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Abstract

Research has indicated that there are many unique stressors that Video Relay Service Interpreters (VI) experience in the call-center setting (Alley, 2016; Brunson, 2011; Wessling & Shaw, 2014), and VIs have a high risk of stress and burnout (Bower, 2015) as a result. The purpose of this study on VI resilience is to explore the VI experiences through an online survey investigating perceived burnout, resilience measure using the 9-Item Resilience Scale, perceived resilience, and the resiliency practices used to maintain resilience and reduce the impact of stress. Five domains of resiliency practices (emotional, physical, cognitive, spiritual, and professional) were assessed for prevalence, frequency, and perceived effectiveness of use. 212 individuals participated in the study, 78.77% (167/212) of which report having had experienced burnout, either currently or in the past. 54.72% (117/212) of the respondents reported that they are not currently experiencing burnout, 29.24% (62/212) reported experiencing burnout at the time of the survey, and 15.57% (33/212) report they may be currently experiencing burnout. Perceived resilience and how the VI scored on the resilience scale appeared to be relatively similar. VIs acknowledged that resilience impacts their interactions with callers and that burnout impacts the quality of interpretation they provide, however there was no strong connection between resilience and the prevalence of burnout in the study. This may indicate that the resiliency practices implemented by VIs may not be enough to prevent burnout in Video Relay Service Centers (VRS). A theme emerged suggesting interpreters find that workplace constraints, such as regulated break time, standardized quality control metrics, and high call volume, to be a significant cause of stress and have sometimes resulted in a disregarded for self-care, reduced quality customer service, or allyship.
Keywords: Video relay service (VRS), video interpreter (VI), resilience, burnout, 9-Item Resilience Scale, resiliency practices, self-care, coping strategies.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Video relay service (VRS) is a telecommunication service regulated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing (Brunson, 2011). Sign language interpreters facilitate communication between hearing persons who use a telephone to communicate in a spoken language and deaf persons who use a video phone to communicate in signed language. Interpreters who work at VRS centers face unique challenges (Brunson, 2011; Marks, n.d). Among the challenges, is the high risk of burnout (Dean, Pollard, Samar, 2010; Bower, 2015). According to Bower (2015), “burnout is a condition in which people suffer from a negative change in feelings, attitude, and expectations, and which may result in fatigue and reduced work abilities” (p.9).

Side effects of burnout can negatively impact the interpreter and presumably all stakeholders in VRS (Bower, 2015; Hall 2018). The resilience of an individual can serve as a protector against burnout (Lybarger, 2018). According to the American Psychological Association, resilience is “the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats, or even significant sources of stress” (American Psychological Association, 2010, p. 2). Given the known risk of burnout when working in video relay service (Bower, 2015), the purpose of this study is to explore video relay service interpreter resilience and the steps that they take to increase their resilience and consequently mitigate their risk of burnout. There is no known research explicitly focused on the resiliency of interpreters working in video relay service. The findings of this study will add to the body of knowledge about VRS interpreting and allow an opportunity for further studies that can inform future practice in the profession.

Through a review of the literature, Chapter 2 will showcase the gap in research related to the resilience of VRS interpreters. The topics of burnout, resilience, perceived resilience, the 9-
Item Resilience Scale, and resiliency practices will be discussed. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used for the study mentioning the mixed-methods approach used to develop a qualitative and quantitative survey for past and present VRS interpreters. The method of recruitment and data analysis will be shared as well. Chapter 4 covers the study results and findings that show interpreters are actively taking steps to promote personal resilience. Many interpreters have experienced or are experiencing burnout despite the use of resiliency practices that are thought to be effective. The findings will highlight resiliency practices that are performed, resilience scores, burnout and more. Chapter 5 will include the limitations of the study and recommendations, summarize the findings, and offer questions for further research.
Chapter II: Literature Review

Introduction

There are multiple negative impacts of burnout, the most concerning of which are the tendency to depersonalize the work and become apathetic, and sometimes to be dehumanized or to dehumanize clients (Brown, 2012; Montero-Marín, Jesus, García-Campayo, Javier, Mera, Domingo Mosquera, & Del Hoyo, Yolanda Lopez, 2009). These impacts can be especially detrimental with work in the VRS setting. The interpreters facilitate communication between a diverse group of individuals many of whom have complex intersectionalities, and among whom are of a marginalized linguistic and cultural minority. If a VRS interpreter is experiencing burnout and exhibits depersonalization and a lack of empathy, it would be reasonable to assume that there is a negative impact on the interpreter, colleagues, and the hearing and deaf video relay service callers. Video relay service has a variety of stakeholders that should be aware of these findings; among them are the hearing and deaf callers, the VRS interpreters, the VRS providers and leadership, and the Federal Communication Committee. Bower (2015) contends that, “VRS interpreters, VRS call center managers, the VRS providers who interpret FCC regulations and establish policies, and the FCC which creates policies and regulations that directly affect VRS interpreters…have a responsibility to implement changes allowing interpreters to work in an environment that do not result in stress and burnout” (p.14).

The recommended call to action by the researcher included that VRS interpreters take responsibility. Previous research findings indicating the high stress and burnout experienced by

---

1 deaf is used in this paper as a way to be inclusive of all individuals who may be deaf including those who identify as culturally with being Deaf.
VRS interpreters were shared in 2013 via presentation (Bower) and later in 2015 by publication. Now, six years after the initial research, an exploration of what the interpreters are doing to mitigate the risk of burnout through resiliency practices is a beneficial next step. Though an analysis of what each stakeholder group is doing to prevent burnout and to promote resilience in the workplace could be incredibly helpful and enlightening, this research will focus on one stakeholder group, VRS interpreters, and will explore what they are doing to increase their resiliency and consequently reduce the likelihood of developing burnout. Discussion of the literature regarding VRS, burnout, and resilience will guide an understanding of the value of the research.

Background

VRS

VRS is a telecommunications service regulated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) that provides interpreting service between individuals who use spoken language to communicate and deaf individuals who use a American Sign Language to communicate (Alley, 2014; Brunson, 2011; Marks, 2015.). In the FCC regulations, interpreters are not referred to as interpreters, but as communication assistants (CAs). The term CA is also used to refer to other employees that provide relay services such a captioning service. The companies that provide VRS more often use the term video interpreters (VIs) (Alley, 2016).

In the VRS environment, interpreters support communication between two individuals who are located in separate locations. VIs work most commonly in call centers within cubicles that divide interpreters from each other. The interpreter’s area is typically equipped with a videophone, which is a device that can simultaneously connect two parties via video, and a phone line (Brunson, 2011). A simplified example of the process is as follows: The deaf and the
non-deaf callers are connected to each other through the interpreter who is in the call center. The interpreter is on the audio phone line with the non-deaf party and on the video phone with the deaf party. When the hearing caller speaks over a phone line, the interpreter hears what was said and interprets the meaning and intent of the message into American Sign Language (ASL). The deaf person sees what was communicated from the hearing person through what was interpreted by the sign language interpreter on the videophone in front of them. The deaf person responds in ASL and the sign language interpreter sees what is being communicated via the videophone and the interpreter interprets what was signed into spoken English on the phone. The hearing person hears what the deaf person communicated through the interpreter on the phone and the conversation continues between the two callers through use of the interpreter.

**VRS Challenges**

Interpreters who choose VRS as a career have a unique set of challenges (Alley, 2015; Bocian, 2012; Brunson, 2011; Dean, Pollard & Samar, 2010; Marks, 2015; Wessling & Shaw, 2014). The FCC governs VRS providers and has strict regulations and expectations of VRS companies and reimburses the companies for the call time when a Deaf and a non-deaf caller are connected through the interpreter. These companies are providing access to telecommunication services as outlined in Title IV of the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) (Wessling & Shaw, 2014). Examples of regulations required by the FCC that impact the VRS providers and the interpreter are: “speed of answer (80% of all calls must be answered within 2 minutes), 24-hour service availability (interpreters can work during any time of the day or night) and 911 accessibility” (Wessling & Shaw, 2014, p.7). The execution of the VRS interpreter’s work is heavily impacted by the regulations imposed by the FCC as the financial profits of the company they work for is dependent on the interpreters adherence to those regulation. While the
regulations are designed to provide quality communication access, the unfortunate side-effect of these regulations is to add constraints to the decision-making that professional interpreters normally perform (Alley, 2015; Wessling and Shaw, 2014).

