

Deaf Translation: Socio-Cultural Perspective

Eileen Forestal

Janis Cole

Abstract

Since antiquity, translation has been an area of inquiry for scholars and is generally regarded as being foundational to Interpreting Studies (Pöchhacker, 2004). Goethe (1827) wrote “Whatever one may say about the inadequacies of translating, it is and continues to be one of the most important and honorable occupations in the world.” Kiraly (2000) stated that after more than 50 years of translating studies at universities in Europe, education focused on teaching translation was moving away from a “‘conduit’ view of learning (Kiraly, 2005, p. 1098), due to the rapid expansion of technology which provided a gamut of research and pedagogy on methods and theories related to teaching translation as well as demands for more translation.

Keywords: deaf translation, socio-cultural perspective

Deaf Translation: Socio-Cultural Perspective

Before proceeding on the discussion on translation, it is important to be on the same page on the difference between translation and interpretation. Cole (2016) offered a brief description on the difference: “Translation typically involves written text [wherein] the translator has a period of time in which to analyze the text, consider its meaning, conduct background research, discuss their work with others, and make revisions before producing the final [draft of the translation set for the audience]” (p. 7). On interpretation, Cole explained, based on Gile (2009), that it “is characterized by working in a situation of immediate transmission that is either spoken or signed” (p.7). Furthermore, it is necessary to clarify the difference between translation and sight translation which is seemingly now being labeled as an ‘hybrid’ of interpretation and translation. “An individual renders a frozen [or a written] source message into a live re-expression in the target language [for a specific audience in its immediate setting]” (Cole, 2016, 8). These two terms, translation and sight translation, are not to be considered as interchangeable.

Up to approximately 2005, there had been very little research or empirical documentation of those who had actually lived the experience of doing this type of translation work, nor had there been any explicit discussion of the influence on their practice of translation of from written English to American Sign Language (ASL) or ASL to spoken language or both. Sign Language (SL) translation is nowadays a field of growing interest to major groups and individuals in translation. The past 18 years have seen a burst of interest on Deaf Translation; in other words, translation from written English to American Sign Language (ASL) by Deaf persons. Stone’s (2005) research on Deaf translators seemingly was ground-breaking, followed by (Boudreault (2005), Adam (2008), Adam, Carty, & Stone (2011), and others. Stone (2005), in his pioneering work related to Deaf translation, declared that the “Deaf translator norm” (p. 127) was a means to assure that Deaf people would receive the translation that was “a parallel understanding of the information ... through a clear mental picture” (p. 129) that was a Deaf culturally form of translation (p. 122), in other words, “a Deaf way of thinking” (p. 125). The interviewees who were Deaf interpreters in Stone’s (2005) research stressed that the translation was “culturally sensitive and appropriate for the audience” (p. 57), namely Deaf people.

Furthermore, with growing interest in translation by Deaf persons as the profession of Deaf interpreters had been expanding through those years, as exhibited in the publications by (Langholtz, (2004); Boudreault (2005); Forestal (2005), Adam, R., Carty, B., & Stone, C. (2011), the first volume on *Deaf interpreters at work: International perspectives* (Metzger, Stone, & Adams, 2014).etc. An exemplary example of this mounting interest was with Gallaudet University in Washington, D.C. and its Department of Interpretation and Translation hosting the first three-day International Research Deaf Translation Summit in March, 2017. A limited number of Deaf translators and Deaf interpreter educators were invited to be part of the summit and explore Deaf translation and research. This was the first of its kind ever to “exchange and revisit the roots of translation, discuss critical topics related to signed language translation in both practice and research” (Cole & Collins, 2017).

Additionally, the interest in Deaf translation sparked the planners of the Graduate to Certification (GTC) Program Roundtable held on December 1-2, 2017, sponsored by CATIE Center at St. Catherine University, to include a panel discussion on Translation with Deaf interpreters who also function as translators as part of the GTC Roundtable’s program. The primary reason to include the panel were: to the stakeholders of GTC program, “it became abundantly clear that the GTC curriculum needed to include approaches and materials to support deaf novice interpreters working toward certification, not just hearing novice interpreters. This panel was one way to

Deaf Translation

open this conversation about the need for translation as an area of study and practice. Not only does this have pedagogical purposes but for deaf interpreters, there is growing demand for English texts to be translated into ASL. For this, and other reasons, translation was identified as an important area of focus in preparing deaf novice interpreters for certification and for multiple career paths (Bowen-Bailey & Swabey, personal comments, July, 2018).

