JUSTISIGNS

VET in Interpreting and Justice

ENSURING EQUALITY & ACCESS FOR THE DEAF COMMUNITY IN INTERPRETED POLICE SETTINGS

ONLINE COURSE INFORMATION

(10 ECTS = c.200 hours of student time)

Online Sessions	Student Study Hours per session	Additional Own Time Study (hours)	Local Workshops (recommended)	Preparing Work	Assessment	Total
2 intro 12 Course	5 (total = 60 hrs)	60	40	40	3.5 hours	203 ½ hours

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course focuses on the introduction of key concepts and the development of practical skills for stakeholders in police settings which involves deaf sign language users and sign language interpreters. The course is built around what constitutes successful communication in an interpreted event that involves at least three participants (a "triadic exchange"), namely police officer/s, a Deaf person/s (for example the accused/offender) and appropriately qualified interpreter/s.

Content is multimodal in nature: we provide PowerPoint slides and written documents in a number of languages, alongside movie clips from a range of community and professional perspectives which offer insights or contain challenges with respect to "normative" responses to Deaf/hard of hearing service users.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

On successful completion of this course, you should be able to:

- Describe the key provisions of the European Directive 2010/64/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Right to Interpretation and Translation in Criminal Proceedings.

- Describe the key provisions of the European Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protections of victims of crime.

- Evaluate the local legislation in your region/country with regard to European requirements for equity of access.

- Discuss the recognition of signed languages as "real" languages at national/regional and pan-European level

- Describe police procedures in your jurisdiction.

- Outline the key challenges in ensuring equitable access to police settings for Deaf community members.

- Describe the key concepts in Demand-Control Schema and how they relate to the work of police officers and interpreters working in police settings.

- Compare and contrast the thought worlds of Deaf civilians and police officers

- Describe the process of "semantic bridging"

- Apply best practice principles to maximize successful communication when operating in triadic exchanges which involve interpreters

- Utilize terminology regarding hearing status that will not cause offence to Deaf or hard of hearing individuals.

- Define a 'vulnerable subject' as per the International Red Cross definition (2014) and outline appropriate strategies for supporting such individuals in police settings.

- Evaluate a police-based interpreted event with respect to the ISO Guidelines for Community Interpreting (2014).

SESSION-BY-SESSION OVERVIEW

Session 1   Legal Basis and Glossary of Terms

Session 2   Benchmarking Current Provisions and Practices

Session 3   Ideal Outcomes

Session 4   Police Protocols

Session 5   Deaf Community Members

Session 6   Sign Languages

Session 7   Interpreting: A special case of co-constructing meaning

Session 8   Sign Language Interpreters

Session 9   Demand-Control Schema

Session 10   Putting it all together: Communicating within Triadic Exchanges
               I Preparation

COURSE CONTENT

Session 1   Legal Basis & Glossary of Terms
This session outlines the European and International legal basis ensuring access to police proceedings. National laws are also presented. We consider specific instruments such as the European Arrest Warrant, the UNCRPD and consider what significance these have for legal professionals and justice and equality policy makers. We pay specific attention to what this legislation means for police officers.

Session 2   Benchmarking Current Provisions and Practices
This session reports on a study of interpreting provision in legal settings across the European Union. We consider what the current levels of training, awareness and provision may mean in terms of quality of access, and consequential delivery of justice.

Session 3   Idealized Outcomes?
In this session, we contemplate what a successful outcome would "look like" in terms of a police interaction with a deaf sign language user from the point of view of Deaf people, interpreters, interpreter educators and police officers. We consider the range of standards that impact on provision of services, for example ISO Standards on Community Interpreting, UNCRPD, European Directives and local legal requirements. We also consider issues of number of interpreters, mode of interpreting, the inclusion of deaf/hearing interpreting teams and consider how this maps against practice.

Session 4   Police Protocols
We outline the protocols that govern police practice vis-à-vis arrest, reading of rights, making a charge, holding and interviewing of suspects, taking of statements, as well as wider engagement with individuals reporting crimes, providing witness statements.

