



AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
INTERPRETERS AND TRANSLATORS
IN EDUCATION

Job Task Analysis Study

for Interpreters and Translators in K–12 Education in the U.S.

To cite this report:

Rodríguez-Castro, M., Ball, J., Burisek, K., Siebach, G., & Xuo, X. (2025, May). Job Task Analysis for U.S. Interpreters and Translators in K–12 Education. AAITE.
<https://www.aaite.org/>

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Acknowledgments	3
Background	4
The JTA Committee	4
The Profession	4
Skill and Knowledge Requirements	5
Working Conditions	9
Conceptual Definitions	11
Methodology	13
Data Collection	14
Participants	15
Survey Design	16
Instrument Reliability	18
Results and Analysis	19
Knowledge and Skills	19
Duties, Tasks, and Responsibilities	27
Working Conditions	38
Conclusion	41
Knowledge and Skills	41
Duties, Tasks, and Responsibilities	44
Working Conditions	46
References	47
Appendix A – Data by State	50
Appendix B – Data by Language	53
Appendix C – Data by Stakeholder Type	57

Acknowledgments

The American Association of Interpreters and Translators in Education (AAITE) Job Task Analysis (JTA) Committee is grateful to those interpreters, translators, administrators, educators, and other professionals working in K–12 educational settings, as well as parent advocates and others who completed the JTA Survey in support of this project. Additionally, the AAITE JTA Committee would like to acknowledge the support of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte for their collaboration in conducting the JTA Survey and professional interpreter organizations that helped us distribute the survey, such as the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID), National Association of Interpreters in Education (NAIE), and American Translators Association (ATA).

Report Authors / JTA Committee Members

Mónica Rodríguez-Castro, PhD, Principal Investigator
Joelynn Ball, MS
Keith Burisek, former NAIE Vice-President
Gabriela Espinoza Siebach, MA
Xinyue Xuo, PhD

AAITE Board Members

Giovanna Carriero-Contreras, Acting Chair & Chair-Elect
Alejandro Méndez, Treasurer
Helena Senatore, Secretary
Luis Hernández, Communications Director
Carol Shaw, Director-at-large
Jennifer Williams, Director-at-large

AAITE Advisory Board Members

Bill Rivers, Chair
Katharine Allen
Montserrat Garibay
Bruce Adelson

Additional Project Contributors

Sandra Carranzas
Majd Haddad
Nicholas Magnolia
Joyce Rabellino
Holly Silvestri, PhD
Mónica Villalobos-Russell
Elizabeth Watkins

Background

The JTA Committee

The American Association of Interpreters and Translators in Education (AAITE) is a nonprofit professional association for interpreters and translators who work in kindergarten through twelfth grade (K–12) educational settings, along with other stakeholders, such as advocates, parents, and community members. In support of the AAITE mission to advance the professionalization of interpreters and translators in K–12 education throughout the United States, the AAITE established a Job Task Analysis (JTA) Committee to lead a nationwide analysis of the current knowledge, skills, duties, tasks, responsibilities, and working conditions of today’s interpreters and translators in K–12 education.

The first phase of this initiative afforded the JTA Committee the opportunity to collect and analyze job descriptions and current job postings for interpreters and translators published by a wide range of school districts throughout the nation. The resulting report, titled “What employers are looking for: A nationwide job description analysis for translators and interpreters in educational settings” (Ball et al., 2023), was published in March 2023. Phase I of the initiative provided the basis for a nationwide survey (Phase II) aimed to collect information from interpreters, translators, and other stakeholders of language and communication support services provided in K–12 educational settings to ascertain the knowledge, skills, duties, tasks, responsibilities, and working conditions of interpreters and translators who provide language and communication access in education to students and their families.

The Profession

As stated in the above AAITE report (Ball et al., 2023), in the U.S., legislative requirements tend to drive language services in the public sector (p. 5); however, policy related to language services in K–12 educational settings is limited and “does not clearly outline the duties, tasks, and responsibilities of those facilitating communication (i.e., interpreters and/or translators)” (p. 6). This

results in possible disparities and inconsistencies in requirements between states, and even between school districts within the same state (p. 35). For example, interpreters working in classrooms in the U.S. may be subject to state-specific requirements or have no requirements at all, leading to significant variability in qualifications and expectations.

Further complicating this landscape is the fact that not all individuals providing interpreting or translating services in education identify as interpreters or translators; they might provide these services in addition to a different primary role within the school or district. Many hold other roles within the educational system, such as bilingual aides, paraprofessionals, or family liaisons, yet still perform tasks that involve facilitating communication. This dual-role scenario highlights the blurred lines between professional designations and the practical needs of school districts.

Data from the AAITE report, “What employers are looking for,” underscores this complexity. Job descriptions for bilingual personnel often include responsibilities traditionally associated with interpreters and translators. These tasks may range from providing oral interpretation and written translation to facilitating communication between families and school staff. However, these positions frequently do not specify the professional qualifications or training typically required of interpreters or translators. This overlap between roles illustrates the need for clearer policies and standardized job descriptions to ensure consistency and professionalism in language services across educational settings (Ball et al., 2023, p. 24).

Skill and Knowledge Requirements

The analysis of job descriptions in the AAITE report (Ball et al., 2023) highlights significant discrepancies in how the roles of interpreters and translators are defined and understood in K–12 educational settings. While the language services industry recognizes interpreting and translation as two distinct professions, each requiring specialized skills and training (p. 7), many job descriptions in K–12 settings combine these tasks into a single role (p. 43). This conflation overlooks the unique demands of each profession and the need for tailored qualifications.

Moreover, job descriptions for interpreters in these settings rarely specify the modes of interpreting required for the role, despite the fact that interpreters have several modes at their disposal, including simultaneous (e.g., whisper interpreting), consecutive, and sight translation (p. 8). This omission creates ambiguity about the skills needed to succeed in these positions and reflects a broader lack of standardization in role expectations.

In terms of settings, job descriptions for interpreters primarily reference events, such as Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings, parent–teacher conferences, and classroom interpreting for signed language interpreters (p. 21). For translators, the tasks most commonly listed involve translating district communications and educational documents (p. 25). These findings underscore the breadth of responsibilities required in educational environments, where interpreters and translators are expected to respond to diverse communication needs.

An additional gap identified in the report is the lack of focus on soft skills—such as interpersonal skills, critical thinking, and collaboration—which are known to influence employability. Despite research showing the importance of soft skills in professional success, no research-based list currently exists for the soft skills required of interpreters and translators in K–12 settings. This absence represents an opportunity to better define the interpersonal and professional competencies that contribute to effective communication.

Events in K–12 education

Events in K–12 education, such as town-hall meetings, parent information sessions, performances, rallies, etc., vary in their level of formality and linguistic complexity. For example, some school districts may hold public town-hall meetings to discuss proposed redistricting initiatives¹ or hold parent information sessions about health issues, such as pertussis, or common disorders, such as autism. Additionally, some school districts may even provide language access for

¹ There are many examples of school districts holding public town-hall meetings. One example is the redistricting plan held by Las Cruces Public School District on Nov. 8, 2024. <https://www.lcps.net/article/1867215>

parents who communicate in a language other than English to events such as graduation or promotion ceremonies. However, not enough data are available regarding how often interpreting services are provided at these events.

IEP meetings

As required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, a child who receives special education and related services must have an Individualized Education Program (IEP). It captures the child's unique needs and is developed and maintained through meetings of the IEP Team (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 2020, p. 1). IEP meetings are held when a student is first deemed eligible for services (p. 7), annually, or more often as needed to review the IEP (p. 14), and every three years when the child is reevaluated (p. 4).

Parents are considered essential members of the IEP team, as they know their child well (p. 7), and therefore have the right to reasonable efforts on the part of the school to arrange for spoken or signed language–interpreting services (p. 12). The content discussed at an IEP meeting may include multiple levels of educational performance; academic, social, or behavioral goals and benchmarks; supplementary aids and services, etc. (pp. 5–6), and therefore may involve technical and specialized terminology and concepts that we define below.

Parent–teacher conferences

As described by Dr. Mary L. Gavin for Nemours KidsHealth, parent–teacher meetings or conferences (Different names are used by different school districts.) are often held once or twice a year and provide an opportunity for the teacher and parents to discuss the student's academic progress (Galvin, 2022, n.p.). In these meetings, the student's academic progress, homework, behavior, and test results may be discussed. These meetings are typically short (under one hour) and allow teachers to provide information and answer parent questions. The primary goal of these meetings is to elicit parent involvement in the child's education and thereby help them achieve their academic goals (Galvin, 2022, n.p.).

The classroom

Interpreters of signed languages who work in the classroom, partner with the teacher to promote the participation of deaf or hard-of-hearing students in the classroom (RID, 2010, p. 3). They may even participate in curriculum planning and preparing substitute interpreters (p. 2). These interpreters play an essential role in the student's knowledge and language acquisition, often serving as a language model, facilitator, and tutor (NAIE, 2019, p. 3). Since the services provided by the interpreter are part of an Individualized Education Program (IEP), signed language interpreters who provide services in the classroom are likely a vital member of the IEP team, where they clarify their role and responsibilities in the classroom and even share access-related observations and concerns (NAIE, 2021, p. 3).

Historically, interpreters in the classroom have primarily provided support for deaf or hard-of-hearing (D/HH) students by interpreting to/from a signed language. However, with increases in unaccompanied minors and awareness of their needs, recommendations for support of immigrant students now include providing interpreting and translation support for *spoken languages* (The Immigrant Learning Center, 2024). Even the College Board provides a degree of language accommodations for students designated as "English learners" by their state or federal policy (College Board, n.d.).

Skills assessments

For signed-language interpreters serving in the classroom, the National Association of Interpreters in Education (NAIE) maintains their support of the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA), which is a primary element in the standards because it is the only performance exam available that is designed to assess interpretation skills in classroom settings. A minimum EIPA score of 4.0 is recommended for interpreters working in classroom settings (NAIE, 2019). Additionally, the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment Written Test (EIPA-WT) is the only knowledge exam available that evaluates technical competencies unique to educational

interpreting. Nonetheless, it may be noted that “EIPA exams are not certifications or a credential by which interpreters should identify themselves (e.g., ‘Jane Doe, EIPA’)” (NAIE, 2023, p. 7–9).

