Gallaudet University
Department of Interpreting and Translation
2017-2018 Colloquium Lecture Series
Dr. Debra Russell
February 9, 2018

This Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided to facilitate communication accessibility and is not a verbatim record of the proceedings.

Dr. Keith Cagle

Good morning everyone! Let's get everyone's attention. Flash the lights. Honk the horns? Good morning, everybody. Thank you so much for coming bright and early. This is our third Colloquium Lecture Series. I'm Keith Cagle and I'm the Chair of the Department of Interpretation and Translation here at Gallaudet. I'd like to welcome our DOIT faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff. If you wouldn't mind raising your hand so we can give you a warm welcome. Thank you so much for coming. Also, I want to welcome our DOIT students in the PhD, MA, and BA programs, please raise your hands. Welcome, everyone!

This is our third in a series sponsored by the Center for Advancement of Interpretation and Translation Research under DOIT. I would like you to know this presentation is filmed and will be archived. In case you want to use this particular series again, or someone wasn't able to make it this morning, you can find that in our archive.

Before I begin, I first want to recognize one individual that is present. I want to say good morning to Betty Colonomos - you all know who that is, right? I am so happy you could join us this morning. I would also like to thank the two interpreters, Amanda Mueller and Jackie Lightfoot. Thank you so much for interpreting this morning. After our presentation is over, you are welcome to join us to eat lunch over on the second floor of the cafeteria from 12:00 to 1:30. Please come - you'll be able to talk with our guest speaker and socialize with all of us.

Now, I'm going to welcome Dr. Lori Whynot to the stage - she is faculty at the DoIT, and she will introduce our guest speaker. I have known our guest speaker since 1988. That's when I went to Canada, to the province of Alberta, to Calgary, and I met our guest speaker. She was such a young beautiful woman - so nice to meet her. Thirty odd years later, she looks the same. She is radiant as ever, and we are thrilled to have her with us this morning. I'll let Dr. Whynot finish go ahead and finish the introduction of our guest speaker.

Dr. Lori Whynot

Hello and welcome! The Department of Interpreting and Translation here at Gallaudet University, and this Colloquium Lecture Series is an annual event. We typically have four different lectures in our series. Today is our third lecture. Many of our guest

lecturers are researchers in our field, and talk about pertinent topics to the field of interpreting and translation. And the goal of this series is to basically highlight important issues within our field. Today, if anyone needs CEUs, please do see Mark Holmes and he will assist with you CEUs. I'm introducing the speaker today, but before I do that, I want to remind everyone of our last lecture series, which is happening April 13. That will be our final speaker, our very own Pamela Collins. She'll be lecturing on her dissertation research, which is Getting Scheduled: An Exploration of the Process.

So today, Dr. Debra Russell will be giving her presentation. We'll first have the presentation, and then we'll have a respondent, Carla Mather. After the respondent has a few words, then we'll hand it over to you for questions and answers. Once we're done with that, around 11:25, we will head over to the cafeteria, second floor, and, again, all are welcome to continue the discussion there and have lunch together.

So, I'll introduce our lecturer today, Dr. Debra Russell. She's from Canada. A certified interpreter and educator, a researcher. Her interpreting practice has been going for over 30 years. She interprets legal, courtroom settings, medical, and mental health settings. Her position was one of honor previously at the University of Alberta. She had the David Peikoff Chair of Deaf Studies at the University of Alberta. Her focus has been legal and courtroom interpreting. Also, Deaf-hearing teams, and mediated education. For those of you who are students here you should recognize her name as she's instrumental in consecutive interpreting research and also, I am privileged to have known Debra through the international consortium. Her role—and many people may know this—she has been the President since the 2011 of the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters (WASLI). Whenever you're around Debra, you just get a sense of her because she always brings such positive energy, beautiful grace, and inspiration to all she meets. So, therefore, I am honored to introduce her today. So please join me in giving her a warm welcome, Dr. Debra Russell.

Dr. Debra Russell

Good morning to you all and thank you for those lovely kind words of introduction to both Lori and to Keith. I'm surprised you remember me, Keith - we met 30 years ago. I'm obviously old, and yet that time has gone in a blink of an eye. It honestly feels like just yesterday when we first met one another and it's an honor for me that our paths continue to coincide at various trajectories along our journey. I'm delighted to be here. I would like to thank the Department of Interpretation and Translation for their invitation to me to be here today. Very much appreciate that. When I held the Peikoff Chair, I think it's remarkable that Peikoff House is here on Gallaudet's campus as well. You may not know David Peikoff was actually Canadian. So, when I held the position, I felt it was a very unique place to be as we talk about the law, and it's reference to David Peikoff. I'd also like to echo my thanks to both the interpreting services and the CART services and to all of you for your presence here this morning.

I'm going to give you a brief overview of who I am as a researcher. I have been influenced by a myriad of Deaf people that I have encountered in my life in Canada. I have lived in many communities throughout Canada, and I think each community has taught me something different. So, I would like to pay homage to all of the Deaf people

in all of the communities where I have been in Canada who have taught me their language and brought me into their world.

Canada looks at British BSL, LSQ, and also looking in the Northwest Territories at Inuit Sign Language as being an official language. Ironically, Inuit is just now being recognized, although it is probably the longest lasting. LSQ has been recognized in the north for some time. But the first nation's people precede all of us in the Northwest Territories and they speak over 40 different languages. So, all of that, I think, influences my view on both language and culture as it imbues my research. I think that is why I come from a human rights based perspective and a language diversity based perspective on my research. Based largely on my upbringing in Canada and things to which I was exposed. With that said, my topics come from areas of interest in interpreting, working in the legal setting, I've worked as an educator here. I've worked with Betty Colonomos - one of my first instructors way back, again, I would say, over 30 years ago. And, I believe that collective experience has been what has influenced me in the path I've taken, the people I've worked with all have been an influence in that. And you can see that reflected on this slide.

This morning, what I'd like to do is touch upon some research that exists - some that was done by myself, and some that was undertaken by other researchers. It's the viewpoint of thinking, not just myself, but for all of you as well. What we look at, when we look at evidence that emanates from research, and what we then do with it. I believe that we all have particular ideologies. Do those ideologies prevent us from visualizing the evidence found in research? Or does it block us from that enterprise? We're going to look at some of the questions we can answer through research, and some of the things we can use as we teach interpreting.

