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Conference interpreting in the United States

Renée Jourdenais

Historical development

In the United States, the advent of conference interpreting dates back to 1789. This is when Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson established within the US government what is now called the Office of Language Services for high-level diplomatic interpreting. The bilingual officers and secretaries staffing the Office played a key role in facilitating diplomatic efforts. As the nation grew in prominence, so, too, did the need for bilingual personnel, expanding considerably in the late 1800s and early 1900s with increasing foreign trade and diplomatic relations (Sawyer 2016). Many of these personnel served in overseas assignments and by the late 1800s, formal “interpreter” positions had been established in a handful of countries (Barnes & Morgan 1961, as cited in Sawyer 2016). While the office in Washington, DC, had been staffed with translators for many years, it wasn’t until after the Second World War that the first interpreting positions were created in Washington (Sawyer 2016). The current Office of Language Services provides diplomatic and conference interpreting for the White House, the US Department of State, and other federal agencies associated with the Executive Branch of the government.

The establishment of the United Nations at the end of the Second World War and resulting decision that it would be a multilingual organization was a pivotal moment for conference interpreting as a profession (Baigorri-Jalón 2004), and for the US interpreting community. The United Nations Headquarters in New York City became a central location for high-level diplomatic discussions among world leaders. Commonly known as UNHQ, it is home to the General Assembly and Security Council, as well as many other intergovernmental councils and organizations. The decision that the UN would operate with two working languages (English and French) and five official languages (English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian) necessitated the use of the interpreters (see Ruiz Rosendo & Diur, Chapter 9, in this volume). At that time, diplomatic interpreters worked in the consecutive mode, typically standing alongside delegates, representatives, and leaders (see Slaughter Olsen, Liu & Viaggio, Chapter 5, in this volume). The interpreting technologies that had been used for simultaneous interpreting during the Nuremberg Trials of 1945 were of great interest for managing the complexity of this multilingual environment. Developed by American businessman Edward Filene and
British engineer A. Gordon-Finlay, these technologies, known as the Filene-Finlay system, consisted of a telephonic relay mechanism, which allowed interpreters to use individual, hands-free microphones to transmit their interpretations to audience members, who could select to hear different languages by choosing a headset from a particular receiving unit (US Patent 1874480A). The development of this system proved to be a defining event for conference interpreting in that it enabled multiple languages to be interpreted simultaneously within a particular audience. The General Assembly adopted this new mode of simultaneous interpreting as the new standard interpreting mode for the UN in 1947 (Baigorri-Jalón 2016; United Nations 1947) (see Baigorri-Jalón 2004, for an interesting discussion of this transition; see also Baigorri-Jalón, Fernández-Sánchez & Payás, Chapter 1, in this volume).

Throughout the decades that followed, simultaneous interpreting technologies became more widespread. With the UN in New York City and the US capital in Washington, DC, these cities became home to many other international organizations as well, including, for example, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Organization of American States, and the Pan-American Health Organization among many others, who used conference interpreters for meetings of their international delegates.

International conventions and annual meetings of large international companies also used simultaneous interpreting services to ensure that their international participants could communicate successfully. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, large conventions using simultaneous interpreting took place in the big cities on the East Coast of the United States: Boston, New York, Orlando, and Miami. The practice slowly spread westward to cities like Las Vegas, Anaheim, and Los Angeles, as they grew popular as convention sites (B. Weber, pers. comm., 17 May 2019).

Main language combinations

With the majority of conference interpreting work in the US focused on the diplomatic functions and high-level meetings carried out by the United Nations and the Department of State, languages of interpretation in the US vary widely. The UNHQ provides interpreting in its six official languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. The Department of State employs in-house conference interpreters working in approximately ten languages and has contracts with hundreds of independent contractors in over 40 other languages to provide for the diplomatic, economic, security and partnership needs of the US government (US Department of State 2020). All of these languages are, not surprisingly, paired with English.

