Educational Interpreters, Deaf Students and Inclusive Education?

İşaret Dili Tercümanları, Sağır Öğrenciler ve Kapsayıcı Eğitim?

Turkish Journal of Special Education
Research and Practice
2020, Volume 1, Number 1, p 27–46
https://dergipark.org.tr/trsped
DOI: 10.37233/TRSPED.2020.0107

Article History:
Received 16 January 2020
Revised 6 January 2021
Accepted 7 January 2021
Available online 13 January 2021

Campbell McDermid [1]

Abstract
A review of the literature was conducted to consolidate the findings of numerous studies concerning the efficacy of including a Deaf student in a regular classroom environment with a sign language interpreter. Numerous challenges were identified including a lack of appropriate qualifications in many educational interpreters, such as fluency in sign language, class content, and ability to interpret accurately. A number of recommendations were noted in the literature like the need to shift paradigms from Deaf students as disabled to Deaf Gain, which includes respect for the culture, language and identity of Deaf people and recognition of how society benefits from their presence and diversity. Specific recommendations were clear job descriptions for educational interpreters, mandatory sign language classes for everyone in the school, and modifications to the class environment both physically, to ensure clear sight lines, and pedagogically, to include aspects of the discursive practices of Deaf teachers and students.

Keywords: *Deaf student, inclusion, interpreter, integration.*

Öz
Bu çalışma kapsamında, sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencilerin işaret dili tercümanı desteği ile kapsayıcı eğitim uygulamaları bağlamında eğitim almalarına ilişkin çalışmalar gözden geçirilmiş ve uygulama için önerilerde bulunulmuştur. Bulgular, işaret dili tercümanlarının, işaret dilinde akıcılık, sınıf ve ders içeriklerine hâkim olma, doğru tercüme yapma ve mesleki yeterlikler gibi birçok alanda sınırlıklara sahil olduklarını göstermektedir. Alan yazında, sağır ya da işitme yetersizliğinden etkilenmiş öğrencilerin engelli olarak görülmemesine yönelik bir paradigma değişikliği ile bu öğrencilerin kültür, dil ve kimliğine saygı ve toplumun varlıklarından nasıl yarar sağladığının tanınması da dahil olmak üzere bir dizi öneri not edilmiştir. Öneriler arasında, ayrıca, işaret dili tercümanları için net iş tanımlarının geliştirilmesi, okuldaki herkes için zorunlu işaret dili derslerinin açılması ve net görüş sağlamak için sınıf ortamında ve pedagojik olarak değişiklikler yapılması da yer almaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Sağır öğrenci, kapsayıcı eğitim, işaret dili tercümanı, kaynaştırma.*

Önerilen Atıf Şekli (Suggested Citation): McDermid, C. (2020). Educational interpreters, Deaf students and inclusive education? *Turkish Journal of Special Education Research and Practice, 2* (1), 27-46. https://doi.org/10.37233/TRSPED.2020.0107

[1] Gallaudet University, School of Education, Business and Human Services, Washington DC, USA.

Corresponding Author: Campbell McDermid, Ph.D., Gallaudet University, Department of Interpretation And Translation**,** Washington DC, USA. E-mail: campbellmcdermid@gmail.com

Campbell McDermid (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4135-2507)

Educational Interpreters, Deaf Students and Inclusive Education?

Historically there have been several movements in the education of Deaf and hard of hearing children. In 1880, the International Congress of Educators of the Deaf (ICED) outlawed the use of signed languages in favor of the oral approach. Later in the United States (US), there was a renaissance of sorts of the assertion of American Sign Language (ASL) and Deaf educators in residential schools for the Deaf. The current trend in the US (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hopper, 2011; Jones, Clark and Soltz, 1997), and perhaps in many parts of the world such as the UK (Powers, 2002), Greece (Lampropoulou and Hadjikakou, 2010) and Austria (Schwab, Wimberger andMamas, 2019), is to put a Deaf child in a regular classroom, historically referred to as mainstreaming or integration and more recently as inclusion (Eriks-Brophy and Whittingham, 2013).

Many of the Deaf children who are put in inclusive settings, especially those who cannot access spoken language easily, rely on a signed language and work with an educational interpreter. While there is information about educational interpreters, there is still a lack of clarity concerning their role. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to serve as a support to teachers who find themselves working with an interpreter providing services to Deaf students. It is not an exhaustive review of the literature, but instead highlights aspects of the inclusion process for teachers to consider and ends with recommendations that may enhance the experience of Deaf learners.

The Illusion of Inclusion

There has been a shift in Deaf education away from the terms mainstreaming or integration to the concept of inclusion (Eriks-Brophy and Whittingham, 2013), and there is concern about a shared definition (Murray, Snoddon, De Meulder and Underwood, 2018). To be successful, an inclusive setting should provide "a continuum of placement options" as well as "appropriate adaptations to the curriculum, instructional materials, teaching strategies, and the classroom environment to accommodate and support included students" (Eriks-Brophy and Whittingham, 2013, p. 64). However, several authors question if this is in fact occurring. Especially for Deaf students who rely on interpreters, they are not receiving the same educational experience as their hearing peers (Hopper, 2011; Winston, 2004).

Concerns from the literature about factors that may impede a student from feeling included range from large class sizes, a lack of teacher support, and the potential negative social and psychological impacts of inclusion on the Deaf students (Eriks-Brophy and Whittingham, 2013). Authors have also pointed out that classroom teachers may lack a background in special education or Deaf education (Alasim, 2018; Eriks-Brophy and Whittingham, 2013; Hayes, 1992). In one study, for example, teachers reportedly felt their training programs left them unprepared to work with Deaf students, though they believed they had learned how to do so later on when asked to teach Deaf students (Eriks-Brophy and Whittingham, 2013).

Also, once a sign language interpreter is employed to work with the Deaf student, the literature suggests that no further modifications to the curriculum or instructional pedagogy are considered. Instead, the interpreter is expected to take on multiple duties and roles to try and make the environment more inclusive (Alasim, 2018; Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992; Jones et al., 1997; Wolbers, Dimling, Lawson and Golos, 2012). However, citing past research, Winston (2004) argued that "No activity was found to be completely accessible through interpretation." (p. 138). In another study, Langer (2007) wrote, "This study makes it clear it is neither fair nor equal to place a deaf

student who relies on sign in a classroom with an interpreter – regardless of that interpreter's skills -- and expect that he is receiving information and experience equivalent to that received by his hearing peers." (p. 230). Not surprisingly, the way inclusion is practiced in a North American context has put Deaf students in the role of visitors or bystander in their own classrooms, lacking full participation (Hopper, 2011). Further, the way the process is currently being practiced has been referred to as the illusion of inclusion (Hopper, 2011; Russell, 2010; Winston, 2004).

On the other hand, national associations of the Deaf, such as the British Deaf Association or the National Association of the Deaf in the United States advocate for a bilingual education for Deaf children (Powers, 2002; Winston, 2004), using both the spoken and signed language of the community. Other authors would agree (Murray et al., 2018). Where this is not possible in an inclusive setting, then a school for the Deaf should be chosen (Powers, 2002). Other models suggested in the literature include the simultaneous enrolment of the Deaf student in a specialist school and in an inclusive classroom, or co-enrolment where a teacher of the Deaf and a regular classroom teacher work together with a mixed class of both Deaf and hearing students (Murray et al., 2018).