I'm going to give you a brief overview of my original PhD study. And the question that came up for my dissertation came from my experience working with those Deaf communities in Canada. There was for a while, broad allegations of sexual and physical abuse that had happened in Deaf schools across Canada. And a lot of those young Deaf people who have grown up to be adults wanted to make official complaints. And, yet, as they went through the judicial process, we were not seeing convictions at the end. Deaf people's stories were not being believed - they were not being seen as credible, and they were dismissed. My question was, did any of this have to do with the credibility of the interpretation? So, I looked at the idea of consecutive interpretation. And it seems as though you get a different result when you utilize consecutive interpretation than you do from simultaneous interpretation. So, when you look into the court system, the experience is quite different, and that thought process led me to my dissertation topic. So I looked at in the legal settings, looking at simultaneous versus consecutive interpretation and their respective merits. I learned from research that came from spoken language field. Maybe you're familiar with Susan Berg-Seligson and her seminal work looking at Spanish-English interpretation. She looked at the bilingual courtroom, and one of her- that original text is quite instrumental within our field. Hopefully before you leave this morning, you'll leave with an appreciation what spoken language interpretation research lends to us and us to them in terms of our mutual progression. But as I've said, that was some of the rationale behind my original

dissertation proposition. We set up a mock trial with three certified interpreters and one interpreter who was not certified at the time, but received credential soon after. And we looked at three particular elements of the settings. We looked at expert witness testimony, direct witness testimony, and cross-examination. And each those elements of courtroom dialogue have their own procedures and goals. And I wanted to look at whether consecutive, simultaneous, or some combination would be most effective in each of those three domains. And for all of you students, as you contemplate methodologies as you lean towards research, do look toward spoken language research. Dellinger, for example, did some similar work on French-English interpretation in Montreal, Canada, and I have borrowed some of his methodology in my own approach. And I'm not looking at a word-sign reference, I'm looking at the overall language that's represented, and whether the entire thought and complexity is there. So when I look at that formula for the analysis, that's what I was looking at. And thus that's the framework I applied.

So I'm a hearing person, so I approach it from that mindset as well, and all of that influenced my research. We looked at simultaneous interpretation in trials and found that we had 83% and 87% accuracy respectively from those interpretations. When we look at spoken language research, ours was actually higher. However, are we satisfied with that level? As an attorney, I doubt they would be satisfied, and I doubt the judges would be satisfied. And then we looked at consecutive interpretations - the same interpreters, same brains, same skill sets lent to the task, but simply a different mode. And we saw 98% and 95% accuracy, respectively. So again, when we look at the other studies that we have referenced and look and see how those percentages rate. We looked at errors. But if an error was detected and corrected, we did not count it. It was errors not detected and not corrected within the text. And you might be thinking, this is all very well for the Canadian experience. But we used chi-square analysis, statistical approach to look at interpretation over the U.S. and it is not random. Our results are not random. All of these situations will end up with the same overall result, which is strong evidence for us that consecutive interpretation resulted in a different level of accuracy than simultaneous.

I'm just going to give you a taste of the results we got from these four trials in these three domains. When we looked at errors, for the expert witness testimony done on the simultaneous level, it's almost 10% of that testimony was erroneous. If it's a Deaf person who's been accused, maybe that has less impact overall. But if it's a Deaf juror who's watching this and accounting for 10% error in this witness testimony, what's the implication of that on the jury? When we look at direct evidence, which would be a Deaf person giving their own narrative, we used two different scenarios. We used sexual abuse and physical assault I think is the other one.

If we look at the sexual abuse situation in the mock trial, 39 out of 189 errors in the narrative for the interpretation. If you think about why the Deaf people were not believed in the cases in Canada of actual sexual abuse in the Deaf schools, and you think about this error percentage, this makes an impact. They also saw errors in the cross-examination. So the impact of this could absolutely be huge. Let's look at consecutive

interpretation, and the number of errors related to a person giving direct evidence - drastically reduced, as you can see.

However, in Trial Number Three, at the bottom, there actually seems to be a higher number of errors with the expert witness. Every now and then in research, things come up that may be surprising and unexpected. So, we looked at the team dynamic and found that within the team of interpreters, there was a little dissent. One of the interpreters believed that their own product was fine - that they were perfectly capable of continuing for 48 minutes. And, obviously, fatigue does set in which does impact their rate of errors. The interpreter with whom they were working had less experience, and experience and time are not necessarily substitutes one for the other, but that second interpreter therefore did not assertively swap with the other interpreter, and instead let them continue for 45 minutes. So dynamics has an impact as well.

And when you look at consecutive interpreting, we also think it also allows for a more naturalistic display of language in the interpretation. It typically involves more natural prosody, which means it's also easier for a Deaf person to look at, absorb, and understand. When you think about spoken language parallels, the same things usually exist. Those contingencies matter when you are looking at the narrative and the discourse. That impacts credibility. When the interpreters are coming in, in my study doing simultaneous and doing consecutive, again, it's the same interpreters and yet the results of their interpretation are different according to the mode. And when you think about the attorney's and judge's perception of what's going on, in a cross-examination, the attorney typically wants to ask rapid questions to see if they can trip up or get different responses from the person being examined. All of these things have different strategies for the question, and, therefore, for the type of interpretation used.

At the end, we see some differences in the Deaf person's direct narrative, we think it should definitely be consecutive interpretation. And, yet, we see, as some statistics will show later, that interpreters are not necessarily using consecutive interpretation for non-English-speaking witnesses on the stand.

There are times when in a cross-examination, you can use simultaneous interpretation and consecutive interpretation. When it's information that's familiar to you already, simultaneous interpretation might be effective. When it's new or complex information that's coming up, you might use consecutive interpretation. When there are very technical issues that come up, for example about blood splatter or DNA, you want to make sure you have exactly what you need and have a consecutive interpretation. You don't want to just do an unprocessed coding and simultaneous interpretation of those kinds of highly technical questions.

I also think that studies have some interesting results for us to ponder. Even well qualified, credentialed, trained interpreters still have demands on their processing that are happening differently between simultaneous and consecutive interpreting, and for us, between the two modalities that we're using. And what we don't have yet is a lot of research on the impact of the dual modalities that sign language interpreters use, and whether it is an increased processing load for us. I think that has implications for us as that gets researched further.

Also, as dialogue happens, and narrative influences our interpreting choices, and those interpreting choices influence how we approach the task - consecutive versus simultaneous interpreting are influenced by that discourse frame. And I also think ideology comes to bare. When we look at the evidence that we have and recognize that it's not being put into practice by practitioners, there's a disconnect there that we need to examine. I believe that that ideology is very much worth exploring in further detail with our practitioners.

