

Western Oregon University
Digital Commons@WOU

Master's of Arts in Interpreting Studies (MAIS)
Theses

Interpreting Studies

11-28-2012

Do we eat our young and one another? Horizontal violence among signed language interpreters

Emily K. Ott
Western Oregon University

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

 Part of the [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ott, E. K. (2012). *Do we eat our young and one another? Horizontal violence among signed language interpreters* (master's thesis). Western Oregon University, Monmouth, Oregon. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/theses/1>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Interpreting Studies at Digital Commons@WOU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's of Arts in Interpreting Studies (MAIS) Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@WOU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@wou.edu, kundas@mail.wou.edu, bakersc@mail.wou.edu.

Do We Eat Our Young and One Another?
Horizontal Violence Among Signed Language Interpreters

By
Emily Ott
A thesis submitted to
Western Oregon University

In partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of:
Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies

November 2012

EVALUATION PAGE

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

**Do We Eat Our Young and One Another?
Horizontal Violence Among Signed Language Interpreters**

Presented By: Emily Kathleen Ott

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

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

Signatures Redacted for Privacy

Date: November 28, 2012

Chairperson:

✓ Amanda Smith
Assistant Professor of Special Education
Signatures Redacted for Privacy

Committee member:

✓ ✓ Dr. Julie Armstrong
Assistant Professor, Special Education Division

Signatures Redacted for Privacy

Committee member:

Dr. Elisa Maroney
Assistant Professor, Special Education ✓

Signatures Redacted for Privacy

Director of Graduate Programs:

✓ Dr. Linda Stonecipher

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful for the help and support of many throughout the process of researching and writing this thesis. Most especially, I would like to thank Nathaniel Ott, Margery and Dennis Iehle, and Bill and Barbara Biehl for their unwavering support and their many hours spent editing. I would like to thank Tiffany Buch for her help with data collection. Many thanks also to Amanda Smith and Dr. Elisa Maroney for their unfailing help and support as instructors, and Amanda as my advisor, for the past eighteen months. Thanks also to Dr. Julie Armstrong for participating as an early sounding board and as a member of my committee, and to Dr. Marie LeJeune for her kind support and direction in the literature review process. I am also grateful to my coworkers for their hours spent patiently listening to me process my thoughts about this research. Finally, I would like to thank Rhoda, Olga, Sophia, and Iris for their willingness to participate in this research. Without the support of these people, I could not have made this happen. Please accept my heartfelt gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables	iv
Abstract.....	v
Introduction.....	7
Literature Review.....	13
Methodology.....	40
Findings.....	53
Conclusion	90
References.....	93
Appendices.....	101
Appendix A: Survey Questions	101
Appendix B: Interview Questions.....	103
Appendix C: Survey Consent Form.....	104
Appendix D: Interview Consent Form.....	105
Appendix E: Explanation of Interview Codes	106

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Interpreters Entering the Field Before 2004	53
Table 2. Interpreters Entering the Field Since 2004	54
Table 3. Interview Codes	55

ABSTRACT

Do We Eat Our Young and One Another? Horizontal Violence Among Signed Language Interpreters

By

**Emily Ott
Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies
Western Oregon University
November 28, 2012**

The aim of this study is to research whether signed language interpreters in Ohio experience intergenerational communication conflict. The initial hypothesis was that interpreters do experience such conflict. The first phase of research was a survey of interpreters in the state of Ohio to determine whether preliminary evidence existed to suggest that new interpreters and more experienced interpreters do experience communication conflict. Such evidence was found. The second phase of research was a process of interviews with two new interpreters and two more experienced interpreters. The data revealed that while there is evidence to support that there is conflict between new and more experienced interpreters, the evidence is perhaps indicative of a larger problem in the field: horizontal violence. Both the survey data and the interview data support the idea that horizontal violence may take place in the interpreting field. Literature from the fields of education and nursing were consulted, since no research has been done about horizontal violence in the field of signed language interpreting. Information from the literature, as well as survey and interview data suggest that while new interpreters and more experienced interpreters do seem to experience conflict, such

conflict is indicative of the larger problem of horizontal violence. Further research about horizontal violence in the field of signed language interpreting is recommended.

INTRODUCTION

Background

This research originated from several of my personal experiences as an interpreter new to the field of signed language interpreting. I had some difficult interpersonal experiences with other interpreters that surprised and troubled me, but they also left me with a curiosity to learn more about how interpreters interact. Primed to look for such situations, I heard about and saw other situations similar to mine happening to my peers. As a new interpreter, the negative experiences I had seemed to me to be about my level of experience, so I wondered whether it might be useful to investigate generational interactions between interpreters.

I looked for previous research on interpersonal communication among signed language interpreters in the United States and did not find any. I was hoping to learn whether my negative experiences were characteristic of a wider trend about intergenerational communication, or if something else in general might have been happening with interpersonal communication among interpreters. Since there was no prior research, I decided to start from my experience and hypothesize that intergenerational communication conflict might be happening in the field of interpreting.

I struggled to frame these thoughts into an appropriate research question, sifting through ideas of many interpreters who heard my idea and provided many anecdotes with their theories about what the problem is. Armed only with anecdotal evidence that people in my community believed there to be a problem, I tried to narrow down my research question and focus. One suggestion I heard from a classmate gifted with creativity was, “Why do we eat our young?” That helped me realize that, once again given the lack of

prior research, my question needed to be in two parts. First, I had to do some type of preliminary investigation about whether evidence of intergenerational communication conflict exists, and then I could move to an attempt to characterize it. My first question, then, became, “Is there evidence of intergenerational communication conflict among signed language interpreters in Ohio?” If evidence appeared, I planned to move to my second question, “What is the nature of intergenerational communication among interpreters in Ohio?” I determined that the dividing line between new and more experienced interpreters, for this study, would be whether an interpreter entered the field before or since 2004, since the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf announced a major change in education requirements in the middle of 2003 (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2008).

I chose a qualitative methodology for this research, because I wanted to be able to get a holistic, descriptive picture of a situation through people’s stories. As the first step into this area, I believe this kind of research can provide a useful starting point for future explorations into the contours of the experience that this research has uncovered. Qualitative research provides the flexibility necessary for a first foray into a new area of research. Without literature about interpersonal communication to guide the design of the study, it was necessary to use methods that allowed a wide net to be cast, so that whatever might be going on in this area would be discovered. Once it is clear that a situation is taking place, a narrowly defined quantitative study can explore its depths, but in the beginning, research design needs to attempt to explore a problem’s width.

Statement of the Problem

With my two research questions, I hypothesized that intergenerational communication conflict was happening in our field. Colloquially stated, my hypothesis was that interpreters, as a field, eat their young. I was conscious of the role of my personal experience in this hypothesis, though, and worked with my advisor to use a procedure that would allow my personal experiences to be an asset, rather than baggage that would have led me to interpret the data with bias. In fact, it is not possible for a qualitative researcher to separate her experiences completely from the research, so it is necessary for me to disclose to all readers of this study what those biases are. I began the research thinking that I would find evidence of intergenerational communication conflict because of a few deeply scarring experiences with other interpreters that shaped me in a powerful way. I identified my connection with the research from the beginning, and my advisor encouraged me to do the research in a way that would allow me to find whatever the data would reveal, rather than looking only for confirmation or disconfirmation of my hypothesis.

I am glad I chose a methodology that would allow me to find whatever the data had to reveal, because my conclusion is not that intergenerational communication conflict is a problem specifically. Rather, I found that intergenerational communication conflict is one facet of a much larger issue that seems to be occurring in our field: horizontal violence. Intergenerational communication conflict does happen, but it seems to be as one part of the larger culture of horizontal violence, which impacts new members of a profession more severely. Had I chosen to focus only on intergenerational

communication, it would have been like taking a photograph of a nose carved into the side of a mountain without widening the lens to see all of Mount Rushmore.

Purpose of the Study

Given that no research has previously been done about signed language interpreters' interpersonal communication, this study was necessary. As practice professionals (Dean & Pollard, 2001) we consider how our framework for ethical decision-making needs to include the realities of working with human beings rather than inanimate tools. It would be a major oversight if we were to ignore the role that our colleagues, also human beings who are not inanimate objects, play in the work that we do. For a field that uniquely works in changing combinations of isolation and teams, with close friends and relative strangers, with novices and those nearing retirement, one could argue that our interpersonal interactions with one another probably play a huge role in the way our work happens.

It is time to place a research lens on those interactions to see what makes interpreters as a group tick. This particular foray into interpreters' interpersonal communication sprang from a hypothesis I developed from a specific problem I had. I hope, though, that this research serves to pave the way for future research not only related to the findings of this study, but also in the area of interpersonal interactions among interpreters in general. Beginning such an academic conversation is crucial in a field centered on people communicating with one another.

Theoretical Basis and Organization

Without literature to guide this investigation, I sought to design a careful methodology and to be aware of the limitations of that methodology. Once I had data to

interpret, I consulted literature. It is not unusual, in a qualitative study, for the investigation of literature to occur after data collection (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Once the data revealed that intergenerational communication conflict was just one part of the experiences of those surveyed and interviewed, and that a wider problem was indicated, I looked to other fields with a more established research base to see if their literature had anything to offer.

Investigation of difficult induction periods and general professional strife, early results of the research, led me to nursing literature, where I discovered the concept of horizontal violence. My definition of horizontal violence is infighting within a group of people who experience stress related to powerlessness (Freire, 1992; Bartholomew, 2006; Dellasega, 2011; Lewis, 2004; Patterson, 2005). I read about horizontal violence in the fields of nursing and education, which, like interpreting, are service professions where work is done with people. Also, like interpreting, those fields are both comprised of more than 75% women (National Education Association, 2011; Buerhaus, Auerback, & Stalger, 2009; Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2011). Given the connections I found in the literature between evidence I observed in the field of interpreting and what I found in education and nursing, it made sense to continue to read literature from those fields. The shared characteristic of being primarily female fields turned out to be quite relevant in a discussion of horizontal violence. That connection and the literature also led me to research ways feminist or critical pedagogy can be useful in solving the problem of horizontal violence.

Limitations of the Study

The biggest limitation of this study is the fact that it is the first of its kind. Without prior research about interpersonal interpreter communication, I designed the study from my research question alone. Certainly, if there had been some type of foundational research to start with, my research question, which I had hoped was broad enough, would not have turned out to be narrower than the problem. While it is not a limitation to discover unexpected findings, and that may in fact reveal methodological strengths, surely if the study had been designed to look for horizontal violence, the findings may have been even more relevant than they turned out to be.

Another limitation to keep in mind is that because of the small sample size and qualitative methodology, these findings should not be generalized or overstated. I found evidence of horizontal violence in interpreters in a sample of 113 surveys and four interviews. While it would be appropriate to say that this study revealed evidence that signed language interpreters may experience horizontal violence, it would not be appropriate to generalize from this kind of study to the extent that one would say signed language interpreters in the United States are definitely experiencing a culture of horizontal violence. Further research would need to be done before such an assertion could confidently be made.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Presently, no research exists about horizontal violence in the field of signed language interpreting in the United States. Despite this limitation, much has been published about horizontal violence in the fields of education and nursing, and the literature has clear connections to the field of interpreting. Given the lack of interpreting related research, as stated in the previous section, it is appropriate to draw from the fields of education and nursing to lay the foundation for this concept in the field of interpreting based on those professions' similarities to interpreting.

Terminology

Different authors have used different terms for the concept of horizontal violence, but the definitions share common traits, including behaviors that characterize horizontal violence and the effects these behaviors have on victims. One of the most frequently used terms, and the one that will be used for this paper, was coined by Paulo Freire, (1992) "horizontal violence." Freire, in his work with oppressed populations, defined horizontal violence in a group as "striking out at their own comrades for the pettiest reasons" (p. 48). The key here is that a situation of powerlessness is created in the subordinated group, and the response to that situation is horizontal violence among group members. Funk (2002), drawing upon Freire's work, defined horizontal violence as "the curious behavior of members of oppressed groups who often lash out at their peers in response to oppression instead of attacking their oppressors" (p.4).

Many scholars whose work has emerged from Freire's use different terms for this phenomenon, including Dellasega (2011) who drew on Freire's (1992) research, but used the term "relational aggression" (p. 4), Lewis (2004) who favored the term "workplace

bullying” (p. 283), and Patterson (2005) who used the term “hazing” (p. 21).

Bartholomew (2006) labeled this behavior “horizontal hostility,” “horizontal violence,” “verbal abuse,” and “bullying” (p. 3).

Despite the diversity of terms used to describe the situation of horizontal violence, definitions include commonalities in the behaviors discussed and in the impact on victims. Begley and Glacken (2004) characterized the behaviors of horizontal violence as a broad range of antagonism, including “gossiping, criticism, innuendo, scapegoating, undermining, intimidation, passive aggression, withholding information, insubordination, and verbal and physical aggression” (p. 30). Other specific behaviors include, either consistently or inconsistently, subtle or overt insults and ridicule, ignoring the victim, making demands that are impossible for the victim to fulfill, or devaluing a person’s work or efforts (Lewis, 2004; Longo, 2007). More generally, horizontal violence includes any kind of verbal or emotional aggression, or any behavior designed to “torment, wear down, or frustrate” (Laschinger, Grau, Finegan, & Wilk, 2012, p. 177).

Freire’s (1992) pioneering work on horizontal violence included a component of a culture of oppression, so several authors included the element of a power difference between perpetrator and victim in their definitions. Sewell, Cain, Woodgate-Jones, and Srokosz (2009) discussed the fact that the critical feedback, unrealistic expectations, and perpetrator assumptions about victims’ inadequate training constituted bullying when those behaviors served to reinforce the existing power differential. De Wet (2011) also included a “perceived difference in power” (p. 10) in her definition of bullying.

Many authors have focused on the impact the behaviors have on the victim, believing that the defining aspect of violence is its impact, not its intent. The impact of

horizontal violence on victims varies in severity, but includes emotional damage, feelings of rejection, isolation, worthlessness, hopelessness, a decrease in self esteem, lower job satisfaction and morale, a decrease in work productivity and an increase in error rates, a decrease in general physical health characterized by conditions such as insomnia, as well as struggles with communication, social relationships and feelings of powerlessness, humiliation, and shame (Rowe & Sherlock, 2005; Yildirim, 2009; Lewis, 2004; Sewell et al., 2009). Victims also tend to suffer from more stress and an increased likelihood of psychological disorders such as anxiety and depression, as well as persistent illnesses, and a loss of confidence, motivation, and trust in others (De Wet, 2011; Sewell et al., 2009).

For this study, horizontal violence is defined as persistent behaviors such as gossip, diminishing comments, rudeness, devaluating others' professional worth, and criticism, perpetrated by members of a group toward one another, whether consistently or inconsistently, that cause harm, anxiety, and stress in the receiver.

Importance

In addition to the alarming and wide-ranging effects horizontal violence can have on those who experience it, the importance of this situation translates into a larger institutional issue when one considers its impact on attrition rates. Thomas and Burk (2009) cited a study by McKenna et al., who found that 1/3 of newly graduated nurses consider leaving the field because of professional hazing. Laschinger et al. (2012) cited a 2009 study by Kovner, Brewer, Greene, and Fairchild, who found an 18% job turnover rate among recently graduated nurses. A report by Lanford and Hardesty (1998) found that even a decade ago, despite a record number of new nurses being licensed, there was a

rapidly increasing number of position vacancies. Laschinger et al. (2012) found that the rate of burnout and job turnover was much greater among new nurses than they anticipated, and they discovered that the experience of bullying was a strongly predictive factor.

The field of education has similar problems with horizontal violence-related attrition. Taranto (2009) cited Ingersoll's finding that new teacher attrition had gone up by 50% that year, in large part due to lack of support and poor working conditions. Buchanan (2010) found that the level of support a new teacher receives is a strong predictor of teacher attrition, because lack of support causes burnout, which is a major factor in the decision to leave the field. In his study, he found that 40% of new teachers leave their positions in the first five years, a statistic duplicated in the state of Illinois (Kapadia, Kavita, & Coca, 2007). McKenzie (2011) found, contrary to his expectation that trust in one's principal or the size of one's school would be most predictive of the climate in an elementary school, in fact, a teacher's trust and collegial relationships with colleagues was most predictive of the climate. Kapadia et al. (2007) also found that one of the factors that has the greatest impact on new teachers' reports of satisfaction and intent to stay in the field is a welcoming faculty. Other studies have cited hazing and lack of support as the strongest predictors of people's decisions to leave the teaching field, not other factors such as school leadership or poverty level that are often given as reasons for attrition (Patterson, 2005; Buchanan 2010). A report published by the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance in 2010 stated that turnover among teachers in the United States costs districts seven billion dollars each year.

This information is concerning, whether one focuses on the behaviors and reactions or the statistics about the personal and fiscal impact on the fields of nursing and teaching. Supportive, collegial climates were highly predictive of low burnout and turnover rates, and negative environments with high degrees of horizontal violence emerged as strong predictors of high turnover rates.

