



Steps Toward Identifying Effective Practices in Video Remote Interpreting

2010 REPORT

Submitted on behalf of the
National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers
By the Interpreting Via Video Work Team
Julie Simon, Beverly Hollrah, Mary Lightfoot, Richard Laurion, and Leilani Johnson

March 2010



© 2010 National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers

The National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers is funded from 2005 – 2010 by the U.S. Department of Education Rehabilitation Services Administration CFDA #84.160A and B, Training of Interpreters for Individuals Who Are Deaf and Individuals Who Are Deaf-Blind. This project was led by the Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center (#H160A050004).

This document is in the public domain. It may be reproduced or otherwise used without permission if cited appropriately. To obtain a copy of this document, contact the RSA National Clearinghouse for Rehabilitation Services Administration, <http://ncrtm.org/>.

FORWARD

The National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC) is authorized and funded by the U.S. Department of Education Rehabilitation Services Administration. The NCIEC includes the following consortium sites:

- National Interpreter Education Center (NIEC), Northeastern University
- Northeastern Regional Interpreter Education Center (NURIEC), Northeastern University
- Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center (GURIEC), Gallaudet University
- Collaboration for the Advancement of Teaching Interpreter Excellence (CATIE), St. Catherine University
- Mid-America Regional Interpreter Education Center (MARIE), University of Arkansas at Little Rock and University of Northern Colorado-DO IT Center
- Western Region Interpreter Education Center (WRIEC), Western Oregon University and El Camino College

The NCIEC Consortium sites are working collaboratively to increase the number of qualified interpreters nationwide and ensure that quality interpreter education opportunities and products are available across the country. A primary requirement of the NCIEC grants is to conduct ongoing activities to identify the needs and effective practices in the fields of interpreting and interpreter education. This report has been prepared based on the findings and conclusions of expert group members, interpreter practitioners, and Deaf consumers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The report was prepared by members of the Interpreting via Video Work Team and its Consultant:

- Julie Simon, Consultant (The Language Door)
- Beverly Hollrah, Co-Chair (GURIEC)
- Mary Lightfoot, Co-Chair (GURIEC)
- Richard Laurion, Team Member (CATIE)
- Leilani Johnson, Team Member (MARIE)

Special thanks are extended to:

- Steve Collins, Contributing Member of the Work Team for his extensive involvement in the project
- Krista Harmon and Phyllis Rogers who provided their expertise to this project
- Leonard Kelly and Charles Reilly from the Gallaudet Research Institute for their guidance and advice on this project
- Content experts, working interpreters, and Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf Blind community members who participated in this project

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	6
Introduction	8
VRI Expert Group	9
Competencies	9
Practitioner Survey and Interviews	10
Deaf Consumer Survey and Interviews	10
Review Process	10
Practitioner Surveys and Interviews	12
Methodology	12
Survey Results and Interview Findings	13
Interview Demographics	16
Training	16
Comparison of settings	20
Working Conditions	22
Technical Support	26
Scheduling	27
Billing and Payment	27
Preparation: Briefing and Debriefing	28
Team Interpreting	32
Cultural and Linguistic Variation	33
Models and Methods of Interpreting	37
Impact on other work	39
Business Practices	41
Knowledge and Skill Sets	42
Challenges	43
Additional Comments	44
Deaf Consumer Surveys and Interviews	46
Methodology	46
Survey Results and Interview Findings	47
Usage	48
Location and Settings	51
Scheduling	52
Interpreter Qualities and Qualifications	53
Preparation: Briefing and Debriefing	56
Technology Considerations	57
Participation	58
Video Remote Interpreting versus Other Situations	58
Challenges of Using a Video Remote Interpreter	60
Additional Comments	61

Analysis and Discussion	62
Conclusion	68
References	72
Appendix A: Practitioner Online Survey Items	73
Appendix B: Practitioner Interview Questions	85
Appendix C: Deaf Consumer Online Survey Items	89
Appendix D: Deaf Consumer Interview Questions	96

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC) has established a multi-year initiative implemented by the Interpreting via Video Work Team. This Work Team is leading a national conversation about issues in Video Relay Service (VRS) and Video Remote Interpreting service (VRI), identifying current and effective practices as well as education/training needed to support interpreters in mastering requisite competencies to work in these settings. The overarching goal of the Work Team is to identify effective practices while forging stronger links between VRS and VRI service providers, educators, practitioners and consumers. The results of this work will lead to ways academia, interpreting professionals, and industry may work together to leverage strengths and resources in order to increase the quantity and quality of interpreter services. In December 2008, the Interpreting via Video Work Team finalized its report on VRS interpreting which can be found on the NCIEC web site at <http://www.nciec.org>.

From January-September 2009, the Interpreting via Video Work Team focused on identifying common needs, issues, and practices specific to the VRI industry. The Work Team's analysis will provide input to interpreter educators regarding essential educational and training needs of interpreters working in Video Remote Interpreting settings. To this end, the Work Team conducted a multi-pronged investigation regarding domains, competencies and current practices of VRI interpreters. Activities included a meeting of recognized experts in VRI and interpreter education, as well as online surveys and focused interviews for interpreter practitioners and Deaf consumers.

This report summarizes the information gathered from these activities as a means of furthering the national dialogue that is currently underway regarding the necessary knowledge and skill competencies required of interpreters who work in the exciting and fast growing field of Video Remote Interpreting. The culmination of this report includes recommendations on the need for future research on how to better prepare interpreters to respond to the demands of working in Video Remote Interpreting systems and the consumers who receive these services.

INTRODUCTION

The priorities listed in the 2005 Federal Register (Vol. 70, No. 148) issued by the U.S. Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services Administration, includes “using state-of-the-art technologies for training on how to deliver interpreting services from remote locations and in handling various technologies during interpreting assignments.” More recently in the 2007 NCIEC Interpreting Practitioner Needs Assessment (Winston & Cokely, 2007) interpreters identified working in Video settings as one of the priority education and training areas for the future. Responding to both imperatives, the Interpreting via Video Work Team set out to look at current practices in the area of Video Remote Interpreting by working collaboratively with service providers, educators, practitioners and consumers.

Over 300 people participated in the process including practitioners, consumers, vendors, organizational partner representatives, and content area experts. The process consisted of three components: a) a VRI Experts Group empanelled six content experts; b) a VRI Practitioner online survey and follow-up interviews; and c) a Deaf Consumer online survey and follow-up interviews. This report provides a comprehensive summary of the Work Team activities related to Video Remote Interpreting, as well as recommendations for future research and training needs.

VRI EXPERT GROUP

In May 2009, six Video Remote Interpreting content area experts met in St. Paul, Minnesota for a two-day meeting with the intention of completing three tasks. The first task was to organize and streamline the list of competencies that had been generated during the VRS Summit in September 2007. (For additional information about the VRS Summit, please see *Steps Toward Identifying Effective Practices in VRS Interpreting*, 2008.) The second task was to develop the protocols, demographic survey and questions to be used for an online survey and during follow-up interviews for interpreters who provide Video Remote Interpreting. The third task was to develop the protocols, demographic survey and questions to be used for an online survey and during follow-up interviews for Deaf consumers who use Video Remote Interpreting services. Additionally, the Expert Group participants were asked to identify venues for soliciting interpreter practitioners and Deaf consumers as participants.

Competencies

Two foundational documents were used to build the specialized competencies for interpreting via video: *Video Relay Services Interpreting Task Analysis Report* (DO IT Center, 2005), and *Toward Competent Practices: Conversations with Stakeholders* (Witter-Merithew & Johnson, 2005). The content area experts were asked to familiarize themselves with the documents, as well as with *Steps Toward Identifying Effective Practices in VRS Interpreting* (NCIEC, 2008), prior to meeting in May 2009, paying particular attention to the domain areas outlined in each of the sources. These domains provided a starting point for organizing the competencies. Additional sources used as a basis for the experts discussion were the *RID Video Relay Service Interpreting Standard*

Practice Paper (RID, 2007) and *Interpreting Culturally Sensitive Information in VRS Settings* (Lightfoot, 2007).

Practitioner Survey and Interviews

Based on the categorization of the competencies, the content area experts were asked to develop the protocols, demographic survey and questions to be used for an online survey and during follow-up interviews for interpreters who provide Video Remote Interpreting services. The online survey and interview questions were developed with the intention of soliciting input from VRI practitioners that would validate the competencies generated during previous research on interpreting in Video Relay Services settings.

Deaf Consumer Survey and Interviews

Again using the competencies as a starting point, the content area experts were asked to develop the protocols, demographic survey and questions to be used for the Deaf consumer online survey and follow-up interviews. The purpose of the interviews was to gather input from consumers on their experiences using Video Remote Interpreters, rather than on their experiences with specific service providers or technology.

Review Process

The Interpreting via Video Work Team worked closely with research scientists from Gallaudet University's Research Institute to determine the parameters of the research, along with the most effective method(s) of data collection, structure of research questions, dissemination of surveys, and process to secure and conduct interviews. Once the research protocols for the interpreter practitioners and the Deaf consumers were established, all materials were sent to the Gallaudet Research Institute for review. The

documents were submitted to the Internal Review Board at Gallaudet University for review and approval.

The Interpreting via Video Work Team held certain assumptions regarding what would be discovered during the VRI research process. Because both VRS and VRI utilize video as the medium for interpreting, the assumption was that much of the work was similar in nature. It was agreed that the domains and competencies of Video Relay Services interpreters, which had been developed by practitioners and experts during the 2007 VRS Summit held at Gallaudet University, and the questions used during the 2008 VRS Focus Groups, would be presented to the Expert Group for revisions and refinements specific to Video Remote Interpreting. The revised/refined domains and competencies and questions, which were used as a basis for the VRI survey and interview questions, were further revised, refined, vetted and validated through the research process.

Another assumption held by the Interpreting via Video Work Team was that respondents to the surveys, both practitioners and Deaf consumers, would understand the term Video Remote Interpreting. It was further assumed that they would understand the difference between Video Relay Service interpreting and Video Remote Interpreting when given a clear definition.

PRACTITIONER SURVEYS AND INTERVIEWS

METHODOLOGY

In June 2009, an online survey, using Survey Monkey, was conducted targeting interpreters who provide Video Remote Interpreting services. The survey included 51 questions using the following formats: yes/no, multiple choice, forced-choice, and short answer questions. Some survey items allowed respondents to select multiple answers, while other items allowed respondents to provide additional comments. The survey was advertised via multiple outlets including the RID *E-news*, various listserv groups, various mailing lists and direct email, as well as through various interpreter-related organizations such as Mano a Mano, National Association of Black Interpreters (NAOBI) and National Association of the Deaf (NAD). Participants who clicked on the link to the survey were presented with information about the study, including guarantee of anonymity, confidentiality, and any risks associated with taking the online survey. Participants indicated agreement with all criteria by clicking a link to the survey itself. Participants had the option of withdrawing from the survey at any time without repercussion.

Survey Monkey provided calculations of both the number of responses to each survey item and the percentage of those responses. Survey Monkey also provided a compilation of comments as applicable to each survey item. (See Appendix A for a list of survey questions.)

In conjunction with the online survey six interpreter practitioners, four female and two male, participated in interviews. None of the six interviewees had completed the online survey, nor had they received the questions prior to the interview so that their answers were unrehearsed. Interviews were conducted by a member of the Interpreting

via Video Work Team and were either audio-recorded if conducted with Hearing participants or video-recorded if conducted with Deaf participants. Audio-recorded interviews were transcribed from spoken English into printed English by a member of the Interpreting via Video Work Team. The video-recorded interviews were translated from American Sign Language into printed English by an outside transcriber and reviewed for accuracy by a Deaf consultant. (See Appendix B for a list of practitioner interview questions.)

The next section will provide an integrated review of the data collected from the practitioner online surveys and focused interviews.

SURVEY RESULTS AND INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Forty-three interpreters responded to the survey including 41 female and 2 male. General demographic information can be found in the following charts.

