoethnography

By Dr. Daniel Gough

In partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of:

Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies

December 2022

Evaluation Page

The undersigned members of the Graduate Faculty of Western Oregon University have examined the enclosed thesis entitled:

Deaf Interpreter's experience with DC-S supervision:

An Autoethnography

Presented by: Daniel Gough

A candidate for the degree of: Master of Arts, Interpreting Studies

And hereby certify that in our opinion it is worthy of acceptance in partial fulfillment of the requirements for this master's degree.

Date:

Chairperson: ________________________________

Dr. Amanda Smith

Professor, Interpreting Studies

Committee member: ________________________________

Dr. Elisa Maroney

Professor, Interpreting Studies

Committee member: ________________________________

Ms. Kendra Keller

Assistant Professor, Interpreting Studies

©2022 Daniel Gough

December 2022

All rights reserved

Acknowledgements

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation Page 2
Acknowledgements 4
TABLE OF CONTENTS 5
List of Abbreviations or Symbols 7
Abstract 8

Chapter 1 9
Feedback Among Interpreters 10
Power Dynamics in Interpreting 10
Theoretical Framework 11
Supervision for Professional Development 13
Purpose of the Study 16

Chapter 2: Literature Review 17
Deaf Culture 17
History of ASL/English Interpreting 18
Majority and Minority Dynamics 18
Tokenism 20
Intersectional Invisibility 21
The relationship rhombus 21
Ethical issues 23
Communication Dynamics 23
Impartiality 24
Gaps 25
Reflective Practice 26

Chapter 3: Methodology 30
Design 32
Data Collection 33

Chapter Four: Findings 35
Participant Demographics 35
Think Aloud Protocol 35
Misperceptions 37
Dynamics 38
Status Quo 40
Chapter 5: Conclusion 43
Implications of Misperceptions 44
Implications of Dynamics 46
Implications of Status Quo 47
References 50

APPENDIX A: Informed Consent 63

List of Abbreviations or Symbols

DC-S: Demand Control Schema

ASL: American Sign Language

IIRAS: Interpreting Institute for Reflection-in-Action & Supervision

Abstract

In this thesis, I sought to examine myself as a Deaf interpreter in Demand and Control Schema (DC-S) supervision sessions. The methodology was a dialogic analysis based on power/communication dynamics in DC-S supervision as a Deaf interpreter. The platform that I used was the Interpreting Institute for Reflection-in-Action & Supervision (IIRAS) platform online sessions. In the session, the hearing participants were 18 years or older, they either work or have worked as ASL/English interpreters. They attended at least three supervision sessions. The data collected included the researcher's journaling, video recordings, and responses from interviews.questions with participants and supervision leaders. There was evidence of hearing and Deaf individuals communicating comfortably and effectively.

Chapter 1

Interpreting decision-making is an ethical issue that has an impact on consumers and the situation at hand. This is especially true for sign language interpreters, who work with Deaf people in various situations. People who identify as culturally Deaf, use signed language to communicate, and occur within other social identities are considered a linguistic minority (Mauldin & Fannon 2021) and have unique needs for interpreted situations that are often overlooked by hearing interpreters. In this paper, I explore the lived experience as a Deaf interpreter through Demand Control Schema (DC-S) supervision (Dean & Pollard, 2009). I further explore the concept of DC-S supervision as a Deaf interpreter and share the benefits and effective communication within supervision sessions.

Background

I am a Deaf interpreter. Although many perceive being Deaf as having a disability, many also recognize Deaf people as a cultural and linguistic minority (Gough, 2014). As a Deaf individual, I started working as an interpreter in 2002 in Trondheim, Norway, for a local university. I interpreted in multiple signed languages, such as Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish, and ASL. Deaf interpreters demonstrate similar skills, if not better, as hearing interpreters in language, culture, and communication skills — all critical for an effective interaction with the consumers with whom they may work (Deaf Interpreter Institute). From 2002 to 2022, I came to realize that I did not have any tools to analyze others' work and my work. This research is based

on my journey as a Deaf person and interpreter utilizing the Demand Control Schema supervision model (Dean & Pollard, 2009).

Feedback Among Interpreters

As a Deaf person working in the interpreting field in the 2000s, I still face challenges and stumble when I leave interpreting assignments with uneasy feelings or unanswered questions about my performance. There were conversations among Deaf interpreters at workshops or conferences and seminars regarding receiving feedback from team interpreters. My experience with receiving feedback from team interpreters often consisted of no feedback or inappropriate feedback. Indeed, Reinhardt (2015) wrote that educators or practitioners do not know how to use effective communication or provide/receive feedback in the interpreting field, especially when working with Deaf interpreters The dynamics within a team of hearing ASL interpreters make it difficult for them to provide or receive feedback amongst themselves. Jackie Emmart (2016) mentioned, “I received an email from my team interpreter that simply said, ‘Can we chat about today?’ I had an immediate hunch that I was soon to receive feedback about my performance and… I froze” (Emmart, 2015, para. 2). This process is already stressful enough among hearing interpreters, but when the team is composed of both hearing and Deaf interpreters, it is likely compounded because of the cultural dynamics with added pressure and stress.

Power Dynamics in Interpreting

Majority and minority dynamics are essential to understanding power and cultural dynamics (O’Brien & Crawley, 2020). The Deaf community is dependent on interpreters for

communication access; therefore, hearing participants and interpreters may hold more power (Diamond, 2020). The interdependent and dialectical relationship is an asymmetrical power dynamic between hearing interpreters and the Deaf community, so it is critical to understand key components about both communities to understand how they influence and respond to each other (Diamond, 2020).

The American Sign Language (ASL) interpreting profession and many other occupations do not have a standardized approach to providing or receiving feedback (Emmart, 2016). Receiving or providing feedback can be painful or brutal, as the feedback often leads people to be emotional because of a lack of skills in feedback. “Our ability and desire to learn is strongly associated with our ability to change, to replace an unproductive skill or behavior adversely affected by an emotional fear with a more productive one” (Stone & Heen, 2015, p. 5). With this in mind, interpreters’ communication tactics should improve to make meaningful changes for the feedback process. Practitioners in the interpreting field must continually assess and reflect on their decision-making processes in each interpreting assignment.

Theoretical Framework

DC-S Supervision for Professional Development

The Demand Control Schema (DC-S), based on Karasek’s demand control theory (Dean & Pollard, 2009; Karasek, 1979), is a framework that helps interpreters focus on assignments' demands and controls. The DC-S framework develops multiple insights regarding the goals and perspectives of interpreting assignments in specific environments instead of focusing on the

technical aspects of interpreting (Dean & Pollard, 2009). *Demands* are situations that a person faces and how they may impact that person. Demands include four categories: environmental, interpersonal, paralinguistic, and intrapersonal (EIPI). *Controls* are decisions for an assignment made in response to the situation (Dean et al., 2004). The application of controls is structured to advance interpreters' decision-making and ethical reasoning skills in a safe and supportive learning environment different from the assignment. The credibility, validity, and reliability of the decision-making model enables a continuum of reflective critical analysis of the practitioner.

Research in mental health and in the medical fields has shown tremendous benefits of utilizing supervision for participants to gain a better understanding and perspectives of workplace issues, increased self-awareness, improved colleague relationships, and increased various positive outcomes for the practitioner and consumer (Curtis, 2017). Thus, in this study, a DC-S supervision approach was undertaken. As explained by Dean and Pollard (2011, as cited by IIRAS, para. 1):

> …we use the term *supervision* in the way psychologists and other mental health professionals use it – describing a supportive, confidential, interactive dialogue between two (or more) professionals regarding their work with consumers, the goal of which is to enhance professional practice. Engaging in reflective learning, such as through supervision, are ways that many practice professionals pursue a career-long process of maintaining effective awareness and management of the intrapersonal elements of their professional activities...

The website continues,

> Schön (1983) describes reflection-in-action as reflecting on the incident while it can still benefit that situation rather than reflecting on how you would do things differently in the future. This is the practice of continuous reflection and analysis of real-time decision making and dynamic shifts in the setting to respond responsibly in the moment. Reflection-on-action is also a vital tool as it serves to inform and equip practitioners to more accurately reflect-IN-action in the future. (IIRAS, para. 2)

Supervision for Professional Development

Through networking and by reflecting on my work and interactions in DC-S supervision, I identified an ideal space where I could develop research on supervision: Interpreting Institute for Reflection-in-Action & Supervision (IIRAS; https://www.iirasinternational.com). IIRAS offers a variety of services to meet the needs of any interpreter interested in reflective practice and supervision. The IIRAS setting became one where I conducted my research, as both participant and researcher. I collected data using an immersed participant autoethnographic approach (Poerwandari, 2021).

