<u>Russell Malcolm Presentation: Meaning & Interpreter Education</u>

>>:   Hi everybody. My name is Betsy Winston. I want to thank Deborah and Karen for inviting me to the class.

I'm excited to be talking to you, and I'm not quite sure what the best way to do this video presentation is, so I'm just going to show you some PowerPoint slides. I'm going to take some time to talk about them, and I will let you either have the slides in front of you or watch this on the computer screen, whichever you prefer.

I'm not going to make too many stops to correct or change things. I'm just going to pretend like you're sitting right out there in front of me. So with that, I'll get started.

Just a little bit about myself. As I said, my name is Betsy Winston. I'm the director of the TIEM Centre, that's T-I-E-M. That stands for Teaching Interpreting Educators & Mentors. I've been doing this for about ten years now. And how did I get here? Well, I, long ago, many, many years ago, about 1970, went to college and majored in French. And when I finished there, I went to the Peace Corps and spent two and a half years in Togo West Africa, which is a Francophone country.

When I came back to the States, I wanted to continue using other languages, but French is not one that gets used in the United States very often, so I began to learn American Sign Language. And from a mere year and a half of learning American Sign Language, which was really probably signed English, I went straight into an

interpreter training program in Portland, Oregon, and from there graduated and became an educational interpreter.

After some time doing that, I became an educator and then I became a researcher. So that's the long story made very short.

My focus is primarily discourse analysis, and I'll explain what that is in a little bit. And if you want more information about me or about any of the work that I've done, you can go to my website, which is linked at the bottom of the PowerPoint slide, and that's www.tiemcentre.org. With that, I'll move on to the next slide.

The topics that I've been asked to talk about tonight are on the PowerPoint. They're sort of general topics. I was asked to talk about meaning-based interpretation, what does that mean. And so I'm going to talk about that in terms of consecutive interpreting, of course, because one of the great focuses of consecutive interpreting is getting the meaning more correct than we do in simultaneous interpreting.

In order to talk about that particular thing a little more, I'm going to spend some time talking about what meaning in interpreting means and the different meanings that it has for different people and for different approaches.

You've already read some of that. I know that you read the Wilcox and Shaffer article which, I have to say, when I found out that this was the text and you were reading that article, I took a bit of a trip down memory lane, and you will see some of that throughout the presentation.

I think the argument that Wilcox and Shaffer make about the conduit

model of meaning is tremendous, and so I will come back to that again and again tonight.

I'll talk about discourse in general. I will talk about some thoughts related to static versus dynamic meaning and what that means for interpreting.

I'll talk about product and process and what we teach, what we focus on. And I'll also talk about some of those various approaches like form and function and impact and how that relates to meaning and interpreting.

After that, I will move on to a brief talk about interpreter education curriculum as we move into the 21st century, briefly touching on invasion in education in general and what that means, what's been going on in your field, from my perspective, and in our work and how all of that ties together to our approach of teaching meaning as the basis for interpretation.

I know that seems to be kind of a broad field, and when I was first asked to talk about this, I came up with about a semester and a half of topics, so I'm going to try to be brief and yet cover some things that I think are important.

Again, I'm not here to be dogmatic or to tell you what's right or wrong or give you a data-based introduction to the field of interpreter education. I'm here to give you some ponderings and thoughts of my own after 30 some years in the field and to talk about where we are and how we, as educators, can bring an emphasis on meaning-based interpretation.

Okay. So I see I cut my head off a little bit in that last section.

I've tried to adjust the camera a bit as I'm going along, so let's see how this works.

I want to talk just a little bit about discourse analysis, since that's my primary focus for both research and education.

On this slide, I've listed the primary tenets, if you will, of discourse analysis. One reason I wanted to do this is because in the Wilcox and Shaffer article you read about cognitive linguistics. And I think many of the approaches between discourse analysis and cognitive linguistics are very similar.

So I'll go over these tenets one at a time here, but then I will go through them in more detail in the next few slides.

So just sort of as a general overview, in discourse analysis we look at natural data, because we believe that they are very important. Language is natural, and that's how we, as interpreters, approach language.
Discourse analysts come from the perspective that discourse is interactive. We think that meaning emerges and is built through the interaction through the discourse. And we believe that all parts of the language are important to building that meaning.

You'll see a couple of different approaches that I've talked about and I will talk about. For example, the locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary approach of -- sorry, I can't see it behind my paper. You'll see the locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary approach introduced first by Austin.