Working with an Interpreter

However, given that many Deaf students will be placed in a regular classroom with an interpreter, what does that process look like? Together with the Deaf student, the interpreter will arrive on the first day of class and there will probably be no in-service training for the teacher on how to work with this person (Langer, 2007; Powers, 2002). The interpreter and Deaf student may sit near the front of the classroom (Alasim, 2018), reasoning that this will give the student better visual access to the board. The interpreter is then expected to sign everything that is said by the teacher and hearing students and then put into spoken words the sign language used by the Deaf student.

Depth of Processing

Let's first look at how the interpreting process works and why such a simplified definition is problematic. In many locations, educational interpreters have been told to interpret into an English-like form of sign language (Signed English, Pidgin Signed English, Manually Coded English), referred to as transliteration in the field of interpreting (Livingston, Singer and Abramson, 1995; Stauffer and Viera, 2000). This puts the focus on the surface or form of the language being spoken. It may be assumed by the teacher that this is how their lessons are being translated.

The process of transliteration is often seen as the act of just decoding spoken language, for example English, and re-encoding it into a signed language (Winston, 2004). Educators may advocate for it premised on what Winston (2004) called the unfounded assumption "that deaf children will learn any language through interpretation; that they will learn English through English signing; and that qualified interpreters can bridge a vast chasm of language deficit, academic disadvantage, and audistic teaching approaches," where audism refers to teaching practices that privilege children who can hear and disadvantages those who cannot (p. 134). However, there are many ways to interpret a text and interpreters may work at different levels of meaning.

Transliteration. To begin with transliteration, the interpreter's goal is to reproduce what is said, using the exact same grammar and words of the original utterance (for example English) but in the symbol system of the second language (such

as ASL), using the handshapes and signs associated with a signed language. Such a technique has been used in the field of music by singers who want to sing a song in French or German, but who only know English. They transliterate the sounds of the original song (in French) into the written symbols of their first language (English) so they can then sing the words in French. For example, take the sentence "Mon chat a une fourrure noire." (My cat has black fur). If a singer did not know French, they could represent the French words using English words and sound combinations. However, it is questionable that an English speaker could actually learn French using a transliteration of French (in English) as outlined below in Table 1.

In the same manner, a sign language transliterator uses the handshapes from sign language to represent the words and grammar of the spoken language in the classroom. It is assumed that a Deaf student can then learn that language (Winston, 2004). However, it has yet to be proven that such a mode does lead to English fluency. In fact, there are several short comings of this approach.

To begin with, a signer's hands are much larger articulators than their vocal cords, and so cannot produce the same number of symbols manually as one produces vocally. Bellugi and Fisher (1972), for example, found that when they asked a small group of signers to discuss a topic in both English and ASL, the signers conveyed the same number of propositions (ideas) but used approximately half the number of signs as spoken words to do so. What this means is that a transliterator cannot keep up with a speaker, and will no doubt drop aspects of the spoken text, perhaps more frequently function words, such as articles, prepositions, inflections for verb tenses, and maybe even conjunctive devices. So, the language a Deaf child is seeing, if done as a transliteration, is probably incomplete and inconsistent.

Literal Interpretation. There are at least two other levels of meaning that an interpreter can convey (McDermid, 2018) that a classroom teacher should be aware of. These include the literal or dynamically equivalent levels. Interpreters may utilize a literal interpretation process, where he or she conveys the teacher's spoken message with a focus on producing a text in the grammar of the signed language. But the interpreter will not alter the details conveyed by the teacher by adding, subtracting or substituting information. Therefore, little to no clarification occurs and the focus is on conveying the literal meaning but not the implied meanings of the teacher (see Table 2 and the literal interpretation of a teacher's response to a student's request).

Dynamic Equivalence. Interpreters can also produce a dynamically equivalent interpretation (McDermid, 2018). Here he or she again follows the grammar of the signed language but may explain the teacher's potentially implied meanings or clarify anything that they think may be confusing for the Deaf student. This is a process of enriching the text or breaking from form to include a potential implicature (implied meaning) (McDermid, 2018). Studies have shown that in fact interpreters work at these levels (Livingston et al., 1995; McDermid, 2012), even those who intended to transliterate (Locker, 1990; Siple, 1995). As an example of a literal and dynamically equivalent text, see Table 2 below. Here the teacher is not directly denying the request but may be implying a refusal. In the dynamically equivalent version, the interpreter may choose to make that denial more explicit.

Table 1. Transliteration

French song	Transliteration using English symbols
Mon chat a une fourrure noire	Moan shat a oon phew-your know-are

Table 2. Literal and dynamic equivalence

	Student	Teacher
Source Text	Can I go to the bathroom?	There is only 5 minutes left in the class.
Literal		CLASS…5-MINUTES LEFT
Dynamic		NO. **STAY**. CLASS SOON DONE.

Note the different grammatical structures. ASL can drop pronouns (Wulf, Dudis, Bayley and Lucas, 2002) and may put the verb at the end of the sentence (Liddell, 1980). The copula verb "is" assumed by a head nod instead of a sign (Liddell, 1980) and aspects like the article "the" and the focus particle "only" are implied in context. Working at the literal or dynamically equivalent level of meaning, the interpreter will be conveying the grammar of the signed language. This means, of course, that the Deaf student will not see the grammar of the spoken word and it also means the teacher has to find ways to give the student additional access to the written language, for example in printed form. It is also assumed the deaf student knows the signed language. He or she may not, especially if they come from a non-signing home. A thorough and appropriate assessment of the student's language abilities must be done, therefore, as recommended in the literature (Jones et al., 1997) to actually see what the student knows and requires.

Mode of Interpreting

Educators should also be aware of the different modes of interpreting, including translation, consecutive and simultaneous (McDermid, 2018). Translation involves having the interpreter study a text and practice various means of translating it. Of the three, it is probably the most accurate and so should be utilized as often as possible and definitely for any type of assessment.

Texts that could be translated include lesson plans, rubrics, handouts, tests, video recordings, and class readings or textbooks. To translate these well, educational interpreters need the materials in advance so they can formulate the best possible translation or a variety of translations (perhaps at different levels such as literal or dynamically equivalent) to meet the needs of the student. They also need to know the teacher's goal, for example to focus on the language form or the content of the text. Often, however, interpreters may not be given materials until the last minute, and so asked to perform a sight translation (where they read over the materials but have little chance to research the topic, to seek help, or to practice their translation).

Consecutive interpreting is the next mode. Here the interpreter listens to a number of comments made by a speaker and then asks them to stop while an interpretation is performed. This may occur in small group settings or even while a teacher is lecturing. According to a study done by Russell (2002) on legal interpreters, the consecutive mode leads to more accurate target texts than simultaneous interpreting. In her study of expert, certified legal interpreters she found they achieved an accuracy rating of between 95% and 98% while working consecutively, but only 83%-87% while working simultaneously. She recommended the consecutive mode for legal contexts, with texts that were complex and where the consequence of errors was significant.

The final mode is simultaneous interpretation. Here the interpreter listens until the speaker produces a complete thought, or perhaps two, and then begins to interpret while the speaker continues to talk (or sign). While not truly simultaneous, it appears to be so as both the speaker and interpreter are producing a message at similar times. Of the three, the simultaneous mode may be the most cognitively demanding on the

interpreter as he or she must make use of memory and contextual information to understand what is said, find an equivalent, produce that equivalent, and consider any implied meanings or potential ramifications of what they have interpreted, all the while checking for student comprehension.