Wessling and Shaw (2014) explained that the VRS interpreter is trained on the technology requirements of the job, the regulations of the FCC, the VRS provider’s policies to comply with regulations and thus qualify for reimbursement from the government, and how to execute calls efficiently. Bocian (2012) mentions various demands on the interpreter such as those “caused by the environment (e.g., computer screen pixilation and freezing), interpersonal protocol (e.g., company scripts), paralinguistic stressors (e.g., stakeholders understanding of the subject), and intrapersonal responses to policies that govern the work (e.g., productivity reports)” (as cited by Alley, 2016, p. 43). Alley (2016) reported that VIs experience stress due to the constraints imposed by the companies for whom they work, such as restricted break times and the use of performance metrics that directly correlate with ability to receive or not receive desired hours in the future. Interpreters in the study shared that there is conflict present between the FCC rules, some of the VRS provider policies, parts of the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) Code of Professional Conduct (CPC) tenets and one’s internal moral compass.

In most interpreting settings outside of VRS, if an interpreter is unqualified or has a conflict of interest, the interpreter will not accept the offered assignment; such discretion is aligned with the values and tenets of the RID CPC. However, in VRS, according to the FCC the interpreter must stay on the call a set amount of time before having another interpreter step in. To address this, VRS providers encourage the VI who feels unqualified to continue with the call and to request another interpreter join the interpreter in the station to work the call as a team. The FCC also expects the interpreter to interpret “effectively, accurately and impartially.” The two
FCC regulations seem to conflict at times. The VRS provider solution of calling a team to help is a tough one because some providers track the amount of teaming time an individual does and emphasizes to request a team only when necessary (Alley, 2016). The constraints of the company and governmental regulations may be a stressor for VIs. A case has also been made that interpreters experience a lack of autonomy in the VRS setting, which may differ from other areas in which an interpreter works (Alley, 2016). Typically, the interpreter has a variety of tools that can be used in an interpreting setting to provide the best interpretations, but with the stringent regulations, there are fewer controls an interpreter can implement to remedy the demands and reduce the potential impact of stress.

Through use of the demand-control schema from Karasek’s 1979 model, Dean and Pollard (2001) assessed health risks involved with the interpreting occupation relating to the field of interpreting. Demand-control schema utilizes the ideas of demands (stressors) and controls (tools to address the demands and reduce the stressors) (Dean & Pollard, 2001). Referencing Dean and Pollard’s findings, Bower states interpreters “may experience more psychological distress, depression and physical exertion than other documented professions. Furthermore, the study showed that VRS interpreters experience greater psychological distress than interpreters in the other three work settings” (2015, p.3). As a follow up to the 2001 study, Dean, Pollard and Samar (2010) performed a similar study and found similar findings by using the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ). These measurements looked at decision latitude, skill discretion, decision authority, role constraint, psychological demands (distress), depression, physical exertion and job dissatisfaction of interpreters in various settings. Similar results were found recognizing the high demands on the VI and the low amount of controls at the VIs disposal. The results of this
investigation suggest VRS occupational stress is greater than some other interpreted settings (Dean, Pollard, and Samar, 2010). Stress is often a precursor to burnout (Bower, 2015).

**Burnout**

Maslach and Leiter (1997) list risk factors for burnout being “work overload, lack of control, lack of reward, lack of community, lack of fairness, and values conflict, all based on a mismatch between the nature of the job and the nature of the person who does the job” (p. 258). There is a substantial body of research on burnout in the healthcare field and other service industries (Hernández, Gangsei, & Engstrom. 2007; Langballe, Falkum, Innstrand, & Aasland, 2006; Maslach, Leiter & Zedeck, 2008). Hernández, Gangsei & Engstrom (2007) share the concept of vicarious trauma and how it has been identified as an experience that impacts human services workers. They propose the concept of vicarious resilience where the human services worker also grows and experiences resilience with the growth of the client. Langballe et al (2006) discusses the application of the Maslach Burnout Inventory and its applicability showing that it was reported to be effective in measuring burnout in seven of the eight professions (e.g., physicians, nurses, bus drivers) in Norway. Maslach et al discuss burnout indicators and inventories. Burnout spans across many professions, not only sign language interpreting.

In the interpreting field there has been some research on burnout and the vicarious trauma experienced by interpreters (MacDonald, 2015; Anderson, 2011), but research specific to VRS is in the infancy stages due to the relative youth of video relay services and the red tape restricting access (Bower, 2015; Dean et al. 2010; Schwenke & Ashby 2012; Arlyn, 2011). The somewhat unpredictable nature of the work can cause joy for some and anxiety for others (Schwenke & Ashby 2012). Interpreters in the VRS setting often have their ways of “getting through” the challenges of the day to day, but for many, the joy in the work is absent from their description of
their work (Bower, 2015; Schwenke & Ashby 2012). VIs have noted an appreciation of the stability of work from VRS as well as a chance to work with other interpreters. Other interpreters have expressed that they enjoy the variety of individuals people get to work with day in and day out (Wessling & Shaw, 2014).

Schwenke & Ashby (2012) suggest an interpreter’s personality type can be connected to one’s propensity to experience burnout. A perfectionist personality type coupled with maladaptive coping mechanisms (e.g., avoidance, self-blame) is likely to experience burnout according to the research. However, if the perfectionist has adaptive coping skills, they can mitigate their increased risk of developing burnout. Schwenke & Ashby prompt educators to take this into mind when assessing interpreting students and to mindfully provide supports to a student with maladaptive perfectionism so one can participate in stress reducing activities.

Moradi, Nima, Ricciardi, Archer, & Garcia, (2014) showed that when employee wellness was good, the performance of the call center employees was also good. Through generalizing research about burnout and the outcomes, it could be assumed that having employees at optimum wellness will benefit the quality of interpretation. Higher quality of interpretation may then provide a better experience of the deaf and non-deaf callers, while positively impacting the other stakeholders of VRS. When the interpreter is equipped with the tools (controls) to face the demands of the job, the lasting negative impact of stress on the individual may be lightened. Hall (2018) suggests an interpreter’s burnout can contribute to oppression of consumers so attentiveness to interpreter stress, burnout, and resilience is important.

Resilience

Among tools that can help an interpreter deal with the demands of the job, Anderson (2012) mentions resilience. Lybarger (2018) says resilience can act as a buffer or a protector
against the stress of VRS. There are a number of definitions of resilience, but Anderson notes the
corcepts that most definitions of resilience share: “it is a dynamic and flexible response to
adversity” (p. 2). The term adversity can range from a minor stressor to a traumatic life event. If
one has the healthy well-being to face the adversity and move through it, then one has the
resilience necessary to return to a similar state of being that one had before the adverse event.

Wessling and Shaw (2014) discuss the emotional extremes that VRS VIs encounter due
to the numerous emotionally charged calls that they interpreter. Emotional extremes, as used in
the survey by Wessling and Shaw, are “emotions that the interpreter continued to feel after the
termination of a VRS call. These persistent emotions might include extreme happiness, extreme
anger and /or extreme sadness” (p1). In this survey study, VIs reported emotionally extreme
responses to a VRS call such as frustration, anger, sadness and happiness. Even though the
emotions are initially not the interpreter’s, but are the expressions of callers, interpreters report
having these emotional experiences carry over to their own personal lives. These extremes
impact the body causing a potentially adverse impact. An individual’s body and brain can
navigate the event, process it, and then (depending on resiliency levels and practice) can return to
the state prior to the event (Anderson, 2012; Wessling & Shaw (2014).

According to Wessling and Shaw (2014) there are positive aspects of emotional extremes
such as the ability to understand and empathize. The ability to empathize and read situations is a
critical component of interpreting. However, emotional extremes (as mentioned above) still tax
the body. There has been research into mirror neurons which are neurons in our brain that help
individuals to empathize (Swabey & Malcolm, 2012, p. 111). When these areas of the brain are
activated, an individual’s body doesn’t discern whether or not the emotions are one’s own or
another’s. The same part of the brain is activated with joy or pain even if the event is not one’s own emotional expressions. This adds another layer to the emotional and cognitive challenges an interpreter may face. Anderson (2012) mentions “Building up your reserves of well-being will help you manage difficult situations” (p. 18). This prompt was given in regard to interpreters engaging in self-care practices “that support a balanced, healthy life” (p.18). Self-care practices, coping strategies are common terms for activities that promote resilience. In this paper the term resiliency practices will be used because it is a broad term that encompasses any proactive, intentional, and deliberate action that promotes resilience which includes self-care and coping strategies (Lybarger, 2018).

In the interpreting profession, there has been research on burnout, but little in the realm of VRS and less on the on resilience of VIs or their personal resiliency practices. However, actions proactively taken by some interpreters to reduce their own risk of burnout suggest interpreters are aware of their needs. In interviews with VRS interpreters, some interpreters disclosed that they have adjusted their schedule to include more break time than allotted by the VRS company (Alley, 2016). According to Alley, “Throughout the interviews, CAs conveyed repeatedly that they are fully aware of the expectations their providers have regarding their productivity and output” (p.154). Despite the pressure to meet expectations of the VRS provider, interpreter’s chose to make decisions based on customer service. Bower (2015) and Alley (2016) uncovered some of the stress and burnout experienced. More research into the resiliency practices of interpreters who work in VRS can build from these findings.

