

INVESTIGATIONS IN

Healthcare Interpreting



**Brenda Nicodemus and
Melanie Metzger, Editors**

Investigations in Healthcare Interpreting

*Brenda Nicodemus
and Melanie Metzger,
Editors*



GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY PRESS

Washington, DC

Gallaudet University Press
Washington, DC 20002
<http://gupress.gallaudet.edu>

© 2014 by Gallaudet University
All rights reserved. Published 2014
Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 1-56368-612-0; 978-1-56368-612-2
ISSN 1545-7613

∞ This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

Investigations in Healthcare Interpreting

Melanie Metzger and Earl Fleetwood, General Editors

- VOLUME 1** *From Topic Boundaries to Omission: New Research on Interpretation*
Melanie Metzger, Steven Collins, Valerie Dively, and Risa Shaw, Editors
- VOLUME 2** *Attitudes, Innuendo, and Regulators: Challenges of Interpretation*
Melanie Metzger and Earl Fleetwood, Editors
- VOLUME 3** *Translation, Sociolinguistic, and Consumer Issues in Interpreting*
Melanie Metzger and Earl Fleetwood, Editors
- VOLUME 4** *Interpreting in Legal Settings*
Debra Russell and Sandra Hale, Editors
- VOLUME 5** *Prosodic Markers and Utterance Boundaries in American Sign Language Interpretation*
Brenda Nicodemus
- VOLUME 6** *Toward a Deaf Translation Norm*
Christopher Stone
- VOLUME 7** *Interpreting in Multilingual, Multicultural Contexts*
Rachel Locker McKee and Jeffrey E. Davis, Editors
- VOLUME 8** *Video Relay Service Interpreters: Intricacies of Sign Language Access*
Jeremy L. Brunson
- VOLUME 9** *Signed Language Interpreting in Brazil*
Ronice Müller de Quadros, Earl Fleetwood, and Melanie Metzger, Editors
- VOLUME 10** *More than Meets the Eye: Revealing the Complexities of K-12 Interpreting*
Melissa B. Smith
- VOLUME 11** *Deaf Interpreters at Work: International Insights*
Robert Adam, Christopher Stone, Steven D. Collins, and Melanie Metzger, Editors
- VOLUME 12** *Investigations in Healthcare Interpreting*
Brenda Nicodemus and Melanie Metzger, Editors

Introduction

During the fall that we were reviewing and editing this volume, Melanie's seven-year-old daughter Bonnie Rose ended up in the emergency room late at night, the evening before the American Thanksgiving holiday. Bonnie Rose had been suffering from a cold and cough, and woke up at 10:00 P.M. unable to stop coughing, and unable, really, to breathe. Concerned that she might have pneumonia, Melanie and her husband called their pediatrician, who recommended an immediate visit to an urgent care clinic for a chest x-ray. In route from the car, they called to request an appointment, only to discover they were being re-routed to the hospital for emergency room care.

In the emergency room they were fortunate—the waiting room was not crowded and there were intake and insurance experts available to acquire the needed legal information, medical history, and to check Bonnie Rose's pulse oxygen level (which was very low) simultaneously. Within the next three hours, their young daughter had blood tests, chest x-rays, nebulizer treatments, IV fluids, and was diagnosed as having not only walking pneumonia, but also her first-ever asthmatic reaction as well. After some discussion about antibiotics and related medications, they were sent home at 2:00 A.M. with prescriptions, medications, and instructions to address both their daughter's diagnosed problems.

Across North America, this type of medical experience is relatively common for many families, though the age, gender, and diagnoses of the patient vary greatly. Navigating the complex tapestry of healthcare professionals via a home phone, cell phone while driving, and face-to-face in the emergency room, while experiencing the emotional distress of having a loved one struggling with her health, raises a number of communicative challenges. All the factors that impact people's ability to coconstruct meaningful discourse, including gender, education, regional variation in language, conversational style, and so forth, are at play as always, but within a context of increased risk and tension. In the situation above, all the participants shared a common language. Added complexities are faced when healthcare interactions are mediated through an interpreter and a new set of issues comes into play with the discourse.

Early studies of doctor-patient discourse focused on a variety of issues, including the complex process of eliciting adequate medical history to

accurately diagnose a patient (Shuy, 1972, 1976, 1983). Research that examined the discourse of medical interviews (even without the stress of emergency care) identified numerous problems including language use differences, cultural differences, and divergent goals between doctors and patients. Further, healthcare providers often use medical jargon and specialized vocabulary that created challenges for patients' comprehension, despite sharing a common language (Shuy, 1972, 1976, 1979, 1983; Ford, 1976; Fisher, 1983).

