Interpreting in the classroom: Tools for teaching

Edited by
Rafael Porlán Moreno
Carmen Arnedo Villaescusa

Interpreting in the classroom: Tools for teaching. — Córdoba: UCOPress. Cordoba University Press, 2022.

17 x 24 , 186 pp.
THEMA: CDJ

Edited by Rafael Porlán Moreno and Carmen Arnedo Villaescusa

(Translation and Interpreting Series; vol. IV)

Publisher: UCOPress. Cordoba University Press, 2022
Campus de Rabanales. Ctra. Nac. VI, km. 396, 14071 Córdoba (Spain)
http://www.uco.es/ucopress/ — ucopress@uco.es

Cover design by Manuel Marcos Aldón

Printer: Gráficas la Paz de Torredonjimeno

ISBN: 978-84-9927-659-5
DL: CO 16-2022

© UCOPress
© The authors

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, translated, stored in any retrieval system, nor transmitted in any form without written permission from the Publishers.

Printed in Spain

Learning to read the room: Sociolinguistic course design for ASL-English interactive interpretation

Tara Stevens
Kimberly Hale
Daniel Roush
Eastern Kentucky University

1. Introduction

The field of American Sign Language (ASL)-English interpreting can be understood and the work of interpreters can be improved by applying multi-disciplinary approaches (Pöchhacker 2016; Roy, Brunson, and Stone 2018). Interpreters as communication experts are required to think critically about communication. During a communicative event, discourse is connected, bound, and influenced by the topic, contextual features, and cultural factors. People have to work together to co-create meaning. According to Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle, people generally want to communicate, make sense, be honest, and accurate, while working together to arrive at some understanding. In this way, naturally, "discourse is interactive" (Winston and Roy 2015, 97). A sociolinguistic approach to understanding communication and applying it to the work of interpretation can assist interpreters in being effective, ethical, and reflective practitioners (Roy and Metzger 2014). Different sociolinguistic subfields (Van Herk 2012; Schembri and Lucas 2015; Bayley, Cameron and Lucas 2015), such as multilingualism, bilingualism, language contact, variation, discourse, language policy, planning, and attitudes are relevant to interpreting (Metzger and Roy 2013) and interpreter education because they assist interpreters in "reading the room." In our professional experience, reading the room (e.g., recognizing pragmatic and sociolinguistic factors of the interaction), increases the likelihood that interpreters will produce accurate and effective interpretations.

Our aim is to demonstrate that sociolinguistic approaches to teaching interactive interpretation can be explored through synthesis of relevant notions, application of analytic conceptual tools, and recursive reflection on effectiveness of new approaches. We do this through a discussion of our iterative course design process, using an *Interactive Interpreting I* at Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) course as the analysis unit. We address identification of relevant communication and linguistic concepts and their application via conversational discourse analysis to interactive interpreting; characteristics and selection of source texts; design of learning experiences; and

analysis and reflection regarding student learning in relation to course and program learning outcomes.

1.1. Developmental characteristics of American Sign Language-English Interpretation Students

While historically in the United States of America many interpreters were family and close friends of Deaf people, there has been a shift to interpreter education programs (IEP) to be primarily outside of the community and within educational institutions (for a more thorough account of the historical context of ASL-English IEPs in the U.S.A., see Cokely 2005). Currently in the U.S.A., many interpreting students are native English speakers and are new American Sign Language (ASL) learners (i.e., not native users from birth); thus, they may not have fully developed bilingual skills. Interpreting students also primarily, fit into the traditional college student demographic (i.e., young adults) and may still be developing full pragmatic and sociolinguistic knowledge and skills in even their native language of English. From our experiences, it seems that intuitively, they know and can use language to achieve goals; however, they often struggle with grasping the complexity of language in meaning construction and how it underlays and drives our interactions and perspective. Language can be used to build relationships or undermine them, to convince, to persuade, or to motivate people, or to achieve our goals. To understand this complexity, students have to uncover the nature and function of languages in complex social, multi-cultural, and institutional contexts. Specific areas that are critical to develop are discussed further below.

Job placement data from alumni of the authors' IEP indicates graduates initially spend most of their time interpreting interactions between two or more people, rather than monologic events such as conferences (Hale 2019). Preparing students to work with these factors in interactive interpreted events, in addition to monologic events, allows them to explore a fuller range of factors they will encounter in the field.

1.2. Setting, program details, and student information

Each ASL-English IEP in the U.S.A. has features that create a unique learning environment. The baccalaureate-granting IEP, housed at EKU - a public regional comprehensive university, is accredited by Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education (CCIE). The ASL and Interpreter Education department offers ASL courses for general education credit for students across the institution, as well as for students minoring in ASL, and majoring in interpretation. The IEP functions on a 2-year cohort cycle. During the first 2 years at the university, students focus on foundational ASL skills, knowledge and experience with Deaf culture, and general edu-

cation courses. In the spring of their sophomore year, students apply to enter the core interpreting program. More information about the application process, which has not changed notably in the program's history, can be found in Petronio and Hale (2009). Those who are accepted into the cohort, take a full load of courses within the IEP during their final 2 years of study.