Impact of Mode and Method

Of course, these various ways of interpreting have a significant impact on the Deaf student. Where possible, educational interpreters should be supported in their use of translation and consecutive interpretation as well as the production of dynamically equivalent target texts. Simultaneous interpretation should only be used where the interpreter is well versed with the topic of discussion (Russell, 2002) and transliteration where there is incontrovertible evidence that the Deaf child can function as well as the hearing students in English, especially when presented with an incomplete signed version.

It should also be noted that when it comes to assessment, several studies have shown that Deaf students do statistically better on tests when they watch an ASL interpreter or when the test material was presented in ASL, as compared to a transliterated version (Fleischer, 1975; Hatfield, Caccamise and Siple, 1978;Hoffmeister, 2000; Livingston et al., 1995). In two other studies, the Deaf students who saw an ASL interpreter did better on multiple-choice tests than the students working with a transliterator, though the differences were not statistically significant (Marschark, Sapere, Convertino, Seewagen and Maltzen, 2004; Murphy and Fleischer, 1977). This may be due to the difference in the amount of information and clarification included by the interpreter. Thus, educators should support the decision of interpreters to use ASL and to work at the dynamically equivalent level of meaning.

The different modes also lead to differences in what is referred to as lag time (Winston, 2004). This is the time it takes the interpreter to listen to a message and reproduce it for the student. Theoretically, while transliterating the interpreter is producing a message at nearly the same time as the speaker, but remember it is at best an incomplete message. At the level of literal or dynamically equivalent, an interpreter may have listened to or lagged behind the speaker for a number of reasons, such as to determine if there were any implied meanings that must be conveyed or due to differences in the structure of the two languages. For example, when a conditional sentence is uttered in English, as can be seen in Table 3, the result of an action or chronology of events can come before or after the antecedent, while in ASL the antecedent typically comes before the result (McDermid, 2018). Thus, even at the literal level of meaning, an interpreter would have to wait for the entire sentence to be spoken before he or she began interpreting. So due to asymmetry in the spoken and signed languages, therefore, the interpreter often must hear at least an entire utterance before rendering an interpretation.

As Winston (2004) pointed out in a review of the literature, to interact successfully a Deaf student's comments must be timely and appropriate. However, if an interpreter is working literally or at the level of dynamic equivalence, the Deaf student may be the last student to "see" a question posed by the teacher and to raise his or her hand as noted in a recent study (Alasim, 2018). Ways of dealing with this delay could be to provide printed flashcards with written questions or to use an overhead projector and type or write questions out so everyone has simultaneous access. Another option may be to assign different questions to each student.

Table 3. Lag time and conditional sentence

English	ASL
I will cancel the trip if it snows. If it snows, I will cancel the trip.	IF SNOW, TRIP CANCEL

Education of Interpreters

In the North American context, teachers should be aware that many if not most interpreters do not have any educational background in interpreting and may have just taken some sign language classes (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992; Russell, 2010). Some may only have a high school education (Jones et al., 1997) or a two-year associates degree (Hayes, 1992). For example, in one study of 59 educational interpreters, 28% only had in-service workshops or no training whatsoever (Schick, Williams and Bolster, 1999). In another, only 43% of 32 survey respondents had completed an interpreter training program and of those, most had attended a 2-year associate of arts program (Hayes, 1992). In still another, of 63 interpreters surveyed and interview, 52 (83 %) did not go to a preparation program, only 10 (16%) had finished an interpreter program and only 5 had one course on education (Yarger, 2001). In a fourth, of 222 interpreters surveyed, more than 50% did not have an undergraduate degree (Jones et al., 1997).

As early as 1985, Gustason noted that even though some interpreters had graduated from a program, they were not prepared to work in educational settings. In a survey of the curricula of 42 interpreter preparation programs, Gustason (1985) found that only 7 had "at least one course in educational interpreting or an education-related area" (p. 266). La Bue (1998) noted, program graduates were typically taught the signed language of Deaf adults and how to interact with them, not children. Most educational interpreters, therefore, are not experts in child language development or child development. They may be unprepared or unable to assess the child's benchmarks or milestones in development.

Content expertise. Educational interpreters must also be content experts across numerous disciplines (Langer, 2007), especially at the secondary level (Yarger, 2001). For example, in a typical week an interpreter may be called upon to interpret topics such as quadratic equations, cell mitosis and meiosis, or concepts like gravitational force. In turn, they may be expected to tutor the Deaf student in these areas (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992; Jones et al., 1997). As Yarger (2001) explained, "The expectation that an individual be skilled in all academic areas is unreasonable, yet it is often present." (p. 18). Instead, many interpreters are not well versed in multiple fields and when asked, may not be given preparation materials (Langer, 2007) and this leaves the Deaf student with restricted access to the content (Yarger, 2001).

There are several ways to address this limitation in interpreters. One suggestion is to have the interpreters sit in on or retake some of the classes prior to interpreting them. Another is to provide preparation time for them to read meet with the teacher and familiarize themselves with the material. A third may be to hire a number of different interpreters who have coursework in the different subject areas and allow them to focus on interpreting only the content they know. A fourth is to provide and/or mandate further education in the content areas. At a minimum, the interpreters should have completed an interpreter education program. In fact, the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (2020) now requires at least a bachelor's degree to sit for certification.

Skill and Fluency

Educators must be aware that in addition to lacking content knowledge, many educational interpreters may not be qualified to interpret, a potential impediment to an inclusive model. In one study (Jones et al., 1997) 65.4% had no interpreter certification (Jones et al., 1997). In a separate survey of 32 educational interpreters, Hayes (1992) found that only 2 were nationally certified.

In 1999, Schick et al. examined the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) results of 59 educational interpreters. The EIPA is fast becoming the national standard for educational interpreters in the United States. Only 44%, or less than half, demonstrated a score of 3.5 out of 5.0 on the EIPA. Later in 2001, Yarger studied 63 educational interpreters and found they had a mean EIPA score of 2.6. Then in 2006 Schick, Williams and Kupermintz (2006) looked at the EIPA results for 1,505 education interpreters and found only 38% demonstrated the ability to meet a standard of 3.5 on the EIPA. Interpreters working at a score of 3.5 on the EIPA were described as having only a basic vocabulary and simple grammar in ASL (Schick et al., 1999). Such interpreters would need “continued supervision” and could not convey complex ideas in sign language (Schick et al., 1999, p. 153). This implies that they would not be able to successfully interpret many topics in an educational setting.

Several authors have looked at the accuracy of educational interpreters. La Bue (1998) found "a lack of cohesive structure, and uniting propositions between sentences" and “pronoun references” when she examined the work of two (p. 200). Overall, she found a repeated “lack of cohesion in the interpreted message” and “a lack of clarity in the signed string” (La Bue, 1998, p. 201). Russell (2010) examined the work of three educational interpreters and found issues with their grammar, use of space, use of pronouns, affect and prosody. In one class, of 280 utterances, less than half (46%) or only 130 were accurately interpreted. In a group of 40 interpreters, Langer (2007) found a similar lack of accuracy where the educational interpreters only correctly conveyed from 1/3 to 2/3 of the information. When a panel of 19 Deaf adults were asked to watch and remember the content from the lectures, they “demonstrated understanding of approximately 40% of the content” (Langer, 2007, p. 203). Langer (2007) called the accuracy of the interpreters “troublingly low" (p. 3). Especially for deaf students who begin their education with a lack of language fluency in a signed or spoken code, "access to a linguistically and cognitively rich classroom may be especially crucial" versus the impoverished language and inaccurate content they are faced with (Langer, 2007, p. 4).

