Interpreter Practitioner Needs Assessment Trends Analysis

Final Report

SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE
NATIONAL CONSORTIUM OF INTERPRETER EDUCATION CENTERS (#H160A&B)
BY DENNIS COKELY, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR & ELIZABETH WINSTON, DIRECTOR
NATIONAL INTERPRETER EDUCATION CENTER
MAY 2010

Foreword

The National Consortium of Interpreting Education Centers (NCIEC) is authorized and funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), U.S. Department of Education. Through grants awarded by the Department, the National Interpreter Education Center (NIEC) and five Regional Interpreter Education Centers (RIECs) that comprise the Consortium are working collaboratively to increase the number of qualified interpreters nationwide and ensure that quality interpreter education opportunities and products are available across the country.

A primary requirement of the NCIEC grants is to conduct ongoing activities to identify needs in the field of interpreter education. This report has been prepared based on the findings and conclusions of a national initiative designed and carried out to assess the needs of interpreter practitioners across the country. This Interpreter Practitioner Needs Assessment Trends Analysis is submitted by the NCIEC on behalf of the NIEC and the five RIECs. The report provides an overview of the needs assessment process and discusses and compares discrete assessment findings.

Acknowledgements

This report is submitted by Dr. Dennis Cokely and Dr. Betsy Winston, National Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University (NIEC), with extensive help and input from:

- Sarah Snow, NIEC
- Karen Dahms, External Consultant: NIEC

We also wish to extend special thanks to the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Center Directors and staff of the:

- National Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University
- Northeastern University Regional Interpreter Education Center
- Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center
- CATIE Center at St. Catherine University
- Mid-America Regional Interpreter Education Center
- Western Region Interpreter Education Center

The Consortium also gratefully acknowledges the input of all the Interpreter Education Programs who took the time to collect the information needed to provide a thoughtful response to the survey. Without their active participation, this Needs Assessment would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	**Executive Summary**	**1**
II.	**Comparison of Interpreter Practitioner Surveys 1 and 2**	**3**
A.	**Basic Information about Respondents**	**3**
	Classification Plan to Apply for Credentials Membership in Professional Organizations Plan to Achieve a Higher Degree Retirement Plans	
B.	**Interpreting Languages and Systems**	**9**
	Languages Used by Interpreters Systems Used by Interpreters	
C.	**Interpreting Settings**	**10**
	Current Distribution of Interpreter Time Settings for Future Specialization	
D.	**Interpreter Pay**	**14**
E.	**Interpreter Training and Education Needs**	**16**
	Survey 1 – Education and Training Priorities Survey 2 – Education and Training Priorities Comparison of Surveys 1 and 2	

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Interpreter Practitioner Survey 1
Appendix B – Interpreter Practitioner Survey 2

NCIEC Interpreter Practitioner Needs Assessment
Trends Analysis Report

I. Executive Summary

The National Interpreting Education Center (NIEC) is authorized and funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), U.S. Department of Education. In addition to the NIEC, grants were also awarded to five Regional Interpreter Education Centers (RIECs). Together, the six Centers have established the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC). This collaborative approach to implementation of the RSA grants fosters Center-to-Center communication and coordination; better leveraging of available resources, and more effective stewardship of federal funds. Since grant award, the NCIEC has been working on a number of national initiatives, one of which has been design, development and implementation of needs assessment activities in key focus areas. The overall objectives of the needs assessment activities are to identify current and future needs of interpreter education programs, interpreter educators, interpreters and consumers of interpreter services.

The Interpreter Practitioner Needs Assessment was carried out through design, development and implementation of a survey instrument. The survey instrument was then disseminated to the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) membership list. Approximately 8,000 RID members received notification and an invitation to complete the electronic survey. The survey period concluded April 15, 2007, resulting in a total of 3,903 assessment responses. A report based on the findings of the first survey is available at: http://www.nciec.org/resource/nna.html. A PDF file with the first Interpreter Practitioner survey questions and summary of responses is attached as Appendix A.

Based on the findings of that first interpreter practitioner effort, the survey instrument was revised and updated, and then disseminated a second time in fall of 2009. There were three primary objectives planned for the second dissemination of the survey:

- Improve and streamline the original survey instrument based on information captured and lessons learned in the first effort
- Collect and compare information and findings generated through the first survey effort to information collected through the second survey nearly three years later
- Identify new or changed needs and emerging trends related to the needs of interpreter practitioners

The second survey period concluded in December, 2009 and resulted in 2.690 completed responses. A PDF file with the second survey questions and summary of responses is attached to this report as Appendix B.

While the survey instruments used in both interpreter practitioner needs assessment efforts were very similar, they were not identical. Because this report, the Interpreter Practitioner Trends Analysis Report, is specifically designed to compare like information

collected in the two efforts, there are data elements unique to each survey that are not included in this report. However, as mentioned above, both sets of survey data, in their entirety, can be reviewed in the PDF files attached as Appendix A and B.

Completion of this report does not mark the end of the interpreter practitioner needs assessment process. Findings and results will continue to be utilized by NCIEC to develop interpreter education priorities, to identify, establish and implement effective practices, and to institute appropriate and relevant evaluation processes. In addition, the Consortium will conduct follow-up needs assessment activities to continue to identify new and changing interpreting needs, and to determine the extent to which what has been learned through this process can be used to influence interpreter education practices and improve interpreter outcomes in the field.

II. Comparison of Interpreter Practitioner Surveys 1 and 2

In the first interpreter practitioner needs assessment, 3,903 respondents completed surveys. In the second dissemination of the survey instrument, 2,690 completed surveys were collected. The following sections of this report compare the two sets of information collected through the two needs assessment efforts, and identify areas where information is either the same, or appears to differ, thereby indicating a potential change in the field or an emerging trend.

Because the two surveys resulted in different size response sets, 3,903 respondents in the first survey, and 2,690 in the second, the trends analysis process focuses primarily on comparing the percentage of respondents in each survey group that responded a particular way to a survey question, versus comparing the number of respondents. However, in some cases, both percentage of respondents and actual numbers of respondents are reported. Another factor to bear in mind when reviewing the comparison data is the different timeframes during which the two surveys were administered. Specifically, Survey 1 was administered in 2006 and carried into the spring of 2007, and Survey 2 was administered in the fall of 2009.

A. Basic Information about Respondents

This section of the trends analysis reports basic information about both sets of the survey respondents. Specifically, it provides a comparison between the two sets of reported information that relate to: national credentials respondents possess, and their plans to pursue national credentials if they don't already possess them; respondent membership in national organizations; respondent plans to pursue a higher academic degree, and respondent plans related to retirement.

Classification

With regard to classification, interpreter practitioner respondents in both surveys were asked to classify themselves according to four different criteria: professional (someone who is credentialed); pre-professional (more than one year working but is not yet credentialed); novice (less than one year following completion of an AA/AAS or BA/BS interpreter education program), and other (does not fit the above categories and is not a student).

Classification data for each of the two survey groups is provided on Table 1.

Respondent Classification Table 1		
Classification	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Professional	79%	83%
Pre-professional	15%	11%
Novice	2%	4%
Other	4%	2%

Finding: It is positive to note that the majority of respondents in both survey sets identified themselves as professional, defined by the instrument as 'someone who is credentialed'. In fact, there was an increase by 4% in the percentage of Survey 2 respondents that identified themselves as a professional. This similarity between the two survey groups is supportive of further comparisons between the two survey sets throughout the remainder of the trends analysis.

Survey 2 asked the 83% of respondents that reported they hold credentials to identify what type of credentials they possessed. The first survey did not ask this question. Information reported by the second survey group is presented on Table 1a.

Credentials Held Table 1a	
Type of Credential	**Survey 2**
RID NIC (National Interpreter Certification)	21%
RID NIC Advanced	4%
RID NIC Master	3%
RID CI (Certificate of Interpretation)	38%
RID CT (Certificate of Transliteration)	40%
RID CDI-P (Certified Deaf Interpreter - Provisional)	0%
RID CDI (Certified Deaf Interpreter)	1%
RID CSC (Comprehensive Skills Certificate)	7%
RID MCSC (Master Comprehensive Skills Certificate)	0%
RID RSC (Reverse Skills Certificate)	1%
RID OTC (Oral Transliteration Certificate)	1%
RID OIC:C (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Comprehensive)	1%
RID OIC:S/V (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Spoken to Visible)	0%
RID OIC:V/S (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Visible to Spoken)	0%
RID IC/TC (Interpretation Certificate/Transliteration Certificate)	3%
RID IC (Interpretation Certificate)	2%
RID TC (Transliteration Certificate)	2%
NAD III (Generalist) - Average Performance	5%
NAD IV (Advanced) - Above Average Performance	5%
NAD V (Master) - Superior Performance	2%
Ed: K-12 (Educational Certificate: K-12)	11%
RID State Certification	1%
State/Local Certification	24%

Finding: The most frequently reported credentials by Survey 2 respondents were: RID Certificate of Transliteration (40%), RID Certificate of Interpretation (38%) and RID National Interpreter Certification (21%). By comparison, a significantly lower percentage of respondents reported holding the other RID-related credentials, or as having achieved NAD-related credentials.

Plan to Apply for Credentials

As reported on Table 1, the majority of Survey 1 and Survey 2 respondents identified themselves as professional, or as having credentials. In both surveys, a follow-up question asked those respondents that **had not** yet acquired national credentials, or those that identified as 'pre-professional, novice, or other', to report on their plans to acquire national credentials. The data reported on Table 2 applies only to that subset of survey respondents (21% of Survey 1 respondents and 17% of Survey 2).

Plan to Apply for Initial Recognized Credentials
Table 2

Timeframe	Survey 1		Survey 2	
Within 3 months	280	7%	142	5%
In 4-6 months	154	4%	98	4%
In 7-9 months	72	2%	55	2%
In 10-12 months	113	3%	77	3%
In 13-18 months	62	2%	33	1%
In 19-24 months	160	4%	75	3%

Finding: In 2012 RID will begin to require that interpreters possess a BA/BS degree before they can sit for national certification. It is interesting that those respondents in both surveys that reported on Table 1 that they did not yet possess national credentials all reported plans to achieve their national credentials within the next 24 months. Based on the timing of both surveys, this seems to indicate respondents in both survey groups plan to acquire their national credentials prior to the 2012 timeframe for the RID BA/BS degree certification requirement.

Both surveys also asked that same subset of survey respondents that reported they had a plan to apply for national credentials, what type of credential they planned to attain.

Credential Sought
Table 3

Credentials	Survey 1		Survey 2	
State level	81	2%	49	2%
National (RID certifications) level	603	15%	288	10%
Both state and national levels	208	5%	158	6%

Finding: It is positive to note that of the subset of respondents that reported they had a plan to achieve initial recognized credentials, most plan to achieve those credentials at either a national level, or at both a state and national level. Very few plan to seek credentials only at the state level (2% of both respondent groups). However, there is a 4% decrease in the percentage Survey 2 respondents that reported they will seek to achieve credentials at the national level, or at the state and national level when compared to Survey 1.

Membership in Professional Organizations

Both sets of respondents were asked to indicate whether they were a member of a professional organization related to deafness and/or interpreting.

Membership in National Organizations Table 4		
Classification	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Yes	97%	95%
No	3%	5%

Finding: The majority of respondents in both survey groups reported they do belong to a professional organization related to deafness and/or interpreting.

Both surveys also asked respondents if they were involved in a professional organization related to deafness and/or interpreting, to identify the particular organization(s). However, this question was asked in an open-ended format in the first survey, while in the second survey respondents were provided a list of professional organizations to select from.