Intersectional Invisibility

My study also adopted another theoretical framework, *intersectional invisibility* (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). The intersectional invisibility framework provides a way to study the ideological sources of reality and its effects on the lives of people with intersecting subordinate

identities (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). The intersectional invisibility model broadens prejudice and discrimination beyond the common practice of oppression that target subordinate groups. That includes more extensive investigations of the often-subtle practices that marginalize minority groups by excluding their experiences or perspectives from social representations and dialogues (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

There is a lack of pedagogical practices related to supervision in interpreting programs (Hetherington, 2012), especially for Deaf interpreters. The role of the Deaf interpreters has grown. However, most interpreter training programs (ITPs) are designed for hearing students (Deaf Interpreter Institute, 2014), which often leads to dissension between the majority and the minority, creating awkward communication dynamics. Research has shown that issues in the interpreter education programs (Smith et al., 2012) that lack ethics, decision making, and standards (Dean & Pollard, 2011; Judd, 2015; Curtis, 2017) impact the participants' well-being and decision-making skills (Maffia, 2014). Supervision sessions are in the infancy stage within the signed language interpreting field, and there continues to be insufficient information on participants' experience in DC-S supervision (Curtis, 2017), which is certainly true among Deaf interpreters. In addition, members of minority communities often face individual, cultural, and systemic oppression due to majority communities and -isms (Hein & Scharer, 2013). The intersectionality of multiple marginalized identities within minority communities may contribute to decreased visibility, validation, and voice among oppressed populations such as Deaf people.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to document current communication dynamics between hearing and Deaf interpreters experiencing DC-S supervision in the signed language interpreting field and to identify the benefits of supervision for Deaf interpreters. In this study, the following essential questions were investigated:

1. How could DC-S supervision sessions improve communication dynamics between hearing and Deaf interpreters?
2. What are the benefits of participation in DC-S supervision for Deaf interpreters?

The questions aimed to unlock how Deaf and hearing interpreters communicate with one another in interpreting programs, supervision sessions, or even at an interpreting assignment. The interpreting profession must make adjustments to boost benefits in DC-S supervision sessions. If practitioners can identify communication dynamics, improvement, or benefits of participation in DC-S supervision for Deaf interpreters will likely emerge. This could open a path for further research and more specific professional development.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, the history of ASL interpreting is discussed to better understand the ASL interpreting field. Some literature contents discussed the lack of cultural training and others discuss communication dynamics and power imbalances. The articles discussed the impartiality of interpreters and the roles of interpreters that may lead to many issues that disrupt interpreting. I discuss gaps because there is a need to understand deficiencies and gaps in interpreting programs before diving into solutions. As a researcher, my goal is to identify the solutions to close those gaps, and I believe that reflective practice, including clinical supervision, is a part of the solution. A few scholarly articles discuss problem-based learning, supervision, demand-control schema, and ethical decision-making (see Dean et al., 2004; Dean & Pollard, 2009; Karasek & Theorell, 1988; McKeachie, 2002). Finally, this literature review discusses the benefits of supervision.

Deaf Culture

The Deaf community is a socio-cultural minority group, and Deaf culture is based on collective lives, sharing information, and status (Ladd, 2003). The population is self-identified by the usage of the capital 'D' in deaf to represent themselves as a socio-cultural and collectivist ASL community unified (Hall et al., 2016). They are also part of a linguistic and cultural minority (Ladd, 2003; Gough 2014; Hall et al., 2016).

History of ASL/English Interpreting

The history of the interpreting field has been documented from 1800 to the 21st century, although the ASL interpreting field was not professionalized until 1964 (Ball, 2013) with the formation of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID). Within the interpreting field, the ASL interpreting field is the youngest (Curtis, 2017; Dean & Pollard; Judd, 2015; Hetherington, 2012; Smith et al., 2012). As a result, ASL interpreters in the field are trying new strategies or approaches for skill development. Philosophical approaches in the past 60 years have caused changes in how practitioners serve Deaf consumers (Ball, 2013). Interpreting programs often are unclear on the hearing interpreter's role, function, and professional identity (Curtis, 2017). In the early stages of the ASL interpreting field, the helper model allowed interpreters to add meaning and intent to the message and act on behalf of the Deaf individual (Wilcox & Shaffer, 2005). As time went on, the interpreter's goals changed, and the models of interpreting changed over time: machine, conduit, and then bilingual-bicultural (Ball, 2013). In addition, hearing-run interpreter programs typically use Deaf community members as support rather than as educators (Wilson, 2011). Non-enculturated, individualistic ASL interpreters became the de facto standard as professional interpreters, and they then find themselves at odds with collectivist Deaf cultural norms and values (Cokely, 2005).

Majority and Minority Dynamics

The vast majority of interpreters within the ASL interpreting field are hearing individuals who interpret for the Deaf community (RID, 2019), and Deaf people continue to be in the

minority. Additionally, most hearing people in America have English as their first language, while Deaf people in America have ASL as their first language. Typically, professional interpreters facilitate messages and interactions between the minority community and the majority community. Professional interpreters must attain training in the cognitive process, translation, and terminology in various venues like legal, mental health, roles, and ethics of interpreting (Stewart et al., 2004). Researchers have found, when examining majority and minority dynamics, including supervision relationships, that majorities are generally in the supervisory leader position (Kusters et al., 2017; O'Brien & Crawley, 2020). Understanding the influence power and culture have upon communication dynamics between participants and supervision leaders is crucial (Tsai, 2011). Power and communication dynamics may neglect what cultural aspects might take place in any situation.

Bourdieu (2011) coined, " forms of capital," a term that distinguishes between economic wealth, social, and cultural capital. The control of economic resources can characterize economic wealth. Social capital consists of actual and potential durable networking or resources. Cultural capital is a person's knowledge and intellectual skills that provides an advantage in social status (Bourdieu, 1986). Capital can be picked up, produced, and or amplified through culture in order to achieve access to social relations that allow goals to be successful in the short and long term (Bonamino et al., 2010). Cultural capital has social consequences and contributes to a sense of place, self-definition, and social network. The dominant culture groups tend to centralize and be

aggressive in any situation, while minority culture groups would go passive as they resign and lose motivation.

Tokenism

Various fields like nursing, interpreting, and healthcare usually train professionals to have rugged psychological toughness (Giordano et al., 2022). Status quo is the tendency that people choose the current state over more optimum alternatives (Hammond, et al., 2019). Tokenism can be defined as a form of discrimination whereby minorities fill roles usually reserved for dominant group members (Medina, 2019). Individuals whose social category is minority groups in particular contexts like the Deaf community will face negative experiences such as increased visibility or social isolation. In one article, a person of color expressed frustration about the gaps in representation, like in theatrical roles are automatically given to white people unless the script clearly states the character is of color (McAskill et al., 2022). Often, minority individuals identify themselves as socially isolated with limited roles that conflict with the expectation of high and low status duties. The more workers are exposed to the stresses of consumers from a dominant (white) autonomous position, the less effective their adopted defensive measures are (Butterworth et al., 1996). The potential of supervision to develop and strengthen a symbiotic system of practice to intervene meaningfully and focus on the delivery process will either fall at the first hurdle or fade out if the process is not appropriately cultivated. Supervisors also often evaluate individuals — including marginalized individuals — based on the supervisors' beliefs

(Medina, 2019). Addressing structural barriers responsible for the inequities between those with access (hearing) and those without (Deaf) is important.

Intersectional Invisibility

As oppressed voices, including intersectional communities, are underrepresented in interpreting fields, it is imperative to increase professionals' understanding of the complex experiences of oppression of minority members (LaMantia et al., 2015). Majority members also are often (incorrectly) assumed as allies to the minority community; in fact, many Deaf people have heard the phrase, *but you do not look Deaf* when we describe our advocacy efforts in personal and professional settings (Wu & Grant, 2020). The Deaf community, including DIs, has felt connected by the isolation and detachment in our invisible marginalization. DIs identified that our shared experiences warranted a deeper examination of cultural/intersectional dynamics within supervision sessions. To explore power, dynamics, and cultures, intersectional invisibility's principles were applied to identify what or where power comes from, like an economical, social, or political privilege. Dismantling the status quo from an intersectional perspective had the goal of eliminating power in supervision sessions that led to healthy, safe, and secure supervision sessions (Berzoff, 2011).

The relationship rhombus

Ekstein and Wallerstein (1972) offered a four-sided diagram, the clinical rhombus, to help illuminate the relationships between the participants in supervision. I adopted the concept and replaced them with the majority groups), managers (minority), and supervision

leaders/supervisees as the primary focus in this study. The definition of the majority is a larger group that controls other smaller groups as shown be seen at the top corner of the rhombus; the minority's role is facing various dynamics that are pressured by the majority and can be seen on the left of the rhombus (Cottrell, 2002). On the bottom of the rhombus are the supervision leaders, whose role is to supervise the session. On the right of the rhombus is the supervisee, whose role is to participate in the supervision. Collusion is a special relationship between two or more participants or supervisors subconsciously aiming to foster closeness through the exclusion of another (Ekstein & Wallerstein, 1972).