Table 1

Interpreter Survey Respondent Gender		
Gender	Number	Response percentage
Female	41	95%
Male	2	5%

Table 2

Interpreter Survey Respondent Age		
Age range	Number	Response percentage
18-29 years	8	19%
30-39 years	6	14%
40-49 years	14	33%
50-59 years	14	33%
60-69 years	2	5%
70+ years	0	0%

Table 3

Interpreter Survey Respondent Education Level		
Level	Number	Response percentage
High School	1	2%
Diploma	0	0%
Some College	4	9%
Certificate	2	5%
Associate's degree	7	16%
Bachelor's degree	17	40%
Master's degree	10	23%
Doctoral degree	2	5%

Table 4

Interpreter Survey Respondent Ethnicity		
Ethnicity	Number	Response percentage
African American/Black	1	2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	7%
Hispanic/Latino	2	5%
Native American/American Indian/Native Alaskan	1	2%
White Non-Hispanic/European American	32	74%
Prefer not to indicate	4	9%

Table 5

Interpreter Survey Respondent Certification Status		
Certification	Number	Response percentage
Yes	40	93%
No	3	7%

Table 6

Interpreter Survey Respondent Length of Time Certified		
Years	Number	Response percentage
<5 years	6	14%
5-10 years	13	30%
11-15 years	8	19%
16-20 years	5	12%
21-24 years	2	5%
25+ years	6	14%

Table 7

Survey Respondent Number of Years Interpreting		
Years	Number	Response percentage
<2 years	1	2%
2-5 years	4	9%
6-10 years	6	14%
11-15 years	6	14%
16-20 years	8	19%
21-25 years	8	19%
25+ years	10	23%

Table 8

Survey Respondent Number of Years as a Video Remote Interpreter		
Years	Number	Response percentage
<6 months	1	2%
6 -12 months	4	9%
1-2 years	6	14%
3-5 years	6	14%
6-10 years	8	19%
10+ years	8	19%

Table 9

Hours per Week Working as Video Remote Interpreter		
Years	Number	Response percentage
<5 hours	31	72%
5-15 hours	7	16%
16-25 hours	4	9%
26-35 hours	0	0%
35+ hours	1	2%

Table 10

Survey Respondent Work Location		
Work Location	Number	Response percentage
Home	6	14%
Office	11	26%
Institution i.e., hospital, post-secondary	7	16%
Centralized call center	18	42%

Based on the practitioners' online responses, shown in the tables above, the average Video Remote Interpreter is a white female between the ages of 40-59 years old with a college education. She is nationally certified with more than 15 years of experiences as an interpreter and, it is equally as probable that she has recently started Video Remote Interpreting work, as it is that she has a 10-year history in this setting. She works primarily from a call center or an office, averaging less than 5 hours per week on Video Remote Interpreting calls.

Interviewee Demographics

Five of the practitioners interviewed were Hearing and one was Deaf, all of whom hold RID certification. The Hearing practitioners had between 6-40 years of general interpreting experience, including working in Video Relay Service, and between 3-8 years of specific Video Remote Interpreting experience. One of the Hearing practitioners was a trilingual interpreter (ASL/English/Spanish) who does Video Remote Interpreting in a trilingual environment. The Deaf practitioner has held RID certification for over 30 years and has worked as an interpreter educator, Deaf education teacher, testing evaluator, and Deaf interpreter. Three of the six practitioners have done Video Remote Interpreting primarily in medical settings, one has done Video Remote Interpreting primarily in post-secondary educational settings, and the remaining two practitioners have done Video Remote Interpreting in generalist settings.

Training

On the survey, 70.9% of respondents indicated they felt prepared to do Video Remote Interpreting work although most of their training for this task occurred on-the-job. Many respondents wrote comments stating that their work as an interpreter in general and their experience doing Video Relay Service interpreting in particular provided them with all the training they needed to do Video Remote Interpreting. Slightly more than one-third of the respondents (35.2%) also indicated having taken an in-service training activity such as a workshop.

While several of the interviewees had training on how to do Video Relay Services work, none of the six had training specific to Video Remote Interpreting work. One interviewee referred to her training as “trial by fire.” Since the area of Video Remote

Interpreting is relatively recent to the interpreting profession, three of the six interviewees were involved with developing Video Remote Interpreting protocols and training as they were learning on the job. One interviewee mentioned working closely with an agency that provided spoken-language telephone interpreting in her state.

Both the survey respondents and the interviewees were asked to identify areas of training needed by either themselves or by their colleagues. Survey respondents were provided with a list of 21 items and asked to rank each item. For 10 items, the majority of respondents indicated that the profession needs additional training but that they personally did not. For the remaining 11 items, the majority of respondents indicated that both they and the profession need additional training.

Table 11

Training Need Perceptions	
Interpreter survey respondent perceptions of training needs for the profession	Interpreter survey respondent perceptions of training needs for the profession & for self
Business practices	Applicable laws & statutes
Consumer advocacy	Audio & video management
Conversation turn-taking management	Environmental management
Cultural competency	Ergonomics
Customer service	Interpreting skills
Ethical and professional decision making	Preparation
Interpersonal relations	Professional development and continuing education
Language skills	Remote video hardware & software
Role & boundaries	Self-care
Team interpreting	Technology
	Working conditions (i.e. breaks)

While the interviewees were not given a list of options for possible training topics, they were asked what kind of training they would like to see provided related to interpreters who provide Video Remote Interpreting services. Their comments focused on several areas, including educating people on the differences between Video Relay Service and Video Remote Interpreting, using an interpreter over a video channel versus using an interpreter in an onsite setting, and understanding protocols (i.e., communication management, turn taking, and etiquette) for using Video Remote Interpreters. The

trilingual interpreter mentioned the need for trilingual interpreters to understand the cultural systems and Spanish varieties for different Latin American countries, as well as the need for training on various societal systems within each country such as educational, legal, and government/political.

Another area where training is needed related to technology and appropriate use of the equipment. One interviewee dismissed the need for training in technology by stating: “I’m not concerned about technology anymore. Someone else can handle that for me.” Another interviewee, however, who works primarily in medical settings suggested that extensive training is needed since the equipment and technology is new for most people who are now using Video Remote Interpreting. In medical settings, for example, healthcare personnel need to understand how the equipment works, including its benefits and drawbacks, as well as how it fits into the medical environment. Training should be provided to all personnel, such as administrators, technicians and lab assistants, not just to doctors and nurses. In addition to training about the technological components of using a Video Remote Interpreter, one interviewee mentioned the need to provide training to Hearing consumers and institutional (i.e., hospitals) employees on Deaf culture and general interpreting services.

Other interviewees shared a similar perspective about providing training to consumers, both Deaf and Hearing. The interviewees mentioned several areas of concern around training including needing to understand the dynamics of working in a 2-dimensional format, knowing the benefits of using the technology, and understanding how it works. They also emphasized that training should focus on the interpreters’ and the consumers’ points of view around using this particular technology.

When asked their preferences on types of continuing education they would like to see, 72.1% of survey respondents indicated wanting a blend of online and face-to-face training. Stand-alone face-to-face training garnered 27.9% responses and stand-alone online training garnered 18.6% responses. One-day workshops were preferred by 48.8% with two-day workshops selected by 32.6%. Week-long and semester/quarter-long courses were each selected by 16.3%. One person commented that Video Remote Interpreting should be incorporated into interpreter education programs. Interviewees were not asked about their preferences on different types of continuing education activities.

Comparison of settings

Upon being asked about the differences between working in a Video Remote Interpreting setting and working in other settings, all six interviewees mentioned the logistical reality of the interpreter not being in the same physical location as the consumers. By being at a distant location, the interpreter cannot see visual aspects of the location: they do not always know who is involved in or observing the interaction; they cannot see visual materials being used (e.g., PowerPoint, anatomy charts in hospitals); they cannot distinguish voices to know who is talking; and they cannot attend to environmental cues such as background sounds.

One interviewee specifically mentioned the difficulty around interpreting pronouns when unable to see which “he” or “she” is being referenced, or when unable to see a visual aid such as a chart or graph. Without asking for clarification which may interrupt the flow of the communication, the interpreter is unable to incorporate unseen references into the interpretation.

Turn-taking poses a challenge because the Video Remote Interpreter can often see only the Deaf consumer on the screen, but not the Hearing consumer(s) and, therefore, cannot adjust using common interpreting communication protocols. An off-camera interpreter cannot see non-verbal turn-taking cues (i.e., eye gaze) of consumers who are not on camera which may lead to awkward interactions. In addition, because Video Remote Interpreting is often used when a local interpreter is not available onsite, the Video Remote Interpreter typically does not know the participants and, hence, has not had opportunity to develop rapport with anyone involved in the interaction, and consequently, not been able to assess each person's communication style. Related to this is the reality that the interpreter may not be familiar with local or regional signs, geography and terminology. One interviewee stated being comfortable in some Video Remote situations about asking for clarification of unfamiliar regional signs or proper names, but that it is not always possible to do this.

Being onsite allows the interpreter to look around the room and access situational and environmental cues including the participants, equipment, visual aids, etc. There is also a greater chance that the interpreter will be familiar with the people involved and with local customs and protocols since the onsite interpreter is most likely from the same community.

Only two of the six practitioners interviewed provide Video Relay Service interpreting as well as Video Remote Interpreting. When asked about the differences between the two settings, one interviewee reported feeling more connected via Video Remote Interpreting to both the Deaf and Hearing consumers than when working in a Video Relay Service setting. Another interviewee who does Video Relay Service

interpreting echoed this sentiment of a Video Remote Interpreting call being more fluid than a Video Relay Service call in that the remote call seems more like a natural conversation than like a phone call.

The technology used for Video Remote Interpreting calls is different from that used for Video Relay Service calls. One interviewee indicated that the agency for which she works has the ability to route calls to different interpreters according to the needs of the call and the particular strengths of the interpreter. This is in contrast to Video Relay Service calls which are placed in a queue and routed to the next available interpreter.

Working Conditions

Several interviewees mentioned that the pace of Video Remote Interpreting calls is often slower than the pace for Video Relay Service calls. There are not only fewer Video Remote Interpreting calls handled in a single shift, but they have a more natural flow akin to a regular conversation. To illustrate issues around conditions while working as a Video Remote Interpreter, the following table shows the primary rankings of 14 factors that impact the work of working remotely as selected by the survey respondents:

Table 12

Factors that Impact Working Remotely		
Always impact interpreting work	Frequently impact interpreting work	Occasionally impact interpreting work
Background and familiarity with the consumers involved	Competence with technology	Availability of technical support
Background and familiarity with the subject matter	Interpreter's access to the meeting facilitator	Duration of the event
Clarity of audio/visual connection	Meeting facilitator's competence	Flow of communication
Competence and effectiveness of the interpreting team		Interpreter's access to the meeting facilitator
Interpreter's cultural fluency		
Interpreter's linguistic fluency		
Prior access to pertinent materials		
Use of other media (Outside the audio/video range of the interpreter's access)		

Practitioners were asked which technical conditions most significantly impact their work in Video Remote Interpreting. Survey responses showed the following breakdown:

Table 13

Conditions Which Impact Video Interpreting Work	
Condition	Response percentage
Video Quality	85.0%
Audio Quality	65.0 %
Stability of Video Remote Connection	62.5%
Availability of Trained Personnel to Troubleshoot Technology Issues	50.0%
Ease of Using Video Remote Hardware	25.0%
Ease of Using Video Remote Software	25.0%
Availability of Technology Training	17.5%

Other issues raised included the placement of the monitors, the ability to see the consumer close up in order to feel a connection to the event and participants, and the logistics of the room itself, such as noise level and people walking in and out.

When asked about the following aspects – Audio Quality, Video Quality, Video Remote Hardware, Video Remote Software, and Connectivity Troubleshooting – the highest percentage of respondents indicated that *both* they and the profession need training in each of these areas. For Video Remote Hardware and Video Remote Software, the second highest response was that *neither* the individual nor the profession needs additional training. This presents an interesting juxtaposition in that the same aspect was ranked as being both highly needed and not at all needed. In general, though, 77.5% of survey respondents indicated that interpreters should have training and/or expertise about managing Video Remote Interpreting technology.

Several interviewees mentioned the need for setting up a Video Remote Interpreting station in a secure, private area whether in a call center, healthcare setting, educational setting or private residence. Good lighting, appropriate backgrounds and appropriate clothing were mentioned as important environmental factors.

Ergonomics, specifically related to the kinds of chairs interpreters use, was mentioned by several interviewees. For those Video Remote Interpreters who work out of their homes, they are able to use a chair of their own choosing, often with adjustable height and no arm rests. For interpreters who work in call centers or at institutions (e.g., hospitals, universities), they often have to use whatever chair is provided regardless of its comfort or fit. Using a chair with adjustable height is particularly helpful for interpreters who share a call station with a fixed camera that cannot be adjusted.

One interviewee who works at a call center explained that she and her colleagues are encouraged to walk around and stretch after a Video Remote Interpreted call and mentioned having set up yoga classes at her center. She also raised the issue of being able to have adjustable equipment so interpreters who share work space can make adjustments as needed such as for camera angle or chair height. Another interpreter talked about the benefit at having her work place of being able to stand or sit while interpreting.

A third interviewee talked about the importance of having up-to-date equipment and appropriate connectivity. Without the right equipment or fast enough connections, the picture and/or sound quality can become compromised making for ineffective communication.

Technical Support

For Video Remote Interpreters who work in a call center or institution, all equipment, both hardware and software, is provided onsite along with technical support. For Video Remote Interpreters who work from home, the company with which they contract provides the hardware and software. Technical support is sometimes available though it is not always immediate. As indicated earlier, one interviewee stressed the need for high quality connections such as T-1 or Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN) lines.

As is inevitable when dealing with technology, on occasion difficulties arise. Survey respondents indicated various ways of managing the problem(s) in the table below:

Table 14

Interpreter Survey Respondent Technology Difficulties	
Management of difficulties	Response percentage
Managed by the interpreter, consumers and the technology specialist	34.3%
Managed by interpreters	28.6%
Managed by technology specialist	31.4%
Managed by consumers and the interpreter	5.7%

Additional comments to this question included respondents submitting a work order or reporting troubles to the technology specialist or calling the interpreter coordinator who then calls the Help Desk. Response time to these requests was not mentioned by the participants.