We will also just briefly, briefly talk about the transactional interactional approach by Brown and Yule of 1983.

And we'll talk a little bit about form, function, and intent and how all of that impacts meaning and, therefore, interpretation.

And now we'll go onto the next slide.

On this slide, you see the first two tenets that I mentioned. First of all, natural data are important, and for discourse analysts, using natural data to study, to work from, is the primary goal. We can't always do it, but we try.

And I think that's important and relevant to us as interpreters, because we encounter language naturally when we're working. We don't get little pieces. We don't get to look at small chunks. We get it from beginning to end, start to finish as it's being built in the minds of the interactants.

And you can see my attempts to show the progress. It's not always straight in the building of meaning. We take curves, we go on and off topic, but we do encounter discourse as interpreters naturally and in a temporal fashion. And so that's why I like the approach of discourse analysis for us as interpreters.

The second tenet on this slide is that discourse is interactive. In the Wilcox and Shaffer article, I know they mentioned the discussion -- controversy, I think is too strong a term for it -- but the discussion that, you know, we have monologues and we have interaction and some programs separate them, even though they really all happen together. Other programs don't. But we've talked about interactive and monologic interpreting especially in our teaching and courses and so forth.

So the thing that I like about discourse analysis is that it doesn't

make that distinction as such, that separation. Much like they talked about in cognitive linguistics, all discourse is interactive, and as you see by this slide, monologues have audiences, and I think there are probably very few instances of a monologue that you can think of that isn't aimed at someone. Even a book is written to an audience, so there really is some intent of interaction there.

On the other end of the continuum, you would have interaction which is really pretty much an interacting set of mini monologues. They may be long, they may be short, but they are small monologues each time a person takes a turn.

So we really, in discourse analysis, don't see interactive and monologic as two separate types of interpreting. They are all on a continuum, depending on how much of a single term there is and how much of other terms there are and how much the speaker is trying to get interaction, even if it's a lecture of this sort. I'm still hoping that I'll get some head nods as you're watching or some smiles or whatever, so there's still always that intent to have an audience.

And likewise, in an interaction, there is still always an intent for me to have my own turn and, thus, have a series of flip flopping interactive monologues, if you will.

The next tenet that I want to talk about is the idea that meaning emerges. And so what is meaning? Meaning is that picture, that understanding, that thought that we each have in our heads that tells us what something means. It's the message.

We each have a different meaning of things. Even though we may both

have the same idea of a dog or a cat or whatever, for each of us, what we see in our heads or what we think of as a dog is somewhat different. It just is.

And as we talk to each other, we begin to build meaning about what each of us thinks of as a dog and eventually we come to an understanding, maybe a mutual understanding, if you will, still not always the same in each of our heads but much closer, so that's what we mean by building meaning.

It's not a static process. Meaning is not something that just happens. Like in the lower picture, you see the computerized sense of transferring data. It goes and comes from a central source back and forth. We assume that the data on each device is going to be exactly the same, no changes.

Meaning, on the other hand, is going to be much more like the puzzle globe that's being built one piece at a time, and as it comes together in each of our heads and together, we get a picture.

So that -- I hope that's making sense, the difference between an emerging meaning that's built over time and a static meaning that is passed on from one person to another.

That's what Wilcox and Shaffer were talking about with meaning as a conduit model. Meaning is the static thing that's just handed off like data from one computer to another.

That's not what we think about meaning as being in discourse analysis, and I think it's essential for us to shift to the idea that meaning is dynamic as interpreters and interpreter educators.

The last tenet that I want the talk about is the idea that all

parts of language are important to building meaning. That may seem sort of common sense, but depending on your approach and your focus in interpreting, we don't always look at all parts of language or of communication acts.

And just to give you a broad sense of many different approaches, discourse analysis is a pretty young field, actually. But over the last 50 or 60 years, there have been several different approaches and perspectives to how we communicate.

The first one that I'll talk about really is Austin from 1968, sorry, I'm looking at my PowerPoint slides here. His idea was to talk about communication as having three different facets, the locutionary, the illocutionary, perlocutionary aspects.

Locutionary aspect is really the words as they come out of your mouth. He was talking about spoken language, obviously. So that old example of it's cold in here. A statement, it's simply stating the temperature.

Illocutionary is the intent of that statement. So maybe I'm stating simply that it's cold in here, but I could also be intending to say could somebody turn up the heat, please? So the words are a statement. My intent as the speaker was really a question.