The relationships can be motivated by obedience based on authority, which could affect the anxieties and resistance of the participants and manifest into unsafe issues (Ekstein & Wallerstein, 1972). Sometimes participants who appear to stand out from the supervision potentially lead to envy and hostility becoming mobilized towards those who wish to escalate themselves above others: “Who do they think they are?” or they unconsciously or consciously rely on minorities to represent their community to receive information or solutions in the supervision session. That action could be considered *tokenism* (Collica-Cox & Schulz, 2020). Tokenism is not easy to navigate as a minority person in a majority group, like supervision. Multiple articles indicated that participants who identified as disabled, as women, as people of color, or as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning experienced adverse experiences (Thacker & Minton, 2021). Some examples of adverse experiences included microaggressions, tokenism, lack of support or mentorship, and invisibility.

Ethical issues

Any minority interpreting and enculturated interpreters must deal with ethical issues in practice, including trust, confidentiality, multiple roles in the assignment, and power (Hall et al., 2016). Any imbalance in trust, confidentiality, roles, or power likely exists because interpreters are hearing and using English, and they may abuse their power with or without intention. The power imbalance concept is a sensitive and challenging topic. Interpreters must be attentive to their power balance to develop trust between hearing interpreters and Deaf community members. Interpreters must develop ethical standards to address situations where power imbalance may appear. Trust is essential in any situations where interpreters interpret in Deaf communities (Barron et al., 2010; Hall et al., 2016; Hsieh et al., 2010; Reinhardt, 2015).

Communication Dynamics

There is a significant difference between the dominant hearing and Deaf cultures. In the hearing community, dominant institutions label Deaf communities as hearing impaired or view Deaf people as disabled (Gimenez, 2001). The hearing community considers the "Deaf" identity a resistance identity and links to past and current social movements (Gimenez, 2001). Thus, hearing identity does not have culture or identity. The deaf community considers "Deaf" pride as a positive thing, and views itself as a cultural and linguistic minority (Diamond, 2020).

People's different extralinguistic knowledge affects communication between individuals from different cultural backgrounds and uses other languages like ASL or English. The goal of communication is to achieve interpersonal/intercultural communication that includes

self-confidence, motivation, attitudes, and personality (Yashima et al., 2004). Contextual variables such as where the interaction happens, who the communication partner is, and who is present in the situation affect how willing one is to communicate. Where motivation is a predictor of an ethnolinguistic study and communication that carries intergroups' social and political implications, social contexts and learning contexts are affected by communication dynamics (Yashima et al., 2004).

Impartiality

Hall et al. (2016) mentioned that Interpreting programs teach interpreters to be language technicians and neutral in their assignments as they relay information between two languages. The neutrality training has been integrated into many programs' curricula throughout the nation. However, this neutrality causes interpreters to devalue the power balance and creates an imbalance between the majority hearing community and the minority Deaf community (Hall et al., 2016). One typical example of the language technician and power imbalance is when

> the conduit interpreter automatically voices what is signed rather than engaging in clarification. The result is that the interpreter interrupts the class, already ahead several points in the material, and the Deaf student experiences embarrassment… Most importantly, when interpreters behave this way, trust is broken with the Deaf student. (Hall et al., 2016, p. 5)

When this happens, the interpreter may be successfully impartial but prevents collaboration with the student. As a result, the interpreter ignores culture, the ability to co-create meaning, and team

decision-making, which leads them to be ethnocentric and oppressive (Hall et al., 2016). The language technicians are only exposed to hearing cultural norms and are not exposed to cultural dynamics or communication dynamics to address cultural sensitivity (Thayil, 2021).

Gaps

There are numerous gaps throughout the interpreting profession. For instance, many interpreters work in cubicles or isolation, are unsupervised, or lack mentoring (Humphrey & Alcorn, 2007; Maffia, 2014). Also, studies (Cogen & Cokely, 2016; Smith et al., 2012) showed gaps in the transition from interpreter training programs to actual employment. The RID noted that a lack of post-graduation support caused this graduation-to-work gap (Smith et al., 2012). The readiness to work gap is the difference between academic and work environment communication (Cogen & Cokely, 2016.; Smith et al., 2012).

Burnout. A study of a cohort of ASL interpreters found that they had less advanced ethical reasoning skills than their age and education as a result of burnout (Dean, 2015). Practitioners who experience many demands in their field with limited ability to respond tend to experience burnout at their job. Burnout can consist of emotional or mental exhaustion from work requiring intricate interpersonal interactions (Schwenke, 2015). Furthermore, interpreting fields have a high burnout rate similar to human service professions (Schwenke, 2015). The burnout factor often results in practitioners leaving their jobs to reduce stress. Schwenke (2015) also found that burnout is preventable if there are more opportunities to team up, "allowing interpreters to talk about their work is collegial" (p. 137). Dean and Pollard (2001, 2009, 2013)

suggested supervision as a solution to reduce the impacts of work-related stress and burnout in the signed language interpreting field.

Confidentiality. Inevitably, confidentiality comes into the picture, as RID-certified interpreters are to adhere to the RID Code of Professional Conduct (CPC); one of the CPC tenets is confidentiality. The RID CPC (2021) states that interpreters should "share assignment-related information only on a confidential and 'as needed' basis." Dean and Pollard (2013) pointed out that professionals and interpreters have often misunderstood and misapplied the tenet, concluding that interpreters are unsure of how to confide in their team about their performance or communication. While other professions maintain strict patient confidentiality, like mental health or counseling, they continue to engage in structured professional discussions about their work through supervision (Buus et al., 2011; Curtis, 2017).

Collegiality/Networking. In ASL/English interpreting, there is a lack of formal space to discuss interpreting work to develop decision-making skills. Curtis (2017) stated that "restorative supervision practice provides collegial and social support" (p. 13). Without a formal space to discuss their professional work, interpreters often experience occupational stress or burnout. Research in mental health settings by Dean and Pollard (2004) found that lack of networking/collegiality among workers led to miscommunication and uncoordinated collaboration or resources that caused missed opportunities for caring, and had a negative impact on clients.

Reflective Practice

Clinical supervision is considered a reflective practice where experts guide participants through clinical practice in the field. Supervision is a group engaging in collaboration and discussion, two valued aspects (Schön, 1983). “Reflective practice is where people in similar professions have specific space to come together to reflect on action and explore other options to improve their decisions in the future” (Schön, 1983, p. 28). Karasek (1979) presented the Karasek model and analysis comparison between Americans and Swedes in job strains (demands) and job decisions (controls). He identified two elements of the work environment: the demands placed on the worker and the controls, and the work has discretion in deciding how to respond to these demands. The demands are measured based on the effects of the psychological aspects of the work situation and skill usage. Controls are measured based on psychological strain responding to or dealing with work situations (Karasek, 1979).

Dean and Pollard (2001) adopted the Karasek model of demands and controls and drew on an educational philosophy called problem-based learning (PBL), which began in the medical profession (Dean & Pollard, 2009; McKeachie, 2002). PBL promotes learners as knowledgeable participants engaged in a group who then create learning opportunities. Dean and Pollard (2005) stated that this model "created observation-supervision, to teach community interpreters how to work more effectively in mental health service settings" (p. 112).

The DC-S protocol for the supervision began to enlighten me by allowing me to identify ways to provide and receive feedback. The experience increased my hunger for improving my

accountability and establishing a standardized approach for providing or receiving feedback in the interpreting world. This is compounded by the reality that interpreters often are unprepared to interpret, which signifies the need for supervision and reflective practice.

Western Oregon University's (WOU) interpreting program faculty recognized that this gap existed and established a program, "Professional Supervision for Interpreting" (PSIP) (Smith et al., 2012). As mentioned, I had the opportunity to participate in supervision at WOU for my graduate courses utilizing DC-S supervision strategies. Professors Elisa Maroney and Amanda Smith used DC-S, an academic-oriented approach, as guidance for supervising students. The guidance enabled students, including me, to have a reflective discussion and constructive dialogue among peers about their interpreting practices.

DC-S pulls practitioners from technical aspects of the work into significant participants in the collegial discussion (Dean & Pollard, 2001). The concept of interpreting using DC-S emphasizes factors in interpreting assignments beyond the boundaries of language and culture. There are four categories: environment, interpersonal, paralinguistic, and intrapersonal (EIPI) (Dean & Pollard, 2001, 2004, 2008, 2009). The controls consist of the skills, decisions, and resources that interpreters interpret and respond to during assignment demands. Using the EIPI framework can untangle decision-making challenges and influence interpreters to make decisions effectively.