Causes of Horizontal Violence: Stress from Oppression

The fields of nursing, education, and interpreting share a common characteristic when it comes to the discussion of horizontal violence. All three fields are more than 75% female. The field of K-12 education is comprised of 76% women as of 2011, the field of nursing is 91% female as of 2009, and signed language interpreting is 87% female as of 2010 (National Education Association, 2011; Buerhaus, Auerback, & Stalger, 2009; Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2011). The significance of the gender composition of these three fields is clear when one looks again at the work of Freire (1992) who initially discovered horizontal violence and connected it to the experience of oppression. Curtis and Rasool (1997) found evidence of horizontal violence in education, and, drawing on the work of Freire, found that the experience of horizontal violence is common in predominately female fields such as education and nursing.

Freire's (1992) research found that horizontal violence results when oppression happens caused by an imbalance of power. As in the case of horizontal violence, one can look at the definition of oppression through multiple perspectives. Situationally, Freire's oppression theory holds that any time one group has more power than another, and when the values of the subordinate group are repressed, oppression happens. Another perspective on oppression comes from considering characteristics of oppressed groups,

which include low self-esteem, self-hatred, and feelings of powerlessness (Bartholomew, 2006). Sieberlich (2004), writing about interpreting, described oppression from the perspective of both the specific behavior and of the person who experiences it as “any behavior that prevents someone from reaching their full potential” (p. 3).

Like Freire (1992), other researchers have found that those who experience oppression lash out at one another, and that this behavior happens often in predominately female fields (Funk, 2002; Katrinli, Atabay, Gunay, & Guneri Cangarli, 2010). Yildirim (2009) cited research from Ferrinho et al., who found nurses at a higher risk for bullying by other nurses because the field is mostly female, and Dellasega’s (2011) research aligns with this finding.

Turning to the field of education, Sewell et al. (2009) found that primary school teachers experienced bullying by fellow teachers more frequently than secondary school teachers did, and drew the conclusion that this relationship is due, in part, to the fact that primary school teaching is even more heavily skewed toward women than secondary school teaching. Additionally, they found that younger women experienced the violence most often. Funk (2002) found that women in education experienced a limited supply of power, and had difficulty attaining leadership roles.

In the field of nursing, in particular, horizontal violence has been studied extensively, and numerous authors have published disconcerting statistics about its frequency. Dellasega (2011) found that 73% of female professionals believed workplace bullying was common or very common. Yildirim (2009) found that 82% of nurses in his study had experienced bullying in the last 12 months, and the most frequent source was other nurses. Baltimore (2006) cited a survey from allnurses.com where 75% of 2000

nurses surveyed felt that nurses “eat their young,” another common, if more colloquial, term for this phenomenon (p. 29). MacKusick and Minick (2010) found that 100% of the registered nurses they surveyed had experienced an “unfriendly workplace” (p. 337). Berry, Gillespie, Gates, and Schafer (2012) found that 75% of their sample had either seen or experienced workplace bullying in the last 30 days. Words used to describe this phenomenon may vary, but the dizzying array of statistics makes clear that the problem of horizontal violence in the female dominated fields of teaching and nursing is real. Research about horizontal violence suggests that gender composition of these fields is not an unrelated fact, but rather a large part of the cause.

What little research there is about signed language interpreters’ experiences of this type of phenomenon supports the research from education and nursing. Spoken language interpreting scholars have not researched horizontal violence, but in the field of signed language interpreting, Harvey (2008) found that interpreters tend to be critical and unkind toward one another as a consequence of witnessing oppression regularly, a situation that causes interpreters to behave like oppressed groups. Freire (1992) would argue that the gender composition of the interpreting field, at 87% female, is the reason interpreters behave like an oppressed group, because the field’s members experience oppression themselves. Regardless of whether the gender composition or the unique experience of witnessing oppression so frequently is responsible, interpreters find themselves shoulder to shoulder with teachers and nurses in having conditions ripe for horizontal violence.

It is important to note that while one may have different perceptions of the level of intent by the perpetrator upon hearing words like “bullying,” the type of violence

discussed here is associated with experiencing oppression. Perpetrators are not necessarily aware of their actions. Bartholomew's (2006) quotation summarizes this idea well. "The nurse may not be conscious of the harm she is causing if she is responding to oppression of which she is not aware" (p. 28). Yildirim (2009) and Begley and Glacken (2004) stressed that the experience of horizontal violence is real, but that the perpetrators are often unaware of their actions. Because of the relationship to oppression, horizontal violence is difficult for perpetrators to identify and name, and often manifests as a culture of group conflict.

Female dominated fields are more likely to perpetrate horizontal violence because of the unconscious experience of oppression, but as Harvey (2008) posited, the oppression may not be limited to the fact that most members of these fields are female. Harvey's research suggested that the experience of regularly witnessing oppression from a close vantage point contributes to the problem of horizontal violence in interpreting. Bartholomew (2006) suggested that nurses experience oppression as a field not only based on their gender, but also in the field's often subjugated relationship with doctors. She also stated that "any profession that holds a belief system rooted in subordination will feel oppressed, and horizontal hostility is the natural expression of this suppressed anger" (Bartholomew, 2006, p. 1). This causes one to recall Freire's (1992) definition of oppression as occurring any time two groups are in contact and one has more power than another. Berry, Gillespie, Gates, and Shafer (2012) agreed that the power differential is key, finding that the lower status group or person is already in a position that makes it difficult to defend against bullying behavior, and that novice nurses experience violence more frequently because they are the most subordinate part of an already oppressed

group. In fields where professionals experience oppression, those most at risk to experience bullying include people in positions of “situational powerlessness” (Cleary, Hunt, Walter, & Robinson, 2009, p. 35), such as those who are not secure in their positions or are new to them, those who are older, and those without a strong ability to move to other positions easily. In order to be more able to stand up to and defend against horizontal violence, victims need assertiveness. Unfortunately, assertiveness is commonly lost as a result of oppression (Begley & Glacken, 2004).

Oppression is the cause of horizontal violence in predominately female fields. It is clear that this oppression can be a result of either the experiences of marginalization by individual members of these fields, or of the experience of being close to oppression on a regular basis. Additionally, the oppression that causes horizontal violence can come from various forms of professional powerlessness, such as the subjugated status of nurses as compared to the population of doctors they find themselves working with so frequently. This situation is representative of another facet of the powerlessness of oppression, which gives rise to horizontal violence: subjugated professional status (Hard, 2006; Rowe & Sherlock, 2005).

Causes of Horizontal Violence: Stress from Subjugated Professional Status

Gavish and Freedman (2011) found that, contrary to their expectation, new teachers were quite concerned with the social status of teaching, and Buchanan’s (2010) participants in a similar study were surprised by the low status of teaching. In discussing the implications of this realization on novice teachers, Gavish and Freedman (2011) stated that “stress occurs when employees are over-sensitive to the low status of their profession, especially when there is a perceived gap between low social status and

employees' own image of their work as important" (p. 464). They went on to connect this experience of stress with teachers using defense mechanisms, which match our definition of horizontal violence. Hard (2006) connected low social standing to a feeling of limited professional identity, and her study found that this feeling leads to horizontal violence.

Low professional status contributes to horizontal violence, and unfortunately, horizontal violence reinforces low professional status. Baltimore (2006) found that the lack of collegiality in the already-subordinate field of nursing further contributed and solidified the field's lower status compared to the field of medicine. Bartholomew (2006) reinforced this finding with the idea that subordinate professional status is furthered by a lack of consensus within a field, such as nursing's public "lack of consensus concerning the entry level requirement...[i.e., Associate Degree in Nursing or Bachelor of Science in Nursing]" (p. 76). If lack of profession-wide consensus about credentialing requirements is indeed a harbinger of horizontal violence, that is another factor that places interpreting squarely in the arena with nursing. Currently, the interpreting field is in the midst of the change from requiring no degree to be eligible for interpreter certification to requiring an Associate's degree to requiring a Bachelor's degree. Additionally, the requirements to interpret vary by state (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2008; Swartz, 2012).

Causes of Horizontal Violence: Stress from Constrained Decision Latitude

One way that conditions such as oppression give rise to horizontal violence is through the stress caused by extra constraints on decision-making. Dellasega (2011) found that powerlessness was a cause of the situation she refers to as relational aggression, and Bartholomew (2006) cited Sapolsky's 1998 research study on rats where it was discovered that the mere perception of control over whatever stressor was

introduced into the situation decreased the effect of that stressor. Other factors that decreased the effects of stressors included having outlets for frustration and predictability, but as Bartholomew pointed out, the study found that rats without appropriate outlets ended up attacking each other, much like people do. This finding aligns with Dean and Pollard's (2001) research applying Karasek's concept of decision latitude to the field of interpreting. They stated that stress is caused not by having challenging work, but by feeling constrained and unable to respond to the challenges with appropriate tools. The limited decision latitude is what causes the stress, not the difficulty of the job.

Bartholomew (2006), Sieberlich (2004), and Harvey (2008) all agreed that anger, frustration, and burnout from vicarious trauma or secondary stress give rise to behaviors that we would call horizontal violence. Dean and Pollard (2001) would agree with Bartholomew's (2006) statement that the heart of the problem in these frustrating situations is that one's resources do not equal one's needs. Dean and Pollard (2001) would say that one's decision latitude is too limited for the professional demands one faces.

It is well documented that nurses face limited decision latitude, which adds to their stress (Cleary, Hunt, and Horsfall, 2010; Baltimore, 2006). The editors of *Nursing* (1999) found horizontal violence present on nursing units where nurses felt overwhelmingly understaffed and overburdened. In Begley and Glacken's (2004) study, they found that nurses felt the effects of Dean and Pollard's (2001) limited decision latitude. Nurses felt powerless because of the restrictive confines of their jobs and the oppression they faced, which caused them to feel anger, humiliation, self-doubt,

frustration, helplessness, and the overwhelming sense of powerlessness. These conditions created horizontal violence, and unfortunately, Begley and Glacken (2004) also found that in a situation of horizontal violence, nurses needed more assertiveness to manage the situation, the very trait that was depleted by the constrained decision-making and oppression in the first place. Cleary et al. (2010) cited a 2009 study by Carmeli and Gittell that reiterated the findings that the high-stress environment of nursing gave rise to a culture of bullying, which we would call horizontal violence. Given that constrained decision latitude causes conditions to be right for horizontal violence, it's no surprise that novice professionals are more affected by it, since novices do not have the same array of (albeit constrained) resources experienced professionals do have (Berry et al., 2012). Since we see that constrained decision latitude adds to the stress of oppression and reduced professional status in causing horizontal violence, it makes sense that Spence et al. (2012) found that above average feelings of professional autonomy and decisional involvement (what Dean and Pollard, 2001, might call decision latitude) resulted in more job satisfaction and less turnover.

Causes of Horizontal Violence: Stress from Professional Hierarchies

Thomas and Burk (2009) argued their unwillingness to accept the idea that nurses still experience gendered oppression in today's world, which is a position with which many scholars would disagree (Bluffington, 1992; Williams, 1992; Musanti & Pence, 2010). Just the same, Thomas and Burk (2009) affirmed that whether or not nurses' gendered oppression is an outdated idea, nurses still experience the negative effects of an oppressive situation, because of the extreme powerlessness that results from the strong professional hierarchies present in nursing. These unofficial but deeply entrenched

ladders of power and authority cause professionals to experience the effects of oppression. Harvey (2008) and Freire (1992) would probably agree with this broader way to conceptualize oppression for the purposes of studying occupational stress since this definition still includes groups who have more power (e.g., doctors or other nurses higher up in the professional hierarchy) and less power (e.g., newer nurses) than one another. Bartholomew (2006) also mentioned professional hierarchy as a cause for the oppressive conditions that cause horizontal violence. "Hostility is a natural outcome of working in a hierarchical system where there is little control and scarce resources" (p. 70). This statement aligns well with Dean and Pollard's (2001) application to the interpreting field of Karasek's ideas about the stress caused by limited professional resources.

Causes of Horizontal Violence: Role Stress

Another factor related to limited decision latitude that causes the stressful conditions contributing to horizontal violence is role stress. Bartholomew (2006) found this to be a factor among nurses, who experienced low self-esteem when they were unable to act out their professional values of caring and kindness due to external pressures. In her experience, the public expects nurses to be constantly caring, to reject their own needs, to never utter a complaint, and to behave in a subordinate way when others speak to them. These rigid expectations of role, the nursing profession's corpus of professional values, the incredible demands of the task of nursing, and the limited decision latitude that nurses experience combine to create a pressure cooker of stress that leads straight to a culture of horizontal violence (Bartholomew, 2006). It is plain to see how oppression contributes to this situation because the already complex task of nursing is compounded by the expectation that it be performed in a modest, feminine way.

Education researchers have also identified the stress that results from a constrained role, a role that also sounds like it has its roots in a traditional notion of femininity. “The notion of horizontal violence...highlights contradictions between a lingering discourse of niceness and a culture which condones behaviors that [marginalize] and exclude others” (Hard, 2006, p. 40). Hard (2006) found that educators believed they needed to be nice and compliant, which prevented organizations from moving forward.

Interpreting scholars, Lee and Llewellyn-Jones (2011), argued that a rigid construct of role, on top of the already-acknowledged demands of professional work, actually inhibits the work of professionals. Dean and Pollard’s (2004) ideas about interpreting as a practice profession support this understanding of rigid role as inhibiting professional work. They argued that fields where work involves interacting with human beings, professionals cannot follow a rigid set of guidelines in the same way that technical professions such as accounting and engineering can. Because the work of an interpreter, a teacher, and a nurse involves interacting with people, these practice professionals must have the range of decision latitude to determine how to act on their professional values in each situation, rather than adhering to a predefined, rigid understanding of their work.

The idea of a constrained role as being harmful to professionals is an idea that is familiar to interpreting scholars; the specific constraint they have often identified is the ideal of invisibility. Researchers in the interpreting field have documented that striving for an ideal of invisibility, either behaviorally or linguistically, is not only impossible but also harmful (Metzger, 1999; Wilcox and Shaffer, 2005; Lee and Llewellyn-Jones, 2011).

The idea of invisibility as one part of the rigid role that practice professionals ought to play is especially pernicious, and Bartholomew (2006) identified this in the field of nursing, calling it “the catch 22” (p. 31). “At a very primal level, there is an unspoken belief that nursing’s identity must stay invisible in order to survive. Yet it is this very invisibility that keeps the group in the subordinate, oppressed position and prevents solidarity” (p. 31). Perhaps interpreters could benefit by looking to oppression theory as a source to find the origins of the notion of invisibility.

Exacerbating Factors

It is clear that the practice professionals in education, nursing, and interpreting experience the unique combination of characteristics of oppression that can lead to horizontal violence. Unfortunately, scholars have found several factors present in these fields that exacerbate the experience. Lewis (2004) cited the finding of Matthiesen et al., that victims of bullying experience lower social supports, which are critical for coping with violence of this nature. Spence et al. (2012) also found that bullying taxes the very resources necessary to stand up to it, much as Begley and Glacken (2004) did. This is a disappointing discovery in light of Spence et al.’s (2012) job demands-resources framework, which presents bullying as an increased job demand that requires more resources to manage.

In addition to lessened social supports and other resources that are depleted by horizontal violence, the phenomenon can be worsened by the experience of transition shock that new professionals often go through as they transition from their training programs into the professional community. One element of the transition shock experienced by new nurses is the difficult adjustment they face when their expectations

of a collegial profession are not met (Spence et al., 2012). In what appears to be a self-reinforcing cycle, the existence of a culture of horizontal violence itself is what causes the transition to be difficult for new graduates, which in turn worsens the experience of horizontal violence. Curtis and Rasool (1997) and Gavish and Freedman (2011) found the same jarring experience of new graduates being surprised by the lack of expected collegiality to be true of new teachers. Another factor that increases the violence-inducing stress already present in these fields is the persistent worry about aggression from coworkers. Much like Spence et al.'s (2012) finding that the shock of experiencing horizontal violence contributes to horizontal violence, Baltimore (2006) found that nurses were quite worried about experiencing aggression from coworkers, and that worry caused a great deal of stress as well as decreased job performance, satisfaction, and morale.

Perpetuating Factors

After identifying the definition of horizontal violence and its causes, as well as factors that worsen it, one must consider how horizontal violence evolves into a persistent culture. Cultures of horizontal violence survive and thrive because horizontal violence brings with it several factors that entrench and encourage the status quo. One way this happens is that new members of a profession are inducted into the culture of horizontal violence, perpetuating it. Any effort at introducing new ideas into the situation is met with and silenced by hostile behaviors (Bartholomew, 2006). It is important to note that horizontal violence happens to those at every age and experience level, with those at each level of experience finding themselves mistreated by the professionals at the stage just above (Baltimore, 2006). Even so, Yildirim (2009) found that new professionals experience more pronounced horizontal violence. Cleary et al. (2010) cited Dellasega's

2009 research that also noted that newly graduated nurses are at a much higher bullying risk. Patterson (2005) found the same to be true of teachers, noting that “beginning teachers are often systematically hazed” (p. 21). The horizontal violence and hazing experienced by new professionals serves to induct them into the culture of horizontal violence, thus reinforcing the culture. Hard (2006) stated that “the outcome of this culture is a powerful expectation of compliance which does little to foster or encourage leadership activity” (p. 40). This expectation of compliance is something Begley and Glacken (2004) discussed, noting that nursing emphasizes rigid adherence to codes of behavior, which serves to reinforce the status quo. This seems to be another unfortunate consequence of rigid roles and behaviors in practice professions (Lee and Llwellyn-Jones, 2011; Dean and Pollard, 2004).