Session 5   Deaf Community Members
We explore how society views deafness, Deaf individuals/ communities from a range of perspectives – medical, socio-cultural and from a human rights perspective. We discuss the recognition of signed languages as "real" languages at national and pan-European level. We critically evaluate other recognitions of signed languages within the framework of a human rights agenda and evaluate what this means for Deaf communities, especially with regard to access to the law. These are essential steps to understanding how Deaf communities view themselves as linguistic minorities and considering what this means for members of Deaf communities who come in contact with police forces and the broader justice system.

Session 6   Sign Languages & Spoken Languages
This session briefly outlines some of the considerations that those working in police settings need to be aware of when working between spoken and signed languages (i.e. in a bilingual, bimodal setting).

Session 7   Interpreting: A special case of co-constructing meaning
This session focuses on how meaning is constructed when we communicate, presenting a cognitively driven perspective on the co-construction of meaning in interactive settings such as

occur in police interviews/witness statement taking. Specifically, we consider key principles of cognitive linguistics which underpin our view of language and communication. We describe the concept of "frames" and compare and contrast the conduit model and the cognitive model of interpreting. We discuss the 'fund of knowledge' that may impede on shared conceptual understanding between Deaf witness, interpreter and police officer/representative of the legal system and outline the challenges arising for interpreters working in health care settings as a result of the lack of shared 'frames' coupled with the 'fund of knowledge' challenge.

Session 8   Sign Language Interpreters
This session introduces the work of sign language interpreters and explores the scope of practice of sign language interpreters in police settings.

Session 9   Demand-Control Schema
This session introduces Dean & Pollard's (2013) Demand-Control Schema. We outline the demands that interpreters and police officers deal with in their work and describe the categories of control that interpreters and police officers can apply in managing their work, pre-, during, and post assignment. We pay particular attention to the range of demands that arise in police settings

Session 10 Putting it all together: Communicating within Triadic Exchanges I – Preparation
This session considers what kind of preparation is needed in order to ensure successful interaction. We consider the recruitment of interpreters, the checking of credentials, and ensuring that there are no conflicts of interests arising from prior relationships with a deaf client. We look at the kinds of questions that may arise pre-arrest, pre-raid, pre-interview, pre-statement taking and suggest a list of considerations that will help to facilitate best practice.

Session 11   Putting it all together: Communicating within Triadic Exchanges II – During an Event
This session looks at the issues that may arise within an interpreted communicative exchange. Here we consider issues relating to the kind of event that is being discussed and how this will impact on questions police officers might put to a suspect/witness; we consider issues of handling complex notions in an interpretation; we look at the modes of interpreting that may be used and why; and we consider how a team of interpreters might be included in a linguistically complex setting. Finally, we discuss the importance of recording the signed content in addition to the written record of an interview.

Session 12   Putting it all together: Communicating within Triadic Exchanges III – Post-Hoc
In this session, we look at what needs to happen post-assignment: de-briefings, consideration of vicarious trauma, taking interpreter statements, etc.

Session 13   Working with Vulnerable Groups
This session considers additional concerns that arise with regard to ensuring appropriate accommodations for suspects/witnesses who might be considered 'vulnerable'. Such individuals include minors, deaf people with disabilities, DeafBlind individuals, elderly deaf people and other deaf individuals who meet the definition of 'vulnerable subject' as per the International Red Cross's definition (2014).

Session 14   Deaf Interpreters
This session describes the work of Deaf Interpreters (DIs), and provides a rationale for their involvement as specialists who provide interpretation and transliteration serviceces, most commonly between a sign language and other visual/tactile communication forms used by individuals who are deaf/ hard of hearing/DeafBlind; translation between a sign language and a written text; and interpretation between two sign languages

Additional Resources

- Links to EULITA
- Links to Hamburg
- Links to KU Lueven
- Links to Heriot Watt
- ISO Standards for Community Interpreters
- Links to other EU projects (IMPLI, CO-Minor, etc.)
- Links to Rape Crisis Centre
- Links to Policing related resources

Readings & Bibliography

Breen, J., (2015) 'On-Demand American Sign Language Interpreting Services: Social Policy Development in the Yukon' in *Sign Language Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3, (pp. 348-361).

Brennan, M., (1999) 'Signs of Injustice' in *The Translator*. Vol. 5, No. 2 (pp. 221-246).