Soft skills

Studies show that there is a relationship between soft skills—such as interpersonal skills, critical thinking, and collaboration—and employability (Asefer et al., 2021). In fact, employers look for attributes such as problem-solving skills, ability to work in a team, and written communication skills in candidates (NACE, 2023, p.26). Additionally, as described by Covey von Pingel (2019), there is a relationship between an interpreter’s soft skills and their first impression, which builds trust and helps navigate an interpreted event (p. 5), to ultimately allow for a successful interpretation. Therefore, a research-based list of soft skills required for interpreters and/or translators in K–12 settings remains critical for a thorough job task analysis.

Working Conditions

Working conditions include the terms and circumstances under which an interpreter or translator in K–12 settings has to work, including compensation and employment status, as they may impact the overall job satisfaction of an interpreter or translator.

Compensation

Since the cost of living varies per region throughout the U.S., compensation for most professions also varies. For interpreters and translators, specifically, variations may happen because of the setting (schools, hospitals, courts), geographical location, language, credentials, education, experience, and employment status (employee vs. contractor). According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS] (2024, n.p.), the median hourly pay for interpreters and translators in 2023 was \$27.45 per hour. This is lower than that of other professionals in educational settings and the lowest for interpreters and translators working in educational services, compared to those working in other settings. Additionally, the BLS indicated that the mean wage for nonmetropolitan areas with the highest concentration of jobs was as low as \$19.64 per hour in 2023 (in south

Nebraska), while the top-paying metropolitan-area mean wages were as high as \$46.95 per hour. However, the BLS does not categorize pay information for interpreters and translators by specialization or setting.

The American Translators Association (ATA) Compensation Survey (ATA, 2022) published that the gross average incomes for self-employed/freelance interpreters and translators are \$58,496 and \$48,305, respectively (p. 21), and the gross average income is \$71,154 for staff interpreters and \$60,674 for staff translators (p. 22). The report does not distinguish between those working in education (9.2% of freelance interpreter data and 5.6% of staff interpreter data) and those in other settings. It therefore includes salaries for interpreters and translators working in legal/court and conference settings, which in some markets receive higher compensation (pp. 28–49).

The total number of interpreters and translators providing services in educational settings is unknown and the BLS excludes self-employed interpreters and translators from their data. That said, while the number of jobs for all settings—schools, hospitals, courtrooms, etc.—for 2023 was estimated by the BLS at over 78,000 (with about 18%, or about 14,000, in educational services), the projected growth is only 2% with about 7,500 new openings expected per year.

Employment status

While employees (staff interpreters and/or translators) typically receive benefits packages, independent contractors do not. Independent contractors must secure their own health insurance, pay their full social security tax, secure their own insurance policies, and cover their own sick and vacation time. However, in accordance with the Affordable Care Act, employers must provide affordable minimum essential coverage to their full-time employees (IRS, 2025, Jan. 24, n.p.). Employers must also pay half of their social security tax (6.2% of their salary) (IRS, 2025, Jan. 2, n.p.), provide paid sick time (BLS, 2021), and provide an average of 80 hours of paid time off (Kolmar, 2023).

Additionally, as McKay (2015) highlights, independent contractors are responsible for their business expenses (pp. 61, 81), which may include office space and supplies, technology, marketing (pp. 116–117, 158–159), transportation, professional organization membership fees (p. 52), continuing education, financial-transaction fees (pp. 191–193), and certification fees (p. 55). Employees, on the other hand, are typically provided office equipment and supplies, and may even be able to participate in organizations as part of corporate memberships.

Conceptual Definitions

This section defines the concepts of the knowledge, skills, duties, tasks, working conditions, and responsibilities that represent competencies that are necessary for interpreters and translators to perform jobs/tasks in K–12 settings, as well as other key concepts.

Knowledge refers to the specific understanding that an individual must have to effectively accomplish a task. Knowledge is critical to understanding what is needed and what it may take to accomplish a task. Knowledge derives from formal education, training, credentials, etc.

Skills refers to the physical and mental capabilities that an interpreter or translator must possess to perform a task efficiently and ethically. A skill is the ability to perform a certain task. Skills are intrinsically associated with knowledge and abilities, as they constitute the foundations of an interpreter or translator's job performance.

Duties refers to a grouping of related tasks that make up a job. It can be understood as the several subcomponents of a job. A list of the duties performed in a job is typically included in a job description.

Tasks refers to specific activities performed as part of an interpreter or translator's job. Each activity is associated with a duty and requires a specific skillset for successful performance. The list of tasks is detailed in the Methodology section.

Responsibilities refers to additional activities or decisions that may be necessary or required as part of the interpreter or translator's job or tasks. Responsibilities may include miscellaneous job elements that the interpreter or translator is accountable for.

Working conditions refers to the physical and psychological conditions in which interpreters and translators work in K–12 settings. Within the scope of this job task analysis, they are limited to compensation and employment status (i.e., employee or contractor).

Interpreter refers to professionals that facilitate real-time communication between users of different spoken and/or signed languages. Interpreters should convey messages accurately, preserving the original meaning, tone, and intent, while adapting to cultural and contextual nuances. Interpreting modes include simultaneous (while the message is being delivered), consecutive (uttered during a pause in communication), and sight translation (oral or signed rendition of written text).

Translator refers to a professional who converts content provided in written form in one language and produces the same message in written form in another language. This is not to be confused with a transliterator who conveys a spoken language using a manually coded system (e.g., Signed Exact English) rather than a natural signed language like American Sign Language (ASL). Although the conversion of written content into a signed language (like ASL) is also a form of translation, this is outside of the scope of this report.

D/HH refers to individuals who are Deaf (i.e., identify as part of the Deaf community and culture, and typically use ASL as their primary means of communication), deaf (generally describes the audiological condition of having a hearing loss, often moderate to profound, without necessarily being connected to the Deaf culture), and hard-of-hearing (typically refers to individuals with mild to moderate hearing loss who may use hearing aids, cochlear implants, or other assistive technology).

EL refers to English Learner, which is a shorthand to include those who speak a language other than English at home. It may be identified differently in different schools and districts, including English as a Second Language (ESL) and English Language Learner (ELL).

LEP refers to Limited English Proficient (DOJ, n.d.), which is a term used in legislation, regulation, and policies to refer to individuals who command a language other than English and may have a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English.

The committee of subject-matter experts considered and discussed the knowledge, skills, duties, and/or abilities needed to perform a wide range of interpreting and translation-related tasks in K–12 settings. The list included in the Methodology section captures the major knowledge, skills, duties, tasks, responsibilities, and working conditions that were previously identified in the job descriptions of this study's Phase I and remain essential for each task or job to be performed competently and ethically. The list also represents the committee's consensus and ensures that the content provided is current and relevant so as to incorporate key critical aspects of the job.

Methodology

This study adopted a survey-based research methodology. As Phase II of a comprehensive JTA Analysis, an online survey of interpreters, translators, and other key stakeholders (i.e., educators, school administrators, and parent/family advocates) was conducted to validate relevant knowledge, skills, duties, tasks, and responsibilities for each position previously determined in Phase I of [AAITE's](#) "What employers are looking for" (Ball et al., 2023).

Phase I of this study reported key concepts and definitions, discussed in the previous section, that support the knowledge, tasks, and skills associated with K–12 education work settings using job task analysis research, specifically through the collection of job descriptions nationwide. Previous work also included an extensive review of the literature and validation of judgment from subject-matter experts. This online survey was specifically designed to gather additional data that will allow us to verify the knowledge, tasks, and skills previously delineated in our JTA analysis. We

used a survey research methodology because it is cost-effective and has been used in similar interpreting studies (e.g., CCHI Job Analysis, 2022).

Data Collection

The online data-collection questionnaire included items on the necessary demographic information, as well as relevant knowledge, skills, duties, tasks, and responsibilities. The questionnaire was not only for translators and interpreters but also other crucial stakeholders of language and communication access in K–12 settings.

A well-run pilot study was conducted from December 2022 to February 2023 to assess the viability of some of the items, clarity of the wording, and overall user-friendliness of the questionnaire. The participants ($n = 23$) in the pilot study were active translation and interpreting professionals who provided preliminary feedback on the task list and overall accessibility and readability. The pilot study afforded us an opportunity to test content validity, and all questions in the final instrument were thoroughly proofread and screened for ambiguity, possible use of complex terminology, and potential redundancy.

Data-collection approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at University of North Carolina at Charlotte and the online survey was subsequently distributed using the Qualtrics software application. All participants received an invitation (recruitment message) via email and were asked to sign an informed consent form. Participants received information about the nature of the questionnaire, main research goals, and participation expectations. Participants were also made aware of the benefits and risks of participation and were informed that their answers would be anonymous.

It may be noted that participation in this study was entirely voluntary and that the participants were not compensated for their time in any manner. The data-collection process ranged from February 2023 to February 2024 and all members received multiple reminders from AAITE to ensure a high participation rate.

Participants

This large-scale validation survey gathered data from 697 respondents who collectively represented all 50 states and one U.S. Territory. They were divided into those who serve as translators exclusively ($n = 14$), those who serve as interpreters exclusively ($n = 339$), those who serve as both translators and interpreters ($n = 218$), and a broader group of language and communication-access stakeholders in K–12 educational settings ($n = 132$).

Broadly speaking, respondents who chose to share their demographic information identified themselves primarily as female (85.10%, $n = 497$), male (13.53%, $n = 79$), and nonbinary (1.37%, $n = 8$). Their ages ranged between 18–30 (8.61%, $n = 51$), 31–45 (34.97%, $n = 207$), 46–60 (43.24%, $n = 256$), and 60+ (13.18%, $n = 78$). They self-reported as white/Caucasian (for signed languages, 84.71%, $n = 133$) or as immigrants (for spoken languages, 71.79%, $n = 280$).