Cohort students, who range in age from 19 to mid-50s, generally represent the demographic majority of the U.S. The IEP is located in an area that is mainly racially white and socio-economically middle-class. Each cohort typically consists of 18-22 students, most identify as female, while usually one to three identify as male. In a recent cohort, two students were African-American, and one was Hispanic. We believe, and the CCIE standards suggest that given the limited diversity within the cohort and within student experiences, selecting instructional materials and conceptual tools that provide students ways to understand language and meaning co-construction beyond their limited, monolingual experience is critical to their success as interpreters.[1]

Finding source texts with linguistically diverse interlocutors for interpreting skill practice is one way to expand students' understanding of language beyond their monolingual experience. A sociolinguistic lens allows students to have a nuanced understanding of bilingual and multilingual interactions, which optimally leads to more sophisticated interpretations (Metzger and Roy 2013). Multiple factors contribute to and act upon multilingualism, with parallels between spoken and signed languages and their communities. Fenlon and Wilkinson (2015) discuss variation in language proficiency while a user's skill may be related to the particular task or setting. Furthermore for signed languages, Fenlon and Wilkinson (2015) explain that students and interpreters need to possess an understanding and recognition of signed languages (1) as real, naturally occurring languages, not merely gestural systems based on their hearing counterparts' spoken language variety and (2) as languages that are not necessarily bound by nation-state boundaries. Early in the implementation of the *Interactive Interpreting I* course explored here, some students still grappled with the idea that ASL and English are different languages, as students were prone to unconscious interlanguage transfer of English semantic structure when analyzing the meaning of ASL signs.

1.3. EKU's ASL-English program curriculum design

Core principles of the program acknowledge interpreting is significantly more than a mere process of linguistic transfer. The program curriculum is strongly based on a sociolinguistic view of interpreter education; discourse, pragmatics, culture, setting, co-creation of meaning, and related factors are critical components when

1 The CCIE adopted a revised set of standards during the writing of this article. As this article was written the program was aligned with the 2014 standards. The program adopts the current standards as they are released by CCIE.

creating an interpretation. With this core value and understanding, the program faculty use backward design principles (Wiggins and McTighe 2006; 17-21) to build curriculum by beginning with the final program level outcomes first, then working backward to course level outcomes that then guide the development of assessments, and finally designing the learning activities and selection of content in individual courses. The faculty used program level goals, objectives, and outcomes to create a unified curricular approach that scaffolds learning from initial ASL courses to the final practicum experience. To demonstrate that the program meets state-of-the-art interpreter education curricular design, the faculty also aligned each specific course level student learning outcome (SLO) to CCIE (2014) curriculum standards (http://ccie-accreditation.org/standards-2/former-standards/). To ensure the entire faculty understands the purpose of each course and how it fits into the overall sequence, the department curriculum committee established and maintains a set of SLOs for each course and a unified curriculum map in a central digital archive. Figure 1 provides a partial view of the curriculum map for the program.

Figure 1 CCIE standard alignment map – partial view

REVISED ASL & English Interpretation (BS) **Program's 2014 CCIE Standards Alignment Map** **version: Oct. 1, 2018** **3 = Strongly supports standard/ knowledge/skill (K/S) applied,** **2 = Somewhat supports standard/ K/S reinforced-practiced,** **1= Minimally supports standard/ K/S introduced** **n/a = Not applicable** **If a 3 is used, it should be mentioned in a class SLO** **(If number is bold, we added or**	ASL 225 Intro to Deaf Studies	ITP 215W Pro Issues in Interpreting	ITP 220 Processing Skills for Interpreters	ITP 310 Prof Decision Making & Ethics	ITP 325 ASL-to-English Interpreting I	ASL 325 "Deaf History"	ASL 305 ASL Comprehension & Fluency I	ITP 340 Interactive Interpreting I	ITP 320 English-to-ASL Interpreting I	ITP 425 ASL-to-English Interpreting II	L 306 ASL Comprehension & Fluency II	SL 390 Contrastive Analysis: Eng & ASL	ITP 410 Prof Decision Making & Ethics II	ITP 420 English-to-ASL Interpreting II	ITP 440 Interactive Interpreting II	ITP 470 Practicum in Interpreting I	ASL 425 Deaf Literature	ASL 380 ST: ASL 7	ITP 495 Practicum in Interpreting II	ASL 101, 105, 201, 202, 205, 301, 302
Standard 6.0 Curriculum: Knowledge Competencies																				
6.1 Interpreting theory and knowledge																				
6.1.1 theories of interpretation and translation	n/a	2	2	1	3	n/a	n/a	3	3	1	1	n/a	2	2	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6.1.2 historical foundations of the profession;	n/a	3	1	2	1	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	1	1	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6.1.3 interpreter role, function, and responsibilities;	1	2	2	3	1	1	n/a	2	1	1	1	n/a	3	3	3	3	n/a	n/a	3	n/a
6.1.4 ethical theory, practice, and decision-making;	n/a	2	1	3	1	1	n/a	2	1	1	1	n/a	3	3	2	3	n/a	n/a	3	n/a
6.1.5 interpreting needs of Deaf, DeafBlind, and hearing consumers;	1	2	2	2	3	1	2*	3	3	3	n/a	n/a	3	3	3	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

The program curriculum map is a table organizing the sequence of courses as column headers. Each CCIE curriculum standard is arranged in separate rows. Within each cell that represents the relationship between a course and a standard is a number that reflects the level of emphasis that a standard has in that course. As is encapsulated in this curriculum map, concepts and skills expressed in the standards are scaffolded and sequenced throughout the program and within courses, with no course taking sole responsibility for any core concept, skill, or program-level outcome. The program employs the CCIE standard concepts of introduced, rein-

forced, and mastered (CCIE, 2014), along with a scale (e.g., 1= minimally supports, 2 = somewhat supports, 3 = strongly supports) for the amount of emphasis placed on a specific standard in a particular course to guide development of learning assessments and activities. For example, a course that strongly supports a specific standard will focus more intently on student achievement regarding that standard. Whereas, a course that minimally supports a standard would be expected to introduce or lightly touch on the standard. Within the current curriculum design, 14 courses currently strongly or somewhat support standards and concepts related to discourse analysis, pragmatic tools, and sociolinguistic factors. Table 1 provides a listing of courses and the level of focus on the concepts addressed in this chapter.