To date, limited research has been done on Deaf translators' approaches to their processes, in other words, steps in their translating work as well as to the pedagogy of translation studies, specifically designed for Deaf persons (De Meulder & Hererick, in press). Whereas Deaf Interpreter Competencies (NCIEC, 2010) does not explicitly mention translation as a competency, there is strong indication that Deaf interpreters must have competencies as listed in the 6 domains of competencies to be effective all around (NCIEC, 2010). The Deaf Interpreter Curriculum (2015, revised 2016) has a unit on Translation as part of a module on Interpreting Theory and Practice. The unit seemingly provides definitions and preliminary information on translation and types of translation such as sight translation, text/video translation, and steps for translation. However, there is no information on theories focused on Deaf translators, other than the current interpreter models used in most interpreter education programs, primarily for ASL-English interpreting by hearing students or approaches for translation such as using a socio-cultural perspective (Cole, 2018) or socio-cognitive theory (Forestal, 2014).

Moreover, there is a brief mention of competencies that Deaf interpreters should have: elicitation strategies, production strategies, contextual information strategies. However, there is no discussion or mention on application of the competencies into translation work. There are no samples of translated work in ASL to compare with written texts for critical analysis. Samples of Deaf translators' work and written texts would provide substantial materials for training of Deaf translators as well as to enable hearing interpreters/translators or coaches to work with Deaf translators. Comments on Deaf translators about their work and processes would guide curriculum development for a larger module focused on translation. Keep in mind that the Deaf Interpreter Curriculum, published in 2015 and edited 2016 prior to end to the federal funding, was one of the most exciting breakthroughs for Deaf interpreters and training. Having published the Deaf Interpreter competencies (NCIEC, 2010) and curriculum (NCIEC, 2015), NCIEC, in turn, published a curriculum for effective teaming of Deaf-hearing interpreters in legal settings as well as curriculum for Deaf interpreters to become legal interpreter trainers.

Since then, there has been more exploration with the teaching and learning related to Deaf interpreters and their work. Thus, the interest on translation and teaching approaches for Deaf interpreters has cropped up as more Deaf interpreters are taking on tasks for translation work. Deaf interpreters in Europe and UK have taken on key roles in translation such as government policies, healthcare information, emergency announcements, etc. Some Deaf interpreters involved in translation education or actively involved in translation projects are looking into translation studies at universities such as Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh, Scotland, especially in Europe and UK (Adam, 2017).

With the advent of European and Canadian translation education's movement towards socio-cultural perspective in translation (Rosas, 2004; Kiraly, 2005; Whitfield, 2005), this is an opportune time to explore how the sociocultural perspective pertains to Deaf interpreters who also work on translation and sight translation. Bourdieu, stated by Hanna (2016), augmented that translation is a socio-cultural activity. Kiraly (2005) provided a substantive argument that the translation theories utilized in translation studies over several decades were primarily focused on the "conduit" view of translation (p. 1100), in which "correct solutions" were given for translation exercises. He argued that translation is an "activity as a social, inter-cultural and interpretative process" (p. 1101) with the instructor as a facilitator of learning. Whitfield (2005) stressed the need to 'create space for a socio-cultural turn' (p. 2) in translation teaching approaches. Through the Deaf interpreter education and curriculum as well as our own empirical experiences and observations as certified interpreters, interpreter educators, and translators, quite several Deaf persons undergoing Deaf interpreter training and several Deaf interpreters, both certified and non-certified, seemingly struggle on whether their work should be 'conduit' where it is deemed that there are "correct solutions to [the] translation" (Kiraly, 2005, p. 1100) such as maintaining the form of the written text or be socially and culturally based in ASL, in other words, as Nida (1964) put it, be dynamic equivalent for the those receiving the message.