And then perlocutionary tends to be thought of as the impact of my statement on others. So the first two, locutionary and illocutionary, still very much focussed primarily on me as the speaker.

Perlocutionary begins to take into account the other person. What is the impact of my comment, my words on someone? Did someone

turn up the heat? Did someone ignore me? Did someone respond back that, no, it's not hot in here, it's cold.

So that's the sense of a broader view of discourse as taking in the whole interaction.

Moving down to the next type of approach or perspective, Brown and Yule's perspective in 1983 talked about transactional and interactional factors important to understanding communication or discourse.

Transactional they talk about as the information that's being exchanged, if you will, the content of what I'm saying to you. So again, the idea that two speakers are involved. It's not focussed just on the speaker but on both people.

And then the interactional piece of that brings into play the idea of social relationships and personal feelings.

So am I the teacher to a student? Am I a doctor to a patient? Am I a client to an attorney? What are the different social relationships that are being balanced through the discourse and as the discourse is emerging?

And personal features and ideas are things like my idea of myself. I'm a woman. I'm middle aged. I'm a teacher. I'm living in the West. I mean all those kinds of things that impact the way I want to present myself to you. I'm trying to make myself look friendly and be understandable.

So those are also things that are always impacting my choices of words, hand gestures, all sorts of things, every time I speak. Every time I listen to the other person, I judge what I need to

change, adjust, whatever.

So those are the personal issues that I think about in interaction and in discourse, and all of these are happening at the same time. There is not one or the other. They are not discrete. They are overlapping.

Another approach that I have on this page is sort of unnamed. It's more Schiffrin, Deborah Schiffrin in 1987 talking about discourse marker, Tannen talking about frames, and it's really talking about the form, the function, and the intent of any piece of discourse or text.

I've included a chapter from my dissertation that talks about this in summary, so you can read more about that later.

On this slide I want to talk about Hymes, really it's a research tool or an analysis tool that he put out in 1974. It's the speaking pneumonic, if you will, and it's built around the word speaking. He's come up with words to talk about the various factors that we, as discourse analysts, need to think about when we're analyzing interaction or discourse.

And as you can see from the slide, each letter of the word speaking has a meaning. So "S" refers to situation.

"P" refers to the participants involved and that we need to think about them.

"E" talks about the ends or goals of the communication, so how do they fit into the word choices, sentence structures, etc. that people are using in an interaction.

"A" stands for acts. What are the speech acts, and that

includes not just the words but gesture, etc., etc. as well.

"K" talks about the key or the tone. So how is it delivered? Was it sarcastic? Was it funny? Was it light-hearted? Was it sad?

"I" stands for instrumentality or the channel. Are we speaking? Are we signing? Are we gesturing? What are the different channels that communication is happening through?

"N" talks about the norms of communication. And "G", the cultural and traditional genres. So again, genres are a piece of this, but they all fit together to talk about the whole of meaning and that meaning as it emerges throughout interaction. On the next few slides I just want to illustrate, as best I can, I tried to be a little more interactive but I couldn't figure out all the movements and animation, so it's just some illustrations of what we mean when we say that meaning is dynamic and emerging. In this first slide you see two people walking along, and in each one's mind is an idea. Now, they seem to be communicating fairly well and building a fairly similar idea about the meaning that discussing.

So the person on the -- the green person that you see has an image of this Trefoil knot. It's not completely formed. They're still discussing it. Words are going between the two of them, and the person in blue is forming an image in pieces, again, of the ideas that the first person is discussing.

Now, you'll see that they're very similar in some way, same kinds of colour, same kind of 3D shape. The person on the -- the blue person has not quite got the idea of the Trefoil knot, the three knots in

this, it's still just a circle, but it's a 3D circle.

So they're getting to where they're building a similar image or similar meaning of this idea, and they're using words to do it. That's what I'm trying to demonstrate here.

On this slide you'll see that the person -- the green person still has the same idea that they're building with all the different features we've talked about from Hymes, Tannen, Schiffrin, and so forth, still using words to talk about this idea.

The blue person is building an idea that has many of the same pieces and parts. This person is getting the idea of a Trefoil knot, but for whatever reason, whatever their background, their own knowledge, their own filters, their own use of language and their own interests, instead of getting a 3D image in many colours, this person is beginning to build an image that is flatter and with only a few colours.

Whether they will ever every develop a more similar idea of what they're talking about or whether they are both happy to go along with the idea as it fits into their realities is something we don't know.

But I just wanted to demonstrate with this that we can still communicate pretty well even though we may end up with different ways to fit the information into our own lives and into our own realities.

