National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers

Interpreting Practitioner National Needs Assessment of 2012 Final Report

Prepared by:

National Interpreter Education Center
Northeastern University

January 2013

Acknowledgements

The Interpreting Practitioner National Needs Assessment of 2012 Final Report was prepared by the National Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University. We offer special thanks to consultant Karen Dahms for assistance in data analysis and technical writing.

Cathy Cogen, Director
Dennis Cokely, Principal Investigator
Trudy Schafer, Project Coordinator
Lillian Garcia Peterkin, Communication and Outreach Coordinator
Aju Cherian, Media/Technology Specialist
Crystal Eusebio, Administrative Assistant

The National Consortium is grateful for ongoing collaboration with the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, as here, in allowing us to query the RID membership.

We also wish to thank the boards of Mano a Mano and the National Alliance of Black Interpreters for sharing the practitioner survey link with members. We look forward to our continuing partnerships.

CATIE Center at St. Catherine University
Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center
Mid-America Regional Interpreter Education Center at University of Northern Colorado
National Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University
Regional Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University
Western Region Interpreter Education Center at Western Oregon University and El Camino Community College

The National Consortium centers are funded from 2010 – 2015 by the U.S. Department of Education Rehabilitation Services Administration, CFDA 84.160A and 84.160B, Training of Interpreters for Individuals Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing and Individuals Who Are Deaf-Blind.

Preface

The National Interpreter Education Center 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) 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 NIEC grant 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 the first national needs assessment completed during the 2010-2015 cycle of the grant. The assessment was specifically designed and carried out to assess the needs of interpreting practitioners. This Interpreting Practitioner National Needs Assessment Final Report provides an overview of the needs assessment process and a detailed discussion of primary assessment findings. The report also identifies changes in needs based on a comparative analysis to practitioner needs assessment activities completed in the previous grant cycle.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Background

The American Sign Language Program at Northeastern University has been awarded a five-year grant to continue to serve as the National Interpreter Education Center (NIEC) from October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2015. The NIEC is authorized and funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), U.S. Department of Education, and is one of six centers that comprise a national consortium of interpreter education centers.

In response to RSA grant requirements, the NIEC conducts periodic needs assessments to assure that the educational activities of the national and regional interpreter education centers are aligned with current demand and training needs. In the previous grant cycle a primary focus area was the design, development and implementation of needs assessment activities in key focus areas. The overall objectives of those activities were to identify current and future needs of interpreter education programs, interpreter educators, interpreters and consumers of interpreter services. A list of needs assessment activities and reports completed in the previous cycle are available on-line at the NIEC website: http://www.interpretereducation.org/resources-technical-assistance/educational-supports-services/, and by scrolling to the Needs Assessment section of the website.

In the previous grant, the first Interpreting practitioner Needs Assessment was carried out through design, development and implementation of an on-line survey instrument. The survey instrument was 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 copy of the 2007 Interpreting Practitioner Needs Assessment Final Report is available at the website identified above.

Based on the findings of the 2007 effort, the interpreting practitioner survey instrument was revised and updated, and disseminated a second time to the RID membership in the fall of 2009. There were three primary objectives planned for the 2009 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 2007 survey effort to information collected through the 2009 survey nearly three years later
- Identify new or changed needs and emerging trends related to the needs of interpreting practitioners

The 2009 survey resulted in 2,690 completed responses. Because a primary goal of the needs assessment process was to identify new or changed needs, the analysis of responses collected through the 2009 survey focused on a comparison of the data to the information collected and findings developed in the 2007 Survey. A copy of the Interpreting

Practitioner Needs Assessment Trends Analysis Final Report, published in May 2010, is also available at the NIEC website.

Current Effort

This report, the **Interpreting Practitioner Needs Assessment 2012: Final Report,** marks the first completed NIEC needs assessment activity in the new grant cycle, and the third formal survey of interpreting practitioners through the RSA grant. The design of the 2012 Survey drew heavily on the two previous practitioner survey instruments to support consistency and facilitate the effective comparison of practitioner-related information over time. However, information collected in the previous surveys also pointed to new areas of interest for future data collection, as well as areas for improvement in the overall survey design and implementation process. As a result, the survey instrument was not identical to the surveys disseminated in 2007 or 2009. In addition, new survey software has allowed more in-depth analysis of the data collected in the 2012 effort.

The 2012 Survey was disseminated electronically by the NIEC directly to the RID membership list as of March 2012. The list comprised a total of 10,984 members, 8,249 certified and 2,735 associate members. In addition, an invitation to take the survey was also extended to members of NAOBI and Mano a Mano through their organizational boards. As a result of the dissemination effort, 3,212 interpreting practitioners responded to and participated in the needs assessment process.

Because the 2012 Survey incorporated new questions and a refined format, in some places in this report, findings relate only to the current survey and respondent pool. Throughout this report, information related only to the 2012 Survey is reported as such. However, in other areas, the data collected in the third needs assessment effort are compared to findings of the 2007 Survey and/or 2009 Survey. Areas where the information reported by practitioners is either the same or appears to differ are identified, thereby indicating status quo in the field, or potentially indicating change or an emerging trend.

In addition, one significant change in the design of the 2012 Survey was to differentiate between the needs of interpreting practitioners that hold a full- or part-time staff position and those of interpreting practitioners that provide services on a freelance/contract basis. Throughout the 2012 Survey instrument, questions were often targeted to one or another of the two groups. As a result, data collected and the findings presented in this report often relate either specifically to staff interpreters or to freelance/contract interpreters, although there were also questions in the survey that broadly collected information from the two sets of respondents as a whole.

A. Basic Information about Respondents

This first section of the report presents basic information about 2012 Survey respondents, including the type of position they hold (staff versus freelance/contract interpreter), the state in which they conduct the majority of their interpreting work, and other general demographic information such as gender, age, ethnicity, and hearing status. Where information is available, comparisons of the 2012 Survey data are made to the 2007 Survey data and/or the 2009 Survey data.

Type of Interpreting Position

An early question in the 2012 Survey queried respondents with regard to their position, specifically, asking whether they hold a full- or part-time staff interpreter position. Responses are presented on Table 1. As with most tables presented in this report, two sets of data are reported: the first data set is the actual number of responses collected in response to the question, and the second assigns a percentage to the hard number response set.

2012 Survey Respondents that hold Full- or Part-time Staff Interpreter Position Table 1		
Staff Interpreter	**# of Responses**	**% of Respondents**
Yes	1,457	48%
No	1,606	52%
Total	**3,063**	**100%**

Finding: In the 2012 Survey, 1,457 respondents reported they work either full- or part-time as a staff interpreter, and 1,606 reported they do not hold any level of staff interpreter position. Later in the survey, a question asked respondents to report on the number of hours they work as a freelance/contract interpreter. In response, 2,225 respondents reported some level of freelance/contract interpreting work. As the two numbers combined indicate (1,457 staff interpreters and 2,225 freelance/contract interpreters), it was evident that a significant portion of respondents works as a staff interpreter but also provide freelance/contract services.

This finding was supported through a more in-depth analysis of the 1,457 staff interpreter respondents. Of those, 797 respondents answered subsequent survey questions that validate they also provide freelance/contract interpreting services. In a further assessment of the 797 staff interpreters

Note: As can be seen on this first table, although 3,212 respondents participated in the 2012 Survey, not all respondents answered the question related to interpreting position. In fact, throughout the survey, there was disparity with regard to the number of respondents that answered any of the questions. Because of this disparity, hard numbers of responses are provided on most data tables in this report, and percentages are calculated on the total number of responses to each survey question. Future survey instruments may include a feature that requires respondents to provide an answer to a question before moving on to the next question. However, overall, the respondent response rate to in the 2012 Survey was high.

that provide freelance/contract services, 443 reported they only work 1-5 hours per week as a freelance/contract interpreter and 162 reported they freelance/contract interpret 6-10 hours per week. In summary, although more than half of the survey's staff interpreter respondents provide freelance/contract services, for the majority of those respondents that work accounts for less than 5 hours of interpreting per week.

Because a goal of the 2012 practitioner needs assessment was to identify and understand differences regarding the needs of staff interpreters versus freelance/contract interpreters, it was important to establish early on what respondents to include in the two groups. With regard to staff interpreters, the decision was clear: the 1,457 respondents that reported they hold a staff interpreter position, whether full- or part-time. For the freelance/contract interpreter subset, the decision was compounded by the fact that more than half of the staff interpreter respondents (797 respondents) also provide freelance/contract services, although, as discussed above, for more than half of those respondents, that work accounts for less than five hours per week, and for nearly all, less than ten hours interpreting per week.

In addition, while some questions in the 2012 Survey were targeted specifically to staff interpreter or freelance/contract interpreter respondents, there were many more questions that were general in nature and elicited responses from the entire survey pool. The survey software provides a filtering mechanism that supported running data for those questions by respondent type: staff versus freelance. However, if the 797 respondents were to be included in the filtered data run for freelance/contract interpreter respondents, those respondents in effect would be counted twice in the analysis as they would also be included in the staff interpreter data run.

Therefore, for the purposes of this report, just the 1,606 respondents on Table 1 that report they **do not** hold a staff interpreter position have been defined as the freelance/contract interpreter subset; the subset does not include the 797 staff interpreter respondents that also provide minimal levels of freelance/contract services. The 1,606 respondents form the basis for the freelance/contract interpreter subset analyzed throughout this report. However, there were several questions in the 2012 Survey that were of particular importance and which were asked in a way that supported inclusion of the 797 staff interpreter respondents that provide freelance/contract services without double counting them. Specific notation has been made in each place in this report wherein the 797 staff interpreters that also provide freelance/contract services are included in the overall freelance/contract respondent analysis.

Throughout the report, much of the 2012 Survey analysis distinguishes between staff and freelance/contract respondents. However, in this first section and periodically in the report, it was more relevant to conduct the analysis on the 3,212 survey respondent group as a whole, and not distinguish between the two subsets.

Respondent Gender

Both the 2009 and 2012 Surveys collected information regarding respondent gender. Responses are presented on Table 2 below. Again, two sets of data are reported for each survey. The first data set is the actual number of responses collected, and the second is the percentage of total responses represented by the hard number.

Respondent Gender Table 2				
Respondent Gender	**2009 Survey**		**2012 Survey**	
	# of Respondents	**% of Responses**	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
Female	2,360	88%	2,462	87%
Male	305	11%	357	13%
Transgender	Not asked	Not asked	6	0%
Other gender	Not asked	Not asked	3	0%
Total	**2,673**	**100%**	**2,828**	**100%**

Finding: The 2007 practitioner survey did not collect information related to gender. However, based on information collected in the 2009 and 2012 surveys, it is evident that the current pool of working interpreters remains predominantly female.

Respondent Age

Only the 2012 Survey queried respondents with regard to their age. Nine age ranges were provided in the survey as possible selection options. Responses are presented on Table 3.

2012 Survey Respondent Age Table 3		
Average Age	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
18 - 20	5	0%
21 – 30	518	18%
31- 40	714	25%
41 – 50	758	27%
51 – 60	660	23%
61 - 70	156	6%
71 – 80	17	1%
81 - 90	1	0%
Above 90	1	0%
Total	**2,830**	**100%**

Finding: Of the 2,830 respondents that answered the question related to age, only 18% were age 30 and younger. This may be concerning with regard to the field's ability to attract and recruit new, young professionals as interpreters. Conversely, 30% of the respondents are over the age of 50, which could indicate that a relatively high number of practitioners may be looking toward retirement in the next ten to fifteen years.

