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Needs Assessment Results

VRS/VRI identified as one of the priority education and training areas for the future. (CIT, 2006)
IV Work Team Goals

- Create a network of stakeholder partners
- Document requisite competencies
- Identify current practices
- Outline effective practices
- Develop and/or promulgate curriculum
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The National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers
Practitioner Data Collection

• Surveys
  • National in scope
  • Distributed by Partner Organizations through E-blasts
  • 43 Participants

• Interviews
  • National in scope
  • Target Solicitation
  • 5 Participants
Demographic Data
(48 total participants)

Gender
- Survey
  - Female: 41
  - Male: 2
- Interview
  - Female: 3
  - Male: 2

Ethnicity (Survey)
- White/Euro American: 32
- Native: 1
- Black/African American: 1
- Hispanic: 2
- Asian: 3
## Survey Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th># Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th># Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 39</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 59</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- # Certified: 93%
- Age: 33%
### Survey Participants & VRI

#### Where do you do VRI?
- Home: 14%
- Office: 26%
- Institution: 16%
- Call Center: 42%

#### Did you feel prepared to work through VRI?
- Yes: 67%
- No: 33%

#### VRI Experience
- > than 2 years: 28%
- < than 2 years: 72%

#### Hours Worked
- < 5 hrs/wk: 72%
- 5 – 15 hrs/wk: 16%
- < 16 hrs/wk: 11%
Practitioner: Factors of Inquiry

Factors of Inquiry
- Background as Interpreter
- Experience as VRI Interpreter
- VRI Training
- VRS and VRI
- VRI compared with Other Settings
- Ergonomics
- Technology
- Work Load
- Location
- Payment of Services
- Prescheduled vs. On-Demand
- Preparation for VRI Calls
- VRI Process/Product
- Debriefing
- Team Interpreting: Hearing or Deaf
- Linguistic or Cultural Variations
- Consecutive Interpreting
- Impact on Other Work
- Impact on Deaf Relationships
- Challenges
Practitioner Surveys Findings

Personal Attributes
- Typical customer service skills
- High degree of autonomy
- Sense of humor
- Ability to calmly manage high-tense situations
- Grace under pressure

Culture & Language
- Awareness of
  - Cultures & Rationalities
  - Language variance
  - Client’s role & relationship in situation
- Able to mediate cultures
- Work in teams

Technology
- Ability to manage & trouble-shoot: equipment-audio-video
- Experience working in a 2D environment
Practitioner Interviews

Demographic Background

- Most were certified and held multiple certifications
- All had 18+ years of interpreting experience
- Most had degrees, most at the graduate level
- Most candidates identified that they more focused on the challenges in VRI and not VRS.

“... even with the preparation there are some things that make it more tedious mentally than live interpreting.”
Practitioner Findings

- Similarities of Perspective between Interview and Survey participants

  - Each talked about being customer focused/driven
    - “The interpreter needs to analyze each situation, determine if effective communication is happening and in the event it is not, needs to be able to make appropriate recommendations to bring about effective communication, or offer alternatives.”

  - Most did not see VRI necessarily tied to VRS

  - Most identified they use consecutive interpreting for their VRI work
Practitioner Interviews

- Each talked about being customer focused/driven
  - “I guess it’s brought our program some notoriety and it’s a topic of discussion usually when I’m at a Deaf function.”

- Each tended to view technology as an aid not a master
  - “I’m not concerned about technology anymore. Someone else can handle that for me.”

- Several see this work potentially done from home
Deaf Consumer Data Collection

- **Surveys**
  - National in scope
  - Distributed by Partner Organizations through E-blasts
  - 244 Participants

- **Interviews**
  - National in scope
  - Target Solicitation
  - 4 Participants
Consumer Demographic Data
[248 total participants]

**Gender**
- **Survey**
  - Female 54.7%
  - Male 45.3%
- **Interview**
  - Female 50%
  - Male 50%

**Hearing Status**
- Deaf 85.3%
- Hard of Hearing 12.1%
- Deaf-Blind 2.6%

**Ethnicity (Survey)**
- White Non-Hispanic/ Euro American 78.1%
- Hispanic/Latino 4.7%
- Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native 4.7%
- Asian/Pacific Islander 3.0%
- African American 2.6%
Deaf Consumer: Factors of Inquiry

- Most common usage
- VRI vs. VRS
- VRI vs. Onsite
- Challenges
- Prescheduled vs. On-Demand
- Interpreter Selection
- Payment Process
- Qualities of VRI Interpreters
- Participation in Call
- Unsuitable Topics for VRI
- VRI Interpreter Preparation
- Debriefing after VRI Call
- Deaf VRI Interpreters
- Linguistic and Cultural Issues
- Consecutive Interpreting
Deaf Consumer: Reasons for VRI Use

- Last Minute event; no time to get an interpreter on site - 41.0%
- Community interpreters are unavailable on site - 29.7%
- VRI is the only option provided by facility (office, company, business) - 23.6%
- Preference for VRI for specific situations - 23.1%
- Other - 20.5%
Deaf Consumers: VRI Events

Event scheduling:

- Never schedule in Advance 44.4%
- 1 – 3 days in advance 16.4%
- Less than 24 hours in advance 15.2%
- More than 1 week in advance 15.2%
- 4 – 6 days in advance 8.8%
### Deaf Consumer: Settings of VRI Use

- Medical: Hospital/ER 37.6%
- Medical: Appt. 32.0%
- Community 32.0%
- Conference 32.0%
- Corporate/Business 30.9%
- Personal/Family 27.8%
- Government 23.2%
- Legal 18.0%
- Employment/VR 15.5%
- Education/K-12 8.2%
- Religious 7.7%
- Mental health 7.7%
- Education/Post-2nd 6.2%
- Performing Arts 4.1%
- Other 12.9%
## Deaf Consumers: Ethical Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Considerations</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep all VRI situation information confidential</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the professional skills and knowledge for the specific VRI situation</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show respect to deaf consumers</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate high ethical business practices</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct themselves appropriately, matching the specific VRI situation</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue professional development (interpreter training)</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect for colleagues (team interpreters)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Consumer – Practitioner Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge or Skill Set</th>
<th>Consumers’ Top Picks</th>
<th>Practitioners’ Top Picks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Turn-Taking Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical and Professional Decision Making</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VRI … What is It?

Our conversation needs to continue around:
- Ethical issues
- Interpreting skill issues
- Experiences in VRI
  - Positive
  - Negative
The VRI process led to many questions on the part of participants and workteam members. As we move to the next step, we would like to hear from YOU … your thoughts, feelings, and perspectives of VRI.
NCIEC Centers

- CATIE Center at St. Catherine University, www.stkate.edu/catie
- Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center, www.guriec.gallaudet.edu
- Western Region Interpreter Education Center at Western Oregon University and El Camino Community College, www.wou.edu/wriec
- Mid-American Interpreter Education Center at University of Arkansas Little Rock and DO-IT Center at University of Northern Colorado, www.ualr.edu/marie
- Northeastern University Regional Interpreter Education Center, www.asl.neu.edu/rie
c
- National Interpreter Education Center, http://www.asl.neu.edu/niec/