Interpreters are required to undergo ethical decision-making (Dean & Pollard, 2009). This characterizes interpreters as reflective practitioners who critically analyze and reflect on their

actions and the implications of their decisions. Ongoing supervision of the participants can be used to reflect to practitioners' decisions and gain collegial support and encouragement to avoid complacency and isolation that lead to burnout (Maffia, 2014). Reflection through goal-setting and an intentional safe space can lead to more effective interpreting. Ericsson (2001) stated that in athlete training, "improvement of performance was uniformly observed when individuals, who were motivated to improve their performance, were given well-defined tasks, were provided with feedback, and had ample opportunities for repetition" (p. 165). Reflective practice can take place when interpreters analyze their cognitive process. The need for practitioners' reflection to improve an interpreter's work have several approaches, and Hall et al. (2016) suggested that his approach would lead interpreters to reposition themselves in alignment with Deaf people and Deaf cultural norms.

Benefits of Supervision

Supervision benefits clients and workers such as interpreters by enabling them to develop better resources, opportunities, and knowledge. A network of interpreter practitioners is critical to gaining information and knowledge in that the more people there are, the more ideas are exchanged. Supervision is also a recognized means of professional support and development in professions such as mental health settings (Hetherington, 2012). The supervision members collectively establish a series of norms such as each person’s opinion is valuable, or appreciates the multiple perspectives (Maffia, 2014). The benefit of supervision in the interpreting field

allows interpreters to talk about their work in a structured setting where the practitioners feel free and safe to discuss their work and seek improvement.

Chapter 3: Methodology

My goal for this study was to have readers relate to my experience and apply information to their practice. I observed the settings of the participants' assignments, culture, and practitioners and reflected on my interactions with participants. I kept a journal to record data collected in my fieldwork, my observations, and feelings post-supervision sessions.

There were two methods used: autoethnography and dialogic. There has been growth in publication and application of autoethnography; however despite gaining much ground, there were only a few published contexts of autoethnography in the interpreting field (Hale & Napier, 2013). This form of data collection resulted in an interpretive narrative about self or a collective group (Maffia, 2014). The autoethnography process began with writing about my experience during supervision. Self-inquiry can illuminate an understanding of numerous constructs across disciplines that often lead to new insights for better understanding to inform societal and practice-based problems (Lewis & Throne, 2021). The self-critical reflection on the narratives was facilitated by three "dialogues:" with the self, between participants, and between supervision leaders and self (O'Neil, 2018 p. 484).

In an autoethnography, the researcher is the subject, and the data consists of the researcher's interpretation of their experiences (Maffia, 2014). Hale and Napier (2013)

mentioned that the researcher is the subject, so data is direct and easily accessible. As a researcher, I wanted to make sure that the study was not focused on me alone, but also on the dynamics between participants and benefits of DC-S supervision. To protect all individuals involved in this study, the survey and scope of the research was evaluated and approved by the WOU Institutional Review Board (IRB). Contact information for the IRB and the thesis advisor were provided to participants in the event they had concerns about the survey (see Appendix A). Participation in the survey was on a voluntary basis. Individuals could exit the survey at any time.

The dialogic pedagogy approach is an adaptation from the Vygotskian sociocultural perspective that enhances three components: theoretical frameworks, autoethnography, and dialogue (Johnson, 2015). The theoretical frameworks — DC-S and invisibility — were examples of a system of interpreting. This approach allowed a personalized reflection using theoretical framework and consideration of attitudes (Dao et al., 2022). I observed the participants' discourse to identify the nuances or culture-specific knowledge and discourse like DC-S supervision sessions (Araújo, 2006). I further observed and collected various records like field notes and participant notes so I could interpret what happened in written form (Araújo, 2006). The discourse in DC-S supervision sessions was noted by me and I encouraged participants to note their experience with prompts from me as researcher to explore their cultural biases to have open dialogue. The discourse approach was a more collaborative, more structured

alternative to member-checking (Araújo, 2006). That approach positioned me as modest and unpretentious while challenging participants' knowledge and biases (Araújo, 2006).

Participants

Participants were already involved in the IIRAS, an international collaboration designed to increase awareness of advanced supervision in interpreting (Smith et al., 2018). The sessions consisted of a monthly gathering of reflective practitioners who utilized DC-S concepts. The supervision session utilized an online platform where ASL/English interpreters were divided into five to seven participants working with a supervision leader. To be eligible for this study, participants had to be 18 years of age or older, currently working or had worked as a professional ASL/English interpreter, and attended three supervision sessions since the research indicates that the amount of time participants are exposed to the DCS supervision can have an impact on outcomes (Judd, 2015). Consent forms also affirmed the participant's age and experience with interpreting and their eligibility.

For this study, a supervision session was defined as two or more practitioners meeting to discuss a particular interpreting situation, using the DC-S framework (Dean & Pollard, 2004). Participants were informed of the expectations by an online implied consent form at the start of the survey (see Appendix A). Participants could decide to be involved in the study by acknowledging their participation was voluntary, and they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Design

The primary data source for this study was my reflective journals completed within an hour after I had finished participating in a supervision session. These journals came in various formats, from written journals to video-recorded ASL journals (Hale & Napier, 2013). The journals were documented as a free-write, a timed 10-minute writing exercise. The goal and purpose of freewriting is to help writers express themselves freely (Vygotsky, 1962). I recorded data of participation through self-observation and journaling (Hale & Napier, 2013). I included other sources of data, such as notes taken by participants and supervision leaders, including myself. I also had an opportunity to meet with my supervision leader before and after sessions to discuss the supervision session. Critical thinking and the use of narrative are facilitated by the relationship and commentative dialogue between participants/supervision leader and self. Sometimes an unexpected development occurs in mentoring relationships when participants and supervision leaders are self-engaged in collaborative autoethnography (Chang et al., 2014).

To understand cultural contexts, ethnography is the proper research approach of choice (Zilber, 2020). Ethnography is immersive and authentic, and requires dedication for an extended time (Chang, 2016). It also is inductive and holistic as it allows me to go into the environment or culture and record my experiences as data collection. In ethnographic research, there are four forms of data collection: observation, journal response collection, self-reflection journal, and narrative writing (Chang, 2016).

An autoethnography is an asset in any journey that allows the author to draw on their lived experience (Hale & Napier, 2013). An autoethnography is a qualitative method where the researcher writes about the self to understand the supervision context and communication dynamics (Adams et al., 2015). It uses a systematic approach to collect, analyze, and interpret data about the self, the environment, dynamics, and possibly others (O'Neil, 2018).

Dialogic pedagogy was added to this study to enable participation and the opportunity for open discourse (Sherman et al., 2019). Dialogic pedagogy enables researchers to ensure that other people's views are included along with their own views. It also provides researchers with the ability to enter a dialogical encounter with participants to question or to express a concern (Abdul, 2020). Since this thesis focuses on cultural context, autoethnography is a way to share ethnographic studies without binding them to traditional ethnography. Using dialogic pedagogy and autoethnography allowed me to see different perspectives to reduce cultural bias and ensure any evidence. Since there is knowledge, nuance, and experiences which constitute a culture, it might be difficult for me to analyze, comprehend, or to perpetuate culture specific knowledge through dialogue because of my biases (Araújo, 2006). The dialogic approach allows collaboration between participants and me to create active meaning from our lived experiences as we recognize our cultural contexts may affect the conversation (Olan & Edge, 2019).

Data Collection

The next step in the data process involved data collection from consent forms and categorizing the data into themes or patterns. Consent forms also served the purpose of affirming

the participant's age and experience in the field of interpreting. The data collected in my supervision experience included participants, supervision leaders, and me; attendance at each supervision session was recorded. The information from participants, supervision leaders, and me had the same open-ended questions at the end of each session: "How do you feel about communication dynamics such as majority/minority that may occur in the supervision session?" and "What is the main benefit you receive from the supervision session?"

For this study, I used a variety of methods for data collection to formulate themes and categories from participants' experiences and my experience. The data comes from participants' responses to the surveys and my journals that were either written or recorded videos to reflect on my experience. These journals were created within an hour after I had finished participating in a supervision session.

Think Aloud Protocol

The structure of the findings report follows the structure of the Think Aloud Protocol (TAP) (Smith, 2014). The TAP framework allowed me to show the inner workings of my autoethnography journey. Sharing my autoethnography allowed the readers of this paper to access my thoughts of the facts, observations, and decision-making process that paved my journey.

I used the Think-Aloud and dialogue journaling approach but in American Sign Language (ASL) to freely express my reflections or thoughts about the previous supervision session (Linares, 2019). People's access to their native language and personal experience is a

core component in the process of compiling reflections altogether since their proficiency in their dominant language, a strong foundation in the native language (Cummins, 2007). Using ASL with video recording within one hour after the supervision session freed me since ASL is my first language and it is easier for me to express myself naturally. I translated the videos into English later. In some sessions, I was able to talk with supervision leaders to gather their comments on how they interacted with the participants through ASL and I wrote down what they said within 15 minutes of the supervision session.