Respondent Race and Ethnicity

The 2009 and 2012 surveys collected information with regard to race and ethnic background of respondents by using the U.S. Census demographic categories. Responses for both surveys are presented on Table 4.

Respondent Race and Ethnicity Table 4				
Race or Ethnicity	**2009 Survey**		**2012 Survey**	
	# of Respondents	**% of Responses**	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
American Indian/Alaskan Native	19	1%	29	1%
Asian	24	1%	25	1%
Black or African-American	97	4%	80	3%
Hispanic or Latino	85	3%	107	4%
Native Hawaii/ Pacific Islander	Not asked	Not asked	6	0%
White	2,347	88%	2,469	88%
Other	94	4%	102	4%
Total	**2,666**	**100%**	**2,818**	**100%**

Finding: In both surveys the majority of interpreting practitioners, or 88% of respondents, identified themselves as "White". This finding may further fuel concern regarding a lack of diversity within the current pool of working interpreters and an ongoing need for targeted efforts to increase recruitment of candidates from culturally diverse ethnic or racial backgrounds.

Respondent Hearing Status

Only the 2012 Survey collected information regarding respondent hearing status. Reported information is provided on Table 5.

2012 Survey Respondent Hearing Status Table 5		
Hearing Status	**2012 Survey**	
	# of Respondents	**% of Responses**
Deaf	54	2%
Deaf-Blind	0	0%
Hard of Hearing	57	2%
Hearing	2,708	96%
Other	15	1%
Total	**2,834**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of respondents, or 96%, reports they are hearing.

In summary, with regard to the overall diversity of the 2012 Survey interpreting practitioner respondents:

- 48% of respondents hold a staff interpreter position
- 56% of staff interpreter respondents also provide freelance/contract interpreting services
- 52% of respondents provide interpreting services on a freelance/contract basis only
- 87% are female
- 88% are white
- 75% are between the ages of 30 and 60
- 96 % are hearing

Respondent Retirement Plans

In order to understand even more about the current respondent pool and potential changes to the size and status of the pool over the next ten years, the 2012 Survey asked respondents to complete a number of questions about their plans to retire from the field of interpreting. The 2007 Survey also collected information related to retirement. Both data sets are presented on Table 6.

2007 and 2012 Survey Respondent Retirement Plans
Table 6

Retirement plans	2007 Survey		2012 Survey	
1-5 years	216	6%	220	8%
6-10 years	637	16%	351	12%
11-15 years	Not asked	Not asked	367	13%
16-20 years	Not asked	Not asked	315	11%
21-25 years	Not asked	Not asked	230	8%
26-30 years	Not asked	Not asked	228	8%
Not contemplating at all	Not asked	Not asked	1,144	40%
No plan to retire	3,015	77%	Not asked	Not asked
Total	**3,868**	**100%**	**2,855**	**100%**

Finding: Looking first at the 2007 Survey, 6% (216) of working interpreters reported they planned to retire in 1-5 years, and an additional 16% (637) reported they planned to retire in 6-10 years, for a total of 853 working interpreters reporting they planned to retire within ten years. The retirement question was asked again in the 2012 Survey, and additional timeframes were provided as selection options. Because that survey was conducted five years later, it might be expected that the number of respondents reporting retirement plans in 1-5 years would have been higher than the 220 reported in the 2007 Survey, particularly as the 637 respondents that reported a retirement plan in 6-10 years in 2007 would now be in the 1-5 year category. However, although both surveys were disseminated to RID membership, there is no way of knowing to what extent practitioners participated in both surveys. With regard to respondents with retirement plans in the next 6-10 years, the numbers fell significantly, from 637 respondents in the 2007 Survey to 351 respondents in the 2012 Survey. Looking at just the number of respondents, in the 2007 Survey. 853 respondents reported a plan to retire within ten years as compared to 571 respondents in the 2012 Survey.

Another major difference in the two surveys was with regard to respondents that reported they had no plan to retire. In the 2007 Survey 77% of respondents reported “no plan to retire” as compared to only 40% of 2012 Survey respondents that reported “not contemplating (retirement) at all”. However, a point of difference in the design of the two surveys is worth mentioning. In the 2007 Survey respondents were only given three selection categories: “1-5 years”, “6-10 years” or “No plan to retire”. In the 2012 survey respondents were provided four additional timeframes as selection options, allowing them to report on retirement plans for up to 30 years out. Perhaps the additional selection items contributed in some way to the differences in the two sets of survey data reported, particularly with regard to no plan to retire. Potentially, a lower number of 2007 respondents may have selected “No plan to retire” if they had been provided the long-range timeframes included in the 2012 Survey.

B. Respondent Work Status

This section of the report assesses various aspects of 2012 Survey respondent work status. It includes information regarding the regions and states in which respondents provide the majority of their interpreting services; for staff interpreter respondents, whether their position is full- or part-time; the hours per week that respondents work; and whether respondents have seen a change in the demand for their services over the past three years.

States Where Respondents do Majority of Interpreting

Table 7 lists the states in which respondents reported they provide the majority of their interpreting services. Although 3,212 individuals participated in the survey, only 2,602 (81%) of respondents provided information regarding the state in which they work. Therefore, the percentages presented below are based on the 81% of responses received. The states are organized and presented based on the grants regional office structure.

States Where 2012 Survey Respondents do Majority of Interpreting by Region Table 7			
GURIEC	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
Alabama	11	12	23
Delaware	3	3	6
District of Columbia	30	46	76
Florida	77	70	147
Georgia	32	19	51
Kentucky	24	12	36
Maryland	28	41	69
Mississippi	5	6	11
North Carolina	36	38	74
Pennsylvania	44	55	99
South Carolina	15	10	25
Tennessee	20	16	36
Virginia	42	29	71
West Virginia	4	1	5
Region total	**371 (51%)**	**358 (49%)**	**729 (100%)**
NURIEC	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
Connecticut	9	12	21
Maine	6	11	17
Massachusetts	32	58	90
New Hampshire	3	10	13
New Jersey	29	42	71
New York	76	120	196
Puerto Rico	7	2	9
Rhode Island	0	5	5
Vermont	2	6	8
Region total	**164 (38%)**	**266 (62%)**	**430 (100%)**
CATIE	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
Illinois	42	46	88
Indiana	19	33	52
Iowa	17	16	33
Kansas	7	3	10
Michigan	27	37	64
Minnesota	50	42	92
Missouri	17	6	23
Nebraska	3	8	11
Ohio	42	48	90
Wisconsin	46	21	67
Region Total	**270 (51%)**	**260 (49%)**	**530 (100%)**

States Where 2012 Survey Respondents do Majority of Interpreting by Region Table 7 (continued)			
MARIE	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
Arkansas	10	8	18
Colorado	31	31	62
Louisiana	11	10	21
Montana	5	0	5
New Mexico	23	15	38
North Dakota	4	0	4
Oklahoma	7	6	13
South Dakota	6	2	8
Texas	50	42	92
Utah	14	21	35
Wyoming	3	0	3
Region Total	**164 (55%)**	**135 (45%)**	**299 (100%)**
WRIEC	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
Alaska	7	6	13
Arizona	30	35	65
California	144	157	301
Hawaii	1	16	17
Idaho	9	9	18
Nevada	7	9	16
Oregon	27	30	57
Washington	36	68	104
Region Total	**261 (44%)**	**330 (56%)**	**591 (100%)**
Do not reside in US	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
Other than state	**9 (39%)**	**14 (51%)**	**23 (100%)**

Finding: At the time this report was prepared, RID reported a membership of 8,249 certified interpreter members and 2,735 associate members (working interpreters that have not yet achieved certification, but that were currently working toward that goal). Therefore, the 2,602 responses collected in the survey represent only 24% of the combined RID members, so the actual number of interpreters working in any given state could potentially be much higher. That withstanding, it is still concerning to see the relatively low number of interpreters in some states, particularly those with large and/or difficult to access rural geographic areas.

Based on the data that was reported, in three of the regions (GURIEC, CATIE and MARIE) a slightly higher percentage of respondents reported holding a staff interpreter position than reported working as a freelance/contract interpreter. Specifically, in both the GURIEC and CATIE regions, 51% of respondents hold a staff interpreter position and 49% work as freelance/contract interpreters; in the MARIE region, 55% of respondents reported holding a staff position as compared to 45% that work on a freelance/contract basis.

In the NURIEC and WRIEC regions, a higher percentage of respondents reported working as a freelance/contract interpreter. In the WRIEC region, 44% reported holding a staff position as compared to 56% working on a freelance/contract basis. In the NURIEC region, the difference is the greatest: 38% of respondents report they hold a staff interpreter position and 62% report they work as a freelance/contract interpreter. Looking more closely at the NURIEC data, 46% of all the responses collected regarding interpreting position were reported for the state of New York, in which 76 respondents reported working as a staff interpreter and 120 respondents reported they work as a freelance/contract interpreter.

In addition, while there were 23 respondents that reported they did not live in a specific state, it is not clear where those individuals do reside, which could potentially include the US Virgin Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Northern Mariana Islands.

Where Staff Interpreters Hold their Position

In the 2012 Survey, staff interpreter respondents were asked in which type of organization they hold their staff position.

Organization Where 2012 Survey Staff Interpreters Hold their Position Table 8		
Type of Organization	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
Medical	62	4%
Legal	16	1%
K-12	468	33%
Post-secondary	278	20%
Vocational/Technical Education	24	2%
Commission or Center on Deafness	26	2%
Vocational Rehabilitation (VR)	22	2%
Public Interpreter Referral Agency	57	4%
Private Interpreter Referral Agency	93	7%
Video Relay Services (VRS)	227	16%
Other (please specify)	135	10%
Total	**1,408**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of the 2012 Survey staff interpreters reported they hold a position in an educational organization, with 33% of respondents reporting they work in K-12 and 20% reporting they work in post-secondary education. The third highest response set was reported as working in VRS (16% of staff interpreters).

The 2012 Survey asked those respondents that reported they hold a staff interpreter position to elaborate regarding full-time versus part-time status.

2012 Survey Staff Interpreter Respondents Table 9		
Status and Benefits	**# of Responses**	**% of Respondents**
Full-time	895	64%
Half-time	53	4%
Part-time	171	12%
Other	284	20%
Total	**1,403**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of staff interpreter respondents (64%) reported they hold a full-time position. Since "half-time" was provided as a selection option, it can be assumed that the 12% of respondents that selected "part-time" work less than 20 hour per week. In addition, a closer analysis of the 20% of respondents in the "Other" category demonstrated most of those respondents also reported they work part-time.

Hours Spent Per Week Interpreting

The 2012 Survey collected information from respondents regarding the hours per week they spend interpreting. This information, collected separately for staff and freelance/contract interpreters, is compiled for both groups on Table 10.