Table 1: Program Courses that address Discourse Analysis, Sociolinguistic Factors, and/or Pragmatic tools

Course Name	Introduced, Reinforced, or Mastered	Level of Support
Introduction to Deaf Studies	Introduced	Minimally
Professional Ethics and Issues in Interpreting	Reinforced	Somewhat
Processing Skills for Interpreters	Introduced	Somewhat
ASL-to-English Interpreting I & II	Reinforced	Strongly
Professional Decision Making & Ethics I	Reinforced	Strongly
ASL 7	Reinforced	Strongly
ASL Comprehension and Fluency I & II	Reinforced	Somewhat
English-to-ASL Interpreting I & II	Reinforced	Strongly
Interactive Interpreting I	Reinforced	Strongly
Interactive Interpreting II	Mastered	Strongly
Practicum II	Mastered	Strongly

1.4. Overview of *Interactive Interpreting I* course design

With program context in mind, exploring the micro level allows for a deeper understanding of specific course activities and how those activities support SLOs (shown in Figure 2), especially as related to discourse analysis, pragmatics, and sociolinguistic factors. Most of the examples included in this analysis are taken from *Interactive Interpreting I,* taken by junior level undergraduate interpreting students. Program level outcomes reinforced in this course are shown in Table 2. This table, and 2014 CCIE standards alignment for the course, appear on the course syllabus as well. The course description explains the focus as, "Exploration of meaning creation in interaction both theoretically and practically through observation and engagement in monolingual and bilingual interactions. Consideration of the impact of the presence of an interpreter on the creation of meaning in interactions."

Figure 2 SLOs for Interactive Interpreting I Course

SLOs (with aligned CCIE Standards in parentheses): Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. Explain the co-creation of meaning in interaction (6.1.5, 6.2.4, 6.3.4) using critical thinking, conceptual pragmatic tools (6.1.1, 6.5.1, 6.5.2, 6.5.3, 6.5.4, 7.1.2):
   a. Define pragmatics
   b. Recognize utterance boundaries, and prosodic cues
   c. Distinguish between direct and indirect language use (locution, illocution, implicature)
   d. Recognize im/politeness strategies and markers
   e. Distinguish various speech acts
   f. Define conversational maxims
   g. Recognize conflicts of conversational maxims
   h. Describe implicatures, schemas (thought worlds, conceptual models, personal and institutional goals, processes, roles, etc.), and conventional scripts/routines/cues for various interactions
   i. Explain the contextualized nature of turn taking
   j. Recognize the impact of (cross)cultural and (cross)sociolinguistic factors on interactions (6.3.4)
2. Analyze and compare the co-creation of meaning in monolingual and bilingual interactions (6.3.4, 6.5.2, 6.5.3, 6.5.4, 7.1.2)
3. Analyze and compare the co-creation of meaning in dyadic and interpreted (triadic) interactions (6.3.4, 6.5.2, 6.5.3, 6.5.4, 7.1.2, 7.1.3)
4. Apply understanding of the co-creation of meaning in the effective interpretation of interactions (with a focus on the consecutive mode) (6.1.5, 6.2.4, 7.2.1, 7.4.1)
5. Prepare for interpreted interactions in advance to predict possible goals, speech acts, implicatures, schemas, and conventional scripts/routines/cues (6.1.5, 6.1.6.6, 7.4.1, 7.4.2)
6. Demonstrate self-monitoring and management of effective interpreted interactions (6.1.5, 6.1.6.6, 7.2.1, 7.4.1, 7.4.2)
7. Demonstrate self- and peer- assessment of their work and professional interactions (6.2.3, 7.3.1, 7.3.2)

Table 2 Program level outcomes supported by Interactive Interpreting I Course

ASL and English Interpretation **Program Level Student Learning Outcomes**	**Outcomes supported in ITP 340**
1) Students of the program will develop critical and creative thinking skills.	Reinforced
2) Students will develop competency in American Sign Language.	Reinforced
3) Students will develop competency in English.	Reinforced
4) Students will possess a generalist level of knowledge in professional issues, theories, and multicultural dynamics related to the interpreter profession.	Reinforced
5) Students will demonstrate ethical and culturally competent decision-making in various interpreter settings.	Reinforced
6) Students of the program will demonstrate at least entry-level competency in interpreting between ASL and English.	Reinforced
7) Students will be able to critically assess their own work and use creative problem-solving to continually develop themselves as professionals.	Reinforced

As an overall goal, students are expected to effectively interpret simulated interactions in the consecutive mode. This is achieved by analyzing meaning and intent through linguistic and pragmatic cues and contextual implicature; rendering a set of cues, including any necessary linguistic and communication behaviors, that potentially evoke a matching construction of meaning the audience's mind; and monitoring and assessing their own and peers' work. The instructors use the concepts of big ideas and essential questions (Wiggins and McTighe 2006; Nosich 2009) to frame weekly and daily lessons through the guided practice process. This process is explained in more detail in section 3, Guided Practice (GP).

Interactive Interpreting I, like most courses within the program, meets during the regular 17-week semester, which includes 15 weeks of instruction, a week of university break, and a final exam week. The 3-credit hour course meets for 1 hour and 15 minutes twice each week. The first 5 weeks of the course emphasize comprehending and analyzing features in monolingual, interactive ASL texts. The next week, students apply the same knowledge and skills with monolingual interactive English texts, and compare the use of pragmatic features between ASL and English.[2] Then for the next 5 weeks, students analyze and consecutively interpret bilingual persuasive, expository, and argumentative texts. In the last weeks of new instruction, students analyze and interpret bilingual interactions that were simulated Video Relay Service (VRS) interactions.[3] The final weeks of the course are spent synthesizing knowledge and skills. While each course varies slightly, this description of the course schedule provides a fairly accurate representation of each offering. This sequence was determined after the identification of relevant important concepts and the application to interactive interpreting.

2. Discourse Analysis

Specific details about how discourse analysis leads to the identification of sociolinguistic factors and application of pragmatic tools are discussed here. The guided preparation work, discussed in section 3, combined with the simulated classroom practice provided students with knowledge and skills that can be applied through reflection to future interpretations.