Now, one part of the study we looked at as we videoed all of these interpreters, was also to look at their preparation ahead of task. So we videoed the two teams and their respective conversations with one another before they started interpreting for these mock trials. One of the teams we videoed showed some lovely examples of constructive conversations. They talked about how to work together in ways that explored their respective frameworks along the Deaf community about language, about interpretation, to reach a common understanding. They didn't mention whether they were going to swap at 20 minutes, but instead they looked at how they viewed language, how they viewed the Deaf lived experience. And that informed their work, and they were a very successful team. They are not the team, needless to say, that had issues with timing and consecutive interpreting and wouldn't switch with one another. That was the other team, who had a far more superficial conversation. They said should we switch at 20? That sounds fine. If I look your direction, that means I need a feed. So it was very much a superficial functional approach to the task. The other team, the original team had a much richer, deeper conversation about the content and the context within which they were about to work.

From the Deaf consumer's point of view, a couple of things really made an impact on them. When the interpreters came up and talked them through a bit of their social geography - how they had learned sign language, what their relationship was with the Deaf community, etc., the Deaf person had a feeling of trust going into the court case. The other team did not do that kind of introduction. They simply talked about - introduced themselves by name, but didn't give any of the other culturally appropriate information that might otherwise be necessary. It was a very short introduction. And the Deaf people felt less trust where that team was concerned.

So when you get into the court, as we look at the research, the interpreters did know that they were being videoed. And this possibly has some influence on what we saw, for example, with over-conferring with one another. So as they conferred with one another repeatedly, where the Deaf people were concerned, they thought it was over-correction and over-conferring of the interpreting team, and had less trust in them accordingly.

So we looked at four elements of the Deaf consumers' perspective. There were four interpreters, as I've said. One of them was a Coda, a native signer, had done some work with police, and social work, etc., and with that person, the Deaf participants typically felt most comfortable. Which is interesting. Even though that person had less courtroom experience. It's a natural language, so to me, does that say we need more Deaf interpreters coming into the courtroom? I'm a second language ASL user. If we have a first language ASL user, perhaps they are well served in the courtroom.

Now let's look at what we learned from the lawyers and the judges. They had largely worked with interpreters, and saw interpreting as a profession, but they were a little annoyed at some things. When the interpreters came and introduced themselves, the lawyers and judges felt as though they were inundated with a slough of interpreting jargon about consecutive interpretation, message equivalence and the like. It was very much a monologue. And the lawyers and judges both said: we actually like to talk about this, the case that we're about to go through and what this particular context is going to look for.

And they said, they all said that the interpreters didn't ask any specific questions about the case. Afterwards, they also said they were surprised that interpreters were able to convey emotion so effectively and wished that they had the opportunity to talk about that ahead of time. Because they may have changed their questions, or may have changed the approach that they used in asking questions based on what they saw in the interpretations. So I think it's very helpful to us to look at the view of the other protagonists in a given situation to really inform our view of what we're doing.

Let's go back to the impact of ideology. If we have a strong foundation in consecutive interpretation, it impacts the efficacy of your simultaneous work. But is simultaneous interpreting an automatic format? Do we resort to that automatically? And does it always result in more effective work? Does simultaneous interpretation always provide access? I think these are some questions we need to explore, as they inform our work.

The next question is how we teach consecutive interpretation. Now, there are some older studies but I wonder, if we undertook them today, would we come up with different results? We looked at 15 programs in Canada and the U.S. to get a sense of the demographic features of consecutive interpretation. Nine out of 15 programs said, yes, we teach it for one semester. Four or five said they teach consecutive for two semesters and one program said they teach it not just for three semesters, but also as an embedded element of their practicum. Now is the ideology behind this that consecutive interpretation is what one learns as a stepping stone on the way to the ultimate goal of simultaneous interpretation? It seems to be.

So the comments on this slide here also show some of the ideology behind this. Some Deaf people, some interpreters, rather, have said that they get taught things in school that actually aren't reflected in the real world, and they're told this by their mentors. But when we look at how it impacts the Deaf community, look at the very top comment. The Deaf person said: “I don't hate consecutive interpreting nearly as much as I hate the interpreting errors.” So, again, what are we learning from the multitude of perspectives of the other people involved in interpreted situations?

I'm going to talk you through some research now related to some snapshots that we got about what interpreting looks like in legal settings. Risa Shaw, who is here in the audience, and I, with Len Roberson undertook some research to get that snapshot view: what interpreters are doing here in the US. Who is interpreting? Who is not interpreting in the legal domain? And if not, why not? As Keith Cagle said, we met 30 years ago, so I mean, I'm on the road toward retirement. We need to be training the next generation of interpreters to come into court settings, to come into legal settings, we need to know

where those practitioners exist for the pipeline. And we need to be doing some succession planning. So I picked just a few snapshots of the statistics that we gathered from this research. I think what was most interesting to me, is that 40% of respondents said that they work regularly with Deaf interpreters; 29% of respondents said that they, as the hearing interpreter, are the gatekeepers for whether Deaf interpreters come in or do not into a given scenario. And then interestingly, 15% reported that they use consecutive interpretation with Deaf witnesses. Now, as we look at policy and practice, that we should be using consecutive interpretation, and yet only 15% of practitioners actually are. What are the other 85% doing? Sixty five percent of respondents reported that they have never been videoed. How is this possible in a police interrogation? What is going on with the interpreting? I think these are some really interesting findings from that study. And then for those interpreters who don't yet work in legal or police settings, they say that it's because they require additional training. So as a field, are we meeting the needs for those trainings? Are we providing it sufficiently?

As I've said, about 40 percent of people work with Deaf interpreters. When we saw that result, Risa and I were quite surprised. That led to some additional research on power and privilege. Because if hearing interpreters are the initial contact for a given assignment, and are also the gatekeepers of whether Deaf interpreters come into that scenario or not, this obviously, has some power and privilege in there. There are systems of power that are built into the world in which we live and also for us as interpreters, in terms of what we do and don't choose to do in our decision-making. So we interviewed some experienced interpreters, both Deaf and hearing, in both Canada and the U.S. And really, I guess what I'm hoping is as we do these comparative studies between countries, we can see, for example, whether they are comparable, and also look at the international domain and explore what's going on elsewhere.

