

JADARA

---

Volume 25 | Number 3

Article 9

---

October 2019

## Identifying Standards for the Training of Interpreters for Deaf People

Glenn B. Anderson  
*University of Arkansas*

Linda K. Stauffer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jadara>

---

### Recommended Citation

Anderson, G. B., & Stauffer, L. K. (2019). Identifying Standards for the Training of Interpreters for Deaf People. *JADARA*, 25(3). Retrieved from <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jadara/vol25/iss3/9>

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS FOR THE TRAINING OF INTERPRETERS FOR DEAF PEOPLE

---

**GLENN B. ANDERSON**

**LINDA K. STAUFFER**

**University of Arkansas**

**Little Rock, AR**

### **Abstract**

Major findings of a national project on identifying standards for the training of interpreters for deaf people are presented. The data produced for this project was based on information collected from two separate national surveys during Summer and Fall, 1987. Selected findings on the student, faculty, and program characteristics of 51 federal and non-federal sponsored interpreter training programs are presented. Attention is then directed to a summary of the opinions of a sample of 403 interpreter educators, interpreting service professionals, and deaf and hearing consumers regarding desirable competencies for interpreter trainees to attain as part of their training. Finally, drawing on selected findings from the project, five (5) recommendations for future action are presented, with focus on the role of federal leadership in support of interpreter training.

service for deaf clients. Subsequent legislation (P.L. 93-112, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 94-142, the Education of the Handicapped Act, and P.L. 95-602, the Rehabilitation Amendments of 1978) has made clear the intent of Congress to provide access to quality interpreting services for all deaf people who may need such assistance, regardless of their mode of communication.

These enactments have created a demand for interpreting services that far exceeded the available supply of interpreters. Recognizing the existence of a chronic shortage of interpreters in the nation, Congress, through P.L. 95-602 (section 304 [d][1]), authorized funding of regional interpreter training programs. This discretionary grant program funded at about \$900,000 annually and administered by the Rehabilitation Service Administration (RSA), provides financial support on a five-year grant cycle for up to 12 programs in strategic geographical locations throughout the country.

---

### **Introduction**

Public law 89-333, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1965, opened an important new means for state vocational rehabilitation agencies to improve services for deaf people by authorizing, for the first time, interpreting as a case

Although the RSA-sponsored regional interpreter training programs were initially authorized in 1980, federal support for interpreter education and training dates back to the mid-1970's. This history of federal leadership and support has been instrumental in facilitating the proliferation of interpreter training programs in numerous colleges, universities, and service

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

programs in response to the need to increase the available supply of trained and qualified interpreters for deaf people.

The national scope of training mandated by Section 304 (d)(1) also called for the establishment of standards of competency for trainees completing programs under this provision. It was mandated that the standards, to be established by the Secretary of the Department of Education, be of a caliber acceptable and applicable to as large a number of states and programs as possible. These standards would pertain to interpreters in postsecondary education, rehabilitation, and related types of settings governed by regulations described in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Commission on Education of the Deaf, 1988).

To generate the information and data needed to identify and specify appropriate standards, the National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) invited the University of Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Deafness and Hearing Impairment (RT-31) to join in a cooperative research agreement. This report summarizes the findings of a national research study that resulted from this cooperative agreement (Anderson & Stauffer, 1990).

The study had five purposes:

1. To identify the salient characteristics of existing interpreter training programs;
2. To identify the key competencies that interpreters should be able to demonstrate upon completion of an interpreter training program;
3. To determine which of the key competencies are considered by professionals and consumers in the field to be most important for trainees to demonstrate upon completion of a program;
4. To prepare recommendations that can be used to identify and specify appropriate

standards of competency for interpreter training; and,

5. To prepare recommendations that can be used to specify an appropriate set of expectations or key characteristics that assist in identifying an exemplary interpreter training program. In order to achieve these objectives a National Survey of Interpreter Training Programs and an Opinion Survey of Interpreters were conducted during the Summer and Fall of 1987.

