Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc.

Journal of Interpretation

Volume 33 | Issue 1 Article 1

Exploring Perceptions of Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Deaf Interpreters

Pauline M. Ballentine
Lamar University, pmballen5@gmail.com

Latoya K. Dixon
Lamar University, ldixon11@lamar.edu

Adele Ann Eberwein
Lamar University, aeberwein@lamar.edu

M. Diane Clark
Lamar University, mclark22@lamar.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi

Suggested Citation

Ballentine, Pauline M.; Dixon, Latoya K.; Eberwein, Adele Ann; and Clark, M. Diane () "Exploring Perceptions of Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Deaf Interpreters," *Journal of Interpretation*: Vol. 33: Iss. 1, Article 1.
Available at: https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol33/iss1/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Exceptional, Deaf, and Interpreter Education at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Interpretation by an authorized editor of the JOI, on behalf of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID). For more information, please contact len.roberson@unf.edu.
© All Rights Reserved

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc.

Exploring Perceptions of Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Deaf Interpreters

Cover Page Footnote

Author note: The authors would like to thank the following individuals who were involved in the first phase of this study: Ashley Green, Holly V. Metcalf, Nicholas Norman and Ernest C. Willman.

This article is available in Journal of Interpretation: https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol33/iss1/1

Exploring Perceptions of Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Deaf Interpreters

Pauline M. Ballentine
Latoya K. Dixon
Adele Ann Eberwein
M. Diane Clark
Lamar University

ABSTRACT

The Beliefs and Attitudes regarding Deaf Interpreters (BADi) scale was developed to assess perceptions of Deaf Interpreters (DIs) among hearing interpreters, community members, and the broader hearing population. This study underwent four phases, encompassing item development, feedback from stakeholders, refinement, and broad data collection. Reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, with a final alpha rating of .72. The BADi items were split into two groups (Deaf and hearing) to investigate the frequencies for each item in both groups. Results indicated that most Deaf and hearing participants responded similarly across items, showcasing an overlap in beliefs and attitudes regarding the role and value of DIs. These findings underscore the importance of understanding and bridging gaps in awareness to maximize the effectiveness and utilization of DIs within diverse communities. As most of the participants were either interpreters or educators, future research should investigate those with limited to no connection to the Deaf community.

While relatively new in the field of research, the concept of Deaf Interpreters (DIs) is far from new (Forestal, 2005). Historical records, such as the use of a Deaf husband and two sisters assisting a Deaf woman during an examination over four centuries ago, highlight the longstanding role of DIs in facilitating communication (Carty et al., 2009). Studies have emphasized the critical role of DIs in bridging cultural and linguistic gaps. Bienvenu and Colonomos (1992) explored their role in relay interpreting, while Forestal (2005) examined the professionalization of DIs, both highlighting their effectiveness in complex communication scenarios. Adam et al. (2011) further introduced the concept of "ghostwriting," describing how DIs often acted as language brokers within their communities, historically without formal recognition.

THE ROLE OF DEAF INTERPRETERS ACROSS CONTEXTS

Deaf interpreting typically involves a DI collaborating with a hearing interpreter to facilitate communication between Deaf and hearing individuals (Forestal, 2005). DIs have been shown to be particularly effective in specialized settings. For instance, Wilcox (1995) emphasized the significant contributions of DIs in legal proceedings, particularly when paired with hearing interpreters. This practice is increasingly utilized in legal (Bronk, 2009; Mathers, 2009) and educational settings (Adam et al., 2014) and helps navigate the linguistic and cultural nuances of

legal discourse while addressing the emotional and psychological dynamics involved. Similarly, their ability to handle emotional and psychological aspects of communication is particularly noted in mental health settings (Vernon & Miller, 2001) where they enhance culturally appropriate communication and bridge gaps between Deaf clients and mental health professionals.