I'm just going to touch on the results of this study. When we think about the intention of providing interpreting services and implication of that service provision and how they're impacted by power and privilege, we need to recognize the outcome. So if an interpreter comes in and is doing unprocessed coding, simultaneous mode, perhaps, it means usually that they don't understand the context. They didn't do any prep, and they are just coding what they're hearing. So that makes an impact on what happens in the rest of the dialogue in that given setting. If we look at interpreters as cultural and linguistic brokers, we make different decisions, our interactions are different and it influences our decision-making, perhaps, toward making consecutive interpretation the approach. And as I've said, there are places to use simultaneous interpretation, but it ought not be used as the default mechanism when consecutive interpretation is actually more appropriate. So as our discussions ensued, we looked at this concept of power. Power and privilege. I think we really don't talk nearly enough about how it impacts us as protagonists in these interpreter mediated settings between Deaf and hearing people. So as you read this quote, it came from a Deaf interpreter who arrived at an assignment and found that the hearing interpreters and the lawyers were already having a discussion, from which the Deaf interpreters were excluded. So as we look at things like this, we can see this constant interplay of power and how it affects every scenario. Sometimes interpreters are oblivious to their own power and privilege, so I think that means we need a lot more discussion in more overt ways. We have many studies looking at what we know and

how interpreters describe their work. With Canada interpreters, we looked at Deaf and hearing teams. Interpreters that worked together often within the community. And much of our research had to do with court and with conferences. So in Canada, we would often welcome new people to come to our country. And we have currently many Deaf people coming from Syria, for example. So we have refugees moving to the country, which is fantastic and lovely. But now, how is it that we work within that community, and how do we adjust to their needs and not force them to assimilate to ours? Those individuals who are working with those people who have recently moved in and settled in our country, it's quite interesting to think about their work and its implications. Oftentimes, we hear that Deaf interpreters don't like the term "Deaf interpreter." It doesn't matter if they're Deaf or hearing - they are an interpreter. Why label one of them a DI? When they come into a particular situation and are introduced as a deaf interpreter and I'm introduced as just an interpreter, what are the implications of that? And then oftentimes people are confused. The outside perspective is they don't understand. We know the terminology - it's culturally rich - but others don't understand the terminology we are using. What are the implications? A Deaf-hearing team? I'm nervous if someone is going to watching me - am I not following the ethical standards of interpreting? We do interpret in different ways for different individuals especially for those refugees who have just moved to our country. So we should consider maybe using specialty language. This is a specialist - an interpreter specialist. So just food for thought, and something for us to continue in our dialogues about the interpreting process, and how work within these teams of one Deaf and one hearing interpreter. I'm so sad that Patrick wasn't able to be present today. Patrick Boudreault, he just had a baby, so I guess that's a good enough reason not to come.

But the study that I want to talk about currently with him is we are looking at Deaf victims in Canada - from the interpreters' perspective, from the attorneys' perspective, and from the judges' perspective, but where is the victim's experience? Where do they come into play? So I did get some money to study and see what Deaf people were experiencing in the judicial system, be it the social workers, the police, the court, and so forth. What are these victims' experiences? We will be analyzing the data soon, but the point of it is that what we're finding is that the interpreters are the barrier. Both a barrier because the interpreters are not trained sufficiently and because they're not available.

We need them immediately for these services. And often times, it delays court services or other services, or the person is left waiting in jail because they're looking for an interpreter and, so, interpreters are a barrier for different reasons. And it seems from the interviews with the attorneys and the judges, their perspective of interpreters is that they're an accommodation. They have a framework, an ideology of deafness as a disability, not a human rights issue.

I'm just going to touch briefly on some international work. Jemima Napier and I are working on a paper where we were looking at one interpreted case here in the U.S. – A case study for jurists. And Deaf jurists were being chosen and so we analyzed the proceedings.

And when we submitted the paper, it was rejected. The journal rejected it. Interesting. Got some great feedback. They wanted to know where our theoretical framework was

for the paper. Great question. So we went back, and looked at spoken language research again, and borrowed Goffman's participant role framework. I hadn't read that for quite a long time, so revisiting it was quite fascinating and it made sense to apply that to our interpreters and what they were doing. So we used that framework and we looked at - was the interpreter as a participant? We know that they are. But what type of participant? What were they doing? And we came up with three roles. Each of these three roles influenced how the interpreters' decisions and interpretations proceeded. We also used Wadensjö's work in taxonomy. Not for sign language, but for spoken language, however, that taxonomy was of great benefit to our work. So we used both of those frameworks for our research. Borrowing from spoken language research was quite a benefit - we submitted the paper again, so hopefully it will be accepted - we'll see. But the point of my bringing this up is that, theoretical framework from spoken language interpreters is something we should utilize in our work.

So, a few other researchers that I have on my list. As a young researcher I was quite fascinated with their work and I'm sure you are as well. Here are some of my favorites, Kolb, a European researcher. He was studying refugees coming from - you know Europe has had many years of experience with refugees settling there. So refugees coming from different countries and the impact of the interpreters, and the decisions they made in the different proceedings. It was supported by previous research, taking spoken research together. It's a beautiful example of how we can influence policy and social justice issues.

Jacobsen. I don't know if Jacobsen from Sweden has come - I think they've come here before - I love their work. Many parallels. The concept of how interpreters often save face. We try and make ourselves look more competent than we are. This is some beautiful work, examples of how interpreters do, in fact, make decisions to save face - to look confident. And it might not actually fit the context needs. But they basically are protecting themselves.

I don't know if you're familiar with Major's work from New Zealand in medical settings. Some interesting research to consider that we've incorporated into our interpreter training. 'Justisigns Project' is a snapshot of the demographics from Europe just as we have done here in North America, looking at those who interpret police settings, court settings, and the judicial settings. They then developed training materials that they disseminated for free to interpreters. Next on the list is Yu and Van Heuven. They looked at spoken language fluency. If the spoken language is in fact fluent, there seems to be more confidence in the message. If there's awkward pausing, the prosody is off, then that credibility is lessened. It's an interesting study, and one that could be replicated with sign language interpreters.

Hale, for me, anything that Sandra writes is worth reading. Her work in regards to consecutive interpreting and simultaneous interpreting, looking at the juror and what they remember about the direct evidence. So if the interpreter uses consecutive versus simultaneous, what the impact on the jury's memory is. It's fascinating work, I encourage you to read it and I think it would be a great one for you to replicate. I'm looking over there! It's a good one for us to replicate for us, again, with sign language interpreting. See if we come up with the same results.