Perhaps one of the reasons educational interpreters do not do well on assessments like the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment is due to a lack of fluency in the signed language. When 222 educational interpreters were surveyed about their fluency, 61% said “that they were either ‘not proficient” in signing or only ‘somewhat proficient” in signing before they were hired (Jones et al., 1997, p. 263).

According to Jacobs (1996), ASL could be considered a very difficult language for English speakers to learn, equivalent to a Category Four on the Foreign Service Institute and Defense Language Institute scales. In addition, and as Jacobs (1996) pointed out, many spoken language interpreter education programs require near-native fluency (say in French or Spanish) as well as English prior to enrolment, which requires between 2400 - 2760 hours of study. However, in a North American context, most sign language interpreter programs only require four semesters of ASL prior to enrolment, or the

equivalent of ASL 4. Given many classes are 3 credit hours and run for 15 weeks, this means most sign language interpreter students begin studying with only 180 hours of in-class language training, far below the 2400-2760 required for near-native fluency (Jacobs, 1996).

Language models. What is very troubling given this lack of fluency is that in inclusive settings, educational interpreters can be asked to be language models for Deaf children (Yarger, 2001) and to teach sign language classes (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992; Jones et al., 1997). According to Yarger's (2001) research, the interpreters are aware of these shortcomings. Yarger (2001) wrote:

> "When they were asked to identify areas of interpreting that were still developing for them, the most frequently cited response dealt with their lack of ability in sign-to-English interpreting and a lack of receptive skills. Additionally, concerns were expressed about insufficient vocabulary and a limited knowledge and understanding of ASL." (p. 20)

To address this lack of fluency and ability to interpret, a number of actions can be taken. Yarger (2001) suggested hiring only qualified interpreters with higher skill requirements. Qualified means an individual who has passed national certification or a minimum of a score of 4.0 on a test such as the EIPA. It also means having native or near-native fluency in sign language which can be ascertained through a sign language proficiency interview, such as the ASLPI offered by Gallaudet University (n.d.). Another strategy is to allow for the interpreters to make use of translation and consecutive interpretation as this should theoretically increase the accuracy of their target texts. Other recommendations include paid tutors who were Deaf and native signers (Yarger, 2001). Russell (2002) suggested more team interpreting to monitor each other, though it did not always lead to error correction. Mandatory ASL classes for the teachers, staff and hearing students has been recommended (Alasim, 2018; Powers, 2002) and this would reduce the reliance on the interpreter and foster more social interaction. Another potential solution is to group Deaf students with hearing students who can sign (Alasim, 2018) again reducing their reliance on the interpreter.

Interpreter Supervision

A concern noted in the literature and one that the classroom teacher should be made aware of is the lack of supervision or appropriate supervision for educational interpreters (Hayes, 1992). In one study, the authors found little to no evaluation of the interpreters' skills (Jones et al., 1997). Given the complexity of their job and their need for ongoing support, it would make more sense to hire a qualified peer (certified interpreter or interpreter educator) as well as a language expert to act in this capacity.

Role and Code of Ethics

Another area of concern in the literature was the role of the educational interpreter and ethical behavior. Gustason (1985), for example, interviewed interpreter educators and found the faculty were concerned that their graduates and school personnel did not understand the role. This was again noted later in two separate studies, where the researchers found no discussion or delineation of the interpreter's role prior to their employment and so this was recommended (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992). In a more recent study, the authors noted how the role changed as the Deaf child progressed through the grades with the same interpreter (Wolbers et al., 2012).

As a summary of their expectations, and as most interpreters are taught to work with adults, they learn to respect issues of self-determination and autonomy. They also follow a code of ethics that mandates neutrality and confidentiality. So once hired to interpret, they probably expect to limit their actions to interpreting and to adhering to those ethical principles.

However, a review of the literature identified a number of duties assigned or taken on by educational interpreters which go beyond being a neutral party as they were taught to do. These included disciplining Deaf students (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992), tutoring, teaching sign language, grading assignments (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992; Jones et al., 1997), teaching classes (Jones et al., 1997), as well as "after-school activities, taking notes for the deaf students," "helping students with homework, caring for hearing aids" and FM systems, and providing speech lessons (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001, p. 357). Alasim (2018) found the interpreters would lead some of the classroom discussions and encourage the Deaf students to participate and ask questions. Some interpreters reported making bulletin boards and doing copying for the teacher (Hayes, 1992).

In addition, the interpreters had taken on the role of facilitating peer interactions and clarifying the teacher's instructions (Alasim, 2018; Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001). They kept the special education and regular classroom teachers informed of the Deaf child's difficulties, checked for comprehension, and reported on the child's ability to concentrate or attend to educational activities (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001). In one study, the interpreter took it upon herself to omit praise from the teacher if she thought it was unwarranted, but to give praise to the Deaf student when the teacher failed to do so (Wolbers et al., 2012). In addition, some interpreters helped co-plan lessons with teachers (Alasim, 2018; Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001), shared sign-related videos, modified activities, and helped out with other children, for example with reading (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001). One was described as adept at breaking things down and simplifying them for the Deaf student (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001).

Antia and Kreimeyer (2001) used a model to describe the different views of educational interpreters, as either full-participants or a mechanical model as a translation machine. The interpreters may have been trained in the mechanistic model, but the regular classroom teachers wanted them to be full participants (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001). It is perhaps no wonder that the interpreters in one study believed the extra duties they had taken on put them in conflict with the confidentiality aspect of their code of ethics (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001) and in another study reportedly found it the most difficult aspect of the code to follow (Hayes, 1992).

To address the multiple roles and potential conflicts educational interpreters face, school administrators and educators must be clear about their expectations. Many countries may have a code of conduct for sign language interpreters and where there are interpreter education programs, students will no doubt be taught to follow it. However, school districts may expect the staff interpreters to function as a member of the educational team and as a full participant. It is important, therefore, to provide pre-employment training on the role of an interpreter to teachers and to have and clear hiring criteria (Yarger, 2001).

It is also important to talk with the interpreter, the student and the parents about the expectations for the interpreter. For example, will the interpreter take on responsibility for discipline, social skills, or altering the curriculum? Other challenges that an interpreter may face and not addressed in the literature are what should an interpreter do if they discover students vandalizing school property or if they suspect

theft or drug abuse? There should also be clarity around the role of contract interpreters who are brought in as freelance workers. In many cases, the interpreter may erroneously believe their professional code supersedes the school's policies or even their legal responsibilities to report abuse or neglect. These should be clarified amongst all parties.