Research also revealed that doctor-patient communication was hampered by different backgrounds, lifestyles, and world experiences (Cicourel, 1983; Mishler, 1984; Tannen & Wallat, 1983, 1993). Moreover, studies pointed out that the communication situation itself occurs in a place and with topics very familiar to the healthcare practitioner (e.g., the environment, the symptoms, and health issues), whereas the patient is often in a weakened state, in an unfamiliar place, and facing decisions that could impact their life routines or even whether they will live or die (Bonanno, 1995; Fisher, 1983).

The critical importance of successful healthcare interaction, as well as the implications should communication go awry, may well account for its ongoing study, even in communicative events that take place with a shared language. Studies continue to this day, focused on the complex communication that occurs in monolingual healthcare situations, updating earlier findings and examining the more current uses of eHealth technology, including doctor-patient communication via electronic messaging (see, for example, Leong et al., 2005; Wallwiener et al., 2009).

Given the documented challenges faced by healthcare practitioners and patients, it is not surprising that a growing body of evidence-based research focuses on bilingual or multilingual healthcare contexts, and issues of accessibility and communication when healthcare is mediated through interpreters. As Pöchhacker and Shlesinger's (2007) volume on discourse-based research in healthcare interpreting brings to light, the issues faced by interpreters, patients, and healthcare providers include not only the communication issues common in a monolingual healthcare discourse encounter, but also interpreters' performance standards and issues related to the participation framework and alignment of participants in medical encounters.

The current volume is intended to add to the dialogue about medical interpreting by providing evidence-based studies of interpreted health care on several critical issues. In Chapter 1, Angelelli reports

on an ethnographic examination of the coconstruction of understanding between Spanish-speaking healthcare patients and English-speaking healthcare providers in a public hospital in California, in the United States. Her study has practical and theoretical implications for interpreting studies in general and for the education of healthcare interpreters and healthcare providers in particular.

Extending previous studies that suggest the importance of an interpreter's interactional skills for accurate communication in medical settings, Major's study in c Chapter 2 examines interpreters' requests for clarification, and their interpretation of requests for clarification by the interlocutors.

Based on 15 years of data and the growing literature on bilingual health communication, Hsieh provides a description of emerging trends on interpreter-mediated healthcare in Chapter 3. Her chapter focuses on four trends: (a) recognizing interpreters as active participants in medical encounters, (b) examining medical interpreting as a coordinated accomplishment, (c) identifying the complexity of clinical demands, and (d) exploring contextual factors in bilingual health care.

Swabey, Nicodemus, and Moreland look at deaf bilingual physicians discourse in Chapter 4. This investigation focuses on how typical medical questions are translated into ASL, while also providing an overview of the current state of ASL-English healthcare interpreting. The authors examine the linguistic challenges in creating ASL translations of common medical interview questions, provide descriptions and samples of the ASL translations, and discuss patterns in the data as a step toward the ultimate goal of improving healthcare communication for deaf patients.

In Chapter 5, Brueck, Rode, Hessmann, Meinicke, Unruh, and Bergmann offer insights of five practicing signed language interpreters into the conditions and factors that characterize medical interpreting in Austria and Germany. One hundred and forty two healthcare assignments, delivered by the five interpreters in 2012, were documented and analyzed. After considering general challenges offered by the medical setting and outlining field-specific conditions in the two countries, recurrent features of medical encounters between deaf patients and hearing doctors that involve a signed language interpreter are discussed in detail with reference to the data.

Leeson, Sheikh, Rozanes, Grehan and Matthews' work on healthcare interpreting stems from cooperation in a European Commission funded project called Medisigns (2010–2012), and is addressed in Chapter 6.

Medisigns is an award-winning project that represents a ground-breaking initiative focused on providing a better understanding of the impact that interpreted interaction in medical contexts within the framework of a blended learning program for deaf people, interpreters, and those in the medical profession.

Driven by studies that document miscommunication and misunderstandings among monolingual healthcare patients and practitioners, and given that Deaf patients often lack access to healthcare information in an accessible form, In Chapter 7, Napier and Sabolcec report on a qualitative examination of access to healthcare information for deaf people in Australia.

In Chapter 8, Smeijers, van den Bogaerde, Ens-Dokkum, and Oudesluys-Murphy introduce guidelines for adapting internationally validated questionnaires found in specialized psychological and psychiatric health care and translating them into Sign Language of the Netherlands (*Nederlandse Gebarentaal*, NGT). The authors describe the selection and translation process of research instruments for use with deaf and hard of hearing individuals. The problems, dilemmas and ethical issues encountered are also discussed.