Scheduling

Survey respondents were asked to indicate how far in advance their Video Remote Interpreting services were scheduled. About a third (31.6%) indicated that their services were on-demand; 18.4% indicated less than 24 hours in advance; 13.2% indicated 1-3 days in advance; 7.9% indicated 4-6 days in advance; and, 28.9% indicated that their services were scheduled more than a week in advance.

When scheduling for Video Remote Interpreting calls, all but one interviewee said that their calls are pre-scheduled anywhere from 1-2 days to 2-3 weeks in advance. The interviewees who work in healthcare settings try to accommodate last minute requests such as emergencies but that regular doctor's appointments or staff meetings are usually pre-arranged. In educational settings, Video Remote Interpreting services are often scheduled for the length of the term, either by semester or quarter, and are based on the student's class schedule. Only one interviewee stated providing Video Remote Interpreting services on-demand, which is in contrast to the survey responses of 31.6%.

Billing and Payment

Most survey respondents (84.6%) indicated that the agency/institution for which they work handles the billing for their services. The remaining respondents (15.4%) indicated that they are responsible for their own billing.

Interviewees, while not asked directly about billing practices, indicated that their Video Remote Interpreting services are usually paid for by the person or entity requesting the Video Remote Interpreting service just as they would for an onsite interpreter. Educational institutions that provide Video Remote Interpreting services to their students do so as part of the regular disability accommodations at no cost to the student. In

healthcare settings, if the service is internal to the healthcare system, then the cost is absorbed by the system. For healthcare systems which contract with outside Video Remote Interpreting providers, costs are billed to the hospital or clinic. One interviewee stated that initial costs for providing Video Remote Interpreting in the healthcare system in her state were covered by a start-up grant, but that they also “billed the hospitals at a lower rate than we normally would bill for an onsite interpreter.”

Preparation: Briefing and Debriefing

The significance of preparation before a Video Remote Interpreting assignment cannot be underestimated; particularly because Video Remote Interpreters do not have access to environmental cues as do onsite interpreters as mentioned earlier. With regard to preparation for a Video Remote Interpreting assignment, survey responses showed the following breakdown:

Table 15

Interpreter Survey Respondent Preparation Opportunities	
Preparation	Response percentage
Very Important	61.5%
Important	17.9%
Somewhat Important	15.4%
Not Important	5.1%

Considering that almost 80% of respondents feel that preparation is important, 67.5% indicated that they do not have access to preparation materials as often when interpreting in Video Remote settings as when interpreting in other settings. When interpreters do have access to materials, 72.2% interpreters indicated they receive them in electronic format (e.g., email) and 55.6% indicated getting materials via personal

conversations. Smaller percentages of respondents indicated getting materials via fax; (25.0%), U.S. Postal Service (11.1%), or other means (22.2%) such as through life experience, library books, phone/VP calls, or daily news.

The most common type of preparation as put forward by the interviewees included “meeting” the clients prior to the event using available technology and obtaining any handouts or materials that may be used such as course text books or agendas. Video Remote Interpreters who work in healthcare systems mentioned preference for getting the patient’s information, as appropriate, including current medical condition, the purpose of the appointment, and the nature of any tests to be performed.

One interviewee provides intrastate Video Remote Interpreting services only and stated knowing many of her consumers prior to the advent of this kind of technological environment due to her long career as an interpreter in a sparsely populated state. She cited the benefits of having had prior interactions with many of the Deaf consumers, and in her specialization of medical interpreting, having had prior interactions with the hospital systems and healthcare providers in her area. While now working remotely, she has noticed that both the Deaf and Hearing consumers seem to be more at ease when she appears on the monitor because they already know her.

In contrast to this, another interviewee talked about making preparation arrangements with new, unfamiliar clients. In her situation, she is able to discuss all arrangements with both the Deaf and the Hearing consumers prior to the actual Video Remote Interpreted assignment. This allows her to gain a clear understanding of the type of equipment being used, who will be involved in the call, and the nature of the call. She can also obtain copies of any documents or materials as needed.

One interviewee talked about the importance of preparation related to the physical work environment. For example, it is important to make sure that the lighting is appropriate at both the interpreter's location and the consumers' location and that sight lines are clearly established.

For those Video Remote Interpreters who only provide on-demand services, preparation is not possible and the interpreter needs to rely on prior knowledge and experience during the assignment. The biggest difference between preparing for a Video Remote Interpreting assignment and preparing for an onsite assignment as indicated by the interviewees relates to gathering data about the environment for the consumers. One interviewee talked about being able to do a faster assessment of a setting by being in that setting physically rather than remotely. It is also possible to do a faster and more accurate language assessment of all consumers while onsite by being able to interact with them in a natural manner prior to the start of the interpreted interaction. This is specifically important in an emergency medical setting when it is not always possible to stop for clarification.

The interviewee who provides Video Remote Interpreting in an educational setting explained the difference in preparation between in-class interpreting and Video Remote Interpreting by emphasizing that it is easier to develop rapport with both the instructor and the students onsite rather than remotely. It is also easier, in her experience, to get course materials such as the syllabus or handouts when onsite. Instructors are likely to respond to an in-person request for information more readily and more quickly in person than via email or telephone.

In conjunction with being able to prepare prior to an assignment, interpreters often benefit from debriefing after an assignment. When asked about opportunities to debrief after a Video Remote Interpreting assignment, the survey respondents answered as follows:

Table 16

Interpreter Survey Respondent Debriefing Opportunities

Debriefing	Response percentage
Always	10.3%
Frequently	12.8%
Occasionally	0.8%
Rarely	33.3%
Never	12.8%

On those occasions when debriefing is possible, the most frequently cited person with whom they have been able to debrief is the team interpreter (64.9%) or an administrator/employer (51.4%). Other parties include colleagues (35.1%), technical support specialists (27.0%), Deaf consumers (21.6%), Hearing consumers (13.5%), and others (1.6%) such as supervisors, scheduling staff, or pastor.

While some of the interviewees mentioned being able to debrief with their team interpreter, particularly if they work in a call center, many Video Remote Interpreters do not have the same opportunities to debrief. One interviewee who works in an educational setting stated debriefing with either the students or the instructor is often impossible because they want to leave as soon as class is over. It is not possible to easily connect with anyone once the equipment is turned off. When this interpreter needs to debrief regarding a class, it is usually with the interpreter coordinator.

Another interviewee who works in healthcare settings related that debriefing is virtually impossible when working remotely. Sometimes the Video Remote Interpreter is

only utilized until the onsite interpreter arrives. Once this happens, the remote interpreter is no longer needed and is disconnected from the call. In these situations, the interpreter has no closure or sense of completion of the job.

Two interviewees indicated that if they have opportunity to debrief, it is usually regarding technical issues such as bandwidth availability or troubleshooting. One interviewee who was involved in setting up the Video Remote Interpreting services in her area said that debriefing was built into the development process. Another interviewee mentioned that she felt at a disadvantage with not being able to debrief after an assignment.

Team Interpreting

With regard to working with a Hearing team interpreter while doing Video Remote Interpreting, 12.8% of survey respondents never work with a team, 43.6% rarely work with a team, 33.3% occasionally work with a team, and 10.3% frequently work with a team. No one responded that they always work with a team. In terms of working with a Deaf team member, 76.9% of respondents indicated they have never had this experience, 12.8% said they rarely work with a Deaf team, 7.7% occasionally work with a Deaf team, and only 2.6% indicated working frequently with a Deaf team. No one responded that they always work with a Deaf team member.

Three of the six interviewees said that they have not worked with a team interpreter, either Deaf or Hearing, when doing Video Remote Interpreting. A fourth interviewee had had only one assignment where she worked with a Hearing team but has never worked with a Deaf team interpreter. She particularly liked working with a team

because, given the nature of the auditory environment in a Video Remote Interpreting setting, having a team reduces the likelihood of auditory information being missed.

The two remaining interviewees, one Deaf and one Hearing, said that they have worked with teams when their respective agencies have determined that the call needs a team. Logistically, this is similar to team arrangements made for onsite assignments. The Hearing interviewee gave no indication as to the percentage of calls that are teamed. The Deaf interviewee said she works with a Hearing team 90-95% of the time. Sometimes she and the Hearing team are in the same location and sometimes one interpreter is onsite with the consumers and the other interpreter is remote.

The length of the Video Remote Interpreting call is typically the factor that will dictate whether or not a team of interpreters is provided. If interpreters are at the same location, for example in a call center or at an institution, the team process is similar to that during an onsite job. If, however, the interpreters are working out of their respective homes, having a team of interpreters requires more logistical planning. In the case of using a Deaf-Hearing team, one interviewee related that her agency's criteria for determining if a team is needed is the same for an onsite assignment and for a Video Remote assignment, both for Deaf-Hearing teams and for Hearing-Hearing teams.

Cultural and Linguistic Variation

Respondents were asked to indicate their comfort level regarding cultural variations that occur with Video Remote Interpreting, choosing from the following eight options: Appropriately assessing class and status of the parties involved; demonstrating culturally appropriate norms; demonstrating general cultural awareness; managing issues of power; managing issues related to privilege; representing culturally appropriate values;

representing unique linguistic and/or cultural features; and showing appropriate cultural deference. For all eight categories, the majority of respondents (between 50.0%-65.9%) indicated they are “Comfortable.” For six of the eight categories, the second highest response was “Very Comfortable”. The remaining two categories that were ranked second as “Not Comfortable” were “managing issues of power” and “managing issues related to privilege.”

When asked to identify strategies used to accommodate the communication when one or more consumers have cultural and/or languages that differ from the interpreter, the responses can be grouped into several categories:

Preparation:

Several respondents indicated that preparation is the key to their work. The preparation can take various forms such as formal instruction and learning via classes, workshops and reading professional materials, interacting with people from other cultures, and drawing on experiences with friends and acquaintances while being cognizant of not stereotyping or mimicking behavior from other cultures.

Interpreting Strategies:

Several respondents indicated that they adjust their interpreting techniques or strategies in order to achieve a successful interaction. These strategies include calling a team, alternating between first-person and third-person, switching between Consecutive and Simultaneous interpreting, passing off the call to another interpreter, or requesting that an onsite interpreter be present (either a Deaf interpreter or another Hearing interpreter who knows the client’s communication style). One person indicated using visual aids, pictures or a writing (white) board.

Interpersonal Strategies:

Several respondents indicated that they engage the consumers in the decision-making process of how to handle language/cultural differences. These strategies include asking direct questions of the consumers, working with callers to determine appropriate meaning, following the consumers' lead, asking about the specific culture, asking about past, successful communication and finding out who else the interpreter can call as a resource.

Whereas some interpreters use the above strategies to engage callers in the decision-making process, other interpreters indicated strategies for putting more of the responsibility on the callers for deciding how to proceed with the communication. For example, one respondent wrote, "maintain[ing] the intended message and allowing both parties to discover a way to communicate by integrating [sic] the body/facial languages, gesturing and signs to convey message." Another respondent wrote, "I expand my interpreting to include references to the language or cultural differences in ways that prompt either the provider or consumer to pay attention, ask questions, etc., without inserting 'the interpreter' into the conversation."

When asked how to handle cultural and linguistic variations among consumers, all interviewees indicated that they stop and ask for clarification when needed. Several interviewees work for agencies or institutions which only provide Video Remote Interpreting within a limited geographic area or for a specific entity like a university. In these situations, the consumers, especially the Deaf consumers, and the interpreter are often already familiar with each other both culturally and linguistically.

One interviewee mentioned that her biggest linguistic challenge comes from knowing, or rather not knowing, company-specific jargon that may be used. Another interviewee talked about the challenge of interpreting for clients from another geographic area, and not knowing local or regional signs for cities, businesses or people.

Cultural and linguistic diversity can also cause issues when interpreting remotely, particularly if the interpreter is not familiar with the consumers' backgrounds. One interpreter offered the example of interpreting remotely for consumers who were on an Indian reservation. The interpreter was aware that there were cultural and linguistic differences between Indian and non-Indian communication, yet she didn't know what they entail.

The trilingual interviewee discussed several strategies for working with consumers who have cultural and/or linguistic diversity. One technique which can be used in any interaction is to ask for clarification of linguistic or cultural information that is not understood. The caveat, though, is that without prior training and/or knowledge of linguistic and cultural differences, the interpreter may not recognize or detect communication differences.

No Differences:

Some respondents indicated that issues associated with cultural and/or language variation are either non-existent or are handled the same way in Video Remote Interpreting as they are in other settings. One respondent wrote a comment that these issues are not different from community work except that sometimes the Deaf and Hearing consumers can not always see each other which puts more responsibility for non-

verbal communication on the interpreter, provided that the interpreter can see and hear all involved parties.

Models and Methods of Interpreting

Survey participants were asked about which interpreting models they use during Video Remote Interpreting assignments, and both survey participants and interviewees were asked about their use of Consecutive Interpreting versus Simultaneous Interpreting during this work.