Because of the open-ended format used in the first survey, there was significant variation in how respondents responded. For example, many respondents identified only those national organizations they belonged to while others identified locally-based teams and committees they serve on. In addition, there were numerous errors related to spelling and entering information electronically that did not allow for accurate counting in the various categories when assessing a survey set of 3,903. However, for the purposes of this report and comparing like information, queries were run on Survey 1 data regarding four prominent organizations: RID, National Association of the Deaf (NAD), CIT and American Sign Language Teachers Association (ASLTA). That information is provided on Table 5.

Type of Membership Table 5	
Survey 1	
RID	80%
NAD	20%
CIT	4%

ASLTA	3%
Survey 2	
RID National	92%
RID State	71%
NAD National	20%
NAD State	8%
CIT	12%
ASLTA	6%

Finding: Since the survey instrument was disseminated through the RID membership list, it should be assumed all respondents belong to RID. However, as Table 5 indicates, not all respondents in either survey group indicated belonging to the organization. In addition, it appears that a higher percentage of Survey 2 respondents belong to CIT and ASLTA than do Survey 1 respondents. However, it is important to remember that spelling and data entry errors occurring due to the open-ended format of the Survey 1 question did contribute to some level of data inaccuracy for that respondent group.

Plan to Achieve a Higher Degree

The surveys asked respondents whether they planned to work toward a higher degree in the next ten years.

Plan to Achieve A Higher Degree
Table 6

Respondents	Survey 1		Survey 2	
Plan to work toward a higher degree in the next 1-5 years	1,685	43%	984	36%
Plan to work toward a higher degree in the next 6-10 years	484	12%	347	13%
No plan to work toward a higher degree	1,687	43%	1313	49%

Finding: In Survey 1, 43% of respondents reported that they had plans to work toward a higher degree in the next 1-5 years. Only 36% of respondents in Survey 2 reported such a plan. There was a 1% increase in the number of respondents that reported they plan to work toward a higher degree in the next 6-10 years, from 12% in Survey 1 to 13% in Survey 2.

It may be concerning that the number of respondents that reported they had no plan to work toward a higher degree rose from 43% in Survey 1, to 49% in Survey 2. However, the data could actually be interpreted several ways. The increase in percentage of respondents that reported they had no plan might actually be a positive indication a trend that interpreters are increasingly attaining the planned for degree. Conversely, it might be construed that increasingly, interpreters are not planning work toward a higher degree, which is at odds with the RID 2012 requirement for a BA/BS degree.

The surveys also asked the respondents that indicated they plan to work toward a higher degree in the next ten years, what degree they would seek to achieve. Because

responses represent a subset of respondents (those that have plans to work toward a higher degree), actual numbers of individuals are reported as well as respondent percentages.

Higher Degrees Sought in Next Ten Years Table 7				
Higher Degree	**Survey 1**		**Survey 2**	
Respondents planning to work toward AA/AS degree	142	4%	81	3%
Respondents planning to work toward BA/BS degree	830	21%	538	20%
Respondents planning to work toward MA/MS degree	776	20%	598	22%
Respondents planning to work toward PhD/EdD degree	232	6%	186	7%

Finding: There is no real difference in percentages between Survey 1 and Survey 2. In both surveys, fewer respondents report plans to work toward an AA/AS degree than do respondents that report plans to work toward a BA/BS or MA/MS degree. The focus in both surveys appears to be on attainment of higher academic degrees. This raises the question whether those individuals will continue to work as interpreters, or will progress on to other careers, once they attain their academic goal.

Retirement Plans

The surveys asked respondents about their plans to retire from the field of interpreting.

Retirement Plans Table 8				
Retirement plans	**Survey 1**		**Survey 2**	
Plan to retire in next 1-5 years	216	6%	153	5%
Plan to retire in next 6-10 years	637	16%	419	16%
No plan to retire	3,015	77%	2077	77%

Finding: There is negligible percentage change in the retirement information reported by the two survey respondent sets. However, it would be useful to compare the retirement data with information about student enrollment and graduation. Future needs assessments should seek to collect enrollment and graduation data in a way that lends comparison to the retirement data collected here.

B. Languages and Systems Used

The surveys were designed to capture detailed information regarding respondent use of the primary interpreting languages and systems. Table 9 reports the extent to which the primary interpreting languages are used by the two survey groups.

Primary Languages Used for Interpreting Table 9						
Survey 1						
Languages	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
ASL/spoken English	4%	4%	6%	15%	14%	56%
Other signed language/English	63%	6%	8%	11%	7%	5%
ASL/other spoken language	92%	4%	2%	1%	1%	0%
Other language combinations	93%	3%	2%	1%	0%	1%
Survey 2						
Languages	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
ASL/spoken English	4%	1%	2%	7%	9%	77%
Other signed language/English	79%	7%	6%	5%	2%	1%
ASL/other spoken language	87%	8%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Other language combinations	92%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Finding: There are several differences in the Survey 1 and Survey 2 data worth noting. Starting with 'ASL/spoken English,' there appears to be a higher percentage of Survey 2 respondents using that language more than 75% of the time; up from 56% in Survey 1 to 77% in Survey 2. With regard to 'Other signed language/English', there appears to be a decrease in the percentage of respondents that even use that language. Specifically, in Survey 1, 63% of the respondents reported they spend "0%" of their time interpreting in that language, and in Survey 2, that percentage rose to 79% of respondents. There seems to be a slight increase in the percentage of respondents that reported they use "ASL/other spoken language' in Survey 2. In Survey 1, 92% of respondents reported they do not use 'ASL/other spoken language', and in Survey 2, 87% reported they do not use 'ASL/other spoken language'.

Systems Used by Interpreters

The surveys also queried respondents with regard to the systems they use for interpreting. The extent to which each of the systems is currently in use by the two respondent groups is reported on Table 10.

Breakdown of Systems Used for Interpreting Table 10						
Survey 1						
Systems	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Signed/Spoken English Transliteration	8%	5%	6%	9%	9%	63%
Oral Transliteration	82%	11%	3%	2%	1%	0%
Cued Transliteration	99%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Language Transliteration	94%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Survey 2						
Systems	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Signed/Spoken English Transliteration	9%	6%	6%	10%	9%	60%
Oral Transliteration	77%	13%	4%	4%	1%	1%
Cued Transliteration	97%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Other Language Transliteration	93%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%

Finding: As Table 10 indicates, there is little variation across the two sets of survey data. For both groups, Signed/Spoken English Transliteration is by far the interpreting system most used by respondents. Looking at both data sets, 72% of Survey 1 respondents and 69% of Survey 2 respondents use Signed/spoken English transliteration more than 50% of the time, with the majority of that subset of respondents using the system more than 75% of the time. By comparison, the majority of responses for both survey groups fell in the '0' category with regard to use of Oral Transliteration, Cued Transliteration and Other Language Transliteration systems.

C. Interpreting Settings

An important objective of the needs assessment process was to capture valid and reliable data related to the various settings in which interpreters are working. Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of time they work interpreting in each of the following settings: medical, K-12, post-secondary education, technical/vocational, business, social services, legal, mental health, religious, vocational rehabilitation (VR), and video relay services/video relay interpreting (VRS/VRI). Ranges from "0%" through "76%-100%" were provided.

While "0%" was provided as a selection option, it was discovered a significant number of respondents skipped settings, and only made a selection in those setting categories in which they work. To accurately calculate any of the percentages reported in relation to the total number of respondents, respondents that skipped settings are counted in the "0%" category. Therefore, in assessing any of the response rates in the "0%" category, it should be remembered the percentage reported counts respondents that actually selected "0%" and respondents that skipped the setting.

Distribution of Interpreting Across Settings Table 11						
Survey 1						
Interpreting Settings	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Medical	43%	31%	15%	7%	4%	1%
K-12	56%	13%	4%	3%	8%	15%
Post-secondary Education	43%	20%	12%	9%	8%	8%
Technical/Vocational	67%	23%	6%	3%	1%	1%
Business	52%	28%	11%	5%	2%	2%
Social Services	58%	29%	9%	2%	1%	1%
Legal	76%	15%	5%	2%	1%	1%
Mental Health	66%	24%	7%	2%	1%	1%
Religious	67%	23%	6%	2%	1%	1%
Vocational Rehabilitation	72%	21%	4%	2%	1%	1%
VRS/VRI	68%	7%	7%	6%	6%	6%
Deaf person's place of employment	Not asked	Not asked	Not asked	Not asked	Not asked	Not asked
Survey 2						
Interpreting Settings	0%	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Medical	38%	32%	14%	9%	5%	2%
K-12	60%	12%	3%	3%	8%	13%
Post-secondary	44%	21%	10%	8%	9%	8%
Technical/Vocational	71%	20%	5%	2%	1%	1%
Business	58%	27%	9%	3%	2%	1%
Social Services	58%	29%	9%	2%	1%	1%
Legal	79%	14%	3%	2%	1%	1%
Mental Health	67%	23%	6%	2%	1%	1%
Religious	66%	25%	5%	2%	1%	1%
Vocational Rehabilitation	77%	17%	3%	1%	1%	1%
VRS/VRI	60%	10%	7%	7%	7%	9%
Deaf person's place of employment	62%	24%	7%	3%	2%	2%

Finding: It is interesting to begin the analysis by looking at the 0% column, indicating that percentage of respondents that spend no time interpreting in that setting. In both surveys, the six settings with the highest percentages in the "0%" category are: technical vocational, legal, mental health, religious, VR and VRS/VRI. For both surveys, in all six settings 60% or more of the respondents reported they do no interpreting work in that setting.

Upon closer analysis, in the medical and VRS/VRI settings, the percentage of respondents in the "0%" category decreased in the second survey, which conversely indicates that the percentage of interpreters that are providing services in those settings is in fact higher in the later survey. It is not surprising to see that 8% more respondents in Survey 2 report working in VRS/VRI settings than in Survey 1. This provides further evidence of the drain VRS/VRI is having on the number of interpreters available to provide face-to-face services in community settings.

Once again looking at the "0%" column, It is encouraging to see a 5% increase in the percentage of Survey 2 respondents that reported working in medical settings, especially as other NCIEC needs assessment activities provide evidence of an increased demand for interpreters in that setting.

There were also settings in which the percentage of respondents counted in the "0%" column increased: K-12, technical/vocational, business, legal and VR. The increase in percentages reported in the "0%" column conversely indicates that there are fewer respondents working as interpreters in those settings. The highest percentage differentiation was in 'business', in which 6% more Survey 2 respondents are counted as not providing any interpreting services in that setting. The second highest difference in reporting was with regard to VR settings, in which 5% more Survey 2 respondents are counted in the "0%" column, or reported as not providing any services in that setting.

In fact, with the exception of K-12 in which approximately 25% of Survey 1 respondents and 21% of Survey 2 respondents work more than 50% of their time, data on Table 11 seems to indicate that the interpreting services of respondents in both survey groups are delivered across multiple settings.

In Table 12, the total percentage of respondents indicating they work in a particular setting is compared with the percentage of respondents that reported they spend more than 50% of their time interpreting in that setting.

Comparison of Distribution of Work in Interpreting Settings
Table 12

Respondents	Survey 1		Survey 2	
Setting	**Working in setting**	**>50% in setting**	**Working in setting**	**>50% in setting**
Medical	57%	5%	62%	7%
K-12	44%	23%	40%	21%
Post-secondary	57%	16%	56%	17%
Technical/Vocational	33%	2%	29%	2%
Business	48%	4%	42%	3%
Social Services	42%	2%	42%	2%
Legal	24%	2%	21%	2%
Mental Health	34%	2%	33%	2%

Religious	33%	2%	34%	2%
VR	28%	2%	23%	2%
VRS/VRI	32%	12%	40%	16%

Finding: The biggest change in percentage between the two surveys is in the VRS/VRI setting. In comparison to Survey 1, there was an 8% increase in the percentage of Survey 2 respondents that reported they work in that setting, as well as a 4% increase in the percentage of those respondents that reported they spend more than 50% of their time interpreting in that setting. This is further evidence of the impact VRS/VRI has on interpreter availability.