Data Analysis

In addition to TAP, I used grounded theory analysis and thematic analysis (Huberman, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). With thematic analysis, I sought themes within the data excerpts, which then created a structured approach to data interpretation. The grounded theory analysis has an explicit focus on the particular instances of going through systematic data collection and analysis (Walker & Myrick, 2006). Using a majority/minority theoretical framework as a guide, my data analytic procedures consisted of two primary phases: (1) individual data review and coding, and (2) group responses to survey and theme search (Chang et al. 2012). Upon completing the first few months of data collection, I began the first phase of analysis by systematically scanning individual texts for recurrent themes (i.e. patterns of emotions, discourse, and/or experiences) and assigned overarching codes to indicate (Walker & Myrick, 2006). I looked for themes within the data such as excerpts from supervision leaders,

participants, and my responses. The themes constituted some form of template enabling a structured approach to data interpretation. Techniques based on thematic analysis tend to be fairly flexible in that they fit with most research questions, any textual data, and most philosophical stances (Cassell & Bishop, 2019). This allowed me to triangulate the data collection.

Chapter Four: Findings

Participant Demographics

Supervision leaders and supervisees held monthly supervision sessions. The supervision leaders were previously trained by IIRAS for this role for various groups. Each supervision session utilized an online videoconferencing platform, Zoom, where ASL/English interpreters were divided into three to five supervisees working with a supervision leader. The supervisees were over 18 years old and identified as professional sign language interpreters. They met the minimum criteria and attended at least three DC-S supervision sessions. They also signed consent forms (see Appendix A). For this study, a supervision session was defined as two or more supervisees meeting to discuss a particular interpreting situation using the DC-S framework (Dean & Pollard, 2004).

The two supervision leaders had years of experience both as interpreters and as supervision leaders within the DC-S framework. One supervision leader was from Rochester, New York and the other supervision leader was from the Bay Area in California. The three supervisees had a wide range of experience in years and were mostly from the west coast including myself. One supervisee just started a career in the interpreting field. Two supervisees worked in virtual remote interpreting settings and another three supervisees worked in the field; none of the participants had ever experienced DC-S supervision.

There were three themes that emerged:

1. Misperceptions
2. Cultural dynamics
3. Status quo

As a supervisee with 20 years of experience in interpreting, but participating in DC-S supervision sessions for the first time, I expected that I would engage in exploring the deeply nuanced phenomenon of intersectional oppression within supervision settings based on my limited experience on feedback dialogues. I also intentionally came to supervision to do research, but ended up benefiting by learning from participants and supervision leaders. Supervision leaders explained the guidelines for establishing a space to voice our insights and where our perspectives would be respected while we used non-evaluative language.

Misperceptions

The supervision leaders guided the supervisees and me through cases. Some supervisees had experienced assignments similar to the cases where they were stuck with no solutions. Supervisee take time to brief the supervision session about the case is called case giver. Within their cases, the case givers had a vision of interpreting for Deaf clients, but the situations threw them out of sync, jeopardizing their ability to interpret or to communicate. They felt that they had exhausted every option, but during supervision sessions, supervision leaders and supervisees provided various perspectives that shifted the case givers' perspectives.

This experience was reflected in my first and second journal entry in September and October 2021, where I noted, "I noticed that the group struggled to find solutions to their

profession. I noted what the supervisees said. They tried their best but didn't know how to handle it better or effectively. They came to the sessions to find solutions."

I also added my response to my supervision leader in the journal. Prior to this study, I felt that I would not be able to contribute in the cases being presented and other supervisees' cases would stump me. In my journals, it was clear that my concerns in the beginning were that I would not know how to handle the cases presented. This turned out to be a misperception; I noticed that supervisees also used clarifying questions (non-evaluative feedback or comments) so I also used clarification. Clarification was given to me without hesitation or judgment. Looking back, the clarifications were beneficial, and I am appreciative that I could use them for discussions during supervision sessions.

In my January 2022 journal, I stated that the supervision sessions became heated when supervisees and supervision leaders reinforced each other's misperceptions and stereotypes about multicultural issues and during interaction. For example, comments such as, "If it were not for a paralinguistic issue, I would interpret with no problem," or "I interpreted for many years and I still struggle with Deaf grassroots people of color." Such comments are likely viewed as offensive by people who are of different races or ethnic groups, lower socioeconomic, and/or minority. However, white interpreters in the sessions apparently overlooked that since they did not speak up or discuss this comment. My observation in my journal, which I affirmed with a supervisee who was a person of color, was that the white participants were not alarmed; rather,

they were unresponsive. When the white supervisee made a comment, the supervisee of color supervisees became passive and uncomfortable, which I noted in my journal and later shared in my dialogue with her. That advocated misperception. This leads to the next theme of cultural dynamics.

Cultural Dynamics

The dynamics, such as power, minority/majority, culture, and communication, via Zoom proved to be challenging and interesting, such as power, minority/majority, culture, communication, and so forth. One participant's response was, "I feel comfortable with the communication dynamics within the supervision session. As a minority, there was one time I felt that I wasn't taken seriously but all in all the communication dynamics during the session has been fine." The supervisees consisted of three white hearing women, one Black hearing woman, and me, a white Deaf, male-presenting nonbinary individual with two white hearing supervision leader.

In general, white participants' interactions with their ethnic and racial minority peers are also characterized by ignorance and misunderstanding (Beddoe, 2017). Regarding interactions between majority supervision leaders/supervisees and minority supervisees, well-intentioned majority supervision leaders often present themselves as being extremely culturally sensitive and aware. Consequently, they may overcompensate in their interactions with minority supervisees through excessive praise and avoidance of criticism, both publicly and privately connoting the racist view that the minority trainee has achieved beyond anyone's expectations (Beddoe, 2017).

In my last reflection in April 2022, I wrote:

> In the last session, I felt a little awkward when my team complimented and informed me that they really want to work with me in the field. I wonder why now? Why not work with another Deaf interpreter? I knew that I have room to improve as an interpreter but I received less feedback after I brought my case to session. I was somewhat disappointed because I hoped to find some tools and ideas to navigate through the case in the future.

Such treatment not only hinders the important training needs for constructive criticism and feedback, but also results in a backlash encountered by the racial and ethnic minority trainee from White peers (Smith et al., 2021). This backlash takes on many forms including jealousy, intimidation, perceptions of favoritism, and decreased levels of acceptance or respect.

One of the supervisees stated, "I sometimes felt judged by my colleagues, was afraid of negative criticism, and had some negative experiences from previous sharing with colleagues so I was passive in discussions, and I recognized how sharing a case can be difficult."

Power dynamics between supervision leaders and supervisees are inherent, resulting from the hierarchical structure of supervision. Failure to adequately attend to issues of power in supervision can result in ineffective or even harmful supervision. Currently, supervision leaders do not have an objective measure of power dynamics within the supervisory relationship or a tool that allows for ongoing measurement and discussion of power in supervision (Travers et al., 2022). The given situation is often used as a rationalization for majority participants' lack of interest in multicultural concerns. The result of these experiences is that racial and ethnic

minority supervisees often experience varying degrees of discrimination, isolation, racism, and differential treatment resulting in feelings of confusion, anger, outrage, and discouragement, which they may choose to disclose to the other supervision leaders and supervisees.

Status Quo

The preservation of the status quo did occur in the supervision session as some supervisees and/or supervision leaders flexed to hold their position to reflect their power in the field. People tend to remain consistent with a decision or take the easiest course of action and do nothing to change for betterment is status quo (Smiley and Fisher, 2022). The events made a huge impact on minority supervisees. The status quo is a significant blow to our collective personal, educational, and professional lives. For example, I saw firsthand how each of my supervisees experienced the early sessions in different ways. Because of the disruption to the status quo, I realized how my sense of safety, emotion management, status, culture, and communication were disrupted throughout the sessions. I had opportunities to see how some of the supervisees responded in the first three sessions. One said,

> I feel that the communication dynamics are good! I feel that I don't really talk about ethics much in ASL. And especially the DCS breakdown I hardly ever talk about in ASL. It has been great having everyone communicate and express themselves in sign language. I do find myself a bit more self conscious about my signing during these sessions and I think it is because I don't talk about DCS a lot in general and then to do it in sign makes it a challenge but not impossible. I have been really enjoying that extra layer of it.

In a February 2022 reflection, I acknowledged that members from the supervision team entrusted me with very deep conversations regarding Deaf interpreting issues and sometimes the Deaf community but I was not sure if communication was clear because two other supervisees did not really engage in the discussion but they normally engage in the discussion in the past sessions.