As there are countless language and communication access stakeholders in K–12 educational settings, the “other stakeholders” category was created to include all stakeholders who do not directly provide interpreting or translation services. This category encompasses all possible roles, as listed below:

1. Advocate – Parents, family members, or community leaders who actively engage in promoting language or communication access in K–12 educational settings;
2. Educator – Teachers and other education professionals who provide direct instruction to students in K–12 educational settings;
3. Language Professional – Members of the interpreting or translation industry with an interest in K–12 educational settings, but who do not themselves interpret or translate in said settings;
4. Service Coordinator – School or district staff who oversee and/or coordinate services related to language or communication access, including English Language Learning programs and D/HH services;

5. Service Provider – School or district staff who provide non-instructional services to students, including therapists, counselors, and speech and language pathologists;
6. Administrator – School or district staff who are essential to the daily operation of the school or district and who did not fit any of the other sub-categories; and
7. Trainer/Instructor – Professionals who train, teach, coach, or mentor interpreters and translators.

Survey Design

The first section of the survey includes demographic information, formal education, ethnicity, gender, job role, years of experience, interpreting modalities, areas of specialization, training and professional development, and specifics about the work environment. Participants were asked to select the state where they primarily work, and the data collected include all 50 states. Participants identified themselves as translators, interpreters, or both, the language(s) used (spoken languages, signed languages, or both) and their country of origin. Respondents' input included additional specifics about their K–12 educational work environment, as listed below:

- *Employment status* includes a wide range of options to represent varied work settings:
 - (i) Independent contractor (1099) working for the school/district;
 - (ii) Employed full-time (W-2) (any classification) working for the school/district;
 - (iii) Employed part-time (W-2) (any classification) working for the school/district;
 - (iv) Independent contractor (1099) working for a language company/service provider;
 - (v) Employed full-time (W-2) (any classification) working for a language company/service provider;
 - (vi) Employed part-time (W-2) (any classification) working for a language company/service provider;

- (vii) Internship/apprenticeship; and
- (viii) Volunteer (in an official capacity, not for family/friends).
- In this study, *education* refers to the following:
 - (i) *Formal education*, which consists of a high-school diploma (or equivalent completed); college degree; associate's degree (or equivalent); bachelor's degree (or equivalent); master's degree (or equivalent), and doctoral degree (or equivalent);
 - (ii) *Specific degrees* in translation and interpreting (T&I), training and professional development in T&I (e.g., sight translation skill development, written translation, professional ethics, training about the U.S. healthcare system or legal system, etc.); and
 - (iii) *Credentials*: For example, EIPA, RID, NCITLB, ATA Certified; CHI/CoreCHI Certified; CMI/HubCMI Certified; certified or licensed as a court interpreter; state certification/licensure as an interpreter; certificate from an academic institution in interpreting and/or translation; qualified or registered court interpreter, etc.

The following sections of the online survey gathered input from professionals about their specific duties or tasks, necessary skills, and job responsibilities for each separate group: spoken-language translators and interpreters, signed-language interpreters, and other stakeholders.

Tasks included the following:

- Written translation of a wide range of documents: for example, general district communication; educational documents; special education and Section 504 documents, such as behavior intervention plans (BIPs), individualized education plans/programs (IEPs), and hearing transcripts; verbally interpreting IEP meetings; classroom-related communication and instruction between teacher and student(s);

school board meetings; parent–teacher conferences, and miscellaneous meetings; phone communications; home visits and hearings, among other meetings and extracurricular activities.

- Signed language interpreting: for example, instruction; IEP meetings for D/HH students; IEP meetings for D/HH families; parent–teacher meetings for D/HH families; assemblies and other events for D/HH students and families; board meetings and hearings.
- Other skills, such as verbal communication; written communication; negotiation; public speaking; critical thinking; research; confidence; collaboration, empathy, use of technology, etc.

Furthermore, respondents shared additional tasks or duties that may not directly relate to translation and interpreting and are captured in the Results. Specifically, in the case of ASL interpreters, additional work environments may need interpreting services in American Sign Language (ASL), Sign Exact English (SEE), Pidgin Signed English (PSE), Tactile ASL, and Conceptually Accurate Signed English (CASE). It may also be noted that translation (or translator) and transliteration (transliterator) are not synonyms. Lastly, participants reported on their estimated average hourly compensation in educational settings.

Instrument Reliability

The instrument reliability (or consistency) was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for four separate groups, namely, spoken languages, ASL, administrators and educators, and advocacy groups. This coefficient is commonly used in social sciences and allows a quantitative measurement of internal consistency of a test score for a sample of data collected from a survey. The coefficient varies between 0 and 1: the higher the value, the better the instrument reliability or consistency. According to Bachman and Kunnan (2005) and Dörnyei and Taguchi (2003), a coefficient above .7 confirms that the results are reliable.

Cronbach's alpha coefficients calculated for the four separate groups are as follows: spoken languages: .704; American Sign Language: .761; administrators and educators: .748; and advocacy groups: .815. Since the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for all four groups were above .7, the instrument reliability (or consistency) can be considered to be adequate. The consistency and validity of the instruments were further evaluated while processing the results with descriptive statistics.

The next section describes the data analysis and preliminary findings for translators, interpreters, and stakeholders in K–12 settings. A high level of participation from active industry professionals and the rigorous use of descriptive data processing, as detailed in the next section, provide a critical insight into the relevant knowledge, skills, duties, tasks, and responsibilities in K–12 translation and interpreting work settings.

Results and Analysis

The following 26 tables, and three appendices at the end of this report, represent key data from the job task analysis survey in each of the primary sections: 1) Knowledge and Skills; 2) Duties, Tasks, and Responsibilities; and 3) Working Conditions.

Knowledge and Skills

The results and analysis of questions related to knowledge and skills are represented in this section, including level of education, years of experience, hard skills, and soft skills.

Education

When asked about the *required minimum level of education* for interpreters and translators, the most common response among all 697 respondents was high-school diploma or equivalent (31%, $n = 218$). However, when combining all post-secondary levels of education, nearly 43% of respondents ($n = 298$) indicated that some level of higher education was the minimum required. (See [Appendices A](#), [B](#), and [C](#) for more information.) When looking at specific groups, other stakeholders primarily selected Bachelor's degree or equivalent (42%, $n = 55$) as the minimum

required level of education for interpreters and translators in education. (See [Appendix A](#) and [Appendix C](#).)

The minimum education requirement most selected by spoken language interpreters and/or translators was high-school diploma or equivalent (39%, $n = 154$). Likewise, those who indicated Spanish as one of their languages also primarily selected high-school diploma or equivalent (42%, $n = 126$). For Pashto, over 70% ($n = 5$) of respondents indicated that some level of higher education was required. (See [Appendix B](#).)

For signed language interpreters, the top three most-selected minimum required education were within two points of each other: High-school diploma or equivalent (25%, $n = 44$), Associate's degree or equivalent (24%, $n = 42$), and Bachelor's degree or equivalent (23%, $n = 40$). (See [Appendix C](#).)

When asked about their *actual level of education*, two spoken language interpreters (one Spanish from Wyoming and one Bosnian from Connecticut) reported having less than a high-school education. (See [Appendix A](#) and [Appendix B](#).) Table 1 shows that over 90% of both signed ($n = 158$) and spoken ($n = 354$) language interpreters and translators indicated that they held some level of higher education. The majority (53%, $n = 93$) of signed language interpreters reported having a Bachelor's degree or equivalent, and none reported having less than a high-school diploma or equivalent. As represented in [Appendix A](#), New Mexico had the highest percentage of interpreter and translator respondents whose highest level of education was a high-school diploma (31%, $n = 4$).

Table 1*Actual level of education*

Level of Education	Spoken Language Interpreters/Translators		Signed Language Interpreters	
	#	%	#	%
High-school diploma or equivalent not received	2	0.51	0	0.00
High-school diploma or equivalent	17	4.30	2	1.14
Some college	49	12.41	8	4.57
Associate's degree or equivalent	44	11.14	33	18.86
Bachelor's degree or equivalent	147	37.22	93	53.14
Master's degree or equivalent	118	29.87	32	18.29
Doctoral degree or equivalent	18	4.56	7	4.00
TOTAL	395		175	

Experience

[Appendix C](#) also shows participant responses regarding the minimum experience required for interpreters and by stakeholder group, while Table 2 shows the *actual years of experience interpreting or translating*. While the most common response provided by spoken language interpreters was that there was no minimum required (44%, $n = 159$) and two years or less (63%, $n = 109$) was reported by signed language interpreters, the most common response by other stakeholders was three to five years (55%, $n = 73$). Additionally, 64% ($n = 110$) of signed language interpreters and 56% ($n = 204$) of spoken language interpreters indicated that they had over 10 years of experience in the profession, making over 10 years of experience the most common response for spoken and signed language professionals in K–12 educational settings.

Table 2*Actual years of experience interpreting (or translating)*

Years of Experience	Spoken Language Interpreters/Translators		Signed Language Interpreters	
	#	%	#	%
2 years or less	18	4.93	13	7.51
3–5 years	44	12.05	16	9.25
5–10 years	99	27.12	34	19.65
More than 10 years	204	55.89	110	63.58
TOTAL	359		173	

Hard skills

Tables 3 and 4 show responses from *other stakeholders* related to the credentials required to demonstrate the job-related competencies and abilities of interpreters and translators in K–12 educational settings. Of 129 respondents, the vast majority selected proficiency in English (over 80%, $n = 121$), proficiency in the non-English language ($n = 110$), training in verbal interpreting skills ($n = 118$), and training in professional ethics ($n = 113$). Both assessment of interpreting skills ($n = 20$) and assessment of translation skills ($n = 14$) were the least-selected credentials (16% and 11%, respectively). Additionally, whether or not a respondent selected Certification as one of the “important” credentials did not seem to affect the respondents’ choice of other credentials.

Other competencies, abilities, or training domains mentioned by respondents included cultural awareness and sensitivity, training in software, knowledge of language and communication access, and professional development.

Table 3

*Which of the following do you consider important for an interpreter/translator to have?
Mark all that apply.*

	#	%
Proficiency in English	121	93.80
Training in verbal interpreting skills	118	91.47
Training in professional ethics	113	87.60
Proficiency in a non-English language	110	85.27
Training in written translation skills	100	77.52
Certification	98	75.97
Knowledge of U.S. education system	91	70.54
Assessment of interpreting skills	20	15.50
Assessment of translation skills	14	10.85
Other; please specify:	6	4.65

Table 4

Responses by other stakeholders based on their selection of Certification as an important competency or not.