Incidental Learning and Social Participation

Part of learning occurs through peer-to-peer interactions and reciprocal teaching amongst students (Russell, 2010), leading to the acquisition of the hidden or unwritten curriculum through the social construction of knowledge (Hopper, 2011). Hopper (2011) refers to this as incidental learning. In her study of two Deaf children with interpreters, she found a lack of social interaction between the Deaf and hearing students. Instead, the Deaf students more often occupied the role of bystander in classroom interactions (Hopper, 2011).

The lack of incidental learning may be due to reduced social participation. In a review of the literature on integrated Deaf students, authors have reported feelings of loneliness (Alasim, 2018; Stinson and Antia, 1999) as well as "an absence of close friendships" (Stinson and Antia, 1999, p. 169) and noted that they are "frequently neglected or rejected by their hearing peers" (Stinson and Antia, 1999, p. 170). According to Hopper (2011), the two Deaf students she studied reportedly felt "boredom, awkwardness, embarrassment, or weirdness" while in class (p.141). Overall, Deaf students in regular classroom settings were seen to "interact infrequently with their hearing classmates and engage in less linguistic and more nonlinguistic interaction than their hearing peers" (Stinson and Antia, 1999, p. 169).

The presence of a sign language interpreter may have a negative impact on incidental learning and social participation. As mentioned earlier, the interpreter and student may end up sitting at the front of the classroom (Alasim, 2018), thereby cutting themselves off from the students behind them. In rural settings, it is not uncommon for the same interpreter to work with the same student yearly, "from preschool to high school," which can hinder the student's independence (Yarger, 2001, p. 17). In fact, it was noted in one study that the Deaf student only interacted with the interpreter (Alasim, 2018) and in another, the student reportedly saw the interpreter as "a friend, parent figure, or counselor" (Hayes, 1992, p. 17). One could ask what impact does this have on the Deaf child's ability to develop friendships? Also, it should be remembered that the interpreter is an adult working with children (Wolbers et al., 2012). The Deaf student is only exposed to adult signing while the hearing students hear an adult's voice when the interpreter conveys the Deaf student's comments, a common factor to consider in a mediated education (Winston, 2004).

It is also important to remember that an interpreter can only interpret for one person at a time (Winston, 2004). Researchers have noted a propensity for educational interpreters to privilege the teacher's instructions over the social discourse of the students (Wolbers et al., 2012). Or when the teacher was silent, some interpreters consciously decided not to interpret what they considered extraneous talk, for example so as to not interrupt the student while he or she was doing independent work (Wolbers et al., 2012). At other times the interpreter only summarized what was said (Hopper, 2011; Wolbers et al., 2012) or interpreted for the loudest or most assertive student repeatedly (Russell, 2010). In one study, the Deaf student was concerned about this process of filtering the messages she received, and shared, "but interpreters probably wouldn't make the same choices as younger kids like me would. Adults might think

some conversations are not appropriate and wouldn't say anything or become embarrassed." (Hopper, 2011, p. 135).

The truncated access provided by interpreters may also influence the Deaf student's friendship circles. Or as Russell (2010) noted, the Deaf student may end up with a lack of access to the viewpoints of other students. Hopper (2011) gave an example from a Deaf student she observed and wrote, "One example was where Jasmine [the Deaf student] had not realized that her peers sometimes made comments that were mean or obnoxious" and how access to those may have changed her relationship with those peers (p. 147).

There are a number of strategies for enhancing participation and potentially incidental learning. One is to have the regular classroom teacher team teach with a teacher of the Deaf (Stinson and Antia, 1999). Another is to employ notetakers and additional interpreters to ensure the Deaf student has more access to the classroom discourse (Hopper, 2011). A third is to ensure there is a critical mass of Deaf students in the school and allow them to interact with each other (Schwab et al., 2019). As mentioned earlier, another suggestion is to put the Deaf student in groups with hearing peers who know sign language (Alasim, 2018). Small group activities have also been recommended (Alasim, 2018), as has reverse inclusion, of hearing students into a classroom for Deaf children (Powers, 2002).

Deaf Gain

While there are many impediments to a Deaf student's full inclusion in a typical classroom setting, as noted throughout this article, there are some actions that can be taken to enhance their experience. This would require a shift from thinking of Deaf students as a disability to a view of Deaf people as a cultural group who can contribute to society, something recommended in the literature (Powers, 2002). This reframes Deaf students from a disability framework to one of recognizing their contribution to the human condition, referred to in the literature as "Deaf-gain" (H-Dirksen and Murray, 2010).

Within a Deaf Gain framework, there is recognition that Deaf people have contributed to our understanding of "the human capacity for language, advances in visual learning, and creative insights into architecture, literature, and collectivist cultural patterns" (H-Dirksen and Murray, 2010, p. 1). There is also respect for diversity and towards a Deaf identity and Deaf culture (Murray et al., 2018). For example from a Deaf Gain perspective, schools for the Deaf would be seen not as segregated but as ''congregated spaces" that facilitate "cultural production" for students and that "address the alienation of children with disabilities that can occur in mainstream settings" (Murray et al., 2018, p. 5). Much of this recognition would also fall within the concept of universal design or creating a learning space that is accessible and appropriate for each student.

On a global level, there has been a shift in recognizing the rights of Deaf students to their own language and culture. This supports a shift in framework from disability to Deaf Gain. The United Nation's Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN-CRPD) (n.d.) Article 24 mandates free and inclusive education with appropriate support systems in place. It also requires "facilitating the learning of sign language and the promotion of the linguistic identity of the deaf community…in the most appropriate languages and modes and means of communication for the individual" and that teachers be employed "including teachers with disabilities, who are qualified in sign language" (UNCRPD, n.d., p. 17).

Deaf epistemology. Part of Deaf Gain is to recognize a Deaf epistemology (Hopper, 2011), a way of teaching and learning that best meets the visual abilities of Deaf students. This involves steps like ensuring videos are closed captioned and making use of visual aids, a white board and graphic organizers as much as possible (Russell, 2010) as well as mnemonic devices or manipulatives (Alasim, 2018). In addition to meeting the needs of a Deaf student, such actions would not doubt support other learners as well.

However, in a classroom with Deaf students it also means limiting completing visual stimuli (Langer, 2007; Winston, 2004; Wolbers et al., 2012). Educators are probably used to producing language, talking, while simultaneously pointing to visual aids or demonstrating how to do things, or reviewing a handout while students are expected to simultaneously read it (Winston, 2004). Some talk as students moves around the room or from class to class (Wolbers et al., 2012). This approach does not work with a Deaf student as it creates competing visual noise, as the student must look at visual aids, and watch the interpreter's signing and the teacher's pointing behaviors or demonstration (Langer, 2007; Winston, 2004).

The discourse patterns of teacher talk should also be considered as part of Deaf Gain. La Bue (1998) identified one pattern as IRE, initiation, response and evaluation. Other patterns were described as "thematic focus," "direct teaching," and "activation of schema" to name a few (Smith and Ramsey, 2004, p. 46). Several challenges were noted with these patterns, however, for it was found in regular classrooms the teacher rarely called upon Deaf students, who in turn rarely volunteered (Alasim, 2018; Wolbers et al., 2012). It was also noted in one study that the educational interpreters did not understand the structure or goal of the various patterns of interaction used by the teacher (Russell, 2010).