Sixty percent (60.0%) of survey respondents selected the Bicultural/Bilingual model as the one they use the most often, followed by 12.5% who use the conduit Model, 12.5% who use the ally model, 10.0% who use the facilitator model, and 0.0% who use the helper model. When asked to indicate how they determine which model to use, several respondents answered that they decide based on the needs of the consumers, particularly the Deaf consumers. Some interpreters indicated using the first few minutes to ascertain the consumers' familiarity with using Video Remote Interpreters, with using interpreters in general, familiarity with the topic, and/or familiarity with the setting. Respondents also indicated they pay attention to the consumers' language use, cognitive abilities, and visual acuity of the Deaf consumer. Some interpreters also use the nature of the assignment to determine which model to use. Their decision is also influenced by what, if any, materials they can access prior to the call.

Several survey respondents indicated that they decide on which model to use in Video Remote Interpreting settings in the same way they do in community settings, or that they use the same model regardless of the setting. Although these respondents indicated that they make decisions on which model to use, they did not indicate how they

make that decision. Some respondents indicated that they move between models depending on the nature and progress of the assignment. While the Bicultural/Bilingual model is often preferred, interpreters indicated using the conduit or facilitator models as needed or as appropriate.

When working in Video Remote Interpreting settings, survey respondents also indicated using both Consecutive Interpreting (CI) and Simultaneous Interpreting (SI) at least part of the time with 61.5% using SI frequently and 34.2% using CI frequently.

When asked about using Consecutive Interpreting in Video Remote settings, one interviewee stated that she doesn't have a chance to use it because she works in an educational setting and most of her Video Remote Interpreting happens during lectures. She referenced possibly being able to use Consecutive Interpreting in a lab setting but has not yet had this experience.

All five remaining interviewees said that they use Consecutive Interpreting as they see fit based on the consumers, the setting and the topic. These interviewees who work in medical settings said that Consecutive Interpreting often makes for the most effective communication when accuracy of information can impact a person's health and/or treatment.

While some callers, both Deaf and Hearing, are at first reluctant about waiting the extra time for a Consecutive, versus Simultaneous, interpretation, most accept it once they understand the reason for using a Consecutive format. One interviewee explained that her agency has developed protocols around when to use Consecutive Interpreting. Her agency also recognizes that business are concerned about costs for interpreting services and sometimes balk at the thought that Consecutive interpretation will take

longer than Simultaneous interpretation. Once the benefits are explained, however, they usually agree to a Consecutive format.

Impact on other work

Survey respondents were asked to rank 12 items related to interpersonal skills in terms of their level of importance for Video Remote Interpreters. The majority of respondents ranked all 12 items as being “very important”. The 12 items included:

- Advocacy for appropriate working conditions that facilitate the interpreting process
- Advocacy for consumers' communication access
- Demonstrate appropriate behaviors and communication strategies
- Demonstrate culturally appropriate collaboration with all parties involved
- Demonstrate respect for consumers' communication choices
- Demonstrate an understanding of the Code of Professional Conduct
- Maintain professional roles and boundaries appropriate to the setting
- Recognize and respect cultural differences
- Respect for colleagues
- Respect for consumers
- Respect for employers
- Use culturally appropriate turn-taking, introductions and follow-up

When asked if doing Video Remote Interpreting has impacted their other work, one interview said that it has reinforced her love of onsite interpreting. “The more I do Video Remote, the more I realize that it is such a value to have an onsite interpreter because you have access to more things onsite than you would with a Video Remote Interpreting situation. I think onsite is the most ideal.”

Another interviewee who has worked with many Video Remote Interpreters has observed that working via Video Remote has caused interpreters to analyze their onsite work and figure out what they need to do to provide the equivalent services remotely. From this person’s standpoint, the additional analysis seems to have caused an overall improvement in general interpreting services. Another interviewee mentioned having

become more conscious of understanding the context for the given remote situation and needing to develop strategies for making the work continuous and effective. This is helpful when working remotely since interpreters do not have the same access to materials and consumers as when they work onsite.

For some interviewees, their Video Remote Interpreting experience has not impacted their relationship with Deaf people and/or with the Deaf community, mostly because they provide Video Remote Services within their own community and/or agency. They are already known, trusted and respected by their consumers. One person reported doing remote interpreting within her own geographic area, while also continuing to work onsite. Seeing the same consumers regardless of the venue allows for continuity within her community.

For the interviewee who works in an educational setting, she feels the use of Video Remote Interpreting has brought her program and her university some notoriety. The Deaf interpreter interviewee mentioned that she and the agency she works for have also become more well-known to members of the Deaf community in her area to the extent that she often gets calls from Deaf people who have concerns about Video Relay Services even though she and her agency do not provide these services.

One interviewee talked about a positive impact on how Video Remote Interpreting has impacted her relationship with Deaf people and the Deaf community. Video Remote Interpreting allows interpreters to meet Deaf and Hearing people from a wide geographic area thereby broadening their experiences. The drawback, though, is that it may reduce the possibility of developing relationships with people from their own community.

Business Practices

Survey respondents were asked to comment on business practices that interpreters should consider when doing Video Remote Interpreting. Responses can be grouped into several areas:

Laws and Ethical Considerations:

Knowing labor laws, understanding applicable state and federal laws, understanding the Code of Professional Conduct, determining if Video Remote Interpreting is appropriate for the setting and/or consumers involved

Working Considerations:

Length of assignment, team availability, IT support and bandwidth needs, environmental cues such as lighting, sound, background, break policy, policy for long calls

Billing Considerations:

Rate of pay, policy for calls that start and/or end late, policy for calculating pay (hourly or minutely), invoicing and reimbursement timelines

Customer Service Considerations:

Professional, courteous, good time manager, polite, non-biased

Overall, 74.4% of survey respondents believe that licensure, local laws and policies impact the work of Video Remote Interpreters. Several respondents indicated that their state of residence requires licensure for interpreters. Several also mentioned the need to know laws in other states if providing services to consumers in a state with required licensure. Some respondents indicated the need to understand FCC requirements, as well, although VRI is not regulated by the FCC. Some respondents indicated that they are required to maintain national (RID) certification and provide proof of on-going continuing education to their state agency in order to provide Video Remote Interpreting services. One survey respondent suggested that an industry standard needs to be developed to ensure more continuity of services. At the present time, there are no

regulations as to who can provide Video Remote Services, nor are there regulations around working conditions and fee structures.

Knowledge and Skill Sets

Practitioners were asked to rank the five most important knowledge or skills sets that interpreters should possess while doing Video Remote Interpreting. Interpreting skills were top-ranked by 72.1% of survey respondents. The next two highest categories, language skills and conversation turn-taking management, were selected by 44.2% respondents, with cultural competency and ethical & professional decision-making each selected by 41.9% respondents. The list below shows all items ranked in descending order:

Table 17

Interpreter Perception of Knowledge/Skill Sets that Interpreters Should Possess	
Knowledge or skill set	Response percentage
Interpreting skills	70.5%
Conversation turn-taking management	45.5%
Language skills	43.2%
Ethical and professional decision-making	40.9%
Cultural competency	40.9%
Customer service	38.6%
Audio & video management	34.1%
Applicable laws & statutes	29.5%
Remote video hardware & software	29.5%
Role & boundaries	25.0%
Interpersonal relations	18.2%
Environmental (i.e., lighting, background, ventilation)	18.2%
Technology	18.2%
Working conditions (i.e., breaks)	15.9%
Preparation	15.9%
Self-care	15.9%
Team interpreting	13.6%
Business practices	9.1%
Consumer advocacy	9.1%
Ergonomics	9.1%
Professional development and continuing education	4.5%

Respondents were asked to identify other knowledge and/or skills sets that are important.

Their responses can be grouped into the following categories:

Personal attributes:

Traits include flexibility, adaptability, confidence, good attitude, patience, composure, high degree of autonomy, sense of humor, ability to calmly manage high-tense situations, grace under pressure, and assertiveness around communication issues. Included, too, is the need for self-advocacy, particularly knowing when to say “no” and when to say “yes”.

Culture and language:

Awareness of each client...and the cultures involved, awareness of regional differences in the Deaf communities and ASL use around the country, cultural mediation, teaming, fingerspelling and numbers, diversity of environments and vocabulary within these environments, awareness of each clients’ role and relationship in the situation.

Technology:

Technology trouble shooting, audio & video management, experience working in a 2D environment, ability to manipulate the equipment being used and maintain customer service, experience related to the onsite assignment technology, ability to control the flow of communication without controlling the conversation.

Challenges

Interviewees were asked to identify challenges they face as Video Remote Interpreters. Several interviewees made reference to the technological challenges and protocols for Video Remote Interpreting work. With regard to the technical challenges, interpreters expressed concern about how quickly technology evolves and how important it is to keep up with the latest improvements. The drawback, however, is the costly nature of needing to purchase new equipment or upgrade the high-speed data line as upgrades become available.

Another equipment related challenge is making sure consumers have current equipment which is compatible with the interpreter's equipment. The equipment also needs to be kept in an accessible, yet secure, location. Once the equipment is set up, the settings should not be adjusted to reduce the chance of technical glitches associated with changing channels or unplugging the machine. In healthcare settings, for example, the equipment is often left in a patient's room allowing anyone to use it or tamper with it, or is not easy to locate for the next patient who may be in a different location in the hospital or clinic.

Another kind of challenge relates to the global nature of Video Remote Interpreting work. One interviewee noted the need to understand licensure requirements in various states when dealing with interstate calls. This correlates to the need to

understand the requirements and limitations for interpreting remotely in a variety of settings like K-12 education or post-secondary education, legal, or medical.

The trilingual interviewee specifically cited the need to know and understand cultural and linguistic differences among the various Spanish-speaking countries, in general, and the differences in class and subcultures, in particular. While recognizing, however, that life-long learning is important for all interpreters, at some point the interpreter just needs to do the best job possible within the given situation.

Additional Comments

Overall, the interviewees feel that Video Remote Interpreting is a great benefit to the Deaf community, particularly for people who live in remote areas. One benefit, especially in medical settings, is that Video Remote Interpreting allows healthcare professionals to provide more immediate triage to patients when an onsite interpreter is not readily available. One caveat, though, is that Video Remote Interpreting should not be viewed as a replacement for using an onsite interpreter. This sentiment was echoed by both interviewees and survey respondents, all of whom see the value in providing interpreting services remotely via video as well as providing interpreting services in the more traditional onsite manner.

DEAF CONSUMER SURVEYS AND INTERVIEWS

METHODOLOGY

In June 2009, an online survey, using Survey Monkey, was conducted targeting Deaf people who have used Video Remote Interpreters. The survey included 27 questions using the following formats: yes/no, multiple choice, forced-choice, and short answer questions. Some survey items allowed respondents to provide additional comments. The survey was advertised via multiple outlets including the NAD *E-news*, various listserv groups, various mailing lists and direct email. Participants who clicked on the link to the survey were presented with information about the study in both video-recorded ASL and printed English, including guarantee of anonymity and confidentiality and any risks associated with taking the online survey. Participants indicated agreement with all criteria by clicking onto the survey itself. Participants had the option of withdrawing from the survey at any time without repercussion.

Survey Monkey provided calculations of both the number of responses to each survey item and the percentage of those responses. Survey Monkey also provided a compilation of comments as applicable to each survey item. (See Appendix C for a list of survey questions.)

In conjunction with the online survey four Deaf consumers, two female and two male, participated in the interviews. None of the four interviewees had completed the online survey, nor had they received the questions prior to the interview so that their answers were unrehearsed. Interviews were conducted by a Deaf contributing member to the Interpreting via Video Work Team and were video-recorded. The video-recorded interviews were translated from American Sign Language into printed English by an

outside transcriber and reviewed for accuracy by the Deaf contributing Work Team member. (See Appendix D for a list of interview questions.)

SURVEY RESULTS AND INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Two-hundred forty-four people answered the Deaf Consumer VRI Survey. Respondents had the option of not answering questions and no question was answered 100% of the time. Percentages are based on the number of people who did respond; skipped answers have no bearing on the response count or the response percent. Respondents were from 44 U.S. states and four U.S. territories. General demographic information can be found in the following charts.

Table 18

Consumer Survey Respondent Gender		
Gender	Number	Response percentage
Female	127	54.7%
Male	105	45.3%

Table 19

Consumer Survey Respondent Audiological Identification		
Audiological identification	Number	Response percentage
Deaf	198	85.3%
Hard of Hearing	28	12.1%
Deaf-Blind	6	2.6%

Table 20

Consumer Survey Respondent Age		
Age	Number	Response percentage
18-29 years	22	9.3%
30-39 years	29	12.3%
40-49 years	53	22.5%
50-59 years	69	29.2%
60-69 years	43	18.2%
70+ years	20	8.5%

Table 21

Consumer Survey Respondent Educational Level		
Educational level	Number	Response percentage
High School	31	13.4%
Diploma	0	0.0%
Some college	44	19.0%
Certificate	3	1.3%
Associate's degree	25	10.8%
Bachelor's degree	54	23.3%
Master's degree	62	26.0%
Doctoral degree	13	5.6%

Table 22

Consumer Survey Respondent Ethnicity		
Ethnicity	Number	Response percentage
African American/Black	6	2.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	3.0%
Hispanic/Latino	11	4.7%
Native American/American Indian/Native Alaskan	11	4.7%
White Non-Hispanic/European American	182	78.1%
Prefer not to indicate	15	6.4%
Other	7	3.0%

Four Deaf consumers, two female and two male, participated in follow-up interviews regarding their experiences with using a Video Remote Interpreter. The interviewees used a Video Remote Interpreter in employment settings, educational settings and healthcare settings, specifically hospitals. All four interviewees also use Video Relay Services, though two interviewees expressed preference for using text-based relay because they like to have access to the English.