### National Survey of Interpreter Training Programs

#### Method

A 16-term questionnaire, which sought information on variables such as student, faculty, and curricula characteristics, was mailed to 61 federal RSA-sponsored and non-federal interpreter training programs. The questionnaire was completed by individuals identified as coordinators within the programs. Responses were received from all 10 RSA-sponsored regional interpreter training programs and from 80% of the non-federally sponsored programs. The overall response rate was 84% (based on 51 out of 61 programs).

#### Results

##### Geographical Distribution of Programs

The 61 programs identified as offering certificate/degree programs in interpreting were distributed among only 33 states. At least one program, however, was located in each of the ten RSA geographical regions of the U.S. (Table 1). The distribution of programs on a region-by-region basis was notably uneven with the largest concentration located in the North Central and

**IDENTIFYING STANDARDS**

Southeast regions, respectively. The smallest concentration of programs was located in four regions (New England, New York-New Jersey, Middle West, and Rocky Mountains). This uneven distribution, in terms of local, state, and federal efforts to respond to the legislative mandates for interpreters, is skewed in favor of those residing in

four regions (North Central, South Central, Southeast, and Pacific Coast). It was also noted that there were no federal programs physically located in two of the regions with small concentrations of programs (New York-New Jersey and Northwest), although both regions contain cities that are major population centers in the U.S.

TABLE 1  
NUMBER OF INTERPRETER TRAINING PROGRAMS AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION  
BY RSA GEOGRAPHICAL REGION AND TYPE OF FUNDING

<u>RSA Region<sup>a</sup></u> Location <sup>b</sup>	Number of <u>IIP Programs</u> N	Program			
		<u>Federal<sup>c</sup></u>		<u>Non-Federal</u>	
		N	%	N	%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
Region I - New England	4	2	20.0	3	6.0
Region II - NJ-NY	2	0	0.0	2	3.9
Region III - Mid-Atlantic	5	1	10.0	4	7.8
Region IV - Southeast	10	2	20.0	8	15.7
Region V - North Central	13	1	10.0	12	23.5
Region VI - South Central	8	1	10.0	7	13.7
Region VII - Middle West	3	1	10.0	2	3.9
Region VIII - Rocky	2	1	10.0	1	2.0
Region IX - Pacific Coast	8	1	10.0	7	13.7
Region X - Northwest	5	0	0.0	5	9.8

<sup>a</sup>Federal Rehabilitation Services Administration Regional System

<sup>b</sup>States by region: (I) CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT; (II) NJ, NY, PR, VI; (III) DE, MD, PA, VA, WV, DC; (IV) AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN; (V) IN, IL, MI, OH, WI; (VI) AR, LA, NM, OK, TX; (VII) IA, KS, MO, NE; (VIII) CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY; (IX) AZ, CA, HI, NV; (X) AK, ID, OR, WA

<sup>c</sup>Refers to programs that are recipients of RSA-sponsored regional interpreter training grants

**IDENTIFYING STANDARDS**

**Size of Programs**

Collectively the 51 programs that responded reported a combined enrollment of 7,273 trainees during the 1985-86 academic year. These included trainees enrolled in pre-service as well as in-service training programs (Table 2). Most programs, on the average, had between 16 to 50 full and part-time trainees matriculating for a degree in interpreting. The most frequently available degree option in interpreting was a two-year associate degree. Of the 1,212 trainees involved in pre-service academic training programs, 77.7% were enrolled in two-year associate degree programs.

Of the 6,011 trainees who participated in in-service training programs during the 1985-86 academic year, a majority (60.9%) received their

training through the federally-sponsored programs. Though there are fewer federally-sponsored than non-federal programs, they appear to be the primary resources for in-service training and interpreter skill maintenance and upgrading. The mean number of individuals who received training through the federal programs was 366.1 compared to 57.3 for the non-federal programs.

Nearly three-fourths of the programs reported annual operating budgets under \$100,000 per year. Only 5 of the 33 responding programs reported operating budgets that were larger than \$100,000 per year. Close to one-half of the 33 responding programs indicated their annual budgets were between \$50,000 to \$100,000 per year with the median at \$58,542.