While there is a wide variety of languages used in the diplomatic interpreting community, in the private conference interpreting market, Spanish-English is the most common spoken language pairing (Spanish to English followed by English to Spanish), with French-English interpreting frequent as well (French to English, followed by English to French—with the French to English direction frequent in the UN context) (AIIC 2016; Kelly et al. 2010). Of course, the languages of the conference and business markets differ depending upon the topic and/or industry in focus: the IT and financial domains, for example, frequently call for interpreting services in Japanese, Chinese, and Korean; the automobile industry often requires Japanese and German interpreting; the aerospace industry provides Russian interpreters with many opportunities for work; and many trade negotiations rely on Spanish interpreters. Locations of these industries also impact languages used for interpreting. For example, Japanese is a frequently interpreted language in the Silicon Valley of California where many technology giants reside.
In the US market, most conference interpreters work from English into another language, be that one’s A (dominant/L1) or one’s B language (Violet 2020). UN staff interpreters constitute a notable exception. They work only into their A language in English, French, Russian, and Spanish, but do work in both directions in Arabic and Chinese (United Nations n.d.). This English-to-other-language dominance in the market is due to the fact that at major conferences and meetings, most participant speakers, regardless of their native language, now use English (see section English as a lingua franca below) and the interpreters interpret into other languages for the broader listening audience. There is also a notable amount of C (passive) language into A language interpreting in the US—particularly in the UN context, where interpreters may work from their B or C languages into their A language (AIIC 2016).

Market features

The United Nations is the single largest employer of conference interpreters in the US. UNHQ has over 100 interpreters on staff and contracts with hundreds more in the local freelance market who have passed the UN in-house exams to earn a place on their rosters. These interpreters provide services for the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, as well as for their subsidiary organizations and many other conferences held at the headquarters (UN 2020). The Department of State (DoS), likewise, is a large employer of conference interpreters. The DoS has approximately 15 conference interpreters on staff, but works with hundreds of freelance interpreters who have passed the DoS interpretation exams and security clearance (US Department of State 2020). Interpreters for the DoS serve an important role in US foreign policy, facilitating communication between world leaders and representatives, and at small bilateral, multilateral and technical conferences on a wide range of global issues (see Slaughter Olsen, Liu & Viaggio, Chapter 5, in this volume).

While staff interpreting positions are available in international organizations and businesses, the majority of conference interpreters in the US are freelancers. As indicated above, a freelance interpreter may also work for either the UN or DoS in addition to doing interpreting for the private market. In fact, in the 2016 AIIC survey, conference interpreters indicated that their work days are somewhat evenly split among these various employers, with the private market providing them with 40 per cent of their work days, special term employers, like the DoS, making up 30 per cent of their work days, and agreement sectors, such as the UN, contributing to another 30 per cent of their interpreting days (AIIC 2016).

In the private market, as one might expect, multinational business meetings and conferences make up a large portion of the work. Major US cities such as San Francisco, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Orlando, Boston, and New York frequently host large conventions and conferences which use simultaneous interpreting in diverse languages. Interpreting at many of these multilingual events is organized by private agencies providing interpreting services. These language service providers recruit and hire the freelance interpreters for these events, and often provide the booths and technological equipment needed for simultaneous interpreting at the venues.

Interpreted conferences and meetings cover a wide range of domains, distributed geographically according to the activities and business sectors dominant in different areas of the country. For example, West Coast interpreting opportunities may focus on information technology, especially, for example, in the Silicon Valley area of California. In Washington, DC, topics tend toward government and policy issues. New York City requires considerable interpreting related to financial markets and, of course, diplomacy, as the UNHQ is located there. Both Texas and
Florida host many meetings and conferences related to the space industry due to the location of major NASA Space Centers in these states. Across the US, the field of athletics also hosts many committee meetings and press conferences requiring the services of conference interpreters.

Not surprisingly, conference interpreters tend to reside in the major cities where the need for interpreting predominantly arises. For example, there are high concentrations of conference interpreters in cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles and Seattle on the West Coast and in New York, Washington, DC, and Miami on the East Coast, with the Houston/Dallas area in Texas also a popular home for interpreters (AIIC 2020; Kelly et al. 2010).

While 73 per cent of interpreters indicate that they work uniquely in the conference market, the other 27 per cent report that they are also engaged in other types of interpreting activities, including medical interpreting, legal interpreting, interpreting in educational and social service settings, and, sometimes, teaching (Kelly et al. 2010).