The teaming of a DI with a hearing interpreter leverages their unique linguistic and cultural expertise to co-construct meaning (Feilbach, 2023). This collaborative approach is effective for clients who are culturally Deaf ASL users, have limited English proficiency, or exhibit atypical language use. In "pivot interpreting," the DI is fed by a hearing interpreter, allowing for a seamless transfer of information (Takeda, 2008). Sforza (2014) noted that similar strategies are employed across Deaf-Deaf and hearing-hearing interpreter teams, although Deaf-Deaf teams uniquely utilize peripheral vision and pauses as signals to coordinate their interpretation.

The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (1997) outlined the benefits of using Certified Deaf Interpreters (CDIs) in their 1997 Standard Practice Paper. These include optimal understanding, efficient use of time and resources, clarification of linguistic content, elimination of cultural confusion, and improved accuracy in communication. According to Beldon's (2017) Street Leverage presentation based on National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC) materials, Deaf individuals' experiences of navigating both Deaf and hearing communities equip them with unique skills, such as linguistic code-switching and providing clarification. These experiences also develop extra-linguistic knowledge (ELK) specific to Deaf culture, which hearing interpreters cannot fully replicate through Interpreting Training Programs (ITPs). Beldon described this "Deaf Formative Formula" as: L1 (ASL) / L2 (English) + C1 (Deaf culture) / C2 (Hearing culture) + ELK = Effective Interpreter (NCIEC Deaf Interpreter Work Team, 2009).

Despite their effectiveness, DIs remain relatively unknown, with limited formal training programs. It is vital to understand the beliefs and attitudes surrounding their roles to maximize their use in the community. This paper introduces the development of the Beliefs and Attitudes Regarding Deaf Interpreters (BADi) scale, which aims to assess perceptions of DIs among hearing interpreters, Deaf community members, and the broader hearing population. The scale's development involved input from DIs themselves to ensure clarity and accessibility for diverse audiences.

METHOD

The study followed a four-phase process. Phase 1 involved developing survey items to assess beliefs and attitudes about DIs. In Phase 2, DIs, community members, and hearing professionals provided feedback on item clarity and suggested additions. Phase 3 focused on refining the items based on this feedback, with 10 CDIs reviewing the final survey for clarity. Phase 4 involved data collection from signing communities, analyzed using descriptive statistics. An exploratory factor analysis identified one factor, followed by Cronbach's alpha tests to finalize the scale.

PHASE 1

The research team included both Deaf and hearing doctoral students, two of whom are CDIs, one hearing interpreter, and three who are Deaf/Hard of Hearing and use interpreting services. The team also included two faculty members, one Deaf and one hearing. Initially, IRB approval was

obtained from the university. The initial list of items came from a literature review resulting from one of the CDI's prior research projects. The search had included both "Certified Deaf Interpreter" and "Deaf Interpreter" as search terms. Other team members contributed ideas for a total of 97 items.

PHASE TWO

CONTENT VALIDITY

The research team developed 97 items, which were set up in Qualtrics with the following statement: Read the following statement. Is this statement written in a clear manner? If not, please provide suggestions on how it could be improved. Participants responded either yes that it was written clearly or no that it was not written clearly and could reword the item or make suggestions.

PARTICIPANTS

One hundred and eleven participants started the study, and 77 evaluated the full 97 items included in this study. A convenience sample was used by sending out the survey to CDIs on the role of the Registry for Interpreters for the Deaf as well as a flyer posted on social media and through personal contacts. No background data was collected given that the focus was on validating the items.

RESULTS FROM PHASE TWO

Participants identified redundant or irrelevant items, though some misunderstood the project's purpose and responded only with true/false judgments. Those who grasped the study provided specific feedback on wording and relevance. No additional items were suggested. The final survey included 46 items, with three reverse-scored to detect response bias.