	Certification IS important	Certification is NOT important
Proficiency in English	94	27
Training in verbal interpreting skills	91	27
Training in professional ethics	88	25
Proficiency in a non-English language	84	26
Training in written translation skills	80	20
Knowledge of U.S. education system	74	17
Assessment of interpreting skills	14	6
Assessment of translation skills	10	4
Other; please specify:	5	1

Table 5 represents responses from *interpreters and/or translators of spoken languages* related to whether the agency, school district, or school they work for requires interpreter and/or translator professional development or training. Of 396 respondents, 58% ($n = 228$) indicated that it was not required, 39% ($n = 153$) indicated that it was required, and 4% ($n = 15$) did not respond to

the question. Among respondents that indicated that they serve as both interpreters and translators ($n = 218$), the majority (67%, $n = 147$) indicated that it was not required.

Table 5

Does the agency, school, or district you work for require any interpreter and/or translator professional development or training?

Professional Development or Training Required	Spoken Language Interpreters		Interpreter/Translators		Translators	
Yes	81	49.39%	64	29.36%	8	57.14%
No	75	45.73%	147	67.43%	0	0.00%
No Response	8	4.88%	7	3.21%	6	42.86%
TOTAL	164		218		14	

Table 6 shows the credentials required of *interpreters and/or translators of spoken languages* to prove they possessed the job-related competencies and abilities in relation to their role in K–12 educational settings. The most common response by each of the spoken language interpreters and/or translator stakeholder groups (interpreters, interpreter/translators, and translators) was proficiency in the non-English language.

However, while the least common responses for interpreters were translation skills into English (18%, $n = 28$), translation skills into the non-English language (17%, $n = 27$), and sight translation (16%, $n = 26$), the least common responses for translators were simultaneous interpreting skills (8%, $n = 1$), consecutive interpreting skills (8%, $n = 1$), and interpreting and/or translation ethics, standards, protocols, etc. (8%, $n = 1$). For respondents that both interpreted and translated, the least common credential selected was interpreting and/or translation ethics, standards, protocols, etc. (20%, $n = 41$), followed by sight translation (21%, $n = 43$).

Table 6

Credential	Spoken Language Interpreters	Interpreter / Translators	Translators
None / Not sure	42	67	5
Proficiency in the non-English language	90	102	7
Proficiency in English (written)	39	80	4
Proficiency in English (verbal)	80	84	3
Translation skills into English	28	75	5
Translation skills into the non-English language	27	88	6
Simultaneous interpreting skills	43	49	1
Consecutive interpreting skills	66	58	1
Sight translation skills	26	43	2
Interpreting and/or translation ethics, standards, protocols, etc.	50	41	1
TOTAL	161	204	13

Table 7 shows the certification status for *interpreters of signed languages* that responded to the survey. Of 173 signed language interpreters that responded to this question, the vast majority (82%, $n = 142$) indicated that they were certified.

Table 7

Certified	#	%
Yes	142	82.08%
No, not yet	31	17.92%

Tables 8 and 9 represent the certifications and scores (as applicable) held by 134 of the 142 interpreters of signed languages that indicated they were certified (eight did not respond). Although 79.1% of respondents ($n = 106$) selected the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA) as the most common credential, the least mentioned credential was the National Association

for the Deaf (NAD, 3.8%, $n = 5$) certification. For those that mentioned the EIPA, about 53% ($n = 56$) reported achieving a score of 4.0 or above. The data show a similar trend for other certifications or tests, such as the RID and State certification/license (29.77%, $n = 39$; 25.37%, $n = 34$, respectively).

Table 8

List all interpreting certifications and/or tests you have completed.

Credential	#	%
EIPA	106	79.10%
RID	39	29.77%
State QA / Certification / License	34	25.37%
NAD	5	3.82%
Other	3	2.24%

Table 9

EIPA Score	#	%
EIPA score 3.0–3.9	36	33.96%
EIPA score 4.0 or above	56	52.83%
EIPA WT	28	26.42%
EIPA score not listed	14	13.21%

Soft skills

[Appendix C](#) captures the responses by each stakeholder group related to the soft skills interpreters and translators working in K–12 educational settings should possess. Among respondents that self-identified as signed language interpreters ($n = 120$), the top ranked soft skills were 1) verbal communication, 2) critical thinking, and 3) collaboration. Among those that self-identified as spoken language interpreters ($n = 123$), the top soft skills were 1) verbal

communication, 2) confidence, and 3) written communication. Those that self-identified as spoken language interpreter/translators ($n = 175$), as translators ($n = 8$), or as other stakeholders ($n = 109$) ranked the top three soft skills as 1) verbal communication, 2) written communication, and 3) critical thinking.

Respondents also mentioned other skills they considered essential for interpreters and translators that were not already listed. Their responses included the following (listed in alphabetical order): adaptability, advocacy, cognitive agility, cultural humility, curiosity, ethical decision-making, flexibility, growth mindset, pleasantness, professionalism, resourcefulness, self-regulation, and session management.

Duties, Tasks, and Responsibilities

The results of questions related to duties, tasks, and responsibilities are included in this section, and further divided between language professionals for spoken languages (including interpreters, translators, and those that provide both services), language professionals for signed languages, and other stakeholders.

Spoken language

Table 10 shows the services that spoken language respondents provide in K–12 settings. The majority (55%, $n = 218$) of participants indicated that they provide both interpreting and translation services, while 41% ($n = 164$) indicated that they only provide interpreting, and 4% ($n = 14$) only provide translation.

Table 10

Services provided	#	%
Interpreting Only	164	41.41
Translation Only	14	3.54
Both Interpreting and Translation	218	55.05

When identifying the most common interpreting modalities, Table 11 shows the responses from spoken language interpreters regarding how often they utilize each modality. Out of 342 respondents, over 60% indicated that they always, sometimes, or often interpret in each of the primary modalities, such as Onsite / In-person ($n = 267$), Video ($n = 247$), and Telephone ($n = 234$).

Table 11

How spoken language interpreters work in each of the following interpreting modalities.

Frequency of Activity	Onsite/In-person		Video		Telephone	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Always (every day)	112	32.75	77	22.51	81	23.68
Often (at least 1–2 times per week)	104	30.41	94	27.49	84	24.56
Sometimes (1–2 times a month)	51	14.91	76	22.22	69	20.18
Rarely (1–2 times a semester)	48	14.04	67	19.59	57	16.67
Never	27	7.89	28	8.19	51	14.91

When asked about the three primary modes of interpreting (Table 12), out of 342 respondents, over 68% ($n = 234$) shared that they always or often interpret in the consecutive mode. In contrast, over 43% of respondents ($n = 149$) indicated that they never or rarely sight-translate, and over 40% ($n = 138$) indicated that they never or rarely interpret in the simultaneous mode. Additionally, for each mode, over 50% of respondents indicated that they always, sometimes, or often interpret in said mode.

Table 12

Spoken language interpreters: How often they utilize each interpreting mode.

Frequency of Activity	Simultaneous		Consecutive		Sight-translation	
	#	%	#	%	#	%

Always (every day)	57	16.67	136	39.77	46	13.45
Often (at least 1–2 times per week)	68	19.88	98	28.65	73	21.35
Sometimes (1–2 times a month)	79	23.10	42	12.28	74	21.64
Rarely (1–2 times a semester)	60	17.54	44	12.87	77	22.51
Never	78	22.81	22	6.43	72	21.05

Table 13 shows the frequency with which respondents for spoken languages indicated that they interpret in each of the listed settings. Data in Table 13 only include respondents that indicated that they only interpret or that they both interpret and translate; 53% ($n = 176$) reported that they always or often interpret at IEPs and 44% ($n = 145$) always or often interpret phone calls.

Another common setting for interpreters was “Other meetings with school staff,” where 66% of respondents ($n = 216$) indicated that they interpret in these settings at least sometimes. The data also show that 62% of respondents ($n = 206$) interpret at parent–teacher conferences (PTC) a few times a semester (rarely or sometimes).

Finally, the majority of respondents indicated that they rarely or never interpret at events (56%, $n = 183$), hearings (63%, $n = 206$), classrooms (65%, $n = 208$), home visits (71%, $n = 230$), or board meetings (71%, $n = 229$). Respondents also shared that additional settings may include evaluation and assessments, medical settings (such as in-school therapy), student support services, and media relations.

Table 13

Spoken language interpreters: How often they interpret in each setting.

	Always (every day)		Often (1–2 times per week)		Sometimes (1–2 times a month)		Rarely (1–2 times a semester)		Never		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
IEP	28	24.77	94	28.40	64	19.34	64	19.34	27	8.16	331
Phone Calls	72	21.82	73	22.12	74	22.42	63	19.09	48	14.55	330
Other Mtgs w/ Staff	43	13.07	84	25.53	89	27.05	80	24.32	33	10.03	329
PTC	23	6.93	66	19.88	106	31.93	100	30.12	37	11.14	332
Events	20	6.15	48	14.77	74	22.77	110	33.85	73	22.46	325
Hearings	21	6.44	34	10.43	65	19.94	102	31.29	104	31.90	326
Classroom	18	5.59	47	14.60	49	15.22	79	24.53	129	40.06	322
Home Visits	16	4.92	28	8.62	51	15.69	78	24.00	152	46.77	325
Board Meetings	12	3.70	18	5.56	65	20.06	79	24.38	150	46.30	324

When asked about duties not related to interpreting, the majority of spoken language interpreters reported that they only interpret and/or translate (59%, $n = 201$; see Table 14). As shown in Table 15, out of 138 respondents that mentioned performing duties not directly related to interpreting and/or translation, the majority (53%, $n = 73$) indicated that they had parent-liaison or outreach duties and only 17% ($n = 23$) indicated that they had teacher or paraprofessional duties.

Table 14

Other Duties: Spoken language interpreters and interpreter/translators only ($n = 339$)

	#	%
--	---	---

Only interpret and/or translate	201	59.29
Have other duties not directly related to interpreting and/or translation	138	40.71

Table 15

Other Duties: Spoken language interpreters and interpreter/translators only (n = 138)

	#	%
Teacher or paraprofessional duties	23	16.67
Managerial or supervisory duties	40	28.99
Parent liaison or outreach duties	73	52.90
In-service or other training duties	66	47.83
Secretarial or clerical duties	54	39.13

When asked about the frequency of translating documentation, out of 209 respondents, the majority (54%, $n = 112$, see Table 16) mentioned that they always or often translate district communications. Contrariwise, out of 203 respondents, the majority (52%, $n = 106$) indicated that they rarely or never translate legal documents in K–12 settings.