Conclusion

Given the known risk of burnout when working in video relay service (VRS) (Bower, 2015), the purpose of this research is to explore video relay service interpreter resilience and the
steps interpreters are taking to increase resilience and consequently mitigate the risk of burnout. There is no known research explicitly focused on the resiliency of interpreters working in video relay service. The finding of this study will add to the body of knowledge about VRS interpreting and allow an opportunity for further studies that can further inform practice in the profession.
Chapter III: Methodology

As follow up to the recognition of burnout among VRS interpreters (Bower, 2015), this inductive exploratory study was conducted to explore the practices VRS interpreters are implementing to increase their resilience and prevent burnout.

The research on resilience and resiliency practices of video interpreters would be considered applied interpreting studies research and fits into one of the three types of needed applied interpreting studies research as outlined by Leeson, Wurm, Vermeerbergen (2011) and cited by Hale and Napier (2013). It “expands our understanding of the interpreting practices, the role of the interpreter and the interpreting context (Hale & Napier, 2013, p. 200-201). Following an exploration of what VRS interpreters are doing to improve their resiliency for themselves, and consequently for the benefit of other stakeholders, further applied research can be done to narrow the exploration and potentially produce research that “feeds directly into teaching by describing skills and strategies that interpreters need to develop” or that “produces technical tools that interpreters and interpreting students can use” (Hale & Napier, 2013, p. 200-201).

This study will use a mixed method approach to investigate interpreter resilience in a VRS setting. Mixed-methods tends to look at research from different perspectives and seeks to “triangulate” the data while multi-methods are not restrained to only triangulation; it allows more than just traditional methods of combining qualitative and quantitative research” (p.196). Hale and Napier share that in 2006, Brewer and Hunter reported the multi-method perspective benefits the writing and publication or research (2014). However, some disagree with the idea of the multi-method approach as described by Brewer and Hunter due to lack of belief in the premise
that the multi-method approach helps make up for any weaknesses in testing from another domain (Bergman, 2007).

**Questionnaire**

This study used a questionnaire that explores the resiliency practices of interpreters in VRS. The survey was designed in such a way to garner both qualitative and quantitative research.

The questionnaire was developed on an online survey platform entitled Qualtrics and was analyzed by the researcher. The questionnaire aimed to elicit “three types of information: factual, behavioral and attitudinal.” The research aimed to gather qualitative and quantitative data through survey questions that utilize Likert scales, closed ended, and open-ended questions.

The recruitment letter and link to the online survey was disseminated through various organizations including Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT), The Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) Video Interpreter Member Section (VIMS), Sorenson VRS, Purple VRS / ZVRS, and Convo. Dissemination was permitted via email, social media, organization website and word of mouth. Through the efforts of snowballing, as mentioned by Stringer (2014), it was hoped that respondents would share information with others eligible to take the survey. Though RID’s membership is not representative of all interpreters in the United States, the most recent demographic information by RID members could be used in comparing the demographic results of the study to see if there is similarity in representation. That will not guarantee the generalizability of the research but would put the results into context with the reported demographics.

Hale and Napier (2013) recognize some benefits to the questionnaire, but caution of the limitations inherent in the process. Some benefits of note include the ease and low-cost of
dissemination, ability to complete on participants own time, and data collection in digital format. However, there may be lack of involvement by some participants due to losing the survey link or putting the response off past the deadline. Another possible limitation is the potential for data to be skewed by a participant completing a survey multiple-times (Hale & Napier, 2013).

Stringer (2014) implores researchers to be aware of their own bias and prevent use of leading questions explaining that an exploration should show the everyday experience of participants; “bringing their assumptions, views, and beliefs out in the open and making them available for discussion” (p. 102). This research seeks to do that with VRS interpreter resilience.

The exploration begins with the online questionnaire created in Qualtrics. The informed consent form was included and consent was obtained prior to involvement in the survey. Demographic questions (including, but not limited to: race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identification, Coda, English as a second or third language users, Tri-lingual interpreters, with blanks left for self-identification if the given options do not match the intersectionality of identity the individual has), questions determining resiliency practices of VRS interpreters, frequency of practice, perceived effectiveness of practice, perceived burnout level and perception of whether or not their stress levels and burnout levels impact the users of VRS. Additionally, a brief standardized questionnaire, 9-Item Resilience Scale, is used to identify an individual’s resilience (Windle, Bennet, Noyes, 2011).

Each survey participant was assigned a number to identify their responses and to protect the confidentiality of the participant. The participant responses were recorded and tallied to report the quantitative data. The researcher looked at the qualitative data from the questions to identify commonalities and themes in the data.
Prior to this research endeavor to explore resiliency practices of VRS interpreters, Katherine Bower (2013) conducted a national study that illustrated the risk of working as an interpreter in VRS. In her journal publication (2015), she calls stakeholders to step up to the plate and do their part in reducing the stress interpreters experience in VRS. It’s now more than five years following the results of Bower’s research and it’s time to see what practices have been implemented by interpreter to foster resiliency and reduce the high risk of burnout in the VRS interpreting setting. From this inductive exploratory study, further applied research recommendations will be shared to further the body of knowledge that often guides practice and influences the lives of VRS interpreters and the many stakeholders of VRSs.
Chapter IV: Results and Findings

Introduction

This study explores the resilience of video relay service (VRS) interpreters through questions that elicit a better understanding of the resilience of video interpreters (VIs) and the resiliency practices VIs are performing to maintain or increase their resilience, which may consequently mitigate the known risk of stress and burnout in VRS interpreting as reported by Bower (2015). The research participants, demographics, survey results, and common themes are discussed in this section.

Participants

Participants were recruited via a request of survey dissemination to VRS providers and interpreter organizations including the Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT), Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID), RID Video Interpreter Member Section (VIMS), Sorenson VRS, Purple Communications/ZVRS, and Convo. A formal letter was sent to the organizations including a brief explanation of the study, a copy of the survey questions that would be involved, the request for assistance with recruitment letter dissemination, and a formal participant recruitment letter to be shared by the organization. The formal participant recruitment letter included a brief description of the research and the online survey link (See appendix X).

Confirmed dissemination was provided by CIT via a membership email, and the RID Research Corner via RID’s Facebook page. Purple Communications/ZVRS leadership confirmed they would share the survey invite with center directors and allow individual center management to decide to disseminate or not. Additional recruitment occurred through snowballing, a means in which the survey link can be shared by participants in an effort to extend the survey invite to others who may not have had the opportunity to initially see it (Stringer, 2014). Snowballing
efforts were confirmed through social media re-posts and emails the researcher was cc’d on, however, the extent to which information was shared is outside the scope of the researcher’s knowledge. The online survey was available March 2, 2019 through March 20, 2019. The survey link opened up to a standard letter of consent that explained the purpose of the study, possible risks or benefits of participation, option to decline participation, an option to provide consent and proceed to the survey and explanation on how to cease further participation in the study at any time (*see Appendix A*). A total of 224 survey responses were recorded; however, 12 participants did not proceed to answer any questions beyond the demographic information. Therefore, these responses were deleted. This resulted in a total number of 212 participants.

**Demographics**

Of total respondents identifying age (n=211), more than 50% (111/211) were between the ages of 25 and 44 years old.

Table 1

*Age of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total distinct respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The age ranges of the total distinct respondents (N=211) is displayed.

Of total respondents identifying age (n=211), more than 50% (111/211) were between the ages of 25 and 44 years old. Among those willing to report gender (N=206) 80.7% (171/206)
identified as cisgender female, 16% (34/206) identified as cisgender male, .5% (1/206) identified as agender and 2.8% (6/206) stated that they prefer not to answer (See Figure 1 to see the gender identification of participants).

Table 2

Gender Identity of Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity*</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender woman (identify as sex assigned at birth - female)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender man (identify as sex assigned at birth - male)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender man</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender woman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans spectrum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender non-conforming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other identity: specify in the blank provided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a woman, I do not like or accept the term &quot;cisgender&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total distinct respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Individuals were able to choose all that applied so the counts may not represent distinct respondents.

There were 211 participants that responded to a question regarding racial and ethnic identification.

Table 3

Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Ethnicity*</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern or North African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other racial or ethnic group not listed above:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European, Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White for me means English, Irish &amp; Scottish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ashkenazi Jew”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solely Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total distinct respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Individuals were able to choose all that applied so the counts may not represent distinct respondents.

Work status was reported by 208 individuals. Among respondents 19.23% (40/208) are full time VRS employees, 62.02% (129/208) are part time VRS employees and 18.75% (39/208) no longer work in VRS.
Survey Responses

Burnout.