One specific example highlights the need for further research into this essential area. Forestal (pc, 2017) stated that in 2016 while working as a consultant for a translation project with a Deaf interpreter (DI), even after applying discourse analysis of the text and discussing the worldview of Deaf consumers in that particular legal

Deaf Translation

situation and how it would best understood, the DI felt pressure from the state official to be “as accurate as possible” as it was a legal document. The DI made the decision to do a translation, line by line, based on the “form of the message [rather than] the impact on the person receiving the message” (Nida, 1969, p. 22). Kiraly, views this as a conduit view in which the translation is conducted, mainly, line by line by maintaining the source’s structure and words or phrases of each sentence, rather than using a sociocultural framework to develop a dynamic equivalent message for the target audience in ASL, as suggested by the two consultants on several occasions and for feedback on his work in the videos by taking the entire text and setting it into two parts so that the entire text would be based on how Deaf persons understand. To expound further on translating into a dynamic equivalence, Nida (1969) explained how a person not being familiar with a specific culture or religion would misunderstand the meaning of a “Biblical phrase, *heap coals of fire on his head* (Rom. 12:20) as a brutal torture, rather than meaning [to] *make a person ashamed of his behavior* (p.2). This example is used to illustrate how sticking with the form of the message can be misconstrued if there is no socio-cultural perspective as part of the translation. There was no discourse frame (Tannen, 1993) to introduce the objective of the text as well as the setting that required an understanding of the text to comply with the law as mandated by the police; discourse structure based on American Sign Language, such as transitions and pauses as normally used by Deaf persons; minimal use of expansion and contextualization (Lawrence, 2004) to provide a greater amount of detail or information to clarify a point, expand an idea, or illustrate a point through a means of different techniques which is a critical feature of ASL discourse. ASL discourse is based on how Deaf persons use their language and employ their socio-cultural rhetoric in their own language. Also, ASL is a visual-spatial language (Cokely & Baker-Shenk, 1980); thus, there is a requirement that the information be presented visually in greater detail (Lawrence, 2004).

It was primarily a text translation - line by line as there were 10 lines as numbered in the text. The target audience, who was a defendant in a trial, was not satisfied as the text material was not understood in light of the purpose of the text; thus, the lawyer for the target audience found out that Forestal was one of the two consultants and contacted both of them. Both consultants had to explain that they were hired only as consultants and were not involved in the final product as well as had no input afterwards. The state agency did not follow up with the consultants. Afterwards, Forestal made connections with the respective DI and asked for the rationale for sticking with line by line of the nine items in the text. The DI explained that it was expected of him to follow the order and form of the text and use a ‘correct’ means of a traditional translation approach (Nida, 1969) by focusing on words and phrases within the text, making that a literal translation (Larson, 1998) as it was the source text. After some discussion, it was discovered that he had never learned the theories and approaches of discourse analysis and translating. He admitted that he was unsure about taking the liberty to translate into ASL, making it dynamic equivalent. He mentioned that there seemed to be no formal training materials or a curriculum on translation for Deaf interpreters. That seemed to have been his primary rationale for sticking with the traditional expectations of a translation. This brings to light a critical need for pedagogical approach for teaching translation to Deaf interpreters.

Based on Deaf Interpreter Competencies’, (2010) foundational competencies and language and culture competencies, one would think that Deaf interpreters would already have an innate ability to do translations, utilizing a socio-cultural perspective as well as skills for elicitation, production, and contextual strategies. It is apparent that today’s exposure that Deaf people, depending on their age and experience with interpreters, are exposed to different service models, some of which are “mainstream translation norms” (Stone, 2005, p.236 as found in Forestal, 2014, p. 27). This has a significant consequence on the work, decision making processes, and effectiveness of Deaf interpreters in their translation work (Forestal, 2014).

“It is also important to consider that it took a long time to convince people that being a skilled signer (or language user in any language) does not make anyone a skilled interpreter; [thus] ... it is not surprising that this also applies to Deaf interpreters. Furthermore, [it has been shown through research] that many people with years of “training” still think of interpreting as a “conduit” rather than as constructed meaning that cannot be “conveyed, transferred, or relayed. [Thus] ... interpreters and translators, both hearing and Deaf, continue to face this struggle” (Winston, personal comment, August, 2018). This is substantiated by Janzen (2005) and Wilcox & Shafer (2005).