Brunson., J.L. (2008) 'Your case will now be heard: sign language interpreters as problematic accommodations in legal interactions' in *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education,* 13 (1): 77-91.

Chid, B., Oschwald, M., Curry, M., Hughes, R., Powers, L. (2011) 'Understanding the experience of crime victims with disabilities and deaf victims' in *Journal of policy Practice,* 10:4, (pp. 247-267).

Deaf sensitivity training for police officers

Disability Discrimination Act
http://www.nidirect.gov.uk/the-disability-discrimination-act-dda

Edwards, C., Harold, G., Kilcommins, S., (2012) 'Access to Justice for people with disabilities as victims of crime of Ireland'. (UCC).

Edwards, C., (2013) 'Pathologising the victim: law and the construction of people with disabilities as victims of crime in Ireland' in *Disability and Society*, 29:5 (pp. 685-698).

Forrest et al. (2009) 'Providing police services to the Deaf' in *The Police Chief Magazine.* (http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1 844&issue_id=72009)

Hale, S & Russell, D., (2008) 'Interpreting in Legal Settings' in *Interpreting in Legal Setting.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet Press (pp.180).

Interpreting in Legal Settings 'Standard Practice Paper' (2000) Written by the *Professional Standards Committee* (RID).

La Vigne, M., Vernon, M., (2003) 'An interpreter isn't enough: deafness, language and due process' in *Wis Law Rev*, no.5. (pp. 843-936).

'Legal interpreting and Translation in the EU: Justice, Freedom and Security through language' in *The Journal of Finnish Association of Legal interpreters and translators* in January 2008.

Leggett, J., Goodman, W., Shamin, D., (2007) 'People with learning disabilities' experiences of being interviewed by the police' in *British Journal of learning disabilities*, 35, (pp. 168-173).

McAlister, J. (1994) 'Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing criminal defendants: How you gonna get justice if you can't talk to the judge?' in *Arizona State Law Journal* (pp. 163-200).

McAnnany, K., (2011) 'With their own hands: a community lawyering approach to improving law enforcement practices in the deaf community' in *Valparaiso University Law Review*. (pp. 875-925).

McCay, V., (2010) 'The horror of being Deaf and in prison' in *American Annals of the Deaf*. Vol. 155, Issue 3. (pp. 311-321).

McCay, V., Miller, K., R., (Summer 2005) 'Obstacles faced by Deaf people in the criminal justice system' in *American Annals of the Deaf*, Vol. 150, No. 3 (pp. 283-291).
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/american_annals_of_the_deaf/v150/150.3vernon.pdf

McCulloch, D., 'Not hearing us. An exploration of the experience of deaf prisoners in English and Welsh prisons', a *report for the Howard League for Penal Reform.*

'Deaf prisoner factfile' The *Howard League for Penal Reform*.

Mertens, D.M. (2000) 'Deaf and hard of hearing people in court', in Truman Et al. (eds) *Research and Inequality*. London: UCL Press.

Miller, K., R., (2004) 'Linguistic Diversity in a Deaf prison population: implications for due process' in Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education. Vol. 9, No.1 (pp.112-119)

Miller, K., R., Vernon, M., Capella, M., E., (2005) 'Violent offenders in a Deaf prison population' in *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*. 10:4. (pp.417-425).

Miller, K., R., Vernon, M., (2001) 'Linguistic diversity in Deaf defendants and due process rights' in *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*. 6:3. (pp.226-234).

Miller, K., Vernon, M., (2003) 'Deaf sex offenders in a prison population' in *Journal of Deaf Studies Education*, Vol. 8, No. 3. (pp.357-362).

Miller, K.R. (2001) 'Access to sign language interpreters in the criminal justice system', *American Annals of the Deaf*, 146 (4): 328-330.

Miller, K., R., & Vernon, M. (2002). 'Assessing linguistic diversity in deaf criminal suspects' in *Sign Language Studies*, 2(4), (30-390)

Vernon, M., & Raifman, L., J., (1997) 'Recognizing and handling problems of incompetent deaf defendants charged with serious offences' in *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, Vol.20, No. 3. (pp. 373-387).

Miranda, L. Sedat M. (2014) 'Interpreter linguistic intervention in the strategies employed by police investigative interviews' in *Police and Research* Vol. 15, No. 4 (pp. 307-321).