Discourse is interactive with conversation being the "basic and fundamental way people talk to each other" (Schiffrin 1994, 100). Discourse is a series of choices with communication entailing constant decision making (Winston and Roy 2015; Schiffrin 1994). These decisions are guided by conversational styles and ongoing reactions to each other. These reactions are partly based on the need to be closer— to

2 Students engaged in role-play with a topic/scenario and goals for one week because it was in their L1.

3 VRS is a phone service connecting Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing individuals to hearing individuals to an interpreter through video technology.

converge, or to be further apart— to diverge with each other to negotiate degree of shared social power. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory offer a way to make sense of this negotiation with the idea of *positive* and *negative face wants*. People negotiate interactions and use politeness strategies according to the need for independence and social power (e.g., negative face wants) and at the same time, the need for interdependence and involvement with one another (e.g., positive face wants).

Moreover understanding interactions also entails identifying *speech acts*—using language to perform an act or to get someone to do something (Austin, Urmson, and Sbisa 1975; Searle 1979). Through the use of language, interlocutors intuitively grasp there is more happening than merely the signs or words being expressed. Examining language-as-acts, whether it is signed or spoken, we can understand how each turn embodies a communicative goal of each interlocutor that furthers the overarching goal for the interaction.

Part of the interpreters' work is deeply understanding and tying the discourse together in a cohesive, coherent way as the communication unfolds. This is related to the idea that in discourse, meaning emerges, and meaning is a "dynamic, fluid, and amorphous concept that people hope to share in some way as they interact" (Winston and Roy 2015, 98) and discourse is context and all parts of the interaction—social, linguistic, cultural, and idiosyncratic factors—impact interaction and discourse. The design and implementation of an interactive interpreting course can adopt and apply these ideas in a myriad of ways, as discussed below.

Discourse analysis is a set of conceptual tools that can be used to assist students in understanding the complexity of effective interpretations of interactive discourse. Winston and Monikowski (2000, 2005) proposed an excellent instructional process to analyze monologic discourse (e.g., lectures, narratives, etc.) as a means to scaffold students' ability to prepare an interpretation that is coherent at the discourse level. Similarly, our approach to conversational discourse analysis provides students with a structure to manage an interaction, to uncover its underlying processes and understand how this impacts the co-creation of meaning. The step-by-step conversational analysis taught to students also allows for application of pragmatic tools and identification of sociolinguistic factors through a turn-by-turn annotation of the source text utterance. Additionally, this process requires students to self-assess their comprehension as they analyze the source text for deeper, often implicit social meaning, and, finally, create a practice target text to achieve interlocutors' communicative and relational goals. Winston and Roy 2015 suggest that examining interactions with turn-taking provide a plethora of ways to witness how interlocutors make meaning through adjacency pairs, understand each other's goals, structure communication, use degrees of politeness and directness to give deference and/or maintain solidarity, and reflect language attitudes.

2.1. Selecting course resources

Selection of resources that support student learning can be challenging because materials must address specific learning outcomes and scaffold on students' current level of skill and knowledge. Interpreting skills courses, by their nature, requires selecting materials for students to learn new content related to interpreting, as well as language samples that can be used for practicing analysis and interpretation skills. In this course *Human Communication Across Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Introduction to Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics* by Remillard and Williams (2016) was selected as the primary text. This textbook introduces topics with straightforward and succinct explanations. The inclusion of intercultural pragmatics is especially relevant for the course-level SLOs. The faculty provide supplements to the core text with signed language and interpretation readings selected for relevance to the key concepts and student learning outcomes.

Textbook design allows for seamless application to source text practice material; however, finding effective source text practice materials to apply the textbook readings to has been challenging. Winston and Roy (2015), citing Schiffrin (1994), insisted that natural language texts are needed in interpreting courses (see also Winston and Swabey 2011). Important criteria for effective source texts for this course included selecting texts that allow students to apply new concepts to interactions that display natural language use. Being constrained by meeting in the classroom as opposed to natural settings with actual interactants in real time, makes it challenging to create authentic learning experiences for students.

For this course, the DVD-ROM series *Still Talking* created by David Still (2006) provided suitable material for student practice. This series was explicitly designed for students to practice consecutive interpretation of conversational interactions between one English speaker and one ASL signer. The source texts provided natural interactions for students to examine during their GP activities. Another beneficial feature of this resource was the organization of source texts. The DVD-ROM video series is organized by conversational genres: procedural, expository, informational, argumentative, and persuasive. Each genre includes four interactions rated according to level of difficulty. Finally, the student is presented with one short video clip representing one turn in the conversation. At the end of the video clip, the student is encouraged to take as much time as necessary, or even re-play the clip, to analyze the meaning of that turn and then present a consecutive interpretation of that turn before advancing to the next video clip that represents the other interlocutor's turn. This turn-by-turn format seems to be an ideal solution for the novice interpreter who is learning consecutive interpretation. It is also ideal for implementing the GP activities explained below. Each video interaction comes with preparation material,

hints of the interlocutor's intent during their turn, and two interpreting models. The original interpretation between these interlocutors are not included in the main sequence of video clips to allow students the opportunity to complete their interpretations before viewing the provided examples.