TABLE 2  
NUMBER OF PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINEE  
ENROLLMENTS BY TYPE OF FUNDING

Programs	# of ITP Programs		Trainee Enrollments						
	Total		Pre-Service <sup>a</sup>			In-Service			
Type	N	N %	N	%	Mean Size	N	%	Mean Size	
<b>TYPE OF FUNDING</b>									
<b>TOTAL<sup>B</sup></b>	51	7273 100	1262	100	24.7	6011	100	117.8	
Federal Program	10	4029 55.4	368	29.2	36.8	3661	60.9	366.1	
Non-Federal Program	41	3244 44.6	894	70.8	21.8	2350	39.1	57.3	

<sup>a</sup>A pre-service trainee is considered a full or part-time student matriculating towards an academic degree in interpreting

<sup>b</sup>Totals of responding ITP Programs

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

### Curricula Characteristics

There appears to be a good deal of commonality rather than diversity among programs with respect to the types of curricula available to trainees enrolled in pre-service academic programs. The following courses were offered by all programs that responded:

- History of Interpreting
- Community/Culture of Deaf People
- Professional Ethics and Consumer Issues
- Skills Development-Methods

The following courses were offered by at least three-fourths of the programs:

- ASL Grammar and Vocabulary
- Skills Development-Specialized Settings
- Skills Development-Special Populations
- Community Resources/Services
- Supervised Internship/Practicum
- Non-verbal Communication
- Cross-Cultural Issues In Interpreting

Approximately two-thirds (N = 36) of the programs include at least some curricular emphasis in their programs on working with deaf-blind consumers and also make practicum/internship opportunities available to interested students. Since experienced, practicing interpreters and

service providers are more likely to have contact with deaf-blind consumers than are students, it was interesting that few programs offered in-service training programs directed towards serving deaf-blind persons. Whether or not the need exists for on-going in-service training workshops in the area of deaf-blindness could not be determined from the data.

### Faculty Characteristics

A total of 89 faculty were employed full-time by the 51 responding programs during the 1985-86 academic year (Table 3). Deaf faculty members comprised less than one-fourth of the total number of full-time faculty employed in interpreter training programs. On the other hand, as noted in Table 3, somewhat more than one-third of the part-time or adjunct staff included deaf faculty members. Thus deaf faculty are more likely to be involved in interpreter training on an adjunct rather than full-time basis. Very few programs were found to employ minority faculty on either a full or part-time basis. In programs where they were employed, they were more likely to be employed on a part-time or adjunct basis.

TABLE 3  
NUMBER OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY EMPLOYED  
IN INTERPRETER TRAINING PROGRAMS BY HEARING STATUS

(N = 51 Programs)

<u>Faculty Hearing</u>	<u>Full - Time</u>		<u>Part - Time</u>		
	Status	N	%	N	%
TOTAL		89	100	159	100
Hearing		69	77.5	100	62.9
Deaf		20	22.5	59	37.1

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

---

Information was also sought on the educational background of full-time faculty. A majority of the full-time faculty employed in interpreter training programs included those with advanced degrees. Nearly three-fourths (88.7%) of the full-time faculty possessed at least a master's degree. Few full-time faculty were reported to possess a doctorate, that may change since several programs did indicate that some of their faculty are nearing completion of their doctoral studies.

Along with educational background, information was also sought on the number of years experience full-time faculty possessed as interpreter educators. It is apparent that those who enter the field of interpreter education are those who are committed to the field and tend to remain for many years. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of the full-time faculty were reported to be those with seven or more years experience as interpreter educators.

### Trainee Post-Graduation Outcomes

Of the 375 students reported to have graduated during the 1985-86 academic year, the programs indicated about two-thirds (68%) were involved in interpreting on either a full or part-time basis. Although the study was unable to obtain specific information on the nature of the graduates' employment, it was apparent from personal communication with the programs, that graduates were more likely to obtain immediate employment in educational settings (i.e., postsecondary education settings) than in other types of settings.

For those graduates who elected to participate in certification evaluations, the most frequently reported type of evaluation was the state screening or Quality Assurance (QA). About one-third of the responding programs indicated that their graduates during the 1985-86 academic year had received QA credentials. Few graduates were reported to have attained RID certification shortly after graduation.