This next slide is just another image of the same green person with the same idea talking to the blue person, but this time the blue person has not only taken the idea of the green person but they're

building, again from their own realities and from all the different parts and pieces that they bring to the conversation, they're building their own even more complex and more sophisticated understanding of the topic.

Again, just another way that we build meaning as we're communicating from one person to another.

And one final slide, lest we think that communication always works well. It's just to demonstrate that you can have somewhat similar meanings and ideas but two completely different realities about that idea, about the meaning that you're trying to convey.

And you can be in complete disagreement about what you're talking about or complete misunderstanding about what you're talking about even though you have many of the same pieces, the same shape, but something is just going wrong. And I think it's always important for us, as interpreters, to understand that meaning can go awry as well as build and emerge. And it may be the misunderstanding that builds and emerges as some people go along. I just wanted to throw that one in there.

On this next slide I want to move on to the impact of the type of meaning we've been talking about, dynamic, emerging meaning as it fits into our ideas of interpreting, and so this slide is entitled Meaning Interpreted.

And if you'll recall the idea of meaning as static in the Wilcox and Shaffer article, for example, they talk about the conduit model of meaning. So that we, as interpreters, have gotten rid of the conduit model of our role but are still holding onto this conduit

model of meaning, static, something that's transferred, and they argue against it in their article. And I bring it up because I think they make a great argument.

And this image just really speaks to me about that conduit model of interpreting. Two heads, a wire from one head to the next, and interpreting is seen as taking a static meaning and simply sending it over to the other head.

That's what I see as the static model of meaning, and I agree completely with Wilcox and Shaffer that it's something we need to get rid of along with the conduit model of interpreting.

The next couple of slides are, again, just my effort to illustrate in some way what happens when we think of meaning as dynamic and then think about interpreting it.

So we have one person on the left who has an image that they're trying to get across. We have the interpreter in the middle. And that image, that meaning is trying to be explained to the other person on the right .

The interpreter gets the vision of the more flattened shape, still the curves and the movement and the colours and so forth, and the person on the right who is finally building the image and, as they interact back and forth, coming up with the rounded but 3D version.

The pink clouds are intended to mean that they are all coming at this with similar world views. They're getting a pretty good understanding. The interpreter has a fairly good understanding of what's happening. Even given all of that, we're still going to find

differences in the meanings that each person has so that the interpreters meaning will have an impact on what the two people understand as they build back and forth.

I also wanted to mention here, I had said that coming back to some of these discussions about meaning had taken me on a walk down memory lane. And I'd gone back to my dissertation and I found some information that I had written before, twenty years ago.

One of the things that came to mind when I was thinking about this whole topic of meaning is the work of Eugene Nida. He was a Bible translator, and in 1964 he wrote about the ideas of dynamic equivalence and formal equivalence.

I'm just thinking now and I always go back to thinking about Nida and his ideas of dynamic equivalence for interpreting and what that can mean for us. And that basically means you are trying to get the same message, as much as possible, across to the audience regardless of the form.

Again, as much as we talk about meaning and equivalence and all the rest, I still go back to Nida as one of the foundations for my thinking on meaning and equivalence.

This last slide is just one more illustration of interpreting meaning when we think of it being dynamic when, again, it doesn't go as well as we might hope.

When the person with the blue thought cloud is trying to convey a meeting about this Trefoil knot, the interpreter with the yellowish green thought cloud doesn't really have the same background and knowledge and understanding. And so they're getting a different

kind of version, still getting a lot of the idea, still getting the Trefoil knot, still getting interactive pieces, but still not quite getting it.

And then the person on the right with the purple cloud really not getting it because of who knows what. Maybe if the two of them were still talking together on the left and the right they would come up with the same misunderstands.

But with the interpreter in the middle, we know for sure that the sort of greenish, yellowish upside down black idea with the green, the yellows is very different and really not parallel to the person with the blue thought cloud. Even though they think they're talking about the same things, they're coming up with different meanings.

This is what we mean by dynamic. This is why misunderstands happen. This is why we can come away from the same conversation with two different ideas about what we've talked about.

And this is how meaning is built through interaction. So we need to think about the impact of that as we teach interpreting and think about what we're looking for as the target of our interpretations, the target form of our interpretations.

With this, I want to move on to the next part of my talk that is talking about innovation and education in our field and how this fits into us, as educators, how do we handle this idea of meaning and, of course, how it ties into teaching consecutive interpreting as part of the whole picture.