One common type of hazing experienced by new professionals in their induction periods was what many commonly refer to as “dues paying.” Patterson (2005) found that the least experienced teachers were routinely given the most difficult tasks, a finding shared by Howe (2006). Howe referred to this time of difficult induction as “sink or swim” and a “rite of passage” (p. 298). Dellasega (2011) echoed this language with her words about nursing. “It seems to be an unspoken rite of passage to mistreat new graduates who come to work eager to apply all the knowledge they have amassed in their education” (p. 75). The editors of *Nursing99* (1999) found similar phrases in their survey, noting that many new nurses reported hearing defenses of harsh treatment that started with “I paid my dues” (p. 49).

The way this “dues paying” kind of hazing serves to shore up cultures of horizontal violence is clear in Bartholomew’s (2006) finding after interviewing a nurse

who had five years of experience. Bartholomew expected this relatively new nurse to be kind to a nurse who had just graduated, but instead found that her behavior was quite harsh. In their interview, Bartholomew found that the nurse with five years of experience believed that if she had to endure harsh induction, so did the new person. In just five short years, this nurse was transformed by horizontal violence into a perpetrator of it. Cleary, Hunt, Walter, and Robinson (2009) echoed this, noting that most people who bully, were themselves bullied.

It stands to reason that new people are more likely to experience worse effects of horizontal violence given that strong professional hierarchies are one type of oppression that causes it (Thomas and Burk, 2009). With these strong professional hierarchies comes a condition necessary in oppression, which is a marked difference in power and authority (Freire, 1992). This underscores De Wet's (2011) finding that new teachers experienced hostility often due to others' use of more authority and power against them.

The experience of the "dues paying" model of induction and the expectation of compliance serves to encourage new professionals to accept the dysfunction and adopt similar behaviors (Baltimore, 2006). Keay (2009) assumed that recently graduated teachers would bring fresh perspectives into their new districts, which would result in departments adopting new ideas. Instead, she found that these new teachers' input was silenced and that they were assimilated into the status quo. Additionally, Keay found that new music teachers were only inducted into the community feeling of their departments when the experienced gatekeepers saw them as measuring up, which encouraged compliance. The incentive for new teachers to do whatever it takes to join those communities echoes a finding by McCluskey, Sim, and Greer Johnson (2011). They

noted that teachers who, for whatever reason, are not inducted into the professional communities at their schools, experience stunted development as professionals.

The earlier idea from Bartholomew (2006) that perpetrators may be unaware of their harmful behavior, is echoed by another finding of Key's (2009). She found that the power-holders in departments influenced new people's behavior without overtly using their power. New teachers felt this power and were cowed into assimilation, even when the more experienced teachers were not aware of having done anything.

New professionals have another disadvantage during their induction periods. New members of these practice professions also face frequent comments from more experienced people that express shock and irritation that the new person does not already have a specific skill from their training program (Baltimore, 2006; editors of Nursing99, 1999). Baltimore (2006) identified the link between comments such as these and the continuation of horizontal violence. Because one element of horizontal violence is that it occurs as a function of culture, individual perpetrators are discouraged from seeing their role in it. Comments like these serve to help more experienced professionals reject the part they play in being responsible for new members' success or failure. If experienced professionals can blame training programs for new nurses' failures, they wash their hands of any responsibility to help the next generation, which creates conditions for horizontal violence. Berry et al. (2012) found that the nurses responsible for training new nurses who joined their staffs were the most likely to perpetuate bullying. They went on to cite a finding by Johnson and Rae that 1/3 of novice nurses who experience bullying intend to leave their positions because of it. As discussed earlier, this kind of attrition is a common

result of horizontal violence, and the increased workloads and constrained decision latitude this can cause only feeds the cycle.

It is clear that new professionals experience the brunt of horizontal violence for several reasons, but there are other reasons it gets perpetuated. One important reason is denial (Bartholomew, 2006). Bartholomew stated that because horizontal violence is an element of culture, it is easy to deny. “When any behavior has been a part of a culture for a long time, it is perceived as normal” (p. 37). Baltimore (2006) reiterated this, noting that offenders rarely recognize what they are doing. Patterson (2005) also found this in education, noting that not only did offenders not recognize what was going on, but also that many people she spoke with did not believe hazing was something that really happens. Even victims have a part in this denial, not wanting to admit that their experiences can be classified as “bullying” (Lewis, 2004, p. 296). Cleary et al. (2009) found that one reason victims do not want to label and report what has happened to them is their fear that the bully may convincingly deny it and discredit them, which supports Baltimore’s (2006) finding that nurses experience fear of further aggression. Indeed, Longo (2007) found that 49% of horizontal violence victims did not report anything, and 53% of bystanders also did not report.

Another factor that facilitates this denial, at least for nurses, is that nursing is viewed as a helping profession, so professional bullying is not easily recognized because it does not fit that image (Baltimore, 2006). Katrinli et al. (2010) found that one reason bullying is not named and discussed professionally is that victims, perpetrators, and bystanders consider it to be a normal part of workplace competition and jockeying. De

Wet (2011) sums up this denial by perpetrators, bystanders, and victims nicely, calling it a “culture of silence” (p. 76).

Yet another factor that perpetuates horizontal violence by encouraging the status quo can be found by turning to Ferster and Skinner’s (1957) theory of intermittent reinforcement. They found that giving their animal subjects reinforcement on a variable schedule encouraged specific behaviors far more than giving them reinforcement on a predictable schedule. This idea of intermittent reinforcement as powerful is related in literature to the perpetuation of horizontal violence. “Sporadic and surprise verbal attacks thus create hyper-vigilance--if one does not know when hostility will strike, one will always be on guard” (Bartholomew, 2006, p. 40). Because of the fact that intermittent experience with trauma will cause one to be hyper-vigilant for quite a long time, it is not necessary for the trauma to be the majority of one’s experiences in order for it to create a strongly negative impact. Indeed, Dellasega (2011) found that her participants reported far more positive experiences than negative ones. Of concern is that despite the frequency of positive experiences and the relative infrequency of negative ones, the negative experiences still leave a lasting negative impact (editors of Nursing99, 1999). Laschinger et al. (2012) also found incidences of bullying to be infrequent, but they found that those incidences had profound effects. Lewis (2004) echoes this finding from the field of education, noting that for victims of bullying, the scars were intense and long lasting.

Another factor that emerges because of horizontal violence that also serves to perpetuate it is professionals’ unwillingness to have their work observed. Musanti and Pence (2010) found that teachers resisted having others see their work, becoming quite defensive. This came out of a fear that others watching them would not be helpful, but

would instead be like a “defect detector” (p. 8). What these teachers expressed was what Baltimore (2006) discussed when she stated that victims of horizontal violence experience persistent fear of further aggression. This is a clear result of intermittent reinforcement; even if instances of bullying are not often, the scars run deep and impact the future behavior of professionals. When the impact includes not wanting to engage in professional dialogue about work practices, the status quo is shored up (Musanti and Pence, 2010).

Research shows that horizontal violence starts to infect professionals even before their induction into the professional community as new graduates. Indeed, even students experience it at the hands of professionals while still in school. Catalano and Tillie (1991) found that the way teacher observation is used with pre-service teachers is damaging, that the collegiality the students expect meets “head-on with the tradition of authoritarianism” (p. 14). Sewell et al. (2009) also found that bullying happened to trainee teachers, in part because of the increased stress the requirements of supervising a student teacher placed on the cooperating teacher. Keay (2009) cited a study by Sirna et al., who discovered that one reason a particular department was struggling to change its negative culture was that student teachers were expected to fit in with the pre-existing culture and were thus assimilated.

Once again, the same phenomenon happens in nursing as well. Longo (2007) found that 53% of student nurses reported experiencing horizontal violence from staff nurses during their internships, and another 34% of students reported witnessing incidents of it. She also found that after going out on practicum experiences, 72% of student nurses believed that nurses “eat their young” (p. 178). Thomas and Burk (2009) also discovered

that student nurses report much vertical violence at the hands of supervising staff nurses during their clinical experiences.

To some extent, professional hazing starts even before students go out on internship experiences. Reports indicate that sometimes, teachers in professional training programs perpetuate this kind of violence with their students in the early phases of their education. Ferris and Kline (2009) found that negative interpersonal interaction, as they call it, occurred even for students in nursing programs, which effectively passed on the culture of bullying even before students got to their clinical experiences. Johnston, Cupples, McGlade, and Steele (2011) found that medical students' levels of professionalism declined during each year of their schooling as they were exposed to the unprofessional behaviors of their teachers and were inducted into that culture. Curtis and Rasool (1997) found that one reason education students are susceptible to harmful teacher culture is that their training programs lack the time to teach them to see themselves as empowered agents of change. Their training focuses its limited time on the technical elements of teaching so much so that their self-concept development as teachers is ignored, leaving them vulnerable to assimilating into negative cultures at their future schools.

Alarming, powerful forces are at work in cultures of horizontal violence that serve to perpetuate it. New professionals are inducted into the culture, being forced to assimilate, but it is difficult for members of a field to identify and name what is happening. Adding to that is the fact that experiences of violence do not even need to be frequent to be harmful, and the fact that the tendrils of this kind of culture reach all the way to students in professional training programs.

What Can Help

Fortunately, because scholars have identified factors that lead to and further horizontal violence, they have also identified factors that may help to reduce it. Critical or feminist pedagogy that empowers students and teaches them to question the status quo is helpful (Catalano & Tillie, 1991). Bluffington (1993) wrote about bell hooks, a feminist educator who prefers her name written in lower case letters. hooks uses Freire's idea of "education as the practice of freedom" (p. 5) to help students name difficult-to-identify institutional factors that perpetuate oppressive practices even during their education. This serves as a foundation for graduates to identify such factors in the workplace as well.

Falk-Rafael, Chinn, and Anderson (2004) noted Freire's work showing that traditional pedagogy reproduces existing power relationships, which is why they encourage a change. They cited empowerment as an important element of any educational program for nurses, since nurses need to be able to facilitate empowerment for their clients. The empowerment in education they advocated is similar to Bluffington's (1993); they encouraged programs to foster awareness of oppressive institutional factors, emphasize relationality, and understand the role of gender in social structures. Catalano and Tillie (1991) added decentralized, collaborative decision-making and the open acknowledgement of power relationships as important factors in classrooms set to empower graduates to notice structural problems and make change. Curtis and Rasool (1997) believed that a necessary element in feminist or critical pedagogy is encouraging students to critically notice who creates knowledge and whose stories get recorded. This type of critical thinking about the process of education is what empowers students to be critical thinkers about their future environments. They noted that this kind

of pedagogy gives students feelings of power over their professional lives, which is necessary to combat the powerlessness of horizontal violence.

Begley and Glacken (2004), who identified the importance of assertiveness and the ways horizontal violence saps assertiveness, found that empowering pedagogy is capable of increasing students' levels of assertiveness during and after their training programs. This helped the population they observed to be prepared to deal with and reduce horizontal violence after they graduated.

Clearly, pedagogy has quite an impact on future professionals' readiness to face and manage horizontal violence. However, the suggestions for reducing this problem do not end there. Patterson (2005) and Harvey (2008) both stressed the importance of recognizing and naming this kind of hostility. They believe that naming it and starting a professional discussion is a way to pop the bubble of denial and invisibility currently enjoyed by horizontal violence.

Another hopeful factor is Laschinger et al.'s (2012) framework of the "job demands-resources" model for nursing (p. 176). They found that systematically framing the task of nursing in terms of the demands of the job that require effort and the resources that professionals possess to help achieve the goals can help nurses be aware of and manage the stresses of their job. As has been shown, lower stress and increased perception of control over one's environment can reduce horizontal violence. The fact that this worked for nurses is good news to interpreters, given that Dean and Pollard's (2001) demand control schema is a similar framework for systematically identifying the relationship between demands and professional tools in interpreting. Laschinger et al. (2012) also found that "psychological capital" (p. 177) factors, such as optimism, self-

efficacy, resilience, and hope, were personal characteristics that enabled individual nurses to be more prepared to deal with the stressors they faced on the job. One can conclude that an effort to identify and develop those characteristics in individuals could be helpful on an organizational level.

Much as horizontal violence leads to professionals being wary of supervision, Catalano and Tillie (1991) found that teachers at all levels who participated in supervision and mentorship felt more engaged, connected and empowered to develop as professionals. Turning to new teachers, McCluskey et al. (2011) found that being inducted into a community of practice was necessary for new teachers to develop strong professional identities. Given that induction is necessary, and that it seems to happen in a negative way on its own, Howe (2006) found that this kind of concerning induction process does not have to be the norm. He found that a system of deliberate, purposeful, gradual teacher induction was successful, leading to more job satisfaction, lower attrition rates, and better job performance. Taranto (2011) had a similar finding, noting that a structured induction process led to teachers feeling connected and supported, which also reduced the experience of horizontal violence.

Horizontal violence is created by conditions of oppression that exist in female-dominated practice professions. It is caused by the stress of oppression-related conditions, such as subjugated professional status, limited decision-latitude, and role stress. It furthers itself by creating situations of low social supports where resources are depleted. The norm of horizontal violence is maintained by cultures that induct new members into the harmful behavior and then deny its existence. The theory of intermittent reinforcement illustrates the insidiousness of horizontal violence, since even a few

experiences with it cause a person to be affected by it long-term. The roots of horizontal violence reach back even into professional training programs, affecting students before they set foot into the professional world. Luckily, naming and recognizing it can help, as can empowering pedagogy and deliberate professional induction programs. The field of interpreting would be well served by recognizing its similarities to the fields of education and nursing, noticing risk factors for horizontal violence, and opening a professional conversation about the existence of horizontal violence in this field.

METHODOLOGY

Research Focus

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there was evidence of intergenerational communication conflict among signed language interpreters in Ohio, and if such evidence exists, to describe the characteristics of the conflict. Interpersonal communication among interpreters has not been examined previously in the field of interpreting, signed or spoken language, which is why the focus was twofold. In order to justify describing a phenomenon, one must first establish that the phenomenon does in fact exist. The methodology to examine this, then, also had two major parts.

Initially, a survey was designed to address the question of whether intergenerational communication conflict existed among interpreters in Ohio. This was intended to be preliminary, to confirm whether moving ahead with a qualitative investigation of the nature of intergenerational communication was a worthwhile endeavor. When the survey data yielded grounds to move forward, research continued with qualitative interviews to address the question of the nature of intergenerational communication in the field.

Survey Methods

In order to gather any kind of data on intergenerational communication, it is necessary to determine where a split in generations might happen. To a large extent, this distinction is arbitrary, but research about generations cannot proceed without a working definition of the generations being examined. Given that no data had been collected at this time, determining where to place the dividing line between generations was a difficult, but necessary task. In the summer of 2003, the Registry of Interpreters for the

Deaf announced a plan to implement a requirement for an academic degree in order to be eligible for professional certification (Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, 2008).

Though many variables occur in a professionalizing field that one could point to that signal an impactful shift in philosophy or practice, this announcement was chosen as the basis for the generational division for the purposes of this study.

After consulting literature about changes in the field of interpreting, it became clear that the shift toward requiring academic degrees for professional credentialing was a major step in the process of professionalizing, a step that increased professional interpreters' experiences of uncertainty (Witter-Merithew & Johnson, 2004). Witter-Merithew and Johnson stated that market disorder, or profession-wide feelings of uncertainty and instability, happens as a result of major steps forward in the process of professionalizing. These steps include establishing education and credentialing requirements. Witter-Merithew and Johnson went on to discuss that interpreters are experiencing an increase in market disorder now, 40 years after the formal creation of the profession, in large part because of uncertain and nonstandard requirements for interpreting practice. Since shifts in credentialing procedure cause uncertainty among professionals in a field, and since interpreters experience this strongly due to changing and nonstandard credentialing procedures, it was logical to choose the announcement of another major change in credentialing requirements as a moment to divide the generations. Thus, for both the survey and the interviews, participants who self-identified as having entered the field prior to January 1, 2004, were considered more experienced interpreters, and those who entered the field during or since 2004 were considered newer

interpreters. The terms “newer” and “more experienced,” then, refer to interpreters’ years of experience as working interpreters, not to their chronological age.

The survey was developed and administered in spring 2012. Participation in the survey was anonymous and confidential. Participant names were not revealed, and tracking any one respondent’s data is not possible. One optional survey question gave participants the option of submitting email addresses if they were willing to be contacted for the interview phase of the research. The survey platform did not allow email addresses to be connected to previous responses, which protected the confidentiality of those who chose to share that information. (See Appendix C for the survey consent form.)