2.2. Example application of pragmatic tools

To demonstrate how the tools of conversational discourse analysis were applied, we provide a brief sample analysis of an interaction taken from the *Still Talking* series—an interview between Doug and Silma. Doug is a hearing, English-speaking college student and Silma is a Deaf woman. Taking a closer look at Silma and Doug's conversation allows students to critically analyse, discuss, and work on crafting an interpretation that supports Doug and Silma's interactive message and intent. Working from a macro to micro view is one way to make sense of the interaction. Starting with the larger context and overarching goals, Doug is writing a paper on Deaf culture for a sociology class; the two of them know each other, and Silma is willing to share her perspective during the 20-minute interview. The simulated interaction provides a model for analysing and interpreting an interaction that is reasonably authentic. Of course, the turn-taking is influenced because the interaction is a filmed, triadic interaction mediated by an interpreter, which mitigates the use of any overlapping talk. Another macro-level pragmatic tool is to examine speech acts (Austin et al. 1975) being carried out by Doug and Silma. Throughout the interview, Doug uses a series of *locutions* in the form of grammatical questions that further the *illocutionary force* of his *rogative speech acts* to cause a *perlocutionary* result: Silma performing her acts of *representatives* and *expressives* in response to his questions or rogatives (Austin et al. 1975).

To understand examples provided here, see Table 3, which provides a transcript of the beginning of the interaction and a few turns of the discussion. The first adjacency pair in the interaction demonstrates a routine greeting and opening of the conversation by acknowledging each other's presence and signalling their desire to continue the conversation. This turn is also marked by an expressive speech act from both interlocutors showing the emotional or psychological state of wanting to connect with each other (Searle 1979). It is important for interpreters to know routine, formulaic language and how it is used so interpretations are natural in achieving interlocutors' goals.

The second adjacency pair opens with Doug following the conversational norms of the cooperative principle, which support the four maxims of cooperative conversation (Grice 1967). Specifically, Doug adheres to the maxim of manner by being clear; the maxim of quantity by being brief and orderly; the maxim of relevance by keeping to the topic; and maxim of quality by being truthful. Moreover, both Doug

and Silma are negotiating the interaction through use of politeness strategies to manage the need for connection (*positive face wants*) while being sensitive to imposing on someone (*negative face wants*) (Brown and Levinson 1987). Doug is using positive politeness strategies to show interest in the topic of Deaf culture and in Silma as a person while, simultaneously, respecting the imposition of the interview on Silma. Silma appears cooperative in sharing information during the interview required by his sociology class, a signal that she is supporting both types of face wants.

As can be seen in the sample pragmatic analysis, there is an important relationship between linguistic form, contextual factors, and their impact on message meaning (Viaggio 1991; Remillard and Williams 2016; Winston and Roy 2015). The interpretations should accurately reflect the content and intent of the interlocutors. In addition, Viaggio (1991) stresses the necessity of understanding the *what* and the *why* of the speaker's intent before the interpreter begins reproducing the message in the target language. In the interpreting classroom, students can benefit from using a discourse analysis approach to help understand how constructing meaning is a cooperative activity between interlocutors that includes the interpreter (Winston and Monikowski 2000/2005). Co-constructing meaning involves perceiving the cues (bottom up processing) and making sense of them in relevant, wider contexts, using embodied, cultural, and shared experiences (top down processing). When working from a broad to narrow view of a communicative event, conversational discourse analysis and pragmatic tools can assist students in uncovering the meaning of the interlocutor's message. A pragmatic analysis of an interaction turn-by-turn can lead to discovery of the intent and the goals of the interlocutors.

Table 3 Expository A Doug and Silma Discussing Deaf Culture

Doug	Silma	Analysis	Possible Interpretation
Adjacency Pair 1			
1. Hi Silma [Hi Silma] 2. Nice to see you again [Nice to see you again]	4. HELLO D-O-U-G [Hello Doug] 5. GOOD SEE PRO-2 AGAIN SAME [It's good to see you again, too]	Routine greeting, acknowledge presence Expressive (speech act) – to connect with each other	HELLO NICE SEE PRO-2 AGAIN Hello, likewise
Adjacency Pair 2			
6. So, as you may know, I'm doing a paper for sociology class? [So, as you may know, I'm doing a paper for sociology class?]		Cooperative Principle for manner and relevance	MAYBE, PRO-2, KNOW-THAT, PRO-1 PAPER WRITE CLASS FS(SOCIOLOGY)-yes/no-q?
7. And, I'm really interested in Deaf culture [And, I'm really interested in Deaf culture]		Positive Face Wants—shows interest in Deaf culture	PRO.1 DEAF CULTURE WANT LEARN MORE

8. So, I was hoping you could help me out with some perspective on the Deaf culture today [So, I was hoping you could help me out with some perspective on the Deaf culture today]		Representative (speech act) —explaining Indirect speech act softens face threatening act	g(shrug) DEAF CULTURE, POSS(self) POINT-OF-VIEW, WHAT-wh q. HELP(you help me) CAN-yes/no-q
	9. FINE++, GOOD [That's fine, ok]	Appears to agree to request sincerely	Sure, okay.
	10. PRO-1 CURIOUS WHAT PRO-1 WANT TO LEARN SOCIOLOGY-wh-q [What would you like to know about sociology?]	Rotative (speech act) –asking what do you want to know about Deaf culture	What questions do you have about Deaf culture to help with your paper for sociology class?
	11. WHAT-2hand WHAT-q ABOUT DEAF CULTURE WHAT-2hand-q [What about Deaf Culture?]	Positive Face Wants—wants to appear accommodating	

2.3. Example of identifying and responding to salient sociolinguistic factors

In addition to using pragmatic tools, the discourse analysis of context and meaning in the service of interpreting work also entails identifying and responding to sociolinguistic factors. This includes learning about and applying the traditional areas of sociolinguistics including: multilingualism, language contact, variation, language attitudes, and language policy and planning (Van Herk 2012, Schembri and Lucas 2015; Bayley, Cameron, and Lucas 2015).

The *Still Talking* video series provide a limited range of diversity and exposure to multilingualism (beyond the ASL and English bilingual interactions) and multiculturalism. One reason why we focus here on the Silma and Doug interaction is due to its multilingual diversity. Silma was born in Africa, although she does not specify which African country, and used an oral method of communicating until moving to Canada at the age of 6 when she started learning ASL. Even though the spoken language she previously used in Africa is not divulged in the video, these contextual factors provided an opportunity for discussion with students about bilingualism and language contact in Deaf communities. A typical limitation of the classroom setting is the difficulty of presenting authentic multilingual samples; fortunately, there are some instances of Silma's language production that use English-influenced features such as the signs glossed here as TO, BUT, and AND. These could be attributed to bilingualism *and* language contact (see Table 3).