Rod Skinner from Scotland I believe came last year to Gallaudet and presented. He is a PhD student at Heriot Watt University. They found an authentic video data of a police interrogation with an interpreter with a Deaf person. All of the people involved said that they could use that for their analysis, which was fantastic and they went ahead and did so. Again, authentic data, not a mock situation. And it shows the decision-making in the moment. And how that then ties into the investigation, and that also has now influenced the BSL laws - policy, and laws in their country. So it's an interesting research perspective. And also the use of BSL in Scotland. Now this final bit of research is quite interesting. It shows the power of research on policy and making changes.

Currently, in Australia, they now have this evidence - the research is there. That means there's no reason that Deaf people can no longer serve on a jury. I know here in the US you have Deaf jurors but in other countries that's not been the case. And this is a situation in which research can influence policy and make changes for the good.

So in summary, what's this mean for us, right? I think for us, as interpreters, myself included, I need to ask myself, am I reading enough? Am I bringing that into the classroom? What I'm reading - the research - am I bringing it into my own classroom, into my own research and, so many implications from what we learn. And we can learn so much from the research. A few examples up here.

For me, the cognitive process, we have a long way to go in regards to what's happening when we are using simultaneous interpretation. We have the research in the spoken language sector, but do we in the sign language?

I think we need a lot more research in regards to power and privilege and the impact it has on turn-taking and also when working with Deaf and hearing teams.

I'm hoping, in the future, we have our new budding researchers here, right? It's time for the old guard to go ahead and retire. And then the new researchers to take over in the field. And how is it that we are able to work collaboratively with spoken language researchers? Can we replicate some of the studies, select studies, and we need to be diligent about what we select. So, if we have it both in signed language and spoken language and we can work together, that's simply beautiful. What we can learn from each other and how we can share. I think we need more, and sometimes our interpreting research can become so narrowed into the signed language interpreting that we forget to look up, and think about cross-disciplinary studies - where is the legal research, the medical researchers, the judges' perspectives, let's get all of the stakeholders involved and have cross-disciplinary studies, collaboration. Replicating studies is not sufficient - we need to collaborate and work together. One great example - one or two years ago, I was writing a chapter on consecutive interpreting for a text. I had submitted my chapter. And a spoken language researcher had written a chapter as well, and submitted her work. The editor saw that our work was very similar and said I think the two of you need to work together. I thought alright, I didn't know who she was and she didn't know who I was. But we did Skype. She lives in Japan and I live in Canada. Very different time zones and we made it work. And we were able to meet digitally and we wrote the chapter together. And I think it's stronger because of it. Had we worked in isolation, it wouldn't have been as good. I'm grateful that I was able to

meet her last summer. We published over three years ago and I finally met her in person last year and it was wonderful.

I think we need to really consider a range of research. And often times, what we'll do is we'll have an article and we'll submit it to an interpreting journalist. But one of the judges had said - why aren't you publishing in our legal journals? You're right. We need to share this information. There are plenty of legal journals. Why are we not publishing there? If we publish there, then we will be able to disseminate our findings more widely. So we have to consider where and when we share our findings. A few of the questions that I'm still interested in (maybe you are, maybe you're not), but our field does require new research. And here's just a few examples that I've come up with. Co-interpreting with Deaf and hearing teams, and the impact on quality. The human cost of decisions on quality and economics. Sometimes we make determinations that if we're going to have a Deaf interpreter, it's going to increase the cost, or if we have a Deaf person involved, it's going to increase the cost, and we need to think outside of that box.

There are so many questions that the more we research, it will benefit all of us in our field. So yes, I do think we have solid research beyond reasonable doubt. But my question is, are we actually utilizing that research? Thank you so much for coming. I appreciate your time and attention.

Dr. Lori Whynot

Thank you, so much, Deb, for a wonderful presentation, and for sharing your expertise and wisdom. We will next be turning it over to Carla Mather for an official response. She is an attorney, she's also an interpreter who works in legal settings, and she's an adjunct faculty member here at the graduate level in our department. So, I would like to turn it over to Carla for her response. Thank you.

Carla Mather

Thank you so much. Such an inspirational and rich discussion. To see how interpreting actually impacts the judicial system from preparation, that it can impact trust, that teaming can impact the errors, that interpreters can be barriers to the Deaf consumers - fascinating discussion. So my question in replicating spoken language interpreting, and then research, I'm wondering what you envision as the challenges, in replicating that research?

Dr. Debra Russell

Interesting question. I think that one of the challenges is that some of the spoken language research has used students in its research. So students are performing the tasks, not professional interpreters. So I think that that elicits a different result. We could avoid that problem by not having students be the participants. I think another challenge is funding. Our field typically has limited additional funding, as compared to spoken language interpreting, where they seem to be able to procure more grants. Perhaps if we are working together collaboratively and we're doing some more joint work, some of their funding can bleed over to us. And I think there's an additional challenge where training is concerned. If we look at all of the research around interpreting that's in North

America, some of the participants are trained and some are not. But when we look at other countries, many of their practitioners have no training. And I think that also implicates the results, so I think we need to consider who we select to be in the studies that we set up. But the methodologies, we can absolutely adopt wholeheartedly from the spoken language world and also build more collaborative efforts with our spoken language colleagues. Thank you.

Carla Mather

What I've noticed in regards to the studies with spoken language research, really, the seminal work has always involved authentic research and data. And I noticed that you mentioned that in your program that you have live interpretation, that you're able to use authentic data, decision-making in the moment. And Obar, a sociolinguist, and Berk-Seligson, as well as others, and even for the O. J. Simpson trial, they had actual transcripts, authentic interpretations, to really research and discover what those decisions were - what the challenges were in the live moment. They use the recordings in the courtroom and how can we bring video recordings into the courtroom? That's quite difficult.

Dr. Debra Russell

You're right, that is a challenge unique to our particular field. A video camera does let you see what's going on, but how can you get it into the courtroom? I think at this stage, we may still need to rely on mock trials and moot court for some of that preliminary work. We can get transcripts and compare them, certainly. And take findings from spoken language research, and compare those with mock trials in the sign language domain. And see at least at that level if we have similar results.

Carla Mather

Right. I'm wondering, when we're talking about funding, let's say that I won the lottery, right? And I have $500 million and I'm able to hand it over to you. What then do we do with spoken language research? Which ones would you want to replicate with that funding?