The group of participants was able to identify items that were redundant and or irrelevant. Many participants simply stated if items were true or not, not really understanding the purpose of the project. Those who understood the project gave specific feedback on re-wording items and/or items that they felt were irrelevant. No additional items were provided by the participants. The final group included a total of 46 items and three were reversed scored to detect response bias.

PHASE THREE

The next phase included the research team rewording the 46 items. These new items were rewritten into a new Qualtrics survey, each in the form of a statement. Each statement was embedded into a Likert scale where 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= neutral, 4= disagree, and 5= strongly disagree. The directions asked participants to respond to each item using the Likert scale.

Three items were identified to reverse code to reduce response bias. The three reverse coded items were: 1) DIs do not facilitate communication between a hearing interpreter and a Deaf consumer; 2) DIs are not required to abide by the Registry for Interpreters for the Deaf's Code of Professional Conduct; and 3) Incorporating Deaf Interpreters is a new concept for the interpreting professional. These three items were reversed scored in the analysis.

The remaining CDI on the team selected 10 other CDIs to review the new Qualtrics items for clarity and completeness. All 10 CDI returned the survey. No additional items were suggested

though four items were suggested to be reworded. These three were reworded. This phase led to the development of the BADi Scale (See Table 1).

Table 1. BADi Scale

SA = Strong Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

*Beliefs and Attitudes about Deaf Interpreters (BADi)	SA	A	N	D	SD
1)* Incorporating Deaf Interpreters is not new concept for the interpreting professional					
2) Deaf Interpreters are an important part of the Deaf Community					
3) Deaf interpreters do not have full access to the spoken message					
4) Deaf interpreters are treated differently than hearing interpreters					
5) The job and responsibilities of Deaf interpreters are well-defined					
6) Deaf interpreters plan an important role in supporting communication for Deaf consumers					
7) Deaf interpreters ensure that the Deaf client's message is interpreted accurately					
8)* Deaf interpreters do facilitate communication between a hearing interpreter and a Deaf consumer					
9) For accuracy and clarity, Deaf interpreters frequently adjust their language to Deaf consumers					
10) Deaf interpreters are language facilitators					
11) Hearing interpreters are viewed as less skilled or qualified than Deaf interpreters					
12) Deaf interpreters often translate printed materials to deaf consumers					
13) Deaf interpreters are present only to help hearing interpreters					
14) Deaf interpreters are professionals whose work is different from hearing interpreters					
15) Deaf interpreters should be assigned when a consumer uses their own home signs					
16) Deaf interpreters should be assigned when a consumer uses a sign language other than ASL					
17) Deaf interpreters should be assigned to interpret for DeafBlind consumers					
18) Cultural background should be considered when a Deaf interpreter is assigned to consumers					
19) Linguistic backgrounds should be considered when a Deaf interpreter is assigned to consumers					
20) Gender and sexuality identities should be considered when assigning a Deaf interpreter					

*Beliefs and Attitudes about Deaf Interpreters (BADi)	SA	A	N	D	SD
21) Religious backgrounds should be considered when assigning a Deaf interpreter					
22) At minimum, Deaf interpreters must be highly proficient in American Sign Language and written English					
23)* Deaf interpreters are required to abide by the Registry for Interpreters for the Deaf's Code of Professional Conduct					
24) Deaf interpreters should be able to effectively capture and interpret the cultural differences of Deaf consumers					
25) Deaf interpreters do not need to be certified					
26) Deaf interpreters do not need to use hearing interpreters in every assignment					
27) Deaf native signers hold the best qualifications to be a Deaf interpreter					
28) Deaf interpreters are not only for minimal signers					
29) The use of a Deaf interpreter may be beneficial for Deaf consumers with 'limited' educational backgrounds					
30) Deaf consumers who are educated benefit from services from Deaf interpreters					
31) Not every assignment requires the presence of a Deaf interpreter					
32) The role of a Deaf interpreter is solely to clarify information					
33) The increased time spent by using a Deaf interpreter is not a burden to Deaf consumers					
34) Deaf consumers can receive full access to language and communication without relying on Deaf interpreters					
35) All individuals with hearing loss can qualify as Deaf interpreters					
36) Deaf interpreters must be assigned exclusively for tactile/ProTactile interpretation					
37) The increased time spent by using a Deaf interpreter is not a burden to hearing providers					
38) Deaf interpreters must by highly skilled in ASL receptive skills					
39) Deaf interpreters should be highly skilled in multiple communication modalities (IS, SEE, PSE, etc.)					
40) Deaf interpreters must be highly skilled in ASL expressive skills					