Table 16

Spoken Language: How often do they translate each type of written material?

	General District Communication		Educational Documents		Special Education Documents		Legal Documents		Editing, Review, & Proofing	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Always (every day)	53	25.36	26	12.75	53	25.60	20	9.85	46	22.12
Often (at least 1–2 times per week)	59	28.23	34	16.67	30	14.49	30	14.78	33	15.87
Sometimes (1–2 times a month)	34	16.27	43	12.08	42	20.29	47	23.15	42	20.19
Rarely (1–2 times a semester)	45	21.53	60	29.41	40	19.32	45	22.17	52	25.00
Never	18	8.61	41	20.10	42	20.29	61	30.05	35	16.83
Total Responses	209		204		207		203		208	

Signed language

Table 17 shows the language forms and varieties that signed language interpreters are required to use as part of their role. Of 175 respondents, the vast majority (97%, $n = 170$) use American Sign Language in their role, with only five indicating that they do not use American Sign Language. The next most-common selection was Pidgin Signed English (77%, $n = 135$).

Table 17

Signed Language: Signed languages (including forms and varieties) required for interpreters

	#	%
American Sign Language (ASL)	170	97.14
Pidgin Signed English (PSE)	135	77.14
Conceptually Accurate Signed English (CASE)	75	42.86
Sign Exact English (SEE)	43	24.57
Tactile ASL	9	5.14
Manually Coded English (MCE)	1	0.57
Total Responses	175	

Table 18 shows how often respondents who indicated they interpret signed languages interpret in each of the listed settings. The vast majority of interpreters (82%, $n = 137$) indicated that they interpret in the classroom every day. Most respondents also indicated that they never interpret at board meetings (81%, $n = 135$) or hearings (90%, $n = 150$). A significant number of respondents also indicated that they rarely or never interpret at IEPs for students (67%, $n = 112$), IEPs for families (81%, $n = 136$), parent–teacher conferences for students (78%, $n = 128$), parent–teacher conferences for families (83%, $n = 139$), and events for families (80%, $n = 133$).

Table 18*Signed Language Interpreters: How often do they interpret in each setting?*

	Always (every day)		Often (1–2 times per week)		Sometimes (1–2 times a month)		Rarely (1–2 times a semester)		Never		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Classroom	137	82.04	9	5.39	1	0.60	8	4.79	12	7.19	167
IEP for student	21	12.57	5	2.99	29	17.37	74	44.31	38	22.75	167
IEP for families	8	4.79	2	1.20	21	12.57	66	39.52	70	41.92	167
PTC for student	8	4.79	6	3.59	25	14.97	76	45.51	52	31.14	167
PTD for families	6	3.59	4	2.40	18	10.78	74	44.31	65	38.95	167
Events for students	47	28.14	12	7.19	59	35.33	47	28.14	2	1.20	167
Events for families	12	7.19	5	2.99	17	10.18	74	44.31	59	35.33	167
Board meetings	1	0.60	2	1.20	4	2.40	25	14.97	135	80.84	167
Hearings	1	0.60	1	0.60	2	1.20	13	7.78	150	89.82	167

When asked about duties not related to interpreting, the majority of signed language interpreters indicated that they had other duties not directly related to interpreting (52%). See Table 19, below. As shown in Table 20, of 87 respondents that indicated that they have duties not directly related to interpreting, the vast majority (92%, $n = 80$) indicated that they had in-service or other training duties, and only 13% ($n = 11$) indicated that they had parent-liaison or outreach duties.

Table 19*Other Duties: Signed language interpreters (n = 166)*

	#	%
I only interpret	79	47.59
I have other duties not directly related to interpreting	87	52.40

Table 20*Other Duties: Signed language interpreters (n = 87)*

	#	%
Teacher or paraprofessional duties	67	77.01
Managerial or supervisory duties	24	27.59
Parent liaison or outreach duties	11	12.64
In-service or other training duties	80	91.95
Secretarial or clerical duties	15	17.24

Other stakeholders

Table 21 shows the settings where other stakeholders indicated that interpreters are required to communicate with students. Of 129 respondents, the majority (71%, $n = 92$) indicated that interpreters are required at parent–teacher meetings to communicate with students. Over 55% of respondents ($n = 71$) indicated that interpreters are needed at IEP meetings for EL students to communicate with school staff and nearly 47% ($n = 60$) indicated the same for D/HH students. Additional settings in which respondents indicated interpreters are required to communicate with students include standardized testing, speech and language evaluations, therapy, enrollment, social interactions between hearing and D/HH students, and extracurricular activities.

Table 21*Other Stakeholders: Settings that require interpreters to communicate **with students***

	#	%
Parent–teacher conferences/meetings	92	71.32
IEP meetings for EL students	71	55.04
IEP meetings for D/HH students	60	46.51
Other interactions with individual EL students or small groups	60	46.51
Classroom instruction for EL students	54	41.86
Classroom instruction for D/HH students	48	37.21
Assemblies and other events for EL students	47	36.43
Other interactions with individual D/HH students or small groups	43	33.33
Assemblies and other events for D/HH students	40	31.01
Hearings	6	4.65
Other (please specify)	8	6.20
Not sure	11	8.53

Table 22 shows the settings where other stakeholders indicated that interpreters are required to communicate with families. Of 125 respondents, 56% ($n = 72$) indicated that interpreters are required to communicate with families at parent–teacher conferences. Over 50% ($n = 66$) indicated that interpreters are required to communicate with LEP families at IEP meetings. Other stakeholders also indicated that interpreters are required to communicate with families at enrollment.

Table 22*Other Stakeholders: Settings that require an interpreter to communicate **with families***

	#	%
Parent–teacher conferences/meetings	72	55.81
IEP meetings for LEP families	66	51.16
Assemblies and other events for LEP families	39	30.23
PTA meetings	34	26.36
Assemblies and other events for D/HH families	32	24.81
Board meetings	32	24.81
Hearings	30	23.26
IEP meetings for D/HH families	28	21.71
Home visits	22	17.05
Phone calls	21	16.28
Other (please specify)	1	0.78
Not sure	15	11.63

Table 23 shows aggregate ranking data from 107 other stakeholders regarding how frequently each type of document requires written translation, where one is the most frequent. In addition to the ranked documents, where district or school communications were identified as the type of document with the most frequent need for translation, stakeholders indicated that current translations are insufficient to meet needs.

Table 23

Ranking by frequency of documents needing translation, per other stakeholders.

Ranking	
1	District/school communications
2	Special education and Section 504 documents
3	Educational documents
4	Legal documents
5	Not sure
6	Other (please specify)

Working Conditions

Employment status

[Appendix B](#) shows that when asked about employment status, the most common response among *spoken language* interpreters and/or translators was employed full-time (42%, $n = 164$), with independent contractor ($n = 151$) as a close second. Of respondents who indicated that their working language was Spanish ($n = 287$), 49% ($n = 141$) indicated that they were full-time employees and 13% ($n = 37$) indicated that they were part-time employees. That is a total of 62% ($n = 178$) of Spanish interpreters and/or translators who indicated they were employees and 32% ($n = 91$) who indicated that they were independent contractors.

Table 24 shows the service provided by spoken language interpreter respondents based on their employment status. The majority among those who indicated that they were employed (full or part time) by the school, school district, or language service provider (70%, $n = 149$) indicated that they interpret and translate. However, the majority of independent contractors (59%, $n = 91$) and other respondents, such as volunteers or those who had provided services in the past 12 months but were no longer providing services (61%, $n = 19$), indicated that they only provide interpreting services.

Table 24

Spoken languages: What services do you provide the district or school where you offer language support?

Services provided	Staff		Contractor		Other		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Interpreting Only	54	25.47	91	59.48	19	61.29	164	41.41
Translation Only	9	4.25	3	1.96	2	6.45	14	3.54
Both Interpreting and Translation	149	70.28	59	38.56	10	32.26	218	55.05

As represented in [Appendix B](#), the most common response among *signed language* interpreters was employed full-time (81%, $n = 141$), with no respondents indicating that they volunteer in their role as interpreters.

Compensation

Table 25 shows the calculated hourly compensation for *spoken language* respondents based on their reported employment status. The majority (57%, $n = 103$) of respondents who indicated they were employed, indicated that they earned the equivalent of between \$21 and \$30 per hour, while only 11% ($n = 20$) indicated that they earned \$20 or less per hour. Among independent contractors, the majority (66%, $n = 81$) indicated that they earned the equivalent of over \$31 per hour, while only 7% ($n = 9$) indicated that they earned \$20 or less per hour.

Table 25*Spoken Language: Compensation by employment status*

	<\$15 per hour		\$15–\$20 per hour		\$21–\$25 per hour		\$26–\$30 per hour		\$31–\$35 per hour		> \$35 per hour		Other	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Employed	3	1.67	17	9.44	49	27.22	54	30.00	24	13.33	28	15.56	5	2.78
Independent Contractor	1	0.82	8	6.56	9	7.38	20	16.39	25	20.49	56	45.90	3	2.46
Other	1	4.35	1	4.35	2	8.70	5	21.74	3	13.04	8	34.78	3	13.04
Total	26		60		79		52		5		92		11	

Table 26 shows the calculated hourly compensation for *signed language* respondents based on their reported employment status. The number of employed respondents who indicated they earn the equivalent of \$21–25, \$26–30, and \$31–35 per hour is very similar (about 20% each). More respondents ($n = 48$) indicated they earn over \$35 per hour, but there is only a slight preference (24% vs. 20%) in comparison with the other responses. Among respondents who indicated that they provide services as independent contractors, the majority (65%, $n = 15$) indicated that they earn over \$35 per hour.