In reiteration, little is known on whether current practices in interpreter education are applicable and effective for teaching Deaf persons as interpreters (DeMeudler & Heverick, In press), Adam (2017), Boudreault, 2005;

Deaf Translation

Cokely, 2005; Winston, 2005). There is a need for exploration on views from Deaf translators about their experiences on translating and translation education, which led us to do a survey as a pilot study.

Research method

As mentioned earlier, this appears timely to explore on at how some Deaf translators perceive their work and whether there is a need for a curriculum for Deaf translators through a means of a survey. Due to very little research on pedagogy on translation to Deaf persons aside from those mentioned above, it was decided to begin with this critical point of looking into the experiences, work, and views of Deaf translators/interpreters by means of use of survey of a small sample of selected Deaf interpreters who also work as translators as a preliminary research. Based on the time line available for this research, we started with seven Deaf interpreters and were able to procure 4 responses.

The Deaf interpreters were selected, based on their immediate availability; thus, contributing towards a potential “backyard research [as it] involves studying [within our profession] ... friends, or immediate work setting” (Glesne & Pshkin, 1992 in Creswell, 2003, p. 184). Precautions were made with the small selected sample to assure confidentiality and respect to their opinions. The questions in the survey were open-ended to allow a free rein on their thoughts and reflections related to their experiences and views on translation. Survey questions were divided into several categories: demographics; certification and college degrees; education, if any, on translation; experiences as translator; views about translation and on education on translation for Deaf persons.

Survey Results

Demographics

The demographics of the four respondents were: three certified Deaf interpreters who also do translation work, one Deaf who works primarily as a translator; three being female and one male; one African-American and three Caucasians with ages between 33 and 65 years. All four live along the East coast while one of them is temporarily a doctoral student in Europe and maintains a home base in the east coast. Inquired about having family members who were Deaf, one has a Deaf sibling, the second one had a Deaf foster sister for a short time, the third respondent has Deaf parents and a Deaf grandparent, and the last one indicated that there were family members who were Deaf with no specification as to which family member. Responses to their schooling indicated that all of them had been mainstreamed for a length of time as they were placed in a regular school that may have offered support program for Deaf students whereas three of them had attended a school for the Deaf and one had been mainstreamed the entire school years (K-12). Respondent One’s majority of school years were in a Deaf program, the last two years were spent being mainstreamed in a high school in a major metropolis, and attended college that had a Deaf focus with Deaf students. Respondent Two was mainstreamed for seven years, attended a school for the Deaf for seven years, and graduated from a hearing college with interpreters in the classroom. The third respondent had attended both a school for the Deaf and a mainstream program. Both Respondent Three and Four earned a BA degree from a Deaf university.

The respondents were questioned about their education, in other words, training, on translation and how much of the training in interpreter education was focused on translation. all the respondents had minimal

Deaf Translation

education, ranging from being intuitive and informal; while a member of the National Technical Institute of the Deaf's theater troupe, the translation process was used for working with scripts for the plays; very little with exposure to some translation theories as part of a Master's degree and through a metropolitan interpreter education program; "only one formal translation course which was designed for hearing interpreters [while] I had informal training when working on a play with an experienced translator as a coach.

Experiences as a translator

Their experiences doing translation work ranged between approximately 12 to 30 years, based on their ages. Respondent one replied that "being immersed in the Deaf community and informally assisting anyone who needed a translation; thus it is pretty much a lifetime of translating". Respondent Four stated that having Deaf parents and a Deaf grandparent meant that since the age of 10, translating as well as interpreting was done for them.

Another question asked about the respondents' first recollection of functioning in the role of "translator". One of them reiterated about having Deaf parents and grandparent and often had to do translating and interpreting. Respondent Three stated that the "sister and her friends were always asking me to translate the English text from their homework assignments into ASL." Respondent One stressed that being involved with the Deaf theater cast at National Technical Institute of the Deaf's was the first exposure to translation for a play, "Taming of the Shrew" and then numerous theatre productions; the first few experiences were time-consuming, and my knowledge and understanding of the nuances of ASL was not as broad and deep back then as it is now. The same respondent added that the cast "had to really work with Shakespeare language to capture the essence of each passage [and it] was a real mental workout". Respondent Two shared the experience of possibly doing translation as being natural and innate, but perhaps did not explicitly label it as a "translation" job" and the experience of learning to translate on the job for a state office and later on doing a filmed translation work as a volunteer for an advocacy office for a major metropolitan city.