Settings for Future Specialization

Respondents in both surveys were asked to select the **one setting** in which they would most like to specialize in the future. That information is presented on Table 13.

Preferred Area of Future Specialization
Table 13

Interpreting Settings	Survey 1	Survey 2
Medical	18%	22%
K-12	16%	14%
Post-secondary Education	20%	19%
Technical/Vocational	1%	2%
Business	7%	6%
Social Services	3%	3%
Legal	12%	11%
Mental Health	6%	5%
Religious	4%	3%
Vocational Rehabilitation	1%	2%
VRS/VRI	8%	9%
Deaf-blind Interpreting	2%	2%

Finding: There are very few differences in data reported by the two survey groups, with post-secondary education, medical, K-12 and legal settings remaining the four most often selected for future specialization. The biggest percent point difference happens with regard to medical settings, with 4% more of Survey 2 respondents reporting they would like to specialize in that setting in the future. What is more concerning are the very low percentages in both sets of survey data in the remaining settings. There appears to be little interest or incentive in the field to specialize in settings including VR; technical/vocational, social services or deaf-blind interpreting. Specialization in interpreting in mental health settings actually saw a 1% decrease in Survey 2, yet this is one of the settings that has been identified in other needs assessment efforts as having an unmet demand for qualified interpreters.

D. Interpreter Pay

In the second interpreter practitioner survey, respondents were asked to report what they charge as a total hourly rate. The first interpreter practitioner survey did not collect this information.

Survey 2 - Interpreter Pay Table 14		
Hourly Pay Ranges	**Respondents**	**% of Respondents**
$1-$10	2	0%
$11-$15	28	1%
$16-$20	113	4%
$21-$25	210	8%
$26-$30	317	12%
$31-$35	390	14%
$36-$40	453	17%
$41-$45	352	13%
$46-$50	307	11%
$51-$55	149	5%
$56-$60	97	4%
$61-$65	47	2%
$66-$70	28	1%
$71-$75	10	0%
$75+	11	0%
No response	176	7%
Total Respondents	2,690	100%

Finding: The highest percentage of Survey 2 respondents (17%), report earning from $36-$40 per hour. An additional 14% report earning from $31-$35 per hour; 13% reported from $41-$45 per hour, and 12% of respondents reported earning from $26-$30 per hour.

Although the first interpreter practitioner survey did not ask respondents to report information about hourly pay, there were two other NCIEC-led survey efforts that did: the Interpreter Referral Agency Needs Assessment survey, and the State Coordinators for the Deaf (SCD) Needs Assessment survey. Information collected in those two efforts can be compared to the Interpreter Practitioner Survey 2 data.

In the SCD survey, 33 respondents reported starting hourly pay information for the part-time interpreters employed by their VR agency. In that survey, respondents were provided slightly broader pay ranges than the ranges used on Table 14. The Interpreter Referral Agency survey used the same pay ranges as the SCD survey to report what they pay part-time interpreters that are nationally certified. The Interpreter Referral Agency survey also reported hourly pay information for interpreters that have local credentials, but the nationally certified data was used since in the Interpreter

Practitioner Survey 2, most respondents reported they were professionals (Table 1), defined as having national credentials, making that data more relevant for comparison. As a further point of clarification, in the Interpreter Practitioner survey, respondents are working interpreters; in the SCD survey, respondents are reporting on behalf of their VR agency, and finally, in the Interpreter Referral Agency survey, respondents are individual agencies. Hourly pay reported by the Interpreter Referral Agency survey indicates pay to the interpreter, not what the agency charges the client.

Comparison of Hourly Pay Across Needs Assessments
Table 15

Respondent	IP Survey 2		SCD Survey		Referral Agency Survey	
Pay Range	**# Responses**	**%**	**# Responses**	**%**	**# Responses**	**%**
$10-20 per hour	141	5%	0	0%	0	0%
$21-30 per hour	527	20%	2	6%	3	9%
$31-40 per hour	843	31%	10	31%	9	26%
$41-50 per hour	659	24%	7	21%	15	44%
$51-60 per hour	246	9%	5	15%	5	15%
$61-70 per hour	75	3%	2	6%	1	3%
$71-80 per hour	21	0%	0	0%	0	0%
$81-90 per hour	0%	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Do not know	176	7%	1	3%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	6	18%	0	0%
Total	**2,690**	**100%**	**33**	**100%**	**34**	**100%**

Finding: The first point of comparison is in the $21-30 per hour range: 20% of Interpreter Practitioner respondents reported they were paid in that range, while only 9% of Interpreter Referral Agency respondents selected that pay range, and 6% of SCD respondents reported that range as its starting hourly pay for part-time interpreters. In the next pay range, 31% of both Interpreter Practitioner and SCD survey respondents reported they pay part-time interpreters from $31-40 per hour, while only 26% of the Interpreter Referral Agency respondents selected that pay range. However, 44% of Interpreter Referral Agency respondents selected the $41-50 pay range in comparison to 24% of Interpreter Practitioner respondents and only 21% of SCD respondents. In the $51-60 range, 9% of Interpreter Practitioner respondents selected that range, while 15% of both SCD and Interpreter Referral Agency respondents selected that range.

In general, it appears that interpreters are more likely to earn higher hourly wages working for VR agencies or for Interpreter Referral Agencies than they may be able to generate as an hourly rate on their own.

E. Interpreter Training and Education Needs

Respondents of both surveys were asked to indicate what type of education and training they would like to have in the future to prepare them for work in the various interpreter settings. However the question was asked differently in the two survey instruments.

Survey 1 – Future Education and Training Priorities

In the first survey, respondents were provided an interpreter setting, and then for that setting, a list of five types of education and training: Language/vocabulary – ASL English; Context/Content Knowledge; Interpreting Knowledge; Interpreting Practice, and Mentoring. It is also important to consider when looking at Table 16, that respondents may have felt they currently possess sufficient knowledge and skills (from prior education and training experiences) and therefore did not indicate a need for more of that type of education and training in the future.

Future Education and Training Needs by Setting
Table 16

Survey 1					
Interpreter Settings	**Language/Vocab – ASL/English**	**Context/Content Knowledge**	**Interpreting Knowledge**	**Interpreting Practice**	**Mentoring**
Medical	51%	48%	18%	25%	32%
K-12	23%	22%	14%	17%	20%
Post-secondary	37%	38%	17%	22%	25%
Technical/Vocational	32%	33%	12%	17%	18%
Business	33%	35%	13%	19%	20%
Social Services	29%	33%	14%	19%	20%
Legal	43%	44%	29%	35%	41%
Mental Health	37%	39%	21%	27%	32%
Religious	25%	24%	10%	16%	16%
Vocational Rehabilitation	22%	25%	10%	15%	15%
VRS/VRI	25%	25%	20%	28%	28%
Working with deaf-blind	15%	18%	19%	29%	24%
Signed Transliteration	21%	20%	14%	22%	19%
Oral Transliteration	11%	12%	12%	18%	15%
Cued Speech	8%	8%	8%	10%	10%

Finding: With regard to **Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English**, the five settings that the most respondents indicated they need future education and training of this type are Medical (51%), Legal (43%), Mental health (37%), Post-secondary education (37%), and Business (33%) settings. This finding is not surprising considering the complexities regarding definitions and terminology in these settings. The need for **Context/Content Knowledge** education and training was highest in the same five settings, though in slightly different order: Medical (48%), Legal (44%), Mental health (39%) and Post-secondary education (38%), and Business (35%) settings. The five settings in which

respondents indicated the most need for **Interpreting Knowledge** education and training were: Legal (29%), Mental health (21%), VRS/VRI (20%), Working with deaf-blind individuals (19%), and Medical (18%) settings. With regard to survey responses in the category of **Interpreting Practice** education and training, the settings ranked the highest with regard to future needs were: Legal (35%), Working with deaf-blind individuals (29%), VRS/VRI (28%), Mental health (27%), and Medical (25%) settings. Finally, the five settings for which respondents identified the greatest need for **Mentoring** education and training were: Legal (41%), Medical (32%), Mental health (32%), VRS/VRI (28%), and Post-secondary education (25%) settings.

It is also interesting to assess these findings from a different perspective - by interpreting setting. Table 17 provides a snapshot of just those interpreting settings that received the five highest percentages of responses.

Highest Percentage Response Settings by Future Education and Training Category
Table 17

Survey 1					
Interpreter Settings	**Language/Vocab – ASL/English**	**Context/Content Knowledge**	**Interpreting Knowledge**	**Interpreting Practice**	**Mentoring**
Legal	43%	44%	29%	35%	41%
Medical	51%	48%	18%	25%	32%
Mental Health	37%	39%	21%	27%	32%
VRS/VRI			20%	28%	28%
Post-secondary	37%	38%			25%
Deaf-blind			19%	29%	
Business	33%	35%			

Finding: Table 17 is intended to provide a snapshot of the education and training categories in which the highest percentages of responses were captured (20% of respondents or more). **Legal, medical** and **mental health** settings were identified by high percentages of respondents for all five education and training categories. **VRS/VRI** settings were identified by high percentages of respondents with regard to future need for Interpreting Knowledge, Interpreting Practice and Mentoring education and training. **Post-secondary education** settings were likewise identified by high percentages of respondents in the areas of Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English, Context/Content Knowledge, and Mentoring education and training. **Working with Deaf-blind Individuals** was a setting in which high percentages of respondents identified the need for future education in the areas of Interpreting Knowledge and Interpreting Practice. And, finally, **business** was a setting identified as needing future education and training in the categories of Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English and Context/Content Knowledge.

Survey 2 – Future Education and Training Priorities

In the second survey, respondents were provided the same setting categories and types of training and education used in Survey 1. However, in the second survey, for each of the identified settings, respondents were asked to rank the importance of each type of training and education on a scale of 1-5, with '1' being the most important training need and '5' the least. Table 18 provides Survey 2 responses for each interpreting setting. The last column on the table, "NR", captures the percentage of respondents that did not provide a response, which may likely indicate the respondent does not interpret in that particular setting, and therefore skipped the question. In addition, it is also important to consider when looking at Table 18, that respondents may have felt they currently possess sufficient knowledge and skills (from prior education and training experiences) and therefore did not indicate a need for more of that type of education and training in the future.