Regular classroom teachers should be aware of the strategies used by Deaf educators when working with Deaf students. In a study of a Deaf instructor, Smith and Ramsey (2004) identified ways of structuring the discourse that may be different than those found in regular classrooms. One way was constantly pointing to students, referred to as indexing, to identify who could take a turn (Smith and Ramsey, 2004). When talking about an object or topic, the teacher signed it in space (spatial referencing) and then repeatedly went back to the same location to reinforce the topic and to expand on it (Smith and Ramsey, 2004). To get attention, the instructor used phrases that could be translated as "May I borrow your eyes, please?" (Smith and Ramsey, 2004, p. 48). He often checked for comprehension by making direct eye gaze with the students and monitored their eye gaze to see if they were paying attention to the discussion. He ensured the students had unobstructed sight lines to each other and he repeated student comments when he suspected some students had not seen them. The desks were arranged in a semi-circle and students were permitted to ask their peers to repeat comments. He made frequent use of ASL non-manual grammar, raising his eyebrows to ask yes/no questions or squinting them to ask Wh questions (where, when, why, who, how). Further he demonstrated his emotions on his face, for example by displaying puzzlement about topics. The teacher also allowed the students to discuss topics in small groups while he continued to hold the floor. During periods of IRE, the instructor "was persistent in his questioning and rarely told the correct answer directly to his students" (Smith and Ramsey, 2004, p. 49), drawing on what Russell (2010) referred to as metacognitive questioning.

In addition to the discourse strategies used by Deaf instructors, the strategies used by Deaf students should also be considered. In an inclusive setting, Hopper (2011) noted how the Deaf students engaged in the role of "overhearing," "by glancing at whiteboards

in their hearing peers' lockers, looking at artifacts their hearing peers possessed, lipreading, and discreetly looking at their peers' computers" (Hopper, 2011, p. 109). This was due to their truncated access through an interpreter.

Often part of every class involves assessing a student's ability to use English. Activities like choral reading, spelling tests, and language assessments in general can present a challenge for sign language interpreters. Assessments for Deaf students in general should be critically reviewed and modified to reduce the need for fluency in the spoken language (Russell, 2010).

Let's look at oral spelling tests, perhaps a common activity in classrooms. When these are required, the interpreter may try strategies that involve exaggerated mouth movements while signing a sign that represents the meaning of the sign, but which has no relation to its phonology (spelling). For example, the concept of "vehicle," is a superordinate term in English as it represents a class of objects, but it is usually represented in ASL by two or three signs such as CAR, TRUCK and BUS. Given there is no one sign for "vehicle" in ASL an interpreter may sign CAR but mouth "vehicle," hoping the Deaf student would be able to hear the word or read their lips clearly. Instead, strategies could be employed that give the student complete visual access to the activity, thus emulating a Deaf epistemology. This could be done by using flashcards with both correct and incorrect spelling, through cloze activities where the student has to supply the right letter, or by providing the letters in a slightly scrambled format. Another option may be to evaluate the student's writing to see if they have used the term or to ask them to provide synonyms for "car."

Finally, as part of universal design and to adopt a Deaf Gain framework, educators should consider including content of interest to the Deaf student and concerning Deaf culture. As mentioned in one study, an interpreter brought in videos with sign language for the teacher to use (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001). Lessons could be created around the use of ASL, its alphabet and its numbering system or that include information about Deaf doctors, lawyers, college presidents and politicians. Students should also be encouraged to suggest topics or choose issues that are of interest to them, again another aspect of universal design.

Conclusion

In summary, the inclusion of Deaf students in the regular classroom setting with an interpreter has many challenges and is not the optimal setting for some learners. It may in fact negatively impact their ability to access the official curriculum as well as engage in social learning practices. Where this is the case, other placement options should be considered. There are a number of recommendations, however, that may enhance the experience of Deaf students who have the ability to succeed in inclusive settings and these are listed next in Table 4. This is not an exhaustive list as other modifications may be necessary. However, the enactment of as many of these recommendations as possible would go a long way to support the social, emotional and educational development of included Deaf learners.

Table 4. Enhancing inclusion

For everyone:

- Mandatory sign language classes for everyone (Russell, 2010; Yarger, 2001)
- Everyone take responsibility to be informed and to include the Deaf student (Alasim, 2018)
- Refocus the view of the school to Deaf Gain (Powers, 2002) and fix the school, not the child (Russell, 2010)
- Create a forum or opportunities for everyone to discuss the issues (Russell, 2010)
- Ensure Deaf students are involved in extra-curricular activities (Powers, 2002; Russell, 2010)

For administration:

- Have clear job description and duties for both full-time and contract interpreters (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992; Jones et al., 1997)
- Hire qualified interpreters (Jones et al.,1997; Russell, 2010)
- Hire interpreters who are fluent, certified or screened, with content knowledge
- Include the parents in the process of education (Powers, 2002; Russell, 2010)
- Involve the Deaf student (Powers, 2002)
- Incorporate Deaf adults and members of the Deaf community (Powers, 2002; Russell, 2010)
- Provide ASL and interpreting tutors for the interpreters (Russell, 2010)
- Support ongoing professional development for the interpreters (Russell, 2010; Yarger, 2001)
- Offer peer mentors for the Deaf students (Russell, 2010)
- Organize reverse integration of hearing students with deaf students (Powers, 2002)
- Have a critical mass of Deaf students for peer interaction (Russell, 2010) or opportunities to interact with other Deaf children (Powers, 2002)
- Deliver in-service for teachers (Hayes, 1992; Langer, 2007; Russell, 2010)
- Encourage team interpreting and hiring multiple interpreters (Russell, 2010)
- Evaluate the interpreters periodically (Hayes, 1992; Jones et al., 1997)
- Employ appropriate ongoing supervision for the interpreter (Hayes, 1992)
- Conduct an appropriate language assessment of the Deaf student (Jones et al., 1997)
- Pay the interpreters for preparation time, to read up on the various topics (Langer, 2007)
- Ensure supplemental support for the Deaf student, such as notetakers and tutors (Langer, 2007; Powers, 2002)

For the teacher:

- Discuss code of ethics and duties with interpreter (Antia and Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992)
- Maintain high expectations for the Deaf student (Powers, 2002; Russell, 2010)
- Prepare your lessons with the interpreter (Langer, 2007; Russell, 2010)
- Ensure Deaf student is called upon to participate (Alasim, 2018; Russell, 2010)
- Adapt assessments so that they do not disadvantage the Deaf student's fluency in the spoken language (Russell, 2010)
- Provide lesson plans and notes to the student (Langer, 2007)
- Collaborate with the teacher of the Deaf (Powers, 2002; Yarger, 2001)
- Restructure physical classroom to include clear sight lines (Langer, 2007)
- Adopt aspects of Deaf epistemology and discourse (Powers, 2002; Smith and Ramsey, 2004)
- Include content on Deaf culture and ASL
- Call on the Deaf student and encourage the Deaf student to participate
- Use visual aids
- Create opportunities for the hearing and Deaf students to interact (Alasim, 2018)
- Pair Deaf students with hearing students who know sign language (Alasim, 2018)

For interpreters:

- Provide in-service to the teacher and student on role and abilities (Langer, 2007)
- Create annual goals and review
- Achieve certification or an acceptable level of processing on an appropriate screening test
- Utilize different modes including translation and consecutive (McDermid, 2018)
- Utilize different depths of processing, including literal or dynamically equivalent (McDermid,