Respondents were asked about their first role model of a Deaf translator. One replied that there was really none; others replied affirmatively and provided names such as Robert Panara, Patrick Graybill, Bernard Bragg, Patricia Yates, and Janis Cole.

The next question, based on their experiences as a translator, was on what motivated or inspired them to work as a translator. Respondent One stated that "I enjoy languages. I like reading, and I like watching good ASL presentations. I'm able to recognize good literature forms, and appreciate them". The second one replied, "I enjoy the work and love analyzing the English text and trying to figure out and create an equivalent ASL text. It doesn't happen often, since interpretation is a fleeting process and you do not have the opportunity to review the interpretation. With translation, you can take the time, consider all the elements within the text and then produce the translation". Respondent Three commented that "I have always been a language person and have always been a natural translator". The fourth one emphasized that using the talent and knowledge to ensure that the consumers understood what the text is conveying.

Views on translation and translation education

A critical question was asked of their views on whether there was a difference between Deaf interpreting and Deaf translating. The responses are in a table below. As one can observe, Respondents One and Three went into depth of explaining their views where as the other two were brief, even though all four were similar in their comments. Respondent Three elucidated that "translation is the task of creating equal meanings between languages. Interpreting includes translation but also includes logistical considerations, power dynamics, in-the-moment decisions about how and what to interpret, consideration of the specific clients involved in the interaction, and consider the impact of my decisions on the consumers involved and their relationships to one another. As an interpreter, we have to think about our presence, appearance, word choices, tone, expressions, and overall role-

Deaf Translation

space then we have to manage all those factors. Those demands are not present in a translation that does not involve interpreting” whereas Respondent One made a comparison between the similarity and difference by stating the similarity between translating and interpreting was “knowing that the end product has to be accessible to the consumer. That’s the ultimate goal for either work. [As for the difference,] interpreting is more within the ‘moment’ and usually ‘live.’ Translating (for me anyway) is more self-reflective work, taking more contemplative time. The end product has different scrutiny for accuracy. With Interpreting, if working with a team, the work can be revised midstream (through team feedback, or backchanneling from a consumer), whereas with translating, there may be more time for processing the way the information can be presented, and can be revisited over time [as] the end product usually has a ‘permanent record’ – written or filmed’.

The following question asked the respondents to go to another level of reflection by asking whether they considered that there was a difference in translation done by Deaf interpreters and by hearing interpreters and what, if any, were the differences. All the respondents gave an affirmation on the difference with an explanation. Respondent One asserted with the following comments:

“Definitely. I think hearing interpreters would translate the same way they interpret without intuitive exploring of native fluency in the L2 (for hearing). A Deaf interpreter will probably intuitively try several different ASL approaches for the same concept, and select the most authentic one.

I think a hearing mindset is predisposed to thinking and producing in an auditory form, even if the person is highly skilled in ASL”.

An affirmation from Respondent Two was,

“Yes, I believe there’s a difference, especially when hearing interpreters decide to add voice over and work from the voice, rather than do a full textual translation.”

Respondent Three expounded affirmatively with this comment,

“There is a universal truth in the translation world about best practices amongst translators. Translations should be done by those whose target language is their mother tongue. I want to take this a bit further to clarify that not all Deaf interpreters had exposure to ASL at birth, but a qualified Deaf interpreter should have the formative experience with ASL required for successful work in this field. Their primary language of communication should be ASL”.

Respondent four gave similar comments as the other three by stating that that Deaf translators would be using their native language whereas hearing interpreters would be working through their ASL that is actually their second language.