The research regarding burnout was used to inform the findings of the main research question regarding resilience and resiliency practices of the VI. Prior research on VI burnout has been conducted by Bower (2015). This survey uses the same definition of burnout used by Bower, which states "burnout is a condition in which people suffer from a negative change in feelings, attitude, and expectations, and which may result in fatigue and reduced work abilities" (p.9). For this current study, 78.77% (167/212) of the 212 respondents responded affirmatively that they have experienced burnout while 20.75% (44/212) said that they had not experienced burnout. Those who answered “Yes” to having experienced burnout (167/212) were then asked, “Are you currently experiencing burnout from work as a VRS interpreter?” and were offered the option to choose yes, no, or maybe. Survey respondents reported that 36.9% (62/167) were currently...
experiencing burnout from work as a VRS interpreter, 19.64% (33/167) may have been experiencing burnout at the time of the survey, and 43.5% (73/167) reported they were not currently experiencing burnout at the time of the survey. Taking into account that 44 individuals out of all the 212 survey respondents reported that they have not experienced burnout, it may be inferred that they also are not currently experiencing burnout. This may indicate that of all survey respondents 54.72% (117/212) are not currently experiencing burnout while 29.24% (62/212) are experiencing burnout, and 15.57% (33/212) may currently be experiencing burnout.
Figure 3. Shows the total number of respondents (N=212) broken down into those who have or have not experienced burnout and those who are experiencing burnout, maybe experiencing burnout or are not experiencing burnout.

While there are 39 individuals out of the 208 that responded that they no longer work in VRS, only 38 provided reason for their departure from the VRS setting. Some possible reasons were provided. The participant could select all the options that apply and/or write a different reason not already listed. Among the options provided by the researcher, the top two reasons for individuals no longer working in VRS are: “No longer enjoyed work in VRS”, and “Mental Burnout.”

![Bar Graph: Reasons for no longer working in VRS](image)

- Mental burnout: 20
- No longer enjoyed work in VRS: 20
- Other: 14
- Physical burnout: 14
- Other job opportunity: 10
- Schedule Conflicts: 7
- Prefer not to answer: 2

Figure 4. Reasons for VRS are listed in bar graph. The other category indicates self-identified reasons listed in Table
## Table 4

**Reason for No Longer Working in VRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for no longer working in VRS*</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Conflicts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No longer enjoyed work in VRS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental burnout</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical burnout</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other job opportunity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Specify in the blank provided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time position became full-time &amp; no time left for VRS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time work as interpreter educator and administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tired of supervising interpreters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridiculous video training requirements were prioritized over the interpreting work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to an area with no VRS work options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced retirement due to workplace injury - bilateral carpal tunnel &amp; bilateral epicondylitis w/bone spurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When management/companies focus primarily on statistical data instead of the employee it was time to change specialties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD caused by VRS work and lack of employer support for vicarious trauma exposure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely underpaid and not enough significant breaks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not appreciated by company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in company procedures, protocols, and values that I could not agree with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low paying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not feel I was respected as a professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full time mom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total distinct respondents** | 38 |

*Counts may not represent distinct respondents
Note: Individuals were able to choose all that applied so the counts may not represent distinct respondents.

The option for individuals to write their own reasons for leaving had 14 results. Some of the results were based on practicality and the need to focus on other responsibilities. Results included responses such as “became a full-time mom,” “[my other] part-time position became a full-time position so no time left for VRS,” and “moved to an area with no VRS work options.”

Others reasons for the separation from VRS interpreting were based more on the relationship between the interpreter and the employer such as, “severely underpaid and not enough significant breaks,” “when management/companies focus primarily on statistical data instead of the employee it was time to change specialties,” “not appreciated by the company,” and “Didn’t feel I was respected as a professional.” In fact, concerns were often expressed regarding the capitalist intentions of the VRS industry. Participants shared, “Changes in company procedures, protocols, and values that I could not agree with,” and “Ridiculous video training requirements were prioritized over the interpreting work,” “Tired of supervising interpreters”, and “low paid.” A couple reasons for departing VRS work were based on health of the VI and their relationship with the company. One interpreter shared she was “Forced [into] retirement due to workplace injury - bilateral carpal tunnel & bilateral epicondylitis w/bone spurs.” Another interpreter reported mental health and lack of employer support as the reasons for exiting the field stating, “PTSD caused by VRS work and lack of employer support for vicarious trauma exposure.”

**Resilience.**

**Perceived Resilience**

An exploration of burnout may inform the research about possible connections that may exist between burnout and resiliency practices. Resilience has a variety of definitions, but as stated
previously, the definition of resilience used by this study and within the survey itself is the
definition provided by the American Psychological Association, which states that resilience is
“the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats, or even significant
sources of stress” (American Psychological Association, 2010, p. 2). Using this definition of
resilience, survey respondents were asked to state their perceived level of resilience. The options
provided were: Not resilient at all, Not very resilient, Neutral, Pretty Resilient and Extremely
resilient. Among the 200 individuals that responded to this resiliency question, 25.5% (51/200)
reported themselves to be “Extremely Resilient,” 61% (122/200) reported themselves as “Pretty
Resilient,” 8.5% (17/200) responded as “neutral”, 5% (10/200) responded as “Not very resilient.”

*Resilience Measure*

In an effort to use a more standardized resilience measure to gauge the resilience of VRS
interpreters, the 9-Item Resilience Scale was included within the survey. This instrument poses
nine questions for which the respondent answers the questions by selecting the option that most
reflects the truth of the statements. Each answer is assigned a number 1-5 and the total of the 9
answers are tallied. The higher the resulting number, the more resilient one is and the lower the
number the less resilient one is according to this instrument. For the purposes of the survey,
resulting scores were grouped into ranges of 5. There were 203 completed responses to the 9-Item Resilience Scale.
Table 5

9-Item RES Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9-Item Resilience Evaluation Scale</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total distinct respondents** 212

*Note:* The 9-Item Resilience Evaluation Scale is a standardized scale that reports the level of resilience to correspond with the numbers; the higher the score, the higher the level of resilience. The lower the number, the lower level of resilience.

**Perception and Reality**

The perceived resilience level appears relatively comparable to the actual measure with some outliers. The majority of those who self-reported as “Extremely Resilient” had scores in the higher ranges and those who listed as “Not very resilient” scored in the lower ranges.
Table 6

9-Item RES and Perceived Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Resilience</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very resilient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total distinct respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The graphic above displays the self-perceived degree of resiliency on the left with the total numbers of respondents to the column to the right. The 9-Item Resilience Evaluation Scale scores are displayed by score ranges in the top center column and the total number of respondents in each range is listed in the bottom center column. Within the middle column the perceived resilience degree responses are broken down by the range of the 9-Item Resilience Scale score that the individuals scored in.

While the self-perceived resilience and the resilience measurement scores are similar, there may be connections made between years of VRS experience, self-perceived resilience and current burnout as seen in the figure below (See Figure X). Interestingly, 44.8% (95/212) of total respondents (N=212) worked in VRS more than 10 years with 32.6% (31/95) of these seasoned interpreters reporting currently experiencing burnout, 47.3% (45/95) report not currently
experiencing burnout, 13.6% (13/95) report they may be currently experiencing burnout and 6.3% (6/95) did not respond.

Table 7

*VRS Experience, Perceived Resilience, and Currently Experiencing Burnout*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRS experience</th>
<th>Perceived Resilience</th>
<th>Currently experiencing burnout?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>1 – 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>7 – 77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very resilient</td>
<td>1 – 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total distinct respondents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>5 – 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>24 – 68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4 – 11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very resilient</td>
<td>2 – 5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total distinct respondents</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>8 – 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>22 – 61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3 – 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very resilient</td>
<td>3 – 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total distinct respondents</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>21 – 26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>47 – 60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6 – 7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRS experience</td>
<td>Perceived Resilience</td>
<td>Current VRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>1 – 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>7 – 4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very resilient</td>
<td>1 – 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total distinct respondents</td>
<td>9 – 5.7%</td>
<td>2 – 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>5 – 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>24 – 15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4 – 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very resilient</td>
<td>2 – 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total distinct respondents</td>
<td>35 – 22.2%</td>
<td>18 – 11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>8 – 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>22 – 13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3 – 1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very resilient</td>
<td>3 – 1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total distinct respondents</td>
<td>36 – 22.8%</td>
<td>8 – 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>Extremely Resilient</td>
<td>21 – 13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretty Resilient</td>
<td>47 – 29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resiliency Practices

The amount of resilience one has is not fixed; it can be built up or broken down. When asked “Do you currently do anything that promotes your own resiliency?”, 83% (166/200) of the 200 interpreters share they currently do something actively to promote their resiliency, while 17% (34/200) report not doing anything to promote their own resilience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resiliency Level</th>
<th>6 – 3.8%</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3 – 1.9%</th>
<th>3 – 1.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6 – 3.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 – 1.9%</td>
<td>3 – 1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very resilient</td>
<td>4 – 2.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 – 1.3%</td>
<td>2 – 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total distinct respondents</strong></td>
<td>78 – 49.4%</td>
<td>31 – 19.6%</td>
<td>32 – 20.3%</td>
<td>15 – 9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISTINCT RESPONDENTS</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The figure breaks down the years of VRS experience, perceived resilience level and whether those are currently experiencing burnout. The blue rows are the totals for the given years of experience and the total number of individuals from that experience level that were currently experiencing burnout, were not currently experiencing burnout or maybe experiencing burnout. Below the blue line the total numbers are then divided by the perceived level of resilience.
Figure 5. The pie chart shows that of those asked (N=200), 83% (166/200) of respondents do something to actively promote their resilience while 17% (34/200) do not.