Items with a * should be reversed score when creating total BADi scores.

PHASE FOUR

A new flyer was created for social media to share the newly revised BADi items. These items were intended to be completed by members of both the Deaf and hearing communities, including interpreters and individuals who either used a DI or requested one on behalf of someone they knew. In addition, this flyer was shared widely with researchers in both the US and Europe who are connected to interpreting. Interpreting agencies also sent the flyer to individuals known to the research team. Finally, snowball recruiting was encouraged if individuals knew of others who

would be interested in the project. The flyer had an embedded QR code to access the Qualtrics survey.

PARTICIPANTS

A total of 207 participants began the study, however, 61 did not complete all the items. The survey included information on participants' race and gender. The demographics allowed the participants to pick more than one race. Of those responding the following demographics were reported; white (n=104), Black/African American (n=22), Asian (n=3), Latinx/Mexican (n=18), and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (n=3). In terms of education, most reported having either a BA (22%) or an MA (42%). Most of the participants were either interpreters (36%) or educators (28%). Gender information of the participants were women (n=105), men (n=32), other/no answer (n=9). All participants live within the United States and are over the age of 18. The group was 49% Deaf and 51% hearing.

DATA PREPARATION

Initially an exploratory factor analysis was completed with both orthogonal and oblique rotations. Only one factor was identified so the analysis was not included. Next, data was reduced from a five-point scale to a binary data point. Strongly disagree and disagree were combined to disagree while strongly agree and agree were combined into agree. Neutral and missing items were deleted. The 46 items were split into a Deaf and a hearing group to investigate the frequencies for each item in both groups (Deaf vs hearing).

After the frequencies were calculated, Cronbach alpha was conducted on the items. The use of 'scale if item deleted' was used to reduce the number of items within the scale. Tests of the proportion were conducted on items split across Deaf versus hearing; given that eight items had differences between 14% to 51%. A Bonferroni correction was completed with the alpha level set at p=.006 or lower.

RESULTS FROM PHASE FOUR

A table of agreements was created for each item split by Deaf versus hearing (see Table 2). Next, all 46 items were analyzed in a reliability analysis that also investigated the alpha rating if items were deleted. Using this measure, six items were deleted leaving an alpha rating of .72, which is an acceptable rating (see Table 2). These six items deleted included:1) Hearing interpreters are the best option for providing communication access between hearing and Deaf individuals, 2) Deaf interpreters must work with hearing interpreters at all times, 3) Deaf interpreters are only needed in special situations, 4) Deaf interpreters are expected to copy word for word exactly the way the hearing interpreter signs, 5) Performing dual roles as a Deaf interpreter and a hearing interpreter is acceptable and 6) Deaf interpreters do not need to be highly fluent in American Sign Language. This led to a 40 items scale.