### National Opinion Survey of Interpreter Competencies

#### Method

A 71-item questionnaire which sought the opinions of a sample of 513 professionals and consumers on desirable competencies for graduates of interpreter training programs was disseminated during Fall, 1987. The sample comprised the following target groups: a) interpreter educators, b) professional interpreters, c) coordinators of interpreter referral service centers, and d) deaf and hearing consumers of interpreting services (i.e., rehabilitation counselors, coordinators of postsecondary programs for deaf students, and representatives and board members of various national organizations).

The sample of interpreter educators was identified through a resource guide on interpreter training programs (Battaglia & Avery, 1986) and through follow-up verification letters to the program coordinators as part of a national survey of existing programs described in the previous section which summarized the results of a national survey of interpreter training programs. Three categories of professional interpreters were randomly selected from the RID Registry of Certified Interpreters in the U.S. (Braswell & Roose, 1987). This involved selecting every tenth name of certified interpreters under three categories who were certified as CSC, OIC:C, and as RSC. A mailing list of interpreter referral service centers was obtained from the former chair of the RID special interest section on interpreter referral centers (R. Thomson, Personal Communication, July 23, 1987). The sample of consumers of interpreting services was identified through the American Annals of the Deaf annual directory of programs and services (Craig & Craig, 1987) and through mailing lists compiled from previous national research projects conducted at

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

the Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Deafness and Hearing Impairment (Watson, Schroedel, & El-Khiami, 1988). Up to three mailings plus telephone follow-up contacts yielded a total of 403 out of 513 completed questionnaires for an overall response rate of 79%.

### Results

#### Rating of the 71 Individual Competencies.

Through an examination of professional literature and research on the education and training of interpreters covering the period of 1970-88, a list of the individual interpreter competencies were identified. These 71 competencies were subsumed under six general competency categories as follows:

1. Professional behavior
2. Cultural aspects
3. Communication modalities/Language competencies
4. Interpreting and transliterating skills
5. Assessment skills
6. Consumer relations

In order to ascertain the respondents' opinions regarding which of the 71 individual competencies are most important for interpreter trainees to acquire as part of their training, the respondents were asked to rate each competency on a four-point scale from (4) very important to (1) not very important.

Because of the large number of competencies that were rated by the respondents, only competencies in which 50% or more of the respondents rated as very important (i.e., 4 on the four-point scale) were included in the data summaries that follow. Using this standard, a total of 39 out of 71 individual competencies were rated as very important. Since the ratings on each of the 39 individual competencies ranged from lowest (51.5%) to highest (92.5%), the data summaries were organized into three groups of ratings as follows: group 1 (those chosen as very important

by 80% or more of the respondents), group 2 (those chosen as very important by between 60% to 79% of the respondents), and group 3 (those chosen as very important by between 50% to 59% of the respondents).

#### Competencies Chosen as Very Important by 80% or More of the Respondents

Nine (9) competencies were rated as very important by 80% or more of the respondents. These 9 competencies were associated with four of the six competency categories, professional behavior, interpreting and transliterating, communication modalities/language competencies, and assessment skills.

The two highest rated competencies were those related to *professional behavior* and included the following:

- maintains confidentiality
- understands role and function of interpreters

The importance of confidentiality regarding interpreting assignments is highlighted by its being the first principle delineated in the RID Code of Ethics (Frishberg, 1986). Because interpreting assignments, at times, infringe on consumer right to privacy, it is considered imperative by many authors that interpreters be able to assure the consumers' trust and right to privacy by being able to maintain confidentiality (Solow, 1981; Fritsch-Rudser, 1986; Frishberg, 1986).

Since changes in public laws and public attitudes in recent years have helped contribute to a dramatic expansion of opportunities for deaf people in education, employment, and community life, there has been a corresponding increase in the demand for interpreting services as well as the need to recruit, train, and increase the available supply of interpreters. Moreover, consumers tend to have varying expectations regarding an interpreter's role and function in an interpreting situation that, at times, include more than merely facilitating communication (Hurwitz, 1988). These



## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

issues, in part, attest to the relevance of placing increased emphasis on the need for interpreters to be knowledgeable of their role and function in various interpreting situations.