Usage

Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they do not use more than one Video Remote Interpreter Service provider, while one-third indicated that they do use more than one service provider. The frequency with which the Deaf respondents report using Video Remote Interpreting varies as indicated in the table below.

Table 23

Frequency of Using Video Remote Interpreters		
Frequency	Number	Response percentage
Once a month	67	37.6%
1-5 hours per week	55	30.9%
5-10 hours per week	19	10.7%
More than 10 hours per week	16	9.0%
More than 3 times a month	15	8.4%
Three times a month	6	3.4%

In terms of color of background used behind the interpreter, more than half of the respondents said that color doesn't matter. When asked to indicate their color preference as a follow-up question, most people selected blue as their color of choice, followed by gray and black. Miscellaneous responses about color preference included the following comments:

- "Background needs to contrast against signer's hands."
- "Depend on interpreter...usually blue."
- "Dark color if the interpreter [sic] is white; lighter if interpreter [sic] is darker skin."
- "Tan or beige with interpreter in dark colors or light [sic] contrasting skin."

When asked to select a reason or reasons for using Video Remote Interpreting based on several options, the breakdown of responses in descending order was:

Table 24

Consumer Reasons for Using Video Remote Interpreting	
Reason	Response percentage
Because the event is last minute; no time to get an interpreter in person	41.0%
Community interpreters are unavailable to interpret in person	29.7%
VRI is the only option provided by facility (office, company, business)	23.6%
I prefer VRI for specific situations	23.1%
Other	20.5%

Reasons given for Other include: “to communicate with other Hearing staff at work,” “for private calls”, “the hospital refused to provide an onsite interpreter”, and “to replace community interpreters who got sick at the last minute.”

The majority of respondents (63.8%) indicated that they do not ask for help when using Video Remote Interpreting services, while 36.2% said that they have asked for help. The person most often indicated as being asked to help is a Deaf interpreter with 27.1% respondents selecting this option. Other sources of help came from the following list as shown in descending order:

Table 25

Request for Assistance	
Assistance type	Response percentage
Deaf interpreter	27.1%
Deaf advocate	23.5%
Family member	20.0%
Support Service Provider	17.6%
Co-worker	14.1%
Communication facilitator	12.9%
Community health worker	9.4%
Other	21.2%

Additional sources of assistance mentioned include technical support and nurses.

In terms of settings where respondents use Video Remote Interpreters and request some type of assistance in the process, the following chart shows the settings where assistance is requested in descending order:

Table 26

Site of Assistance Request	
Location	Response percentage
Medical: Hospital/ER	34.5%
Community	22.8%
Medical: Appointment	21.4%
Conference	21.4%
Employment/vocational rehabilitation	15.5%
Personal/family	18.6%
Government	15.9%
Corporate/business	14.5%
Legal	11.7%
Mental health	6.9%
Education/K-12	5.9%
Religious	4.1%
Education/postsecondary	4.1%
Performing arts	3.4%
Other	6.9%
I have not needed assistance from another person when using video remote interpreting	33.8%

Location and Settings

Survey respondents indicated using Video Remote Services from a variety of locations with office or work being selected by the most respondents (36.9%). Home was selected by 33.8% of respondents, and an institution (i.e., hospital, etc.) was selected by 12.6% of respondents. Three percent (3%) selected an agency as their primary location, and 2.5% selected school. For those respondents who selected other (11.1%), several people indicated using Video Remote Interpreting from a friend's house.

The chart below shows in descending order the settings in which Deaf consumers use Video Remote Interpreting services:

Table 27

Settings Where Deaf Consumers Use Video Remote Interpreting Services	
Setting	Response percentage
Medical: Hospital/ER	37.6%
Medical: Appointment	32.0%
Community	32.0%
Conference	32.0%
Corporate/business	30.9%
Personal/family	27.8%
Government	23.2%
Legal	18.0%
Employment/vocational rehabilitation	15.5%
Education/K-12	8.2%
Religious	7.7%
Mental health	7.7%
Education/postsecondary	6.2%
Performing arts	4.1%
Other (e.g. safety training, nursing home, insurance agent)	12.9%

Scheduling

With regard to scheduling, 44.4% of survey respondents indicated that they never schedule a Video Remote Interpreter in advance. The remaining respondents indicated the following, in descending order:

Table 28

Deaf Consumer Scheduling of Video Remote Interpreting Service	
Scheduling	Response percentage
Never schedule in advance – always last minute	44.4%
1-3 days in advance	16.4%
Less than 24 hours in advance	15.2%
More than one-week in advance	15.2%
4-6 days in advance	8.8%

Three of the four interviewees said that they had used a Video Remote Interpreter on-demand because it was for a last-minute situation such as an emergency trip to the hospital. Only one interviewee used a scheduled Video Remote Interpreter because it was in an educational setting for a semester-long course. This person was able to pick her own interpreters whereas those people who experienced Video Remote Interpreting on-demand had to use whichever interpreter appeared on the screen.

For the survey respondents, when asked who is responsible for paying for the Video Remote Interpreter, 34.8% indicated that an agency or institution pays. Almost a third (32.6%) of the respondents indicated that they don't know who pays, 19.3% respondents indicated that their school or their employer pays, 10.5% respondents indicated that another entity pays, and 2.8% respondents indicate that they pay for the interpreter themselves. For the people who indicated "other", responses included the doctor's office, the hospital, or the Deaf community agency.

Interpreter Qualities and Qualifications

In terms of interpreter qualifications, 42.6% of survey respondents indicated that their interpreter is sometimes qualified, 36.6% indicated that the interpreter is always

qualified, and 3.8% indicated that the interpreter is never qualified. Almost seventeen percent (16.9%) indicated that they don't know if their interpreter is qualified.

When asked to select the five most important knowledge or skill sets that an interpreter should possess, the following results occurred (in descending order):

Table 29

Consumer Perception of Knowledge/Skill Sets that Interpreters Should Possess	
Knowledge or skill set	Response percentage
Interpreting skills	73.0%
Language skills	53.4%
Conversation turn-taking management	39.9%
Cultural competency	33.1%
Ethical and professional decision-making	29.2%
Environmental (i.e., lighting, background, ventilation)	28.7%
Customer service	27.5%
Applicable laws & statutes	25.8%
Role & boundaries	24.2%
Technology	21.9%
Business practices	20.8%
Audio & video management	19.7%
Team interpreting	19.7%
Interpersonal relations	17.4%
Professional development and continuing education	15.7%
Working conditions (i.e., breaks)	14.6%
Preparation	14.6%
Consumer advocacy	12.9%
Remote video hardware & software	12.4%
Self-care	5.6%
Ergonomics	4.5%

Respondents were asked to select the minimum qualification an interpreter should possess for working in general Video Remote Interpreting settings and for working in specialized Video Remote Interpreting settings, such as legal, medical or corporate.

The chart below shows a comparison of responses regarding minimum qualification for each:

Table 30

Consumer Perception of Minimum Qualifications for Interpreters in General and Specialized Settings		
Minimum qualification VRI	General VRI response %	Specialized VRI response %
Recent graduate of an Interpreter Training Program	5.6%	6.6%
Up to 2 years of interpreting experience without certification	7.2%	3.8%
Up to 5 years of interpreting experience without certification	3.3%	4.9%
Up to 5 years of interpreting experience with certification	36.1%	25.3%
More than 5 years of interpreting experience with certification and in a variety of settings	27.2%	46.2%
Doesn't matter or don't know	20.6%	13.2%

When asked what qualities were important for interpreters to have, the interviewees cited the need for good receptive skills and additional knowledge for working in specialized settings such as healthcare.

In terms of interpreting ethics, the respondents were asked to select the three most important qualities from a list of nine options. The chart below shows the results in descending order:

Table 31

Consumer Perception of Interpreting Ethics – Most Important Qualities	
Ethics	Response percentage
Keep all VRI situation information confidential	68.6%
Have the professional skills and knowledge for the specific VRI situation	55.1%
Show respect to Deaf consumers	43.8%
Demonstrate high ethical business practices	34.6%
Conduct themselves appropriately, matching the specific VRI situation	31.4%
Continue professional development (interpreter training)	29.7%
Show respect to Hard of Hearing consumers	15.7%
Demonstrate respect for colleagues (team interpreters)	5.9%
Other	3.8%

Several survey respondents provided additional comments with regard to ethics and Video Remote Interpreters. The comments stressed the importance of interpreters understanding both Deaf and Hearing perspectives, showing respect for both Deaf and Hearing consumers, demonstrating ethical business practices, and continuing with professional development activities.

Preparation: Briefing and Debriefing

When asked what kind of preparation a Video Remote Interpreter should have, all four Deaf consumer interviewees mentioned the need for interpreters to be aware of the technology, how it works and how to solve problems for both software and hardware. They also mentioned the need for interpreters to be skilled and to have content area knowledge for working in specialized settings.

The interviewees who had experienced using a Video Remote Interpreter in a medical setting had no time to either prepare with the interpreter before the assignment started or to debrief with the interpreter after it was over. As one person stated, “the

communication occurs and when that is over, you hang up.” Another consumer commented on the preparation of the healthcare providers. “They [the interpreters] just come up on the screen and they’re good and prepared already. But, the nurse and staff and doctors are not. They take forever to get ready.”

Technology Considerations

In terms of the quality of the video connection when using a Video Remote Interpreter, respondents indicated the following as shown in descending order:

Table 32

Video Connection Quality	
Frequency	Response percentage
Sometimes	46.2%
Always	40.2%
Don’t know	10.9%
Never	2.7%

Several comments generated during the Deaf consumer interviews pertain to the need to provide training to both Deaf and Hearing participants on the use of the technology required during a Video Remote Interpreted call. One interviewee stressed the importance of hospital staff knowing how the equipment works and checking it periodically to make sure it is functioning properly. Another interviewee stressed the importance of educating both Deaf and Hearing consumers on the differences between Video Relay Services and Video Remote Interpreting. For example, Video Relay Services are free to consumers because the service is funded by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), whereas Video Remote Interpreting services are paid by the entity requesting the service just as they would for an onsite interpreter.

Participation

The interviewees were asked if they felt they could fully participate in an appointment through a Video Remote Interpreter. While they expressed feeling somewhat constrained and limited, the general consensus was that participation would vary based on the situation, the other participants and the interpreter. An interviewee said that participation is easier in smaller group meetings with only two or three people. The larger the meeting, the harder it is for the Deaf consumer to actively engage; the interpreter often has a harder time seeing everyone involved since the camera is often on the Deaf participant and a harder time focusing on multiple side conversations happening at the same time.

When using a Video Remote Interpreter, 47.6% of survey respondents indicated always being able to fully participate in the call. More than a third (34.9%) indicated they sometimes can participate fully, while 5.3% indicated they never fully participate, and 12.2% indicated they don't know.

Video Remote Interpreting versus Other Situations

When asked about the difference between using Video Remote Interpreting and Video Relay Services, the interviewee who had used a Video Remote Interpreter in an educational setting stated, “for VRI you usually know who the interpreter is, and for me that’s important because I’m a scientist and want consistency with who the interpreter is. With VRS, there is no guarantee who [that’s] going to be [on a given call]”.

The interviewee who uses a Video Remote Interpreter in the work place stated that an interpreter who works remotely seems to be all business and less inclined to engage in preliminary conversation. The interpreter appears on the monitor at the

designated time for the meeting and signs off as soon as the meeting is over. While this may be a business decision due to the interpreter being hired for and getting paid for a designated time frame, from the Deaf consumer's perspective this seems impersonal. When using a VRS interpreter, however, this same interviewee feels comfortable engaging the interpreter in side conversation before the call begins or while on hold.

This same interviewee also commented on the environmental differences between using a Video Remote Interpreter and using a Video Relay Services interpreter. The benefit of using a Video Remote Interpreter, though, is that she and her Hearing co-worker are usually in the same location so that the interpreter can see both of them, similar to an onsite appointment. This contrasts using a Video Remote Interpreter where the Deaf and Hearing consumers are in different locations; the interpreter can see the Deaf consumer but only hear the Hearing consumer.

In addition to being asked about the differences between using a Video Relay Service interpreter and a Video Remote Interpreter, the Deaf consumer interviewees were also asked about the differences between using an onsite interpreter and a Video Remote Interpreter. One interviewee emphasized that some situations may work better with an onsite interpreter, such as in healthcare settings like surgery or counseling sessions, whereas a remote interpreter may work well for a short staff meeting. This interviewee emphasized that the 2-dimensional nature of video communication may be more challenging than onsite, 3-dimensional communication due to technological and/or visibility issues.