Table 2. Percent of Deaf vs Hearing selecting Strongly Agree vs Strongly Disagree

Item	Deaf		Hearing	
	Agree %	Disagree %	Agree %	Disagree %
1) Incorporating DIs is new concept for the interpreting professional	60	35	24	64
2) DIs are an important part of the Deaf Community	96	3	45	28
3) DIs do not have full access to the spoken message	51	18	45	28
4) DIs are treated differently than HIs	79	6	88	1
5) The job and responsibilities of DIs are well-defined	35	42	18	56
6) DIs plan an important role in supporting communication for Deaf consumers	93	3	96	1
7) DIs ensure that the Deaf client's message is interpreted accurately	89	6	87	5
8) DIs do not facilitate communication between a HI and a Deaf consumer	68	18	77	10
9) For accuracy and clarity, DIs frequently adjust their language to Deaf consumers	90	3	88	4
10) DIs are language facilitators	88	4	85	4
11) HIs are viewed as less skilled or qualified than DIs	18	54	22	53
12) DIs often translate printed materials to deaf consumers	6 3	3	66	11
13) DIs are present only to help HIs	65	22	66	18
14) DIs are professionals whose work is different from HIs	17	71	4	91
15) DIs should be assigned when a consumer uses their own home signs	78	11	76	4
16) DIs should be assigned when a consumer uses a sign language other than ASL	76	3	73	3
17) DIs should be assigned to interpret for DeafBlind consumers	74	11	61	5

18) Cultural background should be considered when a DI is assigned to consumers	83	3	88	12
19) Linguistic backgrounds should be considered when a DI interpreter is assigned to consumers	88	4	88	12
20) Gender and sexuality identities should be considered when assigning a DI	51	18	55	14
21) Religious backgrounds should be considered when assigning a DI	40	23	44	20
22) At minimum, DIs must be highly proficient in American Sign Language and written English	74	14	74	7
23) DIs are not required to abide by the Registry for Interpreters for the Deaf's Code of Professional Conduct	76	6	84	4
24) DIs should be able to effectively capture and interpret the cultural differences of Deaf consumers	92	6	96	4
25) DIs do not need to be certified	71	11	64	18
26) DIs do not need to use HIs in every assignment	54	24	66	5
27) Deaf native signers hold the best qualifications to be a DI	54	19	43	11
28) DIs are not only for minimal signers	79	15	87	4
29) The use of a DI may be beneficial for Deaf consumers with 'limited' educational backgrounds	85	10	85	3
30) Deaf consumers who are educated benefit from services from DIs	67	10	74	5
31) Not every assignment requires the presence of a DI	65	13	73	3
32) The role of a DI is solely to clarify information	24	63	10	84
33) The increased time spent by using a DI is not a burden to Deaf consumers	54	15	43	20
34) Deaf consumers can receive full access to language and communication without relying on DIs	16	24	25	14

35) All individuals with hearing loss can qualify as DIs	6	42	5	61
36) DIs must be assigned exclusively for tactile/ProTactile interpretation	26	47	5	70
37) The increased time spent by using a DI is not a burden to hearing providers	40	27	37	32
38) DIs must by highly skilled in ASL receptive skills	94	4	99	1
39) DIs should be highly skilled in multiple communication modalities (IS, SEE, PSE, etc.)	64	14	66	5
40) DIs must be highly skilled in ASL expressive skills	99	1	91	1
41) HIs are the best option for providing communication access between hearing and Deaf Individuals	23	49	16	58
42) DIs must work with HIs at all times	38	39	12	74
43) DIs are only needed in special situations	33	58	17	68
44) DIs are expected to copy word for word exactly the way the HI signs	0	95	4	91
45) Performing dual roles as a DI and a HI is acceptable	13	58	10	64
46) DIs do not need to be highly fluent in American Sign Language	1	90	1	89

Key: DI = Deaf Interpreter, HI = Hearing interpreter

Missing data makes up the remaining percentages.

DEAF VERSUS HEARING DIFFERENCES IN THE TABLE OF AGREEMENT

In evaluating if there were significant differences between the percentages of agreement between Deaf and hearing participants regarding DIs versus hearing interpreters, only four items were significantly different (see Table 3).

These results suggest that within this sample, both Deaf and hearing participants view most of the items within the BADi in similar ways. The four items mentioned above differ in interesting ways and warrant further research. For example, the notion that a DI must work with hearing interpreters is intriguing, as more Deaf individuals than hearing individuals seem to support this idea.