During a session, another supervisee made a comment about the communication dynamics, “Generally I feel good: I work on being open-minded to various views, I try to be thoughtful of dynamics and I have a deep respect for diversity of thought.” Supervisees often perceive themselves as possessing the most power on maintaining healthy boundaries with their supervision leaders and supervisees (Mackey, J. D., Huang, L., & He, W. (2020). However, supervisees and supervision leaders may also leave the interchange without a feeling of validation of their affective reactions, which could either reinforce their existing cultural status, or to protect their culture status (Razzante, R. J., & Orbe, M. P. (2018). Participants’ comments were tremendously valuable since they pointed to failures addressing the lived experiences of women, people of color, of gays and lesbians, and more recently Deaf people like me.

Summary

The supervision leaders’ and supervisees’ comments were influential and shifted the viewpoint on how the supervision session runs. I was able to have opportunities to talk with supervision leaders and supervisees to collect more information or to affirm their comments. I felt that misperception, cultural dynamics, and status quo influence the dynamics and health of supervision sessions.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The first research question for this study was, “How can Demand Control-Schema supervision sessions improve communication dynamics between hearing and Deaf interpreters?” This study included hearing supervision leaders and supervisees and me, a Deaf interpreter, using the Demand Control-Schema (DC-S) framework via the IIRAS platform. The results of this study showed that there were some effective and ineffective communication and interpersonal issues that created challenging dynamics.

The protocol for DC-S supervision was stated clearly during the initial session and we were familiar with the protocol. We identified demands and created controls with ease. However, there were some challenges during my supervision sessions. Often, supervision leaders and supervisees are not trained with multicultural lenses, which may cause misperceptions or they may overlook any conflicting issues like power dynamics or intersectionality invisibility. I hope my personal journey as a Deaf interpreter will lead to improving the supervision infrastructure. I encourage all supervision leaders in supervision to have mandatory training in multicultural and sensitivity to make supervision sessions effective. The cultural aspects that participants bear may outweigh the cultural capital brought to the relationship with the supervision leaders, either in fluency in spoken English or cultural values that may not sit well with academic values (O'Brien & Crawley, 2020). It is vital to study Deaf supervision leaders or participants in supervision relationships and their navigation to a potential imbalance of power and capital that

their status might cause. The approach to decision-making and improving contexts and skills are needed. Nevertheless, Cogen and Cokely, (2016) agreed with Dean and Pollard that the interpreters' field is reflective practice and that supervision is an essential piece in the interpreting field. In order to make effective practice decisions, one must be a "reflective practitioner" (Schön, 1983, 1987, p. 23).

The second research question was, “What are the benefits of participation in DC-S supervision for Deaf interpreters?” The results of the data analysis of my journals indicate that by participating in DC-S supervision, I gained knowledge, skills, and tools that benefit my interpreting skills. I must note that my experience of participation in the DC-S helped me to reflect on ethical decision-making, and getting feedback from participants benefited me greatly.

Implications of Misperceptions

We work with a diverse population in the interpreting field, including supervision leaders and supervisees. The practice of supervision requires guidelines to make supervisory sessions succeed (Purdie-Vaughns, & Eibach, 2008). Also, it is imperative to have competency guidelines for multiculturalism in the practice of interpreting. It seems appropriate that multicultural perspectives should be incorporated into supervision, just like in the interpreting field. The supervision leaders must be culturally sensitive and address multicultural issues within the supervision leaders-supervisee relationship and teach the supervisee multicultural competencies in working (Basa, 2021).

Generally, supervision leaders and supervisees come from diverse cultural backgrounds, bringing their cultural beliefs and attitudes into the supervision leader-supervisee relationship (Kusters et al., 2017). Interactions of supervision leaders and supervisees with different cultures and linguistic backgrounds increase the need to include multicultural competence in the teaching and learning process of supervision leaders and supervisees (Soheilian et al., 2014). Beliefs that lead to misperception and negativity in a supervisory relationship have the tendency to shut down growth and communication within the supervision process.

Supervision leaders need to have knowledge and skills in working with diverse clients and facilitate this learning through the supervision process. Thus, a supervision leader has the responsibility to help their supervisee develop multicultural competency through the supervision process. Cross-cultural supervision or multicultural supervision has not been well researched. There was little evidence supporting techniques used to facilitate multicultural supervision. Multicultural supervision is important because it teaches multicultural competence to supervisees who will be supervision leaders in their areas for their consumers/students from diverse backgrounds. Thus, all supervision must be recognized as multicultural.

Implications of Dynamics

Power dynamics between supervision leaders and supervisees are inevitable due to the hierarchical structure of supervision. Failure to adequately attend to issues of power in supervision can lead to ineffective supervision. Supervision leaders often do not have a measure of power dynamics within the supervisory relationship or a tool that allows for ongoing measurement and discussion of power in supervision. In addition, issues of power may go unnoticed or unaddressed by supervision leaders. At the very least, failure to address power is against best practices and may even result in ineffective or harmful supervision (Ellis et al., 2014). Ellis et al. further suggested that supervision leaders must attend to power dynamics in supervisory relationships to provide minimally adequate clinical supervision. Supervision leaders should reflect on the supervisory process and invite their supervisees' feedback regarding their supervision experiences. According to the relationship rhombus, the role of the majority is a larger group that controls other smaller groups; the minority's role faces various dynamics inflicted by the majority (Cottrell, 2002).

In future studies, researchers should examine Power Dynamics in Supervision Scale (PDSS) results alongside qualitative data to gain a better understanding of how supervision leaders and supervisees interpret information about power balance in supervision (Dollarhide et al., 2021). Future researchers should also explore how supervision leaders perceive the presence of power in supervision with their supervisees' perceptions of power and investigate differences in perceived power dynamics based on professional and personal identities. The results may not generalize evenly across diverse cultural identities, however. Issues of privilege and oppression

may be salient to how supervisees experience power in the supervisory relationship in more diverse supervision dyads.

Future action projects should develop guidelines for appropriate supervision within interpreting fields. In general, evidence-based guidelines for supervisees and other supervision leaders are lacking for ASL interpreters. Existing guidelines for supervision leaders/supervisees' supervision must be identified and shared, even as improvements are made, as organic discussions take place to formulate how the group works together.

Implications of Status Quo

Participants' responses demonstrated that supervision leaders' actions of the status quo led to tense conversations during the supervision sessions. In the literature review, authors mentioned that who holds or uses the status quo is likely indicative of a damaged supervision leaders. Power in status difference exists if it affects the supervisees' careers. The experience within supervision and status quo abuse can be brutal and may cause supervisees to turn away from the profession. For instance, racism or audism is a form of social categorization and supervision leaders must understand such issues, given their tenacity within the individual psyche and validity (O'Connell, 2022). The evidence encourages managerial awareness to boost supervisees' capacities for interactions with their supervision leaders.

The findings of this study suggest that supervision leaders promote the expression of non-evaluative remarks intended to foster socialization, improve the quality of supervision (Oquendo-Figueroa et al., 2021), and avoid the status quo. The supervision goals may be various,

like case management, restorative justice, and promoting feedback competence. The goals need to be apparent from the beginning so the team can follow and pursue and succeed in accomplishing goals. Thus, it is imperative for supervision leaders to reflect upon their knowledge or skills gaps and to engage in further qualification. Earlier, I discussed cultural implications: supervision leaders and supervisees with particular knowledge about the supervisees and supervisees' cultures can serve as liaisons and provide information or support to include the supervisees in the supervision process. Future researchers should develop and disseminate materials that will improve knowledge and verbiage in the supervision of supervision leaders and supervisees.

The literature on supervision did not show what could be done to prevent unintentional trauma or fears of supervisees. Further, dissemination and implementation research based on current knowledge should proceed in a parallel track. Clarifying available guidelines can help supervision members be more aware of what they can do to support each other's growth and development safely. In taking up the challenge of protecting members' health, researchers need to consider the priorities and gaps presented and proceed along an informed path.

As a Deaf interpreter in the interpreting field, there are other Deaf interpreters and future Deaf interpreters who work with hearing interpreters on a daily basis; they need further research to find their places within the interpreting field. This research has the potential to foster safer, fairer, and consistent supervision experiences for interpreters. Today’s climate is a perfect time

for research to shift to a focus on multiculturalism, status quo, power dynamics, and intersectionality invisibility in the interpreting field and curricula.

References

Abdul Razzak. (2020). Paulo Freire's critical and dialogic pedagogy and its implications for the Bahraini educational context. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *52*(9), 999–1010. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1716731

Araújo, S. (2006). Conflict and violence as theoretical tools in present-day ethnomusicology: Notes on a dialogic ethnography of sound practices in Rio de Janeiro. *Ethnomusicology*, *50*(2), 287–313. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20174454

Ball, C. (2013). *Legacies and legends: History of interpreter education from 1800 to the 21st century.* Interpreting Consolidated.

Barron, D., Holterman, C., Shipster, P., Batson, S., & Alam, M. (2010). Seen but not heard-ethnic minorities' views of primary health care interpreting provision: A focus group study. *Primary Health Care Research & Development*, *11*(2), 132-141.