Dr. Debra Russell

Goodness. If I won a million dollars, hmm... I think the work by Sandra Hale. I think her work has potentially the biggest impact, to me, in my opinion, and for our field. She works with Spanish-English interpreters, and she also does a lot of work with judges, with attorneys. Her approach to research, I just find remarkable. So I think that that's the study I'd like to replicate. There's a study I showed you on the slide earlier about one that she had done that had stuck with me for very a long time about her original work on consecutive interpretation. When we look at Jury's memory of the testimony delivered via those two modes, so I think her work would be incredible to replicate.

Carla Mather

Right, a different topic to discuss - currently we have research, and then how we apply that to pedagogy and practice, right? Some of the studies that you've named, some of these are huge sample sizes, right - 1,000 plus individuals involved in that study. How do we randomize people where we're not necessarily self-selecting the respondents? And the power and privilege that were you talking about. Maybe you have 9 sample size. How did you choose those people, right? I'm wondering if we are to replicate those smaller studies with larger samplings, that then we might be able to utilize that. And then we can journalize the results. But because we don't have sufficient research what would you do with that?

Dr. Debra Russell

I think I have two responses to that. One is about our view of research methodology. Quantitative and qualitative both have their assets. So if we have a sample size of 15, and they are hand-picked because you want a particular experience to be reflected, that shows us something about that particular group. But we can value qualitative and quantitative. If these 15 people are the initial study, it can then be replicated with a larger sample size. So when we're looking at qualitative versus quantitative, we're looking at the type of data. But I think we're never going to win the numbers game per se. We're really never going to win that game. We are a relatively small community in a relatively low incidence population. We look at other countries to see what they're doing with their interpreters in spoken language and in sign language and maybe that increases the overall number, but it decreases the geographic impact. We need to think about what it is we want to learn from other countries and what we want to learn from our experiences. The power study, you're correct, it had 9 people, all from Canada. If we replicated that study in Europe, would it look the same? I don't know. It's worth the comparison and I certainly think it would be interesting. But the world is shrinking in many ways as we collaborate more and more with one another and country barriers are less of an issue.

Carla Mather

That makes sense. I think you provide our new researchers and scholars quite a bit to think about, different approaches, different topics for us to research. And I think as an audience member, the one line that really struck me, and stuck with me, and it was wonderful… you're afraid, now, of what I'm going to say - no no, I mean it in a good way. It really was a wonderful thing that struck me. So let me see if I've got this right. You said, "Research itself can change policy." I actually got goose bumps when you said that. But you're right. In Australia, now, they're able to provide interpreters - you've worked for many years and you've accomplished quite a bit and we see those results in policy and laws. Thank you for coming. I don't want to steal anyone else's time with you. So I'll go ahead and turn it over and let them ask you a few questions.

Dr. Lori Whynot

Wonderful. Alright. So now we'll go ahead and turn it over to the Q & A portion of our time. Do please stand here in this area. And you're able to ask your questions of Debra. Go ahead and come on up. Anyone? This is your opportunity.

Dr. Debra Russell

Don't be nervous.

Dr. Lori Whynot

Keith? Go ahead. Umm-hmm. You can come down on either side.

Audience Member

Soft and cushiony. Very nice.

Dr. Debra Russell

Betty, I know neither of us like rules, but we need to follow the rules on this one and stand in the right place.

Audience Member

Thank you so much for coming. I read your stuff before and it's just beautiful to see you in person, and I really like the challenges, and the thoughts that you pose to us in regards to how we can move forward with your legacy. And your comments, they were powerful. Powerful message about interpreters' resistance to consecutive interpreting. It makes me think - is there any reason behind that? Is SIM-Coming the culprit? That we still believe that ASL, yes, it's the language and then we turn around and we Sim Com. I know that SIM-Coming and simultaneous interpretation isn't the same - it's a little bit cleaner. But do you think that our habits of Sim Coming are part of the reason why we're so resistant to consecutive interpreting, because we've never really separated the languages? I'm wondering about your perspective on that.

Dr. Debra Russell

I do think Sim Com, or simultaneous communication, has an influence and I do think it bleeds into our thoughts. When you sign and speak at the same time, what are we really doing, and what's the language we're really focusing on? We're not recognizing two languages in that moment. And we may think that we're communicating, but it's really not. It's not language, certainly. Why are we doing it? And if it's an everyday behavior, and it becomes part of the culture of interpreting, then I see that as a problem. I also think in my 30-odd years, that we were sort of sold a concept that simultaneous interpreting was the goal. I think Deaf people would sort of say no, consecutive interpreting is what you use for kids, we should be aiming for simultaneous interpretation. And I think we've followed that model, to our detriment. And when we look at some of the things that we take from the spoken language model, some things can be great, and they are things to which we ought to aspire. But there are a lot of reasons behind the choices that have been made. And when we look at Sim Com, it has not been helpful to us. I think it's certainly become habituated, and it certainly influences our everyday task of interpreting as practitioners. So yes, I do think they're intertwined, and I do see it as a problem.

Hello, again. Powerful research, certainly. The work you've done in Canada, comparing it to the U.S. and Europe. So now, if you don't mind my asking, I'm wondering as the President of the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters, I'm wondering then, what's WASLI's plan? How are you going to impact the world with your research? How do you move forward with it?

Dr. Debra Russell

Good question. Thank you. I think what we know from the experiences in many, many countries is that there's insufficient information. So I'm privileged that I can read English and I can access information. I may not use it, but at least I can access the information that's written in English. But in many other countries they do not even have that access to the information in a language that's understandable. And so, part of WASLI's task, which is all of our task, is to figure out the translation of research in various different ways, so it can get to different countries. I mean, I think there's so much we can learn from what happens in other countries. I have done some work in the Ukraine, and I've looked at many of their social structures, and their Deaf communities and how they work. Some of it is stronger than what we have in the U.S. and Canada. We should be looking to those approaches, we should be continually liaising with our professional colleagues for things like this and that's what I look to WASLI to be doing. And so, if you guys are hoping to come to Paris this year for the conference that would be great. And we're also working in partnership with as many entities as we can to understand the perspectives. Because we have the power and the privilege, but it's not just for us to go and teach legal interpreting 101 from my perspective. Goodness knows if we try that approach, we'll fail. We first have to learn from the other groups, other countries, other representations, what they're looking for, what they need in their work, and try to address that together. So that's some of the things I think we're hoping to accomplish with WASLI. And, obviously, I'm not good at following rules as you can see.