Quinto-Pozos and Adam (2015) discussed two general forms of language contact—*unimodal contact* where two languages of the same modality interact (i.e., spoken to spoken or signed to signed) and *multimodal contact* refers to two languages with differing modalities interacting. What is happening in Silma's case with the use of TO, BUT, and AND is an example of language contact, a commonplace experience for most Deaf people that occurs between signed, spoken, and written languages. Thus, language contact can create multilingual and multimodal users of languages showing a rich language range.

This also relates to the sociolinguistic areas of language variation and language attitude held by interlocutors and interpreters. For example, Van Herk (2012) states variation in language can come from factors relating to place, social status, time, ethnicity, gender, and identity. In the interaction with Doug and Silma, Doug demonstrates variation related to place denoting his Canadian origin with the marked pronunciation of *about*. Silma uses a variation of the sign CULTURE with outward palm orientation that seems to violate typical patterns of phonological sign production of native ASL signers. Many of the interpreting students adopted the same production as used by Silma in an attempt to match the particular language style of the interpreting consumer and to show respect. However, those student interpreters lacked the intuition to determine whether the sign is a widely accepted regional variant or a production error stemming from second language learning.

Palmer, Reynolds, and Minor (2012) found language attitudes in relation to language variation by Deaf people and interpreters is evident in the VRS setting. Their study showed Deaf people and interpreters will use regional signs even if there is a standard form; interpreters, at times, show a willingness for language match of consumers but not always. Consumers share a preference for their regional variety over the standard form (Palmer et al. 2012). Hill (2005, citing Eagly and Chaiken 1993, 1) in defining language attitude explained it as "a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor." Returning to the above example for the sign CULTURE— interpreting students' attitude exhibiting respect for variation is reassuring, but they still need to know if the particular production of a sign is generally used by the core members of the ASL-signing community.

Finally, serious and oftentimes deleterious effects of *language policy and planning,* a sociolinguistic subfield related to educational planning of languages, is evident in the education of deaf and hard-of-hearing children. Silma's experience served as a starting place to discuss language policy and planning for signed languages. This discussion reinforced content from a prior course regarding a qualitative study reporting on adults' educational experience in elementary through high school settings. Oliva and

Lytle (2014, 37) describe the phenomenon of lack of access to "ubiquitous conversation" and similar issues, such as isolation within mainstreamed education for Deaf students where bilingual English and an ASL educational approach are not embraced.

Multiple areas of potential discussion for interpreting students are present in this video series. An important concept that can be discussed with students is the official recognition of ASL and other signed languages as minority languages and promotion of them as a human rights issue. Another area of discussion is ASL and other signed languages are associated with a disability instead of a linguistic and cultural group identity. Challenging the assumption that deafness is a disability that needs to be normalized by learning a spoken language exclusively rather than promoting ASL and English bilingualism is another important area of discussion relevant to the source text sample. To gain the most benefit from source texts faculty should bring these important sociolinguistic factors to the fore.

3. Guided Practice

The authors employed Talbert's (2017) GP model to guide students through a conversational discourse analysis process that explicitly addressed sociolinguistic factors while using pragmatic tools. Some core faculty members within the program lean heavily on Talbert's (2017) explanation of GP while Talbert's (2017) approach is embedded in his flipped learning course design, the GP concept and components can be applied within any course design.[4] The goal of GP is to provide students with a framework for knowledge and skills needed to successfully participate in classroom activities. Instructors can design GP materials for the preferred unit of instruction – daily, weekly, or some other schedule. The aim is to assist students in preparing for activities during the classroom session. The GP format followed in the courses designed by the authors carry forward the concept of guided practice into the classroom practice sessions as well.

Essential components of Talbert's (2017) GP are: *overview*, *learning objectives*, *resources*, *exercises*, and *submission instructions*. The instructor designs and provides these items, usually via the institution's learning management system (LMS), to students prior to the classroom session. The *overview* is generally one paragraph that connects the current GP to prior learning to assist students in making connections and moving forward. The *learning objectives*, basic and advanced, provide a standard that students can use to judge their learning. In general, the authors follow Talbert's approach (2017) that has students work on basic learning objectives, the knowledge and understanding level of Bloom's Taxonomy, prior to the class session, while advanced learning objectives are worked on during the class session with guidance from the instructor. *Resources*, which are provided along with the *overview* and *learning*

4 To learn more about flipped learning see Talbert 2017.

objectives, allow students a variety of ways to engage with and achieve mastery of basic learning objectives. These can include a range of materials, such as videos, textbook pages, and Quizlet.com vocabulary review. Faculty within this program primarily provide required resources and materials in the GP and inform students they can also use other resources.

Finally, *exercises* and *instructions for submitting work* are the last components of the GP provided to students prior to the class session. Students complete and submit exercises prior to the class session so instructors can assess students' attainment of basic learning objectives. Exercises take various forms depending on the objectives. For example, students may submit recordings of themselves using vocabulary items, responses to comprehension questions, or initial attempts at discourse analysis. In addition to the steps outlined in Talbert's (2017) text, the authors' GP usually includes information about the specific classroom activities and how preparation will lead into classroom activities. In the classroom sessions, instructors provide essential questions (Wiggins and McTighe 2006; Nosich 2009), advanced learning objectives for that session, and/or core activities for the class session. This guided process allows students to take ownership of their learning process (Talbert 2017, 45). As students work through classroom activities, the instructor is available to continue to guide them using a variety of techniques such as Socratic questioning, mini-lectures, worked examples, and group practice.