Basa, V. (2021). Multicultural competence in supervision within the helping profession. *Academia Letters*.

Beddoe, Liz. "Harmful supervision: A commentary." *The Clinical Supervisor* 36.1 (2017): 88-101.

Berzoff, J. (2011). Why do we need a biopsychosocial perspective with vulnerable, oppressed and at-risk populations. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, *81*(2–3), 132–166.

Bohrer, A. J. (2022). Marxism and Intersectionality: A Critical Historiography. In *Marx Matters* (pp. 242-268). Brill.

Bonamino, A., Alves, F., Franco, C., & Cazelli, S. (2010). The effects of different forms of capital on school performance: a study in the light of Bourdieu and Coleman. *Revista Brasileira de Educação* , *15* , 487-499.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richarson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, pp. 241-258.

Bourdieu, P. (2011) The forms of capital. In I. Szeman and T. Kaposy (eds) *Cultural Theory: An Anthology* (pp. 314). Wiley-Blackwell.

Butterworth T., Bishop V. & Carson J. (1996) First steps towards evaluating clinical supervision in nursing and health visiting. Part 1: Theory, policy and practice development. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 5*, 127–132.

Buus, N., Angel, S., Traynor, M., & Gonge, H. (2011). Psychiatric nursing staff members' reflections on participating in group-based clinical supervision: A semi-structured interview study. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, *20*(2), 95–101. https://www.doi.org/10.1111/j.1447-0349.2010.00709.x

Cassell, & Bishop, V. (2019). Qualitative data analysis: Exploring themes, metaphors and stories. *European Management Review, 16*(1), 195–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12176

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, K. A. C. (2012). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press, Inc.

Chang, H., Longman, K. A., & Franco, M. A. (2014). Leadership development through mentoring in Higher Education: A collaborative autoethnography of leaders of color. Mentoring and Tutoring. *Partnership in Learning 22*(4), 373–389.

Chang, H. (2016). *Autoethnography. In Autoethnography Eas Method* (pp. 43-58). Routledge.

Cogen, C., & Cokely, D. (2016). *Preparing interpreters for tomorrow: Report on a study of emerging trends in interpreting and implications for interpreter education.* National Interpreter Education Center.

Cokely, D. (2005). Shifting positionality: *A critical examination of the turning point in the relationship of interpreters and the Deaf community.* In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, & E. Winston (Eds.), Sign language interpreting and interpreter education: Directions for research and practice (pp. 3-29). Oxford University Press.

Collica-Cox, K., & Schulz, D. M. (2020). A token for your thoughts? Perceptions of tokenism among female corrections executives. *Criminal Justice Review*, *45*(3), 337-357.

Cottrell, S. (2002). Suspicion, resistance, tokenism and mutiny: problematic dynamics relevant to the implementation of clinical supervision in nursing. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, *9*(6), 667-671.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 221–240.

Curtis, J. (2017). *Supervision in signed language interpreting: Benefits for the field and practitioners.* Western Oregon University.

Dao, Nguyen, M. X., Iwashita, N., & Spinelli, F. (2022). A dialogic approach to fostering TESOL teacher‐learners' research engagement: Insights from a "learning‐to‐research" procedure. *TESOL Quarterly*, *56*(2), 775–787. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3127

Deaf Interpreter Institute. *Deaf Interpreter Institute*. (n.d.). http://www.diinstitute.org/.

Dean, R. K., & Pollard Jr., R. Q. (2001). The application of demand-control theory to sign language interpreting: Implications for stress and interpreter training. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 6*(1), 1-14.

Dean, R. K., Pollard, R. Q., & English, M. A. (2004). Observation-supervision in mental health interpreter training. CIT: Still shining after, 25, 55-75.

Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. Q., (2005). Consumers and service effectiveness in interpreting work: A practice profession perspective. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson & E. Wilson (Eds.), *Interpreting and interpreter education: Directions for research and practice* (pp. 259-282). Oxford University Press.

Dean, R. K., & Pollard Jr, R. Q. (2009). Effectiveness of observation-supervision training in community mental health interpreting settings.

Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. Q. (2013). The demand control schema: Interpreting as a practice profession. CreateSpace.

Diamond, S. L. (2021). *American Sign Language interpreters and the deaf/hard of hearing community: negotiating social justice and power dynamics* (Doctoral dissertation).

Dollarhide, C. T., Hale, S. C., & Stone‐Sabali, S. (2021). A new model for social justice supervision. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *99*(1), 104-113.

https://www.doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2019.1580011

Emmart, J. (2016, November 16). *Change ahead: A new approach to feedback for sign language interpreters*. Street Leverage. https://streetleverage.com/live_presentations/change-ahead-new-approach-feedback-sign-language-interpreters/

Emmart, J. (2015, December 8). Sign Language Interpreters and the “F” Word. Street Leverage. https://streetleverage.com/2015/12/sign-language-interpreters-and-the-f-word/

Gough, D. S. (2014). *Exploring deaf student motivation towards learning English literacy*. Lamar University-Beaumont.

Hale, S., & Napier, J. (2013). Research Methods in Interpreting: A Practical Resource.

Hammond, S. F., Gajendran, T., Maund, K., & Savage, D. A. (2019). Rethinking the challenges to attaining sustainable cities and communities: lessons from social norms and status quo bias. In *West Africa Built Environment Research (WABER) Conference, Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences*(pp. 894-906).

Hein, L. C., & Scharer, K. M. (2013). Who cares if it is a hate crime? Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender hate crimes: Mental health implications and interventions. *Perspectives In Psychiatric Care*, *49*(2), 84–93.

Hetherington, A. (2012). Supervision and the interpreting profession: Support and accountability through reflective practice. *International Journal of Interpreter Education, 4*(1), 46–57.

Johnson, K. E. (2015). Reclaiming the relevance of L2 teacher education. *The Modern Language Journal, 99*, 515–528. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12242

Judd, J. (2015). *Decision, decision: The effects of Demand Control Schema reflective practice training on ethical decision making by Auslan/English interpreters* (Master's thesis). Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

Karasek Jr, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 285-308.

King, Hebl, M. R., George, J. M., & Matusik, S. F. (2010). Understanding tokenism: Antecedents and consequences of a psychological climate of gender inequity. *Journal of Management, 36*(2), 482–510. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308328508

Kusters, A., De Mulder, M., & O'Brien, D. (2017b). *Innovations in deaf studies: The role of deaf scholars*. Oxford University Press.

Ladd, P., (2003). *Understanding deaf culture: In search of deafhood*. Multilingual Matters.

LaMantia, K., Wagner, H., & Bohecker, L. (2015). Ally development through feminist pedagogy: A systemic focus on intersectionality. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *9*(2), 1–18.

Lewis, C., & Throne, R. (2021). Autoethnography and other self-inquiry methods for practice-based doctoral research. In *Practice-Based and Practice-Led Research for Dissertation Development* (pp. 87-107). IGI Global.

Linares, R. E. (2019). Meaningful writing opportunities: Write‐alouds and dialogue journaling with newcomer and English learner high schoolers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *62*(5), 521-530.

Lor, M. (2012). Effects of client trauma on interpreters: An exploratory study of vicarious trauma.

Mackey, J. D., Huang, L., & He, W. (2020). You abuse and I criticize: An ego depletion and leader–member exchange examination of abusive supervision and destructive voice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *164*(3), 579-591.

McKeanchie, W. J. (2002) *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers*. Houghton Mifflin.

McNeill, B. W., Horn, K. L., & Perez, J. A. (1995). The training and supervisory needs of racial and ethnic minority students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development,* *23*(4), 246-258.

Medina, c. (2019). *Where Marketing and Diversity Meet–An Analysis of Inclusivity, Tokenism and Social Responsibility in Practice* (Doctoral Dissertation, Florida International University).

Morgan, H. (2018). The effects of difference of "race" and colour in supervision. In *On Supervision* (pp. 187-203). Routledge.

O'Brien, D., & Crawley, V. (2020). Multilingual and multicultural supervision meetings: the case of a deaf supervisor and hearing postgraduate researcher. *The Learner Development Journal, 4*, 6-19.

O'Connell, N. (2022). "Opportunity Blocked": Deaf People, Employment and the Sociology of Audism. *Humanity & Society*, *46*(2), 336-358.

O'Neil, S. M. (2018). On becoming a better supervisor: A deconstruction of autoethnography as method for professional development. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *32*(6), 483-501.

Olan, E., & Edge, C. (2019). Collaborative meaning-making and dialogic interactions in critical friends as co-Authors, *Studying Teacher Education*, *15*(1), 31-43,

Oquendo-Figueroa, Y., Johnson-Esparza, Y., & Muther, J. P. (2021). Considerations and strategies for enhancing the supervision and training of foreign-born Spanish-speaking supervisees. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, *51*(3), 211-218.