The next three highest rated competencies were those related to *interpreting and transliterating* and included the following:

- accuracy in conveying the speaker's feelings and message
- production of clear and smooth fingerspelling and signs
- selection of appropriate conceptual signs while interpreting

Because consumers relying on an interpreter for communication receive the message through a third party (i.e., an interpreter) rather than directly from the source (i.e., the speaker), the ability to convey accurately the speaker's feelings and message effectively is considered a skill that separates highly skilled from less skilled interpreters (Rudner, Getson, & Dirst, 1981). Further, among consumers who rely on the use of sign communication in interpreting situations, "clear and readable" signs as well as the ability to convey accurately the speaker's message through the use of appropriate conceptual signs were found in previous research studies to be rated very high among those skills essential to good interpreting and transliterating (Brassel, Montanelli, & Quigley, 1974; Rudner, Getson, & Dirst, 1981).

There were two competencies associated with *communication modalities/language competencies* that were rated as very important by 80% or more of the respondents. These competencies included the following:

- ability to read and understand conversational ASL
- proficiency in conversational ASL

In interpreting situations when neither the speech nor the signing of the deaf person is understood by the hearing person, an interpreter may be relied on to provide sign-to-voice interpreting. Research by Hurwitz (1986) on

factors related to effective sign-to-voice interpreting have noted that proficiency in reading and understanding ASL enhances an interpreter's ability to voice interpret, particularly with consumers who are more comfortable using ASL. Moreover, Murphy (1978) surveyed a group of deaf consumers to ascertain what they perceived to be the characteristics of an ideal interpreter. The top two identified characteristics were 1) skill in ASL and 2) skill in "reversing" (i.e., from ASL to English) what a deaf person signs.

The last two competencies rated as very important by 80% or more of the respondents were competencies related to being able to assess one's qualifications and limitations when making decisions about accepting interpreting assignments and secondly, being knowledgeable of interpreter standards of conduct as delineated in the RID Code of Ethics.

### Competencies Chosen as Very Important by 60% to 79% of the Respondents

Sixteen (16) competencies were rated as very important by between 60% to 79% of the respondents. These 16 competencies were associated with 5 of the 6 competency categories: *interpreting and transliterating skills*, *communication modalities/language competencies*, *assessment skills*, *consumer relations*, and *professional behavior*, respectively.

The competencies associated with the *interpreting and transliterating* category included the following:

- accurately voice a message from one mode to another in a simultaneous manner
- accurately voice a message from one language to another consecutively
- accurately interpret from one language to another consecutively
- accurately transliterate a message from one mode to another in a simultaneous manner

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

---

- interpret and transliterate at a language level applicable to consumers of different age groups

Interpreters are expected to be able to facilitate communication between deaf and hearing people who do not share the same language (i.e., spoken English and ASL) or the same communication modalities (i.e., audition and vision). The interpreting process can involve conveying a message from sign particularly during the process of watching an interpreter for an extended period of time, is that some interpreters come across to the viewers as "boring monotones" (Heath & Lee, 1982 cited in Frishberg, 1986, p. 93). As a consequence, this can become a distracting factor during the interpreting process. In response to this concern, Heath and Lee also suggest that interpreter training programs emphasize developing skills in the appropriate use of nonmanual behaviors, such as the use of facial expressions, body posture and movement, and turn-taking behaviors.

### Competencies Chosen as Very Important by Between 50% to 60% of the Respondents

Fourteen (14) competencies were rated as very important by between 50% to 60% of the respondents. Eight (8) of the 14 competencies listed were those associated with interpreting and transliterating skills and included the following:

- ability to use appropriate technical vocabulary in legal settings
- ability to use appropriate technical vocabulary in medical settings
- ability to use appropriate technical vocabulary in mental health settings
- ability to interpret and transliterate according to the communication preferences of individuals of different ethnic/cultural groups
- ability to interpret and transliterate at a language level appropriate for deaf consumers with minimal language skills

- production of appropriate voice quality during sign to voice interpreting
- maintaining of appropriate eye contact with audience
- ability to maintain appropriate time lag when interpreting

The first three competencies listed above involve interpreting in professional settings where specialized and technical terminology generally used are unique to that particular setting. When legal, medical, and mental health settings are considered, the range of potential environments within these settings in which interpreters are likely to work is quite diverse and can be demanding and challenging for even experienced interpreters. Ensuring that the technical language is understandable to the consumer is viewed as an essential aspect of an interpreter's role in these settings (Frishberg, 1986).