Challenges of Using a Video Remote Interpreter

The Deaf consumer interviewees were asked about challenges they have experienced when using a Video Remote Interpreter. One challenge for using a Video Remote Interpreter in a hospital setting has to do with the ability or inability to see the monitor, and therefore see the interpreter. One interviewee talked about his wife's experience of lying face up on a hospital bed but not being able to sit up to see the screen. The interviewee had to serve as a relay interpreter between his wife and the on-screen interpreter which interfered with his ability to support his wife as needed.

Another interviewee had a similar hospital experience of lying in a bed while being covered by a white sheet. She couldn't sit up to see the interpreter and the interpreter couldn't see the patient's hands against the white background. This same interviewee also commented on the lack of connections she felt with the doctor. "I didn't have a sense of connection with the doctor. I was looking at the screen in front of me and the doctor was standing in another part of the room behind me. I couldn't see the doctor next to the interpreter."

One interviewee referred to the challenge related to the technical aspects of using a Video Remote Interpreter. If the network being used for the video appointment is streamed through a wireless system, there is a greater chance that the signal may be weak or start to deteriorate during the call, as opposed to using a hard-wired system.

Finding qualified interpreters is another challenge. As one interviewee stated, "The demand for quality interpreters [is high]. They are hard to find. Some interpreters are fine for conversations. They're great, but when it comes to a more intensive level, a more sophisticated knowledge of business vernacular, they don't have it. It's hard to find

an interpreter who has that area of knowledge, that background for the subject matter of the communication.” Another interviewee summed up her experience this way. “The interpreter was not very skilled.”

Additional Comments

At the end of the survey, respondents were given an opportunity to provide additional comments. The positive comments centered on the ease with which some consumers can access a Video Remote Interpreter and the time it saves by not having to wait for an onsite interpreter. The negative comments, on the other hand, centered on the impersonal feeling the consumers get when using an interpreter who is in another location. Not only is there no sense of rapport with the interpreter, but often no sense of rapport with the Hearing participants since the Deaf person must watch the monitor to access communication and cannot freely look around at other people in his/her location. As with other forms of communication access, personal preference varies by consumers as to the benefits and drawbacks of using a Video Remote Interpreter.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

As stated previously, the purpose of this study was to look at current practices in the area of Video Remote Interpreting, as well as to look at the competencies and skills that both interpreter practitioners and Deaf consumers identify as being important. On both the practitioner survey and the Deaf consumer survey, respondents were presented with a list of 21 items and asked to select the five most important knowledge and skill sets that interpreters should possess. Results from each survey were presented in their respective sections above, but are presented in Table 33 as a means of comparison.

Interestingly, both sets of respondents selected the same five items most often as the top choices. These include Interpreting Skills, Language Skills, Conversation Turn-taking Management, Cultural Competency, and Ethical and Professional Decision Making.

These findings are similar to those found in the study on Video Relay Service interpreting (NCIEC, 2008).

Table 33

Practitioner and Consumer Perceptions of Needed VRI Interpreter Knowledge/Skill Sets			
Practitioner perspectives of knowledge or skill set	Response percentage	Consumer perspectives of knowledge or skill set	Response percentage
Interpreting skills	72.1%	Interpreting skills	73.0%
Language skills	44.2%	Language skills	53.4%
Conversation turn-taking management	44.2%	Conversation turn-taking management	39.9%
Cultural competency	41.9%	Cultural competency	33.1%
Ethical and professional decision-making	41.9%	Ethical and professional decision-making	29.2%
Customer service	39.5%	Environmental	28.7%
Audio & video management	34.9%	Customer service	27.5%
Remote video hardware & software	30.2%	Applicable laws & statutes	25.8%
Applicable laws & statutes	27.9%	Role & boundaries	24.2%
Role & boundaries	23.3%	Technology	21.9%
Environmental	18.6%	Business practices	20.8%
Technology	18.6%	Audio & video management	19.7%
Interpersonal relations	18.6%	Team Interpreting	19.7%
Working conditions	16.3%	Interpersonal relations	17.4%
Preparation	15.9%	Professional development and continuing education	15.7%
Team interpreting	14.0%	Working conditions	14.6%
Self-care	14.0%	Preparation	14.6%
Business practices	9.3%	Consumer advocacy	12.9%
Consumer advocacy	9.3%	Remote video hardware & software	12.4%
Ergonomics	9.3%	Self-care	5.6%
Professional development and continuing education	4.7%	Ergonomics	4.5%

At the opposite end of the list, several items were selected the least frequently by both sets of respondents, including (interpreter) Self-care, Consumer Advocacy, Ergonomics, Professional Development and Continuing Education. Most other items fell within the middle range for both groups, although interpreter practitioners selected technical skill sets such as Remote Video Hardware & Software more often than did the Deaf consumers. This may be due to the fact that the interpreter is usually responsible for troubleshooting technical problems than is the Deaf consumer. As discussed previously in the section on Practitioner Surveys and Interviews, sub-section Technical Support, interpreters responded that they only work with consumers 5.7% of the time on resolving technical issues. The goal for many consumers is to communicate via technical format but not necessarily to set up or fix that media/medium.

In addition to knowledge and skill set requirements for Video Remote Interpreting, it is also important to look at the settings in which Video Remote Interpreting is being used. Based on input to both the surveys and the interviews, healthcare settings is emerging as one of the areas in which Video Remote Interpreting is being used with increasing frequency, often within emergency departments as opposed to during regular, pre-scheduled appointments. Given the urgent nature of emergency situations, being able to access an interpreter remotely within a short period of time is beneficial, particularly in rural areas when the closest interpreter may be several hours away. However, using an off-site interpreter has its drawbacks and/or challenges as referenced previously in this report. These drawbacks may be technical or logistical or sociolinguistic in nature.

Technical challenges include, but are not limited to, hospital staff not being able to use the equipment, the hospital equipment not being compatible with the interpreter's equipment, software issues and/or hardware issues. In terms of how Video Remote Interpreting is utilized, both consumers and practitioners noted that both they, as well as Hearing consumers, need more training on the technical aspects of using a Video Remote Interpreter. Knowing how to access and use the equipment is essential to achieving the goal of successful communication. The need for Hearing consumers to understand how to use an interpreter in general is also important, regardless of the setting.

Logistical issues include, but are not limited to, hospital staff not being able to find the equipment, the equipment not being configured or connected, the Deaf consumer not being able to see the screen, the Deaf consumer not being able to freely move his/her hands and arms due to restraints or I.V. lines, the interpreter not being able to see the Deaf patient because of equipment placement, or the interpreter not being able to hear the Hearing participants due to background noise such as monitors or due to speakers being out of the range of the interpreter's hearing or view.

For regularly scheduled, non-emergency appointments, both consumers and practitioners indicated preference for the interpreter to be onsite rather than remote. Working onsite allows the interpreter to fully assess the situation and develop rapport with all participants. Onsite, too, the interpreter has access to materials such as wall-charts and other visual aids that can be used for conveying information.

While using a Video Remote Interpreter in a medical setting may be acceptable when needed for emergencies, using a Video Remote Interpreter in a mental health setting is not seen as preferable for several reasons. While some respondents expressed

concern about being able to do an effective job of interpreting in a mental health setting due to technical and/or logistical reasons, some responses also showed concern for the well-being of the patients. For example, if a patient is experiencing paranoia or delusions, having a camera and TV monitor in the room may exacerbate his/her feels of “being watched”. Also, if the patient doesn’t look at or toward the camera and monitor, or if he/she moves around the room, the interpretation is not feasible. The interpreter and the Deaf consumer need to be able to see and pay attention to each other for communication to occur. A patient who is experiencing a psychotic or hallucinogenic episode, or who is heavily medicated, may also not be able to effectively communicate through a piece of equipment. An onsite interpreter can assess the situation and make adjustments as needed for communication as well as for logistical challenges.

Some of the drawbacks of using a Video Remote Interpreter, regardless of the setting, as indicated by both practitioners and consumers, include sight and sound restrictions. When an interpreter is not physically present, he/she will not have full visual access, and sometimes not have full auditory access to the environment(s) of the Deaf and/or Hearing participants. For example, if a Video Remote Interpreter is used during a meeting, the camera will be fixed on the Deaf consumer; the interpreter will often not be able to see who else is in the room or be able to identify who is speaking. It may be difficult for the interpreter to utilize standard turn-taking strategies or back-channel cues.

Another possible drawback pertains to the use of team interpreters. For lengthy assignments, two interpreters may be needed. If either or both interpreters are off-site, especially if the interpreters themselves are in different locations, it will be virtually impossible for them to practice standard team techniques such as providing linguistic

support (i.e., feeds), logistical support (i.e., adjusting placement), or practical support (i.e., filling in missed information.)

In conclusion, both interpreter practitioners and Deaf consumers expressed similar views on issues pertaining to Video Remote Interpreting. Since this format for utilization of interpreting services is fairly recent, more research is warranted into Video Remote Interpreting. There are additional issues that need further study in order to fully understand effective practices for Video Remote Interpreting which will be discussed in the next section of this report. The end goal, however, is the same for all participants – effective, high-quality communication.

CONCLUSION

While this research has provided insight and awareness into the issues around using a Video Remote Interpreter, there are still many questions that need to be addressed. The first area to be addressed is that while interpreter practitioners and consumers ranked both Language Skills and Cultural Competency as requisite knowledge and skill sets, they were not asked to identify specific details as to what these mean or how they are defined. In relation to these areas, there is also need for research on issues of cultural and linguistic diversity within and between interpreter and consumers when interactive via Video Remote Interpreting.

The second area is the need to investigate the issues around geographic and regional diversity. These issues may include how interstate calls are handled between states which have licensure requirements for interpreters and those states without licensure requirements, or how interpreters deal with regional and/or geographic linguistic or cultural variations.

The third area is that this report is missing the perspective of Hearing consumers and the perspective of technical support personnel. Due to fiscal, staff and time limitations, it was not possible to include either of these groups in the current study. In order to gain a balanced perspective on the state of the field, however, it is important to gather their data.

The fourth area is the importance of gathering additional data from trilingual interpreters, particularly those who use ASL, English, and Spanish. This population of practitioners is quickly growing as demand increases, not only among Spanish-language users in the United States, but in many other Spanish-language countries. There are

significant linguistic and cultural differences between Spanish-language countries with regard to lexical usage, cultural and societal norms which effect communication and the interpreting process. Needed, too, is data from both Deaf and Hearing consumers who use Spanish during a Video Remote Interpreting, situation.

A fifth area that needs further study surrounds the use of Deaf interpreters during a Video Remote Interpreted situation. While many Deaf consumers responded that they have not experienced using a Deaf interpreter in this setting, the field may see an increasing need for Deaf interpreters particularly with consumers who use a sign language other than ASL or with consumers who are Deaf-Blind.

Related to this, a sixth area of study that warrants attention is input from consumers who are Deaf-Blind. Only 2.6% of Deaf consumers who responded to the survey identified themselves as Deaf-Blind. Also, no Deaf-Blind consumers were interviewed for this study despite numerous attempts to identify Deaf-Blind consumers who had experienced using a Video Remote Interpreter. Part of the issue may stem from the fact that Deaf-Blind people have a variety of communication preferences including close vision and/or tactile communication. For those Deaf-Blind consumers who rely on tactile communication, using a Video Remote Interpreter is virtually impossible because they cannot see the interpreter on the screen. Even those Deaf-Blind people who prefer close-vision communication may find using a Video Remote Interpreter to be challenging because the consumer may be not able to make adjustments for placement, lighting, or environmental cues as they would with an onsite interpreter. It is important to work with agencies and/or organizations that serve Deaf-Blind persons in order to gather data about the needs and experiences of using a Video Remote Interpreter.

A seventh area of study that necessitates further research involves issues of confidentiality around working as a Video Remote Interpreter. Healthcare and educational settings are utilizing Video Remote Interpreters with increasing frequency yet none of the interpreter practitioners or Deaf consumers involved in this project mentioned HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) or FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act), respectively, and the impact on how interpreters obtain information about clients. It would be beneficial to understand if Video Remote Interpreters and onsite interpreters have equal access to client information and how this impacts their work.

An eighth and final area identified which needs further consideration involves educating consumers and practitioners about the differences between Video Relay Services and Video Remote Interpreting. As stated earlier in this report, the Interpreting via Video Work Team went into this project under the assumption that given a clear definition of VRS and VRI, survey respondents would understand the differences and answer the questions accordingly. After reviewing the comments provided by survey respondents, particularly by the Deaf consumers, it was clear that many people misunderstood the differences and answered the VRI-related questions as if they were VRS-related questions. There was less confusion among practitioners which is not surprising since those interpreters who work in one or both settings have different technical issues and scheduling issues.

This report is an important step in the process of understanding current practices of using interpreters in a Video Remote Interpreting format; however additional investigation and research are still needed to fully understand the factors which effect

both practitioners and consumers. The Interpreting via Video Work Team will share the results of this study with practitioners, consumers, stakeholders and service providers in order to facilitate further growth and understanding of Video Remote Interpreting issues. The Work Team looks forward to on-going collaborations as current and effective practices of Video Remote Interpreting are examined.