Table 26*Signed Language: Compensation by employment status*

	<\$15 per hour		\$15–\$20 per hour		\$21–\$25 per hour		\$26–\$30 per hour		\$31–\$35 per hour		> \$35 per hour		Other	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Employed	2	1.53	7	5.34	27	20.61	26	19.85	26	19.85	32	24.43	11	8.40
Independent Contractor	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.04	2	8.70	1	4.35	15	65.22	2	8.70
Other	0	0.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	1	25.00	0	0.00	1	25.00	1	25.00
Total	2		8		30		29		27		48		14	

Conclusion

Knowledge and Skills

Considering the requirements of other interpreter certification programs² and in agreement with the data that we collected from job descriptions, the survey responses from this job task analysis confirmed that the *minimum education-level* requirement for an entry-level certification program was a high-school diploma or equivalent. This education level seems adequate, provided that an exam contains sufficient technical or specialized terminology and sentence structure to confirm that the candidate will be able to fully understand and faithfully interpret and render the content they will encounter in most common K–12 settings. It may be noted that the level of technical complexity and linguistic command required for the specific interpreter and/or translator job position and/or project should be considered when creating the job description or project requirements, as a higher education level may be required.

² The Certification Commission for Healthcare Interpreters requires a minimum of a high-school diploma or equivalent. The National Center for State Courts does not list a minimum education-level requirement to sit for the exam, but lists that the interpreter must “display wide general knowledge characteristic of what a minimum of two years of general education at a college or university would provide.” Some states, such as Wyoming, specifically ask about a high-school diploma or equivalent in their certification application process.

While most job descriptions for interpreters and/or translators in K–12 educational settings either did not list a minimum education level or listed high-school diploma or equivalent as the required minimum (Ball et al., p. 17), this job task analysis results show that most (96%) K–12 interpreters and translators have some level of post-secondary academic preparation and most other stakeholders (81%) perceive that the minimum required should be some level of post-secondary education.

Unlike the case of spoken interpreters, the findings suggest possible disparities vis-à-vis formal education among interpreters, since the majority of signed language interpreters hold a Bachelor's degree or equivalent. While limited data and information are available to conclusively suggest the minimum education level required to successfully interpret in K–12 educational settings, the linguistic complexities and academic knowledge to understand meaning in the context required of each setting should be considered to determine the minimum education level required for interpreters.

For example, it is widely acknowledged that the minimum education required to understand and faithfully interpret at an IEP meeting or an event such as a redistricting public town-hall meeting will be different from what is required for a parent–teacher conference. It may even be different for different classrooms, such as a kindergarten class or an Advanced Placement world history high-school class.

In relation to *experience*, as is the case for other interpreter certification programs, the minimum requirement for an entry-level certification program may not be as important, if all other skills and knowledge are duly vetted and tested. However, it is expected that a minimum experience requirement should be considered for specific positions or projects for more complex or technical settings. To that end, the majority of job descriptions did not list any minimum experience required (Ball et al., 2023, p. 19). This finding is supported by 44% of spoken language survey respondents, but not by most (67%) signed language interpreter respondents or the vast majority (96%) of other

stakeholders. Additionally, the findings confirm that the majority of both signed (64%) and spoken (56%) language interpreters indicated that they have over 10 years of experience in the profession.

These figures—along with reports regarding interpreter shortages^{3, 4}—suggest that while many interpreters and/or translators currently providing services in K–12 educational settings may have a lot of experience, as may be required in some settings, there seems to be a need that extends beyond the current workforce, which may account for why job descriptions do not list a minimum experience requirement. A nationwide—or even local—needs assessment is recommended to identify the workforce availability versus needs and barriers to access for academic and non-academic programs to fill identified workforce gaps.

Regarding necessary *hard skills*, the findings suggest that each language group has different training, testing, and credentialing requirements to ensure that interpreters in each setting are prepared for the requirements of their role. *Spoken language interpreters* highlighted the need for proficiency in English and a language other than English, as well as training in interpreting skills and professional ethics. Additionally, as the findings show, there is no consensus on the most relevant credentials, with responses ranging from proficiency to translation skills into English and sight translation.

By contrast, it is important to note that respondents undermine both the assessment of interpreting and translation skills and place minimal emphasis on possessing sight translation and simultaneous interpreting skills. It is concerning that the majority indicate that translator professional development or training is not required in such a labor-intensive industry.

Unlike spoken interpreters, the findings confirm that most *signed language interpreters* are actually tested, thus attesting to a more sophisticated vetting process. The majority of signed language interpreters have taken the EIPA performance test, and of those who have, over 50%

³ <https://www.the74million.org/article/left-powerless-non-english-speaking-parents-denied-vital-translation-services/>

⁴ <http://www.interpretereducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Final-K-12-Interpreter-Report-12-20.pdf>

have a score of 4.0 or above, the minimum recommended by NAIE. However, even among the requirements for signed language interpreters, who, broadly speaking, have a more established vetting and credentialing process, there are gaps to be addressed.

When we compare *soft skills*, all interpreters agree on the need for communication and critical thinking. However, while *signed language interpreters* emphasize collaboration, *spoken language interpreters* emphasize confidence and written communication in their skillsets. The findings also shed light on the need for adaptability, ethical decision-making, flexibility, professionalism, and self-regulation, to name a few examples.

Duties, Tasks, and Responsibilities

The job task analysis revealed the differences in the required duties, tasks, and responsibilities for spoken and signed language interpreters. The data in this analysis, as well as the report resulting from the analysis of job descriptions (Ball et al., 2023), confirm the need to align the job descriptions and job announcements to the actual tasks, duties, and responsibilities of working professionals in this field, for both spoken and signed language interpreters. Along those lines, the findings determine that the employment status of some interpreters and/or translators is directly correlated to the duties and tasks required. This will be further explored in the working-conditions section.

Spoken language

While interpreting and translation are recognized as separate professions with distinctive skillsets, the majority (55%) of spoken language professionals provide both interpreting and translation services. As the findings confirm, the majority of interpreters (60%) must be able to provide interpreting services in consecutive, simultaneous, and sight-translation, in the three primary interpreting modalities (onsite, video, and telephone), in such events as IEPs, phone calls, and multiple meetings between school personnel and families. This suggests a critical need to command all three primary modes of interpreting in order to remain competitive.

The findings also confirm that the most common duties, outside of translation and interpreting tasks, for spoken language interpreters are parent-liaison or outreach responsibilities, as well as in-service or other training duties, which unexpectedly contradicts the findings of the job description analysis (Ball et al., 2023, p. 42), where secretarial and related tasks were most commonly listed. Additionally, the findings confirm the need for translation of district communications. This is an expected finding and aligns with our former conclusions in the job description analysis.

Signed language

In the case of signed language interpreters, the majority shared that they work in American Sign Language (ASL), Pidgin Signed English (PSE), Conceptually Accurate Signed English (CASE), and/or Signed Exact English (SEE). Unlike spoken language interpreters, signed language interpreters highlighted that they rarely interpret at IEPs for students or families, hearings, parent-teacher conferences, or board meetings, and report classroom-related interpreting events to be the most common.

In fact, when comparing duties and responsibilities not directly related to interpreting and translating that are listed on job descriptions (Ball et al., 2023, pp. 29–31) to other duties, as reported in this analysis, teacher and paraprofessional duties, which is the most commonly listed *other* duty for signed language interpreters on job descriptions (Ball et al., p. 29), comes in second to training duties. Examples include providing language, culture, and other training to colleagues and families. This is an unexpected finding, as it reveals the need for signed interpreters to assist with outreach activities.

Lastly, stakeholders confirm the need for signed language interpreters to assist students in a wide range of communications, such as standardized testing, speech and language evaluations, therapy, enrollment, and social interactions between hearing and D/HH students. Based on stakeholders' responses, interpreters become critical at IEP meetings for EL students, as well as

communications with D/HH students. Likewise, they also interpret for families in parent–teacher conferences and meetings. This finding further aligns with our previous concluding remarks (Ball et al., 2023, pp. 33–36).

Working Conditions

The majority (70%) of spoken language professionals who are employed in full or part-time positions provide both interpreting and translation services. Considering that only 4% of spoken language respondents indicated that they only provide translation services, a required service to fully comply with language-access requirements, the data suggest that the majority of translations for families are provided by staff dual-role interpreter–translators. Furthermore, the majority (61%) of those who provide services as independent contractors only provide interpreting or translation. An expected finding considering that these are separate professions.

When analyzing compensation, staff spoken interpreters reported an hourly rate between \$21 and \$30 and few respondents earned \$20 or less per hour. By contrast, as introduced in the background, most independent contractors, who are not entitled to employment benefits, report higher compensation rates exceeding \$31 per hour. Similar trends can be observed vis-à-vis full-time signed-language interpreters, as full-time employees report earnings ranging from \$21–25 to \$26–30. An interesting finding is that independent contractors of signed languages represent a smaller group but earn over \$35 per hour. As the data confirm, the subcontracting model has become more common among spoken language interpreters, while most signed language interpreters are employed. This may suggest that they not only enjoy similar earnings but also perceive higher job security.

In a nutshell, the purpose of this report was to confirm the knowledge, skills, duties, tasks, and responsibilities that were previously identified in the job description analysis for interpreters and translators in education. These findings highlight the disparities and identified gaps among spoken language interpreters and signed language interpreters, and reiterate our concerns

regarding possible inconsistencies present in employer expectations and hiring practices. These findings may be helpful to proceed with standardization of best practices in school districts in the U.S. and new research-informed initiatives aimed at regulating and elevating the translation and interpreting professions. More importantly, it may support the development of training standards and a certification process for interpreters and translators in education.

References

American Translators Association. (2022). *ATA Compensation Survey*, 21–49.

<https://www.atanet.org/publications/ata-compensation-survey-sixth-edition/>

Asefer, A., & Abidin, Z. (2021). Soft skills and graduates' employability in the 21st century from employers' perspectives: A review of literature. *International Journal of Infrastructure Research and Management*, 9(2), 44–59.