Future Education and Training Needs by Setting
Table 18

Survey 2						
Medical	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	21%	15%	6%	10%	9%	39%
Context/Content Knowledge	17%	19%	8%	9%	8%	39%
Interpreting Knowledge	6%	9%	23%	12%	7%	43%
Interpreting Practice	6%	11%	12%	18%	10%	43%
Mentoring	13%	5%	7%	8%	24%	43%
K-12	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	16%	9%	7%	7%	9%	52%
Context/Content Knowledge	10%	13%	9%	9%	6%	53%
Interpreting Knowledge	8%	9%	15%	9%	6%	54%
Interpreting Practice	6%	10%	9%	15%	7%	53%
Mentoring	12%	5%	5%	6%	19%	53%
Post-secondary	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	18%	12%	7%	8%	9%	46%
Context/Content Knowledge	15%	15%	8%	9%	7%	46%
Interpreting Knowledge	7%	9%	21%	9%	5%	49%
Interpreting Practice	5%	10%	10%	19%	7%	49%
Mentoring	14%	3%	3%	6%	25%	49%
Technical/Vocational	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	13%	9%	3%	5%	6%	64%
Context/Content Knowledge	10%	10%	5%	6%	5%	64%
Interpreting Knowledge	4%	5%	16%	6%	3%	66%
Interpreting Practice	3%	6%	7%	13%	5%	66%
Mentoring	8%	3%	3%	4%	16%	66%
Business	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	11%	10%	6%	6%	5%	62%
Context/Content Knowledge	11%	10%	5%	6%	6%	61%
Interpreting Knowledge	5%	7%	15%	7%	3%	63%
Interpreting Practice	5%	7%	7%	15%	3%	63%
Mentoring	8%	3%	3%	4%	18%	63%

Future Education and Training Needs by Setting Table 18 (continued)						
Social Services	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	9%	8%	7%	7%	5%	64%
Context/Content Knowledge	11%	10%	5%	5%	5%	63%
Interpreting Knowledge	5%	7%	15%	6%	3%	65%
Interpreting Practice	5%	7%	6%	12%	5%	65%
Mentoring	8%	2%	3%	4%	17%	66%
Legal	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	10%	8%	6%	5%	4%	67%
Context/Content Knowledge	8%	9%	6%	5%	4%	67%
Interpreting Knowledge	5%	5%	9%	8%	6%	67%
Interpreting Practice	4%	5%	5%	10%	9%	67%
Mentoring	10%	3%	5%	5%	10%	67%
Mental Health	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	10%	10%	9%	8%	7%	56%
Context/Content Knowledge	14%	12%	6%	7%	7%	54%
Interpreting Knowledge	6%	8%	14%	9%	6%	57%
Interpreting Practice	6%	8%	8%	13%	8%	57%
Mentoring	12%	5%	6%	6%	16%	55%
Religious	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	13%	11%	5%	6%	5%	60%
Context/Content Knowledge	14%	11%	4%	5%	7%	60%
Interpreting Knowledge	5%	5%	16%	7%	5%	62%
Interpreting Practice	3%	6%	9%	14%	6%	62%
Mentoring	7%	3%	6%	6%	16%	62%
Vocational Rehabilitation	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	9%	6%	5%	5%	5%	70%
Context/Content Knowledge	9%	9%	5%	5%	4%	68%
Interpreting Knowledge	5%	6%	12%	5%	2%	70%
Interpreting Practice	4%	6%	5%	10%	5%	70%
Mentoring	7%	2%	2%	4%	14%	71%
VRS/VRI	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	10%	7%	6%	7%	8%	62%
Context/Content Knowledge	8%	9%	7%	7%	8%	62%
Interpreting Knowledge	6%	8%	11%	7%	6%	62%
Interpreting Practice	7%	8%	8%	10%	5%	62%
Mentoring	9%	5%	5%	6%	13%	62%
Working with deaf-blind	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	6%	5%	5%	7%	8%	69%
Context/Content Knowledge	5%	7%	7%	7%	5%	69%
Interpreting Knowledge	7%	7%	8%	5%	5%	69%
Interpreting Practice	7%	8%	5%	8%	5%	68%
Mentoring	9%	4%	5%	4%	10%	68%

Future Education and Training Needs by Setting Table 18 (continued)						
Signed Transliteration	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	6%	5%	5%	7%	8%	69%
Context/Content Knowledge	5%	7%	7%	7%	5%	69%
Interpreting Knowledge	7%	7%	8%	5%	5%	69%
Interpreting Practice	7%	8%	5%	8%	5%	68%
Mentoring	9%	4%	5%	4%	10%	68%
Oral Transliteration	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	7%	3%	3%	3%	5%	80%
Context/Content Knowledge	3%	6%	5%	5%	2%	80%
Interpreting Knowledge	4%	4%	7%	3%	2%	80%
Interpreting Practice	5%	5%	3%	6%	3%	80%
Mentoring	5%	2%	2%	3%	8%	80%
Cued Speech	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NR**
Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English	4%	2%	2%	2%	4%	87%
Context/Content Knowledge	1%	4%	3%	3%	2%	87%
Interpreting Knowledge	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	87%
Interpreting Practice	3%	4%	3%	4%	1%	86%
Mentoring	4%	1%	2%	1%	5%	86%

It is difficult to analyze Table 18 due to the extensive size of the table and the amount of data reported on it. It is interesting though to note the 'NR' column, which includes respondents that skipped over that setting when making their response, likely indicating they do not work in that setting.

To better assess training and education priorities based on the ranking information provided, Table 19 was developed. On Table 19, the percentage of just those respondents that selected either a '1' (most important) or those respondents that selected a '2' ranking (second in importance) are combined. As a reminder, in each of the interpreting settings there were a significant percentage of respondents that did not provide a response (assumed as they do not work in that setting). The percentages provided on Table 19 are based on the total number of Survey 2 respondents and include those respondents that are counted in the 'NR' column. As an example, on Table 18, in the medical setting, for Language/Vocabulary – ASL English, there were 39% of respondents that did not provide a response who are counted in the 'NR' column. When that 39% of 'NR' respondents is considered, the 36% reported on Table 19 actually seems to be a substantial portion of respondents. This holds true for the entire table.

Future Education and Training Needs by Setting Table 19					
Survey 2					
Interpreter Settings	**Language/Vocab – ASL/English**	**Context/Content Knowledge**	**Interpreting Knowledge**	**Interpreting Practice**	**Mentoring**
Medical	**36%**	**36%**	**15%**	**17%**	**18%**
K-12	**25%**	**23%**	**17%**	**16%**	**17%**
Post-secondary	**30%**	**30%**	**16%**	**15%**	**17%**
Technical/Voc	**22%**	20%	9%	9%	11%
Business	21%	21%	12%	12%	11%
Social Services	17%	21%	12%	12%	10%
Legal	18%	17%	10%	9%	13%
Mental Health	20%	**26%**	**14%**	14%	**17%**
Religious	**24**%	**25%**	10%	9%	10%
VR	15%	15%	11%	10%	9%
VRS/VRI	17%	17%	**14%**	**15%**	**14%**
Deaf-blind	11%	12%	**14%**	**15%**	13%
Signed Transliteration	11%	12%	**14%**	**15%**	13%
Oral Transliteration	10%	9%	8%	10%	7%
Cued Speech	6%	5%	5%	7%	5%
Note: Percentages provided are based on combining respondents that assigned the education and training category either a 1 or a 2 ranking					

Finding: The analysis of Survey 2 data follows that performed on Survey 1. First, the highest ranked education and training categories are assessed. In the category of **Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English**, the five highest ranked settings are: Medical (36%); Post-secondary (30%); K-12 (25%); Religious (24%), and Technical/vocational (22%). For **Context/Content Knowledge**, the five highest ranked settings are: Medical (36%), Post-secondary (30%); Mental Health (26%); Religious (25%), and K-12 (23%). In the category of **Interpreting Knowledge**, the three highest ranked settings are: K-12 (17%); Post-secondary (16%), and Medical (15%). Mental health, VRS/VRI, Interpreting for Deaf-blind and Signed Transliteration are all at 14%. In the category of **Interpreting Practice**, the highest ranked settings are Medical (17%) and K-12 (16%). Post-secondary, Interpreting for Deaf-blind, Signed Transliteration and Oral Transliteration all received 15%. Finally, in the **Mentoring** category, the five highest ranked settings are: Medical (18%); K-12 (17%); Post-secondary (17%); Mental Health (17%), and VRS/VRI (14%).

It is also interesting to assess these findings from a different perspective - by interpreting setting. Table 20 provides a snapshot of just those interpreting settings that received the highest percentage of responses.

Highest Percentage Response Settings by Future Education and Training Category Table 20					
Survey 2					
Interpreter Settings	**Language/Vocab – ASL/English**	**Context/Content Knowledge**	**Interpreting Knowledge**	**Interpreting Practice**	**Mentoring**
Medical	36%	36%	15%	17%	18%
Post-secondary	30%	30%	16%	15%	17%
K-12	25%	23%	17%	16%	17%
Technical/Voc	22%				
Mental Health		26%	14%		17%
Religious	24%	25%			
VRS/VRI			14%	15%	14%
Deaf-blind			14%	15%	
Signed Transliteration			14%	15%	

Finding: Table 20 is intended to provide a snapshot of the interpreting settings in which the highest percentages of responses were captured. Three of the settings received high rankings in all five categories of education and training: Medical, Post-secondary and K-12. Mental health settings received high rankings in the categories of Context/content knowledge (26%), Interpreting knowledge (14%) and Mentoring (17%). Likewise, VRS/VRI settings also received high rankings in three of the education categories: Interpreting knowledge (14%), Interpreting practice (15%), and Mentoring (14%). Religious settings received high rankings in the categories of Language/Vocabulary – ASL English (24%) and Context/Content knowledge (25%). Interpreting for Deaf-blind individuals received high rankings in the categories of Interpreting knowledge (14%) and Interpreting practice (15%), and Signed Transliteration settings received high rankings in the same two categories: Interpreting knowledge (14%) and Interpreting Practice (15%).

Comparison of Highest Ranked Education and Training in Surveys 1 and 2

Table 21 provides a comparison between the two sets of collected data. It provides the five highest percentages reported in each education and training category.

Comparison of Highest Ranking Education Categories By Setting Table 21										
Type of Education Training	**Language/Vocab – ASL/English**		**Context/Content Knowledge**		**Interpreting Knowledge**		**Interpreting Practice**		**Mentoring**	
Setting	**S-1**	**S-2**	**S-1**	**S-2**	**S-1**	**S-2**	**S-1**	**S-2**	**S-1**	**S-2**
Medical	51%	36%	48%	36%	18%	15%	25%	17%	32%	18%
K-12		25%		23%		17%		16%		17%
Post-secondary	37%	30%	38%	30%		16%		15%	25%	17%
Technical/Voc		22%								
Business	33%		35%							
Social Services										
Legal	43%		44%		29%		35%		41%	

Mental Health	37%		39%	26%	21%	14%	27%		32%	17%
Religious		24%		25%						
VR										
VRS/VRI					20%	14%	28%		28%	14%
Deaf-blind					19%	14%	29%	15%		
Signed Transliteration						14%		15%		
Oral Transliteration								15%		
Cued Speech										
Note: Survey 2 percentages provided are based on combining respondents that assigned the education and training category either a 1 or a 2 ranking										

Because the data was collected differently in the two surveys, the percentages are not comparable between them. However, it is interesting to consider the order of priority represented by the percentage points within each of the two surveys.

To further support a comparison among Survey 1 and Survey 2 data, Table 22 provides a ranking for each of the education and training categories. The number '1' was assigned to the education and training category which received the highest percentage of responses from the particular survey group, and the number '5' indicates it was fifth in order of importance. There are education and training categories that 'tied' in terms of the percentage of respondents that selected that option, and therefore, share a ranking score. Only those settings that are reflected by the highest five percentage points reported are included on Table 22.

Comparison of Highest Ranking Education Categories By Setting
Table 22

Type of Education Training	**Language/Vocab – ASL/English**		**Context/Content Knowledge**		**Interpreting Knowledge**		**Interpreting Practice**		**Mentoring**	
Setting	**S-1**	**S-2**	**S-1**	**S-2**	**S-1**	**S-2**	**S-1**	**S-2**	**S-1**	**S-2**
Medical	1	1	1	1	5	3	5	1	2	1
K-12		3		5		1		2		2
Post-secondary	3	2	4	2		2		3	4	2
Technical/Vocational		5								
Business	4		5							
Legal	2		2		1		1		1	
Mental Health	3		3	3	2	4	4		2	2
Religious		4		4						
VRS/VRI					3	4	3		3	3
Deaf-blind					4	4	2	3		
Signed Transliteration						4		3		
Oral Transliteration								3		
Note: 'S-1' indicates Survey 1 and 'S-2' indicates Survey 2										

Finding: Analysis begins with an examination of the five highest percentage response sets reported in each of the five education and training categories. There are some similarities and significant differences between the two sets of survey data in the **Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English** category. Two of the rankings are the same or similar: both response sets ranked that type of education high for Medical and Post-

secondary education settings. The other highest percentage rankings in that education category were not similar. In Survey 1, the other three rankings under Language/Vocabulary – ASL/English were in Business, Legal and Mental Health settings, while in Survey 2, the other three rankings were in K-12, Technical/Vocational and Religious settings.