The respondents were then asked if there is a need for a curriculum focused specifically on translation for Deaf persons. All four respondents replied in an assertive manner. All of them stated that there was a “huge need” for one and that it would make a powerful impact on Deaf persons to become translators. Respondent One remarked, “I believe Deaf people need to be empowered by knowledge of what they ALREADY do, and have that fleshed out by more targeted training. It will require capturing what is intuitive and spreading it in a petri dish and examining it for components. I would hesitate at looking at current interpreter education and hoping to draw knowledge/inspiration from their approach and modifying for Deaf. Again, it will be skewed. Let it be organically developed intuitively. I guess that will drive “research-based education” proponents batty. So be it!”.

Based on if the respondents replied affirmatively that there was need for a curriculum for Deaf translators, this question was posed about what model, materials, and videos would be used for teaching translation to Deaf interpreters. Related to a question about videos that would be useful for demonstrating translation by Deaf interpreters for instructional purposes, all the four respondents did not know of any.

Respondent One emphasized that the model should be whatever is ‘Deaf-developed’ and that this respondent “would not look to other professions/hearing approaches” for such a model and “would use my own experience in the theatre with lots of script translating. I would also structure the materials used by genre, and purpose of communication ... and I would make sure material has a lot of culturally embedded content that would require analysis and breakdown”. Respondent Two replied with much depth by stating that Leneham’s research on translation, even though it is not a model per se would be useful as he focused how the translation should be

Deaf Translation

reviewed few times. “I also like Mona Baker’s translation steps and structure. ... There are some translation theories that could work for teaching [such as] Vermeer’s Skopos theory and Toury’s postulates”. Respondent Two added that “we can incorporate more translation theories, moving away from the interpreting process models. I currently cannot think of a specific translation model that would be perfectly suitable for translation, because most of the interpreting model focuses on adapting to a singular person or situation, whereas translation is more about making sure its suitable for a large percentage of the population who will access the translation, and recognizing that it does mean that we may have to sacrifice some individuals’ understandability of the text”.

Continuing with the same question above, Respondent Three responded emphatically by use of exclamation points that the model and training materials are what Deaf interpreters created by ourselves! “Every other model was created by hearing people all over the world. We have to consider visual rules, technology requirements, etc. in our translation work that they never thought about; therefore, we can benefit from some parts of their models but our model will look very different. Hearing models are fine for them, but [we] require a level of complexity that hearing translators cannot grasp”.

The respondents were questioned if translation work should be considered as a “Deaf job” (DeMeulder & Heverick, In press, p. 1) and explain whether it is or not. All asserted that translation is a Deaf job with provisions that “translation work into ASL should default to Deaf interpreters” (Respondent Three), substantiated by Respondent One, stating that “the Deaf person has an excellent command of both languages, and knows how to work between the two. [Also,] translation is intuitive”. Respondent Two affirmed that translation is a Deaf job.. it’s important [to always keep in mind] that the Deaf individual is the face of the translation, the final product. However, I’ve seen some poor translations due to ideology of translation or not fully understanding the English text”. Respondent Four declared that historically Deaf people had been translating for each other wherever Deaf communities existed.

Conclusion

Based on the comments of the respondents to the survey, the views confirm significantly that translation is “socially constructed activity, which is influenced by its social, cultural, and historical context as well as the translator’s knowledge base (Wofram, 1994, as found in Cole, 2016, p. 5). “Boudreault and Stone (2005) stressed that interpreting [and translation] processes are complex, requiring numerous ethical decisions ... Formal education should include theoretical knowledge of interpreting, linguistics and discourse, studies in mass culture and Deaf culture, mechanisms of oppression and audism, ethical reasoning, communication skills and such (Boudreault, 2005; Cokely, 2005; Gertz, G., 2004)” (Forestal, 2014, pp. 32). It was stressed throughout the comments related to translation and translation education that Deaf persons are enabled to reach into their own “instincts”, as one participant stated, to draw out socio-cultural perspectives into their translations and to work within the frame of ASL discourse and Deaf-centric approaches (Forestal, 2014, p. 36), derived from their foundational and formative experiences as Deaf persons (NCIEC, 2010).