Conference interpreters report that they work predominantly in the simultaneous mode, and staff interpreters at the UN work almost exclusively in this mode (AIIC 2016). DoS interpreters engage in consecutive interpreting when facilitating conversations among world leaders and representatives, but simultaneous interpreting predominates in conferences and meetings hosted by various government entities. Freelance interpreters report using a broader range of modalities than staff interpreters, although again, most of the work is simultaneous. They also engage in consecutive interpreting, working with bidule (hand-held transmitters and headsets), and doing occasional liaison (escort) and chuchotage (whispering) interpreting (AIIC 2016) (see also Bartłomiejczyk & Stachowiak-Szymczak, Chapter 2, in this volume).

American Sign Language (ASL)

When languages of interpreting are surveyed across the broader interpreting market, English, Spanish, and American Sign Language (ASL) make up the majority of the US interpreting market (Kelly et al. 2010). While ASL is most commonly used in community interpreting settings (not unlike interpreting services overall), one also frequently finds ASL interpreters working in classrooms, on news broadcasts (especially during emergency situations), in performance venues (e.g. at concerts, plays), and increasingly, in more ‘traditional’ conference interpreting settings, such as diplomatic events and professional conferences.

The 1980s saw the initial use of Deaf Interpreters in formal conference settings. One of these first conferences was reported to be held in Monterey, California, in 1983. The Conference of Interpreter Trainers brought in conference interpreting faculty from the Monterey Institute of International Studies (now known as the Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey) to give talks on interpreter education. One of the participants from Gallaudet University invited a Deaf Interpreter to provide a sight interpretation in ASL of her oral presentation (Stone & Russell 2014). The Deaf Way conference hosted in Washington, DC, several years later also featured Deaf Interpreters (Stone & Russell 2014).

The Americans with Disabilities Act passed in 1990 required that the Deaf community be provided with services enabling them to participate equally in all aspects of society. This furthered opportunities for the Deaf community in the professional workspace, and created a broader need for ASL interpreting services and expertise:

The needs of these deaf professionals, who may be lawyers, neurologists, teachers, medical practitioners, CEOs, members of parliament, etc., has led to a change in the interpreting field too, with interpreters having to work increasingly from the signed language of a
technical expert into a spoken language, with specialised terminology and in a specific register, or in diplomatic or corporate environments—echelons previously the domain of spoken language interpreters only.

(Bontempo 2015: 120)

With increasing need for qualified interpreters with technical expertise for such events, the US National Institutes of Health (NIH) awarded a grant to the organizers of the 2006 Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research (TISLR9) conference “to provide full access to the conference for US Deaf researchers in attendance and to develop an access protocol that could be replicated for other scientific conferences in the United States” (Supalla et al. 2010: 197). The TISLR is an internationally recognized academic conference for the presentation of sign language research. However, until this particular 2006 event, provision of interpreters for Deaf participants had been largely the responsibility of the participants themselves, resulting in very uneven access to the shared research (Supalla et al. 2010). The 2006 conference, held in Brazil, had four official languages: ASL, Brazilian Sign Language, Brazilian Portuguese and English, and was deliberately planned for both deaf and hearing participants. This NIH grant-funded ASL Access project, carefully coordinated among researchers, conference organizers and ASL interpreters, established guidelines and procedures for every aspect of interpretation services at the conference: identifying and recruiting qualified interpreters; scheduling sign language interpreters and overall conference events in order to accommodate the interpreters; working with conference organizers and presenters; working with interpreters of other spoken and signed languages; and establishing appropriate physical arrangements for interpreters and monitors on stage (Supalla et al. 2010). (See also Turner, Gribič, Stone, Tester & de Wit, Chapter 38, in this volume.)

**Trends**

Perhaps the most influential “trend” in the conference interpreting market has been the recent COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic cancelled virtually all US conference interpreting events for the major part of 2020 and this has continued into 2021 (at the time this chapter is going to press). Large gatherings of people were discouraged (if not prohibited), travel was halted, and workplaces were closed. Events that required multilingual interpretation simply ceased to exist. That said, diplomatic venues like the UN and Department of State had to quickly find ways to continue their work—and remote, or distance, interpreting provided a means to do so.