Since the goal was to get a sense of whether intergenerational communication conflict existed among interpreters in Ohio, the survey was sent to everyone listed on the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf database in the state of Ohio who provided an email address in their listing. The survey was sent to 433 individuals in May of 2012. Of the 433 surveys that were disseminated, 113 responses were collected for a 26% response rate. The platform used was SurveyMonkey.com. Each group, the newer interpreter group and the more experienced interpreter group, answered ten questions about their comfort level with and trust in other interpreters. Most questions asked respondents to rank their feelings on a scale of 1-5 for interpreters of their generation and interpreters of the opposite generation with a box for optional comments. (Refer to Appendix A for the complete list of survey questions.)

The survey was conducted qualitatively. Merriam (2009) explained that the goal of qualitative research is to be “richly descriptive” (p. 16), using words to paint a picture of a particular experience, rather than attempting to quantify it with numbers. Analysis of

the survey data was done to establish whether or not any evidence of intergenerational communication conflict existed, to get a nuanced first description of interpreters' experiences with intergenerational communication, and to determine that the interview phase was worth conducting.

Because the survey was the preliminary portion of the study, data was not analyzed using tests for statistical significance. Those tests would have been useful if the goal of the study had been to produce a quantitative picture of whether this conflict existed. Rather, the goal of the survey was to determine whether enough evidence of a problem existed to move forward with the rich description phase of research. An examination of the mean responses on the survey was the extent of quantitative data analysis, since such an examination revealed sufficient evidence to move forward with the study.

The online survey platform calculated the mean response for each question that asked participants to rate their feelings about each group on a scale, and the bar for data analysis was to see whether each group tended to express more comfort and trust in their own group than in the opposite group. This proved to be the case, and the effect was more pronounced for newer interpreters. More experienced interpreters often favored their own group, but newer interpreters favored their own group in all but one question, and by a larger margin. Because the purpose of the survey was to determine whether enough evidence existed to conduct interviews, no formal statistical testing was necessary other than an examination of the mean responses. This analysis served as grounds to continue to the interview portion of the research. The answers to the optional comments

were also collected and analyzed, and those comments served as a starting point for developing interview questions.

Interview Methods

Four subjects were interviewed, two who were in the category of newer interpreters and two who were in the category of more experienced interpreters. The small sample size and qualitative approach allowed for richer description than a larger sample size or quantitative approach would have. As Roy (2012) points out, the goal of qualitative research is not to obtain a large, randomly selected sample, but to selectively choose a sample from a particular context and “explore a phenomenon deeply” (p. 661). The small size and qualitative approach of the interview phase of this study allowed for that depth, rather than a more shallow but wider picture. Since the focus of the study was intergenerational communication, choosing two interpreters from each generation was sufficient.

Each person who submitted their email addresses in the survey was emailed and asked to submit demographic information, such as their certification status, how many years of experience they have, what kind of interpreting work they do, and how often they interact with the opposite generation. Since the generations encompass such a broad range of people, especially the more experienced generation, gathering participant demographics enabled the selection of interviewees with as much homogeneity as possible.

Once demographics were collected from those still interested in participating, the four people whose demographics were most homogenous were contacted and asked to participate in the study. All four responded affirmatively. All four participants live in

urban areas in the state of Ohio and all hold national certification under the RID-NAD NIC testing system. The more experienced interpreters each had approximately 20 years of experience, and the newer interpreters each had approximately five years of experience. All four participants were female, lived and worked in urban areas of Ohio, interacted with the other generation frequently, were certified under the NIC system, and interpreted in community settings. The more experienced interpreters were between the ages of 35 and 60, and the newer interpreters were between the ages of 25 and 30. Their ages were the least important factor in determining homogeneity, because the objective was to find people with similar working environments and communities and similar levels of experience on both sides of the 2004 dividing line.

Once each participant consented (see interview consent form in Appendix D) to the interviews, the interview sessions were scheduled. In order to enhance trustworthiness of the study, I determined that I should not conduct the interviews since I am clearly in the newer interpreters' generation. My identity as a clear member of one generation over the other and as the designer of this study might prevent participants from speaking candidly. To mitigate this risk, another person asked the interview questions of the participants. She was an interpreter in an urban Ohio city whose level of experience placed her near the generational line. She had no affiliation with this topic or this study, no conflicts of interest with the interviewees, and was not a divisive figure in the interpreting community. Participants were informed of her role in the study and all agreed to move forward.

Each newer interpreter was asked four questions and each experienced interpreter was asked five questions. (Refer to Appendix B for the list of interview questions.) A

research guide written by Gillham (2000) recommends limiting the number of interview questions in a qualitative study to approximately five. Questions were written with the goal of being open-ended, non-leading, and dissimilar to one another as recommended by Gillham (2000). Survey comments were used to help determine what kinds of questions to ask. This was done by reading the responses to open-ended comments to identify themes that emerged. A holistic reading was done to find an overall theme. This theme, the idea that interpreters expressed the worry that they would be judged by other interpreters, was used to generate one of the interview questions.

Interviews were analyzed with an open coding method, defined as “the analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 101). In practice, open coding is a process whereby the researcher examines data and assigns numerous codes to it, not limiting the process to a few pre-selected codes relating to the results one expects to find. Then, in the tradition of grounded theory, which “seeks not just to understand, but also to build a substantive theory about the phenomenon of interest” (Merriam, 2009, p. 23), codes are synthesized into progressively larger themes after examining and re-examining the data (Heath & Cowley, 2004). This “constant comparison” (Heath & Cowley, 2004, p. 149) and open coding, rather than the exclusionary coding of pre-set categories, allows theories to emerge from the data rather than imposing theories on the data.

Codes were developed with a careful reading and rereading of the interviews, and codes gradually yielded increasingly broad categories as the data was analyzed again and again. This method of open coding allowed for patterns in the data to emerge (Heath & Cowley, 2004; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Using a system of exclusionary coding, only

coding for utterances relevant to intergenerational communication conflict, would have suppressed the process of natural discovery that is critical to the first research foray into un-researched territory. Glaser and Strauss (1967) stressed the importance of using a data analysis method that allows patterns to emerge, rather than limiting one's framework to what one expects to find. They stated, "it must be [emphasized] that integration of the theory is best when it emerges, like the concepts. The theory should never just be put together" (p. 41). Heath and Cowley (2004) would agree. Discussing the need to use open coding and let patterns emerge from such coding, they stated,

Selection to fit preconceived or prematurely developed ideas is to be avoided, however creative these may appear. The researcher must be able to tolerate confusion, hard work and the tedium of the constant comparative method and wait for concepts to emerge (p. 144).

The fact that the subject of interpersonal communication among interpreters had not been previously researched was a key reason to choose a qualitative methodology, to allow patterns to emerge naturally in the data and not stick too firmly to the testing of a narrow hypothesis. In keeping with this decision, open coding made the most sense.

Methodological Strengths

The use of a qualitative methodology is appropriate when one seeks to describe an area that has not been previously researched, because having no prior research from which to generate a hypothesis, the researcher must remain as open as possible to what the data can reveal. As Heath and Cowley (2004) and Strauss and Glaser (1967) suggest, using a constant comparison, open coding approach allows the data to reveal whatever it can, which is why using such a methodology for a new area of research is a sound approach. With no field-specific literature about a subject, using an experimental study with a quantitative methodology and an aim toward generalizing one's findings to a

broad population would not be appropriate. Given that generalizability is an unreasonable goal in this situation, a qualitative approach to the question allows the flexibility necessary to spot a broad range of patterns in the data and develop a preliminary description of a particular phenomenon (Roy, 2012).

An element enhancing the strength of the methodology is the triangulation of two types of data collection. While the survey data was not analyzed for statistical significance in a strictly quantitative fashion, this data did provide a shallow, broad picture of a large sample size. Survey results provided justification to continue with a qualitative look at the phenomenon; without the survey, asserting that any phenomenon worth describing was occurring would not be methodologically sound.

Analyzing the interview data according to a literature-supported method of coding lends trustworthiness to the findings, especially since the findings revealed a related, but somewhat different phenomenon than the study originally set out to describe. Finding a new pattern in data that is not directly related to one's hypothesis would seem sloppy and random without an accepted method of arriving at such a finding. Qualitative research analyzed through open coding "involves a radically different way of thinking about data.... [Researchers] must learn to listen, letting the data speak to them" (Straus & Corbin, 1998, p. 59). This method of letting the data reveal whatever it will is nonetheless "a very focused one. The focusing forces researchers to consider the range of plausibility, to avoid taking one stand or stance toward the data" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 65). This combination of flexibility and structure made qualitative research analyzed through open coding the appropriate way to approach this first foray into learning about interpreters' interpersonal experiences from their own voices.

Finally, using another person to ask the interview questions helped mitigate the personal influence of the researcher on the data. In qualitative research, it is essential that one acknowledge one's connection to, role in, and effect on data collected. Much as we say it is impossible for an interpreter to be invisible, and dangerous to pretend as much (Metzger, 1999), the same is true of a qualitative researcher who works with people. While the researcher's influence cannot be completely eradicated, acknowledging it and taking steps to mitigate it are necessary. Asking another person to conduct the interviews mitigated this influence to some extent, because it eliminated the situation more experienced interpreters would have faced in being asked to speak candidly about their experiences with and opinions of newer interpreters in front of one who fits squarely in that category.

Methodological Limitations

Being the first study of its kind, there are several limitations that need to be discussed. First, the sample size of four interviewees, just two from each category, was quite small. While qualitative approaches do not require the large, randomly assigned sample groups of quantitative experimental studies, it is still necessary to acknowledge that with such a small sample, it is not appropriate to generalize the findings beyond the population of the study. Also, since such a study has not been done before, one does not have the luxury of consulting field-specific studies with similar methodologies to compare the findings.

A related limitation is that qualitative research, in general, is not generalizable. Certainly these findings can still be useful, perhaps pointing to a new hypothesis about the interpersonal situation in the field of interpreting or serving as preliminary evidence

for such a study in the future. However, it is necessary to understand that these findings cannot be generalized to all interpreters in the state of Ohio or to the profession as a whole. Generalizability is not the goal of qualitative research. In qualitative research, the aim is to “piece together an understanding of a process or a context” (Roy, 2012, p. 661). Roy (2012) goes on to argue that “the techniques of qualitative inquiry are arguably concerned less with representativeness than with a focus on specific characteristics of interest” (p. 661). Malterud (2001) argues that qualitative research’s generalizability or transferability is not so much connected to sample size as it is to the relevance of the sample. She emphasizes that as long as the sample is well explained and the study makes clear what level of transferability is reasonable from the research, qualitative methodology is sound. For this study, it is clear that generalizability is not feasible. What is feasible is to take these findings as the starting point for another study that may aim to make generalizations about the field as a whole.

The survey data was preliminary for this study, used to serve as evidence that intergenerational communication conflict happened. Even with a sample size of 113, the lack of rigorous statistical analysis does not allow this finding to be taken as a fact to be applied to the field as a whole. The data was instead used to support continuing to the qualitative phase of research.

Another factor worth mentioning, though not so much a limitation, is the fact that the findings did not align with the original hypothesis that intergenerational communication conflict exists among interpreters. Indeed, evidence of such conflict was present, but the pattern yielded by the data pointed to the larger experience of horizontal violence, not an experience that was specifically generational in nature. Though

horizontal violence tends to have a stronger effect on newer members of a profession than on more experienced ones, it is not specifically intergenerational in nature (Baltimore, 2006; Keay, 2009). Since the study was designed to examine intergenerational communication, perhaps even richer results may have been uncovered if it had been designed to examine the profession-wide experience of horizontal violence and not constrained by a methodology designed to find intergenerational communication issues. Such issues were found, but that was not the central issue in the findings. If the study had been designed to examine horizontal violence in interpreting, the data may have yielded even more impactful findings that might be more broadly applicable.

Finally, as mentioned in the methodological strengths, it is necessary to examine the influence of the researcher on the data and the findings. Methodological checks and balances were used to ensure that this effect was as minimal as possible, but especially in qualitative research, the researcher's effect cannot be ignored. This topic was chosen because of my personal experience. In the face of a dearth of literature, the hypothesis developed from my personal experience. My background, knowledge, and knowledge gaps were always present when designing the methodology and writing the questions. Even with the use of a literature-supported qualitative data analysis method, I was the one doing the analysis, and the filter of my experiences could never be turned off. While the finding of a pattern for which I was not looking confirmed the fact that I was not so dogmatic about my hypothesis that I was prevented from seeing what the data could reveal, it is still impossible for anyone to fully ascertain the effect my mental frame had on the findings. Even the interview data itself may have been colored by who I am. Despite the mitigating effect of using another person to ask the interview questions,

interviewees communicated with me by email and were aware of the nature of the study. One cannot know the assumptions they brought to the table about what the study sought to find or what my agenda was, but one can be certain they had some type of assumption. We cannot know what effect those thoughts and feelings had on the interviews.

Each limitation was mitigated to the extent that it could be, and explicitly stating such limitations here helps contextualize these findings for readers and future researchers. It is important to understand the research findings in light of the specific methodological strengths and limitations in order to appropriately understand and use the findings of this study.

FINDINGS

Survey Results

Of the 433 surveys emailed, 113 responses were collected, for a response rate of 26%. The first survey question asked whether participants entered the field before or since 2004, and the last question asked participants to submit email addresses if they were willing to be contacted for the interview portion of the survey. The other eight questions asked participants to rate their own generational group and the opposite group on a scale of 1-5 in various domains, such as feelings of trust and satisfaction in interpersonal interactions. (Refer to Appendix A for full list of survey questions.) Table 1 shows the average score interpreters who entered the field before 2004 gave their own group and the other group for each question. Note that higher numbers indicated positive feelings and lower numbers indicated more negative feelings. Table 2 shows the same information for interpreters who have entered the field since 2004.

TABLE 1

Interpreters Entering the Field Before 2004

Question	Subject	Score for own group	Score for other group	Difference
2	Feeling valued	4.21	4.15	.06
3	Feeling comfortable	4.25	4.03	.22
4	Feeling supported	3.88	3.53	.35
5	Results of making mistakes	3.26	2.57	.69
6	Feeling valued for skill	3.80	3.75	.05
7	Satisfied with interactions	4.26	3.98	.28
8	Trust in others	3.41	2.95	.46
9	Trust others have in you	3.58	3.40	.18

TABLE 2

Interpreters Entering the Field Since 2004

Question	Subject	Score for own group	Score for other group	Difference
2	Feeling valued	3.91	3.13	.78
3	Feeling comfortable	3.91	3.19	.72
4	Feeling supported	3.88	3.65	.23
5	Results of making mistakes	2.75	2.33	.42
6	Feeling valued for skill	3.77	3.39	.38
7	Satisfied with interactions	4.20	3.50	.70
8	Trust in others	3.07	3.32	-.25
9	Trust others have in you	3.33	2.89	.44

As previously stated, no statistical testing was done on the survey data, because its purpose was to determine whether evidence supported a deeper investigation of this phenomenon through interviews. The differences in the mean answers revealed that such evidence did exist, so no additional analysis was done on this preliminary evidence.

It is interesting to note that, other than question eight for the newer interpreters, both groups rated their own group more positively than the opposite group for each question. Also, for five of the eight questions, the newer interpreters had a larger difference in feelings, preferring their group to the opposite group by a greater margin than the more experienced interpreters preferred their own group. Both groups reported the lowest scores, or the most negative feelings, in the area of whether they felt they needed to justify themselves to other interpreters after making a mistake. Also interesting to note is that, with the exception of the way new interpreters perceived experienced interpreters' feelings about them, each group believed others trusted them more than they

trusted others. This suggests that there is a gap between the amount of trust interpreters perceive others to have in them and the amount of trust interpreters actually have in one another.

Interview Results

The interviews were coded using an open coding format (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). As I read the transcripts, utterances that seemed significant were given codes. I did not code for horizontal violence or any thematic idea in order to allow coding to be focused on data collection and leave the interpretation and analysis for after data was collected and gathered.

Each interviewee has been given a pseudonym for this paper in order to preserve their privacy. Rhoda and Olga are the two people who have entered the field since 2004, and Sophia and Iris are the two people who entered the field prior to 2004. Table 3 shows how many times each participant’s responses were labeled with specific codes. The first column on the left lists each of the codes that were used to label responses. The next four columns show how many times a code was used to label responses for each participant. The last column totals how many times each code was assigned to utterances by the two newer interpreters, the two more experienced interpreters, and the total is given.