Audience Member

Hi, my name is Stephanie, and I'm one of the Deaf interpreters here at Gallaudet. And you're talking about power and privilege. It really triggered me in regards to how I work with hearing interpreters in the legal setting. Now what I'm envisioning is how can we, in regards to power and privilege, really as you said, there's no research when we're talking about Deaf and hearing teams, and power and privilege. So don't ask me, I'm not doing another research project, so I'm not going to do it - I'm just asking - someone else can do it, but I'm imagining, right, when we're talking about that, what the impact is on the world, like in colleges, providing that - something related to power and privilege, what does that look like?

Dr. Debra Russell

I think we have a lot of research - I'm using a Canadian sign there - looking at power and privilege but not in application to Deaf and hearing people. But in the general application, it needs to be explored as well within our field. So we can pull from the research that does exist.

So the work that Risa and myself did - a basic study - was the beginning of the conversation for us. And I think that question is worth exploring, as we get into more research. So we look at power and privilege as a - use as a theme for a conference. EFSLI, for example, the European Forum of Sign Language Interpreters, had it as their theme two years ago. So when you think about power and privilege, we do know it exists, we do know it's there, and we can use it to guide discussions around things like Deaf and hearing interpreting teams and how they work together. We can use that to share those varying perspectives, so I think we can absolutely leverage that.

Audience Member

Hi, Tawny Holmes. I am faculty here. So my interest in the topic today was really about the ethics side. When we look at legal interpreting and ethics. So I'm really glad you mentioned that.

So we had talked about the importance of Deaf and hearing teams working together. We've talked about Deaf consumers. I'm also wondering about the Deaf professionals, as practitioners - the Deaf attorneys, Deaf judges, Deaf consultants - how they come into the picture and how their view is included as stakeholders. And also, whether you're aware that the National Association for Deaf here in the US is partnering with the American Bar Association, and that cooperative is looking at funding some research to establish guidelines for the judicial community to be submitted to judges and attorneys so they have more effective working relationship when they come across Deaf people in their courtrooms, in whatever capacity that may be. So I wonder if you are A: aware of that, and B: if you have any ability to leverage that in some way and capitalize on that?

Dr. Debra Russell

So the idea of research from the Deaf attorney's perspective is really interesting. Patrick and myself interviewed four attorneys in Canada - four Deaf attorneys. And I know that there's more in the U.S.. But we talked to them and found that they have additional challenges working within the court system. When they're seen as clients versus as attorneys, because when they're attorneys, they're seen as professionals and they're ready for their work. But they're viewed as clients. So that viewpoint is an issue. And that, to me, is attitudinal. So that's an issue for us to consider. We definitely need to look at that from the view of the Deaf professional's perspective, as there's more and more of them entering the legal field. So I think you're right, Tawny, we absolutely do need more work on that. And where the NAD is concerned, I haven't read that paper in-depth, but I have heard about it.

And if we can look at our perspectives and submit them, that's great. But if we can work together to co-publish in the journals of other fields like the Bar Associations, I think that's a marvelous step forward. I think we're somewhat used to pushing the human rights view and trying to drive that through in terms of strategy. But, really, if it was more about sitting down over a cup of tea and a conversation and making connections that way, it's possibly a much better approach. Maybe I'm getting a little too political here, but I think that cooperation certainly is key.

Gustavo Navarette

Hi. I'm Gustavo - I'm an interpreter here at Gallaudet University. And back to Betty's point in regards to - and really your point as well - that resistance to consecutive interpreting in the culture, and maybe - and I came a little late and I apologize if I'm asking to repeat yourself. I'm a trilingual interpreter, Spanish, English, and ASL. And I know that spoken language interpreters work predominantly in consecutive interpreting. Most legal, law enforcement work uses that as well. And there's quite a bit of an advantage. But I didn't see that until I began working in both Spanish and English and in the legal forum. So in my training as an interpreter, CI was more of like okay, it's something that's been taught, get it over with and get it out of the way because it was really part of the journey to get to the simultaneous. It was part of the curriculum, but it really wasn't valued. They did teach it, but it was a quick semester and then on we went.

And, so, my sense is that, it starts with our education, right? Within our programs we're resistant to consecutive interpreting. And as an interpreter practitioner I see the power that it has on my work - the product is sufficiently better in both legal and also any spoken language setting. So with that, you know, ASL-English interpreting, we're missing that opportunity. And I can remember, again, it was taught to me way back when, but we never really use it. So I'm wondering in regards to the interpreter education, isn't that where it starts, where we need to really approach and change the ideologies of CI, of consecutive interpreting.

Dr. Debra Russell

What a perfect question. So, yes, I think sometimes I'd like to blow up all of our training programs and just start from scratch - deconstruct to reconstruct. I also think we're somewhat blocked in the ways we want to teach, and how we have been teaching in those old methodologies. I think we need to be embedding every course with translation and with consecutive interpretation. If we look at the work by Dennis Cokely, an article he wrote a few years ago about changing the curriculum, from Northeastern University. I thought he had some great ideas - incorporating translation, incorporating consecutive interpretation, and incorporating simultaneous in every aspect of what we teach throughout a program. That would show that in both values and practice that we're incorporating it as practitioners. And possibly, then that resistance would be lessened. But I think that people have bad experiences with consecutive interpretation because they're not well-trained in it, and if they're not well-versed in it, the outcome is usually not good, and they continue with that mindset. I think that sometimes, as instructors, we also forget what interpreting really looks like. So I think we need to emphasize this. Even though I'm old, I still work as an interpreter, because I can't teach without that everyday practical experience in the field. If instructors are not interpreting and not using consecutive interpretation in that, I think that shows where the values are. So I think what we want is really good models - good role models in our work, among our peers, and in what we're teaching. And people will then see good models of consecutive interpretation and recognize that it's not as complex and problematic as they think, but rather, it's an absolutely valuable tool.

And honestly, I'm sort of apologizing to the Deaf community and the interpreting community. We sold you all on the idea that simultaneous was somehow better. And so now there's some resistance in the Deaf community that consecutive interpretation can be effective. So we have some work to do there as well, sort of on the social and political level. It's a big conversation, obviously, but it certainly should be part of our teaching. I work as a mentor, and there's some work on mentoring out there. And I've worked with one who was working with consecutive interpretation, but if you see the comment that was made earlier, they said that it's different in the real world. What you see in the real world and what you see in the training programs doesn't connect - but it should. And honestly, without us making those first preliminary steps back to getting consecutive interpretation into the curriculum in embedded ways, we won't see the results of that.