Hours Per Week 2012 Survey Respondents Interpret Table 10				
Hours per week	**Staff Interpreters**		**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	
	# of Respondents	**% of Responses**	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
1-5	95	7%	334	24%
6-10	111	8%	203	14%
11-15	140	10%	146	10%
16-20	192	14%	166	12%
21-25	234	17%	165	12%
26-30	265	19%	173	12%
31-35	227	16%	114	8%
36-40	117	8%	79	5%
40+	17	1%	35	2%
Total	**1,398**	**100%**	**1,415**	**100%**

Finding: Of the staff interpreters, only 44% reported they interpret more than 25 hours per week, and 56% reported their staff interpreting position accounts for less than 26 hours of interpreting per week. This is interesting considering that 64% of the 2012 Survey staff interpreters reported they hold a full-time staff interpreter position. With regard to freelance/contract interpreters, 48% of respondents reported they spend less than 15 hours per week interpreting, and in aggregate, 60% interpret less than 20 hours per week. This data seems to indicate that the majority of freelance/contract interpreters provide their services on a part-time (less than half-time) basis.

Demand for Interpreting Services

Respondents of the 2012 Survey were asked to report whether they have experienced more demand, less demand, or no change in demand for their services over the previous three years. Responses are presented on Table 11.

Demand For Services of 2012 Survey Respondents Over Past 3 Years Table 11		
Level of Demand	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
More demand	1,526	53%
Less demand	432	15%
No change in demand	615	22%
Don't know	285	10%
Total	**2,858**	**100%**

Finding: Most 2012 Survey respondents have seen an increase in the demand for their services, with 53% of respondents reporting more demand, and only 15% having experienced less demand. Of the responses collected, 22% of practitioners reported they have experienced no change in demand.

Table 12 compares demand for services responses by staff interpreters versus freelance/contract interpreters.

Demand For Services of Staff Versus Freelance/Contract Respondents Over Past 3 Years Table 12				
Level of Demand	**Staff Interpreters**		**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	
More demand	751	57%	766	51%
Less demand	163	12%	268	18%
No change in demand	295	22%	316	21%
Don't know	118	9%	166	11%
Total	**1,327**	**100%**	**1,516**	**100%**

Finding: More staff interpreters reported increased demand for their services than did freelance/contract interpreters: 57% of respondents as compared to 51%. This seems to be further supported with regard to respondents that have experienced less demand for their services, with 12% of staff interpreters reporting less demand in the past three years as compared to 18% of freelance/contract interpreters.

As a reminder, responses in the category of freelance/contract interpreters do not include those 797 staff interpreters that reported they do some freelance/contract interpreting.

However, those 797 respondents are included in the staff interpreter data and therefore it is not completely evident whether the reported information related to demand is with regard to their staff position or their work as freelance/contract interpreters, or both.

Table 13 presents an additional look at the demand for interpreter services. Reponses are presented state-by-state, organized within the grant's regional center structure.

2012 Survey Respondent Demand For Services Over Previous 3 Years Table 13			
GURIEC	**Less Demand**	**More Demand**	**No Change**
Alabama	1	12	5
Delaware	0	5	1
District of Columbia	17	32	16
Florida	17	75	29
Georgia	3	26	13
Kentucky	6	21	7
Maryland	8	30	12
Mississippi	1	7	2
North Carolina	15	38	13
Pennsylvania	5	51	22
South Carolina	1	13	8
Tennessee	1	21	6
Virginia	7	38	20
West Virginia	0	3	0
Region total	**82 (13%)**	**372 (62%)**	**154 (25%)**
NURIEC	**Less Demand**	**More Demand**	**No Change**
Connecticut	4	9	3
Maine	3	10	2
Massachusetts	11	38	21
New Hampshire	2	5	5
New Jersey	22	26	12
New York	32	89	43
Rhode Island	1	2	1
Vermont	3	2	3
Region total	**78 (22%)**	**181 (52%)**	**90 (26%)**

2012 Survey Respondent Demand For Services Over Previous 3 Years Table 13 (continued)			
CATIE	**Less Demand**	**More Demand**	**No Change**
Illinois	11	55	11
Indiana	4	38	5
Iowa	3	17	5
Kansas	0	6	4
Michigan	2	42	15
Minnesota	5	52	15
Missouri	2	11	6
Nebraska	0	6	3
Ohio	20	42	16
Wisconsin	9	26	13
Region total	**56 (13%)**	**295 (66%)**	**93 (21%)**
MARIE	**Less Demand**	**More Demand**	**No Change**
Arkansas	1	7	6
Colorado	8	29	14
Louisiana	3	11	4
Montana	0	1	2
New Mexico	7	15	9
North Dakota	0	3	0
Oklahoma	3	6	2
South Dakota	1	2	3
Texas	16	50	17
Utah	8	14	7
Wyoming	0	3	0
Region Total	**47 (19%)**	**141 (56%)**	**64 (25%)**
WRIEC	**Less Demand**	**More Demand**	**No Change**
Alaska	1	8	2
Arizona	14	25	12
California	54	146	61
Hawaii	8	6	2
Idaho	1	11	4
Nevada	3	6	5
Oregon	9	26	12
Washington	16	54	18
Region Total	**106 (21%)**	**282 (56%)**	**116 (23%)**
Do not reside in US	**Less Demand**	**More Demand**	**No Change**
Other than State Total	**1 (7%)**	**10 (67%)**	**4 (26%)**
Total Respondents	**372 (17%)**	**1,285 (59%)**	**522 (24%)**

Finding: On a state-by-state basis, only respondents that interpret in the state of Hawaii reported experiencing less demand for their services. In every other state, a higher number of respondents reported experiencing more demand for their services than did respondents reporting less demand, and in some states, the difference is significant.

Looking at the state-by-state data in aggregate, or on a regional basis, further supports that 2012 Survey respondents have experienced increased demand for their services, with more than 50% of respondents in each of the regions reporting having experienced more demand for their services. In two of the regions, GURIEC and CATIE, more than 60% of respondents reported experiencing more demand for their services.

While there were 15 respondents that reported they did not live in a specific state, it is not clear where those individuals do reside, which could potentially include the US Virgin Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Northern Mariana Islands.

It should also be noted that numbers of responses reported on Table 13 are lower than numbers reported on Table 11, due to differences in respondent reporting. Specifically, some respondents that answered a question in the survey regarding the state in which they conduct the majority of their interpreting may not have answered the question regarding demand for services, and vice versa. Only those respondents that answered both survey questions appear on Table 13.

A follow-up question in the 2012 Survey asked respondents that reported "less demand" for their services to identify possible contributing factors. This information is presented for both staff interpreters and freelance/contract interpreters. Percentages on Table 14 are based only on the number of respondents that reported less demand for their services (163 staff interpreters and 268 freelance/contract interpreters). Respondents were able to select multiple factors.

Factors Contributing to Demand for 2012 Survey Respondent Services
Table 14

Possible Factors	All Respondents		Staff Interpreters		Freelance/Contract Interpreters	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Demand for interpreting in general has decreased in my area	202	47%	72	44%	129	48%
Funding for hiring interpreters is not as available as it was before	197	46%	67	41%	129	48%
Work is going to other interpreters	161	38%	52	32%	109	41%
Work is going to less experienced/less expensive interpreters	242	56%	79	48%	162	61%
VRI has become more widely used in my area	95	22%	33	20%	62	23%
Deaf individuals using other means to obtain communication access	74	17%	27	17%	47	18%
Other (please explain)	116	27%	41	25%	74	28%

Finding: For both staff interpreter and freelance/contract interpreters, the factor with the highest percentage of responses was "work is going to less experienced/less expensive interpreters." While it was the highest ranked contributing factor for both groups, it appears to particularly influence a decrease in demand for freelance/contract interpreter services, with 61% of respondents identifying it as a contributing factor. It is also interesting that percentages for each of the possible contributing factors are higher for freelance/contract interpreters than for staff interpreters, perhaps indicating that freelance/contract interpreters overall are more vulnerable to fluctuating demand for their services. This finding is consistent with the data reported earlier on Tables 11 and 12.

A question in the 2012 Survey asked respondents whether they have received offers of interpreting assignments from referral entities that were unfamiliar to them (e.g. spoken language referral agencies), over the previous three years. Responses are presented on Table 15.

2012 Survey Respondent Assignments from Unfamiliar Referral Entities
Table 15

Type of Response	All Respondents		Staff Interpreters		Freelance/Contract Interpreters	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2,274	80%	1,030	78%	1,232	82%
No	577	20%	295	22%	279	18%
Total	**2,851**	**100%**	**1,325**	**100%**	**1,511**	**100%**

Finding: In all three respondent groups, a significant majority reported they have received offers of interpreting assignments from referral entities unfamiliar to them.

A follow up survey question asked respondents to provide additional information related to the types of entities they have received offers of interpreting assignments from. That information is provided below.

2012 Survey Respondent Identification of Unfamiliar Referral Entities
Table 16

	All Respondents		Staff Interpreters		Freelance/Contract Interpreters	
Response selections	#	%	#	%	#	%
The entities WERE familiar with the prevailing practices of ASL/English interpreters	929	41%	405	40%	517	43%
The entities WERE NOT familiar with the prevailing practices of ASL/English interpreters	1,354	60%	597	59%	752	62%
The entities were from out of state	1,705	76%	769	75%	927	76%

Finding: It is interesting that for all three respondent groups, 75% or more respondents reported the unfamiliar referral entity was not from their state. It is also concerning to note the high percentage of respondents in each of the survey sub-groups that reported the referral entities offering them assignments were not familiar with the prevailing practices of ASL/English interpreters.

C. Respondent Qualifications

This next section of the report provides information regarding respondent academic achievement, membership in national organizations and the degree to which respondents are certified.

Respondent Academic Status

Only the 2012 Survey asked respondents to report their highest level of completed education. That information is presented on Table 17.

Highest Level of Completed Education for 2012 Survey Respondents Table 17		
Highest Completed Education Level	**2012 Survey**	
	# of Respondents	**% of Responses**
Some high school	2	0%
High school diploma/GED	51	2%
Some college	246	9%
Associate degree/Vocational certificate	671	24%
BA/BS degree	902	32%
Some graduate coursework	293	10%
MA/MS degree	601	21%
PhD/EdD degree	75	3%
Total	**2,841**	**100%**

Finding: In 2012, RID began requiring interpreters to possess a BA/BS degree for certification. Currently, 35% of 2012 Survey respondents reported they hold less than a BA/BS degree. However, 64% of respondents do report attainment of at least a BA/BS degree, and 34% of respondents have attained educational accomplishments beyond a BA/BS degree.

Table 18 was developed to assess whether there is a significant difference in academic achievement between staff interpreters and freelance/contract interpreters.

Highest Level of Completed Education of 2012 Survey Respondents Staff Interpreters Versus Freelance/Contract Interpreters Table 18				
Highest Education Level	**Staff Interpreters**		**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	
	# of Respondents	**% of Responses**	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
Some high school	0	0%	2	0%
High school diploma/GED	17	1%	33	2%
Some college	116	9%	127	8%
AA/AS degree/ Vocational certificate	371	28%	298	20%
BA/BS degree	458	35%	440	29%
Some graduate coursework	126	10%	164	11%
MA/MS degree	215	16%	384	26%
PhD/EdD degree	20	2%	55	4%
Total	**1,323**	**100%**	**1,503**	**100%**

Finding: With attention to the new RID requirement for a BA/BS degree, it is interesting to note that 38% of staff interpreters report attainment an AA/AS degree or less, as compared to 30% of freelance/contract interpreters. Further, with regard to attainment of a BA/BS degree or higher, 63% of staff interpreters reported they possess a BA/BS degree or higher, and 70% of freelance/contract interpreters possess a BA/BS degree or higher. Overall, therefore, it would appear that freelance/contract interpreters have slightly higher levels of academic achievement than do staff interpreters.