TABLE 3

Interview Codes

Codes	Rhoda	Olga	Sophia	Iris	New/Experienced/All
Negative about new	9	3	3	3	12/6/18
Positive about new	2	2	1	3	4/4/8
New = ITP	4	2	1	2	6/3/9
Positive about experienced	0	4	2	2	4/4/8
Negative about experienced	16	1	1	2	17/3/20

Disposition [attitude] (new)	8	0	2	2	8/4/12
Disposition [attitude] (experienced)	9	1	0	0	10/0/10
New = confidence	0	0	2	0	0/2/2
Statements about skills	3	1	3		4/3/7
What experienced should do	3	1	2	1	4/3/7
What new should do	1	0	0	0	1/0/1
Fear	8	0	1	2	8/3/11
Judgment	19	1	1	2	20/3/23
Self = experienced	1	2	1	3	3/4/7
Self does not equal new	16	3	0	0	19/0/19
Definition of generations	10	1	0	0	11/0/11
Competitive	6	0	0	0	6/0/6
“middle generation”/positive group/polarization	6	0	1	2	6/3/9
Self = new	1	0	0	3	1/3/4
Different standards for new vs. more experienced	1	1	0	0	2/0/2
Defending own choices	6	0	0	0	6/0/6

Interpretation of Results

At the beginning of this research, my hypothesis was that the survey would reveal evidence of intergenerational conflict between newer and more experienced interpreters, and that the interviews would provide a description of people’s experiences with this conflict. What I found was surprising and unexpected: evidence of a culture of horizontal violence within the interpreting profession.

The average survey response numbers indicated that each group felt more comfortable with their own group, and that this effect was greater for newer interpreters,

which provided the preliminary evidence of intergenerational tension necessary to do interviews on the subject. Additionally, the survey comments supported these results, with several comments about intergenerational tension. The interviews also provided responses that indicated some experience of intergenerational conflict, which makes sense in light of the larger finding of evidence of horizontal violence.

While survey responses did indicate intergenerational tension, comments also indicated a general sense of negativity that was not generationally bound. This was indicated through comments like, “Some people are easier to talk with than others, regardless of years of experience,” and “I have met interpreters on both sides of experience who were totally unsupportive...I haven’t found this to be an ‘experienced’ or not issue.” This finding was supported in the interviews, where I did find evidence of intergenerational tension, but I also found evidence of tension as a whole, which was also not bound to specific generational concerns. As I noticed some of these elements of the interview and survey responses that did not fit a narrative of intergenerational conflict, I discovered that the responses did seem to bear uncanny resemblance to the concept of horizontal violence.

In the surveys, comments revealed that interpreters of both generations perceived judgment at the hands of other interpreters any time one admits not knowing something. This comment, made by a more experienced interpreter on the survey, captures the feeling of judgment well.

I feel “seasoned” interpreters judge you on your confidence. If you admit you don’t know something, or have some additional learning to do, then you are viewed as incompetent. Newer interpreters, while in that phase of looking up to “seasoned” interpreters, expect that we are 100% up to date on current processes of teaching interpreting.

This comment was revealing, since it came from a more experienced interpreter. It shows that even though this person is a more experienced interpreter, he or she has scars from bad experiences with interpreters who are perhaps even more experienced than this person is. Such a comment was particularly interesting when compared to another comment that was also made by a more experienced interpreter on the survey.

I think “seasoned” interpreters often think that they know all there is to know about interpreting. I often think that the perspective is to get those CEUs to remain certified, but no one can really teach them much more than they already know.

This statement paralleled the previous one. The previous commenter expressed that there is pressure to constantly appear as if one knows everything, and this person expressed concern with the fact that interpreters behave as if they know everything. Those two comments, both from more experienced interpreters, described in a small way what the literature review revealed about cycles of horizontal violence. Cultures of horizontal violence include a pressure for the status quo to be maintained. In this case, if everyone behaves as if they already know everything, others perceive this and feel pressured to behave the same way.

A survey participant from the group of newer interpreters summed this situation up nicely.

Though I feel supported by interpreters of my approximate level, as I move towards becoming a more experienced interpreter, that gap seems to widen and I can see how the cycle carries through to the next generation.

This person was expressing his or her understanding that the cycle of mistrust and dissatisfying interactions happens and starts early. This, too, fit with the literature about horizontal violence (Baltimore, 2006). All three comments seem to be describing the situation of a cycle that feeds itself. Given the literature about horizontal violence, it

makes sense that I initially found some evidence of intergenerational tension, but found wider evidence of a culture of general tension. Literature suggests that horizontal violence is a culture that pervades whole fields, but that it happens more intensely to new professionals (Spence et al., 2012; Gavish & Freedman, 2011). An example of a new interpreter describing the experience of this culture having more of an impact on new interpreters, as the literature describes, was expressed poignantly in this comment from the survey.

Throughout school and practicum, it is very disheartening to be called ‘babies’ to indicate our immaturity in the field and then be able to consider yourself a professional, in both your own and others’ eyes once graduation has happened. Due to this, the level of trust with more experienced interpreters, for me at least, is nil.

The above comment aligns with the work of Ferris and Kline (2009) and Curtis and Rasool (1997) who found that cultures of horizontal violence begin to be spread to students before they graduate their training programs. Iris echoed this comment in the interviews, saying the following about interpreters finishing up their training programs:

I also notice that some of them suffer from serious self-esteem issues, because it seems that in our ITP programs, we take so much time tearing them down to build them back up, that building back up process doesn’t happen, so when we get them in the field, they still suffer from...really low self esteem...

This was a striking example of what researchers were talking about with horizontal violence beginning in training programs. As a more experienced interpreter who is a member of the professional community, it was notable that Iris was able to notice and comment on the fact that this problem starts in training programs, despite the fact that she is not involved in any training programs. This phenomenon appears to be powerful enough for community members to notice it.

Survey comments also revealed that interpreters feel constrained in decision-making because of what others may think. Another more experienced interpreter commented on the survey, “I feel that any time a mistake is made, you are ‘called out’ on it. If you can’t justify why your choice was made you look incompetent.” This comment expresses what Musanti and Pence (2010) discovered in their research about horizontal violence among teachers, that teachers are hesitant to be observed because they believe other teachers would watch with the goal of finding fault. A new interpreter echoed this feeling of constraint in decision-making by saying:

You never know how strictly someone else interprets the code of ethics. Some people believe confidentiality means never speak of a job to anyone. Others are more flexible in their interpretation and believe without identifying details, a conversation between two interpreters bound by the COE can be appropriate.

These expressions of uncertainty echoed Baltimore’s (2006) finding that one factor that worsens horizontal violence is the stress of always being worried that an experience of it is right around the corner. These interpreters’ concerns about looking incompetent because of a mistake and not being able to tell what another person will think of a behavior were examples, from our field, of this phenomenon. Another more experienced interpreter from the survey made a comment that succinctly captures the reality that instances of horizontal violence are frequent and not necessarily predictable in this statement, “I have seen my share of back stabbing.”

Dean and Pollard (2001) and Lee and Llwellyn (2011) have written about the stress that comes from feeling constrained in one’s decision making because of outside factors, and Laschinger et al. (2012) supported their ideas from the field of nursing. Above all, it is stress that causes horizontal violence. The stress comes from many areas, such as the experience of being close to oppression, feeling powerless, and having

subordinate professional status, but scholars agree that stress is the factor that precipitates horizontal violence (Bartholomew, 2006; Dellasega, 2011).

The comments that indicated a feeling of needing to justify one's choices in the face of others' presumably judgmental thoughts or comments appeared not only in the surveys and in the literature, but in the interviews as well (Musanti and Pence, 2010). Rhoda's interview contained the most explicit comments that indicated an underlying habit of justifying her choices to others; she made six statements that had an element of her justifying her choices to the interviewer. In telling a story about a negative situation with a more experienced interpreter, Rhoda made comments such as

I'm somebody who's like, "Is the goal being conveyed, are we doing all of this"...there's a lot of other components to it, and these people will make you feel small about missing, like a minor detail that even correcting it and adding it in would throw and skew the message, and so, like I might elect to omit it purposefully...

In this anecdote, Rhoda was talking about the negative way another interpreter treated her when she chose to omit a minor detail of the source language in her interpretation. She made several comments like this one, where in the midst of recounting how she was treated, she justified the fact that her omission was purposeful and not a mistake, going so far as to give an example of the type of minor detail she was talking about in order to justify that its omission was indeed warranted.

Literature supported the finding that professionals are hesitant to be observed and to work together with one another based on the belief that others will only seek to criticize them (Musanti & Pence, 2010). The literature also supported the idea that those in fields experiencing horizontal violence are always on guard for another experience of horizontal violence, which causes a great deal of stress, which feeds back into the cycle

of horizontal violence (Baltimore, 2006). Since this literature indicated that the combination of hesitance for one's work to be observed or discussed and persistent anxiety that a negative and scarring experience is about to happen, it makes sense that both the surveys and the interviews gave evidence of the need to justify one's choices to other professionals. The finding that indicated that survey and interview participants felt the need to justify their choices to others and even to me surprised me, but once I learned about horizontal violence, that puzzle piece seemed to snap into place.

The pervasive sense of having to justify decisions is related to the feeling of not wanting to be observed, as Musanti and Pence (2010) found in the field of education. While Rhoda's interview contained direct evidence of defending her choices, Olga's interview expressed the feeling of hesitancy to be observed in quite a different way. Olga, the other newer interpreter, had an interview that differed from the other three in a stark way. While Rhoda, Iris, and Sophia were open and willing to talk, Olga was hesitant and at times seemed quite unwilling to answer the questions. When asked "What is your general impression of or how would you describe more experienced interpreters," which came just after the same question asked about newer interpreters, Olga's response was, "I guess I don't, uh, I know that you can't explain it anymore you said, I don't understand, um (pause) I don't know, I don't know how to answer that." After the interviewer clarified that this question was the same as the previous question about new interpreters, except that this was about more experienced interpreters, she said, "I don't know. I really, I don't know what you're going for there, I'm sorry. I feel like they are more experienced...I don't know what else to say, I'm sorry." Later in Olga's interview, when she was asked to think of a time she interacted with the group of more experienced

interpreters and describe what came to mind, she said, “Um (pause) we, ugh, I feel like these are, are hard questions because I’m not sure what kind of interaction. Like a teaming interaction, a personal interaction...” The interviewer responded by telling her she could use any of those situations, anything that came to mind, and asked if that helped. She responded, “Ok, um (pause) no” before giving a short description of a situation that came to mind.

In listening to the tape, it was difficult for me to transcribe the paralinguistic cues I noticed, but my interpretation of them was that Olga sounded defensive and unwilling to answer the questions. Surely, that’s a limitation of doing a research study with only one researcher, because no one could corroborate that interpretation. One could interpret her comments and her tone as genuine confusion, but that does not seem likely, given that the first question she struggled with was identical to the question before it, except the word “new” was replaced with the word “more experienced,” and she had no trouble answering it the first time. Another interpretation might be that she simply had very little to say, but her tone, the hesitations, and clarifying statements she made seem to make that theory unlikely, as well. Given this, I believe the most accurate way to interpret her comments and her tone was that she was expressing a feeling of defensiveness.

Because it was so difficult to pin down and it was different from the other interviews, I ignored the sense of reticence I picked up from Olga and only coded her transcribed utterances for content, as I did with the others. Later, once I read about horizontal violence, I came upon Musanti and Pence’s (2010) research about professionals who experience horizontal violence being unwilling to be observed and even discuss their work with other professionals for fear of judgment and horizontal

violence. I realized that an explanation for Olga's defensiveness was that it was a symptom of her experience with horizontal violence. Rhoda's subtle justifications of her decisions in a narrative about experiencing horizontal violence were a clear symptom of this, and I also believe that Olga's comments were indeed defensive in nature, and that this was symptomatic of the same problem.

In any qualitative research study, the researcher cannot be fully separated from the research (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), and the fact that the research participants are people means that everyone involved had assumptions and biases about the process. These can be identified and their impact can be minimized through careful methodological design, which is what I did when I asked another person to conduct the interviews. I was hoping to minimize my impact on the situation by removing myself from the interview setting, so that interviewees did not have to wonder about my motivations while answering the questions. I also tried to minimize the impact by clearly explaining why another person would be asking the interview questions and explaining the process to the participants several times. Despite all these efforts, it was still the case that as the researcher, I remained connected to this study, and it was very possible that participants may have wondered about my motives in doing this study. Because I am a professional interpreter and so was the interviewer, and because participants knew this, it was true that interpreters were talking to other interpreters about their feelings about interpreting. Musanti and Pence (2010) noted that some professionals experiencing horizontal violence are hesitant to talk to others in their fields about their feelings. Perhaps Olga's demeanor was indeed a symptom of her experiences with horizontal violence, like Rhoda's justifications of her behavior appeared to be.

It is noteworthy that Olga and Rhoda are both newer interpreters, and research suggests that new professionals experience the effects of horizontal violence more severely, which aligns with what Rhoda's and Olga's interviews demonstrated. This was consistent with the literature from nursing and teaching (Spence et al., 2012; Gavish & Freedman, 2011).

Another element of horizontal violence that came through in the interviews was the fact that all four interviewees were aware of negative experiences with more experienced interpreters. When asked their opinion about the perception from the surveys, expressed by both sides of the generational divide, that this is a field where anyone with more experience might judge one's mistakes harshly, all four people were familiar with the idea that this may happen. Olga, who was unsure about answering some of the other questions, expressed some uncertainty about this question too, but said "...if I were to work with an interpreter who I didn't know, who was more experienced...I might feel like, hmm, that they were disappointed that maybe I didn't know something." Even given her hesitation about taking a stand on other questions, this came to mind for her when asked what survey participants may have been getting at with those comments.

The other interviewees also quickly thought of examples of this phenomenon. When asked what her experiences with more experienced interpreters were like when she was newer, more experienced interpreter Sophia responded:

That varied. Some of them were very intimidating and some of them were not helpful and understanding and if I was struggling or made a mistake, instead of just being encouraging and feeding me, it'd be like, "oh, ugh, just let me do it." Um, but that, that was rare, thank goodness...I think that there were a lot, um, a lot more encouraging, even thought...the intimidation part was just my own stuff I'm sure...

Sophia's response is telling, because while she made sure to explain that overall, her experience with more experienced interpreters when she was new was a positive one, what came to her mind first was a certain (perhaps even small) number of negative experiences. At first, my instinct was to think that this kind of comment was not indicative of horizontal violence, because her ending assessment was that her experiences were mostly positive. Then, I read the literature, and I saw that several scholars have stated that horizontal violence is certainly not a constant experience in people's lives, but that even a few negative experiences leave long-lasting scars (Bartholomew, 2006; Dellasega, 2011; Laschinger et al., 2012; Lewis, 2004). Ferster's and Skinner's (1957) research about intermittent reinforcement illustrated that a situation that repeats on an unpredictable schedule trains one's brain to be at the ready for it for a long time. Nursing and education scholars agree that even a few negative experiences with horizontal violence leave long-lasting scars (Bartholomew, 2006; Dellasega, 2011; Laschinger et al., 2012; Lewis, 2004). From this perspective, Sophia's remarks could be consistent with experiences of horizontal violence. She did not characterize her general experiences as negative, but negativity was what initially came to mind for her, even though this was not the question about why some people report negative experiences. This reaction was almost exactly what Laschinger et. al, (2012) and Lewis (2004) found in their studies.

Iris, the other more experienced interviewee, expressed a similar sentiment. When asked how she would describe more experienced interpreters, her response was:

Experienced interpreters to me are either cocky and very egotistical and hard to get along with and very old school, or they are very encouraging, very much a part of the mentoring that needs to happen in our field...So, it, it, there doesn't seem to be an in between. There just seems to be either one or the other.

She also expressed positive feelings about many other interpreters, but the negative experiences stood out enough to merit mention. Her comment expressed a polarization; she thought of experiences that are either positive or memorably negative, not much in between. Expressed another way, she may be thinking of experiences that are either appropriate for professionals or experiences that have the hallmarks of horizontal violence.

Rhoda also expressed the idea that even a few negative experiences leave lasting scars numerous times in her interview. At one point, after a lengthy discussion about why survey respondents may have expressed the perception that people at all experience levels have interactions with people slightly higher up on the experience ladder that are negative, she said:

I think, if you're, if you're made to feel little once, you're gonna feel very nervous about having, about feeling that way again...I think there is always that underlying nervousness of, like, "I have to ask somebody who's more experienced, but I don't want to look dumb in front of them, and I don't want to look ignorant, um, or really such a novice,"...one bad experience with a more experienced interpreter can really, really be a detriment, I think...

Rhoda's comments starkly expressed the fear Bartholomew (2006) found in nursing. The idea that just a few bad experiences can create fear for the future and a sense of always having to be in a defensive position against future negative experiences is acute here. Like Sophia, Olga, and Iris, Rhoda also made a statement characterizing more experienced interpreters, in general, though hers was the opposite of what Sophia and Iris expressed. Early in Rhoda's interview, she described experienced interpreters who value both mentorship and helping bring new people into the community in a productive way as "few and far between...for people who've been more experienced."

As the previous statements demonstrated, all four participants expressed familiarity with the idea that interpreters of all generations have negative encounters with more experienced interpreters. I found it startling that all four participants, across the generational boundary, expressed this idea in several different ways, in response to several different interview questions. I had anticipated that at least one person might express surprise at the idea that interpreters often report negative experiences at the hands of more experienced professionals, but this was not the case.