Audience Member

Hi, my name is Anna and I'm a Deaf interpreter taking classes here at Gallaudet in the DoIT. I'm wondering, your experience - what your positive experiences have been, working with WASLI?

Dr. Debra Russell

I have been incredibly fortunate to have had the opportunity to work in a variety of countries under the auspices of WASLI. And I think that it's a remarkable experience. And that has let me see some of the similarities exist in the world and the commonalities that we have as practitioners, no matter where we are.

I have gone to other countries, and looked at their interpreters and the scenarios in which those interpreters work, come home, and quit my own complaining when I've compared what other interpreters are going through in other countries. Some of their battles and their journeys toward interpreting are so much more difficult than ours. And I think that the reciprocity of information and experience that I have gained as a member of WASLI and as President has been remarkable. We've also got an official Memorandum of Understanding with the World Federation of the Deaf, and I think that has been an incredibly positive move. It lets us move forward together as two organizations representing two sides of this enterprise. I have gone to other countries and seen Deaf people progressing in one direction and interpreters progressing in another with zero connection between the two communities. I really think we're most effective when we are working together. So watching the WFD and WASLI connection as it strengthens has really been a remarkable part of my experience.

Dr. Lori Whynot

Alright. Any other questions? Perhaps I'll go ahead and ask my own if no one else. So I teach the consecutive interpreting class. I'm glad to see some of my students here. Just two days ago, we were talking about practicing CI and it's very interesting, I think it's an important topic and message that you've brought to us today. It's important to really infuse CI within our teaching and our practice.

And that it needs to be one of our tools that we use, and consistently use moving forward. I think we are encouraging our students to do that and I really appreciate your emphasis on this. The other comment that I wanted to make was in regards to the international work you spoke of. And I know your work at WASLI has been international. And I still have a sense, with the international experience, when you come back here to the states, and I'm reminded all the time when I do that, we do complain quite a bit. And you're right. It's enough. We need to look up and realize what we have. We need to figure out how we need to heighten our own practice and field and look around and collaborate. So thank you for that.

Any other comments or questions? We have time for one more. Would you like to say something more?

Dr. Debra Russell

Can I? Actually, yes, where consecutive interpretation is concerned, I think our field needs to stop seeing it as two separate things. Instead, it's a continuum. Simultaneous and consecutive interpretation can both happen within the same domain. For example, at a police interview when they're just warming up with the person - you could do that on a simultaneous basis. But as they switch more into the heart of their witness interview, and they're talking about the details of what happened, you can switch over to consecutive. So it's not one or the other. And they're not, it's not a binary choice. It's choices along a continuum. If we blend those more consciously and more intentionally, I think we're reflecting the use of the language in a more effective way.

Dr. Lori Whynot

Your point - that reminds me again. Two days ago, we were talking about this, I gave the students the opportunity to basically practice some consecutive interpreting - an introduction of it. And it might feel awkward, it might feel funny, and certainly that's normal. But we become more proficient with practice. So maybe today, we should be thinking about how we use it and explaining that continuum and giving them more opportunity to the students to practice it along this continuum and also then talking about it with Deaf and hearing individuals, that we are interpreting, and it is a continuum. Great reminder. Thank you for sharing all of your information. If there are any other questions, we've got time for one more.

Audience Member

Hi. Nice to see you here at Gallaudet.

Dr. Debra Russell

And good to see you.

Audience Member

As I'm listening to your presentation in regards to the perspective, the research, all within the legal settings, I really want to bring in the Deaf community. And my

experience as a Deaf interpreter - I'm an interpreter as well as an educator. And what I'm seeing is a shift in perspective. I feel that everything we've done that we've researched, we need to get it to the actual Deaf community - to the grassroots Deaf community, those that are not necessarily involved in academia. Maybe the Associations of the Deaf at the state level, we bring it to, I don't know, those who are self-educated. We need to disseminate that information. How do we get the community to know this and understand our roles as Deaf interpreters? Or if we're using consecutive, oftentimes we see these myths come up. I don't need a Deaf interpreter. I don't need consecutive, I'm smart enough. And there's myths that are really perpetuated and therefore they don't understand what we're doing and why we're doing it. Sometimes family members are involved saying - oh, they don't need that, we don't need two interpreters. Two interpreters with consecutive - you know a Deaf and a hearing team. It's just going to make everything last so much longer and take too long. And we realize that it's the perspectives that we need to shift with education, bringing this material to the community and to the family members. Just something to consider. My two cents, that's all. Thanks.

Dr. Debra Russell

Right. We need to talk about the dissemination of our research, and publishing in other fields. But you bring up a very good point. We should be sharing it in sign language with the Deaf community as well. And as we progress forward, we need to consider whether the Deaf community knows about the research and the implications of it. So, you know, coming here to Gallaudet, I think it's great. You have journals in sign language - it's wonderful. Not necessarily available everywhere else. But we need to consider making research summaries, for example, to talk about the implications it has for stakeholder groups like the Deaf community. So we are seeing Deaf communities take on more workshops in my area. But I'd love to see them doing workshops on research. But that means the research has to be changed to a teachable manner so that can be used in a friendly environment and that the translation is effective. So I think that's a potential avenue we could explore. And you're right about the resistance, we could talk about that all day. I think the reason behind it, though, is that there isn't enough conversation about the value of Deaf interpreters within the Deaf community, so we need to further explore that.

Dr. Lori Whynot

Well, it is time for us to wrap-up. I want to say, again, thank you, Debra. Thank you so much for coming. Thank you for all the ideas you have shared - much for us to continue with in this discussion. And, hopefully, you'll be joining us then, on the second floor of the cafeteria for lunch. Around 11:45 - we'll meet there around that time, just before 12. Anyway, do please join us. Before we close, I want to say thank you so much, Carla, for being here as the respondent. I want to thank the tech people who assisted us: Barry White, Patrick Harris, and Kimberly Kivets. Thank you so much for your technical assistance and thank you to the Department of Interpretation and Translation.

Thank you, CAITR. Normally, Dr. Brenda Nicodemus moderates this, so I want to thank her for her coordination efforts with this. And remember, our final lecturer is our own Pamela Collins who will be presenting on April 13.

Thank you, Marc, also. If anyone needs CEUs, please do see Marc Holmes right over there in the red shirt to my right. Again, Debra, thank you so much!