In Austria, amid a persistent lack of policy on reliable communication support services for patients with an insufficient command of German, an initiative was taken to jump-start professional interpreting service provision by harnessing videoconferencing technology. In Chapter 9, Pöchlhammer describes and analyzes a field test carried out in preparation for a pilot project on video interpreting for Austrian healthcare institutions. The discussion of the field test data links up various dimensions, highlighting how social forces such as public and professional attitudes and policy considerations are as critical to successful project implementation as human and technological resources.

In Chapter 10, in an exploratory study, van den Bogaerde and de Lange, questioned deaf clients ($n=276$) as well as medical healthcare workers ($n=445$) about their experiences about accessibility of healthcare for patients. The authors also present the results for a subgroup of eight sign language interpreters (SLIs) and four deaf communication experts that were involved in the survey and relate their results to the answers provided by deaf clients and hearing medical professionals. Their results indicate a discrepancy between groups, and therefore add support to previous calls for deaf awareness training for hearing healthcare staff as a necessary part of accessibility.

Our hope for the current volume is to bring together these empirical studies of healthcare interpretation in deaf and hearing bilingual or multilingual encounters that incorporate interpreters, to address the ongoing issues faced by all of us as we negotiate the complexities of communication in healthcare settings.

REFERENCES

- Bonanno, M. (1995). Hedges in the medical intake interview: Discourse task, gender, and role. PhD diss., Georgetown University.
- Cicourel, A. (1983). Hearing is not believing: Language and the structure of belief in medical communication. In S. Fisher & A. D. Todd (Eds.), *The social organization of doctor-patient communication*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Fisher, S. (1983). Doctor talk/patient talk: How treatment decisions are negotiated in doctor-patient communication. In S. Fisher & A. D. Todd (Eds.), *The social organization of doctor-patient communication* (pp. 135–157). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Ford, J. (1976). A linguistic analysis of doctor-patient communication problems. PhD diss., Georgetown University.
- Leong, S., Gingrich, D., Lewis, P., Mauger, T., & George, J. (2005). Enhancing doctor-patient communication using email: A pilot study. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine* 18(3) 180–188.
- Mishler, E. (1984). *The discourse of medicine: Dialects of medical interviews*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Pöchhacker, F., & Shlesinger, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Healthcare interpreting: Discourse and interaction*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Shuy, R. (1972). Sociolinguistics and the medical history. Paper presented at the Third International Conference of Applied Linguistics.
- Shuy, R. (1976). The medical interview: Problems in communication. *Primary Care* 3(3), 375–386.
- Shuy, R. (1979). Language policy in medicine: Some emerging issues. In J. Alatis & G. Tucker (Eds.), *Language in public life* (pp. xxx–xxx). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Shuy, R. (1983). Three types of interference to an effective exchange of information in the medical interview. In S. Fisher & A. Todd (Ed.), *The social organization of doctor-patient communication* (pp. 189–202). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Tannen, D., & Wallat, C. (1983). Doctor/mother/child communication: Linguistic analysis of pediatric interaction. In S. Fisher & A. Todd (Ed.), *The social*

organization of doctor-patient communication (pp. 203–219). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Tannen, D., & Wallat, C. (1993). Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Framing in discourse* (pp. 57–76). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wallwiener, M. C., Wallwiener, J., Kansy, H., Seegar, & Rajab, T. (2009). Impact of electronic messaging on the patient-physician interaction. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 15(5) 243–250.

Contributors

Claudia V. Angelelli
School of Management and
Languages
Heriot-Watt University
Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom

Anja Bergmann
Professional Signed Language Interpreter
Karlsruhe, Germany

Beppie van den Bogaerde
Department of Deaf Studies
Utrecht University of Applied Sciences
Utrecht, Netherlands

Patricia Brueck
Professional Signed Language Interpreter
Vienna, Austria

M. Ens-Dokkum
Medical Department
Kentalis School for the Deaf
Zoetermeer, Netherlands

Carmel Grehan
Centre for Deaf Studies
School of Linguistic, Speech and
Communication Sciences
Trinity College Dublin (University of
Dublin)
Dublin, Ireland

Jens Hessmann
Department of Health and Social
Sciences
Magdeburg-Stendal University of
Applied Sciences
Magdeburg, Germany

Elaine Hsieh
Department of Communication
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK

Rob de Lange
Research Unit Deaf Studies
Utrecht University of Applied Sciences
Utrecht, Netherlands

Lorraine Leeson
Centre for Deaf Studies, School
of Linguistic, Speech and
Communication Sciences, Trinity
College Dublin (University of
Dublin)
Dublin, Ireland

George Major
School of Language and Culture
Auckland University of Technology
Auckland, New Zealand

Patrick A. Matthews
Centre for Deaf Studies
School of Linguistic, Speech and
Communication Sciences
Trinity College Dublin (University
of Dublin)
Dublin, Ireland