Professional credentials

The 2012 Survey also asked respondents to report on the professional credentials they hold.

Professional Credentials of 2012 Survey Respondents Table 19				
Type of Credential	**Staff interpreters**		**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	
National credentials (RID, EIPA, etc.)	1,099	84%	1,233	83%
State/local credentials	462	35%	444	30%
No credentials held	97	7%	141	9%

Finding: The attainment of professional credentials is similar across the two respondent groups, with high percentages of both survey subsets reporting attainment of national credentials.

A follow up question in the survey asked respondents to report on the national credentials they hold.

National Credentials held by 2012 Survey Respondents Table 20		
National Credential	**2012 Survey**	
NIC (National Interpreter Certification)	708	31%
NIC-A (Advanced)	159	7%
NIC-M (Masters)	103	4%
CI (Certificate of Interpretation)	908	39%
CT (Certificate of Transliteration)	941	41%
CDI (Certified Deaf Interpreter)	38	2%
CSC (Comprehensive Skills Certificate)	186	8%
MCSC (Master Comprehensive Skills Certificate)	9	0%
RSC (Reverse Skills Certificate)	20	1%
OTC (Oral Transliteration Certificate)	28	1%
OIC:C (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Comprehensive)	11	0%
OIC:S/V (Spoken to Visible)	5	0%
OIC:V/S (Visible to Spoken)	2	0%
IC/TC (Interpretation Certificate/Transliteration Certificate)	44	2%
IC (Interpretation Certificate)	43	2%
TC (Transliteration Certificate)	64	3%
NAD III (Generalist) – Average Performance	110	5%
NAD IV (Advanced) – Above Average Performance	120	5%
NAD V (Master) – Superior Performance	49	2%
EIPA K-12	449	19%

Finding: In the 2012 Survey, 41% of respondents reported holding a Certificate of Transliteration (CT) and 39% of respondents a Certificate of Interpretation (CI). In addition, 31% of respondents report attainment of National Interpreter Certification (NIC) – 42% if NIC-Advanced and NIC-Masters are included. Note that SC:L was inadvertently omitted from the list of certifications.

Information collected regarding attainment of national credentials is further assessed by staff interpreter versus freelance/contract interpreter respondents on Table 21.

National Credentials held by 2012 Survey Respondents Table 21				
National Credential	**Staff Interpreters**		**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	
NIC (National Interpreter Certification)	347	32%	355	29%
NIC-A (Advanced)	68	6%	90	7%
NIC-M (Masters)	44	4%	59	5%
CI (Certificate of Interpretation)	392	36%	513	42%
CT (Certificate of Transliteration)	417	38%	520	43%
CDI (Certified Deaf Interpreter)	10	1%	28	2%
CSC (Comprehensive Skills Certificate)	71	7%	113	9%
MCSC (Master Comprehensive Skills Certificate)	4	0%	5	0%
RSC (Reverse Skills Certificate)	6	1%	14	1%
OTC (Oral Transliteration Certificate)	11	1%	17	1%
OIC:C (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Comprehensive)	6	1%	5	0%
OIC:S/V (Spoken to Visible)	3	0%	2	0%
OIC:V/S (Visible to Spoken)	1	0%	1	0%
IC/TC (Interpretation Certificate/ Transliteration Certificate)	16	1%	28	2%
IC (Interpretation Certificate)	17	2%	26	2%
TC (Transliteration Certificate)	23	2%	41	3%
NAD III (Generalist) – Average Performance	57	5%	50	4%
NAD IV (Advanced) – Above Average Performance	64	6%	55	5%
NAD V (Master) – Superior Performance	19	2%	30	2%
EIPA K-12	272	25%	177	15%

Finding: In the 2012 Survey, higher percentages of freelance/contract interpreters reported attainment of CTs (43%) than did staff interpreters (38%), as well as CIs (42% versus 36%). Conversely, more staff interpreters reported attainment of an EIPA K-12 than did freelance/contract interpreters (25% as compared to 15%). With regard to attainment of some level of NIC, including at the Advanced and Masters level, the two groups are relatively the same: 42% of staff interpreters compared to 41% of freelance/contract interpreters.

Table 22 compares the 2009 and 2012 Surveys with regard to the national credentials held by the two different sets of respondents.

National Credentials held by 2009 and 2012 Survey Respondents Table 22		
National Credential	**2009 Survey**	**2012 Survey**
NIC (National Interpreter Certification)	21%	31%
NIC-A (Advanced)	4%	7%
NIC-M (Master)	3%	4%
CI (Certificate of Interpretation)	38%	39%
CT (Certificate of Transliteration)	40%	41%
CDI (Certified Deaf Interpreter)	0%	2%
CSC (Comprehensive Skills Certificate)	7%	8%
MCSC (Master Comprehensive Skills Certificate)	0%	0%
RSC (Reverse Skills Certificate)	1%	1%
OTC (Oral Transliteration Certificate)	1%	1%
OIC:C (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Comprehensive)	1%	0%
OIC:S/V (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Spoken to Visible)	0%	0%
OIC:V/S (Oral Interpreting Certificate: Visible to Spoken)	0%	0%
IC/TC (Interpretation Certificate/Transliteration Certificate)	3%	2%
IC (Interpretation Certificate)	2%	2%
TC (Transliteration Certificate)	2%	3%
NAD III (Generalist) – Average Performance	5%	5%
NAD IV (Advanced) – Above Average Performance	5%	5%
NAD V (Master) – Superior Performance	2%	2%
EIPA K-12	11%	19%
RID State Certification	1%	Not asked
State/Local Certification	24%	Not asked

Finding: For both survey groups, the most frequently reported credentials were CT (38% and 39%) and CI (40% and 41%), with similar percentages of both survey respondent groups reporting attainment of those credentials. With regard to NIC, which was introduced in 2005, as one might expect, a higher percentage of 2012 Survey respondents reported attainment of NIC/NIC-A/NIC-M (42%) than did 2009 Survey respondents (28%). There was also an increase in the percentage of respondents that reported holding EIPA K-12 credentials, which increased from 11% of respondents in the 2009 Survey to 19% of all respondents in the 2012 Survey; 25% of staff interpreter respondents, and 15% of freelance/contract interpreter respondents (Table 21).

Significantly lower percentages of both survey respondent groups reported holding the other RID-related credentials, or as having achieved NAD-related credentials.

Oldest Credentials Held

Only the 2012 Survey asked respondents to report on the number of years that they have held their oldest national credential. Table 23 presents that information for both staff interpreters and freelance/contract interpreters.

Years Oldest National Credential Held by 2012 Survey Respondents Table 23				
Years Held	**Staff Interpreters**		**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	
1—5 years	418	40%	424	35%
6—10 years	212	20%	227	19%
11—15 years	186	18%	223	19%
16—20 years	91	9%	106	9%
21—25 years	31	3%	56	5%
26—30 years	47	4%	69	6%
31—35 years	46	4%	72	6%
36—40 years	18	2%	26	2%
Total	**1,049**	**100%**	**1,203**	**100%**

Finding: For both survey subsets, the highest percentage of responses fell in the 1-5 year category: 40% of staff interpreters and 35% of freelance/contract interpreters. Overall, in looking at Table 23, it is evident that the majority of 2012 Survey respondents have held their oldest national credential for less than ten years: 60% of staff interpreters and 54% of freelance/contract interpreters.

Membership in Professional Organizations

All three interpreting practitioner surveys asked respondents to identify the professional organizations they belong to. However, this question was asked in an open-ended format in the 2007 Survey, while in the 2009 and 2012 Surveys, respondents were provided a list of professional organizations to select from – though the selection options in the two later surveys were not identical.

Because of the open-ended format used in the 2007 Survey, there was significant variation in responses. For example, many respondents identified only those national organizations they belonged to while other respondents 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 the responses collected in the 2007 Survey. However, for the purposes of this report and comparing like information, queries were run on the 2007 Survey data regarding four prominent organizations: RID, NAD, CIT and ASLTA.

Respondent membership information is reported and compared for all three surveys on Table 24.

Membership in Professional Organizations Table 24			
Organization	**2007 Survey**	**2009 Survey**	**2012 Survey**
RID	80%	92%	100%
RID State	Not asked	71%	74%
NAD	20%	20%	23%
NAD State	Not asked	8%	10%
CIT	4%	12%	Not asked
ASLTA	3%	6%	Not asked
NAOBI	Not asked	Not asked	4%
Mano a Mano	Not asked	Not asked	2%

Finding: Since all the first two survey instruments were disseminated exclusively through the RID membership list, it should be assumed all survey respondents belonged to RID. However, as Table 24 indicates, not all respondents in either of the first two surveys reported belonging to the organization. In addition, a higher percentage of 2009 Survey respondents reported belonging to CIT and ASLTA than did 2007 Survey respondents. However, it is important to remember that spelling and data entry errors occurring due to the open-ended format of the question in the 2007 Survey contributed to some level of data inaccuracy for that respondent group. The 2012 Survey did not ask respondents to report membership in either CIT or ASLTA.

In the 2012 needs assessment effort, NAOBI and Mano a Mano were asked to disseminate the survey to members. Though there are some respondents in the 2012 Survey pool that reported membership in those two organizations, there is no data documenting how many surveys were actually disseminated to and completed by members of either NAOBI or Mano a Mano.

Interpreter Pay

The 2012 Survey asked those respondents that reported they hold a staff interpreter position to elaborate regarding full- versus part-time status and the benefits they receive.

2012 Survey Staff Interpreter Respondents Table 25		
Status and Benefits	**# of Responses**	**% of Respondents**
Full-time with full benefits	848	60%
Full-time with partial benefits	47	3%
Half-time with full benefits	39	3%
Half-time with partial benefits	14	1%
Part-time with full benefits	48	3%
Part-time with partial benefits	123	9%
Other (explain)	284	20%
Total	**1,403**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of staff interpreter respondents (60%) reported they hold a full-time position with full benefits. The next highest ranked category, "Other", was selected by 20% of respondents. An assessment of responses entered in that category indicated most of those respondents work part-time and receive no benefits.

Annual Salary

The 2012 Survey respondents that reported they hold a staff interpreter position were asked to report on their annual salary. That information is presented on Table 26.

Annual Salary for 2012 Survey Staff Interpreter Respondents
Table 26

Annual Salary Range	# of Responses	% of Respondents
$10-15,000	86	6%
$15-20,000	73	5%
$20-30,000	267	19%
$30-40,000	337	24%
$40-50,000	244	18%
$50-60,000	167	12%
$60-70,000	118	9%
$70-80,000	55	4%
$80-90,000	39	3%
Total	**1,386**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of staff interpreter respondents (72%) reported earnings of less than $50,000 per year; 54% report earning less than $40,000 annually. Only 28% of the respondents reported annual earnings higher than $50,000. However, it should be noted that 37% of the staff interpreter respondents reported they worked either half- or part-time (see Table 25).

In order to understand more about interpreter pay, additional analysis was conducted to assess the annual salary of just those 60% of staff interpreter respondents that reported they hold a full-time position and receive full benefits.