Resiliency practices are defined within the survey “as the activities and disciplines that can positively impact resilience. Self-care and coping skills are other commonly used terms for some of the practices that develop resilience.” The respondents who shared that they currently participate in resiliency practice (N=166) were then asked “In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience?” and were provided with the options to select: a) cognitive, b) spiritual, c) physical, d) emotional and e) professional.

Development in the realm of emotional resiliency had the most respondents with 84.0% (141/166) responses. This included activities that focused on emotional development. Resiliency practices in the area of cognitive development closely followed with 80.7% (134/166) responses. These included activities that focused on cognitive development. Physical resiliency practices were reportedly practiced by 75.9% (126/166) of individuals. This included activities that focused on physical actions a VI would take. The least reported practices were in professional resiliency practices at 65.1% (108/166) responses and spiritual resiliency practices at 63.2% (105/166) responses. Professional resilience practices focused on activities a professional could engage to develop one’s professional life. Spiritual resiliency practices focused on activities an individual can do to develop one’s connection with the world.
In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Resiliency practices in provided resilience domains is displayed with the number of respondents who report practicing in the given domain. (N=166)

When these numbers are considered with the 34 individuals who reported not to practice any acts of resiliency, findings suggest that, while 17% of interpreters do not create opportunities to promote resilience, 83% of interpreters report creating opportunities to promote resilience.

Those surveyed reported doing resiliency practices in several domains: 70.5% (141/200) of VRS interpreters surveyed create opportunities to promote resilience in the emotional domain, 67% (134/200) in the cognitive domain, 63% (126/200) in the physical domain, 54% (108/200) in the professional domain, and 52% (105/200) in the spiritual domain.

*Emotional Resiliency Practices.*

Emotional resiliency practices were reportedly the most used resiliency domain from the options provided with 141 respondents (70.5% of all the 200 interpreters who answered the initial question about resiliency). Among the options provided, the three most used practices are “investing in family relationships” (n=104), “investing in friendship relationships” (n=97),
“cultivating gratefulness” (n=84). They are closely followed by “deep breathing or controlled breathing” (n=81), and “listening to music to calm yourself” (n=75) closely behind.

**Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investing in family relationships</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in friendship relationships</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating Gratefulness</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Breathing/Controlled Breathing...</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to music to calm yourself</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praying</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditating</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journaling</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating made up happy endings when...</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Specify in the blank provided</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Emotional resiliency practice is displayed with the number of respondents who report practicing given practices in this domain (N=131)

The frequency of some of the practices that are reported to be used vary as illustrated in the image.
Cultivating Gratefulness

Investing in family relationships

Investing in friendship relationships

Journaling

Praying

Meditating

Deep Breathing/Controlled Breathing...

Listening to music to calm yourself

Creating made up happy endings when you don’t know the outcome of a…

Counseling

Other: Specify in the blank provided

Frequency of Emotional Resiliency Practices

Number of respondents

Once a Month
A few times a month
Every Other Week
Once a Week
A Few Times a Week
Once Every other Day
Once a Day
A Few Times Day
Multiple Times a Day
Resiliency practices in the emotional domain appear to be used in a variety of frequencies (as illustrated above), but there is not a strong pattern for most. The majority of the 81 “deep and controlled breathing” respondents are reported to either be used multiple times a day \( (n=29) \) or a few times a day \( (n=29) \). “Listening to music to calm yourself” is either be used multiple times a day \( (n=27) \) or a few times a day \( (n=24) \) by most of the 75 respondents that use this practice with the next highest frequency is once a day \( (n=14) \). Most of those who invest in friendship \( (n=97) \) appear to do it multiple times a day \( (n=25) \), or a few times per week \( (n=27) \). The act of “investing in family relationships” was reported by 104 individuals and the majority of those individuals do this either “multiple times a day” \( (n=46) \) and “a few times a day” \( (n=24) \) while other frequencies have less respondents. “Cultivating gratefulness” is most often used once a day \( (n=21) \) or more (a few times a day, \( n=20 \); multiple times a day, \( n=25 \)).

When asked about the effectiveness of these practices, almost all respondents reported either “somewhat beneficial” and “extremely beneficial” with more stating “extremely beneficial” more often than “somewhat beneficial”. In “cultivating gratefulness”, 2 people reported neutral, and 1 said the practice is “somewhat not beneficial”. The remaining stated a degree of benefit. “Investing in family relationships”, “investing in friendship relationships” and listening to music each had one individual report “neutral” and one person reported “somewhat not beneficial”. All other respondents believed the acts to be beneficial (See Figure X.X).
How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?

- Counseling: 24 respondents
- Deep Breathing/Controlled Breathing: 33 respondents
- Listening to music to calm yourself: 34 respondents
- Creating made up happy endings when you don’t know the outcome of a…: 10 respondents
- Meditating: 16 respondents
- Praying: 46 respondents
- Investing in friendship relationships: 26 respondents
- Investing in family relationships: 21 respondents
- Journaling: 15 respondents
- Cultivating Gratefulness: 29 respondents

Number of respondents

- Extremely Beneficial
- Somewhat Beneficial
- Neutral
- Somewhat Not Beneficial
- Not Beneficial at All
Emotional resiliency practices were also self-specified by many: “Remembering that the tough situation is a small part of my life, resetting brain, dog walking, gardening, Craft projects at home or in a group, Positive self-talk, comedy shows, Petting my cat, Debriefing when needed, regular exercise, outside if possible, Crafting, Debriefing, “I have self-care assignments every week that might be getting a manicure, massage, going to yoga or the lake, taking a walks or vitamins, drinking extra water, seeing a friend, etc.”, Listening to podcasts, Nature, Mentorship, Play Pokemon Go, venting to my wife, church, Debrief, Yoga, Giving myself permission to relax - knowing my limits, intense physical exercise, Laugh a lot, creating an environment that is peaceful - for example eliminating negative relationships, “I'm currently in a small group 13 wk. class at my church that is like counseling, but not. We are unpacking wounds, triggers and coping mechanisms. It is excellent, though tough. We have accountability partners weekly.”, Giving back/volunteer work, venting to a trusted interpreter colleague, be retrospective, saying no when I know my boundaries are being pushed.”

**Cognitive resiliency practices.**

Cognitive resiliency practices were reportedly practiced by 134 individuals. The types of practices able to be selected were: meditation, mindfulness practice (awareness of emotions and thoughts and triggers), use of a mantra, mental exercise or games (such as crosswords, sodoku…), reading, actively learning something new, cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), utilizing coping skills while in a call. Respondents also had the ability to write down their own answers as well. The most used practice was reading with 104 respondents followed by
mindfulness practices with 82 responses, and actively learning something new with 70 responses. Many other practices are reportedly used as well.

**Figure 10. Cognitive Resiliency Practice**

The top three most used cognitive practices are also reported to be the most frequently used. Those who use these practices reported the degree they believe them to be beneficial in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress. Reading is reported as extremely beneficial by 30.39% (31/104), somewhat beneficial by 55.88% (57/104), neutral by 10.78% (11/104), somewhat not beneficial by 1.96% (2/104) and reported as not beneficial at all by .98% (1/104). Mindfulness practice is reported as extremely beneficial by 53.75% (43/82), somewhat beneficial by 41.25% (33/82), neutral by 3.75% (3/82), somewhat not beneficial by 1.25% (1/82), with no responses rating it as not beneficial at all. Mental exercises or games are reported to be extremely beneficial by 32.39% (23/70), somewhat beneficial by 49.30% (35/70), neutral effectiveness by 14.08% (10/70), somewhat not beneficial by 2.82% (2.70) and not beneficial at
all by 1.41% (1/70). Though use of cognitive behavioral therapy was only reportedly used by 14 individuals, those who use it report its’ effectiveness at a higher percentage than all other pre-given options; stating the degree of benefit it has in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress to be extremely beneficial by 73.33% (11/14) and somewhat beneficial by 26.67% (4/14) with no one reporting the use of CBT as neutral, somewhat not beneficial or not beneficial at all.