On this slide I'm hoping to move from the idea of meaning to the ideas and concepts I was asked to talk about in terms of our field

and in education. And at the top of the slide, you see I'm just talking about innovation and education.

A general rule of thumb, if you will, whenever something is introduced into education, from the innovation to the complete change in people's minds, it can be a process of 20 years. So there's a long ramping up to implementing and then actually making a change.

I say that so that we're not overwhelmed or disappointed when we don't see change happening quickly in our field, because it doesn't happen in education in general.

When we think about interpreting education, we can think about some of the changes that we've been through from community-based apprenticeships and interactions with deaf people to a more academy-based that is based in the institutions of higher learning, ITPs, IEPs, whatever you want to call them.

We have become more and more academy-based, and most of our formal programs are in academies and institutions and colleges, etc. But the programs themselves are not necessarily quite as academy-based as we would hope. Just because they're located in colleges and universities doesn't mean that the programs themselves have become totally academic.

We still aren't always introducing effective practices. We aren't always introducing research-based practices. We don't necessarily have curricula that are cohesive and well thought out, and I'll get to that in a moment.

We aren't always fit carefully into the academic world so that our

faculty and so forth aren't always the equals of PhDs and the other programs in the academy.

So our field is making its move into the academy, and I don't think it's going to stop. I think we'll continue progressing.

We've been doing this for, gosh, 30, maybe even 40 years, in fact, probably 50 years, but we're not completely there yet.

Then if we think about interpreting educators, even as our programs moved into institutions of higher learning, our faculty haven't moved in nearly as quickly. So while a program may still be in a university, there may be no faculty who have anything beyond a bachelor's degree.

Now we are seeing more and more people like yourselves working for master's degrees, and yet we still need people moving on towards PhDs.

So our faculty within those academy-based programs are a little further behind in moving into the academy, into using research, into using effective practices. We're still bringing our seat-of-the-pants kind of approaches into the classrooms. We're not always looking at research as the way to inform our teaching, nor are we looking at our teaching to be studied as research.

So that's kind of -- I want to share that whole picture with you, because I think it has to inform how we think about meaning-based interpreting, how that's being taught, how we can teach it, whether we're teaching in a program, whether we're doing workshops, whether we're mentoring, whether we are teaching at an

agency.

So I hope that makes sense. Of course please feel free to send me questions if you have any about this, because I know I've done it pretty briefly.

On this slide, as I mentioned before, as we have educators coming into programs, we have lots of people coming in with lots of pieces. Some of them are excellent. Some of them work really well without any research behind them, and we hope to build research to prove that they are effective. Other things have been researched that really don't work very well in terms of teaching. But we do now have lots of pieces.

A couple of years ago I was asked to write an article on effective practices in interpreting and interpreting education, where we've been, where we are now, and where we are going. And I started out with kind of a negative opinion, knowing that it had been 50, 60 years since we'd begun talking about this, knowing that people were doing all sorts of things. There wasn't much of anything out there. But indeed, as I began reviewing, looking at things, looking at practices, looking at resources, at this point in our field, we have lots and lots of resources. Not as many as we could use, but we have plenty of resources.

I'm sitting in my office giving this presentation, and as I look at my reading chair across the room, I see about 40 books stacked up that I have to read to catch up on, information that's been out for two or three years that I've skimmed that I haven't had the chance to read yet.

When I started 30 some years ago, I knew every resource, every article, every person working in the field. I knew it by heart. And now we have tons of things, videos, websites, teachers, teaching practices. We have lots of things, lots of ideas, but there's very little coherence to them.

As I pull together classes, I often feel like I'll pulling things out of the air, a piece here, a piece there, and I think that's where we are right now in our teaching in general in interpreting education.

As I said before, there are many ideas out there for us to teach with and for programs to use, but they rarely -- they don't always form a really coherent picture. Some programs have more coherence than others. Some teachers' approaches have more coherence than others.

So some, as you see, and I'm thinking now more about programs, some programs will adopt a fairly sensical approach to skill development, for example. And so this puzzle sort of shows, you know, a lot of pieces coming together with maybe one or two pieces being fit in. Not always the case, but some programs do have that kind of overall structure.

Some programs that have more coherence, more of an overall structure, have general curricular goals that they actually strive to meet. Whatever they're teaching, they have an overall enveloping sense or philosophy of critical thinking as essential to everything they do within their curriculum.