Britta Meinicke
Professional Signed Language
Interpreter
Cologne, Germany

Christopher Moreland, MD
Department of Medicine
The University of Texas Health
Science Center
San Antonio, TX

Jemina Napier
Heriot-Watt University
School of Management and
Languages
Heriot-Watt University
Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom

Brenda Nicodemus
Department of Interpretation
Gallaudet University
Washington, DC

A. M. Oudesluys-Murphy
Department of Paediatrics
Leiden University Medical Centre
Leiden, the Netherlands

Franz Pöchhacker
Center for Translation Studies
University of Vienna
Vienna, Austria

Juliane Rode
Professional Signed Language
Interpreter
Munich, Germany

Ilana Rozanes
School of Computer Science and
Statistics
Trinity College Dublin (University of
Dublin)
Dublin, Ireland

Joseph Sabolcec
Northern Melbourne Institute of TAFE
Melbourne, Australia

Asim A. Sheikh
Barrister-at-Law
Four Courts, Dublin and Forensic
and Legal Medicine
School of Medicine and Medical Science
University College Dublin
Dublin, Ireland

Anika S. Smeijers, MD
Department of Paediatrics
Leiden University Medical Centre
Leiden, the Netherlands

Laurie Swabey
School of Humanities, Arts, and
Sciences
St. Catherine University
Minneapolis, MN

Daniela Unruh
Professional Signed Language Interpreter
Munich, Germany

Investigations in Healthcare Interpreting

Contents

Introduction	vii
Contributors	xiii
“Uh . . . I Am Not Understanding You at All”: Constructing (Mis)Understanding in Provider/Patient- Interpreted Medical Encounters <i>Claudia V. Angelelli</i>	1
“Sorry, Could You Explain That?” Clarification Requests in Interpreted Healthcare Interaction <i>George Major</i>	32
Emerging Trends and the Corresponding Challenges in Bilingual Health Communication <i>Elaine Hsieh</i>	70
An Examination of Medical Interview Questions Rendered in American Sign Language by Deaf Physicians and Interpreters <i>Laurie Swabey, Brenda Nicodemus, and Christopher Moreland</i>	104
Diagnosing Healthcare Assignments: A Year of Medical Interpreting for Deaf People in Austria and Germany <i>Patricia Brueck, Juliane Rode, Jens Hessmann, Britta Meinicke, Daniela Unruh, and Anja Bergmann</i>	128
Critical Care Required: Access to Interpreted Healthcare in Ireland <i>Lorraine Leeson, Asim A. Sheikh, Ilana Rozanes, Carmel Grehan, and Patrick A. Matthews</i>	185
Direct, Interpreter-Mediated or Translated? A Qualitative Study of Access to Preventive and Ongoing Healthcare Information for Australian Deaf People <i>Jemina Napier and Joseph Sabolcec</i>	233

Scientific-Based Translation of Standardized Questionnaires into Sign Language of the Netherlands	277
<i>Anika S. Smeijers, Beppie van den Bogaerde, M. Ens-Dokkum, and A. M. Oudesluys-Murphy</i>	
Remote Possibilities: Trialing Simultaneous Video Interpreting for Austrian Hospitals	302
<i>Franz Pöchhacker</i>	
Healthcare Accessibility and the Role of Sign Language Interpreters	326
<i>Beppie van den Bogaerde and Rob de Lange</i>	
Index	359

“Uh . . . I Am Not Understanding You at All”: Constructing (Mis)Understanding in Provider/Patient-Interpreted Medical Encounters

Claudia V. Angelelli

ABSTRACT

In multilingual societies, patients seeking health care and the health-care professionals who serve them often do not speak the same language. In a healthcare encounter, in both urban and rural areas, effective communication between these providers and patients is enabled by interpreters. Interpreters vary in their abilities and qualifications; moreover, for some language combinations there simply are as yet no professional interpreters. In this chapter I present a transcript of a typical healthcare provider–patient conversation about the patient’s current health concern contextualized in her medical history and medicine intake. I examine the co-construction of understanding among the interlocutors and the way in which they work together in an attempt to communicate. The data are part of a larger ethnographic study (Angelelli, 2001 & 2004a) conducted in a public hospital in California, where interpreters work for Spanish-speaking patients and English-speaking healthcare providers in both face-to-face and over-the-speakerphone interpreted communicative events (ICEs). This study has practical and theoretical implications for interpreting studies in general and for the education of health-care interpreters and healthcare providers in particular.



The need for communication between speakers of the more dominant and less dominant languages is constant. Providing reliable services for linguistically and culturally diverse linguistic minorities has proven to be a challenge all over the world. In multilingual societies, patients seeking health care and the healthcare professionals who serve them often do not speak the same language. In both urban and rural areas, communication between healthcare providers and patients who do not share a language