What is more critically noted is that there is an emphasis on the need of a translation curriculum and a ‘new’ model of translation for Deaf person as well as development of instructional materials and videos. Regarding a model for Deaf persons, it was stressed by Respondent Two, as mentioned in the survey results, that more translation theories should be incorporated, moving away from interpreting process models. The curriculum should be broad enough to include the theories on translation and research on how minorities “produce [translation] work for their own communities, so the same could be defined here, whereas a [socio-cultural] framework implies that the translation is produced for and by individuals”.

Seleskovitch (1978; 1986) called attention that one of the best practices for interpretation [and translation] was to out that the best practice was to have interpreters [and translators] to work from the source text towards their native language for the audiences who share the same native language. Those who would interpret into their

Deaf Translation

native language; thus the native language of Deaf translators is ASL and should be working from English towards ASL for a more Deaf-centric translation, using socio-cultural perspective as denoted by DeMeulder & Heverick (In press), Bourdieu (Hanna, 2016), Stone, (2009), Bienvenu (1991). In this case, the native language of Deaf audiences is American Sign Language. Thus, translation from English to ASL should be defaulted to Deaf translators, provided that they have requisite skills and foundational competencies (NCIEC, 2010) for working between the two languages.

To reiterate, “as long as Deaf people have existed, they have been translating and interpreting within the Deaf community” (Forestal, 2014, p. 30), wherein language brokering Adam, Carty & Stone (2011) and socio-cultural perspectives are incorporated as part of the translation and interpreting. Boudreault (2005), Stone (2009) and Adam, Carty & Stone (2011). discerned that within the Deaf community, ghost writing, reporting, translating, and interpreting was a natural event and a form of reciprocity, rather than a paid service. Cokely (2005) surmised after several meetings with a focus group of Deaf interpreters discussing their work that it was “clear that the linguistic and communicative strategies that [they] commonly employ are markedly different from what has become expected, conventional practice among non-Deaf interpreters” (p. 20).

Recommendations

In the beginning of this research, it was hoped through the research design that a larger number of Deaf respondents, including diverse Deaf persons, would be collected from different parts of United States. As indicated above, it turned out that there were a smaller number of respondents available from the East coast, due to time limitations. It is recommended that a survey similar to this be sent out to a larger number and that the survey be made available in both a video with ASL translations and written English questions, which would make the survey more accessible to Deaf respondents.

Moreover, the next step after the survey would be interviews with the respondents who were willing to be interviewed and recorded on a video. The interview would entail asking them to ‘walk through their steps on their translation process’. Those who do professional work as translators and teach interpreter education as well will then be inquired on how they would proceed to teach translation process to Deaf persons, making the translation work ‘Deaf-centric’ by incorporating socio-cultural frame into their work. There should be questions to guide them to explore how their foundational experiences as a Deaf person influenced their work and decisions on their translations. Also, the table would be turned on them as they would be asked how they would have liked the process for translating taught to them.

To go a step further, a comparative analysis should be conducted between Deaf translators who had Deaf parents or family members and those who do not; a comparison would be to look how their processes as well as inclusion of socio-cultural perspectives in the translation. The same should be done for diverse Deaf translators to explore what they bring into their translation such as their socio-cultural framework.