Rhoda's interview expressed evidence of another facet of horizontal violence. She mentioned "gatekeepers" several times in her interview, with comments about how there are experienced interpreters in her community that use their professional capital to prevent new people who do not meet with their approval from gaining entry into the professional community. De Wet (2011) discussed the use of authority and power to prevent advancement as an element of horizontal violence in education. Scholars such as Patterson (2005) in education and Bartholomew (2006) in nursing have also discussed the idea of powerful, experienced members of a profession using horizontal violence to maintain the status quo by ensuring that new people pay their dues, enduring a kind of hazing.

Rhoda used the word "gatekeepers" for this phenomenon of more experienced interpreters who use their authority to allow or deny access to the professional community several times, and as mentioned previously, Rhoda's conclusion was that this type of more experienced interpreter is more common than the open, welcoming more experienced interpreter. Rhoda's comments included:

I've actually heard them say, "Like, you're there, but not yet, like you're just not quite to me" kind of thing...so I think there's that, there's a glass ceiling. There

are definitely gatekeepers, at least in my local community, and those are all the, those more experienced interpreters, and here you really have to, uh, suck up to the right one. To get in. Um, so, that's what I feel in a general sense from more experienced interpreters, is like, "You're never gonna be on that level, so you better respect me. And I hold all the jobs, so you better suck up to me in the right way. Or I better like you. And if I don't like you, you're not going to work. Or I will make sure that you don't."

Later in her interview, she said:

I think our less experienced interpreters are more nervous to ask [for some type of help] because they're afraid if they ask it then they're gonna look stupid and they're not gonna get jobs, because it's so competitive here, like, "Oh, you should've known that," like, "Hmm, keep that in the back of your mind, you know, now you're not gonna get as many jobs," so, I, I think that happens, too, because there are those gatekeepers, and it's kinda like which gatekeeper can you navigate enough to...you know, not be too nervous to ask and still get the answer that you seek...

In the literature, see Patterson (2005) and Bartholomew (2006), the idea of professionals using their power to restrict access to the professional community has nuance, and Rhoda expressed that nuance here. She did not accuse people of doing this purposefully, but she described the feelings of being on the receiving end of an experience like this in great detail. Patterson (2005) and Bartholomew (2006) agreed that those Rhoda would call "gatekeepers," at least in education and nursing, are likely not aware of this perception of their behavior, nor are they deliberately attempting to restrict access to the community. Both authors have agreed, though, that regardless of the authoritative person's intentions or awareness of the situation, the affected party experiences a great deal of stress, and it appears Rhoda would agree.

Another interesting finding that came from the interviews was the way Olga, Rhoda, and Iris identified themselves in the continuum of experience levels. Despite the fact that, for the purposes of this research, Olga and Rhoda were considered newer

interpreters, because they entered the field after 2004, both of them made several statements that separated themselves from the category of “new” interpreters.

Rhoda had 16 comments that I coded “self does not equal new,” indicating that she was distancing herself from the category of “new” interpreters. She did this by using “they” and not “we” to talk about new interpreters, as well as using the word “students” frequently when she talked about new interpreters. At one point, she said, “I am starting to see a pattern of students, and I say students meaning new interpreters, newer interpreters who are maybe only a year or two into it...” which distances her from the “new” category in a few ways. Using the word “students” explicitly to refer to new interpreters separates her, since she is not a student, as does specifically mentioning an amount of experience, since she told me that she, like Olga, has between five and six years of experience. Later in her answer to the same question of what comes to mind when she thinks about “new interpreters,” which did not ask her to define that category since this research study had already defined that, she said, “...and so I guess I kind of look at new interpreters as like, people who have only been out for a year or two...” again mentioning a specific timeframe that excludes her.

Rhoda made several comments about people who have been out of their programs for six months or a year, which seemed to be a very specific way to divide time and experience level in order to make generalizations, but did serve to further separate her from the “new” category. She went on to describe her definition of the generational categories, saying, “I see that newer generation as like one or two years, and then I feel like there’s this other middle generation, um, which is a little, a little different.” She mentioned the “younger, like one or two year generation” another time before redefining

her idea of generational boundaries by saying, “I look at [the] newer generation as one to two, maybe three years of working. Then I feel like there’s this middle generation...” which she went on to describe as the generation with the appropriately positive mindset and behaviors.

Olga also made statements that distanced herself from the new category, beginning by answering the question about what comes to mind when she thinks of newer interpreters by, like Rhoda, talking about students. She said:

I feel like I have, uh, worked with some recent grads or people who are not yet graduating...and there’s some of them who are, have been doing a good job, somebody who I would say, “Oh, that’s pretty good for a recent grad,” but there’s been quite a few where I’ve been disappointed that they’re gonna be graduating soon.

She continued to associate new interpreters with students or “recent grads,” and later when she expressed confusion and hesitancy about being asked to describe more experienced interpreters, when she did answer, she used the word “we,” which seemed to place her in the category of more experienced interpreters. She did this more starkly later, when she gave an example of a more experienced interpreter. She said “I work with an interpreter who has, um, I think four or five years of experience...” and then characterized that person in a very positive light. This was in response to the question about more experienced interpreters. She chose someone for this example who had the same amount of experience Olga herself has, despite the fact that for this study, that person (and Olga) would not be in the category of more experienced interpreters, which is quite interesting. The fact that Olga may consider herself more experienced might also speak to her hesitancy to answer the questions, if she worried that I was trying to paint more experienced interpreters, a category with which she seems to identify, in a negative light.

It also may explain what seemed like confusion when she was asked to describe more experienced interpreters. It seemed like she did not understand the category, and if she was trying to reconcile the category with which she identified (more experienced) with the category the study defined as more experienced (not including someone with her level of experience), that could have created her apparent confusion.

Olga and Rhoda also both used language about new interpreters suggesting that they have different standards for “good” when it comes to new people, further highlighting that they did not identify with that group. Olga said, “pretty good for a recent grad” and, “pretty good beginning interpreters,” while Rhoda talked about what she would expect “even from a novice,” and at one point used the word “newbies.”

The fact that both Olga and Rhoda distanced themselves from being considered new and that twice, Olga identified herself as fitting the category of more experienced interpreters was surprising to me, since for this study, neither of them fit the category of more experienced interpreter. Bartholomew (2006) found the same phenomenon when interviewing someone she considered a new nurse, one with five years of experience. She was surprised to find this nurse talk in a harsh way about the need for new nurses to pay their dues like she had, explicitly placing herself in the category of more experienced nurses.

Iris, one of the more experienced interpreters, also made an interesting comment relevant to self-identification in generations. In the beginning, when asked about new interpreters, Iris used words like “they,” which disassociated herself from that category. She also associated herself with more experienced interpreters by using the word “us” when talking about “seasoned interpreters.” This makes sense, because by the definitions

of this study, Iris is a more experienced interpreter, with around 20 years of experience. Interestingly, though, when asked about the survey respondents' comments that indicated a perception that interpreters at all levels experience judgment from those slightly higher on the experience chain, Iris identified herself in the category of new interpreters. She said:

I think that comes from the fact that some of our older, more experienced interpreters, I term it as "eating our young." Our younger interpreters are afraid to ask questions because sometimes *we* get looks of, "Ugh, I can't believe you don't know that," whereas our interpreter training programs are not standardized, so we don't all know the same thing because we haven't all learned the same thing, um, I think that's where that comes from, and a lot of *us* operate under the "fake it till we make it" kinda mentality, because *we* don't want to be looked down upon by the certified interpreters or older interpreters. (Emphasis mine.)

This was quite surprising. Three times in this comment, Iris explicitly identified herself with the group of new interpreters, despite the fact that she has nearly 20 years of experience. She also speaks about being looked down upon by certified interpreters, despite the fact that she is a certified interpreter. Clearly, Iris knew that she is certified and has almost 20 years of experience, and earlier in the interview she identified with more experienced interpreters, even when she made comments that did not portray experienced interpreters in the most positive way. It seems, then, that in this comment, she was flashing back to the mindset of being a newer interpreter experiencing horizontal violence at the hands of a more experienced interpreter. This is a powerful example of what Bartholomew (2006) and others meant when they said that a few experiences with horizontal violence leave deep scars.

It is also interesting to note that of the four interviewees, Iris gave the most equal portrayal of new interpreters, making three positive and three negative statements about them. The other three participants all made more negative statements about new

interpreters than positive statements. If Iris, however consciously, identifies with the group of new interpreters, it makes sense that she portrayed them in the most balanced way. It seems clear that Olga and Rhoda, whether consciously or not, tried to disassociate themselves from new interpreters, and Sophia has approximately 20 years of experience, so she is also not a new interpreter by any definition. If those three participants did not identify with new interpreters at all, it makes sense that their characterizations were more negative than positive and Iris' perspective was more balanced, since the first three were talking about a group in which they did not claim membership, and Iris was discussing a group with which she appears to feel some connection. The surprising element of this was the fact that Iris, with approximately 20 years of experience, identified herself in the new category three times.

The previous findings gave evidence to the idea that a culture of horizontal violence may exist in the interpreting field by illustrating how participants are aware of and have experienced the effects of it. The following findings indicated evidence of horizontal violence in interpreting in that participants' comments gave evidence of their perpetrating such a culture. It is important to note that, if indeed this is evidence of horizontal violence, it would not be appropriate to accuse participants in this study or interpreters, in general, of purposefully being violent toward others. Research is clear that horizontal violence is a pernicious culture that is both experienced by and perpetrated by members of a group (Freire, 1992; Funk, 2002). The fact that members of a group are both victims and perpetrators of damaging behavior is one element that makes it so pernicious; it becomes difficult to identify and name (Bartholomew, 2006). People may know it happens, but it is difficult to identify anyone more specific than a generic "other"

who perpetrates it because each individual can legitimately claim victimhood. It is important, then, that the following findings are read in the same way the previous findings were, with an eye toward wondering whether this is indeed evidence of a culture of horizontal violence in our field. It would be inappropriate to scapegoat these participants in any way, rather, their experiences and comments should be taken as the authentic experiences and narratives of people who work in this field, which can perhaps provide a window into a wider cultural phenomenon.

Potential evidence of horizontal violence became clear in the way all four participants spoke about other interpreters, most often newer interpreters. I found this particularly startling from Rhoda and Olga, who were the newer interpreters. Perhaps, it was most startling from Rhoda, whose comments depicted painful encounters and diminished feelings at the hands of more experienced interpreters. When Rhoda characterized newer interpreters, which was the first question for all interviewees, she began with two positive statements about new interpreters (students, actually, from one specific training program with which she has some type of affiliation), saying, “I see a lot of motivated people, and a lot of people who are very much wanting to build that camaraderie within the profession.” She continued by making four negative comments about new interpreters, saying that they are too detached from the Deaf community, that they have dismissive attitudes about spending time with Deaf people, that they have the erroneous and arrogant belief that a degree from a training program makes them superior to others, and that they do not respect more experienced interpreters. She went on to talk about new interpreters’ skills being sub-par, “even for a novice,” but I believe it is noteworthy that so many negative comments about new interpreters’ attitudes came so

early on in her interview. This was especially interesting in light of her comments later on, expressing jadedness about other people perceiving new interpreters in a negative light based on a stereotype of their experience level.

Olga, too, made negative comments about new interpreters, though hers primarily focused on skill; she did not make comments about new interpreters' dispositions or attitudes. Her general impression of newer interpreters (again, students or recent graduates) was that they are often not skilled enough to handle the work, and Olga wondered why training programs allowed them to graduate. It would be interesting to interview Olga and Rhoda again and specifically ask them to characterize "the group of interpreters that includes you," because as mentioned previously, they both worked linguistically to distance themselves from the category of new, despite the fact that this study would classify them as such.

Sophia and Iris also made negative comments about newer interpreters. Sophia described them as not patient, not empathetic, and not flexible. She also spoke about their confidence level by saying:

Well, what I've noticed is there seems to be a lot more confidence than when I think back to when I was new and starting, um, what that comes from exactly I'm not sure, the ITP program, I don't know. Um, a lot more willingness to jump in and stretch themselves, get their feet wet, um, even if, you know, it was way beyond what they should've attempted.

This could be a positive statement, but she also could be describing arrogance, especially since she went on to talk about new interpreters' lack of empathy and lack of necessary flexibility. Later in her interview, she contrasted new interpreters' confidence to the level of confidence her generation had when they were new, mentioning that her generation started off in a more timid way that seems to be gone now. In her description of more

experienced interpreters, Sophia characterized them as having the appropriate level of confidence that comes with time, as well as having the necessary flexibility and empathy that she previously said new interpreters generally lack.

Iris gave the most balanced portrayal of new interpreters; she was the only participant who had the same amount of positive and negative comments about new people. Still, her negative comments included that new interpreters often “do not have the life experience” and “lack a work ethic from time to time.” She also described them as often cocky. Iris saw polarization more often than the others, expressing that more experienced interpreters are either good and supportive or cocky and egotistical with no in between. Her description of new interpreters was not quite as polarized, but her final sentence did incorporate such a dichotomy, saying she sees new interpreters who are either suffering from low self-esteem at the hands of training programs or new interpreters who are cocky and arrogant.

Finally, several interviewees used dismissive language about new interpreters. Olga’s comment that some new interpreters have skills she would deem “pretty good for a recent grad” and Rhoda’s comment that many new interpreters do not have the skills she would hope for, “even from a novice” indicated that they may have had a different standard in their mind by which they measure new interpreters. Rhoda made comments later in her interview indicating that she does not appreciate being considered a new interpreter, that she would prefer to be evaluated as an individual, so one could draw the conclusion that Olga and Rhoda have a double standard that diminishes new interpreters, by which they may prefer not to be measured. Rhoda and Sophia also used dismissive language about new interpreters, both using the word “newbie.” Rhoda and Olga used the

terms “students” and “recent grads” to refer to newer interpreters, terms which Sophia and Iris did not use. While “students” and “recent grads” are not themselves dismissive terms, one could assume that using it to characterize new interpreters, not actual students, is perhaps not what those new professionals might wish to be called. It is certainly not what Olga and Rhoda would wish to be called, given their efforts to distance themselves from those terms, though an interpreter with 20 years of experience might legitimately look at someone who has been working in the field for five or six years and label that person a recent graduate.

One poignant survey comment can provide perspective on the issue of dismissive language, indicating that new interpreters are aware of this tendency and experience it as horizontal violence. Despite the fact that the survey did not ask about types of labels people use for different groups of interpreters, one survey respondent, as quoted above, said, “it is very disheartening to be called ‘babies’ to indicate our immaturity in the field and then be able to consider yourself a professional...Due to this, the level of trust with more experienced interpreters, for me at least, is nil.”

Given that horizontal violence is not specifically generational in nature, if indeed it is happening in the interpreting field, it makes sense that all four participants also made negative comments about more experienced interpreters. I found that everyone said negative things about both generations, which is, perhaps, indicative of a culture of horizontal violence, a condition that is not bound by specific generations (Freire, 1992; Bartholomew, 2006; Funk, 2002; Katrinli et al., 2010). Three of the four participants made more negative comments about new people than about more experienced people, which also holds with literature stating that while horizontal violence is not specifically

generational, it is experienced more severely by new professionals given their relative lack of status and power (Cleary et al., 2009). Still, they each made negative comments about more experienced interpreters, as well.

Sophia characterized more experienced interpreters as intimidating. Iris, as previously mentioned, characterized more experienced interpreters in a dichotomous way, with half the dichotomy being cocky and egotistical. Rhoda shared her own definitions of the generations of interpreters many times, and described the older generation as being impatient with the mindset of “we’re in this together,” and not patient with having new interpreters in the field. All four participants characterized more experienced interpreters as being impatient with someone who makes a mistake or does not know something, which is what the survey respondents also said. This was evidence of horizontal violence from two perspectives. One way to look at the unanimity of this sentiment is that survey participants and interview participants alike were aware of horizontal violence and could name one manifestation of it in the description of other interpreters as impatient with mistakes. This would be consistent with Baltimore’s (2006) observation that one element of a culture of horizontal violence is those with more experience (at any level, not just newer and more experienced interpreters as a whole) shaming anyone with less experience by projecting an attitude of “I can’t believe you didn’t know that” (p. 29).

Another way to look at this, though, is that evidence of the perpetuation of horizontal violence was present in the fact that each person, at some point, characterized more experienced interpreters in this negative way. This shows how the culture of horizontal violence is strengthened, through labeling the “other” with a negative

stereotype of behavior. Rather than identifying it as a cultural characteristic of interpreters, that all interpreters may exhibit the unfortunate tendency to judge others for not knowing something (a behavior both Olga and Rhoda displayed in this very same interview), participants instead characterized a group of interpreters as the culprits for this negative behavior. Given that scapegoating and criticism are both elements of horizontal violence, it makes sense that this evidence pointed toward such a culture in this field (Begley and Glacken, 2004). The fact that all four participants made negative comments about both new and more experienced interpreters could be interpreted to say that all four participants made negative comments about all interpreters, given that I divided “all interpreters” into just two groups for the original purpose of this study. Since horizontal violence is a cultural trend where members of a culture are all perpetrators and victims, this evidence was consistent with such a culture.