REFERENCES

- Lightfoot, M. (2007). Interpreting culturally sensitive information in VRS settings. *RID VIEWS*, 24(6), 1, 17.
- NCIEC Interpreting via Video Work Team. (2008). *Steps toward identifying effective practices in VRS interpreting*. Retrieved October 27, 2009.
http://www.nciec.org/projects/docs/Steps_VRS_2008Report.pdf
- Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (2007). *Video Relay Service interpreting standard practice paper*. Retrieved October 16, 2008, from
http://rid.org/UserFiles/pdfs/Standard_Practice_Papers/Drafts_June_2006/VRS_SPP.pdf.
- Taylor, M. (2005). *Video Relay Services interpreting task analysis report*. Distance Opportunities for Interpreting Training Center, University of Northern Colorado.
- Winston, E. & Cokely, D (2007). *NCIEC interpreting practitioner needs assessment: Final report*. <http://nciec.org/resource/docs/PracRept.pdf>, September 26, 2007.
- Witter-Merithew, A. & Johnson, L. J. (2005). *Toward competent practice: Conversations with stakeholders*. Alexandria, VA: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Appendix A

Practitioner Online Survey Items

Dear VRI Interpreter,

The Interpreting via Video Work Team, an initiative of the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers is conducting a study to learn more about the competencies required for working in Video Remote Interpreting settings. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) is a fee based interpreting service where at least one person (the interpreter, the Deaf person or the hearing person) is at a distance. Thus, the interpreter may be located with the Deaf person(s), the interpreter may be located with the hearing person(s), or the Deaf and hearing people may be together at the same location. The Work Team is interested in targeting interpreters who work in VRI settings to learn more about the competencies required for working in such settings.

This letter is to invite you to participate in an on-line survey about your work in VRI settings. You must be at least 18 years old to participate. At no time will participants be asked to reveal proprietary information related to a specific provider or to reveal confidential information about specific calls. All comments will be kept confidential and participants' names will not be revealed. There are no identifiable risks to you for taking part in this survey. The on-line survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

The decision to participate in this survey is up to you. You do not have to participate and you can refuse to answer any question. You may withdraw from the survey at any time.

Information gathered via the on-line survey will be shared in a report to be available by the end of December 2009. This data will guide us in better understanding the needs of interpreters who work in VRI settings. Please know that your name will not be connected to your responses.

Feel free to contact us with questions. Questions may be directed to Beverly Hollrah, beverly.hollrah@gallaudet.edu or Mary Lightfoot, mary.lightfoot@gallaudet.edu.

You may proceed with participating in this survey by clicking on "Next".

Sincerely,
Interpreting via Video Work Team (NCIEC)

The NCIEC Interpreting via Video Work Team is focused on identifying common needs, issues, and practice of Video Remote Interpreting settings. The Work Team's initial analysis will provide input to interpreter education regarding essential educational and training needs of interpreters working in video settings. Your participation in this survey will help us further this work.

For purposes of this survey, Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) is defined as a fee based interpreting service where at least one person (the interpreter, the Deaf person or the hearing person) is at a distance. Thus, the interpreter may be located with the Deaf person(s) with the hearing person(s) at a remote location; the interpreter may be located with the hearing person(s) with the Deaf person(s) at a remote location; or the Deaf and hearing people may be together with the interpreter at a remote location.

Currently, VRI is being used in a variety of settings.

1. Please select one of the following:

I am a hearing interpreter

I am a Deaf interpreter

2. What is the highest education level you have achieved?

High School

Diploma

Some College

Certificate

AA degree

Bachelors degree

Masters degree

Doctorate

Other (please specify)

3. Specify major for each degree awarded

AA Degree _____

Bachelors _____

Masters _____

Doctorate _____

4. Age

18-29

30-39

40-49

50-59

60-69

70+

5. Gender

Male

Female

6. Ethnicity

African American/Black

Asian/Pacific Islander

Hispanic/Latino

Native American/ American Indian/ Native Alaskan

White Non-Hispanic/European American

I prefer not to indicate

Other (please specify)

7. In what state/territory do you live?

8. How many years have you been interpreting?

Less than 2 years

2-5 years

6-10 years

11-15 years

16-20 years

21-25 years

26 years or more

9. How long have you worked as a video remote interpreter (VRI)?

Less than 6 months

6 months-1 year

1-2 years

3-5 years

6-10 years

More than 10 years

10. How much video remote interpreting do you do?

Less than 5 hours per week

5-15 hours per week

16-25 hours per week

26-35 hours per week

More than 35 hours per week

11. Please select the settings in which you do video remote interpreting? (Check all that apply.)

Community

Conference

Corporate/Business

Education, K-12

Education, Post-secondary

Employment/Vocational Rehabilitation
Government
Legal
Medical: Appointments
Medical: Hospital/Emergency Room
Mental Health
Performing Arts
Personal/Family
Religious
Other (please specify)

12. Are you a certified interpreter?

Yes
No

13. If you are certified, how long have you been certified?

Less than 5 years
5-10 years
11-15 years
16-20 years
21-24 years
25+ years

14. If you are certified, what certification(s) do you hold?

15. When you started doing video remote interpreting, did you feel appropriately prepared?

Yes
No

16. Please explain.

17. What type of education and/or experience did you have that prepared you to do video remote interpreting? (Check all that apply.)

None
Pre-service training (e.g. interpreter training program)
In-service training (e.g. workshops, conference sessions)
On-the-job training
Other (please specify)

18. From what location are you primarily providing video remote services?

Home
Office
Institution (i.e., college, university, hospital, etc.)
Centralized call center
Other (please specify)

19. Please select the five most important knowledge or skills sets that interpreters should possess when doing video remote interpreting (VRI).

Knowledge of:

Applicable Laws & Statutes
Audio & Video Management
Business Practices
Consumer Advocacy
Conversation Turn-taking Management
Cultural Competency
Customer Service
Environmental (i.e., lighting, background, ventilation, etc.)
Ergonomics
Ethical and Professional Decision Making
Interpersonal Relations
Interpreting Skills
Language Skills
Preparation
Professional Development and Continuing Education
Remote Video Hardware & Software
Role & Boundaries
Self-Care
Team Interpreting
Technology
Working conditions (i.e., breaks)

20. What other unique knowledge or skill sets should interpreters possess in order to do video remote interpreting?

21. Please indicate in which of the following areas you and/or the professional in general need additional training. (Options: No training needed; I need training; The profession needs training; Both I and the profession need training.)

Applicable Laws & Statutes
Audio & Video Management
Business Practices
Consumer Advocacy
Conversation Turn-Taking Management
Cultural Competence
Consumer Service
Environment Management (i.e. lighting, background, ventilation)
Ergonomics
Ethical and Professional Decision Making
Interpersonal Relations
Interpreting skills
Language Skills
Preparation

Professional Development and Continuing Education
Remote Video hardware & Software
Role and Boundaries
Self-Care
Team Interpreting
Technology
Working conditions (i.e. breaks)

22. What specific type of continuing education would you like to see for video remote interpreting?

Face to Face
Online
Blended (Online and Face to Face)
Not Interested
Other (please specify)

23. Please indicate the length of continuing education activities you would like to see regarding video remote interpreting?

1-day workshop
2-day workshop
Week-long course
Semester/quarter-long course
Other (please specify)

24. In your current practice, please indicate your level of comfort regarding cultural variations that you encounter while interpreting in video remote settings. (Options: Not comfortable; Comfortable; Very Comfortable)

Appropriately assessing class and status of the parties involved
Demonstrating culturally appropriate norms
Demonstrating general cultural awareness
Managing issues of power
Managing issues related to privilege
Representing culturally appropriate values
Representing unique linguistic and/or cultural features
Showing appropriate cultural deference

25. What strategies do you use to accommodate the communication when one or more consumers have a culture and/or language that is different than your own?

26. When doing video remote interpreting, how often do the following factors impact the message? (Options: Never; Rarely; Occasionally; Frequently; Always)

Availability of technical support
Background and familiarity with the consumers involved
Background and familiarity with the subject matter
Clarity of audio/visual connection
Competence and effectiveness of the interpreting team

Competence with technology
Duration of the event
Flow of communication
Interpreter's access to the meeting facilitator
Interpreter's cultural fluency
Interpreter's linguistic fluency
Meeting facilitator's competence
Prior access to pertinent materials
Use of other media (outside the audio/visual range of the interpreter's access)

27. For the following interpersonal skills, indicate the level of importance for video remote interpreting work. (Options: Very important; Important; Somewhat important; Not important at all)

Advocacy for appropriate working conditions that facilitate the interpreting process
Advocacy for consumers' communication access
Demonstrate appropriate behaviors and communication strategies
Demonstrate culturally appropriate collaboration with all parties involved
Demonstrate respect for consumers' communication choice
Demonstrate an understanding of the Code of Professional Conduct
Maintain professional roles and boundaries appropriate to the setting
Recognize and respect cultural differences
Respect for colleagues
Respect for consumers
Respect for employers
Use culturally appropriate turn-taking, introductions and follow-up

28. Which model of interpreting do you find yourself using MOST often while video remote interpreting?

Helper
Conduit
Facilitator
Bicultural/Bilingual
Ally
Other (please specify)

29. How do you determine which model to use when doing video remote interpreting?

30. Do you ever feel uncomfortable providing video remote interpreting services as a result of the Deaf consumer's: (Select all that apply.)

Accents and dialects
Age
Consumer needs
Gender
Geography and regional influence
Multiple language issues

Specialized jargon
Specific culture(s) represented
Values and norms

31. Do you ever feel uncomfortable providing video remote interpreting services as a result of the Hearing consumer's: (Select all that apply.)

Accents and dialects
Age
Consumer needs
Gender
Geography and regional influence
Multiple language issues
Specialized jargon
Specific culture(s) represented
Values and norms

32. Please check which of the following most significantly impact your work while doing video remote interpreting. (Select all that apply.)

Audio quality
Video quality
Ease of using video remote hardware
Ease of using video remote software
Stability of video remote connection
Availability of technology training
Availability of trained personnel to troubleshoot technology issues
Other (Please specify)

33. Please indicate in which of the following aspects you and/or the profession in general need training in order to handle technology issues. (Options: No training needed; I need training; The profession needs training; Both I and the profession need training.)

Audio quality
Video quality
Video remote hardware
Video remote software
Connectivity troubleshooting

34. Should interpreters have training/expertise about managing video remote interpreting technology?

Yes
No

35. When you are doing video remote interpreting, how are technology difficulties MOST OFTEN handled? (Select one option.)

I monitor and manage technology difficulties
Technology specialist monitors and manages technology difficulties

Consumers monitor and manage technology difficulties
We manage technology difficulties together
Other (Please specify)

Consecutive Interpreting is defined as the rendering of the interpretation after the signer/speaker has completed her/his discourse (idea, chunk, response, etc.) in the source language and pauses while the interpreter transmits that information into the target language.

Simultaneous Interpretation is defined as the process of interpreting into the target language at the same time the source language is being delivered.

36. While doing video remote interpreting, how often do you do the following types of interpreting? (Options: Never; Rarely; Occasionally; Frequently; Always)

Simultaneous Interpreting

Consecutive Interpreting

37. What strategies do you employ when you need to clarify, make corrections to the interpretation or interject the Deaf consumer's comments?

38. What strategies do you employ when you need to clarify, make corrections to the interpretation or interject the Hearing consumer's comments?

39. How often do you work with a team interpreter while doing video remote interpreting?

Never

Rarely

Occasionally

Frequently

Always

40. How often have you worked as part of a Deaf/Hearing Interpreting Team while doing video remote interpreting?

Never

Rarely

Occasionally

Frequently

Always

41. What business practice considerations should interpreters contemplate when approaching the task of video remote interpreting?

42. Do licensure, local laws and policies impact our work as a video remote interpreter?

Yes

No

43. If yes, please explain.

44. How far in advance are MOST of your video remote interpreting assignments scheduled? (Select one.)

On-demand

Less than 24 hours in advance

1-3 days in advance

4-6 days in advance

More than a week in advance

45. Who is responsible for billing/invoicing after a video remote interpreting assignment?

I am responsible for my own billing.

The agency/institution for which I work handles the billing.

Other (Please specify)

46. How often are you able to debrief after a video remote interpreting assignment?

Never

Rarely

Occasionally

Frequently

Always

47. If you are able to debrief after a video remote interpreting assignment, who is included in the debriefing session with you? (Check all that apply.)

Administrator/Employer

Colleagues

Deaf consumers

Hearing consumers

Team interpreter

Technical support specialists

Other (please specify)

48. During video remote interpreting, how important is preparation in order for you to successfully do your work?

Very Important

Important

Somewhat Important

Not Important at all

49. Do you have access to preparation materials for doing video remote interpreting as often as you do for other types of interpreting settings?

Yes

No

50. In what format do you receive preparation materials when working in Video Remote Interpreting? (Check all that apply.)

Electronic/Scan/E-mail

Fax

Personal conversations

U.S. Mail

Other (please specify)

51. Additional comments regarding Video Remote Interpreting.

Appendix B

Practitioner Interview Questions

To Interviewer:

Please read these statements to the Interpreter Practitioner prior to the interview:

- 1) The purpose of this project is to identify best practices for interpreters who work in Video Remote Interpreting (VRI). This project is focused on VRI, rather than VRS, interpreting.
- 2) The goal for the interviews is to gather consumer input about VRI interpreting. The goal is NOT to gather information about any particular call center or service provider.
- 3) All information will be kept strictly confidential. All results of the project will be reported in ways which ensure that no individual is identified, nor will any comments be linked to a specific person. The tapes will be only be viewed by members of the NCIEC Interpreting via Video Committee staff and consultants.
- 4) Dr. Julie Simon, President of The Language Door, has been retained as a consultant to this project for the purposes of data review and summary.