Napeir, J. Haug, T. 'Justisigns: A European overview of sign language interpreting provision in legal settings'.

Newby, K., & Weald, J., (2015) 'Best Practices for BSL/English Interpreters working in legal settings' in *Legal Interpreting Best Practices*. ASLI.

Roberson, L., Russell, D., & Shaw, R. 'American Sign Language/English Interpreting in *Legal Settings: Current Practices in North America*, Vol. 21, Issue 1 in Journal of Interpretation Article 6, RID.`

Russell, D., (2013) 'Interpreting Legal Discourse and Working in legal settings: An AVLIC Position Paper. Synopsis Prepared for ASL Translation
Seaborn, B., Andrews, J., Martin, G., (2010) 'Deaf Adults and the Comprehension of Miranda' in *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 10:2, (pp. 107-132).

Smith, C., Dicus, D., (2015) 'A preliminary Study on Interpreting for Emergent Signers' in *Sign Language Studies*, Vol. 15, Number 2, (pp. 202-224). Published by Gallaudet University Press.

Vernon, M., (2009) 'ADA routinely violated by prisons in the case of deaf prisoners' in *Prison Legal News* (p.14).

Rubin, P.N. And Dunne, T. (1994) 'The Americans with Disabilities Act: Emergency Response Systems and Telecommunication Devices for the Deaf'. Washington: US Department of Justice. Accessed online at: http://www.nij.Gov/pubs-sum/151177.Htm

Schneider, N.R., Sales, B. D., (2010) 'Deaf or hard of hearing inmates in prison' in *Disability & Society*. (pp.77-89).

SignHealth (2011) 'Deaf People in the Criminal Justice System' Accessed online at:http://www.Signhealth.org.Uk/documents/news/SCC%20Report%20March%202011%20FINAL.Pdf

Vernon, M., (2009) 'ADA routinely Violated by prisons in the case of Deaf prisoners' in *Prison Legal News*.

Vernon, M., Greengerg, S., F., (1999) 'Violence in deaf and hard-of-hearing people: a review of the literature' in *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, Vol. 4, No. 3. (pp. 259-272).

Wood, J., B., (Spring 1984) 'Protecting Deaf suspects' right to understand criminal proceedings' in *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 75, No.1. (pp. 166-197).

Young, A., Monteiro, B., and Ridgeway, S., (2000) 'Deaf people with mental health needs in the criminal justice system: a review of the UK literature' in *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*. Vol. 11, Issue 3. (pp.556-570).

Police

Berk-Seligson, S. (2009). *Coerced confessions: the discourse of bilingual police interrogations*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Böser, U. (2013). "So tell me what happened! Interpreting the free recall segment of the investigative interview". *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 8(1).

Brennan, M., Brown, R., & MacKay, B. (1997). *Equality before the law: Deaf people's access to justice*. Durham,, UK: Deaf Studies Research Unit.

Buri, Maria Rosaria (2005). "The state of the art of police interpreting in a border area of the European Union: The case of Lecce and Brindisi (Italy)." In Valero Garcés (ed.). *Traducción como mediación entre lenguas y culturas/Translation as mediation or how to bridge linguistic and cultural gaps.* Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá. pp. 175-181.

Edwards, D. and Stokoe, E. 2011. "You Don't Have to Answer": Lawyers' Contributions in Police Interrogations of Suspects." In *Research on Language and social interaction* 44(1): pp. 21–43. Routledge

Ewens, S., Vrij, A., Mann, S., & Leal, S. (2015). Using the Reverse Order Technique with Non-Native Speakers or Through an Interpreter. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*.

Heydon, G. (2004). "Establishing the structure of police evidentiary interviews with suspects". In *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, 11(1).

ImPLI Project. *Final Report*. Available online at http://www.isit-paris.fr/documents/ImPLI/Final_Report.pdf (accessed 21.03.2013)

Kredens and Morris (2010). "Interpreting Outside the Courtroom 'A Shattered Mirror?' Interpreting in legal contexts outside the courtrooom." In *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics.* Routledge.

Kruglov, A. (1999). "*Police Interpreting*: Politeness and Sociocultural Context." In *The Translator* 5, pp. 285–303.