As mentioned previously in the context of Musanti and Pence’s (2010) finding that horizontal violence is characterized by a professionals’ unwillingness to be observed and discuss their work with other professionals, Olga’s unusual demeanor was puzzling to me when I began analyzing the data. She seemed confused at some points, which was surprising since no one else was confused by the questions, and since she understood questions similar to the ones over which she expressed confusion. At other points, though, her tone sounded almost defensive. The question she had the most trouble with was, “What is your general impression of or how would you describe more experienced interpreters?” The first question was the same question about newer interpreters, which she answered without much hesitation. There are many possible explanations for her confusion, and certainly other researchers might not have characterized her tone as

defensive. Given that she had six utterances in a row expressing confusion and hesitancy to answer the question, and answered “no” when the interviewer asked if her repeated clarifications helped at all, my interpretation of the situation was hesitancy, confusion, and a defensive tone. I was inclined to dismiss this finding as irrelevant until I discovered one relevant point in the literature from Bartholomew (2006) and Patterson (2005) and another in Olga’s interview. First, Olga went further than Rhoda in distancing herself from the category of new interpreters and identifying with more experienced interpreters, even though that was not consistent with the definitions used for this project. This distancing led me to wonder whether she had the assumption that my goal in this interview, being in the category of newer interpreters myself, was to portray more experienced interpreters in a negative light. If indeed we both work in a field with horizontal violence, it makes sense that she might not have trusted my motives and she might have been behaving in a defensive way based on prior experiences, as Ferster and Skinner (1957) and Bartholomew (2006) might suppose.

The finding in the literature that made this seem relevant was Bartholomew’s (2006) and Patterson’s (2005) discussion of the fact that denial of the situation is a common trait of cultures of horizontal violence. In both nursing and education, not only were perpetrators unaware of the impact of their behaviors (possibly because perpetrators are also victims), but many members of the professions did not believe horizontal violence or hazing was a reality of their field. Since denial is a common part of horizontal violence, I saw Olga’s reticence in a new light. I still suspect that she may not have trusted my motives for the study, especially since participants knew I was looking to see whether evidence of intergenerational communication conflict existed. Now, I also

suspect that regardless of whether she held the assumption that I was trying to scapegoat more experienced interpreters (the group with which she seems to identify), she may also have had a problem with the idea that I was looking for evidence of intergenerational conflict. If she works in a field with horizontal violence, which I now hypothesize that she and all the participants do, she might also feel defensive about the idea that one might characterize the field in such a way, preferring to deny that such conflict happens. There are several explanations for Olga's unusual demeanor that all point to horizontal violence in some way.

More evidence of horizontal violence came out in the way participants spoke about interpreter training programs (ITPs). Upon initial coding of the data, I noticed that all four people mentioned ITPs and mentorship, but I suspected that would not be relevant to the synthesis of results. Once again, this assumption proved to be incorrect after consulting the literature. Baltimore (2006) in nursing and Taranto (2011) in education both discussed the trait of professionals abdicating responsibility for their role in the success or failure of new members and the field as a whole by placing blame on others, usually on training programs in particular. Saying "I can't believe you didn't learn that in school" (Baltimore, 2006, p. 29) not only diminishes a new person, as discussed previously, but it also shifts responsibility for the profession's success entirely to the training program. One hallmark of horizontal violence is the way members of the culture can deny any personal responsibility, going so far as denying that horizontal violence even happens. Since this denial of responsibility is all too frequent, the commonality of blaming training programs for the perceived failure of the new generation is troubling. This tendency allows experienced professionals to abdicate any responsibility for their

role in helping others in the field, which creates a situation where they can perpetrate the culture of horizontal violence in the absence of any responsibility to acknowledge or prevent it.

All four participants showed evidence of this phenomenon in their interviews. In Olga's first response, she said, "...there's been quite a few where I've been a little disappointed that they're gonna be graduating soon, so my impression is that maybe the programs need to be a little bit better, or not graduate people who aren't really ready." Later, she spoke about the fact that "ITPs [sigh] maybe just need to offer more practicum for the students who might not be ready yet."

Iris commented about new interpreters' frequent lack of self-esteem and cited ITPs as the cause of that. She said "...I also notice that some of them suffer from serious self-esteem issues, because it seems that in our...ITP programs, we take so much time tearing them down to build them back up, that building back up process doesn't happen..." Later, in the section where she identified herself in the group of newer interpreters, she commented about how it felt like the field participates in "eating our young." She felt this way because people make comments such as "Ugh, I can't believe you didn't know that," which she said is unfair because "our interpreter training programs are not standardized, so we don't all know the same thing because we haven't all learned the same thing, um, I think that's where that comes from..." Interestingly, while the common experience of having others judge work with the "I can't believe you didn't know that" attitude is indicative of shifting blame entirely to training programs, Iris seemed to blame the training programs for the situation in the first place. It is important to note that literature supports the idea that horizontal violence happens within training

programs, which was the theme of her comment (Sewell et al., 2009; Longo, 2007). Still, what was interesting for this point was that Iris, like the others, laid blame for a negative situation on ITPs.

Rhoda began her discussion about new interpreters by qualifying that it depends on the program where they learned. She did not say that more experienced interpreters can be classified by how they were trained or brought into the field, which seems to imply that training programs are responsible only for whether the new people are the “motivated...people who are very much wanting to build that camaraderie within the profession” that she would hope for or those that have the negative attitudes and sub-par skills “even for a novice” that she was disappointed to see. She summarized this idea by saying, “honestly, a lot of that depends on where the newer interpreter came from” after a discussion of two different interpreting programs in her area.

Sophia attributed the degree of confidence that new interpreters have, which she thought was perhaps inappropriately high, to the ITPs by saying “...what that comes from exactly I’m not sure, the ITP program, I don’t know.” All four interviewees put responsibility for problems with new interpreters’ skill or attitude in the laps of the training programs, which is indicative of the tendency to abdicate responsibility for any role in helping new people join the field.

Interestingly, despite this tendency, all four people also spoke of the fact that more experienced interpreters have an obligation to provide mentorship. Every interviewee cited ITPs’ failures to adequately prepare interpreters, but they also all spoke about how other people have a responsibility for mentorship. That was often given as the difference between the good kind of experienced interpreters and the bad kind. Consistent

with the findings of Sewell et al. (2009) and Longo (2007), though participants still discussed this as though it were the responsibility of other people to do this mentorship and training. They often used experienced interpreters' perceived lack of willingness to engage in mentorship and training as evidence that they were the bad kind of interpreters.

Rhoda differentiated good experienced interpreters from bad ones by saying that the good ones':

mindset is a little different, of like, "let's build the profession, let's, you know, mentoring is important...you shouldn't always have to pay an arm and a leg for mentoring, let's do a school to work transition, let's um, help the newbies so they can get their feet wet, and do all of that," um, so more of that camaraderie here...

This statement indicated Rhoda's belief that more experienced interpreters have a responsibility to provide mentorship. Sophia echoed this by saying that it is important for more experienced interpreters to not forget that they arrived at their level of skill through mentorship and to provide that to others. Olga used the word "obligation," saying, "...more experienced interpreters have an obligation to teach, to, to mentor, I think that's definitely an obligation that they have," also separating the appropriate experienced interpreters from those that might judge others. Iris also talked about how willingness to provide mentoring is what separates the polarization of good experienced interpreters from bad ones, saying, "...or, they are very encouraging, very much a part of the mentoring that needs to happen in our field...very supportive and wanting to help the younger interpreters coming up."

All four interviews revealed findings consistent with the literature saying that horizontal violence may include the tendency for professionals to remove themselves from a role in helping shape the culture of the field. In these interviews, they did this by blaming training programs for the failings exhibited by new interpreters and pointing out

that experienced interpreters, always a distant other, never referred to as “we,” have an obligation to mentor. So it would seem as though new interpreters might be left high and dry because the bad kind of experienced interpreters, a distant other, are shirking their obligation, and because interpreting programs are also failing at their obligations. I imagine Sewell et al., (2009) and Longo (2007) would not be surprised by this, since this is what they also found. I also believe Bartholomew (2006) and Patterson (2005) would not find this surprising, given their separate findings of the denial of the culture of horizontal violence that is so common.

A final element of horizontal hostility was evident in the interviews in the way people spoke about overconfidence and dues paying. Baltimore (2006), Keay (2009), and McCluskey et al. (2011) all found that another element of horizontal violence is the tendency for professionals to expect new members of the field to pay their dues, which is one reason the problem can be denied. Victims of horizontal violence can pretend that horizontal violence is not what happened to them, rather that they just paid their dues. This attitude normalizes a culture of horizontal violence and also perpetuates the status quo by encouraging these people to turn around and expect that the same type of negative induction period should happen to the next generation of new professionals. This can range from use of authority to deny access to the professional community until such dues are paid as De Wet (2011) found and as Rhoda discussed in her comments about “gatekeepers,” to the simple attitude that dues paying is a normal part of the field that is an expected rite of passage.

Sophia, Iris, and Rhoda all expressed this idea in slightly different ways. Rhoda talked about the attitude that completion of an ITP should equal work in the interpreting

field as inappropriately arrogant, citing stiff competition in her area for jobs. While she never mentioned the idea of “dues paying” explicitly, she did bring up three times the inappropriateness of people thinking that graduation should lead quickly to interpreting work. Most college training programs in all fields cite alumni job placement rates as a measurement of their success or failure, so it may be reasonable for students to assume that completion of a program would lead to work in that field. Also, Rhoda has secured work as a professional interpreter. Given this, it is reasonable to interpret her comments the way Bartholomew (2006) interpreted the comments of a nurse with five years of experience who had experienced a harsh induction period. This nurse spoke critically of new people who complained about the harsh conditions of being a new person, because if she had to go through it and pay those dues, they should too. It might have been an inappropriate reading of Rhoda’s comments to assume that she felt this way, but given the fact that she mentioned three times how inappropriate it is for graduates to expect to work quickly, the fact that she mentioned the competitive nature of her interpreting community, and the fact that she works as an interpreter, it is reasonable to assume that she may have experienced difficulty finding a job initially. Perhaps that experience, one that many may agree is difficult and not ideal, has led Rhoda to believe that it is a rite of passage that everyone should go through without complaint.

Sophia also made comments that are relevant to the dues paying idea. She spoke about how new interpreters have an inappropriate level of confidence that her generation of interpreters did not have. She mentioned this confidence comparison six times in her interview, commenting that she felt afraid to interpret from ASL to English when she was new, and she indicated that it is not appropriate that new people do not seem to go

through such feelings. Again, it might be reasonable to hope that new professionals begin their work equipped with the skills to do it confidently, but Sophia indicated that the fact that her generation had to experience a time of fear and lack of confidence means that new professionals should still go through this.

Iris was the only one of the four to use the phrase “paying their dues.” She commented about how new interpreters who “lack work ethic from time to time” have difficulty working with older interpreters who have “paid their dues and taken the cruddy assignments.” Part of horizontal violence is that new professionals tend to be saddled with the most difficult tasks, which they are the least prepared to handle (De Wet, 2011; Lewis, 2004; Longo, 2007). Scholars agree that this is not an appropriate way to induct a new professional, yet it seems that it not only happens, but that experienced professionals believe that it should continue to happen since it happened to them. Baltimore’s (2006) nurse certainly felt that way after just five years; it is no surprise, then, that professionals who have lived with the scars of their difficult induction might have this belief even more entrenched. It makes sense, when viewed through such a lens, that Iris believed new people should be given the “cruddy” assignments as a matter of course, even saying that not wanting to go through difficult induction might be evident of a “lack of work ethic.”

Given that professionals who experience horizontal violence often deny that it happens, it is no surprise that people make a psychological shift from, “I went through a difficult period of induction that I have some responsibility in preventing for the future” to, “My induction was normal, and complaining about that situation is indicative of the personal failures of the new generation, the training programs, and other people who do not fulfill their responsibilities to train new people.”

In a study where I expected to find evidence confirming or disconfirming the presence of intergenerational conflict between interpreters, it was startling to find so much evidence that lined up with so many points in the literature of a culture of horizontal violence. It would not be appropriate to overstate the findings from this study to declare with certainty that the interpreting field definitely experiences horizontal violence. However, a study that was not designed to look for such a culture yielded a staggering amount of evidence that pointed to such a possibility, so it is certainly a phenomenon that bears further research.

After discovering this evidence that something beyond intergenerational conflict was happening and consulting the literature to see if other fields had similar experiences, it is now my hypothesis that these findings point to the experience of horizontal violence in the field of interpreting. It is necessary to reiterate once again that it would not be appropriate to scapegoat or blame the participants in the surveys or interviews as examples of the bad kind of interpreters, because if indeed this is evidence of horizontal violence, it is not anyone's fault. Furthermore, giving in to the tendency to lay blame absolves the individuals who make up this field of the responsibility to shine light on the cultural goings on of the profession and consider analytically whether any elements of such a toxic culture might indeed be present in our field. If indeed horizontal violence is happening, literature suggests that such an investigation might be an uphill battle, since it is so slippery and difficult to name and pin down. The staggering statistics about its effects on victims and institutions as a whole, though, suggest that such a critical investigation is well worth the time and research it would take.

CONCLUSION

This study began with my personal experiences and the hypothesis that intergenerational communication conflict happens among interpreters. With no prior research in the area of interpersonal interaction among signed language interpreters in the United States, I was in a position of being without much guidance on how to proceed, and I was also confident that whatever this research may lead to, it would benefit the field. It is necessary for a field that deals with interpersonal interactions to research their own interpersonal interactions. The benefit to the field in starting such an academic conversation was clear, which gave me the impetus to continue down this path.

The research question, “Why do we eat our young” turned into the more professional sounding two-pronged question, “Is there evidence that intergenerational communication conflict happens among signed language interpreters in Ohio,” and “What is the nature of intergenerational communication among signed language interpreters in Ohio?”

I used a qualitative methodology to approach my questions, beginning with a survey, which led to interviews. I surveyed interpreters in the state of Ohio by email, and from the responses I received, I used averages in the scores newer interpreters and more experienced interpreters reported for one another to conclude that enough evidence of intergenerational conflict existed to move to interviews.

With the interviews, I attempted to characterize people’s experiences with intergenerational communication. I interviewed two newer interpreters and two more experienced interpreters. In an effort to minimize participant hesitancy, another person asked the interview questions. I decided to have another person ask the questions because

I clearly fit into one of the two categories of experience, and I did not want that identity to bias participant responses. The interviewer is also a professional interpreter, but she falls close to the generational line used for this study, and she had no conflicts of interest with any of the participants. Having a separate interviewer allowed for more neutral data collection.

I coded the interview data using an open coding method (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) in order to allow patterns to emerge from the data, rather than limiting myself to only looking for evidence relevant to intergenerational communication. This method of analysis was logical for a foray into a new subject area, since the goal was to cast a wide net and see what emerged. It proved to be useful, since rather than confirmation or disconfirmation of my initial hypothesis, I found that my hypothesis addressed one small piece of the picture that emerged from the data.

The data did reveal evidence of intergenerational communication conflict among interpreters, but only as part of a larger culture of horizontal violence among interpreters. I thought I would find that the newer interpreters may have had bad experiences with more experienced interpreters, and that the more experienced interpreters might report having had bad experiences when they were new. Rather, I found that all four people gave evidence of being victims of horizontal violence in different, yet scarring, ways, and much more surprisingly, that all four gave evidence of unknowingly perpetuating this culture, as well. I was uncomfortable with that finding, because I believe none of the interviewees thought that was what their comments would reveal. Rather than scapegoating the interviewees, I urge the field to use that kind of data to raise questions about whether we do indeed have a culture of horizontal violence in interpreting, and

whether, as is consistent with literature about horizontal violence, we might all simultaneously suffer from it and perpetuate it.

Unfortunately, this study was not designed in a way that would allow me to conclusively declare that interpreters do suffer from a culture of horizontal violence. I would encourage future researchers to use this information as a starting place and design a study that could attempt to answer that question. For now, from this research, we can glean evidence to indicate that such a culture may be present in our field.

I believe, though, it would be inappropriate to leave the findings at that. It is important to use this research as the beginning of an academic investigation of interpersonal interaction among interpreters in a broad way, but also to use these findings to impel us as a field to thoughtfully consider whether this culture might be present in our profession. The fact that this study cannot be generalized to such an extent should not be a reason to ignore that question, because as literature shows, if horizontal violence is happening, it has serious consequences for individuals, organizations, and the field as a whole. I believe that in order to strive for more mindful and thoughtful practice as interpreters, we must investigate evidence of such a consequential element of our professional culture.

It is my recommendation that further research be done in the area of interpersonal interaction among interpreters, in general, perhaps using previous hypotheses from similar service fields with female majorities as a guide. I also recommend that further research be done to investigate whether horizontal violence is indeed happening in our field, to what extent it may be happening, and how to go about solving that problem.