Demand control schema is an approach that focuses on critical

thinking as a whole and how critical thinking can be developed across the curriculum. So that would be a curricular goal that would be essential to develop critical thinking in our students. Another goal would be to develop a goal that discourse is dynamic, that it is everywhere, that it affects everything we do when we communicate, and that it is every part of our interactions every day. And that is also infused across the curriculum.

And the third point there is actually saying just that. It's infused throughout the curriculum as opposed to programs that have a class in fingerspelling, a class in classifiers, a class in bits and pieces that's not really cohesive or connected.

And finally, another curricular goal that we would hope to see or I would hope to see is that the interactions that are happening with students amongst the deaf community are valuable, things like service learning as a way to have a valuable contribution to the community rather than just going out and observing and spending three hours watching a movie that's done in sign language.

Which are the more valuable piece? And I'm not going to say that any of that is not valuable. But which are the pieces that we encourage across the entire curriculum? So a cohesive program would be having these kinds of goals over the whole program.

Serving these curricular goals, we would hope to find some kind of curricular structure, and this is a place where I've just begun musing a bit for myself trying to pull together categories. I'm not real comfortable with everything I have just yet, but it's just something to think about.

Some of the different curricular structures we see across the country, again, right or wrong, good or bad, and I am speaking more about the United States. I can't speak so much for Canada or Europe or South America or Australia, but in the States, we see some structures that are kind of coalescing into slightly different ones. So we might see a focus or a goal that was really looking at interpreting process, and so their courses are structured to think about the interpreting process.

So they will often follow a developmental or an additive process, if you will, starting with pre-interpreting, then translation, consecutive interpreting, and "simultaneous interpreting".

You'll see I've put simultaneous interpreting in quotes, because it's not really simultaneous interpreting. We're always listening and then signing or signing and then speaking. So again, I've put that in parenthesis -- sorry, in quotes.

And I call that an additive process, because each of those stages adds one more level of difficulty to the interpreting process as we are teaching it.

Now, again, as we have talked in the past and as you've been talking in this class, consecutive interpreting is probably the best way to get the best quality interpretation that's still live as opposed to translation, which may give us a lot of time to come up with an even better interpretation.

But consecutive interpreting in the spontaneous living world is often the way that we can get the best quality interpretation.

Simultaneous interpreting adds the extra difficulty of time pressure, and with that, we often lose some quality in the message that we're interpreting.

Other programs may focus on the interpreting process talking about courses that go from source language to target language. Some people call that sign to voice, voice to sign.

    And just a little bit on the bit of positive evidence that things are changing, those used to be called expressive and receptive.

In my day, when we first started, they were called interpreting and reverse interpreting. So changes do happen in education. They are, as I say, sometimes very slow.

Another way to look at curricular structure is a focus on the settings rather than on the interpreting process. So you will find programs that focus on educational interpreting, medical interpreting, legal interpreting, and that's where you might also find a focus on monologue versus interactive.

So those are just some of the structures that I've been pondering. There are others out there. There are different ways to look at it, but these are some of the structures that we see typically see across interpreting programs.

Given the discussion about curricular goals and structures, whatever a program's or an agency's or whatever mentoring program's goals and structures are, there are some things that we want to look at all the time as either if we're program directors or educators within a program to judge how well -- how cohesively the program is being

held together.

We're looking for comprehensiveness, essential processes like critical thinking, decision-making, self-assessment are applied across the curriculum. They are applied to foundational subjects like roles and discourse -- they're discourse-centred rather than just discourse-based. I don't know if I made that distinction before.

But when I think of discourse-centred, I mean big picture of discourse study. Discourse based pretty much anything we do, a fingerspelling class is discourse-based, because fingerspelling happens in discourse.

A class in, you know, classifiers, if you will, classifiers happen in discourse, so it would be a discourse-based class. But is the curriculum as a whole discourse-focussed or discourse-centred? So that's a distinction I like to make.

Is the curriculum cohesive, introduced and reinforced across the curriculum? Is it based on evidence-based practice, research that demonstrates or supports that the things that are being done, the practices, the resources, etc., are really useful in producing effective results?

We also then need to think about things like whether the program itself is practical and feasible, replicable, sustainable. Because even if it's a wonderful program on paper, if it's not practical, if it can't be replicated anywhere else and if it's not sustainable, it's probably not going to be a very useful place or long-term kind of place to work. And I'll go into some of those ideas in the next

slides.

In the last slide I mentioned that a program might have all the features on paper, but some of the issues like practicality and feasibility may make it impossible or impractical to implement. And, again, I will get back to how this is related to meaning and consecutive interpreting in particular.