Table 3. Tests of the Proportions on Individual Items by Deaf versus Hearing

Item Name	Deaf Proportion	Hearing Proportion	Proportion Difference	Test of the proportion and *p* value
Incorporating DI is new concept	60	24	36	19.31 p=.0001
DI important to Deaf Community	96	45	51	45.02 p=.0001
DI must work with HI	38	12	26	13.13 p=.0003
DI must be assigned to DeafBlind for ProTactile and tactile	26	5	21	12.30 p=.0005

KEY FINDINGS

Key findings show that both Deaf and hearing participants with interpreting experience recognize the important role of DIs in the field of sign language interpreting. To assess attitudes toward DIs, researchers developed an attitude scale, which was later validated by collecting responses from RID-certified interpreters. A review for consistency led to the removal of a few items that did not add to the overall measure. Differences between Deaf and hearing participants were found in four key areas: hearing interpreters viewed DIs as a newer concept, while Deaf participants recognized a longer history; Deaf participants rated DIs as more important than hearing participants did; Deaf participants were more likely to say that DIs must collaborate with hearing interpreters; and significantly more Deaf participants believed DIs should work with DeafBlind clients using Protactile communication. Future research should explore whether these findings hold true in a larger population.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study align seamlessly with the introduction, emphasizing the critical role of DIs in bridging linguistic and cultural gaps. As highlighted earlier, DIs have historically played essential roles in various contexts, including legal, mental health, and educational settings (Forestal, 2005; Vernon & Miller, 2001). The BADi scale results confirm these foundational ideas, shedding light on the shared recognition of the importance of DIs among Deaf and hearing participants. The value of including a DI in many situations like use of ProTactile, those with low literacy levels, as well as being used in medical and legal contexts were equally endorsed by all participants. This valuing of DIs contrasts with recent complaints by TV viewers regarding the California wildfires.

After seeing both Deaf and hearing interpreters on the MSNBC tv news, Christopher Rufo, known for his dismissive attitude towards critical race theory, posted a video mocking ASL interpreters (Garcia, 2025). He claimed that the news should stop showing "ridiculous" ASL

interpreters because they turn press conferences into a joke. Rufo also announced the dangerous assumption that closed captions were sufficient for Deaf people. Then, Charlie Kirk complained that he could not watch and follow emergency information because ASL interpreters on the screen were distracting.

Unfortunately, many people supported their views, showing ignorance for agreeing that ASL interpreters were a distraction. This attitude is harmful because Deaf people and people with disabilities are vulnerable during disasters and emergencies. When last-minute notifications, such as evacuation orders, are issued during events like wildfires, Deaf people rely heavily on ASL interpreters to receive critical information.

These ignorant comments with support from many people highlight the urgent need for greater understanding of societal attitudes toward the use of DIs, especially outside the interpreting community that favors the use of DIs as discussed. Recognizing the essential role of interpreters for equal access during emergencies is crucial for fostering these types of comments from hearing participants exhibited less familiarity with the scope and necessity of DIs, pointing to a need for broader education and outreach to enhance awareness of their critical contributions that should be included in future research.

A few differences were significantly different between Deaf and hearing participants. For instance, DIs demonstrated a stronger emphasis on the necessity of DIs for working with DeafBlind individuals, especially those using tactile and ProTactile interpreting, bring valuable lived experiences and a deeper understanding of these roles. In contrast, hearing interpreters viewed DIs as a relatively new concept. Interestingly, DIs were more likely to affirm the necessity of working with hearing interpreters—a somewhat surprising finding that appears to be in clear need of additional research. These types of findings suggest that Holcomb's (2025) concept of DEAM (Deaf Dream Team) is timely.