Mikkelson, H. (2010). "Consecutive or Simultaneous? An Analysis of Their Use in the Judicial Setting". In *Across the Board, Australian Sign Language Interpreters Association* 5 (1).
Mulayim, S., Lai, M., & Norma, C. (2014). *Police investigative interviews and interpreting: Context, challenges, and strategies*. CRC Press.
Nakane, I. (2007). "Problems in Communicating the Suspect's Rights in Interpreted Police Interviews". *Applied Linguistics* vol. 28, 1.

Nakane, I. (2009). "The Myth of an Invisible Mediator: An Australian Case Study of English-Japanese Police Interpreting". In *Portal* vol. 6 (1).

Nakane, I. (2010). "Partial Non-use of Interpreters in Japanese Criminal Court Proceedings". In *Japanese Studies*, 20(3): pp. 443-459.

Ortega, J. M. & Foulquié, A. (2008). *"Interpreting in police settings in Spain: Service providers' and interpreters'perspectives."* In Valero, C.; Martin, A. (eds.) *Crossing Borders in Community Interpreting: Definitions and Dilemmas.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John *Benjamins.*

Perez I. A. & Wilson C. W. L. (2007) "Interpreter-mediated police interviews: working as a professional team". In C. Wadensjö, B. Englund Dimitrova and A.-L. Nilsson (eds.) *The Critical Link 4: Professionalisation of Interpreters in the Community.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp.79-93.

Pöllabauer, S. (2006). "'During the interview, the interpreter will provide a faithful translation'. The potentials and pitfalls of researching interpreting in immigration, asylum, and pólice settings: Methodology and research paradigms". In *Lingüística Antverpiensia NS* 5: pp. 229-244.

Russell, S. (2000). "Let Me Put it Simply...: The Case for a Standard Translation of the Police Caution and its Explanation." In *Forensic Linguistics,* vol. 7(1): pp. 26-48.

TRAFUT – Training for the Future. *Final Report.* Available Online at http://www.eulita.eu/

Van-der Vlis, E. J. (2010). The right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings. *JoSTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation*, *14*, 26-40.

Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Interpreting as Interaction.* New York: Longman.

Court

Anegermeyer, P. S. (2005). "Who is 'you'? Forms of address and ambiguous participant roles in court interpreting". In *Target* 17(2): pp. 203-226.

Angermeyer, P. S. (2006). "Translation style and participant roles in court interpreting". In *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(1): pp. 3-28.

Barsky, R. (2010). "Accessing Contextual Assumptions in Dialogue Interpreting: The Case of Illegal Immigrants in the United States." In *Text and Context: Essays on Translation and Interpreting in Honour of Ian Mason*. Manchester: St. Jerome Press: pp. 288-302.

Berk-Seligson, S. (2000). "Interpreting for the Police: Issues in Pre-trial Phases of the Judicial Process." *Forensic Linguistics* vol 7(2).

Berk-Seligson, S. (1990/2002). *The Bilingual Courtroom: Court Interpreters in the Judicial Process*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hale, S. (2004). *The Discourse of Court Interpreting: Discourse Practices of the Law, Witness and the Interpreter.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hale, S. (2006). "Themes and methodological issues in court interpreting research". Linguistica Antverpiensia 5, pp. 205-228. Available online at http://www.lans-tts.be/img/NS5/hale.PDF (accessed 3.12.2013)

Hale, S. (2010). "Court Interpreting The need to raise the bar. Court interpreters as specialised experts.". *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics.* Routledge.

Jacobsen, B. (2004). "Pragmatic Meaning in Court Interpreting: An empirical study of additions in consecutively interpreted question-answer dialogues". *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics no.* 32.

Jacobsen, B. (2010). "Interactional Pragmatics and Court Interpreting." *Doing Justice to Court Interpreting.*

Jacobsen, B. (2012). "The Significance of Interpreting Modes for Question-Answer Dialogues in Court Interpreting". In *Interpreting* 14(2): pp. 217-241.

Russell, D. (2002) *Interpreting in legal contexts: consecutive and simultaneous interpretation.* Linstok Press.

Russell, D. (2004). "Interpreting strategies in legal discourse". *Critical Link 4: Interpreting in the community.*