Bachman, L. F., & Kunnan, A. J., (2005). *Statistical Analyses for Language Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ball, J., Rodríguez-Castro, M., Senatore, H., Siebach, G., Silvestri, H., & Villalobos-Russell, M. (2023, March). *What employers are looking for: A nationwide job description analysis for translators and interpreters in educational settings*. AAITE (American Association of Interpreters and Translators in Education). <https://www.aaite.org/>

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2021, March). *The Economics Daily: Paid sick leave was available to 79 percent of civilian workers*. U.S. Department of Labor. (2025, February 07). <https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2021/paid-sick-leave-was-available-to-79-percent-of-civilian-workers-in-march-2021.htm>

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2024, August). *Occupational Outlook Handbook*. Interpreters and Translators. U.S. Department of Labor. (2025, January 16). <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/media-and-communication/interpreters-and-translators.htm>

- Certification Commission for Healthcare Interpreters. (2022, October). *National Job Task Analysis Study for Healthcare Interpreters*. Certification Commission for Healthcare Interpreters.
https://cchicertification.org/uploads/CCHI_Job_Analysis_Report_2022.pdf
- College Board. (n.d.). *Supports for English learners*. SAT Suite of Assessments.
<https://satsuite.collegeboard.org/k12-educators/educator-experience/in-school/register/supports-english-learners>
- Covey von Pingel, T. L. (2019). *First impressions: Improving the connection between deaf consumers and ASL* [dissertation, Arizona State University].
- Department of Justice. (n.d.). *Commonly asked questions and answers regarding limited English proficient (LEP) individuals*. Civil Rights Division Federal, Coordination and Compliance Section. <https://www.lep.gov/faq/faqs-rights-lep-individuals/commonly-asked-questions-and-answers-regarding-limited-english>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. Routledge.
- Gavin, M. L. (2022, January). *Parent–teacher conferences (for parents)*. Nemours KidsHealth.
<https://kidshealth.org/en/parents/parent-teacher-conferences.html>
- The Immigrant Learning Center. (2024, September 10) Supporting unaccompanied minors in the classroom. The Immigrant Learning Center. <https://www.ilctr.org/resource-hub/supporting-unaccompanied-minors-in-the-classroom/>
- Internal Revenue Service. (2025, January 2). *Topic no. 751, social security and Medicare withholding rates*. <https://www.irs.gov/taxtopics/tc751#:~:text=The%20current%20tax%20rate%20for,employee%2C%20or%2012.4%25%20total>
- Internal Revenue Service. (2025, January 24). *Employer shared responsibility provisions*.
<https://www.irs.gov/affordable-care-act/employers/employer-shared-responsibility-provisions>

- Kolmar, C. (2023, June 28). *50+ telling paid time off (PTO) statistics [2023]: Average PTO in the USA*. Zippia. <https://www.zippia.com/advice/pto-statistics/>
- McKay, C. (2015). *How to succeed as a freelance translator* (3rd ed.). Two Rat Press and Translatewrite, Inc.
- Mikkelsen, H., & Jourdenais, R. (2018). *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*. Routledge.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2023, November). Job outlook 2024, 26. <https://www.naceweb.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2023/publication/research-report/2024-nace-job-outlook.pdf>
- National Association of Interpreters in Education. (2019). Professional guidelines for interpreting in educational settings (1st ed.). Retrieved from www.naiedu.org/guidelines.
- National Association of Interpreters in Education. (2021). Educational interpreter code of ethics. <https://naiedu.org/codeofethics>
- National Association of Interpreters in Education. (2023). A case for national certification: Sign language interpreters working in K–12 education, 7–8. <https://naiedu.org/ctf>
- National Association of Interpreters in Education. (2023, March). State requirements for educational interpreters. <https://naiedu.org/state-standards/>
- Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (2020, July). A guide to the individualized education program. U.S. Department of Education. <https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/parents/needs/speced/iepguide/iepguide.pdf>
- Professional Standards Committee. (2010). An overview of K–12 educational interpreting. Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. <https://rid.org/resources/#spp>

Appendix A – Data by State

State	Total	Minimum Experience Required					Actual Experience			
		Not Sure/ No Min.	2 Years or Less	3–5 Years	5–10 Years	More than 10 Years	2 Years or Less	3–5 Years	5–10 Years	More than 10 Years
Alabama	7	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
Alaska	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Arizona	20	8	5	3	0	1	2	0	6	5
Arkansas	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
California	125	49	40	23	1	2	5	16	20	57
Colorado	47	27	5	12	0	2	4	1	12	13
Connecticut	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Delaware	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Florida	24	9	8	3	0	1	1	2	6	10
Georgia	18	7	4	6	0	0	0	2	2	8
Hawaii	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Idaho	27	6	16	5	0	0	3	3	8	9
Illinois	15	4	9	1	0	0	0	4	1	8
Indiana	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Iowa	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Kansas	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Kentucky	8	4	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	5
Louisiana	6	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	2
Maine	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Maryland	55	36	7	6	0	3	1	2	17	25
Massachusetts	12	6	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	6
Michigan	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
Minnesota	12	5	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	5
Mississippi	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Missouri	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Montana	5	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	2
Nebraska	13	4	7	2	0	0	2	1	0	5
Nevada	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
New Hampshire	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
New Jersey	8	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
New Mexico	14	9	2	1	0	0	0	4	2	5
New York	16	6	2	6	2	0	1	2	2	3
North Carolina	34	17	13	3	1	0	1	0	13	16
North Dakota	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ohio	16	4	9	1	0	0	1	2	1	9
Oklahoma	4	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Oregon	8	7	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	5
Pennsylvania	11	6	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	8
Rhode Island	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	19	11	5	1	0	1	0	1	8	9
South Dakota	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tennessee	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5
Texas	45	25	9	8	1	0	2	3	5	28
Utah	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Vermont	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	31	14	8	4	1	2	1	2	6	14
Washington	11	6	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	7
West Virginia	20	6	8	5	0	1	0	0	2	1
Wisconsin	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
Wyoming	11	7	2	2	0	0	0	5	1	2
U.S. Territories	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

State	Total	Minimum Education Required			Total	Actual Education		
		Not Sure/No Min.	High-School Diploma or Equivalent	Higher Education		High-School Diploma or Equivalent Not Completed	High-School Diploma or Equivalent	Higher Education
Alabama	7	3	1	3	5	0	0	5
Alaska	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Arizona	20	6	2	9	16	0	1	13
Arkansas	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
California	125	20	52	52	109	0	1	105
Colorado	47	10	19	17	31	0	1	29
Connecticut	4	0	1	3	4	1	0	3
Delaware	4	1	1	2	2	0	0	2
Florida	24	14	4	6	22	0	1	21
Georgia	18	4	3	11	13	0	0	13
Hawaii	4	2	0	2	4	0	0	4
Idaho	27	6	4	17	23	0	0	21
Illinois	15	3	4	8	14	0	0	13
Indiana	6	3	3	0	6	0	0	6
Iowa	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	2
Kansas	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1
Kentucky	8	1	3	4	7	0	0	7
Louisiana	6	5	0	1	5	0	0	5
Maine	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	2
Maryland	55	23	20	11	48	0	1	46
Massachusetts	12	4	3	4	10	0	0	10
Michigan	6	1	4	1	6	0	0	6
Minnesota	12	1	5	6	12	0	1	11
Mississippi	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Missouri	4	0	1	2	3	0	1	1
Montana	5	2	0	3	4	0	0	4
Nebraska	13	3	3	7	8	0	0	8
Nevada	3	0	1	2	2	0	1	1
New Hampshire	3	0	0	3	2	0	0	2
New Jersey	8	3	2	3	6	0	0	5
New Mexico	14	1	7	5	13	0	4	9
New York	16	3	4	9	8	0	0	8
North Carolina	34	8	8	18	30	0	1	28
North Dakota	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Ohio	16	3	6	6	15	0	1	13
Oklahoma	4	0	2	2	4	0	0	4
Oregon	8	2	5	1	8	0	1	7
Pennsylvania	11	3	0	8	8	0	0	8
Rhode Island	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	19	7	8	4	19	0	0	19
South Dakota	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
Tennessee	7	5	2	0	7	0	0	7
Texas	45	11	9	24	40	0	3	36
Utah	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	2
Vermont	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	1
Virginia	31	9	10	11	25	0	0	25
Washington	11	2	5	4	9	0	0	8
West Virginia	20	3	4	13	3	0	0	3
Wisconsin	6	2	0	4	6	0	0	6
Wyoming	11	4	4	3	8	1	1	6
U.S. Territories	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

		Compensation							
State	Total	No response	< \$15/hr	\$15–\$20/hr	\$21–\$25/hr	\$26–\$30/hr	\$31–\$35/hr	> \$35/hr	Other
Alabama	5	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Alaska	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Arizona	16	4	0	1	7	1	1	1	1
Arkansas	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
California	109	21	0	7	11	25	15	28	2
Colorado	31	4	0	0	5	2	4	16	0
Connecticut	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
Delaware	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Florida	22	6	0	0	0	3	4	8	1
Georgia	13	3	0	1	2	0	4	2	1
Hawaii	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Idaho	23	3	0	1	6	6	3	3	1
Illinois	14	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	1
Indiana	6	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	0
Iowa	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Kansas	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kentucky	7	2	0	1	1	0	3	0	0
Louisiana	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	0
Maine	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Maryland	48	9	0	2	10	17	2	7	1
Massachusetts	10	2	0	2	0	2	2	1	1
Michigan	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2
Minnesota	12	3	0	1	1	5	0	2	0
Mississippi	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Missouri	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Montana	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Nebraska	8	1	0	0	4	1	2	0	0
Nevada	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
New Jersey	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
New Mexico	13	3	0	0	4	1	2	3	0
New York	8	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	0
North Carolina	30	2	1	2	12	7	3	3	0
North Dakota	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	15	2	1	0	4	1	5	2	0
Oklahoma	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Oregon	8	1	0	0	2	3	2	0	0
Pennsylvania	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	19	1	3	3	1	5	1	5	0
South Dakota	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Tennessee	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	0
Texas	40	7	1	4	8	6	3	9	2
Utah	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Vermont	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	25	4	1	0	1	6	4	7	2
Washington	9	2	0	1	0	1	2	3	0
West Virginia	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wisconsin	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	1
Wyoming	8	0	0	1	3	1	1	1	1
U.S. Territories	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	578	95	7	34	90	108	79	140	25