Many individuals had other cognitive practices they listed on their own and among those who specified their own cognitive practice, they were reported to be extremely beneficial by 61.54% (n=16), somewhat beneficial by 30.77% (n=8), and neutrally beneficial by 2 individuals (7.69%). There were a variety of items listed as cognitive practices listed: “smiling as much as I can in the camera between calls”, “pray”, “self-talk”, “prayer for the callers, for myself, for social justice, or all the hurting people…I pray for them on my drive home. Then I let go.”, jigsaw puzzles during break, music, sailing, play mah jon, member of a 12-step program, talk with a professional, keeping a peaceful photo on the desk in front of me, hobbies (crochet, sewing, crafts), breathing!, I always have something to drink to give me time to think, coaching, “another coping skill – after a tough call, visually seeing myself throw the call out of my head or “erasing” the notes (and call) after completion—imagining a happy ending to a rough all.”, journaling, visualizing my “shield” which blocks me from absorbing negative energy from others, regular swimming and walking on my off time, API- assuming positive intent, active in church, quietly drum my fingers, interpretive dancing, power poses between calls, “intentional positive self-talk: “You got this!”, “I know sign language!! Let’s go!!”, loggin on, a.n.d “GO GIRL!!!”. Also, if I’ve had a rough call, I log out if possible, and go actually physically “shake it off”. Also, if I’ve had an especially amazing call or some famous Deaf person populated on my
screen, I log out and do a victory lap around the center.” talk with other interpreters, speaking with a professional, “Journal. When I’m triggered by calls, I talk with a coworker and take my revelations home. I write them down and read them to confirm I have self-automated thoughts proving. I can process what content I conjure without fear of it being unsatisfactory to some else’s expectations.”, mindfully sending compassion to myself and to the callers, practicing radical acceptance, “keeping track of all the good calls vs all the bad calls in the day. keeps things in perspective”, I have a full-time job that I LOVE, that helps me stay mentally active, making space to decompress after a difficult call or situation in order to physically and mentally reset, “Personal Development – Positive Affirmations.”

Physical Resiliency Practices.

Within the physical domain of resiliency practices, several types of practices were listed for the survey respondent to select the actions they take. The options included some practices that could take place during a VRS shift and others that could take place outside of a VRS shift. The provided options were included, stretching arms and hands, yoga, breathing exercises, eye movement exercises, eating healthy snacks on breaks, working out three or more times a week, walking on breaks, using modified positioning (such as a unique chair or standing desk), having a balanced diet, participate in recreational activities, regular sleep habits (approx. 7 or more hours daily). There was also an option to write in a type of resiliency practice not already listed. The top three physical resiliency practices reported to be used are stretching arms and hands, drinking approximately eight, 8oz glasses of water a day, and breathing exercises (See figure X).
Among the top three selected physical resiliency practices, the subjective effectiveness in its ability to maintain resiliency and limit the impact of stress are somewhat mixed but shows that the majority of participants who perform these practices find it to be extremely beneficial.
How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?

- **Drink Water (approx. eight, 8oz glasses daily or more)**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 67
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 22
  - Neutral: 3

- **Regular Sleep Habits (approx. 7 or more hours daily)**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 60
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 6

- **Participate in recreational activities with a team**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 4
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 4

- **Having a Balanced Diet**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 49
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 17

- **Using Modified Positioning (Such as a unique chair or standing desk)**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 20
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 21

- **Walking On Breaks**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 33
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 29

- **Working Out Three or More Times a Week**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 47
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 11

- **Eating Healthy Snacks on Breaks**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 34
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 26

- **Eye Movement Exercises**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 5
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 2

- **Breathing Exercises**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 44
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 30

- **Yoga**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 24
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 16

- **Stretching Arms and Hands**
  - Extremely Beneficial: 40
  - Somewhat Beneficial: 39

The chart indicates the number of respondents for each practice and the level of benefit they perceive.
Figure 12. Self-Reported Efficacy of Physical Resiliency Practice

From the choices provided, the activity that is most reported by those who do it as extremely beneficial is regular amounts of sleep with over 91% of individuals saying it is extremely beneficial. This is followed by working out three or more times a week with 78% of individuals that perform this resiliency practice reporting it to be extremely beneficial for limiting the impact of stress and maintaining resiliency. The resiliency practice with the third highest percentage of respondents believing it to be extremely beneficial is drinking enough water at 73%. Drinking enough water, and having a balanced diet are the top two frequently used practices reported by respondents who engage in those activities, followed by using modified positioning (such as a unique chair or standing desk).
How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?

- Cultivating Gratefulness: 49 respondents
- Journaling: 29 respondents
- Investing in family relationships: 80 respondents
- Investing in friendship relationships: 66 respondents
- Meditating: 46 respondents
- Praying: 46 respondents
- Deep Breathing/Controlled Breathing: 33 respondents
- Listening to music to calm yourself: 34 respondents
- Other: Specify in the blank provided: 16 respondents
- Counseling: 24 respondents
- Creating made up happy endings when you don’t know the outcome of a…: 10 respondents

Number of respondents
Figure 13. Perceived benefit of the given physical resiliency practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AWA.FIELD</th>
<th>Multiple Times a Day</th>
<th>A Few Times a Day</th>
<th>Once a Day</th>
<th>Once Every other Day</th>
<th>A Few Times a Week</th>
<th>Once Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stretching Arms and Hands</td>
<td>33.70%  31</td>
<td>34.76%  32</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td>9.78%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yoga Practices</td>
<td>0.00%  0</td>
<td>0.00%  0</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
<td>29.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Breathing Exercises</td>
<td>31.58%  24</td>
<td>34.21%  26</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>17.11%</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eye Movement Exercises</td>
<td>30.00%  3</td>
<td>30.00%  3</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eating Healthy Snacks on Breaks</td>
<td>22.39%  15</td>
<td>43.28%  29</td>
<td>22.39%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Working Out Three or More Times a Week</td>
<td>6.67%  4</td>
<td>1.67%  1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Walking On Breaks</td>
<td>20.63%  13</td>
<td>26.98%  17</td>
<td>15.87%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Using Modified Positioning (Such as a unique chair or standing desk)</td>
<td>46.67%  21</td>
<td>11.11%  5</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Having a Balanced Diet</td>
<td>52.11%  37</td>
<td>21.13%  15</td>
<td>15.49%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Participate on an Athletic Team</td>
<td>11.11%  1</td>
<td>0.00%  0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regular Amounts of Sleep</td>
<td>15.15%  10</td>
<td>4.55%  3</td>
<td>62.12%</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>7.58%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Drinking Enough Water</td>
<td>68.48%  63</td>
<td>11.96%  11</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other: Specify</td>
<td>9.09%  1</td>
<td>18.18%  2</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other: Specify</td>
<td>27.59%  8</td>
<td>6.90%  2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Practices that are most frequently used.

Spiritual Resiliency Practices.

There were 105 individuals that reported using spiritual resiliency practices. The options to select from were: a) praying, b) meditation, c) yoga, d) attending faith organization gatherings, e)
small group religious gatherings, f) reading religious texts, and g) believing in a greater purpose. Participants had the option to type a practice used that was not listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spiritual Resiliency Practice: What do you do?</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Believing in a greater purpose</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praying</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending faith organization gatherings</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading religious texts</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group religious gatherings</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Specify in the blank provided</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 15. Prevalence of Spiritual Resiliency Practice](image)

The most used according to respondents is g) Believing in a greater purpose with 71.4% (75/105) responses. It was performed once a day or more by 90.66% (65/75) individuals; with 72% (54/75) reported this practice to be extremely beneficial in maintaining resiliency and reducing the impact of stress; 22.67% (17/75) reporting it to be somewhat beneficial, 2.67% (2/75) neutral, 2.67% (2/75) reporting it is somewhat not beneficial. “Praying” was used selected by 73 individuals reporting praying, of which 63 did at least once a day or more. This was reported as extremely beneficial by 75.34% (55/73) and somewhat beneficial by 23.29% (17/73) with only one person responding neutral to the benefits of that resiliency practice. “Attending faith organization gatherings” with 58 respondents of which 18 attend a few times a week (31/03%), 30 attend once a week (51.72%), 2 attend every other week (3.45%), 5 attend a few times a
month (8.62%), and 3 attend one a month (5.17%). There were 41 people (70.69%) who reported this is a “extremely beneficial” resiliency practice; 11 (18.97%) people who believe it to be “somewhat beneficial,” and 6 (10.34%) who responded with “neutral”. All respondents who selected “Small group spiritual gatherings” reported it was beneficial to maintaining resiliency and reducing the impact of stress by those reported attending with 77.42% (24/31) calling it extremely beneficial and 22.5% (7/31) reporting it is somewhat beneficial. Several other spiritual practices were reported as beneficial by selection of the choices provided and by specifying a practice that was not already listed.

How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?