Annual Salary for 2012 Survey Full-time/Full Benefits Staff Interpreters Table 27		
Annual Salary Range	**Full-time Staff Interpreters with Full Benefits**	
	# of Respondents	**% of Responses**
$10–15,000	1	0%
$15—20,000	18	2%
$20—30,000	133	16%
$30—40,000	214	26%
$40—50,000	179	21%
$50—60,000	116	14%
$60—70,000	96	11%
$70—80,000	51	6%
$80—90,000	33	4%
Total	**841**	**100%**

Finding: Of the full-time/full benefits staff interpreter respondents, 35% earn more than $50,000 annually. Conversely, 65% of those same respondents earn less than $50,000 each year, and 44% of the respondents less than $40,000. Drawing upon 2012 Survey software capabilities, the mean annual salary of the Survey 2012 staff interpreter respondents that work full-time and receive full benefits was approximately $40,700. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics Program, the mean annual salary in the U.S. was $45,230 in May 2011.[1]

Utilizing the same software capabilities, the mean annual salary was calculated for each of the ten employment settings identified and reported on in the 2012 Survey (see Table 8). Information was calculated two ways: first, for all 2012 Survey respondents that reported they work either full- or part-time as a staff interpreter, and secondly, for just those staff interpreter respondents that reported they work full-time and receive full benefits. That information is presented on Table 28.

It should be noted that the actual number of respondents that reported they work in each of the employment settings varied widely.

[1] May 2011 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates. Bureau of Labor Statistics. http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm#00-0000 [retrieved September 15, 2011]

2012 Survey Staff Interpreter Median Annual Salary by Organization Where Position Held Table 28				
Type of Employment Setting	**All Staff Interpreters**		**Those Full-time w/Full Benefits**	
	# of Respondents	**Mean Salary**	**# of Respondents**	**Mean Salary**
Legal	16	$55,000	13	$64,000
Video Relay Services (VRS)	225	$42,000	102	$57,000
Private Interpreter Referral Agency	90	$46,000	48	$55,000
Medical	62	$38,000	23	$52,000
Vocational Rehabilitation	22	$35,000	10	$44,000
Post-secondary	272	$29,000	129	$41,000
Public Referral Agency	56	$35,000	36	$40,000
Vocational/Tech Education	24	$35,000	12	$39,000
Commission/Center on Deafness	26	$32,000	15	$37,000
K-12	465	$29,000	388	$31,000
Total	**1,386**	**100%**	**848**	**100%**

Finding: With the exception of K-12, the mean annual salary increased significantly between the two sub-sets – all staff interpreter respondents and just those staff interpreter respondents that reported they are employed full-time and receive full benefits (60% of staff interpreter respondents). Focusing just on the data reported by the full-time with full benefits staff interpreter respondents, it is interesting that although the highest number of respondents reported employment in K-12 settings, by far that group commands the lowest mean annual salary: only $31,000, which is nearly 30% lower than the national mean annual salary reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 2011.

Conversely, while only 13 of the 2012 Survey respondents reported holding a position in a legal organization, that group commands a significantly higher mean annual salary: $64,000, more than double the mean annual salary earned by respondents that hold their position in K-12, and significantly higher than the national mean. It is also interesting to note the differences in mean annual salary of respondents working for a private interpreter referral agency versus a public interpreter referral agency - $55,000 as compared to $40,000 in annual earnings.

Hourly Wage for Freelance/Contract Interpreters

The 2012 Survey also asked respondents that reported they work as freelance/contract interpreters to report on their hourly wage. That information is presented on Table 29 for two groups: those 1,606 survey respondents that only do freelance/contract interpreting, and those same 1,606 respondents plus the 797 staff interpreters that do some level of freelance/contract interpreting.

2102 Survey Hourly Wage for Freelance/Contract Interpreter Respondents Table 29				
Hourly Range	**Freelance/Contract Only Interpreters**		**Freelance/Contract & Staff Interpreters that Freelance**	
$10-15	7	1%	10	0%
$16-20	9	1%	20	1%
$21-25	63	5%	108	5%
$26-30	105	8%	183	8%
$31-35	194	14%	316	15%
$36-40	269	19%	414	19%
$41-45	236	17%	404	19%
$46-50	191	14%	280	13%
$51-55	135	10%	188	9%
$56-60	74	5%	115	5%
$61-65	58	4%	83	4%
$66-70	25	2%	29	1%
$71-75	10	1%	14	1%
$76+	10	1%	14	1%
Total	**1,386**	**100%**	**2,178**	**100%**

Finding: Drawing upon the statistical capabilities of the survey software, the mean hourly wage for 2012 Survey respondents that only work as freelance/contract interpreters was approximately $40.00 per hour, and the mean hourly wage for that same group but including the 797 staff interpreters that also work some time as freelance/contract interpreters was approximately $38.00 per hour. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the national hourly mean wage as of May 2011 was just $21.74.

Based on the data reported by 2012 Survey respondents – both staff interpreter and freelance/contract interpreters – it would appear that the annual salary earned by interpreters holding a full-time position is lower than the national mean, yet the hourly wage earned by freelance/contract interpreters is likely to be significantly higher – potentially nearly double the national mean.

The 2009 Survey also asked respondents to report on hourly wage; the 2007 practitioner survey did not collect this information. Information regarding the hourly wage of freelance/contract interpreters from both the 2009 and 2012 surveys is presented on Table 30. Because the 2009 survey did not cull out those interpreters that only did freelance/contract work from those that did both staff and freelance/contract interpreting, the second 2012 Survey group on Table 29, which includes freelance/contract interpreters and staff interpreters that also do freelance/contract work, is used in the survey-to-survey comparison on Table 30.

2009 Survey and 2012 Survey Comparison of Freelance/Contract Interpreter Pay Table 30				
Hourly Pay Ranges	**2009 Survey**		**2012 Survey**	
$1-$10	2	0%	Not asked	Not asked
$11-$15	28	1%	10	0%
$16-$20	113	4%	20	1%
$21-$25	210	8%	108	5%
$26-$30	317	12%	183	8%
$31-$35	390	15%	316	15%
$36-$40	453	18%	414	19%
$41-$45	352	14%	404	19%
$46-$50	307	12%	280	13%
$51-$55	149	5%	188	9%
$56-$60	97	3%	115	5%
$61-$65	47	1%	83	4%
$66-$70	28	1%	29	1%
$71-$75	10	0%	14	1%
$75+	11	0%	14	1%
Total	**2,514**	**100%**	**2,178**	**100%**

Finding: Because different survey software was used in the 2009 Survey, there was not the same capability to calculate a mean hourly wage as was available in the 2012 Survey. However, broad comparisons can be made. In the 2009 Survey, 58% of freelance/contract interpreter respondents reported an hourly wage lower than $40.00, compared to 48% of 2012 Survey respondents. While it is important to remember that responses to both surveys only represented a sample of the total working interpreters, it does appear that hourly earnings are on the increase.

The 2012 Survey asked respondents that only work on a freelance/contract basis to report whether they charge a two-hour minimum for assignments. That information is presented on Table 31.

2012 Survey Respondents That Charge Two-hour Minimum Table 31		
Response	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	
Yes	1,201	87%
No	183	13%
Total	**1,384**	**100%**

Finding: The majority of freelance/contract interpreter respondents charge a two-hour minimum for their interpreting services: 87% of respondents.

D. Interpreting Settings

All three practitioner surveys included a number of questions related to the variety of settings in which interpreters provide services. This information is of particular importance to the grant as interpreter training and education priorities and products are developed. In the 2012 Survey, the primary question related to settings listed 27 potential selection options and ten choices with regard to the number of hours respondents interpret in each setting. Preliminary analysis of the information related to interpreting settings indicated that a significant number of respondents did not respond to each setting category, although "0" hours was provided as an option. It is likely that the low number of responses was due to respondents neglecting to select "0", but instead skipping ahead to enter information only in those setting categories that applied to their interpreting work. To accurately calculate any of the percentages reported in relation to the total number of respondents, respondents that skipped settings are counted in a no response (NR) column.

Settings Where Staff Interpreter Respondents Provide Services

The 2012 Survey asked the question related to interpreting settings two different ways: 1) explicitly targeted to staff interpreter respondents, and 2) related to freelance/contract work. Table 32 presents data reported by staff interpreters for each of the 27 setting categories listed in the survey instrument. We recognize that VRS and VRI are not settings per se. However, since we did not have access to data on the settings in which VRS /VRI services were provided, we have chosen to list VRS and VRI with the other settings. This may more easily assist in understanding the impact of VRS/VRI on provision of interpreting services.

2012 Survey: Hours of Service per Setting Provided by Staff Interpreter Respondents
Table 32

Type of Setting	NR	0	1—5	6—10	11—15	16—20	21—25	26—30	31—35	36—40
Medical										
Doctor's appointments	27%	52%	15%	5%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hospitalization/surgery	30%	58%	11%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Emergency rooms	29%	60%	10%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other medical settings	29%	54%	15%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mental Health										
In-patient services	29%	61%	9%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Out-patient services	29%	57%	13%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Self-Help	31%	63%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Job-related										
Job interviews	28%	50%	21%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Client meetings	29%	41%	25%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Staff meetings	26%	32%	34%	5%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Training/professional development	30%	38%	27%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2012 Survey: Hours of Service per Setting Provided by Staff Interpreter Respondents Table 32 (continued)										
K-12										
K-12 classes	25%	39%	5%	3%	2%	4%	4%	5%	9%	4%
Other K-12 activities	30%	42%	20%	5%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Post-secondary										
College/University	27%	43%	9%	5%	4%	5%	4%	2%	1%	0%
Other activities	29%	49%	17%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voc/Tech trainings	30%	53%	12%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Adult Education										
Adult Ed activities	32%	57%	10%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other education	32%	50%	16%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Social services	**30%**	**50%**	**15%**	**4%**	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Legal	**31%**	**56%**	**11%**	**2%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
VRS	**5%**	**60%**	**6%**	**5%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**5%**	**3%**
VRI	**24%**	**67%**	**5%**	**2%**	**0%**	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**1%**
Other										
Family/personal matters	31%	48%	15%	4%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
General consumer	29%	54%	8%	3%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Performing Arts	32%	56%	11%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Religious activities	32%	56%	11%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other settings	33%	46%	15%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%

In order to better assess the wide array of data collected related to the settings in which staff respondents interpret, the 27 settings listed on Table 32 were aggregated into 11 major setting categories on Table 31: medical, mental health, job-related, K-12, post-secondary, adult education, social services, legal, VRS, VRI and other.

In addition, the percentage of respondents that selected "0" and those counted previously in the "NR" column on Table 32, were combined to make it easier to assess the extent to which staff interpreter respondents do not provide services in a particular setting. Combining the no responses with the respondents that selected 0 in any of the settings is also consistent with how analysis was carried out in the 2007 and 2009 Surveys.