REFERENCES

- Baltimore, J. J. (2006). Nurse collegiality: Fact or fiction? *Nursing Management*, 37(5), 28-36. doi: 10.1097/00006247-200605000-00008
- Bartholomew, K. (2006). *Ending nurse-to-nurse hostility: Why nurses eat their young and each other*. Marblehead, MA: HCPro.
- Begley, C., & Glacken, M. (2004). Irish nursing students' changing levels of assertiveness during their pre-registration programme. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(7), 501-510. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2004.06.002
- Begley, C., & Glacken, M. (2004). Irish nursing students' changing levels of assertiveness during their pre-registration programme. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(7), 501-510. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2004.06.002
- Berry, P., Gillespie, G., Gates, D., & Schafer, J. (2012). Novice nurse productivity following workplace bullying. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 44(1), 80-87.
- Bluffington, N. (1993). When teachers aren't nice: Bell hooks and feminist pedagogy. In *44th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication*. San Diego, CA.
- Buchanan, J. (2010). May I be excused? Why teachers leave the profession. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 30(2), 199-211. doi: 10.1080/02188791003721952
- Buerhaus, P. I., Auerbach, D. I., & Staiger, D. O. (2009). The recent surge in nurse employment: Causes and implications. *Health Affairs*, 28(4), 657-668. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.28.4.w657
- Catalano, A., & Tillie, D. (1991). Power and involvement in preservice teacher education. In *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*

(pp. 1-23). Chicago, IL.

- Cleary, M., Hunt, G. E., & Horsfall, J. (2010). Identifying and addressing bullying in nursing. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 31*(5), 331-335. doi: 10.3109/01612840903308531
- Cleary, M., Hunt, G., Walter, G., & Robinson, M. (2009). Dealing with bullying in the workplace: Toward zero tolerance. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health, 47*(12), 34-41.
- Curtis, A. C., & Rasool, J. A. (1997). Motivating future educators through empowerment: A special case. *The Educational Forum, 61*(4), 307-313. doi: 10.1080/00131729709335275
- De Wet, C. (2011). The professional lives of teacher victims of workplace bullying: A narrative analysis. *Perspectives in Education, 29*(4), 66-77.
- Dean, R., & Pollard, R. (2004). A practice-profession model of ethical reasoning. *Views, 21*(9), 25-28.
- Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. (2001). Application of demand-control theory to sign language interpreting: Implications for stress and interpreter training. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 6*(1), 1-14.
- Dellasega, C. (2011). *When nurses hurt nurses: Recognizing and overcoming the cycle of nurse bullying*. Indianapolis, IN: Sigma Theta Tau International.
- Editors of Nursing99. (1999). Nurses, are we still eating our young? *Nursing99, 29*(11), 48-50.
- Falk-Rafael, A. R., Chinn, P. L., & Anderson, M. (2004). The effectiveness of feminist pedagogy in empowering a community of learners. *Journal of Nursing Education,*

43(3), 107-115.

Ferris, P., & Kline, T. (2009). Negative interpersonal interactions in student training settings. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 61(3), 319-333. doi:

10.1080/13636820903180400

Ferster, C. B., & Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Schedules of reinforcement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Freire, P. (1992). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Funk, C. (2002). *Cutting down the tall poppies: Horizontal violence*.

Gavish, B., & Friedman, I. A. (2011). Novice teachers as organisational people:

Expectations of a professional work environment, collegiality, recognition and respect. *Educational Studies*, 37(4), 451-467. doi:

10.1080/03055698.2010.540891

Gillham, B. (2000). *The research interview*. London: Continuum.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Hard, L. (2006). Horizontal violence in early childhood education and care: Implications for leadership enactment. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 31(3), 40-48.

Harvey, M. (2008). The hazards of empathy: Vicarious trauma of interpreters for the deaf. In T. Richards (Author), *Establishing a freelance interpretation business: Professional guidance for sign language interpreters* (3rd ed., pp. 99-116).

Hillsboro, OR: Butte Publications.

Heath, H., & Cowley, S. (2004). Developing a grounded theory approach: A comparison

- of Glaser and Strauss. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 41(2), 141-150.
doi: 10.1016/S0020-7489(03)00113-5
- Howe, E. R. (2006). Exemplary teacher induction: An international review. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(3), 287-297. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2006.00195.x
- Johnston, J. L., Cupples, M. E., McGlade, K. J., & Steele, K. (2011). Medical students' attitudes to professionalism: An opportunity for the GP tutor? *Education for Primary Care*, 22, 321-327.
- Kapadia, Kavita, & Coca, V. (2007). *Keeping new teachers: A first look at the influences of induction in the Chicago public schools* (p. 1, Rep. No. ED498332). Chicago, IL: Joyce Foundation.
- Katrinli, A., Atabay, G., Gunay, G., & Cangarli, B. G. (2010). Nurses' perceptions of individual and organizational political reasons for horizontal and peer bullying. *Nursing Ethics*, 17(5), 614-627. doi: 10.1177/0969733010368748
- Key, J. (2009). Being influenced or being an influence: New teachers' induction experiences. *European Physical Education Review*, 15(2), 225-247. doi: 10.1177/1356336X09345235
- Lanford, A., & Hardesty, P. (1998). The nursing shortage...will we become an endangered species or near extinction in the new millennium? *The Florida Nurse*, 46(8), 29-30.
- Laschinger, H. K., Grau, A. L., Finegan, J., & Wilk, P. (2012). Predictors of new graduate nurses' workplace well-being: Testing the job demands-resources model. *Health Care Management Review*, 37(2), 175-186.
- Lee, R., & Llwellyn-Jones, P. (2011). Re-visiting role: Arguing for a multi-dimensional

- analysis of interpreter behavior. *Supporting Deaf People*, 1-7.
- Lewis, D. (2004). Bullying at work: The impact of shame among university and college lecturers. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 32(3), 281-299. doi: 10.1080/03069880410001723521
- Longo, J. (2007). Horizontal violence among nursing students. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 21(3), 177-178. doi: 10.1016/j.apnu.2007.02.005
- MacKusick, C. I., & Minick, P. (2010). Why are nurses leaving? Findings from an initial qualitative study on nursing attrition. *Medsurg Nursing: Official Journal of the Academy of Medical-Surgical Nurses*, 19(6), 335-340.
- Malterud, K. (2001). Qualitative research: Standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The Lancet*, 358(9280), 483-488. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(01)05627-6
- McCluskey, K., Sim, C., & Johnson, G. (2011). Imagining a profession: A beginning teacher's story of isolation. *Teaching Education*, 22(1), 79-90. doi: 10.1080/10476210.2010.542807
- McKenzie, S. (2011). *Trust and organizational citizenship: A study of the relationship of the three referents of trust and the organizational citizenship of elementary school teachers* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at San Antonio, 2011) (p. 1). Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest LLC.
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Wiley, John and Sons, Incorporated.
- Metzger, M. (n.d.). *Sign language interpreting: Deconstructing the myth of neutrality*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Musanti, S. I., & Pence, L. (2010). Collaboration and teacher development: Unpacking,

- resistance, constructing knowledge, and navigating identities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 37(1), 73-89.
- National Center for Education and Evaluation and Regional Assistance. (2010). *How well prepared and supported are new teachers? Results for the northwest region from the 2003/04 schools and staffing survey* (pp. 1-23, Rep. No. REL 2010-No. 907).
- National Education Association. (2011). *Rankings and estimates: Rankings of the states 2011 and estimates of school statistics 2012* (pp. 1-107, Rep.). Washington, D.C.: NEA Research.
- Patterson, M. (2005). Hazed! *Educational Leadership*, 62(8), 20-23.
- Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (2008, March 31). *RID announces degree requirement extension for hearing candidates for certification* [Press release]. Retrieved March 9, 2012, from http://www.rid.org/UserFiles/File/pdfs/News/Degree_Requirement_Extension.pdf
- Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (2011). 2010 annual report to our members. *Views*, 28(1), 49-62.
- Rowe, M., & Sherlock, H. (2005). Stress and verbal abuse in nursing: Do burned out nurses eat their young? *Journal of Nursing Management*, 13(3), 242-248. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2004.00533.x
- Roy, K. (2012). In search of a culture: Navigating the dimensions of qualitative research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74, 660-665.
- Sewell, K., Cain, T., Woodgate-Jones, A., & Srokosz, A. (2009). Bullying and the postgraduate trainee teacher: A comparative study. *Journal of Education for*

Teaching, 35(1), 3-18. doi: 10.1080/02607470802587087

Sieberlich, A. (2004, February 28). Respect in the face of witnessing oppression: It can be done. *Leadership Institute for Interpreters*. Retrieved September 10, 2012, from <http://www.leadershipinstitute.biz/articles.html>

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Swartz, D. (2012). Regulations governing interpreter requirements, state-by-state. *Project Burnsat: Interpreter Job Satisfaction and Burnout Research Site*. Retrieved September, 2012, from <http://www.360translations.com/burnsat/stateregs.htm>

Taranto, G. (2011). New-teacher induction 2.0. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 28(1), 4-15.

Thomas, S. P., & Burk, R. (2009). Junior nursing students' experiences of vertical violence during clinical rotations. *Nursing Outlook*, 57(4), 226-231. doi: 10.1016/j.outlook.2008.08.004

Wilcox, S., & Shaffer, B. (2005). Towards a cognitive model of interpreting. In T. Janzen (Author), *Topics in signed language interpreting: Theory and practice* (pp. 27-50). Philadelphia, PA: Johns Benjamins Publishing.

Williams, C. L. (1992). The glass escalator: Hidden advantages for men in the "female" professions. *Social Problems*, 39(3), 253-267. doi: 10.1525/sp.1992.39.3.03x0034h

Witter-Merithew, A., & Johnson, L. (2004). Market disorder within the field of sign language interpreting: Professionalization implications. *Journal of Interpretation*,

19-55.

Yildirim, D. (2009). Bullying among nurses and its effects. *International Nursing Review*, 56, 504-511.

APPENDIX A

Survey Questions

The survey begins with this explanation:

“The purpose of this survey is to examine how interpreters who entered the field before 2004 and those who entered the field from 2004-present communicate with one another.

This survey is anonymous. You may exit the survey at any time and your data will not be submitted.

This 10 questions survey should take less than 10 minutes. Thank you for your time.”

1. When did you enter the interpreting field?
 - a. Before 2004
 - b. 2004-present

At this point the survey branches. Those who selected “before 2004” will see this explanation:

“For the purpose of this survey, ‘newer interpreter’ refers to those who entered the field since 2004. ‘Interpreters with my level of experience or more’ refers to interpreters who, like you, entered the field before 2004.”

Those who selected “2004-present” will see this explanation:

“For the purpose of this survey, ‘more experienced interpreters’ refers to those who entered the field prior to 2004. ‘Interpreters with my approximate level of experience’ refers to those who, like you, entered the field in 2004 or later.”

Then, each group will see the same questions, but their options will be different. For questions 2-9, those who selected “before 2004” for question one will rate the following categories:

“Newer interpreters”
“Interpreters with my level of experience or more”

Those who selected “2004-present” will rate these categories:

“More experienced interpreters”
“Interpreters with my approximate level of experience”

The rest of the questions are as follows:

2. How valued do you feel by other interpreters? (5 choices: very valued, somewhat valued, neutral, somewhat unvalued, very unvalued) Optional comments:
3. When you talk with other interpreters, how comfortable do you feel letting down your guard and communicating openly?" (5 choices: very comfortable, somewhat comfortable, neutral, somewhat uncomfortable, very uncomfortable) Optional comments:
4. I feel supported by other interpreters. (4 choices: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) Optional comments:
5. I feel that after making a mistake, I don't have to explain or justify myself to other interpreters (5 choices: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) Optional comments:
6. I believe that other interpreters accurately perceive my skill and value me for it. (5 choices: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) Optional comments:
7. How satisfied do you feel with your interactions with other interpreters? (5 choices: very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neutral, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied) Optional comments:
8. How much trust do you have in other interpreters? (4 choices: a great deal of trust, some trust, little trust, no trust) Optional comments:
9. How much trust do you think other interpreters have in you? (4 choices: a great deal of trust, some trust, little trust, no trust) Optional comments:
10. If you would be willing to be contacted for the interview portion of the study, please enter your email address. For your privacy, this will not be connected to your other answers.

The survey is now complete. Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX B

Interview Questions

The interpreters who entered the field prior to 2004 will be asked:

1. What's your general impression of, or how would you describe, newer interpreters?
2. What's your general impression of, or how would you describe, more experienced interpreters?
3. Think of a time when you interacted with someone from the group of newer interpreters. What comes to mind?
4. It seems like there was a common theme in the survey of interpreters of both groups being worried about being labeled "incompetent" by other more experienced interpreters when admitting to not knowing something, and of having to maintain a "know it all" attitude. What do you make of that?
5. What was your experience of more experienced interpreters when you were new?

Participants who entered the field after 2004 will be asked:

1. What's your general impression of, or how would you describe, newer interpreters?
2. What's your general impression of, or how would you describe, more experienced interpreters?
3. Think of a time when you interacted with someone from the group of more experienced interpreters. What comes to mind?
4. It seems like there was a common theme in the survey of interpreters of both groups feeling concerned about being judged by more experienced interpreters if they revealed they didn't know something. What do you make of that?

All participants may be asked follow-up questions, to include:

1. It sounds like you have strong feelings about that. Tell me more.
2. What do you mean by that?
3. What does that look like?
4. Could you describe that in more detail for me?
5. Could you give me an example?

APPENDIX C

Survey Consent Form

Good afternoon,

My name is Emily Ott, and I'm a student in the Masters of Art in Interpreting Studies program at Western Oregon University and an interpreter in Columbus, Ohio. I am conducting a research study that examines communication between different generations of interpreters in the state of Ohio.

I would appreciate it if you would complete the survey linked below by May 31. The survey is anonymous, and your contribution will help add to the knowledge in the field about intergenerational communication among interpreters. The survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete.

You may exit the survey at any time and no data will be submitted. Completion of the survey indicates your consent to participate in this study via your answers to these questions.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me here or at emilyki.ott@gmail.com. Thank you for your time.

This research project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at Western Oregon University. For questions about the review process, please contact the IRB at irb@wou.edu or my faculty advisors, Amanda Smith and Dr. Elisa Maroney, at smithar@wou.edu or maronee@wou.edu.

Here is the survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ZG7T7PZ>

Thank you,
Emily Ott

APPENDIX D

Interview Consent Form

Good afternoon,

My name is Emily Ott, and I'm a student in the Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies program at Western Oregon University and an interpreter in Columbus, Ohio. I am conducting a research study that examines communication between different generations of interpreters in the state of Ohio.

Thank you for your willingness to be interviewed for this research; your contribution will help add to the knowledge in our field about intergenerational communication among interpreters. Your interview will be audio recorded and later transcribed. In the transcript, and in the final thesis, your name and any identifying information will be kept confidential. The audio recording will be stored on my personal, password-protected computer and destroyed upon completion of the thesis to ensure the privacy of your identity. We will set up your interview either in person or through an online video chatting software, and it will take approximately one hour.

The only risk to you in participating in this survey is any possible discomfort you may feel in speaking candidly about your experiences with interpersonal communication, though I anticipate this risk to be minimal. If you feel discomfort, you are free to decline to answer any questions or discontinue the interview at any time. Should follow-up be needed, I would be happy to follow up with you and you may contact my advisor for this project, Amanda Smith, at smithar@wou.edu.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at this email address. Thank you for your time.

This research project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at Western Oregon University. For questions about the review process, please contact the IRB at irb@wou.edu or my faculty advisor, Amanda Smith at smithar@wou.edu.

Your response to this email indicates your consent.

Thank you,

Emily Ott

APPENDIX E

Explanation of Interview Codes

“Negative about new” was the code assigned to any statement that was negative about new interpreters. “Positive about new” was the code assigned to any statement that was positive about new interpreters. The analogous codes for experienced interpreters were also used. “New = ITP” was the code assigned to any statement that connected new interpreters to training programs. “Disposition [attitude] (new)” and “Disposition [attitude] (experienced)” were the codes assigned to statements that commented on the attitudes of new or more experienced interpreters, and “statements about skills” was assigned to any comment that focused on the skill of a particular interpreter. “New = confidence” was assigned to any statements that connected new interpreters with confidence. “What new should do” and “what experienced should do” were assigned to any statements in which the interviewees talked about what various groups of interpreters ought to be doing. Statements that revealed fear and judgment were coded accordingly. “Self = experienced” was assigned to any statement that connected an interviewee to the experienced group, and “self does not equal new” was assigned to any statement where the interviewee used language distancing herself from the group of new interpreters. “Self = new” was assigned to any statement where the interviewees did connect themselves with new interpreters. “Definition of generations” was assigned to any statement where interviewees gave their own interpretations of what delineates the different generations of interpreters, and “competitive” was assigned any time someone made a comment revealing competitiveness. “‘Middle generation’/positive group/polarization” was assigned to statements that described the polarization between

generations as well as an ideal generation or group of interpreters outside that polarization. “Different standards for new vs. more experienced” was the label given to any statement that expressed a different standard of “good” for new and more experienced interpreters. “Defending own choices” was assigned to any statements where someone defended her own decisions to the interviewer during the interview.