2018)
- Attend ASL classes or tutoring and demonstrate native or near-native fluency
- Enroll in coursework on child development, language and education (Langer, 2007)
- Become content experts in the different topics that have to be interpreted

References

Alasim, K. (2018). Participation and interaction of deaf and hard-of-hearing students in inclusion classroom. *International Journal of Special Education, 33*(2), 493-506. https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2013.0009

Antia, S., & Kreimeyer, K. (2001). The role of interpreters in inclusive classrooms. *American Annals of the Deaf, 146*(4), 355-365. www.jstor.org/stable/44390115

Bellugi, U., & Fisher, S. (1972) A comparison of sign language and spoken language. *Cognition, 1* (2-3), 173-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(72)90018-2

Eriks-Brophy, A., & Whittingham, J. (2013). Teachers' perceptions of the inclusion of children with hearing loss in general education settings. *American Annals of the Deaf, 158*(1), 63-97. https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2013.0009

Fleischer, L. R. (1975). *Sign language interpretation under four interpreting conditions* (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, Brigham Young University, 1975). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (AAT 7600700)

Gallaudet University. (n.d.) *American Sign Language Proficiency Interview (ASLPI).* Accessed https://www.gallaudet.edu/the-american-sign-language-proficiency-interview/aslpi

Gustason, G. (1985). Interpreters entering public school employment. *American Annals of the Deaf, 130*(4), 265-266. www.jstor.org/stable/44389589

H-Dirksen L., & Murray, J. J. (2010). Deaf Studies in the 21st Century: "Deaf-gain" and the future of human diversity. In M. Marschark and P. Spencer (Eds.) The *Oxford Handbook of Deaf Studies, Language, and Education* (Vol. 2). https://10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195390032.013.0014

Hatfield, N., Caccamise, F., & Siple, P. (1978). Deaf students' language competency: A bilingual perspective. *American Annals of the Deaf, 123*(7), 847-851. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4439981

Hayes, P. L. (1992). Educational interpreters for deaf students: Their responsibilities, problems, and concerns. *Journal of Interpretation, 5,* 5–24.

Hoffmeister, R. J. (2000). A piece of the puzzle: ASL and reading comprehension in Deaf children. In C. Chamberlain, J. P. Morford and R. I. Mayberry (Eds.) *Language Acquisition by Eye* (pp. 143-163). Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hopper, M. J. (2011). *Positioned as bystanders: Deaf students experiences and perceptions of informal learning phenomenon* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Rochester, Rochester New York.

Jacobs, R. (1996). Just how hard is it to learn ASL? The case for ASL as a truly foreign language. In C. Lucas (Ed.) *Multicultural Aspects of Sociolinguistics in Deaf Communities* (pp. 183-226). Gallaudet University Press: Washington, DC.

Jones, B. E., Clark, G. M., & Soltz, D. F. (1997). Characteristics and practices of sign language interpreters in inclusive education programs. *Exceptional Children*, *63*(2), 257-268. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440299706300209

La Bue, M. A. (1998). *Interpreted education: A study of deaf students' access to the content and form of literacy instruction in a mainstreamed high school English class*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 9830061)

Lampropoulou, V., & Hadjikakou, K. (2010). An examination of the history of deaf education in Greece and in Cyprus: Determining factors for its development. *L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 10*(1), 41-56. https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2010.10.01.07

Langer, E. C. (2007). *Classroom discourse and interpreted education: What is conveyed to deaf elementary school students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3256442).

Liddell, S. K. (1980). *American Sign Language Syntax.* The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton Publishers.

Livingston, S., Singer, B., & Abramson, T. (1995). A study to determine the effectiveness of two kinds of interpreting. In A *Confluence of Diverse Relationships: Proceedings of the Thirteenth National Convention of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (pp.* 154 -176). Silver Springs: RID Publications.

Locker, R. (1990). Lexical equivalence in transliterating for Deaf students in university classrooms: Two perspectives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 167-195.

Marschark, M., Sapere, P., Convertino, C., Seewagen, R., & Maltzen, H. (2004). Comprehension of sign language interpreting: deciphering a complex task situation. Sign Language Studies, 4, 345-367. https://doi.org/10.1353/sls.2004.0018

McDermid, C. (2012). *Adult second language pragmatic enrichment: The case of ASL* (Doctoral dissertation). Proquest Dissertations and Theses Full Text (No. NR92815).

McDermid, C. (2018). *Learning to Interpret: Working from English into American Sign Language*. Rochester, New York: Rochester Institute of Technology Press.

Murphy, H. J., & Fleischer, L. R. (1977). The effects of Amesland versus Siglish upon test scores. *Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf, 11*(2), 15-18.

Murray, J. J., Snoddon, K., De Meulder, M., & Underwood, K. (2018): Intersectional inclusion for deaf learners: moving beyond General Comment no. 4 on Article 24 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education.* https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1482013

Powers, S. (2002). From concepts to practice in Deaf Education: A United Kingdom perspective on inclusion. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 7*(3), 230-243. www.jstor.org/stable/42658618

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (2020). *National Interpreter Certification (NIC)*. Accessed January 14, 2020 at https://rid.org/rid-certification-overview/available-certification/nic-certification/

Russell, D. (2002). *Interpreting in Legal Contexts*: *Consecutive and Simultaneous Interpretation*. Burtonsville MD: Linstok Press.

Russell, D. (2010). *Illusion of inclusion: Realities and consequences*. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Education of the Deaf (ICED), Vancouver, June.

Schick, B., Williams, K., & Bolster, L. (1999). Skill levels of education interpreters working in public schools. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 4*(2), 144-155. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/4.2.144

Schick, B., Williams, K., & Kupermintz, H. (2006). Look who's being left behind: Educational interpreters and access to education for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing students*. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 11(1),* 3-20. https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enj007

Schwab, S., Wimberger, T., & Mamas, C. (2019). Fostering social participation in inclusive classrooms of students who are Deaf. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 66*(3), 325-342. https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2018.1562158

Siple, L. (1995). *The use of addition in sign language transliteration (*Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of New York Buffalo. UMI Number 9617912

Smith, D.H., & Ramsey, C.L.L. (2004). Classroom discourse practices of a Deaf teacher using American Sign Language. *Sign Language Studies, 5*(1), 39-62. https://doi.org/10.1353/sls.2004.0026

Stinson, M., & Antia, S. (1999, Summer). Considerations in educating deaf and hard-of-hearing students in inclusive settings. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 4(3) 163–175, https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/4.3.163

Stauffer, L. K., & Viera, J. A. (2000). Transliteration: A comparison of consumer needs and transliterator preparation and practice. In D. Watson (Ed.), *Journal of Interpretation* (61 - 82). Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.

United Nations. (n.d.). Conventions on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). Retrieved from https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html

Winston, E. (2004). Interpretability and accessibility of mainstream classrooms. In E. A. Winston (Ed.), *Educational Interpreting: How It Can Succeed*? (pp. 132–168). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Wolbers, K.A., Dimling, L.M., Lawson, H.R., & Golos, D.B. (2012). Parallel and divergent interpreting in an elementary school classroom. *American Annals of the Deaf 157*(1), 48-65. https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.1609

Wulf, A., Dudis, P., Bayley, R., & Lucas, C. (2002). Variable subject presence in ASL narratives. *Sign Language Studies, 3*(1), 54-76. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26204893

Yarger, C.C. (2001). Educational interpreting: Understanding the rural experience. *American Annals of the Deaf, 146*(1), 16-30. doi:10.1353/aad.2012.0074

Uzun Özet

İşaret Dili Tercümanları, Sağır Öğrenciler ve Kapsayıcı Eğitim?