**Remote simultaneous interpreting**

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, advances in technology and increasing use of online meeting and teleconferencing platforms had been impacting conference interpreting field in interesting ways. First and foremost was the fact that these technologies were increasing the reach of meetings and events, thereby increasing the potential for multilingual and multicultural participants. This, in turn, was increasing the demand for interpreters, especially for those who were willing to interpret on these new platforms.

As a result, a number of companies developed remote simultaneous interpreting platforms specifically designed to facilitate multilingual interpreting during events such as webinars and virtual meetings. Initially interpreters had only audio access to the events they were interpreting, but then gained video access in the early 2010s thanks to the advent of browser- and cloud-based technologies (Olsen 2020). The availability of cloud-based platforms soon
made conference interpreting more possible and more cost-effective for many companies. Without the costs of bringing a team of interpreters on-site, non-governmental organizations, non-profit organizations, and even therapeutic support groups were increasingly able to use remote interpreting services for their multilingual meetings (see Seeber & Fox, Chapter 35, in this volume).

Even on-site events were making use of these interpreting technologies to stream interpretation to wider audiences. Once limited by the number of booths, the range of languages available for a conference was now limited only by the bandwidth of the server. A 2019 Las Vegas conference, for example, was streamed online to 4000 listeners, in 23 languages, using 64 interpreters who were working from an interpreting hub set up at the event and in another city, where an additional 18 interpreters were located (N. Bowman, pers. comm., 17 May 2019).

Prior to the pandemic, the UN had also begun streaming interpretations from booths live on UN Web TV and on the YouTube United Nations LIVE Channel. Interpretations were no longer only for a small group of UN delegates, but were now being remotely broadcast to audiences around the world. Delegates were now able to speak to and be heard by those they represented.

These uses of remote interpreting technologies were not occurring without critics and concerns. While the interpreting environments of the on-site interpreters were still largely controlled for quality, there were times when interpreters found themselves in less-than-ideal situations, for example, interpreting without visuals, with poor internet connectivity, and with questionable sound quality. Furthermore, while these platforms provided access to interpreting services for those who may not have otherwise been able to hire interpreters, the need for interpreters for short interpreting assignments began to raise questions about the appropriateness of the “day rate” for interpreters. Travel days were no longer required and newer clients did not necessarily understand how the rate scale applied to interpreters who were only interpreting for an hour or two.

While some interpreters were embracing the new opportunities and intrigued by the challenges afforded by these technologies, others were steadfast in their commitment to on-site interpreting assignments.

And then the COVID-19 pandemic hit.

The COVID-19 pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic dramatically decreased, and in many cases actually eliminated, the need for conference interpreting services (DS-Interpretation 2020; Nimzdi, 2020). In early 2020, events, organizations, businesses, and travel were shut down worldwide for an anticipated period of several weeks. Those weeks soon turned into months. In fact, as of this writing, 14 months after the start of the pandemic, there are still no in-person business gatherings of any size in the US and most large companies still have many of their employees working from home. Travel is minimal, particularly for groups, and large conference gatherings were either cancelled or went virtual in 2020 and will be virtual in 2021 as well. That said, businesses and organizations have adjusted to their new virtual environments, and small pockets of conference interpreting services have been reappearing, most notably in diplomatic organizations like the UN and the Department of State, in the technology sector (e.g. remote conferences on networking strategies), and in the political sector (e.g. political town hall meetings, as 2020 was a presidential election year in the US).

Working under pandemic restrictions has increased the need for, and the rush to, telecommuting and online communication options for interpreters. Meeting platforms, such as
Zoom and WebX, quickly incorporated features that could allow for interpreting into another language. Others, like Microsoft Teams, had partnered with technology companies who had developed video interpreting technology (VIT) and were now integrating the technology into their applications. In fact, companies engaged in the development of VIT have reported dramatic increases in business of 20 per cent to 250 per cent since the beginning of the pandemic (Nimzdi 2020). Several of these companies, Kudo, Interprefy, and VoiceBoxer, for example, are also providing trained interpreters for remotely interpreted events, and offering training to interpreters on their platforms (Kudo 2020).