2012 Survey: Hours of Service per Setting Provided by Staff Interpreter Respondents Table 33									
Type of Setting	**NR/0**	**1—5**	**6—10**	**11—15**	**16—20**	**21—25**	**26—30**	**31—35**	**36—40**
Medical	85%	13%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mental health	90%	9%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Job-related	68%	27%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
K-12	66%	13%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%	5%	2%
Post-secondary	77%	13%	4%	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Adult Education	86%	13%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Social services	80%	15%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Legal	87%	11%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
VRS	65%	6%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	3%
VRI	91%	5%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Other	84%	12%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Finding: It is interesting to start the analysis by assessing the "NR/0" column, which as a data set provides a snapshot both of staff interpreter respondents that do and do not work in a particular setting. For example, with regard to VRS: 65% of respondents do not work in VRS, which conversely would indicates 35% do interpret in that setting. The next two settings with the highest percentage of respondents reporting they provide some level of service are K-12 (34% provide some level of service) and job-related (32% provide some level of service). The three settings in which the highest number of respondents reported they do no work (based on inclusion of no responses), are VRI (91%), mental health (90%) and Legal (87%). Each setting provides data of interest. With regard to medical settings, while 85% of staff interpreter respondents do no work in that setting, 13% of respondents that do spend 1-5 hours per week interpreting in that setting. Responses in the category of mental health are similar: 90% of respondents are listed in the NR/0 column, and 9% in the 1-5 hour column. There are only three settings in which 1% or higher of staff interpreter respondents reported working more than 20 hours per week: K-12, post-secondary and VRS.

Table 34 orders the data reported above on Table 33 by percentage point: first, by the settings in which the highest percentage of staff interpreter respondents reported they provide interpreting services, and then secondly, by the settings in which the highest percentage of respondents reported they do not provide any level of service.

2012 Survey: Settings in which Staff Interpreter Respondents Do and Do Not Provide Services Table 34			
Setting	**% that interpret in setting**	**Setting**	**% that don't interpret in setting**
VRS	35%	VRI	91%
K-12	34%	Mental Health	90%
Job-related	32%	Legal	87%
Post-secondary	23%	Adult Education	86%
Social Services	20%	Medical	85%
Other	16%	Other	84%
Medical	15%	Social Services	80%
Adult Education	14%	Post-secondary	77%
Legal	13%	Job-related	68%
Mental Health	10%	K-12	66%
VRI	9%	VRS	65%

Finding: In summary, the five settings in which the highest number of respondents reported providing interpreting services are VRS, K-12, job-related, post-secondary education and social services. The five settings in which the highest number of respondents reported they do not provide any level of interpreting services are VRI, mental health, legal, adult-education and medical.

Settings Freelance/Contract Interpreters Provides Services In

In the 2012 Survey, respondents were asked to assign an hourly range to each setting in which they provide freelance/contract interpreting services. Because this question was explicitly broken out for all those respondents that provide freelance/contract services, the 797 staff interpreter respondents that also provide freelance/contract interpreting services are included in the data presented on Table 35.

2012 Survey: Hours of Service per Setting Provided by Freelance/Contract Interpreter Respondents Table 35										
Type of Setting	**NR**	**0**	**1—5**	**6—10**	**11—15**	**16—20**	**21—25**	**26—30**	**31—35**	**36—40**
Medical										
Doctor's appointments	14%	22%	53%	8%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hospitalization/surgery	27%	40%	30%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Emergency rooms	26%	43%	28%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other medical settings	29%	36%	33%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mental Health										
In-patient services	31%	50%	17%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Out-patient services	31%	44%	24%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Self-Help	34%	55%	10%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Job-related										
Job interviews	32%	44%	23%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Client meetings	29%	32%	34%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Staff meetings	26%	29%	39%	5%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Training/professional development	28%	31%	35%	5%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
K-12										
K-12 classes	36%	52%	8%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other K-12 activities	37%	52%	10%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Post-secondary										
College/University	21%	27%	27%	12%	5%	4%	2%	1%	1%	0%
Other activities	33%	41%	22%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Voc/Tech trainings	34%	45%	18%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Adult Education										
Adult Ed activities	35%	50%	14%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other education	35%	49%	15%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Social services	**29%**	**34%**	**33%**	**3%**	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Legal	**31%**	**50%**	**15%**	**3%**	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
VRS	**0%**	**66%**	**6%**	**5%**	**4%**	**5%**	**4%**	**5%**	**3%**	**2%**
VRI	**18%**	**77%**	**4%**	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Other										
Family/personal matters	33%	46%	19%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
General consumer	36%	57%	6%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Performing Arts	30%	49%	17%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Religious activities	30%	45%	23%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other settings	36%	38%	23%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

In order to better assess the settings in which freelance/contract interpreter respondents interpret, the 27 settings listed on Table 35 were also aggregated into 11 major setting categories on Table 36: medical, mental health, job-related, K-12, post-secondary, adult education, social services, legal, VRS, VRI and other. In addition, the percentage of respondents that selected "0" and those counted previously in the "NR" column on Table 35, were combined to make it easier to assess the extent to which staff interpreter respondents do not provide services in a particular setting. As a reminder, because this setting-related question was explicitly broken out for all those respondents that provide freelance/contract services, the 797 staff interpreter respondents that also provide freelance/contract interpreting services are included in the data presented below.

2012 Survey: Hours of Service per Setting Provided by Freelance/Contract Interpreter Respondents
Table 36

Type of Setting	NR/0	1—5	6—10	11—15	16—20	21—25	26—30	31—35	36—40
Medical	59%	36%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mental health	82%	17%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Job-related	63%	33%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
K-12	87%	9%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Post-secondary	67%	22%	6%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Adult Education	85%	15%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Social services	63%	33%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Legal	81%	15%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
VRS	66%	6%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%	3%	2%
VRI	95%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	80%	18%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Once again it is interesting to start the analysis by assessing the "NR/0" column, which as a data set provides a snapshot both of respondents that do and do not work in a particular setting. To facilitate the analysis, Table 37 orders the data reported above by percentage point: first, by the settings in which the highest percentage of freelance/contract respondents reported they provide interpreting services, and then secondly, by the settings in which the highest percentage of respondents reported they do not provide any level of service. The staff interpreters that also provide freelance/contract services are included in the analysis.

2012 Survey: Settings in which Freelance/Contract Respondents Do and Do Not Provide Services Table 37			
Setting	**% that interpret in setting**	**Setting**	**% that don't interpret in setting**
Medical	41%	VRI	95%
Social Services	37%	K-12	87%
Job-related	37%	Adult Education	85%
VRS	34%	Mental Health	82%
Post-secondary	33%	Legal	81%
Other	20%	Other	80%
Legal	19%	Post-secondary	67%
Mental Health	18%	VRS	66%
Adult Education	15%	Job-related	63%
K-12	13%	Social Services	63%
VRI	5%	Medical	59%

Finding: In summary, the five settings in which the highest number of freelance/contract interpreter respondents reported providing interpreting services are medical, social services, job-related, VRS and post-secondary. The five settings in which the highest number of freelance/contract respondents reported they do not provide any level of interpreting services are VRI, K-12, adult education, mental health and legal.

Table 38 was developed to assess differences regarding the settings where 2012 Survey staff interpreters versus freelance/contract interpreters provide services.

In order to facilitate easier analysis of the data presented above, Table 38 combines staff and freelance/contract interpreter respondent data.

2012 Survey: Settings in which Respondents Do and Do Not Provide Services Table 38			
Staff and Freelance/Contract Respondents that DO provide Services in Setting			
Setting	**% Staff Interpreter Respondents**	**Setting**	**% Freelance/Contract Respondents**
VRS	35%	Medical	41%
K-12	34%	Social Services	37%
Job-related	32%	Job-related	37%
Post-secondary	23%	VRS	34%
Social Services	20%	Post-secondary	33%
Other	16%	Other	20%
Medical	15%	Legal	19%
Adult Education	14%	Mental Health	18%
Legal	13%	Adult Education	15%
Mental Health	10%	K-12	13%
VRI	9%	VRI	5%
Staff and Freelance/Contract Respondents that DO NOT Provide Services in Setting			
Setting	**% Staff Interpreter Respondents**	**Setting**	**% Freelance/Contract Respondents**
VRI	91%	VRI	95%
Mental Health	90%	K-12	87%
Legal	87%	Adult Education	85%
Adult Education	86%	Mental Health	82%
Medical	85%	Legal	81%
Other	84%	Other	80%
Social Services	80%	Post-secondary	67%
Post-secondary	77%	VRS	66%
Job-related	68%	Job-related	63%
K-12	66%	Social Services	63%
VRS	65%	Medical	59%

Findings: Data comparison among the two survey sub-sets is best carried out on a setting-by-setting basis focusing just on data related to settings in which respondents DO provide services. With regard to VRS and VRI: 35% of staff respondents interpret in VRS settings as do 34% of freelance/contract interpreters; only 9% of staff respondents and 5% of freelance/contract respondents report provision of services in VRI settings. In educational settings, 34% of staff interpreters provide services in K-12 settings as compared to only 13% of freelance/contract interpreters; in post-secondary education, 23% of staff interpreter reported they provide services as opposed to 33% of freelance/contract respondents. In adult educational settings, 14% of staff interpreters and 15% of freelance/contract interpreter respondents provide services. In job-related settings, 32% of staff interpreters report provision of services and 37% of freelance/contract respondents.

With regard to medical settings, only 15% of staff interpreters provide services, as compared to 41% of freelance/contract interpreters. In legal settings, only 13% of staff interpreters report they provide interpreting services, as do 19% of freelance/contract. In social service settings, 20% of staff interpreters provide services as compared to 37% of freelance/contract interpreters, and in mental health settings, only 10% of staff interpreters report they provide services as compared to 18% of freelance/contract interpreter respondents.

Comparison to 2007 and 2009 Surveys

There were significant differences with regard to the design aspects of the three practitioner survey instruments that made effective comparison problematic. In the 2007 and 2009 Surveys, respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of time they spend interpreting in 11 settings; in the 2012 Survey, respondents were asked to report on the hours they spend interpreting in 27 setting categories. Because of the differences related to the identification of the various interpreting settings and the use of percentage ranges in the first two surveys and hourly ranges in the third, it was only possible to make broad comparisons among survey findings. In addition, the 2012 Survey broke out the question related to interpreting settings by staff interpreter respondents and freelance/contract interpreter respondents, which was not done in the two earlier surveys.

Differences in survey design aside, there were some comparisons that could be broadly made across the three surveys. Table 39 presents setting-related data collected through the 2007 and 2009 Surveys. Only those setting categories that were similar to the settings identified in the 2012 Survey were pulled from the earlier reports. As a reminder, respondents that did not make a percentage range selection for a particular setting were counted in the 2007 and 2009 analysis process in the "0" column.

Settings in which 2007 and 2009 Survey Respondents Provide Services Table 39						
2007 Survey						
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%
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%
VRS/VRI	68%	7%	7%	6%	6%	6%
2009 Survey						
Medical	38%	32%	14%	9%	5%	2%
K-12	60%	12%	3%	3%	8%	13%
Post-secondary	44%	21%	10%	8%	9%	8%
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%
VRS/VRI	60%	10%	7%	7%	7%	9%

Finding: A primary point of difference in the data collected in the earlier surveys and the 2012 Survey data relates to a higher percentage of 2007 and 2009 respondents reporting provision of services in the 11-25% range or higher. For the majority of 2012 Survey respondents that reported interpreting in any of the setting categories provided, the 1-5 hour range was typically selected, with the exception of VRS. Although the majority of selections in the 2007 and 2009 Surveys also fell in the 1-10% range, (comparable to 1-5 hours as 10% would equate to 4 hours in a 40 hour work week), there were significantly more respondents in the 2007 and 2009 Surveys that selected higher percentage ranges than 2012 Survey respondents that selected higher hourly ranges.