But many of the things that we need in the field and we need for programs are things that are either not, practically speaking, there, may not be feasible, and may or may not be able to be replicated within any given program.

Some of the things that we do have for our programs are things like standards and guidelines. We have the CIT interpreter education standards that were passed in 1994, almost 20 years ago, that have become the CCIE accreditation process.

Meaning-based interpreting is a foundation of that, implicitly or explicitly. And so programs that are going for accreditation are looking to be including meaning-based or meaning-centred translation and interpretation, rather than sort of the spotty kinds of some of this, some of that sorts of approaches to teaching interpreting. Some curriculum -- some curricula, some programs are attempting, as best they can, to implement effective practices. In the field we really don't have a lot of identified effective practices. That's something that we, as educators, need to be working on as well. Another thing that makes programs somewhat impractical or not replicable or not very feasible are the availability of qualified faculty.

You may have a wonderful program on paper. If you can't find the faculty to teach in those programs, if you can't find faculty who understand about meaning-centred interpretation, who understand about consecutive interpreting's value in the overall picture, you won't be able to replicate some of those programs in places where you're working.

Qualified students is a final issue that we don't often talk about. We often take whoever we can get. Some programs have entry level language skills and knowledge-based skills, many don't. That means that we can't teach through to the end of a meaning-based curriculum if we don't have students who work with language in a meaningful way.

If your students are still asking what the sign for or what the word for is in English or ASL, yes, of course words have meaning and signs have meaning, but again, that's that spotty sort of little bits and pieces of meaning-centred curriculum and meaning-centred interpreting rather than looking at the big picture overall.

The last thing on this particular slide is one that we've begun to address in some areas. The question of program exit levels needed to graduate from a program or a class or your mentoring program or whatever you're working with not being equal to what is required to enter practice, so become a professional interpreter.

These are issues that affect interpreting, interpreting education, affect our programs and our curricula across the board.

And so, again, these are things if we have them, great. If we don't have them, implementing a cohesive, comprehensive interpreter

program that includes the aspects that we want such as meaning-centred interpretation practices may or may not be possible. And finally, even if we have all of the pieces together, we may have a very comprehensive, cohesive curriculum, but when we look at a program in and of itself, we see that on paper it's all there, we have qualified faculty, we have great students, we still see that parts and pieces of it begin to fall away as different courses are taught.

One teacher may be teaching translation, consecutive and simultaneous interpreting all within a single semester. Another one may be expecting translation to happen later.

Another one may think that consecutive interpreting already happened. Another may think that it's not important or that meaning is not as important as getting the students' hands moving.

So when you begin looking at a program overall, unless it's carefully managed and monitored, the pieces that bring together a full meaning -centred interpreting mentality and focus still tend to fall out and drop out. And we have blanks in places where we need to have cohesion and connection.

Again, this goes back to us, as teachers, learning about meaning-centred interpreting and interpreting practices and talking about where and how we can think about teaching that as we go out into the world.

I know I've gone through some of this pretty quickly, and I hope I've able to make the connections.

It's often easier when there's somebody out there with a puzzled

look on their face, so I know I've missed a connection somewhere. I hope you will send me your questions. Ask whatever you want to ask to fill in your gaps.

One of the final questions that I was asked to talk about are trends that I've seen in the past and coming into this year and the future, both in teaching meaning-centred interpreting and in interpreting education in general.

So first I'll just muse a little bit on the trends in teaching meaning-centred interpreting. One of the aspects that really has an impact on whether or not we can teach meaning-centred interpreting is where we're teaching.

Pre-service programs like IEPs, if they are built with a structure that builds meaning-centred interpreting into the curriculum throughout, we have a really great chance of working, teaching one of those classes, and finding out where our class fits into the overall picture.

If a program does not necessarily have a very meaning-centred interpreting approach, then I've found that it's really hard, and I'm not quite sure how to say this, but I've found that it's really hard to walk into a two-year interpreting program, try to introduce the idea of meaning-centred interpreting into a single course, and have the students really buy into it.

They don't have to think about it in other courses. They don't have to worry about overall pictures and consecutive to -- and simultaneous and where one works better than the other, what the qualities and benefits of each are.

And I know, as I was walking down memory lane doing some of this, I found my chapter in my dissertation about meaning-based emergent interaction where meaning is being built.

I wrote my dissertation 20 years ago. The fact that I taught that for a long time, I've often dropped it from classes, from workshops, etc. because it is so hard to bring such a huge concept into a small time and space.