Bu çalışmada, sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencilerin işaret dili tercümanı desteği ile kapsayıcı eğitim uygulamaları bağlamında eğitim almalarına ilişkin çalışmalar gözden geçirilmiş ve uygulama için önerilerde bulunulmuştur. Sağır ya da işitme yetersizliğinden etkilenmiş öğrencilerin kapsayıcı eğitim ortamlarında öğrenim görmesi, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri (Antia ve Kreimeyer, 2001), Birleşik Krallık (Powers, 2002), Yunanistan (Lampropoulou ve Hadjikakou, 2010) ve Avusturya (Schwab, Wimberger ve Mamas, 2019) gibi ülkelerde sıklıkla kullanılan bir yaklaşım haline gelmiştir. Kapsayıcı eğitim uygulamalarıyla ilgili birçok sınırlılık ve zorluk olduğu bilinmektedir. Bu sınırlılıkların en önemlilerinden biri, genel eğitim öğretmenlerinin sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan çocuklar ile çalışma konusunda kendilerini yetersiz ya da hazırlıksız hissetmeleridir (Eriks-Brophy ve Whittingham, 2013).

Alanyazında, kapsayıcı eğitim ortamlarında sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrenciler ile çalışan öğretmenleri desteklemek için bir dizi öneri yer almaktadır. Pek çok öğretmenden işaret dili tercümanlarıyla çalışmaları isteneceği göz önüne alındığında, öğretmenlerin tercümanların nasıl eğitildiğinin ve metinleri konuşulandan işaret diline nasıl tercüme ettiklerinin farkında olmaları gerekir. Tercüman, sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrenci tarafından anlaşılabilir ya da anlaşılabilir olmayan, kelimesi kelimesine bir tercüme yapabileceği gibi, daha edebi bir tercüme de yapabilir (McDermid, 2018). Ayrıca, öğrencilerin daha iyi anlayabilmesi için işaret dili metnini zenginleştiren veya ima edilen anlamları açıklayan dinamik eşdeğer bir çeviri oluşturabilirler (McDermid, 2018). Araştırmalar, tercümanlar harf çevirisi yerine daha dinamik eşdeğer bir çeviri yaptığında, sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencilerin testlerde daha başarılı olduğunu göstermiştir (Fleischer, 1975; Hatfield, Caccamise ve Siple, 1978; Hoffmeister, 2000; Livingston, Singer ve Abramson, 1995).

Öğretmenler, işaret dili tercümanlarının çeviri için ardıl veya eşzamanlı çalışma da dahil olmak üzere farklı çeviri biçimlerini benimseyebileceklerinin farkında olmalıdır. Eşzamanlı çeviri biçiminde çalışırken, tercümanlar tercüme etmeden önce çoğu kez tüm bir söyleneni duymak için beklemek zorundadır. Bu bir "gecikme" yaratır ve sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencinin, işiten öğrencilerden sonra yorumları veya soruları göreceği/duyacağı anlamına gelir (Winston, 2004). Ardıl çeviri biçimi gibi farklı çeviri biçimlerinin eşzamanlı çeviriden daha doğru olabileceğinin de farkında olmalıdırlar (Russell, 2002).

Eğitimciler, işaret dili tercümanlarına pedagoji hakkında çok şey öğretilmediğini de biliyor olmalıdır (Gustason, 1985). Tercümanlar, muhtemelen matematik, coğrafya veya fen bilimleri gibi alanlarda içerik uzmanı olmayacaktırlar (Langer, 2007; Yarger, 2001). Bu, sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencilerin bu alanlarda kısıtlı ya da yanlış bilgilere erişmelerine neden olabilir. Aynı tercümanlar, bu alanlarda dersler dışında öğrencileri desteklemek için de görevlendirilebilirler ve bu uygulama, durumu daha da sorunla hale getirebilir (Antia ve Kreimeyer, 2001; Hayes, 1992; Jones, Clark ve Soltz, 1997). İşaret dili tercümanları genellikle işaret dilinde akıcı değildirler ve bu nedenle işaret dili rol modelleri olarak hizmet etmemelidir (Jones vd., 1997). İçerik bilgisi eksikliğine ek olarak, akıcılıktaki eksiklik onların yorumlama yeteneklerini daha da etkileyebilir (Schick, Williams ve Kupermintz, 2006). Bu durum da onların doğru yorumlama yeteneklerinin sorgulanmasına neden olur (Schick vd., 2006).

Sayılan bu zorlukların üstesinden gelmek için sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencileri engelli olarak gören bakış açısından ziyade, bu öğrencilerin kültürüne, diline ve kimliğine saygı gösteren ve onların toplumda daha aktif olarak yer almalarını kazanç olarak gören bir bakış açısına geçmeye gereksinim duyulmaktadır (H-Dirksen ve Murray, 2010). Bu felsefe değişikliğini başarmak için öğretmenlerin ve yöneticilerin belirli önerileri dikkate almaları önerilmektedir. Bu bağlamda, sınıf ve okul ortamında yapılacak düzenlemeler belirlenmelidir. Kurum düzeyinde, okuldaki herkes için zorunlu işaret dili dersleri düşünülmeli (Yarger, 2001), ana dil rol modelleri de getirilmelidir. İşiten öğrenciler işaret dilini kullandıklarında, kişilerarası ilişkileri geliştirebilir ve tesadüfi öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırarak sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrenciye yardımcı olabilir (Hopper, 2011).

İşaret dili tercümanları istihdam edilirken açık ve uygun iş tanımlarının oluşturulması gerekir (Antia ve Kreimeyer, 2001). Ayrıca, bu tercümanlar için süpervizyon sistemi kurulmalıdır (Hayes, 1992). Çeviri doğruluğunu artırmak için tercümanların, eşzamanlı çeviri ve ardıl çeviri de dâhil olmak üzere farklı çeviri biçimlerini kullanmasına izin verilmelidir. Tercümanlara, tercüme için çağrılmadan önce içeriği öğrenebilmeleri ve bunu net bir şekilde tercüme etmenin yollarını bulabilmeleri için hazırlık süresi verilmelidir. Ayrıca, mümkün olduğunca eşzamanlı çeviriden uzak durulmalıdır.

Son olarak, pedagojik uyarlamaların öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin söylemsel uygulamalarının özelliklerini içerecek şekilde değerlendirilmesi gerekir (Smith ve Ramsey, 2004). Öğretmenler, sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencilerin, bir bildiriyi okumak ve tercümanı izlemek gibi aynı anda farklı görsel uyaranlara odaklanmak zorunda olmadıkları bir sınıf oluşturmalıdır. Tüm sınıfa soru sorulurken, sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencinin sorulara işiten öğrenciler ile aynı anda erişiminin sağlanması için soruları yazılı olarak sormak gibi önlemler alınmalıdır. Öğretmenler ayrıca sağır ya da işitme yetersizliği olan öğrencilere derslerde düzenli olarak söz verildiğinden ve uygun desteklerin sunulduğundan emin olmalıdır.