Support for competency in being able to interpret and transliterate according to the communication preferences of consumers of different ethnic/cultural groups, in part, responds to the increase in racial/cultural diversity among deaf and hard of hearing persons (R. Jordan, Personal Communication, December 21, 1987). Demographic information on professional interpreters and on students enrolled in interpreter training programs indicates, that the interpreting profession tends to attract very few individuals of Black, Hispanic, Asian, and other nonwhite ethnic groups (Cokely, 1981). On the other hand, it has been noted that in geographical areas with sizable non-white ethnic populations, some interpreters (i.e., those who are not members of ethnic minority groups), at times, may either be unprepared or uncomfortable interpreting in assignments that involve predominately ethnic minority consumers and/or during cultural events specifically for ethnic minority persons (Mathers and White, 1985). Moreover, in some geographical areas, hearing-impaired members of ethnic minority groups may use local or regional signs

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

that may be unfamiliar to interpreters who have not had prior training or exposure to such communication preferences (Aramburo & McAllister, 1985, Mathers and White, 1985).

Recognition of the need to more adequately address the interpreting needs of consumers of different ethnic/cultural groups is also evident through the recent establishment of a special interest group within RID. One of the goals of this special interest group is to increase awareness of the unique nature of interpreting for hearing-impaired individuals of non-white ethnic groups (V. Randleman & J. Jess, Personal Communication, March 7, 1988).

There was also support for encouraging interpreters to develop competency to work with hearing-impaired individuals identified as possessing minimal language skills (MLS). The term MLS does not characterize a hearing-impaired individuals' intelligence or amount of communication, but is used to refer to those whose signing system is considered to be highly idiosyncratic. Such individuals can include those who may have been isolated from other deaf people and developed a localized means of communication of signing (i.e., "home signs"). It may also include those who do not read or write well and who, in general, may not possess an extensive spoken English vocabulary (Frishberg, 1986). Because these individuals may come from diverse backgrounds and vary in their communication needs, effective communication with these individuals may, at times, challenge the skills of an interpreter. When necessary and appropriate, interpreters are encouraged to use helpful environmental aids, pantomime and gestures and/or work with an intermediary interpreter, usually a deaf person, with RSC certification. This person is brought into the interpreting situation to help facilitate communication between the deaf consumer, the interpreter, and the hearing consumer (Frishberg, 1986).

Five other competencies that were rated as very important by between 50% and 60% of the respondents were those associated with three competency categories: consumer relations, communication modalities/language competencies, and cultural aspects. Those associated with consumer relations included two competencies that emphasize interpreter involvement, where appropriate and necessary, in orienting consumers to interpreter role and function and in being able to successfully resolve conflicts that may arise with consumers during an interpreting assignment. Competencies associated with communication modalities/language were knowledge and understanding of the linguistic principles of ASL and proficiency in the various visual-gestural codes for English.

The final competency associated with cultural aspects involved acquiring an understanding and knowledge of the social and cultural aspects of deafness and deaf people.

### Recommendations

Consistent with the efforts underway among interpreter preparation programs to respond to the increasing demands for interpreting services by providing the best education and training possible, given their limited resources, we attempt to present some thoughts and recommendations for future directions and initiatives.

Recommendation 1. Efforts should be made to improve the uneven geographical distribution of programs in the 10 RSA geographical regions.

Recommendation 2. Federal funding for interpreter training, which has remained at about \$900,000 annually for the past 9 years should be increased to more adequately respond to the intent of congress to provide access to quality interpreting services for all deaf people needing such assistance.

Recommendation 2a. RSA should increase its investment in pre-service academic programs that offer at least a

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

---

two-year associate degree program in interpreting.