Please provide this information to the interviewee in either written or verbal form:

The NCIEC Interpreting via Video Work Team is focused on identifying common needs, issues, and practice of Video Remote Interpreting settings. The Work Team's initial analysis will provide input to interpreter education regarding essential educational and training needs of interpreters working in video settings. Your participation in this survey will help us further this work.

For purposes of this survey, Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) is defined as a fee based interpreting service where at least one person (the interpreter, the Deaf person or the hearing person) is at a distance. Thus, the interpreter may be located with the Deaf person(s) with the hearing person(s) at a remote location; the interpreter may be located with the hearing person(s) with the Deaf person(s) at a remote location; or the Deaf and hearing people may be together with the interpreter at a remote location.

Currently, VRI is being used in a variety of settings.

Interview Questions

1. Please state your name, city/state of residence.
2. Please tell me about your background/history as an interpreter in general.
3. Please tell me about your background/experience working as a video remote interpreter.
4. What kind of training did you have in order to do Video Remote Interpreting?
5. What future training would you like to have related to Video Remote Interpreting?
6. What are some of the differences between working as a video remote interpreter and interpreting in other settings?
7. Do you also do VRS interpreting?
8. If so, how does this differ from your work as a video remote interpreter?
9. Please describe your working conditions related to Video Remote Interpreting, such as ergonomics, technology, work load, location, etc.
10. Are your services as a video remote interpreter scheduled in advance or do you provide on-demand Video Remote Interpreting services?
11. If your services are pre-scheduled, how far in advance and by whom?
12. Who pays for your services as a video remote interpreter?
13. What kind of preparation are you able to do as a video remote interpreter?
14. How is your preparation different when your services are pre-scheduled versus on-demand?
15. How is your preparation different from working in other settings?
16. What, if anything, is the difference in your interpreting process or product when your services are pre-scheduled versus on-demand?
17. Are you able to debrief after a video remote interpreted assignment? If so, with whom?
18. Do you ever work with a hearing, team interpreter? If so, how is that arranged and how does that work?

19. Do you ever work with a Deaf, team interpreter? If so, how is that arranged and how does that work?
20. How do you handle linguistic and/or cultural variations among/between yourself and your clients?
21. Do you use Consecutive Interpreting? If so, how do you determine when to use it?
22. How has your work as a video remote interpreter impacted your other interpreting work?
23. How has your work as a video remote interpreter impacted your relationship with Deaf people and the Deaf community?
24. What are two or three challenges that you face as a video remote interpreter?
25. Do you have any additional comments about working as a video remote interpreter?

Thank you very much for your time and input.

Appendix C

Deaf Consumer Online Survey Items

Greeting Deaf, Hard of Hearing and Deaf-Blind VRI Consumer,

To see the ASL version of this information, please copy this link and use it within another web browser page:

http://quicktimepc2.gallaudet.edu/deptinterpretation/Collins_Survey_Intro_mymedia_segment01.mov

The Interpreting via Video Work Team, part of the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers, is conducting a study to learn more about the requirements for working in Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) settings. VRI is a fee-based interpreting service where at least one person (the interpreter, the Deaf person or the hearing person) is in a different location.

In VRI, the interpreter may be located with the Deaf person(s), the interpreter may be located with the hearing person(s), or the Deaf and hearing people may be together at the same location and the interpreter is in a different place.

VRI is different from VRS interpreting. In VRS, you call through a service provider and the call is paid by the FCC. In VRI, you make an appointment with the video interpreter and the call is paid by private customers. VRI is also available on-demand without an appointment. VRI does not require the deaf person to be in a separate location from the hearing person.

Here is information about the VRI survey:

- You must be 18 years old or older to participate.
- You will not need to provide your name.
- All information will be confidential.
- You will not need to name your interpreter(s) or service provider (company).
- The on-line survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.
- It is your decision to participate.
- You can refuse to answer any question.
- You can withdraw from the survey at any time by clicking cancel.
- You need to complete the survey by June 30, 2009.
- The information collected from the surveys will be used to improve the field of interpreting and VRI.

If you have questions, please contact Beverly Hollrah (beverly.hollrah@gallaudet.edu) or Mary Lightfoot (mary.lightfoot@gallaudet.edu).

If you want to proceed with this survey, please click on "Next".

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Interpreting via Video Work Team (NCIEC)

The NCIEC Interpreting via Video Work Team is focused on identifying common needs, issues, and practice of Video Remote Interpreting settings.

For purposes of this survey, Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) is defined as a fee-based interpreting service where at least one person (the interpreter, the Deaf person or the hearing person) is in a different location. The interpreter may be located with the Deaf person(s) and the hearing person(s) is at a different location; the interpreter may be located with the hearing person(s) and the Deaf person(s) is at a different location; or the Deaf and hearing people may be together and the interpreter at a different location.

1. I am

- Deaf
- Hard of Hearing
- Deaf-Blind

2. Gender

- Male
- Female

3. Age

- 18-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60-69
- 70+

4. What is the highest educational level you have?

- High School
- Diploma (GED)
- Some College
- Certificate
- AA Degree
- Bachelors Degree
- Masters Degree
- Doctorate

5. Specify major for each degree awarded

- AA Degree _____
- Bachelors _____
- Masters _____
- Doctorate _____

6. Ethnicity

- African American/Black
- Asian/Pacific Islander

Hispanic/Latino
Native American/ American Indian/ Native Alaskan
White Non-Hispanic/European American
I prefer not to indicate

7. In what state do you live?

8. I do not live in a state, I live in the following U.S. territory:

9. How often do you use Video Remote Interpreting (VRI)?

1-5 hours per week
5-10 hours per week
More than 10 hours per week
Once a month
Three times a month
More than three times a month

10. Do you use more than one Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) service provider?

Yes
No

11. When using Video Remote Interpreting (VRI), what color background do you like best?

Color doesn't matter
I like color _____

12. Where do you use Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) services most often? Pick one.

Home
Office or work
School
Institution (hospital, etc.)
Agency
Other (please describe)

13. Please check the reasons you use Video Remote Interpreting (VRI). Choose all that fit you.

Community interpreters are unavailable to interpret in person
Because the event is last minute - no time to get an interpreter in person
VRI is the only option provided by the facility (office, company, or business)
I prefer VRI for specific situations
Other (please explain)

14. Please select all the setting(s) in which you use Video Remote Interpreting. (Check all that apply.)

Community

Conference
Corporate/Business
Education, K-12
Education, Post-secondary
Employment/Vocational Rehabilitation
Government
Legal
Medical: Appointments
Medical: Hospital/Emergency Room
Mental Health
Performing Arts
Personal/Family
Religious
Other (please specify)

15. Do you sometimes ask for help when using VRI?

Yes
No

16. If yes, who helps you? (Pick all that fit you.)

Deaf Advocate
Deaf interpreter
Support Service Provider (SSP)
Community Health Worker
Family Member
Friend
Co-worker
Communication Facilitator (CF)
Other (please specify)

17. In what settings do you ask for help? (Check all that apply.)

Community
Conference
Corporate/Business
Education, K-12
Education, Post-secondary
Employment/Vocational Rehabilitation
Government
Legal
Medical: Appointments
Medical: Hospital/Emergency Room
Mental Health
Performing Arts
Personal/Family
Religious

I have not needed assistance from another person when using Video Remote Interpreting.

Other (please specify)

18. How far in advance do you schedule the video remote interpreter (VRI) for an appointment most often? (Pick one.)

I never schedule in advance - it's always last minute

Less than 24 hours in advance

1-3 days in advance

4-6 days in advance

More than a week in advance

19. Who is responsible for paying the video remote interpreter (VRI)?

I pay for the interpreter

An agency/institution pays for the interpreter

My school or employer pays for the interpreter

I don't know who pays the interpreter

Other (please specify)

20. When I use VRI, the interpreter is qualified.

Always

Sometimes

Never

Don't know

21. When I use VRI, the video connection is good.

Always

Sometimes

Never

Don't know

22. When I use VRI, I can fully participate.

Always

Sometimes

Never

Don't know

23. Please select the five most important knowledge or skills sets that interpreters should possess when doing Video Remote Interpreting (VRI). Knowledge of:

Applicable Laws & Statutes

Audio & Video Management

Business Practices

Consumer Advocacy

Conversation Turn-taking Management

Cultural Competency

Customer Service

Environmental (i.e., lighting, background, ventilation, etc.)

Ergonomics

Ethical and Professional Decision Making
Interpersonal Relations
Interpreting Skills
Language Skills
Preparation
Professional Development and Continuing Education
Remote Video Hardware & Software
Role & Boundaries
Self-Care
Team Interpreting
Technology
Working conditions (i.e., breaks)

24. What is the minimum qualification that interpreters should have to work in general Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) settings?

Recent graduate of an Interpreter Training Program
Up to 2 years of interpreting experience without certification
Up to 5 years of interpreting experience without certification
Up to 5 years of interpreting experience WITH certification
More than 5 years of interpreting experience with certification and in a variety of settings
Doesn't matter or don't know

25. What is the minimum qualification that interpreters should have to work in specialized Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) settings, such as legal, medical, corporate, etc.?

Recent graduate of an Interpreter Training Program
Up to 2 years of interpreting experience without certification
Up to 5 years of interpreting experience without certification
Up to 5 years of interpreting experience WITH certification
More than 5 years of interpreting experience with certification and in a variety of settings
Doesn't matter or don't know

26. What three interpreting ethics are most important for an interpreter to do during VRI? (Pick only 3 options.)

Keep all VRI situation information confidential
Have the professional skills and knowledge for the specific VRI situation
Conduct themselves appropriately, matching the specific VRI situation
Show respect to deaf consumers
Show respect to hearing consumers
Demonstrate respect for colleagues (team interpreters)
Demonstrate high ethical business practices
Continue professional development (interpreter training)
Other (please specify)

27. Additional comments regarding Video Remote Interpreting (VRI):

Appendix D

Deaf Consumer Interview Questions

To Interviewer:

Please read these statements to the Deaf consumer prior to the interview:

- 1) The purpose of this project is to identify best practices for interpreters who work in Video Remote Interpreting (VRI). This project is focused on VRI, rather than VRS, interpreting.
- 2) The goal for the interviews is to gather consumer input about VRI interpreting. The goal is NOT to gather information about any particular call center or service provider.
- 3) All information will be kept strictly confidential. All results of the project will be reported in ways which ensure that no individual is identified, nor will any comments be linked to a specific person. The tapes will be only be viewed by members of the NCIEC Interpreting Via Video Committee staff and consultants.
- 4) Dr. Julie Simon, President of The Language Door, has been retained as a consultant to this project for the purposes of data review and summary.

Please provide this information to the interviewee in either written or verbal form:

The NCIEC Interpreting via Video Work Team is focused on identifying common needs, issues, and practice of Video Remote Interpreting settings. The Work Team's initial analysis will provide input to interpreter education regarding essential educational and training needs of interpreters working in video settings. Your participation in this survey will help us further this work.

For purposes of this survey, Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) is defined as a fee based interpreting service where at least one person (the interpreter, the Deaf person or the hearing person) is at a distance. Thus, the interpreter may be located with the Deaf person(s) with the hearing person(s) at a remote location; the interpreter may be located with the hearing person(s) with the Deaf person(s) at a remote location; or the Deaf and hearing people may be together with the interpreter at a remote location.

Currently, VRI is being used in a variety of settings.

Interview Questions

1. Please state your name, city/state of residence.
2. How often do you use a video remote interpreter?
3. Do you use VRI interpreters mostly for work? School? Business? Personal?
4. Do you also use VRS interpreting?
5. What are some of the differences between using a video remote interpreter (VRI) and using an interpreter in Video Relay settings (VRS)?
6. What are some of the differences between using a video remote interpreter (VRI) and using an interpreter in face-to-face settings?
7. What are two or three challenges that you face when you use a video remote interpreter?
8. Do you set up a appointment with the video remote interpreter or do you use a video remote interpreter on-demand?
9. Are you able to pick the interpreter?
10. Who pays for the interpreter?
11. What are three important qualities for a video remote interpreter to have?
12. Do you feel you can fully participate during a VRI appointment?
13. Are there any topics that do not work well using a video remote interpreter?
14. What kind of preparation do you think a video remote interpreter should do?
15. Are you able to prepare with or meet with the interpreter before the VRI appointment?
16. Are you able to debrief with the interpreter after a video remote interpreted appointment?
17. Do you ever work with a Deaf interpreter on a VRI appointment? If so, how is that arranged and how does that work?
18. Is it important for the interpreter to match your linguistic and cultural needs?

19. Does the interpreter ever use Consecutive Interpreting during a VRI appointment?
If so, are you comfortable with this process?

20. Do you have any additional comments about using a video remote interpreter?

Thank you for your time and input.