The DEAM approach, introduced by Thomas K. Holcomb (2025), underscores the importance of Deaf-centered interpreting through collaboration between interpreters and Deaf individuals. This framework calls for interpreters to unpack their privileges, engage in dialogue with Deaf clients, and consider the broader context of Deaf individuals' lives. Like the findings of this study, DEAM emphasizes the importance of fostering culturally sensitive and empowering interpreting practices. Insights from the BADi scale support this vision by identifying disparities in perceptions, particularly among hearing participants and advocating for targeted educational initiatives to address these gaps.

The results also highlight the unique qualifications of DIs, particularly their ability to navigate complex communication challenges and specialized contexts, such as legal settings and DeafBlind communication. According to the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (2024), DIs' lifelong fluency in signed languages and cultural expertise equip them to provide accurate, culturally sensitive interpretations that foster consumer autonomy. These attributes underscore their irreplaceable value in achieving communication equity, particularly for underserved populations like the DeafBlind community.

Future Research and Limitations

While the study focused on interpreters, broader research is needed to include general samples of Deaf consumers and hearing individuals to fully understand community-wide perceptions of DIs. The disparities in hearing participants' responses, such as their lower familiarity with the contexts in which DIs are essential, suggest potential undervaluation stemming from limited exposure or education. These findings mirror prior research indicating that hearing professionals do not always fully appreciate the critical contributions of DIs, despite their significance in ensuring accurate and culturally competent communication (Adam et al., 2011; Beldon, 2017). The comments regarding interpreters on screen at emergency briefings also suggest that more education is needed regarding the benefit of both DIs and hearing interpreters at these briefings to the Deaf community. For example, Dr. Patricia Hughes, the CEO of the Greater Los Angeles Agency on Deafness, Inc. (GLAD), shared that there were not enough CDIs during the recent California wildfires. Regardless, she emphasized the importance of ensuring that qualified interpreting services are provided at all times to facilitate effective communication, particularly in public shelters and to address areas for improvement later (The Daily Moth, 2025).

All research has limitations and this one does also. The participants were either interpreters or educators in this study. Broader participation is now needed to address issues like those discussed above regarding the resistance to having live interpreters at press conferences as well as the tendency for some stations to not fully show the live interpreter on the screen. This study, while comprehensive in its scope of interpreters and educators, highlights several areas for further investigation. Broader research is needed to include general samples of Deaf consumers and hearing individuals to gain a more complete understanding of community-wide perceptions of DIs. The disparities observed in hearing participants' responses, particularly their lower familiarity with the contexts in which DIs are essential, suggest a potential undervaluation due to limited exposure or education. Future studies should address these gaps, exploring the effects of targeted educational initiatives on public attitudes toward DIs.

Additionally, research should examine the societal resistance and misconceptions surrounding the presence of interpreters at public events, such as the backlash against ASL interpreters in emergency briefings. Investigating the impact of such public attitudes on the accessibility and inclusion of DIs during critical situations will provide valuable insights for advocacy and policy development.

Another limitation of this study is its reliance on participants primarily connected to the interpreting or educational sectors. Expanding the sample to include diverse demographic and occupational groups, such as medical professionals, legal practitioners, and general community members, could provide a broader understanding of societal attitudes and beliefs about DIs. Furthermore, the influence of cultural, linguistic, and intersectional identities on perceptions of DIs warrants deeper exploration. Finally, given the evolving roles and recognition of DIs, longitudinal studies are recommended to track changes in beliefs and attitudes over time, particularly as awareness and educational efforts progress. These studies could also explore the efficacy of different training and certification programs for DIs in addressing the unique challenges they face in diverse contexts.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the BADi scale emerges as a foundational tool for measuring beliefs and attitudes about DIs, offering valuable insights to inform policy changes and training programs. By addressing intersectional factors such as cultural, gender, and linguistic diversity, this tool can foster greater understanding and collaboration within interpreting and related fields. Expanding training opportunities, increasing outreach, and fostering community-based research are crucial steps toward bridging linguistic and cultural divides and maximizing the contributions of DIs. These efforts align with the DEAM vision of inclusive, empowering interpreting experiences that ensure meaningful participation and engagement for Deaf individuals.