In the **Context/Content Knowledge** category, the highest percentage of responses in both surveys was collected in Medical settings, and the third in Mental Health settings. Both response sets also included Post-secondary Education, though it was ranked higher in Survey 2. The other response sets were different in the two surveys. In Survey 1, the other two rankings were in Business and Legal settings, while in Survey 2, the other two rankings were in K-12 and Religious settings.

There are four areas of similarity in the **Interpreting Knowledge** education and training category. Although ranked in different order, respondents in both survey sets indicate this type of education and training is needed in Medical, Mental health and VRS/VRI settings, and when Interpreting for Deaf/Blind individuals. However, the highest percentage of Survey 1 responses was in Legal settings. By comparison, the highest percentages of Survey 2 responses were in K-12 settings, and the second in Post-secondary education. A high percentage of Survey 2 responses also fell into the Signed Transliteration category.

There are quite a few differences in the **Interpreting Practice** category. While Medical settings was among the top five for both survey sets, in Survey 2 it received the highest percentage of responses, and in Survey 1, the fifth highest. Both responses sets included Interpreting for Deaf/Blind individuals. The other rankings in both survey sets were different. In Survey 1, the other high percentage sets were in Legal, Mental Health and VRS/VRI settings. In comparison, in Survey 2, the other high percentage response sets were in K-12, Post-secondary, Signed Transliteration and Oral Transliteration settings.

The last category of education and training is **Mentoring**. There are four areas of similarity in this category. Although ranked in different order, respondents in both survey sets indicate this type of education and training is needed in Medical, Post-secondary Education, Mental health and VRS/VRI settings. However, in Survey 1, the highest percentage of responses was in Legal settings, and in Survey 2, the second highest percentage of responses was in K-12 settings.

There are some summary similarities that can be drawn between the two sets of survey data. Both sets of data consistently point to the importance of all five types of education and training in **Medical, Post-secondary Education** and **Mental health** settings. To a lesser degree, there is some level of similarity with regard to education and training needs in **VRS/VRI** settings, and for **Interpreting for Deaf-blind Individuals**. The major points of difference between the two survey groups are with regard to education and training in Legal and K-12 settings. **Legal** settings emerged in all five education and training categories in Survey 1, but did not receive a high percentage of responses in

any of the five categories in Survey 2. In comparison, **K-12** settings consistently received a high percentage of Survey 2 responses in all five education and training categories, but did not receive a high percentage response rate in any of the five categories in Survey 1.

This concludes the Interpreter Practitioner Trends Analysis Report. As a reminder, the full sets of survey questions and responses are attached as Appendix A and B of this report.

Practitioner Survey

Results Overview

Date: 5/17/2010 12:57 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

This survey is intended for interpreters who consider themselves professional, pre-preofessional or novices. For the purposes of this survey, these are our definitions.<blockquote>Professional: someone who is credentialed
 Pre-professional: more than one year working but is not yet credentialed
 Novice: less than one year following completion of an AA/AAS or BA/BS interpreter education program.
 Other: does not fit the above categories and is not a Student. Please respond to this survey, and add an explanation of your professional status.</blockquote> If you are a student, please take our Students Survey.
 This survey consists of 4 pages, and takes about 10 minutes to complete.

1. How would you classify yourself?

Professional	2662	78%
Pre-professional	526	15%
Novice	78	2%
Other, please explain	130	4%
Total	3396	100%

2. Are you involved in a professional organization related to deafness and/or interpreting?

Yes	3266	96%
No	123	4%
Total	3389	100%

3. Approximately what percentage of your work is in interpreting?

0	18	1%
1-10%	207	6%
11-25%	215	6%
26-50%	254	7%
51-75%	377	11%
76-100%	2323	68%
Total	3394	100%

4. Approximately what percentage of your interpreting work is between the following languages? (total must equal 100%)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
ASL/spoken English	42 1%	127 4%	218 7%	513 15%	481 14%	1938 58%
Other signed language/English	645 33%	203 10%	294 15%	413 21%	245 12%	174 9%
ASL/other spoken language	993 77%	146 11%	62 5%	46 4%	23 2%	15 1%
Other language combinations	999 80%	111 9%	67 5%	36 3%	13 1%	30 2%

5. Approximately what percentage of your interpreting work is between the following systems? (total must equal 100%)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Signed/spoken English transliteration	90 3%	158 5%	184 6%	280 8%	297 9%	2308 70%
Oral transliteration	871 58%	399 27%	113 8%	65 4%	24 2%	18 1%
Cued transliteration	1193 96%	23 2%	7 1%	9 1%	2 0%	8 1%
Other language transliteration	1090 84%	87 7%	43 3%	40 3%	16 1%	27 2%

6. Approximately what percentage of your interpreting is with

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Individuals who are deaf-blind	1212 48%	1103 44%	122 5%	35 1%	14 1%	36 1%

Deaf/hearing teams	593 19%	545 17%	185 6%	108 3%	186 6%	1538 49%
Other	854 52%	116 7%	70 4%	53 3%	88 5%	455 28%

7. Approximately what percentage of your interpreting work is in each of the following areas? (total must equal 100%)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Medical settings	727 27%	1061 40%	477 18%	242 9%	129 5%	37 1%
K-12	996 40%	446 18%	124 5%	113 4%	292 12%	546 22%
Post-secondary education	561 22%	660 26%	418 17%	297 12%	292 12%	293 12%
Technical/vocational training	897 44%	789 39%	192 9%	95 5%	32 2%	27 1%
Business	699 30%	930 40%	372 16%	173 8%	77 3%	48 2%
Social services	769 35%	997 45%	295 13%	74 3%	42 2%	18 1%
Legal settings	1271 62%	484 24%	149 7%	69 3%	38 2%	28 1%
Mental health settings	1007 47%	810 38%	218 10%	60 3%	30 1%	18 1%
Religious settings	1066 49%	767 35%	212 10%	68 3%	40 2%	44 2%
Vocational rehabilitation	1069 54%	683 34%	134 7%	61 3%	28 1%	23 1%
VRS/VRI	1181 52%	239 10%	236 10%	201 9%	196 9%	227 10%

8. If you could choose one area to specialize in, which would it be?

Medical setting		594	18%
K-12		577	17%
Post-secondary education		726	22%

Technical/vocational training		54	2%
Business		215	6%
Social service		101	3%
Legal setting		375	11%
Mental health setting		206	6%
Religious setting		130	4%
Settings working with/for individuals who are deaf-blind		58	2%
Vocational rehabilitation		51	2%
VRS/VRI		279	8%
	Total	3366	100%

9. What is your teaching status regarding ASL?

Currently teach ASL		524	16%
Plan to teach ASL in the future		504	15%
Neither teach nor plan to teach ASL in the future		2328	69%
	Total	3356	100%

10. What is your teaching status regarding interpreting?

Currently teach interpreting		415	12%
Plan to teach interpreting in the future		679	20%
Neither teach nor plan to teach interpreting in the future		2258	67%
	Total	3352	100%

11. Do you have plans to retire from interpreting in the next decade?

Yes, I plan to retire in 1-5 years.	197	6%
Yes, I plan to retire in 6-10 years.	571	17%
No.	2621	77%
Total	3389	100%

12. Do you plan to begin working toward a higher degree in the next decade?

Yes, I plan to begin work on a higher degree in 1-5 years.	1485	44%
Yes, I plan to begin work on a higher degree in 6-10 years.	411	12%
No.	1490	44%
Total	3386	100%

13. If yes, what degree would you seek?

AA/AS	142	7%
BA/BS	830	42%
MA/MS	776	39%
EDS	10	1%
PhD/EdD	232	12%
Total	1990	100%

14. In your geographic region do you see a need for a third language fluency?

Yes	2338	69%
No	1038	31%
Total	3376	100%

15. In your geographic region are there adequate education opportunities in interpreting?

Yes		1902	56%
No		1481	44%
	Total	3383	100%

16. Do you think you could benefit from a tutor or mentor?

Yes		2719	81%
No		647	19%
	Total	3366	100%

17. Would you want to have a mentor if one were available?

Yes		2549	76%
No		801	24%
	Total	3350	100%

18. Have you taken a course or workshop that is completely online?

Yes		1223	36%
No		2153	64%
	Total	3376	100%

19. Have you participated in online coursework or online activities in conjunction with a course or workshop?

Yes		1378	41%
No		2010	59%
	Total	3388	100%

Please click Submit to continue on to page 2...

For each of the special areas/types of interpreting that you work in listed below, what types of education and training helped you feel prepared for the setting?
Please choose one or more options to identify any specific education that targeted your needs for the topic/area. Please do not choose items for areas in which you do not work - simply leave that item blank and move to the next.

20. Medical settings

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1922	83%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1918	83%
Interpreting Knowledge	1488	64%
Interpreting Practice	1442	62%
Mentoring	528	23%

21. K-12

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1649	79%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1632	78%
Interpreting Knowledge	1493	72%
Interpreting Practice	1444	69%
Mentoring	715	34%

22. Post-secondary education

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	2103	86%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	2141	87%
Interpreting Knowledge	1823	74%
Interpreting Practice	1700	69%
Mentoring	902	37%

23. Technical/vocational training

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1416	80%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1435	82%

Interpreting Knowledge		1132	64%
Interpreting Practice		1052	60%
Mentoring		396	22%

24. Business

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1576	79%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1653	83%
Interpreting Knowledge		1368	68%
Interpreting Practice		1216	61%
Mentoring		480	24%

25. Social services

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1412	75%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1544	82%
Interpreting Knowledge		1276	68%
Interpreting Practice		1153	61%
Mentoring		415	22%

26. Legal settings

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1035	87%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1018	85%
Interpreting Knowledge		885	74%
Interpreting Practice		830	70%
Mentoring		658	55%

27. Mental health settings

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1353	81%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1450	87%
Interpreting Knowledge	1231	73%
Interpreting Practice	1107	66%
Mentoring	624	37%

28. Religious settings

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1387	83%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1428	85%
Interpreting Knowledge	1054	63%
Interpreting Practice	1069	64%
Mentoring	574	34%

29. Vocational rehabilitation

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1095	76%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1162	80%
Interpreting Knowledge	975	68%
Interpreting Practice	862	60%
Mentoring	300	21%

30. VRS/VRI

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	982	75%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	938	71%

Interpreting Knowledge		1004	76%
Interpreting Practice		1018	77%
Mentoring		678	51%

31. Working with/for individuals who are deaf-blind

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		817	55%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		870	58%
Interpreting Knowledge		1063	71%
Interpreting Practice		1164	78%
Mentoring		685	46%

32. Signed transliteration

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		2010	80%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1821	72%
Interpreting Knowledge		1843	73%
Interpreting Practice		1906	76%
Mentoring		820	33%

33. Oral transliteration

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		476	50%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		534	56%
Interpreting Knowledge		580	61%
Interpreting Practice		679	72%
Mentoring		276	29%

34. Cued speech

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	101	37%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	107	39%
Interpreting Knowledge	116	42%
Interpreting Practice	147	54%
Mentoring	116	42%

Please click Submit to continue on to page 3...