Deaf Translation

References

- Adam, R. (2017, March). *In the beginning was the deaf translator, or was it?* Paper presented at the International Research Deaf Translation Summit, Gallaudet University. Washington, D.C.
- Adam, R., Carty, B., & Stone, C. (2011). Ghostwriting: Deaf translators with the deaf community. *Babel*, 57 (4), 375-393
- Adam, R. & Stone, C. (2008, October). Deaf interpreters in the community: The missing link? Paper presented at the meeting of Conference of Interpreter Trainers, San Juan, PR.
- Bienvenu, M.J. (1991, August). *Relay interpreting*. Paper presented at meeting of Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf Conference, Bethesda, MD.
- Boudreault, P. (2005). Deaf interpreters. In T. Janzen (Ed.) *Topics in signed language interpreting: Theory and practice* (pp. 323-355). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Bowen-Bailey, D. & Swabey, L. (July, 2018).personal comments,
- Baker-Shenk, C. & Cokely, D. (1980). *American Sign Language: Teacher's Resource on Grammar and Culture*, Washington, D. C.: Clerc Books, Gallaudet University Press.
- Cokely, D. (2005). Shifting positionality: A critical examination of the turning point in the relationship of interpreters and the deaf community. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, & E. Winston (Eds.), *Sign language interpreting and interpreter education* (pp. 208-234). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cole, J. (2016). *Deaf translators: What are they thinking?* Unpublished paper. Gallaudet University. Washington, D. C.
- Cole, J. & Collins, S. (2017, March). Opening comments presented at the International Research Deaf Translation Summit, Gallaudet University. Washington, D.C.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- De Meulder, M. & Heyerick, I. (In press). (Deaf) interpreters on television: Challenging power and responsibility. In L. Meufant, A. Sinte, M. Van Herreweghe, & M. Vermeerbergen (eds.) *Sign language research, uses and practices. Crossing views on theoretical and applied sign language linguistics*. Be Gruler Mouton
- Forestal, E. (2005). The emerging professionals: Deaf interpreters, their views and experiences on training. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, & E. Winston (Eds.), *Sign language interpreting and interpreter education* (pp. 208-234). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Forestal, E. M. (2014). Deaf interpreters: Dynamics of their interpreting processes, In M. Metzger, C. Stone, & R. Adams (Eds.), *Deaf interpreters at work: International perspectives*. (p. 29-50). Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.
- Gertz, G. (2004). Dysconscious audism: A theoretical proposition. In H. L. Bauman (Ed.). *Open your eyes: Deaf studies talking*. (pp. 219-234). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deaf Translation

- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training*. Revised Edition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Hanna, S. (2016). Bourdieu in translation studies: The socio-cultural dynamics of Shakespeare translation in Egypt. New York, NY: Routledge. 231p.
- Janzen, T. (2005). Interpretation and language use: ASL and English. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in signed language interpreting: Theory and practice* (p, 69-105). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A social constructivist approach to translator education: Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kiraly, D. (2005). Project-based learning: A case for situated translation. *Meta*, 50(4), 1998-2111.
- Langholtz, D. (2004). Deaf interpreters today: A growing profession. *WFD News*, 17(1),17. Helsinki, Finland: World Federation of the Deaf.
- Larson, M. (1998). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*, Second Edition, Mildred, University Press of America.,
- Lawrence, S. (2004). Interpreter Discourse: English to ASL expansion. [CD-ROM]. *Interpreter discourse: English to ASL expansion/ASL to English compression*. Rochester, NY: National Technical Institute for the Deaf/Rochester Institute of Technology.
- Metzger, M., Stone, C., & Adams, R. (2014). *Deaf interpreters at work: International perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press,
- National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers. (2010). *Deaf interpreter competencies*, Retrieved July 1, 2018, from <http://www.diinstitute.org/di-competencies/>
- National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers. (2014). *Institute on legal interpreting: Highly effective court interpreting teams in action*. Denver, CO: University of Northern Colorado-Mid-America Regional Interpreter Education Program.
- National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers. (2015). *Deaf Interpreter Curriculum*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University.
- Nida, Eugene A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.
- Nida, Eugene A. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.
- Pochhacek, F. (2004). *Introducing interpreting studies*. New York: Rutledge.
- Rosas, M. (2004). Dan Kiraly's A social constructivist approach to translator education. *Translation Journal*. 8(4).
- Seleskovitch, D. (1986). Interpreting versus translating. Paris: *Actes du Congres de l' association des traducteurs americains*, p. 369-376.
- Seleskovitch, D. (1978). *Interpreting for international conferences*. Washington, DC: Pen and Booth.
- Stone, C. (2005) *Towards a deaf translation norm*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.
- Stone, C. (2009) *Towards a deaf translation norm*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press
- Tannen, D. (1993). *Framing in Discourse*. Ed. Deborah **Tannen**. New York City: Oxford University Press.

Deaf Translation

Whitfield, A. (2005). Towards a socio-cultural turn in translation teaching: A Canadian perspective. *Meta*, 50(4).

Wilcox, S. & Shafer, B. (2005). Towards a cognitive model of interpreting. In T. Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in Signed Language Interpreting: Theory and practice*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. pp. 27-50.

Winston, E., (August, 2018). personal comment.