3.1. Guided preparation for conversational discourse analysis

In the course, each simulated interpreting assignment followed a standardized three-step process, divided into multiple parts in an effort to emulate the typical interpreting process in the field. Parts 1 and 2 included exploration of *pre-assignment controls* (Dean and Pollard 2013) and completion of the first consecutive interpretation. These were completed as part of the pre-class session GP activities. During and following the class session, students completed Part 3, assessment of interpretations and created a revised interpretation.

The provided GP documents outlined the standardized *conversational discourse analysis* process for Parts 1 and 2. Part 1, essentially instructions to help prepare for the interpretation, served as a way for students to develop pre-assignment controls (Dean and Pollard 2013). Students completed prediction work after being given a specific context. The broad context for the example discussed earlier in this chapter was: "Silma is educating Doug about the culture of Deaf people." Next, while completing a meaning analysis, students practice predictions for the 32 turns by applying several pragmatic tools such as Speech Acts, Cooperative Principle, Face Wants, and Politeness Strategies. Once the analysis was complete, students revisit-

ed their initial prediction work, researched additional background information, and double-checked comprehension of each turn.

In Part 2, students created a consecutive interpretation of the interaction. In an effort to engage their cognitive monitor while interpreting, students reviewed their goals for improvement before interpreting (Dean and Pollard 2013). Immediately after interpreting the interaction, students performed a retrospective think aloud protocol (Ericsson and Simon 1992) to help uncover and report on their thought processes during the interpretation (Smith 2014; Stevens and Hale 2016). Finally, students completed a reflection with a brief assessment and analysis of progress toward goals and patterns in the interpreting work. The GP exercises were submitted to the instructors prior to attending the group classroom session.

3.2. Classroom practice and follow-up activities

The goal of classroom activities was to allow students to use targeted knowledge and skills with support of classmates and instructors. During the classroom sessions, students engaged in several activities including interpreting, giving and receiving feedback, and clarifying content and language use. Frequently, students worked in small groups, consecutively interpreting and providing peer-to-peer feedback on the interpretations. Instructors used feedback discussion time to provide feedback on the interpretations. Instructors also guided thoughtful discussion of how to apply the previously completed pragmatic analysis to convey meaning and intent of the message in order to achieve speakers' goals. In addition to small group activities, students and instructors engaged in large group discussions centered on source text comprehension difficulties and specific problematic areas with interpreting concepts. Instructors focused attention to salient aspects of the source text students may have overlooked or needed additional practice addressing.

After the classroom session, students completed Part 3 of the three-step process. In a series of follow-up activities, students viewed and assessed two model interpretations from the DVD-ROM series and compared those samples to their own work. The focus of the comparative assessment was on the reconstructing of pragmatic meaning between the student's independent work and the model interpretations. As students completed final preparations to interpret the interaction again, they reviewed their prior self-assessment of their progress toward their goals. They then reinterpreted the interaction. Next, students reflected on their work through another think aloud protocol as a final assessment of the interpretation.

4. Reflective data analysis for iterative course design

As mentioned earlier, the course design process used by the authors is an iterative process. The final component of our process is reflective data analysis and course

revision. Throughout the semester instructors use formative assessment of student performance relative to the student learning outcomes to determine the effectiveness of the teaching approach. In response to student performance incremental changes are often made through the term of the course. In addition, a more thorough review of the course occurs at the end of the semester, and again during the planning phase of the next offering of that course.

Several key pieces of information form the basis of the assessment of the effectiveness of the course. First, student performance across several indicators provide crucial data regarding student achievement of the course SLO. The faculty of the *Interactive Interpreting I* course analysed the following student data samples: student interpretations, student think-aloud-protocol reports, student analysis and reflections, and a final course paper.

Faculty also asked students to assess their progress toward the course level learning outcomes using a 4-point scale: *beginning, developing, competent,* and *accomplished.* Each SLO was reformatted into an "I can" statement. *I can explain the co-creation of meaning in interaction using critical thinking and conceptual pragmatic tools,* for example. Students rated their current level of competence for each *I can* SLO statement. A standardized scale is used throughout the ASL-English Interpretation degree program at EKU for student self-assessment of SLO competence.

Beginning is defined as, "Fails to demonstrate skill/knowledge beyond rudimentary levels."

Developing level states, "Demonstrates skill/knowledge in a limited or inexact capacity; making progress, but has not yet achieved competence. Lacks depth, integration, and/or synthesis."

Competent is defined as, "Demonstrates skill/knowledge; although not necessarily with ease, demonstrates depth, integration and synthesis."

Accomplished, the top level, states, "Clearly demonstrates skill/knowledge with accuracy and precision; depth, integration, synthesis, and analysis are evident."

Faculty members review all data to determine adequate progress toward course and program SLO, as well as compliance with CCIE standards. No iteration of a course design is perfect, and faculty use the review and reflection process to make changes to the course design, materials, or activities to attempt to improve student attainment of the course and program outcomes. In one iteration of the course one change was to give more assistance early on with identifying speech acts. Another time, students were not quite satisfied with individual progress on their TAPs; however, faculty realized (with our ongoing view of the program) that mastery of

the TAPs process was not the goal. This information was made explicit to students so they better understood that the purpose was to build foundational skills. At the conclusion of the most recent offering of the course, the faculty members determined that students generally succeeded in attaining the learning outcomes for the course as well as making progress on the relevant program outcomes. Even so, faculty are considering some minor adjustments for the next offering of the course.