For the following questions, what education/training would you like to have now in order to become better prepared?
(include areas in which you do not currently work but would like to work)

35. Medical settings

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1805	73%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1663	67%
Interpreting Knowledge	638	26%
Interpreting Practice	896	36%
Mentoring	1089	44%

36. K-12

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	830	56%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	798	54%
Interpreting Knowledge	492	33%
Interpreting Practice	638	43%
Mentoring	723	49%

37. Post-secondary education

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1333	67%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1354	68%
Interpreting Knowledge	602	30%
Interpreting Practice	827	41%
Mentoring	904	45%

38. Technical/vocational training

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1150	70%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1178	71%
Interpreting Knowledge	403	24%
Interpreting Practice	608	37%
Mentoring	637	39%

39. Business

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1187	68%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1227	70%
Interpreting Knowledge	476	27%
Interpreting Practice	673	38%
Mentoring	712	41%

40. Social services

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1057	63%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1179	71%

Interpreting Knowledge		497	30%
Interpreting Practice		682	41%
Mentoring		720	43%

41. Legal settings

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1477	81%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1476	80%
Interpreting Knowledge		951	52%
Interpreting Practice		1157	63%
Mentoring		1341	73%

42. Mental health settings

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1318	73%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1359	75%
Interpreting Knowledge		728	40%
Interpreting Practice		915	51%
Mentoring		1071	59%

43. Religious settings

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		904	70%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		834	64%
Interpreting Knowledge		366	28%
Interpreting Practice		574	44%
Mentoring		592	46%

44. Vocational rehabilitation

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	811	64%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	875	69%
Interpreting Knowledge	378	30%
Interpreting Practice	531	42%
Mentoring	538	42%

45. VRS/VRI

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	875	57%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	888	58%
Interpreting Knowledge	706	46%
Interpreting Practice	1004	65%
Mentoring	986	64%

46. Working with/for individuals who are deaf-blind

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	557	40%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	646	46%
Interpreting Knowledge	681	49%
Interpreting Practice	1008	72%
Mentoring	852	61%

47. Signed transliteration

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	792	55%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	752	52%

Interpreting Knowledge		527	37%
Interpreting Practice		808	56%
Mentoring		701	49%

48. Oral transliteration

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		390	40%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		427	44%
Interpreting Knowledge		457	47%
Interpreting Practice		662	69%
Mentoring		543	56%

49. Cued speech

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		284	49%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		278	48%
Interpreting Knowledge		309	53%
Interpreting Practice		373	64%
Mentoring		350	60%

Please click Submit to continue on to page 4...

52. Do you work with clients that have cultural backgrounds different from yours?

Yes		2859	85%
No		503	15%
	Total	3362	100%

55. Did you identify yourself as a pre-professional, novice, or other interpreter in Question 1?

Yes. Please		808	26%

continue with the following questions...			
No. Please do not continue. Thank you for participating in our survey. You may click Submit at the bottom of the page.		2351	74%
	Total	3159	100%

56. When do you anticipate applying for your initial recognized credentials?

Within 3 months		261	34%
4-6 months		145	19%
7-9 months		63	8%
10-12 months		105	14%
13-18 months		54	7%
19-24 months		137	18%
	Total	765	100%

57. At what level do you plan to be credentialed?

State (QAST, ACCI)		73	9%
National (RID certifications; RID/NAD; EIPA)		555	69%
Both state and national		180	22%
	Total	808	100%

Thank you for taking our survey.

© 2010 Copyright MarketTools Inc. All Rights Reserved. | Privacy Policy | Terms Of Use

NNA - Practitioner Survey 2009 Final

Results Overview

Date: 1/8/2010 10:43 AM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

This survey is intended for interpreters who consider themselves professional, pre-professional or novices. For the purposes of this survey, these are our definitions. Professional: someone who is credentialedPre-professional: more than one year working but is not yet credentialedNovice: less than one year following completion of an AA/AAS or BA/BS interpreter education program.Other: does not fit the above categories and is not a Student. Please respond to this survey, and add an explanation of your professional status. This survey consists of 4 pages, and takes about 15 minutes to complete.

1. How would you classify yourself?

Actions

Professional	2228	83%
Pre-professional	296	11%
Novice	96	4%
Other	64	2%
Total	2684	100%

2. How do you identify?

Actions

Deaf	62	2%
Hearing	2499	93%
Hard-of-Hearing	41	2%
Other, please specify	77	3%
Total	2679	100%

3. Your gender:

Actions

Male	305	11%
Female	2360	88%
Other, please describe	8	0%
Total	2673	100%

4. Your ethnicity?

Actions

African American	97	4%
Asian American	24	1%
White	2347	88%
Native American	19	1%
Latino/a	85	3%
Other, please specify	94	4%
Total	2666	100%

5. What percentage of your time is spent socializing with Deaf, Hard-of-Hearing, and or Deaf-Blind people?(Please don't count assignment/work related time.)

Actions

0	143	5%
1-10%	1303	49%
11-25%	643	24%
26-50%	253	9%
51-75%	165	6%
76-100%	170	6%
Total	2677	100%

6. What year did you receive your first national certification?

Actions

1972	13	1%
1973	17	1%
1974	12	1%
1975	18	1%
1976	20	1%
1977	28	1%
1978	33	2%
1979	22	1%
1980	29	1%
1981	22	1%
1982	17	1%

1983		25	1%
1984		20	1%
1985		24	1%
1986		29	1%
1987		14	1%
1988		11	1%
1989		18	1%
1990		26	1%
1991		26	1%
1992		22	1%
1993		32	2%
1994		33	2%
1995		40	2%
1996		52	3%
1997		56	3%
1998		77	4%
1999		83	4%
2000		108	5%
2001		96	5%
2002		71	4%
2003		85	4%
2004		77	4%
2005		71	4%
2006		89	4%
2007		114	6%
2008		196	10%
2009		302	15%
	Total	2028	100%

7. If you have more than one national certification, what year did you recieve your most recent certification?

Actions

1972		1	0%
1973		3	0%

1974		4	0%
1975		2	0%
1976		4	0%
1977		1	0%
1978		4	0%
1979		4	0%
1980		10	1%
1981		5	0%
1982		1	0%
1983		1	0%
1984		8	1%
1985		7	1%
1986		5	0%
1987		4	0%
1988		3	0%
1989		4	0%
1990		8	1%
1991		15	1%
1992		16	1%
1993		6	1%
1994		19	2%
1995		22	2%
1996		20	2%
1997		23	2%
1998		37	3%
1999		27	2%
2000		43	4%
2001		50	4%
2002		48	4%
2003		57	5%
2004		43	4%
2005		71	6%
2006		74	6%

2007		112	9%
2008		220	19%
2009		201	17%
	Total	1183	100%

8. If you are credentialed, what credentials do you hold?Select all that apply. Actions

RID NIC (National Interpreter Certification)		496	21%
RID NIC Advanced		102	4%
RID NIC Master		77	3%
RID CI (Certificate of Interpretation)		888	38%
RID CT (Certificate of Transliteration)		933	40%
RID CDI-P (Certified Deaf Interpreter - Provisional)		6	0%
RID CDI (Certified Deaf Interpreter)		24	1%
RID CSC (Comprehensive Skills Certificate)		166	7%
RID MCSC (Master Comprehensive Skills Certificate)		6	0%
RID RSC (Reverse Skills Certificate)		19	1%
RID OTC (Oral Transliteration Certificate)		19	1%
RID OIC:C (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Comprehensive)		12	1%
RID OIC:S/V (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Spoken to Visible)		5	0%
RID OIC:V/S (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Visible to Spoken)		3	0%

RID IC/TC (Interpretation Certificate/Transliteration Certificate)		68	3%
RID IC (Interpretation Certificate)		38	2%
RID TC (Transliteration Certificate)		53	2%
NAD III (Generalist) - Average Performance		127	5%
NAD IV (Advanced) - Above Average Performance		110	5%
NAD V (Master) - Superior Performance		51	2%
Ed: K-12 (Educational Certificate: K-12)		266	11%
RID State Certification		14	1%
State/Local Certification		565	24%
Other, please specify		339	14%

9. Are you involved in a professional organization related to deafness and/or interpreting? Actions

Yes		2543	95%
No		128	5%
	Total	2671	100%

10. If yes, what organizations?Select all that apply. Actions

RID National		2352	92%
RID State		1817	71%
NAD National		518	20%
NAD State		209	8%
National Council of Hispano Deaf and Hard of Hearing		9	0%
National Black Deaf Advocates		30	1%
Intertribal Deaf Council		10	0%

National Alliance of Black Interpreters		89	3%
ASLTA		161	6%
CIT		308	12%
Mano a Mano		42	2%
National Asian Deaf Congress		4	0%
American Association of the Deaf Blind		71	3%
Cultural Diversity in Leadership Committee (RID)		7	0%
Other, please specify		332	13%

11. Where do you live? Actions

Alabama		27	1%
Alaska		11	0%
American Samoa		0	0%
Arizona		69	3%
Arkansas		16	1%
California		286	11%
Colorado		55	2%
Connecticut		35	1%
Delaware		12	0%
District of Columbia		26	1%
Florida		162	6%
Georgia		58	2%
Guam		0	0%
Hawaii		17	1%
Idaho		22	1%
Illinois		93	4%
Indiana		55	2%
Iowa		37	1%

Kansas		13	0%
Kentucky		36	1%
Louisiana		22	1%
Maine		12	0%
Maryland		89	3%
Massachusetts		77	3%
Michigan		64	2%
Minnesota		134	5%
Mississippi		5	0%
Missouri		26	1%
Montana		9	0%
Nebraska		12	0%
Nevada		12	0%
New Hampshire		12	0%
New Jersey		62	2%
New Mexico		34	1%
New York		186	7%
North Carolina		75	3%
North Dakota		5	0%
Northern Marianas Islands		0	0%
Ohio		99	4%
Oklahoma		16	1%
Oregon		66	2%
Pennsylvania		99	4%
Puerto Rico		4	0%
Rhode Island		9	0%
South Carolina		24	1%
South Dakota		8	0%
Tennessee		37	1%
Texas		121	5%
Utah		29	1%
Vermont		7	0%

Virginia		82	3%
Virgin Islands		1	0%
Washington		99	4%
West Virginia		8	0%
Wisconsin		74	3%
Wyoming		7	0%
	Total	2656	100%

12. In which state(s) do you interpret most frequently? If VRS/VRI, choose the state in which your call center is located. Select the percentage of time that you interpret in each State - total should equal 100%. Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	<25%	25-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Alabama	41 62%	3 5%	5 8%	17 26%
Alaska	31 74%	0 0%	1 2%	10 24%
American Samoa	27 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Arizona	38 37%	2 2%	2 2%	62 60%
Arkansas	27 63%	0 0%	2 5%	14 33%
California	44 13%	1 0%	4 1%	278 85%
Colorado	26 31%	3 4%	4 5%	51 61%
Connecticut	37 56%	0 0%	2 3%	27 41%
Delaware	27 71%	2 5%	1 3%	8 21%
District of Columbia	61 46%	25 19%	16 12%	31 23%
Florida	43 22%	6 3%	8 4%	137 71%
Georgia	31 36%	5 6%	5 6%	45 52%