In addition to the striking decline in conference interpreting work, the most dramatic change to the interpreting environment has been the fact that interpreters are now working from home. Even UN interpreters have found themselves providing diplomatic interpreting from their bedrooms, living rooms, and home offices—oftentimes with family members and pets present (United Nations Dept of Global Communications 2020). Working from home means that conditions are frequently less than ideal; poor internet connections, interruptions from household and neighbourhood noises, and the quality of equipment available, all impact the interpreting context. This has led interpreters to collaborate and seek out solutions for improving sound quality, protecting hearing, and ensuring adequate lighting. They have even lobbied for wording in their contracts that protects them from the challenges inherent in these virtual environments (e.g. DS-Interpretation, Inc. 2020).

**English as a lingua franca**

There is much discussion throughout the interpreting community about the use of English as a lingua franca and the challenges it creates for interpreters (e.g. Albl- Mikasa 2014; see also Albl-Mikasa, Chapter 39, in this volume). As English is the primary language used for communication in the US, its impact is perhaps somewhat less notable in the US than in other countries. That said, the English booth at conferences is less frequently found than it once was (B. Weber, pers. comm., 17 May 2019). Most conference and meeting communication in the private market occurs in English and, as previously mentioned, interpreters are typically working from English into languages spoken by visitors or guests.

International organizations and events continue to have an English booth. UN delegates may sometimes choose to use English for their presentations, but they want to be certain that their words are interpreted and recorded precisely in all of the official languages of the UN so that others around the world can hear and understand what they have said (S. Kochetov, pers. comm., 17 February 2020). A brief review of speeches on the YouTube United Nations channel shows that while international diplomats may use English, they also appreciate being able to switch to their primary languages during their speech for the purposes of rhetorical effect, thus requiring interpreters to be ready to interpret into English at any moment.

Many smaller business meetings between international partners are now simply conducted in English and thus do not require the skills of an interpreter. Even some international leaders have been known to use English for their conversations, with interpreters there on standby, to supply a word or clarification if need be.

**Professional associations**

There are several professional membership associations in the US for conference interpreters. The International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) has currently 150 members domiciled in the US and it has a US chapter (www.aiic-usa.com). Only AIIC is dedicated
to conference interpreting, the other US-based organizations focus on interpreters in general. The American Translators Association (ATA) (using ‘translators’ in its broader sense) (www.atanet.org) is the largest professional organization in the US for interpreters and translators, hosting an annual conference and advocating for issues of relevance for (mainly community) interpreters engaged in a variety of fields. The American Association of Language Specialists (TAALS) (www.taals.net) is a long-standing professional association for interpreters and focuses on ethical working standards. It also provides an online member directory for people seeking interpreters and translators. The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) (www.rid.org) and the National Association of the Deaf (NAD) (www.nad.org) are long-standing associations for interpreters of signed (and spoken) languages, advocating for quality interpreting standards, ethics, and offering ASL interpreter certification.

There are also numerous regional and professional organizations focused on interpreting in specific domains, for example, the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators (NAJIT) and the National Council on Interpreting in Health Care (NCIHC), among many others. Some conference interpreters join such associations as well because they intersect with domains in which they are very active.

Training opportunities

There are several programmes in the US that offer training for conference interpreters. One of the oldest and best-known programmes is that offered by the Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey (formerly, the Monterey Institute of International Studies) (MIIS). MIIS, which has been offering interpreter training since the 1960s, issues a Master of Arts (MA) in Conference Interpreting in each of seven languages paired with English: Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Korean, Russian, and Spanish. Gallaudet University, established in 1864 as an educational institution for the deaf and hard-of-hearing, offers both an MA and PhD in Interpretation in American Sign Language paired with English. In more recent years, in order to meet the increasing need for interpreters throughout the US, both the University of Illinois and the University of Maryland (UMD) began programmes for the training of conference interpreters. UMD offers both a Graduate Certificate in Conference Interpreting and a Master’s in Professional Studies in Interpreting, with a track in Conference Interpreting. The University of Illinois offers an MA in Translation & Interpretation with a specialization in Conference and Community Interpreting available both on-campus and online. Both the Maryland and Illinois programmes offer foundational coursework and training in English, with practice sessions available in a variety of languages.

Wake Forest University (WFU) offers an MA in Translation and Interpreting Studies (Spanish, Chinese, Portuguese) and a Graduate Certificate in Interpreting Studies (Spanish) in which there are opportunities during coursework for training in simultaneous interpreting. Similarly, New York University (NYU) offers an MA in Translation and Interpreting which has an elective course offering Consecutive and Conference Interpreting. This course is available in French, Spanish, and Chinese (paired with English).