So, again, I think my point is if you're in a program or an area or with a group of people who already understand this, it's much easier to bring into your own teaching than if you're working with a program that doesn't focus on meaning and focuses more on action, on movement, on words, and any other kinds of approaches we might see.

If we're teaching in post-service settings such as workshops or mentoring people or working at an agency, sometimes we have a little more flexibility to bring in meaning-based teaching practices, and sometimes we don't. That depends a lot on who the audience is.

If you have an audience of people who are already thinking about meaning-centred interpreting practices, then you can walk in and teach a course on consecutive interpreting that's going to go over well, because people are already convinced that meaning is important and that meaning is built and dynamic and not a static thing that's just passed on without any real thought other than interpreting.

I know that's not clear. It doesn't make sense. But it's very difficult if people don't come in with that mindset to teach about consecutive interpreting or any kind of meaning-centred interpreting before you step back establish that concept in peoples' minds.

The same with mentoring, although of course, if you are running your own mentoring business, you can establish the parameters and tell the mentees that your working with what your philosophies are, and so you can bring meaning-centred interpreting in. You can bring consecutive interpreting practice in to your own mentoring practices much more easily.

And the other place where there's a lot of training going on that I think we don't talk about very much are the agencies, the interpreting agencies.

Many of them are bringing in their own trainers, their own educators, and they will have a lot of latitude in what they can teach and how they set up their programs.

Often times, in fact, you will have an interpreting program in an institution and an interpreting service in an institution. The interpreting program faculty don't work with the interpreting service.

The interpreting service has their own trainers and mentors and puts on their own workshops, and so you could find a very different set of philosophies and approaches even within the same institution. But again, that is a place where we may be able to find people who are either more open to learning about a new concept and having a whole new approach brought to them or who have already brought it into this smaller group because of their own backgrounds and experiences.

I'm not sure that this last slide is completely on topic, but I wanted to ponder just a little bit the trends in interpreting

education that I've seen. Again, this is not data-based, it's just my own personal opinion, so I'm sharing it with that caveat in mind. One of the trends obviously that we're seeing are higher levels of formal education in interpreting educators. So like you, more people are going for master's degrees, more people are going for PhDs, and that in and of itself brings more research into the field, which fortunately for us will bring more evidence-based practices into the field.

At the same time, with more and more people coming in and working within specific institutions or agencies, I do also see, sadly, more siloing, if you will. The more people get out there and settle into a place, the more we begin to be focussed on our own work and we become less and less aware of what other people are doing.

I'd love to see a whole lot more interaction, more networking. It's one of the goals of my business is to promote that and build that. It's just sad to me, again, I think I said earlier when I started I knew everyone and everything that was going on. Now I don't. And it's partly human nature, but I hope that we can learn how to share more comfortably and more effectively amongst all of us, because there are many, many wonderful ideas out there.

Other trends that I'm seeing, less animosity amongst people. In the olden days, there were people standing up on stages yelling at each other, using negative language, putting each other down, telling people that their ideas weren't any good.

I see much less of that in the last 15 years or so, and I'm really, really glad to see that, a lot more collaboration, if you

will, when we get together, which again, sort of is balanced by this whole idea of siloing and how often we do get together and who gets together when "we" get together. Who doesn't come when we get together?

I see less sharing. That goes back a little bit to the siloing idea. We do our work. We are satisfied. We're happy with what we're doing. We don't get out and do presentations. We don't share the work.

As educators, we don't do the research we need to do on our work so that we can then share it as an effective practice. I'd love to see more of that.

And, again, I think these are probably all interrelated. I see less coherence in the field. Many more single ideas popping up all over, great ideas, interesting ideas, some evidence-based, some not, but there's no tying of them all together into not even a single theory, but a few interrelated, overlapping ideas and theories that we can all learn from.

So I see that happening, and I hope that we can come to a place where there is more sharing, more coordinated effort to know or to make available the information that we have out there.

On this slide, I just have something for you to ponder. I've set it up with a little animation. I don't know whether it will work on this recording that we're doing, but the slide says to ponder.

Given that meaning is dynamic and that interpreting meaning is dynamic, what is the impact of this on the assessment of interpreted meaning?

I leave you with that question. Looking forward to coming back in the fall to talking about it in the assessment course.

In the next slide you'll see some contact information. Thank you all very much for having me in your class, and I'm looking forward to any questions or comments that you might have.

Thank you, and have a good week.