- Extremely Beneficial: 41 out of 55 respondents
- Somewhat Beneficial: 11 out of 17 respondents
- Neutral: 6 respondents
- Somewhat Not Beneficial: 2 respondents
- Not Beneficial at All: 2 respondents

Figure 16. Benefit of maintaining resiliency and limiting impact of stress
There were 108 individuals that reported using professional resiliency practices. Respondents were able to select the practices performed from the options provided or to write in a practice not previously listed. The options provided were deliberate skill development, mentoring, daily professional skill development goals, intentional relationship building with colleagues, reading leadership materials, engaging a variety of assessments, and expanding base knowledge/schema through participation in unfamiliar activities. The three reported to be used the most were “deliberate skill development” (n=78), intentional relationship building with colleagues (n=58) and expanding base knowledge/schema through participation in unfamiliar events (n=52).

*Figure 17. Frequency of Spiritual Resiliency Practices.*

*Professional Resiliency Practices.*

There were 108 individuals that reported using professional resiliency practices. Respondents were able to select the practices performed from the options provided or to write in a practice not previously listed. The options provided were deliberate skill development, mentoring, daily professional skill development goals, intentional relationship building with colleagues, reading leadership materials, engaging a variety of assessments, and expanding base knowledge/schema through participation in unfamiliar activities. The three reported to be used the most were “deliberate skill development” (n=78), intentional relationship building with colleagues (n=58) and expanding base knowledge/schema through participation in unfamiliar events (n=52).
Of the top three reported used resiliency practice, no clear pattern for frequency of use emerges. The frequency of use highest among the three categories are “a few times a week” for “deliberate skill development” (n=19), “once a day” for “intentional relationship building with colleagues” (n=15), and “a few times a month” for expanding one’s schema.
Figure 19. Frequency of Professional Resiliency Practices.

Among the top three used, the perceived effectiveness of those practices at maintaining resiliency and reducing the impact of stress is reported to be somewhat beneficial and extremely beneficial for the majority of respondents that used the given practice as indicated on the bar graph.
Perceived effectiveness of the reported top three used professional resiliency practices

- **Expanding base knowledge/schema through participation in unfamiliar events**: 47.1% Extremely Beneficial, 45.1% Somewhat Beneficial, 5.9% Neutral, 2.0% Somewhat Not Beneficial, 0.0% Not Beneficial at All
- **Intentional relationship building with colleagues**: 63.2% Extremely Beneficial, 31.6% Somewhat Beneficial, 3.5% Neutral, 1.8% Somewhat Not Beneficial, 0.0% Not Beneficial at All
- **Deliberate skill development**: 39.0% Extremely Beneficial, 50.6% Somewhat Beneficial, 7.8% Neutral, 1.3% Somewhat Not Beneficial, 1.3% Not Beneficial at All

Figure 20. Perceived Effectiveness of Professional Resiliency Practices.

From the selections provided, the most effective practices (based upon the perception of those who perform it) are “mentoring” and “intentional relationship building with colleagues”. There were many other professional resiliency practices that individual specified such as, workshops or CEU course, “seeking feedback from deaf interpreters and clients”, “workshops related to VRS, resilience skill development, self-care etc.”, “give back to the profession by serving on a state board”, “keeping up with local, national and international news”, “research and review ASL knowledge”, teaching that forces one “to keep learning and evaluating”, “reading and thinking about the field”, “attending Deaf events”.
Participants were asked which sentence described them best relating to active coping skills and avoidance coping skills. The researcher looked at avoidance coping skills or active coping skills alongside the survey respondents who responded to the question asking if they were currently burned out or not. There doesn’t seem to a strong connection between the two based on these findings.

Knowledge versus application of knowledge.

When looking at knowledge and application of resiliency practices, there does not appear to be a large difference between those who are currently burned out and those who are not.

### Current Burnout and Active or Avoidance Coping Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Coping Skills - You are intentional about doing something to improve the situation.</strong></td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidance Coping Skills - You avoid and procrastinate dealing with challenges.</strong></td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I don't know. I haven't considered my coping skills I use when I encounter challenges.</strong></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 21.** Coping Skills in Respondents Who Are Currently Experiencing Burnout.

Current Burnout and Knowledge and Application of Resiliency Practices

- **Yes**: 70.4%
  - I am aware of several resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) and I implement them regularly.
- **No**: 65.6%
  - I am aware of several resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) and I do not implement them regularly.
- **Maybe**: 66.7%
  - I am not aware of specific resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) so I cannot implement them regularly.

When asked to answer the degree of agreement with the statement “My level of resilience influences my interactions with callers” 2 people strongly disagreed, 3 people somewhat disagreed, 16 neither agreed nor disagreed, 59 somewhat agreed, and 104 strongly agreed. There was a total of 184 individuals that responded to the question indicating that of those 184 people 32.07% (n=59) somewhat agreed, and 56.52% strongly agreed to the statement.
"My level of resilience influences my interactions with callers."

There were 166 individuals who reported having had experienced burnout at one time. They were asked what they believed happened to their quality of work as a VRS interpreter. The quality of work “significantly improves” and “moderately improves” both had one respondent. There were no responses for “mildly improves”; however, 21 individuals believe the quality remains the same; 67 individuals believed the quality of work mildly decreases; 48 believed the
quality of work moderately decreases, and 28 individuals report that the quality of work significantly decreases.

While experiencing burnout, do you believe your quality of your work as VRS interpreter ________.

- Significantly Decreases: 28
- Moderately Decreases: 48
- Mildly Decreases: 67
- Remains the same: 21
- Mildly Improves: 1
- Moderately Improves: 1
- Significantly Improves: 1

Figure 24. Perceived effect burnout has on the quality of interpreting service.

Workplace Constraints

Survey participants were asked if they had ever had to make decisions that was contrary to the rules, regulations, and/or policies believed to be in place (whether by the VRS provider or the Federal Communication Commission). They were also given an option to write regarding any
other thoughts that would like to be shared as related to burnout, resilience, and resiliency practices.

When asked about compliance with company policies and/or FCC guidelines, there appears to be uncertainty by VIs whom the constraints are put in place, VRS providers or the FCC; which has been shown in previous research (Ally, 2014). A review of the comments suggest that regulations and policies may have been violated in an effort to promote one’s own self-care, and/or to practice allyship, and/or to provide quality customer service.

A significant portion of the answer were focused on environmental constraints such as break time restrictions, break time length, start and end time for work, staying with the call longer than one should for the caller and customer service and metrics.

When survey respondents were asked “Any thoughts you would like to share about your experience as a VRS interpreter as related to burnout, resilience, and resiliency practices?” many responses echoed that of the previous questions related to breaking the rules of the company due to the need of the individual interpreter to perform resiliency practices that included taking actions such as extended breaks, breaks during restricted times, chatting with callers before or after a call is placed etc. Other responses focused on making decisions that have been made based on the needs of the callers.

**Discussion**

The findings of the research provided information on burnout, resilience and resiliency practices that are currently being implemented by VIs. Though there is not a plethora of research on VRS, this study can be framed from other studies that touch on similar topics.

Regarding burnout and stress that VIs experience this research used a definition of burnout that was within previous research by Bower (2015) that states: “burnout is a condition in which
people suffer from a negative change in feelings, attitude, and expectations, and which may result in fatigue and reduced work abilities (p.9).” Bower (2015) reported high stress factors in VRS that contribute to the likelihood of burnout as described by Maslach and Leiter (1997). Through the survey conducted in 2013, Bower had findings that indicated 60% of the 355 individuals that responded to the questions indicating they were currently experiencing burnout, and 16% indicated they had experienced burnout previously showing total of 76% of VIs who were currently or had experienced burnout. The other 10 percent were labeled as “unclear yes or no.”

The current research yielded a smaller number of respondents (212 compared to 355), but the difference in identification of burnout still appears significant. In Bower’s study 76% of respondents shared that they are currently experiencing burnout or have experienced feelings of burnout in the past; this current study reports 78.77% (167/212) report having had experienced burnout. However, of the current study’s 212 respondents, 54.72% (117/212) report not currently experiencing burnout, only 29.24% (62/212) report currently experiencing burnout and 15.57% (33/212) were unsure if they are experiencing burnout. The total number of those who have experienced burnout is higher than the Bower’s, but the percentage of individuals who currently are experiencing burnout is lower, 29.24% (62/212) compared to Bower’s study at 60% (201/335). Bower’s study mentioned the responsibility of the VRS providers to “achieve the balance for their employees within the setting as a whole,” but also mentions that “interpreters must use resources such as self-care techniques to balance stressors in their work.”