Appendix B – Data by Language

Language	Total	Minimum Experience Required					Actual Experience			
		Not sure/ No Min.	2 Years or Less	3–5 Years	5–10 Years	More than 10 Years	2 Years or Less	3–5 Years	5–10 Years	More than 10 Years
Signed Languages	175	54	109	9	0	0	12	16	34	109
American Sign Language (ASL)	170	52	106	9	0	0	11	15	34	106
Conceptually Accurate Signed English (CASE)	75	19	51	3	0	0	2	9	14	48
Manually Coded English (MCE)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pidgin Signed English (PSE)	135	42	84	7	0	0	8	13	28	84
Sign Exact English (SEE)	43	12	28	2	0	0	5	6	5	25
Tactile ASL	9	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	3
Spoken Languages	392	255	60	30	4	12	18	43	97	203
Spanish	297	198	51	22	1	4	13	37	76	150
Languages Other Than Spanish	112	72	10	8	3	8	5	6	26	64
Arabic	19	15	3	1	0	0	1	4	1	13
Armenian	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Bengali	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bosnian	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Chin Hakha	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chin Mara	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Chin Mizo	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chin Zophei	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chinese	8	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
Creole	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Croatian	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Dari	8	4	1	2	0	1	3	0	2	3
Farsi	5	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	3
Filipino/Tagalog	5	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	1
French	14	10	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	10
German	4	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Gujarati	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Haitian Creole	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Hindi	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Hmong	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Ilocano	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Japanese	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Kannada	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Kikuyu	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Kinyarwanda	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Kirundi	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Kiswahili	4	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
Korean	6	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	4
Marathi	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Mixtec	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Montenegrin	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nepali	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pashto	7	3	1	2	0	1	3	0	2	2
Polish	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Portuguese	16	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	10
Punjabi	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Russian	10	6	1	1	0	1	0	0	6	3
Sandawi	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Serbian	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sindhi	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Tajiki	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Tongan	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ukrainian	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Urdu	4	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	1
Vietnamese	6	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	3
Visayan	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Language	Total	Minimum Education Required			Actual Education		
		Not Sure/ No Minimum	High School or Equiv.	Higher Education	High School Not Complete	High School or Equiv.	Higher Education
Signed Languages	175	42	43	87	0	2	158
American Sign Language (ASL)	170	40	43	84	0	1	154
Conceptually Accurate Signed English (CASE)	75	20	17	36	0	1	67
Manually Coded English (MCE)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Pidgin Signed English (PSE)	135	33	35	65	0	2	122
Sign Exact English (SEE)	43	9	10	23	0	0	40
Tactile ASL	9	0	3	5	0	0	8
Spoken Languages	392	133	154	100	2	17	354
Spanish	297	96	126	73	1	13	274
Languages Other Than Spanish	112	50	30	29	1	4	96
Arabic	19	8	10	1	0	1	15
Armenian	5	1	2	2	0	0	5
Bengali	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Bosnian	3	1	0	2	1	0	1
Chin Hakha	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Chin Mara	3	0	2	1	0	0	3
Chin Mizo	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Chin Zophei	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Chinese	8	2	3	3	0	0	8
Creole	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Croatian	2	1	0	1	0	0	1
Dari	8	1	1	6	0	1	6
Farsi	5	1	0	4	0	0	4
Filipino/Tagalog	5	2	0	3	0	0	5
French	14	5	5	3	0	0	11
German	4	0	1	3	0	0	3
Gujarati	2	1	0	1	0	0	2
Haitian Creole	3	1	2	0	0	0	3
Hindi	4	1	1	2	0	0	4
Hmong	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Ilocano	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Japanese	3	3	0	0	0	0	3
Kannada	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Kikuyu	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Kinyarwanda	3	1	0	2	0	0	3
Kirundi	3	1	0	2	0	0	3
Kiswahili	4	2	0	2	0	0	4
Korean	6	5	0	1	0	0	6
Marathi	2	0	1	1	0	0	2
Mixtec	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
Montenegrin	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Nepali	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Pashto	7	1	1	5	0	1	5
Polish	2	0	1	1	0	0	2
Portuguese	16	12	1	3	0	0	15
Punjabi	2	0	1	1	0	0	2
Russian	10	6	1	2	0	0	9
Sandawi	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Serbian	2	1	0	1	0	0	1
Sindhi	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Tajiki	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Tongan	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Ukrainian	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
Urdu	4	0	1	3	0	0	4
Vietnamese	6	2	2	2	0	0	5
Visayan	1	1	0	0	0	0	1

Language	Total	Location (mark all that apply)				Employment Status					
		Not Sure	Urban	Sub-urban	Rural	Not Working	Employed Full-Time	Employed Part-Time	Independent Contractor	Volunteer	Other
Signed Languages	175	1	75	85	57	3	141	4	26	0	1
American Sign Language (ASL)	170	1	74	81	57	3	136	4	26	0	1
Conceptually Accurate Signed English (CASE)	75	1	33	40	20	1	61	2	10	0	1
Manually Coded English (MCE)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pidgin Signed English (PSE)	135	1	56	65	49	2	109	3	20	0	1
Sign Exact English (SEE)	43	0	24	19	11	2	34	0	7	0	0
Tactile ASL	9	0	5	6	2	1	7	0	1	0	0
Spoken Languages	392	4	285	179	64	0	164	46	151	4	16
Spanish	297	1	213	130	48	0	141	37	91	4	14
Languages Other Than Spanish	112	4	81	59	20	0	30	10	68	1	2
Arabic	19	1	17	9	3	0	5	3	11	0	0
Armenian	5	0	5	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0
Bengali	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bosnian	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Chin Hakha	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Chin Mara	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Chin Mizo	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Chin Zophei	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Chinese	8	0	6	4	1	0	4	2	2	0	0
Creole	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Croatian	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Dari	8	1	7	2	0	0	4	1	2	0	0
Farsi	5	0	5	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	0
Filipino/Tagalog	5	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	3	0	1
French	14	0	10	8	1	0	4	1	9	0	0
German	4	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0
Gujarati	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Haitian Creole	3	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	0
Hindi	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	1
Hmong	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ilocano	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Japanese	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Kannada	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Kikuyu	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Kinyarwanda	3	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
Kirundi	3	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
Kiswahili	4	0	3	2	1	0	2	0	2	0	0
Korean	6	0	1	5	0	0	4	2	0	0	0
Marathi	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Mixtec	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Montenegrin	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Nepali	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pashto	7	1	6	2	0	0	4	1	1	0	0
Polish	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
Portuguese	16	1	11	9	2	0	4	0	11	1	0
Punjabi	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Russian	10	0	9	4	2	0	3	0	7	0	0
Sandawi	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Serbian	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Sindhi	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Tajiki	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Tongan	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ukrainian	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
Urdu	4	0	3	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0
Vietnamese	6	1	5	3	3	0	0	0	6	0	0
Visayan	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Language	Total	Compensation							
		No Response	<\$15 per Hour	\$15–\$20 per Hour	\$21–\$25 per Hour	\$26–\$30 per Hour	\$31–\$35 per Hour	>\$35 per Hour	Other
<i>Signed Languages</i>	175	19	2	8	30	28	27	47	14
American Sign Language (ASL)	170	17	2	8	29	27	26	47	14
Conceptually Accurate Signed English (CASE)	75	7	0	3	13	8	17	18	9
Manually Coded English (MCE)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pidgin Signed English (PSE)	135	13	1	7	25	19	22	37	11
Sign Exact English (SEE)	43	4	1	2	8	6	10	10	2
Tactile ASL	9	2	0	1	3	0	1	1	1
<i>Spoken Languages</i>	392	69	5	26	60	79	52	90	11
Spanish	297	47	4	21	53	61	41	62	8
Languages Other Than Spanish	112	25	2	5	8	20	12	34	6
Arabic	19	3	1	3	4	3	4	1	0
Armenian	5	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0
Bengali	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bosnian	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chin Hakha	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chin Mara	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Chin Mizo	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chin Zophei	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chinese	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	1
Creole	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Croatian	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dari	8	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	0
Farsi	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0
Filipino/Tagalog	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0
French	14	4	0	0	2	4	1	3	0
German	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
Gujarati	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Haitian Creole	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Hindi	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
Hmong	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Ilocano	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Japanese	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Kannada	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kikuyu	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kinyarwanda	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Kirundi	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Kiswahili	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Korean	6	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1
Marathi	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Mixtec	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Montenegrin	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nepali	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pashto	7	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	0
Polish	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Portuguese	16	1	1	1	0	3	0	7	3
Punjabi	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Russian	10	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	0
Sandawi	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Serbian	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sindhi	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Tajiki	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Tongan	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Ukrainian	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Urdu	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
Vietnamese	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Visayan	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix C – Data by Stakeholder Type

	Signed Lang. Interpreters	Spoken Lang. Interpreters	Interpreter/ Translators	Translators	Other Stakeholders	Total
Sex/Gender Identity						
Prefer not to answer	5	0	1	8	7	13
Woman (female)	134	109	150	0	96	497
Man (male)	13	23	31	0	12	79
Nonbinary	4	0	2	0	2	8
Other	2	1	0	0	0	3
# of respondents	158	133	184	8	117	600

Minimum Experience Required for Interpreters and/or Translators in Educational Settings						
Not sure/ No minimum	56	110	141	7	20	334
2 years or less	109	25	34	1	32	201
3–5 years	9	7	20	3	73	112
5–10 years	0	2	2	1	4	9
More than 10 years	0	3	9	0	3	15
# of respondents	174	147	206	12	132	671

Minimum Education Required for Interpreters and/or Translators in Educational Settings						
Not sure / No minimum	24	64	67	3	5	181
High-school diploma or equivalent	44	65	85	4	20	218
Some college	5	9	15	1	12	42
Associate's degree or equivalent	42	9	19	0	26	96
Bachelor's degree or equivalent	40	15	27	5	55	142
Master's degree or equivalent	1	0	2	0	14	17
Doctoral degree or equivalent	0	0	1	0	0	1
# of respondents	174	162	216	13	132	697

Soft Skills Ranked from Most (1) to Least (13) Required					
Verbal Communication	1	1	1	2	1
Written Communication	6	3	2	1	2
Negotiation	12	11	12	11	10
Public Speaking	9	5	5	7	9
Critical Thinking	2	4	3	3	3
Research	10	9	9	4	11
Confidence	5	2	4	5	7
Collaboration	3	8	6	8	5
Patience	4	6	8	10	4
Courtesy	7	7	7	9	6
Networking	13	13	13	13	13
Empathy	8	10	11	12	8
Use of technology	11	12	10	6	12
# of respondents	120	123	175	8	109