A more effective way to assess changes related to the settings interpreting practitioners work in pulls data from the 2007 Survey and compares it to like data in the 2012 Survey. Specifically, on Table 37, the first three percentage/hourly ranges respondents were provided as selection options, and the seven setting categories that were consistently identified in both surveys, are compared. As discussed above, although percentage ranges higher than 11-25% and 11-15 hours are not reiterated on Table 38, it should be kept in mind that significantly more 2007 Survey respondents selected the higher range options than did 2012 Survey respondents.

Another difference in the data has to do with how it was collected: in the 2007 Survey, all respondents provided input to the interpreting setting question as one respondent pool; in the 2012 Survey, the information was collected two times: once from staff interpreter respondents and then later in the survey from freelance/contract interpreter respondents. The column identified as 2012/S denotes the 2012 Survey staff interpreter respondents, and the column identified as 2012/F denotes the 2012 Survey freelance/contract interpreter respondents.

Settings in which 2007 and 2012 Survey Respondents Provide Services Table 40									
Interpreting Setting	**2007**	**2012/S**	**2012/F**	**2007**	**2012/S**	**2012/F**	**2007**	**2012/S**	**2012/F**
	NR/0	NR/0	NR/0	1-10%	1-5 hrs	1-5 hrs	11-25%	6-10 hrs	6-10 hrs
Medical	43%	85%	59%	31%	13%	36%	15%	2%	4%
K-12	56%	66%	87%	13%	13%	9%	4%	4%	2%
Post-secondary	43%	77%	67%	20%	13%	22%	12%	4%	6%
Business	52%	68%	63%	28%	27%	33%	11%	4%	4%
Social Services	58%	80%	63%	29%	15%	33%	9%	4%	3%
Legal	76%	87%	81%	15%	11%	15%	5%	2%	3%
Mental Health	66%	90%	82%	24%	9%	17%	7%	1%	1%

Table 41 was developed to facilitate and simplify analysis of the data collected in the 2007 and 2012 Surveys. It lists the seven setting categories that were common in both surveys and calculates percentage of that reported they do provide services as well as those that do not provide services in each setting.

Settings in which 2007 and 2012 Survey Respondents Provide Services Table 41						
Interpreting Setting	**% Respondents Do Provide Services**			**% Respondents Do Not Provide Services**		
	2007	2012/S	2012/F	2007	2012/S	2012/F
Medical	57%	15%	41%	43%	85%	59%
K-12	44%	34%	13%	56%	66%	87%
Post-secondary	57%	23%	33%	43%	77%	67%
Business	48%	32%	37%	52%	68%	63%
Social Services	42%	20%	37%	58%	80%	63%
Legal	24%	13%	19%	76%	87%	81%
Mental Health	34%	10%	18%	66%	90%	82%

Finding: With regard to the data provided for the 2007 Survey; that survey did not distinguish between staff versus freelance/contract interpreters, therefore, data in the 2007 columns relates to both groups. Because the data was collected differently in the 2012 Survey, breaking out staff interpreter respondents from freelance/contract interpreter respondents, comparisons between the two surveys can only be broadly based. That said, it is interesting that in all seven setting areas, higher percentages of 2007 respondents reported provision of services than did either of the two 2012 Survey sub-groups.

E. Training and Education Needs

Both the 2007 and 2012 Surveys asked respondents a number of questions related to interpreter training and education needs, availability, and preferred delivery mechanisms.

Adequacy of Existing Training and Education

A question in both surveys asked respondents to report whether there were adequate interpreter education opportunities in their geographic area. Responses are presented on Table 42.

2007 and 2012 Survey Respondents Report Adequacy of Interpreter Education
Table 42

Type of Response	2007 Survey		2012 Survey	
	# of Respondents	% of Responses	# of Respondents	% of Responses
Yes	1,652	42%	1,874	67%
No	Not asked	Not asked	917	33%
Total	**NA**	**NA**	**2,791**	**100%**

Finding: In 2007 only 42% of respondents reported there were adequate interpreter education opportunities in their geographic area; that number increased five years later to 67% of respondents. Based on responses to the two surveys, it appears the field has expanded and improved upon its capacity to meet the training and education needs of interpreters. Table 43 further assesses the data reported by 2012 Survey respondents and was developed to assist the NIEC and five regional centers in understanding where training and education needs still exist.

2012 Survey Respondents that Reported Sufficient and Insufficient Training & Professional Development Table 43		
GURIEC	**Sufficient Training/Education**	**Insufficient Training/Education**
Alabama	12	8
Delaware	1	5
District of Columbia	66	4
Florida	83	49
Georgia	28	18
Kentucky	27	7
Maryland	47	18
Mississippi	2	9
North Carolina	47	25
Pennsylvania	55	32
South Carolina	7	14
Tennessee	14	15
Virginia	59	7
West Virginia	0	3
Region total	**448 (68%)**	**214 (32%)**
NURIEC	**Sufficient Training/Education**	**Insufficient Training/Education**
Connecticut	8	11
Maine	10	5
Massachusetts	59	20
New Hampshire	9	3
New Jersey	45	22
New York	134	46
Puerto Rico	2	6
Rhode Island	4	1
Vermont	5	3
Region total	**276 (70%)**	**117 (30%)**

2012 Survey Respondents that Reported Sufficient and Insufficient Training & Professional Development Table 43 (continued)		
CATIE	**Sufficient Training/Education**	**Insufficient Training/Education**
Illinois	66	17
Indiana	31	19
Iowa	13	14
Kansas	8	2
Michigan	29	30
Minnesota	71	12
Missouri	10	9
Nebraska	5	6
Ohio	55	28
Wisconsin	38	22
Region total	**326 (67%)**	**159 (33%)**
MARIE	**Sufficient Training/Education**	**Insufficient Training/Education**
Arkansas	10	4
Colorado	34	20
Louisiana	11	8
New Mexico	17	14
North Dakota	1	3
Oklahoma	8	4
South Dakota	8	0
Texas	65	19
Utah	28	6
Wyoming	0	3
Region total	**182 (69%)**	**81 (31%)**
WRIEC	**Sufficient Training/Education**	**Insufficient Training/Education**
Alaska	7	5
Arizona	32	28
California	184	93
Hawaii	1	15
Idaho	11	4
Nevada	10	4
Oregon	35	17
Washington	66	30
Region total	**346 (64%)**	**196 (36%)**

Finding: In all five regions, significantly higher percentages of respondents reported there is sufficient training and education in their geographic area than reported there is not.

Settings for which Interpreter Education and Training are Needed

Another question in the 2012 Survey asked respondents what areas of education and training they needed to better prepare them or to deepen their interpreting work. Respondents were permitted to select multiple settings. Responses are presented on Table 44 for all respondents, as well as broken out for staff interpreter respondents and freelance/contract interpreter respondents.

Identified Settings in which Training/Education Are Needed
2012 Survey Respondents
Table 44

Type of Setting	All Respondents		Staff Respondents		Freelance/Contract Respondents	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Medical	NA	36%	NA	36%	NA	37%
Doctor's appointments	909	35%	421	34%	483	35%
Hospitalization/surgery	1,026	39%	464	38%	557	40%
Emergency rooms	1,007	38%	463	37%	542	39%
Other medical settings	866	33%	415	34%	448	33%
Mental Health	NA	35%	NA	34%	NA	36%
Mental Health in-patient services	1,114	42%	500	40%	610	44%
Mental Health out-patient services	1,049	40%	478	39%	565	41%
Self-Help (12 step) appointments	605	23%	275	22%	327	24%
Job-related	NA	19%	NA	19%	NA	18%
Job interviews	584	22%	261	21%	321	23%
Client meetings	311	12%	156	13%	153	11%
Staff meetings	387	15%	187	15%	197	14%
Training/professional development	647	25%	318	26%	326	24%

Identified Settings in which Training/Education Are Needed 2012 Survey Respondents (continued) Table 44						
Type of Setting	**All Respondents**		**Staff Respondents**		**Freelance/Contract Respondents**	
	#	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
K-12	NA	15%	NA	17%	NA	12%
K-12 classes	460	18%	251	20%	204	15%
Other K-12 activities	284	11%	167	14%	113	8%
Post-secondary	NA	20%	NA	22%	NA	19%
College/University classes	757	29%	386	31%	367	27%
Other college/university activities	344	13%	176	14%	166	12%
Vocational/Technical trainings	499	19%	251	20%	243	18%
Adult Ed	NA	13%	NA	14%	NA	11%
Adult Education activities	340	13%	174	14%	163	12%
Other educational settings	303	12%	162	13%	138	10%
Social Services/VR	NA	25%	NA	26%	NA	24%
Social services appointments (e.g. VR, social security)	667	25%	326	26%	337	24%
Legal	1,325	50%	605	49%	713	52%
All Others	NA	18%	NA	18%	NA	18%
Family/personal matters	415	16%	212	17%	200	15%
Consumer matters (e.g. ordering pizza, customer service)	171	7%	88	7%	83	6%
Performing Arts/entertainment	888	34%	427	35%	458	33%
Religious Settings	564	21%	260	21%	299	22%
Other (please specify)	336	13%	152	12%	183	13%

In order to better assess the wide array of settings in which staff respondents interpret, the 21 settings listed on Table 44 were aggregated into 9 major setting categories on Table 45: medical, mental health, job-related, K-12, post-secondary, adult education, social services, legal, and other.

Aggregated Settings in which Training/Education Are Needed 2012 Survey Respondents Table 45			
Type of Setting	**% All Respondents**	**% Staff Respondents**	**% Freelance/Contract Respondents**
Medical	36%	36%	37%
Mental Health	35%	34%	36%
Job-related	19%	19%	18%
K-12	15%	17%	12%
Post-secondary	20%	22%	19%
Adult Ed	13%	14%	11%
Social Services/VR	25%	26%	24%
Legal	50%	49%	52%
All Others	18%	18%	18%

Finding: Percentages were very similar across the three respondent groupings (all respondents, staff interpreter respondents and freelance/contract interpreter respondents). For all three groups, the setting with the highest percentage of responses was legal (50%, 49% and 52% of respondents respectively). The second highest ranked setting was medical, identified by 36% of all 2012 Survey respondents, 36% of staff respondents and 37% of freelance/contract interpreter respondents. The third highest ranked setting was mental health, selected by 35% of all respondents, 34% of staff interpreter respondents, and 36% of freelance/interpreter respondents.

Using the filtering capabilities of the survey software, analysis was conducted on just those 917 respondents that reported there was insufficient education and training in their geographic area (see Table 42). Respondents were permitted to select multiple settings.

2012 Survey Respondents That Reported Insufficient Training Aggregated Settings in which Training/Education Are Needed Table 46	
Type of Setting	**% Respondents**
Legal	52%
Medical	36%
Mental Health	34%
Social Services/VR	27%
Post-secondary education	25%
Job-related	22%
K-12	19%
All Others	19%
Adult Education	15%

Finding: The three settings with the highest percentage of responses were: legal (52%), medical (36%), and mental health (34%). Again, this data relates only to those respondents that reported insufficient training and education in their geographic area earlier in the survey. This is consistent with data reported on Table 45 for the three respondent groups.