Guam	21 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Hawaii	21 58%	0 0%	0 0%	15 42%
Idaho	22 51%	1 2%	1 2%	19 44%
Illinois	36 29%	8 7%	2 2%	77 63%
Indiana	35 42%	2 2%	2 2%	44 53%
Iowa	24 39%	3 5%	3 5%	31 51%
Kansas	23 56%	5 12%	1 2%	12 29%
Kentucky	26 39%	2 3%	5 8%	33 50%
Louisiana	23 52%	1 2%	0 0%	20 45%
Maine	21 66%	0 0%	0 0%	11 34%
Maryland	47 31%	26 17%	13 9%	64 43%
Massachusetts	47 38%	4 3%	10 8%	63 51%
Michigan	25 29%	2 2%	0 0%	58 68%
Minnesota	33 20%	4 2%	3 2%	121 75%
Mississippi	20 74%	0 0%	2 7%	5 19%
Missouri	23 46%	7 14%	1 2%	19 38%
Montana	19 68%	0 0%	0 0%	9 32%
Nebraska	22 58%	1 3%	0 0%	15 39%
Nevada	27 68%	2 5%	1 2%	10 25%
New Hampshire	26 63%	5 12%	3 7%	7 17%
New Jersey	45 38%	8 7%	14 12%	52 44%

New Mexico	26 41%	3 5%	1 2%	34 53%
New York	52 22%	9 4%	8 3%	165 71%
North Carolina	24 26%	0 0%	4 4%	63 69%
North Dakota	19 73%	1 4%	3 12%	3 12%
Northern Marianas Islands	19 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Ohio	27 21%	4 3%	2 2%	93 74%
Oklahoma	18 53%	0 0%	1 3%	15 44%
Oregon	29 29%	8 8%	11 11%	52 52%
Pennsylvania	46 34%	5 4%	9 7%	74 55%
Puerto Rico	20 83%	0 0%	1 4%	3 12%
Rhode Island	23 79%	1 3%	1 3%	4 14%
South Carolina	24 51%	2 4%	0 0%	21 45%
South Dakota	21 72%	0 0%	3 10%	5 17%
Tennessee	23 35%	2 3%	4 6%	36 55%
Texas	33 22%	4 3%	6 4%	109 72%
Utah	23 48%	2 4%	2 4%	21 44%
Vermont	27 73%	2 5%	0 0%	8 22%
Virginia	47 36%	18 14%	9 7%	57 44%
Virgin Islands	18 95%	0 0%	1 5%	0 0%
Washington	39 28%	8 6%	5 4%	86 62%
West Virginia	22 79%	0 0%	0 0%	6 21%

Wisconsin	33 31%	4 4%	7 6%	64 59%
Wyoming	19 73%	1 4%	1 4%	5 19%

13. Do you work as a:

Actions

Full-time staff interpreter with benefits	792	31%
Full-time freelance interpreter	515	20%
Part-time staff interpreter with benefits	143	6%
Part-time freelance interpreter	636	24%
Other, please specify	510	20%
Total	2596	100%

14. On average, how many hours a week do you interpret?

Actions

1-5	308	12%
6-10	187	7%
11-15	171	7%
16-20	233	9%
21-25	267	10%
26-30	407	15%
31-35	466	18%
36-40	330	13%
40+	259	10%
Total	2628	100%

15. What percentage of your work is done on a paid basis?

Actions

0	73	3%
1-10%	39	1%

11-25%		17	1%
26-50%		41	2%
51-75%		156	6%
76-100%		2301	88%
	Total	2627	100%

16. For your paid interpreting work, what is the total hourly rate that you charge?

Actions

$1-$10		2	0%
$11-$15		28	1%
$16-$20		113	4%
$21-$25		210	8%
$26-$30		317	13%
$31-$35		390	16%
$36-$40		453	18%
$41-$45		352	14%
$46-$50		307	12%
$51-$55		149	6%
$56-$60		97	4%
$61-$65		47	2%
$66-$70		28	1%
$71-$75		10	0%
$75+		11	0%
	Total	2514	100%

17. What percentage of your interpreting is done on a pro bono basis?

Actions

0		484	19%
1-10%		1696	65%
11-25%		303	12%
26-50%		51	2%
51-75%		16	1%
76-100%		50	2%
	Total	2600	100%

18. Approximately what percentage of your interpreting is in settings(Total must equal 100%) Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
With individuals who are deaf-blind	1274 56%	827 36%	92 4%	35 2%	18 1%	24 1%
Where Deaf/hearing teams are used	1045 44%	605 26%	182 8%	113 5%	116 5%	301 13%
Where trilingual interpreting services are used	1515 71%	432 20%	77 4%	43 2%	28 1%	39 2%
Other	276 14%	41 2%	54 3%	84 4%	216 11%	1261 65%

19. Approximately what percentage of your interpreting work is in each of the following areas? (total must equal 100%) Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Medical settings	518 24%	862 40%	375 17%	227 10%	131 6%	60 3%
K-12	902 46%	330 17%	87 4%	81 4%	214 11%	360 18%
Post-secondary education	503 25%	553 28%	278 14%	228 11%	229 11%	215 11%
Technical/vocational training	804 51%	550 35%	112 7%	55 3%	29 2%	24 2%
Business	615 36%	708 41%	230 13%	91 5%	50 3%	31 2%
Social services	620 36%	791 46%	219 13%	59 3%	28 2%	13 1%
Legal settings	1031 64%	369 23%	91 6%	50 3%	36 2%	25 2%
Mental health settings	810 48%	632 37%	169 10%	51 3%	18 1%	17 1%

Religious settings	832 48%	674 39%	133 8%	46 3%	25 1%	37 2%
Vocational rehabilitation	925 60%	471 30%	90 6%	33 2%	14 1%	19 1%
VRS/VRI	806 43%	264 14%	198 11%	174 9%	176 9%	242 13%
In a Deaf person's place of employment	666 39%	627 37%	172 10%	96 6%	62 4%	64 4%

20. In your work in general, what percentage of the deaf people for whom you interpret are also VR consumers?

Actions

Don't know	1493	58%
0-10%	340	13%
11-20%	101	4%
21-30%	83	3%
31-40%	55	2%
41-50%	73	3%
51-60%	54	2%
61-70%	45	2%
71-80%	91	4%
81-90%	118	5%
91-100%	129	5%
Total	2582	100%

21. If you indicated that you work in VR, which of the following types of VR work have you done or do you do most frequently?Please rank the items according to how frequently you work in each one.

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Intake/Initial assessment interviews	113 28%	72 18%	44 11%	32 8%	27 7%	30 8%	38 10%	42 11%
Vocational and aptitude assessment	77 23%	77 23%	49 15%	30 9%	22 7%	19 6%	23 7%	33 10%

Job interviews	56 16%	66 18%	57 16%	49 14%	44 12%	40 11%	26 7%	20 6%
Job placement	29 9%	54 17%	52 17%	53 17%	48 15%	35 11%	29 9%	14 4%
Job training	66 17%	40 10%	59 15%	58 15%	56 14%	38 10%	37 9%	43 11%
Follow-up interviews	86 26%	41 12%	49 15%	44 13%	37 11%	36 11%	22 7%	16 5%
Case management meetings	50 12%	80 20%	43 11%	36 9%	45 11%	53 13%	58 14%	35 9%
Staff meetings	114 23%	82 17%	58 12%	49 10%	30 6%	33 7%	52 11%	71 15%

22. If you indicated that you rarely (less than 10%) work in VR, which of the following reasons explains why you don't work more frequently in the VR setting?Select all that apply. Actions

VR schedule too unpredictable	165	8%
Hourly pay not competitive	215	11%
Distance to assignments	144	7%
No opportunities for full-time employment & benefits	152	8%
Can't guarantee sufficient work load	189	9%
Not enough support (e.g. availability of CDI's, or other team interpreting)	77	4%
Rarely asked	903	45%
Other, please specify	823	41%

23. If you could choose **one** area to specialize in, which would it be? Actions

Medical setting	579	22%
K-12	372	14%

Post-secondary education		524	20%
Technical/vocational training		47	2%
Business		151	6%
Social service		79	3%
Legal setting		308	12%
Mental health setting		157	6%
Religious setting		89	3%
Settings working with/for individuals who are deaf-blind		43	2%
Vocational rehabilitation		41	2%
VRS/VRI		256	10%
	Total	2646	100%

24. What is your status regarding teaching ASL? Actions

Currently teach ASL		326	12%
Plan to teach ASL in the future		400	15%
Neither teach nor plan to teach ASL in the future		1906	72%
	Total	2632	100%

25. What is your status regarding teaching interpreting? Actions

Currently teach interpreting		245	9%
Plan to teach interpreting in the future		598	23%
Neither teach nor plan to teach interpreting in the future		1780	68%
	Total	2623	100%

26. Do you have plans to retire from interpreting in the next decade?

Actions

Yes, I plan to retire in 1-5 years.	153	6%
Yes, I plan to retire in 6-10 years.	419	16%
No.	2077	78%
Total	2649	100%

27. Do you plan to begin working toward a higher degree in the next decade?

Actions

Yes, I plan to begin work on a higher degree in 1-5 years.	984	37%
Yes, I plan to begin work on a higher degree in 6-10 years.	347	13%
No.	1313	50%
Total	2644	100%

28. If yes, what degree would you seek?

Actions

AA/AS	81	6%
BA/BS	538	38%
MA/MS/M Ed	598	43%
PhD/EdD	186	13%
Total	1403	100%

29. Do you work with clients that have cultural backgrounds different from yours?

Actions

Yes	2177	83%
No	444	17%
Total	2621	100%

2036 Responses

30. In your geographic region do you see a need for multilingual competence in spoken languages other than English?

Actions

Yes	1918	74%
No	674	26%
Total	2592	100%

1870 Responses

Please click Submit to continue on to page 2...

31. Do you use spoken languages other than English while interpreting?

Actions

Yes	262	10%
No	2384	90%
Total	2646	100%

266 Responses

32. In your geographic region, do you see a need for multilingual competence in signed languages other than ASL?

Actions

Yes	931	36%
No	1669	64%
Total	2600	100%

878 Responses

33. Do you use signed languages other than ASL while interpreting?

Actions

Yes	475	18%
No	2152	82%
Total	2627	100%

492 Responses

34. Approximately what percentage of your interpreting work is between the following languages? (total must equal 100%)

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%

selecting the option.						
ASL/spoken English	22 1%	26 1%	73 3%	177 7%	244 9%	2063 79%
Other signed language/English	678 55%	187 15%	143 12%	133 11%	59 5%	37 3%
ASL/other spoken language	741 67%	215 19%	70 6%	36 3%	27 2%	23 2%
Other language combinations	820 81%	112 11%	32 3%	16 2%	14 1%	17 2%

35. Approximately what percentage of your interpreting work is between the following systems? (total must equal 100%)

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Signed/spoken English transliteration	79 3%	132 5%	161 6%	283 11%	245 10%	1620 64%
Oral transliteration/spoken English transliteration	731 55%	335 25%	117 9%	104 8%	31 2%	19 1%
Cued transliteration/spoken English transliteration	1079 93%	41 4%	13 1%	8 1%	4 0%	13 1%
Other language transliteration/spoken English transliteration	941 82%	78 7%	50 4%	39 3%	18 2%	15 1%

36. In your geographic region how many CEU-granting educational opportunities in interpreting are available on average per month at:

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0 per month	1-3 per month	4-5 per month	5+ per month
Novice Level	481 22%	1410 66%	166 8%	95 4%
Intermediate Level	422 19%	1556 70%	182 8%	64 3%
Advanced Level	855 39%	1177 54%	100 5%	57 3%

37. In the past 12 months, have you worked with a mentor?

Actions

Yes		855	32%

No		1788	68%
	Total	2643	100%

38. In the past 12 months, have you been a mentor? Actions

Yes		1030	39%
No		1627	61%
	Total	2657	100%

39. If you have been a mentor in the past 12 months, have you had training? Actions

MMP		24	2%
Workshops online		21	2%
Workshops face to face		514	53%
RID-funded mentorship program		29	3%
Courses online		20	2%
Courses face to face		101	10%
Other, please specify		268	27%
	Total	977	100%