**Recommendation 2b.** RSA should increase its investment in training that emphasizes interpreter skill maintenance and upgrading and that responds to the needs of various constituencies within a multi-state region.

**Recommendation 3.** In addition to the Rehabilitation Services Administration, other federal agencies within and external to the Department of Education should be encouraged to provide funding and support for the education and training of interpreters preparing for careers in related specialty areas, such as educational, mental health, legal and other appropriate professional disciplines.

**Recommendation 4.** A national database on the career development and employment of interpreter training graduates should be established through federal leadership and funding.

**Recommendation 5.** Federal leadership and support should be directed towards providing the RSA-sponsored interpreter training programs with a mandate and funding to establish a standardized performance evaluation system to appropriately evaluate the interpreter competencies of their graduates.

Finally, in our efforts to advocate for the best education and training possible for those interested in pursuing a professional career in interpreting, we believe that the ideal solution is one in which trainees have access to a broad mix of programs that range from associate to doctoral degree programs as well as continuing professional development through in-service training. Such a mix of programs would enable the profession to have access to a continuing supply of trained interpreters, administrators of interpreter referral and related service programs, interpreter educators, and individuals interested in research and related scholarly pursuits in the area of interpreting.

## IDENTIFYING STANDARDS

---

### References

---

- Anderson G., & Stauffer, L. (1990). *Identifying standards for the training of interpreters for deaf people*. Final report. Little Rock, AR: University of Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Deafness and Hearing Impairment.
- Aramburo, A., & McAllister, E. (1985). Interpreting for southern black deaf. In M. McIntire (Ed.), *Interpreting: The art of cross-cultural mediation*. Proceedings of the 1985 RID Convention (pp. 107-110). Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.
- Battaglia, M., & Avery, J. (Eds.) (1986). *A resource guide of training programs: Interpreting for the hearing-impaired*. Rochester, NY: National Technical Institute for the Deaf.
- Brasel, B., Montanelli, D., & Quigley, S. (1974). The component skills of interpreting as viewed by interpreters. *Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf*, 7(3), 20-27.
- Braswell, M., & Roose, D. (Eds.). (1987). *Registry of certified interpreters*. Rockville, MD: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc.
- Cokely, D. (1981). Sign language interpreters: A demographic survey. *Sign Language Studies*, 32, 261-285.
- Commission on Education of the Deaf (1988). *Toward equality: Education of the deaf*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Craig, W., & Craig, H. (Eds.). (1987, April). Directory of programs and services. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 132(2).
- Friberg, N. (1986). *Interpreting: An introduction*. Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.
- Fritsch-Rudser, S.F. (1986). The RID Code of Ethics, confidentiality, and supervision. *Journal of Interpretation*, 3, 47-51.
- Hurwitz, T.A. (Ed.). (1988). *Report of a national study of deaf consumers knowledge and use of interpreters*. Unpublished report. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of the Deaf.
- Hurwitz, T.A. (1986). Two factors related to effective voice interpreting. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 131(3), 248-252.
- Mathers, C., & White, P. (1985). Cross-cultural, cross-racial mediation. In M. McIntire (Ed.), *Interpreting: The art of cross-cultural mediation*. Proceedings of the 1985 RID Convention (pp. 97-106). Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.
- Murphy, H. (1978). Perceptions of deaf persons and interpreters of the deaf of an "ideal" interpreter. In F. Caccamise, J. Stangarone, et al. (Eds.), *Interpreting potpourri*, Proceedings of the 5th National Convention of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (pp. 54-58). Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.
- RID, Inc. (1985). *Oral interpreters: A communication dimension*. Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.
- Rudner, L., Getson, P., & Dirst, R. (1981). Interpreter competence. *RID Interpreting Journal*, 1(1), 10-16.
- Solow, S.N. (1981). *Sign language interpreting: A basic resource book*. Silver Spring, MD: The National Association of the Deaf.
- Watson, D., Schroedel, J., & El-Khiami, A. (1988). A national study of postsecondary education of deaf students. In D. Watson, G. Long, M. Taff-Watson, & M. Harvey (Eds.), *Two decades of excellence: A foundation for the future* (pp. 16-32). Little Rock, AR: American Deafness and Rehabilitation Association.