Most Urgent Training and Education Need

Another question in the survey asked respondents to select one setting area in which training and education are most urgently needed. That information is presented on Table 47. For this table settings were not aggregated because respondents were permitted only one selection, and aggregating the data by a broader setting category creates a potential for diminishing the overall responses collected in a number of the sub-setting categories. In the interests of facilitating prioritization, only those sub-settings that had a response percentage rate of 5% or higher are included. The settings are listed highest to lowest with regard to percentage of responses received.

Most Urgent Training Education Need of 2012 Survey Respondents Table 47		
Sub-setting	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
Legal	594	24%
Mental Health in-patient services	182	7%
Doctor's appointments	141	6%
Hospitalization/surgery	154	6%
Mental Health out-patient services	150	6%
K-12 classes	148	6%
College/University classes	132	5%
Emergency rooms	133	5%
Performing Arts/entertainment	135	5%

Finding: The highest ranked setting was legal, with 24% of respondents selecting that setting as most urgent for training and education. Earlier 2012 Survey findings, only 13% of staff interpreter respondents and 19% of freelance/contract interpreter respondents reported they provide services in a legal setting (see Table 38); for the majority of those respondents, interpreting in a legal setting accounts for less than five hours per week. On Table 8, only 16 respondents reported they hold a staff position in a legal organization. It is interesting therefore to consider whether the low percentage of respondents currently providing services in a legal setting is due to lack of targeted education and training needed to prepare interpreters for work in the setting. However, another factor to consider is salary: on Table 28 staff interpreter respondents that reported they hold a full-time position in a legal organization reported a mean annual salary of $64,000.

Three of the other sub-settings identified on Table 47 relate to medical settings. Again referencing Table 38, only 15% of staff interpreters reported they provide services in a medical setting; that number increases to 41% of freelance/contract interpreter respondents. Salary potential could again be a draw: for the 23 respondents that reported they hold a full-time position in a medical organization (Table 28), the mean annual salary was calculated as $52,000.

Two sub-settings on Table 47 related to mental health settings. Of the 2012 Survey respondents, only 10% of staff interpreters and 18% of freelance/contract interpreters reported they provide services in a mental health setting. Salary data was not collected in the survey with regard to holding a staff position in a mental health organization.

Once again utilizing survey software capabilities, analysis was conducted to identify the most urgent training and education needs of those 917 respondents that reported insufficient training and education in their geographic area. Settings were not aggregated and only those sub-settings that had a response percentage rate of 5% or higher are included. The settings are listed highest to lowest with regard to percentage of responses received.

Survey 2012 Respondents That Reported Insufficient Training and Education
One Most Urgent Area of Education and Training
Table 48

Area of training	# of Respondents	% of Responses
Legal settings	208	25%
K-12 classes	70	8%
Mental Health out-patient services	62	7%
Mental Health in-patient services	57	7%
Training/professional development	48	6%
College/University classes	51	6%
Emergency rooms	43	5%
Doctor's appointments	42	5%
Hospitalization/surgery	43	5%

Finding: The sub-settings identified are the same as those listed on Table 47 for all respondents, with the exception of training/professional development (6%), which appears on Table 48, and performing arts/entertainment (5%), which was included on Table 47. In addition, the ranking is slightly different but only by one percentage point in most categories other than legal, which was once again ranked the highest.

The 2012 Survey asked respondents to identify what aspect of training they needed in the one setting area they identified as most urgent and important. Overall survey responses are presented on Table 49; they are not filtered by specific setting or sub-setting.

2012 Survey Respondents Type of Training Needed In Setting Identified as Most Urgent and Important Table 49		
Training area	**# of Respondents**	**% of Responses**
Ethical Decision-making	232	8%
Lexical/Vocabulary Level (ASL-English)	461	17%
Discourse level (ASL/English)	497	18%
Context/Content Knowledge	708	26%
Interpreting Knowledge	94	3%
Interpreting Practice	387	14%
Other (please specify)	178	6%
N/A	187	7%
Total	**2,744**	**100%**

Finding: The highest percentage of 2012 Survey respondents identified a need for context/content knowledge. The area with the second highest responses percentage was discourse level (ASL/English), which was identified by 18% of respondents, followed by Lexical/Vocabulary Level (ASL-English), with 17% of respondents selecting that option.

Because legal, medical and mental health were identified as setting areas most urgent for training and education by four survey groups (all respondents, staff interpreter respondents, freelance/contract interpreter respondents, and the 917 respondents that reported insufficient training in their geographic area), a closer analysis of the type of training needed in each of the three settings was conducted. Table 50 presents that information.

Training Content Area for Legal 2012 Survey Respondents that Selected Legal Setting as Most Needed Table 50			
Type of Training	**Legal**	**Medical**	**Mental Health**
Ethical Decision-making	5%	12%	16%
Lexical/Vocabulary Level (ASL-English)	17%	23%	13%
Discourse level (ASL/English)	14%	13%	19%
Context/Content Knowledge	38%	33%	31%
Interpreting Knowledge	4%	3%	4%
Interpreting Practice	16%	13%	11%

Finding: For all three settings, the training and education with the highest percentage of responses was Context/content/knowledge. For legal settings, the next two highest percentage points were assigned to Lexical/Vocabulary Level (ASL-English), identified by 17% of respondents, and Interpreting practice, identified by 16% of respondents. With regard to medical settings, 23% of respondents selected Lexical/Vocabulary Level (ASL-English), and 13% of respondents selected Discourse level (ASL-English) and Interpreting practice respectively. In mental health settings, 19% of respondents identified a need for Discourse level (ASL-English) and 16% of respondents selected Ethical Decision-making.

Comparison of 2007 and 2012 Survey Training and Education Needs

Information related to training and education needs was collected differently in the 2007 and 2012 Surveys. In the 2007 Survey, respondents were provided a list of interpreter settings, and then for each setting five types of training and education: Language/vocabulary (ASL-English); Context/Content Knowledge; Interpreting Knowledge; Interpreting Practice, and Mentoring. Information extracted from the 2007 Survey is presented on Table 51.

2007 Survey Respondents Identified Future Education and Training Needs by Setting Table 51					
2007 Survey					
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%

Finding: Although the data was collected differently in the two surveys, there were significant similarities. The three settings that were consistently identified in the 2012 Survey as highest priority with regard to needed training were legal, medical and mental health. As evidenced on Table 51, those same three settings were consistently assigned the highest percentage of 2007 Survey responses.

Training and Education Access and Delivery Modes

The 2012 Survey asked respondents to report where they access training and education. Responses are presented for all respondents as well as broken out by staff versus freelance/contract interpreter respondent.

Where 2012 Survey Staff and Freelance/Contract Respondents Access Training Table 52			
Training Provider	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
Local RID Chapter	68%	67%	68%
Regional Conferences	56%	56%	56%
National Conferences	47%	46%	47%
My employer	49%	27%	38%
Private Professional Development	34%	38%	36%
Regional Interpreter Education Center	21%	20%	21%
Other	18%	19%	19%
National Interpreter Education Center	12%	12%	12%
Local IEP/ITP	15%	12%	13%

Finding: The highest percentage of respondents in all three sub-groups reported they access training and education through their local RID chapter. The next highest category was regional conferences, followed by national conferences. The only notable difference among the three respondent groups was in the category of 'my employer', which not surprisingly was selected by a lower percentage of freelance/contract respondents.

Respondents of the 2012 Survey were also asked to identify their preferred training delivery mode. That information is provided for all respondents as well as broken out by staff interpreter versus freelance/contract interpreter respondent.

2012 Survey Respondents Preferred Modes for Training Delivery Table 53			
Delivery mode	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
In-person instruction	70%	66%	68%
Hybrid instruction	11%	10%	11%
On-line instruction	9%	10%	9%
Self-paced on-line modules	8%	10%	9%

Finding: By far, in-person instruction was identified most often by respondents in all three survey sub-groups as the preferred training delivery mode.

The 2012 Survey respondents were also asked to report what education/training format works best for them. Responses are presented on the table below.

2012 Survey Respondents Preferred Education/Training Format Table 54			
Training format	**Staff Interpreters**	**Freelance/Contract Interpreters**	**All Respondents**
Graduate courses	7%	5%	6%
Short-term workshops	47%	47%	47%
Intensive trainings	22%	22%	22%
Individual mentoring	14%	17%	16%

Finding: Short-term workshops were selected by nearly half of respondents in each of the three survey sub-groups as the preferred education and training format (47% of respondents in each group). In addition, 22% of respondents in each of the sub-groups identified intensive trainings as second with regard to preference.

Conclusion

The 2012 needs assessment findings provide a picture of who interpreting practitioners are today, where they work and how much they earn, levels of demand for services, and expressed professional development needs and preferences:

- Most interpreters (75%) are between the ages of 30 and 60 years old. Twenty percent of interpreters may retire within the next six to ten years. The interpreter work force continues to be largely female (87%) and white (88%). Ninety-six percent identify as hearing. These numbers remain relatively unchanged over the past seven years. The lack of diversity of the work force and the impending retirement of elder, more experienced interpreters should move the field toward a continuing and concerted recruitment effort.

- In terms of educational achievement overall, 64% of respondents reported that they hold a bachelor's degree or higher. Freelance/contract interpreters edge out staff interpreters, 70% holding a BA/BS degree compared with 63% among staff interpreters. Still work must be done to continue to raise educational standards for certification and employment.

- The majority of interpreters (77%) engage in freelance/contract work; about 52% perform only freelance/contract work. More than half of the 48% who hold a staff position also perform freelance/contract work, typically less than 10 hours per week. A significant number (80%) of respondents reported being contacted by referral entities that were unfamiliar to them. Of those who said they had been contacted, 76% said the entities were from out of state and 60% said the entities were not familiar with prevailing practices of ASL-English language interpreters, i.e. 2-hour minimum, teaming practices, preparation needs.

- The five most common settings in which interpreters provide services are VRS, K-12, job-related, post-secondary education and social services. On the other hand, the settings in which interpreters tend not to provide any level of interpreting services are: mental health, legal, adult-education and medical. Fewer than 10% of interpreters seem to work via VRI.

- While interpreters' salaries vary widely by setting, the mean annual salary earned by staff interpreters holding full-time, benefits-eligible positions ($40,700) is below the 2011 national mean as reported by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics Program ($45,230). Eighty-seven percent of contract/freelance interpreters charge a 2-hour minimum. While freelance/contract interpreter hourly earnings range from $11 to more than $75, the national average $40 per hour, up by two dollars from 2009. In hourly wages, interpreter earnings exceed the national mean of $21.74).

- Nationally, the demand for interpreting services seems to continue to be on the rise overall. Many of those interpreters who reported a decline in demand for their services expressed the perception that work is going to less experienced, less expensive interpreters.

- Availability of professional development for interpreters seems to have improved since 2007 when only 42% of survey respondents reported there were adequate opportunities in their geographic area. Two-thirds of current survey respondents seem satisfied with the adequacy of educational opportunities. Still there is work to be done.

- Interpreters express that their most urgent training needs are in the areas of legal, medical, and mental health interpreting. Context/content knowledge training is in greatest demand in each of these areas. In-person, short-term workshops continue to be the preferred training format.

This report will be disseminated widely to national organizations, interpreting practitioners, interpreter education programs, consumers and other key stakeholder groups. It will inform priorities related to grant developed interpreter education and training practices and products. Moreover, the National Interpreter Education Center will gain more specific direction by triangulating data from additional needs assessment activities focused on interpreter referral agencies and the deaf community.