40. If you have worked as a mentor, in what areas have you worked? Actions

Ethics		719	61%
Interpreting knowledge		810	69%
Interpreting skills (ASL-English)		883	75%
Interpreting skills (English-ASL)		926	79%
Interpreting situations (ASL-English)		769	66%

Interpreting situations (English-ASL)		780	66%
National test preparation		390	33%
Local test preparation		177	15%
Other, please specify		133	11%

41. If you have been mentored, in what areas? Actions

Ethics		552	47%
Interpreting knowledge		529	45%
Interpreting skills (ASL-English)		795	68%
Interpreting skills (English-ASL)		784	67%
Interpreting situations (ASL-English)		595	51%
Interpreting situations (English-ASL)		578	50%
National test preparation		572	49%
Local test preparation		122	10%
Other, please specify		120	10%

42. If you have wanted to work with a mentor, but been unable to find one, in which areas couldn't you find one? Actions

Ethics		121	25%
Interpreting knowledge		93	20%
Interpreting skills (ASL-English)		185	39%
Interpreting skills (English-ASL)		165	35%

Interpreting situations (ASL-English)		127	27%
Interpreting situations (English-ASL)		117	25%
National test preparation		201	42%
Local test preparation		62	13%
Other, please specify		110	23%

43. Have you taken a course or workshop that is completely online? Actions

Yes		1079	41%
No		1582	59%
	Total	2661	100%

44. Have you participated in online coursework or online activities in conjunction with a course or workshop? Actions

Yes		980	37%
No		1672	63%
	Total	2652	100%

For each of the special **areas/types of interpreting that you work in** listed below, what types of education and training **helped you** feel prepared for the setting?
*Please choose **one or more** options to identify any specific education that targeted your needs for the topic/area. Please **do not** choose items for areas in which you do not work - simply leave that item blank and move to the next.*

45. Medical settings Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1580	85%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1510	81%
Interpreting Knowledge		1114	60%
Interpreting Practice		1122	60%

Mentoring		362	19%

46. Mental health settings — Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1069	76%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1174	84%
Interpreting Knowledge		871	62%
Interpreting Practice		878	63%
Mentoring		359	26%

47. K-12 — Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1234	81%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1231	81%
Interpreting Knowledge		1097	72%
Interpreting Practice		1092	71%
Mentoring		478	31%

48. Post-secondary education — Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1565	86%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1588	87%
Interpreting Knowledge		1307	72%
Interpreting Practice		1288	70%
Mentoring		548	30%

49. Technical/vocational training — Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		998	81%

Contextual/Content Knowledge		996	81%
Interpreting Knowledge		750	61%
Interpreting Practice		749	61%
Mentoring		231	19%

50. Legal settings

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		716	87%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		708	86%
Interpreting Knowledge		610	74%
Interpreting Practice		594	72%
Mentoring		381	46%

51. Business

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1079	79%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1120	82%
Interpreting Knowledge		896	66%
Interpreting Practice		842	62%
Mentoring		261	19%

52. Social services

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		966	73%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1087	83%
Interpreting Knowledge		889	68%
Interpreting Practice		819	62%
Mentoring		237	18%

53. Religious settings

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	1099	85%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	1093	85%
Interpreting Knowledge	775	60%
Interpreting Practice	796	62%
Mentoring	383	30%

54. Vocational rehabilitation

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	700	73%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	752	79%
Interpreting Knowledge	637	67%
Interpreting Practice	592	62%
Mentoring	150	16%

55. VRS/VRI

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	934	80%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	916	78%
Interpreting Knowledge	906	77%
Interpreting Practice	950	81%
Mentoring	542	46%

56. Working with/for individuals who are deaf-blind

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	574	53%

Contextual/Content Knowledge		666	62%
Interpreting Knowledge		785	73%
Interpreting Practice		885	82%
Mentoring		407	38%

57. Signed transliteration

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		1241	78%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		1107	70%
Interpreting Knowledge		1118	71%
Interpreting Practice		1168	74%
Mentoring		386	24%

58. Oral transliteration

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		333	58%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		339	59%
Interpreting Knowledge		385	67%
Interpreting Practice		424	73%
Mentoring		150	26%

59. Cued speech

Actions

Language/vocabulary - ASL/English		77	48%
Contextual/Content Knowledge		74	47%
Interpreting Knowledge		101	64%
Interpreting Practice		111	70%
Mentoring		73	46%

Please click Submit to continue on to page 3...

For any of the following settings that you currently work in, what education/training would you recommend to help prepare others?Please rank order each one, with 1 being the most important, and 5 being the least.

60. Medical settings

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	567 35%	392 24%	173 11%	268 16%	239 15%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	457 28%	504 31%	223 14%	236 14%	221 13%
Interpreting Knowledge	172 11%	234 15%	628 41%	316 20%	194 13%
Interpreting Practice	160 10%	298 19%	335 22%	490 32%	256 17%
Mentoring	349 23%	135 9%	187 12%	222 14%	642 42%

61. Mental health settings

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	266 22%	272 23%	232 19%	227 19%	194 16%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	403 32%	315 25%	165 13%	180 14%	186 15%
Interpreting Knowledge	165 14%	217 19%	393 34%	234 20%	156 13%
Interpreting Practice	159 14%	224 19%	208 18%	352 30%	223 19%
Mentoring	314 26%	126 11%	153 13%	161 14%	434 37%

62. K-12

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	430 33%	251 19%	196 15%	190 14%	244 19%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	269 21%	359 28%	244 19%	254 20%	168 13%
Interpreting Knowledge	206 17%	239 19%	396 32%	246 20%	161 13%
Interpreting Practice	172 13%	270 21%	244 19%	394 31%	197 15%
Mentoring	310 24%	122 10%	149 12%	160 13%	527 42%

63. Post-secondary education

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	482 33%	325 22%	180 12%	219 15%	240 17%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	399 27%	415 28%	215 15%	243 17%	191 13%
Interpreting Knowledge	175 13%	245 18%	572 41%	250 18%	144 10%
Interpreting Practice	135 10%	281 20%	283 20%	497 36%	192 14%
Mentoring	323 24%	110 8%	109 8%	164 12%	662 48%

64. Technical/vocational training

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	323 34%	240 25%	86 9%	132 14%	173 18%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	282 29%	286 29%	133 13%	164 17%	121 12%
Interpreting Knowledge	106 12%	146 16%	405 45%	171 19%	79 9%

Interpreting Practice	84 9%	170 19%	196 22%	334 37%	121 13%
Mentoring	205 23%	71 8%	77 9%	101 11%	441 49%

65. Legal settings

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	277 31%	221 25%	163 18%	122 14%	105 12%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	220 25%	256 29%	169 19%	127 14%	113 13%
Interpreting Knowledge	109 13%	141 17%	234 28%	190 23%	159 19%
Interpreting Practice	92 11%	130 16%	121 15%	268 32%	220 26%
Mentoring	250 28%	94 11%	144 16%	118 13%	275 31%

66. Business

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	318 31%	248 24%	156 15%	168 16%	143 14%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	317 30%	295 28%	144 14%	149 14%	155 15%
Interpreting Knowledge	122 12%	181 18%	395 40%	184 19%	100 10%
Interpreting Practice	114 12%	187 19%	199 20%	374 38%	109 11%
Mentoring	221 23%	82 8%	77 8%	95 10%	495 51%

67. Social services

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5

Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.					
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	250 26%	229 24%	179 18%	182 19%	131 13%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	319 32%	255 26%	133 14%	133 14%	145 15%
Interpreting Knowledge	133 14%	187 20%	363 39%	159 17%	93 10%
Interpreting Practice	122 13%	180 19%	158 17%	334 36%	136 15%
Mentoring	210 23%	75 8%	85 9%	112 12%	444 48%

68. Religious settings

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	363 34%	307 29%	115 11%	155 14%	131 12%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	381 35%	306 28%	98 9%	121 11%	184 17%
Interpreting Knowledge	112 11%	143 14%	406 41%	195 20%	143 14%
Interpreting Practice	76 8%	170 17%	228 23%	368 37%	165 16%
Mentoring	193 19%	80 8%	151 15%	164 16%	430 42%

69. Vocational rehabilitation

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	229 29%	173 22%	126 16%	142 18%	114 15%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	229 28%	237 29%	127 16%	110 14%	106 13%
Interpreting Knowledge	116 15%	132 17%	311 41%	138 18%	63 8%

Interpreting Practice	99 13%	156 21%	127 17%	262 35%	114 15%
Mentoring	165 22%	57 8%	58 8%	88 12%	373 50%

70. VRS/VRI

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	291 28%	193 19%	164 16%	176 17%	207 20%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	200 20%	235 23%	176 17%	191 19%	207 21%
Interpreting Knowledge	172 17%	226 22%	311 31%	173 17%	127 13%
Interpreting Practice	177 17%	207 20%	210 20%	289 28%	143 14%
Mentoring	251 24%	129 13%	131 13%	158 15%	360 35%

71. Working with/for individuals who are deaf-blind

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	169 20%	139 17%	137 16%	177 21%	212 25%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	144 17%	181 22%	193 23%	191 23%	126 15%
Interpreting Knowledge	188 22%	180 21%	223 26%	140 16%	124 15%
Interpreting Practice	195 22%	215 24%	138 16%	205 23%	131 15%
Mentoring	238 28%	112 13%	130 15%	99 12%	265 31%

72. Signed transliteration

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5

Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.					
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	439 40%	190 17%	132 12%	121 11%	209 19%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	171 16%	357 34%	211 20%	209 20%	109 10%
Interpreting Knowledge	154 15%	196 19%	391 37%	203 19%	102 10%
Interpreting Practice	163 15%	212 20%	189 18%	357 34%	133 13%
Mentoring	217 22%	72 7%	87 9%	125 13%	496 50%

73. Oral transliteration

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	172 32%	84 16%	70 13%	78 14%	137 25%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	71 14%	158 30%	123 23%	118 23%	54 10%
Interpreting Knowledge	106 20%	95 18%	187 35%	89 16%	63 12%
Interpreting Practice	120 21%	131 23%	85 15%	154 27%	74 13%
Mentoring	140 26%	54 10%	48 9%	71 13%	218 41%

74. Cued speech

Actions

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Language/vocabulary - ASL/English	116 32%	45 13%	43 12%	51 14%	102 29%
Contextual/Content Knowledge	34 10%	100 29%	71 20%	93 27%	51 15%
Interpreting Knowledge	78 22%	60 17%	106 30%	66 18%	49 14%

Interpreting Practice	66 18%	99 27%	60 16%	95 26%	45 12%
Mentoring	104 28%	36 10%	61 17%	38 10%	126 35%

Please click Submit to continue on to page 4...

75. Did you identify yourself as a pre-professional, novice, or other in Question 1? Actions

Yes. Please continue with the following questions...		492	20%
No. Please do not continue. Thank you for participating in our survey. You may click Submit at the bottom of the page.		2030	80%
	Total	2522	100%

76. When do you anticipate applying for your initial recognized credentials? Actions

Within 3 months		142	30%
4-6 months		98	20%
7-9 months		55	11%
10-12 months		77	16%
13-18 months		33	7%
19-24 months		75	16%
	Total	480	100%

77. At what level do you plan to be credentialed? Actions

State level		49	10%
National (RID certifications) level		288	58%
Both state and national levels		158	32%

Total	495	100%

Thank you for taking our survey.

Products & Services | About Us | Support/Help | Zoomerang Forums
© 2010 Copyright MarketTools Inc. All Rights Reserved. | Privacy Policy | Terms Of Use