REFERENCES

Adam, R., Aro, M., Druetta, J. C., Dunne, S., & Klintberg, J. (2014). Deaf Interpreters: An Introduction. In R. Adam, C. Stone, S.D. Collins, & M. Metzger (Eds.), *Deaf interpreters at work*: *International insights* (pp. 1-18). Gallaudet University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2t5xgm8

Adam, R., Carty, B., & Stone, C. (2011). Ghostwriting: Deaf translators within the Deaf community. *Babel, 57*(4), 375–393. https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.57.4.01ada

Beldon, J. (2017). *Deaf interpreters: The value of formative experience.* StreetLeverage. https://streetleverage.com/live_presentations/deaf-interpreters-value-formative-experience/\

Bienvenu, M. J., & Colonomos, B. (1992). Relay interpreting in the '90s. In L. Swabey (Ed.), *Proceedings of the eighth national convention of the conference of interpreter trainers* (pp. 69–80). Conference of Interpreter Trainers.

Bronk, A. (2009). Interpreters: Gatekeepers for the deaf interpreter community. *RID Views*. *26*(2), 27-28.

Carty, B., Macready, S., & Sayers, E. E. (2009). "A grave and gracious woman": Deaf people and signed language in colonial New England. *Sign Language Studies*, *9*(3), 38-57.

Feilbach, J. (2023). Healthcare Providers' Perceptions of Deaf-Hearing Interpreter Teams: Impact of Interpreting Approaches. *Journal of Interpretation. 31(*1*).* https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol31/iss1/2

Forestal, E. (2005). The emerging professionals: Deaf interpreters and their views and experiences on training. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson, & E. Winston (Eds.), *Sign language interpreting and interpreter education*, (p. 235-258). Oxford University Press.

Garcia, E. (2025, January 13). *As wildfires rage, this conservative attacks sign language interpreters sharing news*. MSNBC. https://www.msnbc.com/opinion/msnbc-opinion/california-wildfires-deaths-asl-chris-rufo-rcna187341

Holcomb, T. K. (20, January 2025). *Deaf Centered Interpreting - Ep. 1 - "DEAM" - Deaf Dream Team*. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z4syPQw8US4

Mathers, C. M. (2009). Modifying instruction in the deaf interpreting model. *The International Journal of Interpreting, 1*, 68-76.

NCIEC Deaf Interpreter Work Team. (2009). Analysis of Deaf interpreter focus group discussions conducted April-July 2007. *National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers.* http://www.diinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/DI_FocusGroups_FinalReport1.pdf

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (2024). *Professional Practice Paper: Deaf Interpreter.* https://rid.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/RID-PPP-Deaf-Interpreter.pdf

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. (1997). *Standard practice paper: Use of a certified deaf interpreter.* https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3DKvZMflFLdbXFLVVFsbmRzTVU/view?resourcekey=0-DOFw0jDu1kIDMlsVKhi29g

Sforza, S. (2014). DI(2) = Team Interpreting. In R. Adam, C. Stone, S. D. Collins, & M. Metzger (Eds.), *Deaf Interpreters at work: International insights* (pp. 19–28). Gallaudet University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2t5xgm8.7

Takeda, K. (2008). Interpreting at the Tokyo war crimes tribunal. *Interpreting*, *10*(1), 65–83. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.10.1.05tak

The Daily Moth. (14, January 2025). *Interview with GLAD on Los Angelos wildfires.* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xRPQzqRUCH0

Vernon, M., & Miller, K. (2001). Interpreting in mental health settings: Issues and concerns. *American Annals of the Deaf 146*(5), 429-434. https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0200

Wilcox, P. (1995). Dual interpretation and discourse effectiveness in legal settings. *Journal of Interpretation*, 7(1), 89–98.