There are a significant number of community college programmes, undergraduate programmes, and short-term professional courses throughout the US which offer training in ASL and/or Spanish interpreting, but this coursework typically prepares individuals for interpreting in community settings rather than in conference settings.

As there is no governing body or group in the US that determines the particular curriculum for an MA programme, each university is able to design an interpreting programme that best fits its faculty expertise and training goals. The above-mentioned MA programmes vary in length
from one to two years and vary in classes offered. As mentioned, some offer language-specific coursework, while others offer more generalized training. Such is the situation with domain-focused and theoretical training as well. Some programmes offer classes in, for example, translation or interpreting studies and/or research, while others may incorporate theory and research into their more practice-focused classes. Others, for example, have classes specifically titled “Interpreting in Organizations” or “Interpreting for Finance” while others simply include varied domains and terminology throughout the programme of study. This variability in course offerings and titles of classes makes it challenging to compare programmes from websites alone. Those selecting a training programme in the US would do well to research the individual features of the various programmes to see what best meets their goals and training needs.

Research from the region

Interestingly, the US produces very little research on conference interpreting. While there is a considerable library of publications on interpreting in community venues (e.g. medical, legal, educational, social), not much is researched regarding conference interpreting itself. With only a few MA-level training programmes across the States, a community of scholars or researchers focused on this domain of study simply does not exist. As mentioned above, Gallaudet University offers the only PhD programme in Interpreting, and while there is valuable research coming from that programme on the dialogic and discoursal aspects of ASL interpreting, the research is not particular to the conference environment.

Of pedagogical note from the US is David Sawyer’s (2004) book, *Fundamental Aspects of Interpreter Education: Curriculum and Assessment*, which discusses interpreter education more broadly and presents a case study of the German conference interpretation programme at MIIS in the late 1990s/early 2000s. More recently, Julie Johnson, also a professor at MIIS, has been researching the role of mindfulness in the training of interpreters (see Johnson, Chapter 40, this volume).

Looking ahead

At the current writing of this chapter (early 2021), the pandemic conditions are slowly easing in the US, and we are eager to see what this means for the future of conference interpreting. We know that adaptations made in the past 14 months are certain to lead to permanent changes in the field. One of which, most certainly, will be an increase in remote interpreting. The UN, the Department of State, international organizations, and the for-profit community, have realized that they can, in fact, successfully meet in the online environment, employing multiple languages with the services of interpreters, and without the costs and logistics of travel. No organizations, businesses, or institutions that I have spoken with believe that they will return to fully on-site events. They cite common themes of reduced costs and more language access as being two of the compelling reasons for this. Not having to pay for travel of meeting participants, or interpreters has been a welcome relief to many budgets. Furthermore, workarounds implemented during the pandemic have demonstrated that shorter meetings with remote interpreting are a viable alternative to multi-day conferences with on-site interpreting. As a result, many non-profit organizations and smaller businesses that never could have offered interpretation at their meetings in the past now do so. This has created new work for conference interpreters.

These remote interpreting opportunities will lead to increased flexibility for conference interpreters. Interpreters will be able to book assignments without additional travel days, better
structure their workday around shorter meetings, and entertain the possibility of living in areas of the US that are not associated with the extremely high cost of living in the big cities.

However, these opportunities demand vigilant interpreter advocacy: clients need to better understand the remote working conditions necessary for successful interpreting to take place; pricing structures for shorter meetings need to accurately represent the value provided by the interpreters, as well as the time invested in preparation; and interpreters need to ensure that their work is not sent “off-shore” where rates may be lower. Organizations, like TAALS and AIIC, and, in fact, even language service providers (LSPs), will play critical roles in advocating for interpreters and shaping the future of US conference interpreting.

Notes

1. This is a designation used by AIIC in the survey.
2. This is a designation used by AIIC for organizations with whom AIIC has established a collective agreement.
3. A Deaf Interpreter (DI) is an interpreter who is deaf or hard-of-hearing, has excellent communicative abilities in both ASL and English, as well as other visual and tactile communication modes, and, importantly, has extensive knowledge and understanding of the Deaf community.

Further reading
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