Poerwandari, E. K. (2021). Minimizing bias and maximizing the potential strengths of autoethnography as a narrative research. *Japanese Psychological Research*, *63*(4), 310-323.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, *59*(5), 377-391.

Newport, E. L., & Meier, R. P. (2017). The acquisition of American Sign Language. In *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition* (pp. 881-938). Psychology Press.

Maffia, D. V. (2014). The transition from participation to facilitation of supervision: An autoethnography (Master's thesis). Western Oregon University, Monmouth, Oregon.

Mauldin, L., & Fannon, T. (2021). They told me my name: Developing a deaf identity. *Symbolic Interaction*, *44*(2), 339-366.

McAskill, Bacchus, N., & Desloges, C. (2022). Interview with Natasha Bacchus, aka Courage (ASL-English Transcript). Canadian Theatre Review, 190, 50–52. https://doi.org/10.3138/ctr.190.011

Razzante, R. J., & Orbe, M. P. (2018). Two sides of the same coin: Conceptualizing dominant group theory in the context of co-cultural theory. *Communication Theory*, *28*(3), 354-375.

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (2019). *2019 annual report*. https://rid.org/2019-annual-report/

Reinhardt, L. R. (2015). *Deaf-hearing interpreter teams: navigating trust in shared space* (master's thesis). Western Oregon University, Monmouth, Oregon. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/theses/21

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

Schwenke, T. J. (2015). Sign language interpreters and burnout: Exploring perfectionism and coping. *JADARA*, *49*(2), 1-24.

Sherman, B. J., Bateman, K. M., Jeong, S., & Hudock, L. A. (2019). Dialogic meta-ethnography: Troubling methodology in ethnographically informed qualitative inquiry. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 16*(1), 279–302. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09961-8

Smith, A. R., Cancel, P. D., & Maroney, E. M. (2012). Creating innovative opportunities for interpreter education program graduates: Transitioning to the professional world. In L. Robertson & S. Shaw (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Twentieth Conference of Interpreter Trainers*, Charlotte, NC.

Smith, A. (2014). Think aloud protocols: Viable for teaching, learning, and professional development in interpreting. *Translation & Interpreting, 6*(1), 128-143.

Smith, A., Dean, R., & Curtis, J. (2018). Interpreting institute for reflection-in-action & supervision.

Smith, A. (2019). Reflective practice: Interpreter mindset, pre-interpreting, technical skills, adaptive skills, and supervision. *Integrated and Open Interpreter Education*.

Smiley, A. H., & Fisher, M. (2022). The Golden Age Is Behind Us: How the Status Quo Impacts the Evaluation of Technology. *Psychological Science*, *33*(9), 1605-1614.

Smith, D. C., James, C. D., & Griffiths, M. A. (2021). Co‐brand partnerships making space for the next black girl: Backlash in social justice branding. *Psychology & Marketing*, *38*(12), 2314-2326.

Soheilian, S. S., Inman, A. G., Klinger, R. S., Isenberg, D. S., & Kulp, L. E. (2014). Multicultural supervision: Supervisees' reflections on culturally competent supervision. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, *27*(4), 379-392.

Speciale, M., Gess, J., & Speedlin, S. (2015). You don't look like a lesbian: A co-autoethnography of intersectional identities in counselor education. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *9*(4), 256-272. https://www.doi.org/10.1080/15538605.2015.1103678

Stewart, D., Schein, J., & Cartwright, B. (2004). *Sign language interpreting: Exploring its art and science*. Allyn & Bacon.

Stone, D., & Heen, S. (2015). *Thanks for the feedback: The science and art of receiving feedback well (even when it is off base, unfair, poorly delivered, and frankly, you're not in the mood)*. Penguin.

Taylor, C. (2014). Boundaries in advanced nursing practice: The benefits of group supervision. *Mental Health Practice, 17*(10), 26–31. https://doi.org/10.7748/mhp.17.10.25.e866

Thacker, N., & Minton, C. A. B. (2021). Minoritized professionals' experiences in counselor education: A review of research. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *60*(1), 35-50.

Thayil, N.. (2021, February 14). *Interpreters and culture are inextricably linked*. https://nhmtranslation.com/en/interpreters-and-culture/

Travers, Á., Abujaber, N., McBride, K. A., Tingsted Blum, P., Wiedemann, N., & Vallières, F. (2022). Identifying best practice for the supervision of mental health and psychosocial support in humanitarian emergencies: a Delphi study. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, *16*(1), 1-10.

Tsai, Y. (2011). Relationship between organizational culture, leadership behavior and job satisfaction. *BMC health services research*, *11*(1), 1-9.

Tsang, A. Ka Tat, Leung, Vivian W. Y, Tan, Weijia, Chuang, Deng-Min, & Hu, Ran. (2021). Decentering the majority–minority paradigm: A multidimensional conceptualization of interethnic relations based on a study of Chinese Canadians. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-021-00826-0

Walker, D., & Myrick, F. (2006). Grounded theory: An exploration of process and procedure. *Qualitative health research*, *16*(4), 547-559.

Wheeler, S., & Richards, K. (2007). The impact of clinical supervision on counsellors and therapists, their practice and their clients. A systematic review of the literature. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 7*(1), 54–65. doi:10.1080/14733140601185274

Wilcox, S., & Shaffer, B. (2005). Towards a cognitive model of interpreting. *Topics in Signed Language Interpreting: Theory and practice.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wu, C., & Grant, N. (2020). Intersectionality-beyond the individual: A look into cultural identity development of deaf and hard-of-hearing children of multicultural "hearing" families. *Deaf identities: Exploring new frontiers*, 226-253.

Yashima, T., Zenuk‐Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, *54*(1), 119-152.

Zenizo, A. (2013). *Self-care in the field of interpreting* (Master's thesis).

Zilber, T. B. (2020). The methodology/theory interface: Ethnography and the microfoundations of institutions. *Organization Theory, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787720919439

APPENDIX A: Informed Consent

Informational Summary of Research

My name is Daniel Gough, and I am requesting that you participate in a research study. I am a master's degree student at Western Oregon University in the College of Education under the supervision of Dr. Amanda Smith. You are invited to be in a research study as a possible participant because you are a participant or supervision leader at the Interpreting Institute for Reflection-in-Action & Supervision (IIRAS). I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Participant Description/Eligibility
ASL/English interpreters aged 18 or older currently participating in IIRAS Demand-Control Schema (DC-S) supervision sessions and plan to attend at least three sessions will be eligible to participate.

Research Description
The purpose of this research is to investigate how Demand Control-Schema supervision sessions improve communication dynamics between hearing and Deaf interpreters and what the benefits of participation in DC-S supervision are for Deaf interpreters.

Supervision is talking about your work for improvement and is a type of reflective learning practice with many other names, including peer consultation and case conferencing. Many professions use this type of practice as a tool for professional development and maintaining ethical behavior. In this study, supervision is considered to be a reflective practice. Reflective practice is "the capacity for professionals to reflect on action together to engage in the process of continuous learning."

In order to conduct this research, participants will respond to open-ended questions on a Google Form after the end of each supervision session.

1. "How do you feel about communication dynamics such as the majority/minority that may occur in the supervision session?"
2. "What is the main benefit you receive from the supervision session?"

As a typical scope of practice, I will engage participants through reflective practices regarding their work as interpreters. After each session, I will ask you to reflect on your experiences as a participant in a written or video reflection responding to those two open-ended questions.

Benefits

Your responses will contribute to a better understanding of the practice of DC-S supervision, especially related to Deaf interpreters. You will also be provided an opportunity to reflect and share your experiences about supervision sessions.

Risks

There are no known risks associated with participating in this study. Should you feel any unintended emotional or physical discomfort at any time, you have the right to skip, withdraw, discontinue from the study without adverse consequences.

Confidentiality

The records of this study will be kept private. In any report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely, and only the researcher will have access to the records which will be maintained in a password protected laptop in a secure location in my office.

Contacts and Questions

You understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Studies Involving Human Subjects: Western Oregon University. The Institutional Review Board may be contacted at (503)-838-9200, email at irb@wou.edu, or visit their website at http://www.wou.edu/irb/ if you have any related similar research projects. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research study, you may contact the principal investigator, Daniel Gough at dgough18@mail.wou.edu, or his Thesis Committee Chair, Amanda Smith, at 345 N. Monmouth Ave. Monmouth, OR 97361,503-838-8650, and smithar@mail.wou.edu. You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Thank you,

Daniel Gough

Selecting the option below indicates your consent:

- I am over the age of 18.
- I am working or have worked as an ASL/English interpreter.

- I will or have attended at least three supervision sessions.
- I have read and understood the above consent form.
- I hereby give my consent to participate in the study voluntarily.

Signature ________________ (or click empty box “I meet the above criteria”)