5. Conclusion

Utilizing the analytical concepts from discourse analysis and pragmatics offer many approaches to teaching and understanding language, communication, and interpreting, especially when the depth and breadth are explored through a guided approach to synthesis, application, and reflection. Furthermore, each area of sociolinguistics provides a multi-faceted view of context, language, communication, and interpreting. Recognizing and understanding conventional cues, discourse strategies, and cultural assumptions for co-constructing meaning and intent require interpreters to have a full repertoire of linguistic, pragmatic, cultural, social, and institutional knowledge and skill to effectively mediate the co-construction of meaning between people who have different or even similar cultural assumptions, goals, and schemas. Recognizing the sociolinguistic and pragmatic features of interactions, reading the room, provides the foundation to the application of sociolinguistic conceptual frameworks. This is one way to help interpreting students and working interpreters understand and improve their craft. Implementing a sociolinguistic approach to program and course design provides ample practice with concepts and skills, in a scaffolded way, before students graduate and become independent interpreters.

References

Austin, J., J. Urmson, and M. Sbisa. 1975. *How to Do Things With Words.* Cambridge, MA: University Press.

Bayley, R., R. Cameron, and C. Lucas (eds.). 2015. *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Brown, P., and S. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Cokely, Dennis. 2005. "Shifting Positionality: A Critical Examination of the Turning Point in the Relationship of Interpreters and the Deaf Community." In *Sign Language Interpreting and Interpreter Education: Directions for Research and Practice,* ed. by Marc Marschark, Rico Peterson, E. A. Winston, P. Sapere, C. Convertino, R. Seewagen, and C. Monikowski, 3–28. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Dean, R. K., and R.Q. Pollard. 2013. *The Demand Control Schema: Interpreting as a Practice Profession.* North Charleston, SC: CreateSpace.

Ericsson, K. A., and H.A. Simon. 1992. *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fenlon, J., and E. Wilkinson, E. 2015. "Sign Languages in the World." In *Sociolinguistics and Deaf Communities,* ed. by A. C. Schembri and C. Lucas, 5–28. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Grice, H.P. 1975. "Logic and Conversation." In *The Logic of Grammar,* ed. by D. Davidson and G. Harman, 6--75. Encino and Belmont, CA: Dickenson Publishing Company.

Hale, K.J. 2019. "ASL-English Interpreting Internal Program Evaluation." (Unpublished document, Eastern Kentucky University, 2019).

Hill, J. C. 2015. "Language Attitudes in Deaf Communities." In *Sociolinguistics and Deaf Communities,* ed. by A. C. Schembri and C. Lucas, 146–174. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Metzger, M., and C. Roy. 2013. "Sociolinguistic Studies of Signed Language Interpreting." In *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, ed. by R. Bayley, R. Cameron, and C. Lucas, 735–753. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Nosich, G. 2009. *Learning to Think Things Through: A Guide to Critical Thinking Across the Curriculum.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Oliva, G. A., and L.R. Lytle. 2014. *Turning the Tide: Making Life Better for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Schoolchildren.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Palmer, J. L., W. Reynolds, and R. Minor. 2012. "You Want What On Your Pizza!?": Videophone And Video-Relay Service As Potential Influences on the Lexical Standardization of American Sign Language." *Sign Language Studies 12* (3): 371-397.

Petronio, K., and K. Hale. 2009. One IEP, Two Sites: A Comparison of Factors and Outcomes. *International Journal of Interpreter Education* (1): *45-61.*

Pöchhacker, F. 2016. *Introducing Interpreting Studies* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge

Quinto-Pozos, D., and R. Adam. 2015. "Sign Languages in Contact." In *Sociolinguistics and Deaf Communities,* ed. by A.C. Schembri and C. Lucas, 29–60. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Remillard, V., and W. Karen. 2016. *Human Communication Across Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Introduction to Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics.* Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Roy, Cynthia. (2000). *Interpreting as a discourse process.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Roy, C., J. Brunson, and C. Stone. 2018. *The Academic Foundations of Interpreting Studies.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Roy, M. & Metzger, M. (2014). "Researching signed language interpreting research through a sociolinguistic lens." *Translation and Interpreting 6*(1): 158-176.

Searle, J. 1979. *Expression and Meaning.* Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Schembri, A. C., and C. Lucas, C. (eds.). 2015. *Sociolinguistics in Deaf Communities.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse* (vol VIII). Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, A. 2014. "Think Aloud Protocols: Viable for Teaching, Learning, and Professional Development in Interpreting." *Translation and Interpreting 6* (1): 128-143. doi:106201.2014.a07

Stevens, T., and K. Hale. 2016. "Implementing Think-Aloud-Protocols Provides Insight to Students' Internal Metacognitive Processes." In *It Works For Me, Metacognitively,* ed. H. Blythe, C. Sweet, and R. Carpenter, 83–86. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Still, D. 2006. *Still Talking: Interactive Interpreting* (DVD-ROM). Still Interpreting, Inc. Vancouver, BC.

Talbert, Robert. 2017. *Flipped Learning: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Van Herk, G. 2012. *What is Sociolinguistics?* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Viaggio, S. 1991. "Teaching Beginners to Shut Up and Listen: A Conference Interpreter Espouses Silence." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the First Language International Conference, Elsinore, Denmark May 31-June 2.

Wiggins, G., and J. McTighe. 2006. *Understanding by Design.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Winston, E. A., and C. Monikowski. 2000. "Discourse Mapping: Developing Textual Coherence Skills in Interpreters." In *Innovative Practices for Interpreting Training,* ed. C. Roy, 15–66. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Winston, E. A., and C. Monikowski. 2005. "Discourse Mapping: The GPS of Translation." In *Advances in Teaching Sign Language Interpreters*, ed. C. Roy, 49–77 Washington D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Winston, E. A., and C. Roy. 2015. "Discourse Analysis and Sign Languages." In *Sociolinguistics and Deaf Communities*, ed. A. C. Schembri and C. Lucas, 95–119. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Winston, B., and L. Swabey. 2011. "Garbage In, Garbage Out: The Importance of Source Text Selection in Assessing Interpretations and Translations." In *EFSLI 2010 Conference Proceedings*, ed. C. Stone, and R. Ada, 84–94. Glasgow: EuroPrint.