While many of the stressors in VRS as noted in previous research remain present, such constraints within the VRS environment, interpreters have been taking action to maintain or improve their resilience and reduce the impact of stress. There were 166 out of 200 (83%) of
interpreters who report being proactive in developing and maintaining resilience which is said to be a buffer to stress (Lybarger, 2018). Interpreters selected many of the resilience practices and added many of their own within the various domains a) cognitive, b) spiritual, c) physical, d) emotional and e) professional. Interpreters were offered an opportunity to rate the degree of one own’s resilience and were also provided a standardized measure, The 9=Item Resilience Scale. The findings showed that most interpreters 9=Item Resilience Scale score appeared comparable to their perceived resilience level. However ironic, the overall resilience scores and resiliency practices did not seem to directly impact burnout levels. This could be for many reasons such as an already depleted level of resilience that needed to be built up in order to no longer be burned out, lack of frequency of resiliency practice, performing VRS work for lengthy shifts or too often due to financial reasons or otherwise, there is a possibility that the work of VRS is incongruent with many individuals, or there is also the possibility that while an interpreter may perform resiliency practices in an effort to maintain their own resilience, the demands of the work and setting have not yet been balanced by the VRS providers.

While the overall numbers for perceived resilience, resiliency practices and burnout don’t appear to strong connections between them, there may be a connection between level of experience in VRS and the rate of burnout as those who worked in VRS for 10 or more years reported less burnout than did interpreters of other experiential levels. This may indicate a constellation of factors that maintain resilience and reduce the impact of stress that have yet to be fully identified, but it would behoove the VRS providers to research these factors, acknowledge the stressors in VRS that have been echoed for years, seek to remedy the issues and communicate these attempts with the members of the organization.

Limitations and Future Research
There are several limitations that may have impacted the results of this study. First, though actions were taken to reduce bias, the researcher is also a fellow VI which may contribute to researcher bias during the survey development, analysis and reporting. The reality of time is a constraint that impacted the depth of analysis conducted. Had one had more time available and budgeted the time accordingly, a more in-depth analysis may have occurred that may had encouraged other themes to surface.

Due to the privacy of many VRS providers, the exact number of interpreters working in VRS and the demographics are unknown. Additionally, the survey was disseminated nationwide, but only a small number of responses were made. Generalizing any results should be done with caution, but further research of similar exploration or more narrowed explanation could inform more about the experiences of individuals from specific demographics that are not represented or are underrepresented.

While this study sought the input of VRS employees that may no longer be a VIs, there was only a small number that responded so the perspective of management or other divisions of VRS companies was not representative of those perspectives. Further research with all stakeholder groups of VRS would provide a more holistic understanding of the issues at hand and can guide future practice in VRS interpreting.

**Chapter V: Conclusion**

This study provides a greater understanding of prevalence of VRS interpreter burnout, interpreter resilience, and the resiliency practices that are being implemented.

In Chapter, 1 a review of the literature showed an emergence of VRS interpreting research. The risk of stress and burnout in VRS interpreting was reported from a survey
conducted in 2013 (Bower, 2015), and the emotional extremes that VRS interpreters endure was reported by Wessling and Shaw (2014). The constraints of the job that are implemented through interpretation of the FCC guidelines by VRS companies have been reported (Alley, 2014), the intricacies of VRS interpreting (Brunson, 2011), and unique challenges in the setting have also been researched (Alley, 2016; Bocian, 2012; Brunson, 2011; Wessling & Shaw, 2014).

Several of the aforementioned researchers have discussed interpreter self-care, but there was no known study that looked specifically at burnout, resilience, and the resiliency practices of VRS interpreters. This study is a small initial step in the attempt to bridge the gap in the research by offering a preliminary exploration of the current experiences of VRS interpreters as related to resilience. The literature also reviewed relevant information related to burnout, discussed the 9-item Resilience Scale used and the various domains of resiliency practices that were to be explored: a) cognitive, b) spiritual, c) physical, d) emotional and e) professional.

In Chapter 3, the explanation of the methodology outlines the process of the mixed-methods research conducted. Through a qualitative and quantitative survey development, recruitment, dissemination, analysis, and reporting the methods of the exploratory study are described. Chapter 4 introduces the results and findings of the this study, which show that burnout is still an issue facing VRS interpreters despite the many resiliency practices interpreters are implementing. Various resiliency practices were shared with highlights of the top three used by people of each domain, along with those that were used the most frequently and were reported to be the most beneficial in maintaining resilience and reducing the impact of stress. Limitations of the study were shared along with recommendations for further research.

Through a survey of the relevant literature, developing a research study, discussing the results and findings of this study on VRS interpreter resilience, it is clear that there is more work
to be done. The majority of interpreters acknowledge that their interaction with the callers is impacted by their level of resilience and that burnout impacts the quality of interpreting services provided. In fact, most report a decrease in interpreting capabilities when experiencing burnout. While some interpreters are content in the VRS setting, a large number of interpreter report that they often do not enjoy their work.

Improving resilience is often based on capitalistic notions of maintaining or increasing revenue in the corporate world. The ploy to elicit change by noting the monetary benefit of the longevity of employees working in VRS is recommended to persuade change, but this study on resilience is rooted in the value of the individual. Interpreters, deaf persons, hearing persons, and communities are impacted by the provision of VRS service. The VRS interpreters are worthy of VRS corporations making changes to create work environments where interpreters can thrive and not painstakingly schedule there day in order to not burnout. They are also worthy of the FCC’s considerations of mandating working conditions to improve the experience of the interpreter and those served. The deaf and hearing persons connected via VRS deserve interpreters that are capable of providing the best interpretations/transliterations as possible, which requires the interpreters to take the time to give attention to their burnout level, their resiliency level, and to regularly implement resiliency practices.
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Appendix A. Participant Recruitment letter

Dear Past and Present VRS Interpreters,

My name is Adella Shaw and I am a graduate student in the Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies and Communication Equity (MAISCE) program at St. Catherine University at St. Catherine University in St. Paul, MN. I am conducting my thesis research on the experiences of video relay service (VRS) interpreters by looking at resilience and resiliency practices. As part of my study, I am asking past and present VRS interpreters to complete an online survey. You are receiving this communication because, as a past or present VRS interpreter, your participation will contribute a unique and valuable perspective to this exploration.

If you are interested in participating, please use the link below to read the consent information and participate in the survey. The survey will take approximately 15-25 minutes of your time.

The survey is open from ___ to ___.

Link to Survey: An Exploration of VRS Interpreter Resilience

This study has been approved by the St. Catherine University review board (# 1197). If you have any questions, I invite you to ask them before you begin the survey. You can contact me at amshaw049@stkate.edu. If you have any additional questions later and would like to talk to the faculty advisor, please contact Erica Alley, Ph.D. at 651-690-6018, elalley@stkate.edu, or by VP: 612-255-3386. If you have other questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher or research advisor, you may also contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St. Catherine University Institutional Review Board, at (651) 690-7739 or jsschmitt@stkate.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Adella Shaw, NIC
MAISCE student
St. Catherine University
Appendix B. Survey Dissemination Request

Dear Organization/Company,

My name is Adella Shaw, and I am a graduate student in the Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies and Communication Equity (MAISCE) program at St. Catherine University at St. Catherine University in St. Paul, MN. I am conducting my thesis research on the experiences of video relay service (VRS) interpreters by looking at resilience and resiliency practices. As part of my study, I am asking past and present VRS interpreters to complete an online survey.

You are receiving this email to request your help disseminating information to your “employees/members.”

The participation of VRS interpreters across the country from various providers and organizations will contribute a greater understanding of the unique and valuable experiences of VRS interpreters. The survey responses are anonymous, and the survey questions do not ask that VRS providers be identified. I have included the survey questions in a separate document for your review.

If you are interested in participating by sharing information about this research study, please use the attached recruitment email. That email includes information about the study and provides the link to the survey.

The survey will be open from ___ to ____.

This study has been approved by the St. Catherine University review board (# 1197). If you have any questions, I invite you to ask them. You can contact me at amshaw049@stkate.edu. If you have any additional questions later and would like to talk to the faculty advisor, please contact Erica Alley, Ph.D. at 651-690-6018, elalley@stkate.edu, or by VP: 612-255-3386. If you have other questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher or research advisor, you may also contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St. Catherine University Institutional Review Board, at (651) 690-7739 or jsschmitt@stkate.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Adella Shaw, NIC
MAISCE student
St. Catherine University
Appendix C. Informed Consent

**Study Title: An Exploration of VRS Interpreter Resilience**

**Researcher: Adella Shaw, NIC**

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled “An Exploration of VRS Interpreter Resilience.” The study is being conducted by Adella Shaw, a graduate student in the Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies and Communication Equity (MAISCE) program at St. Catherine University in St. Paul, MN.

The purpose of this research is to explore VRS interpreter resilience, and the steps interpreters are taking to increase resilience.

This study is important because recent research reports VRS interpreters experience high amounts of stress and burnout (Bower, 2015). It has been suggested that burnout among interpreters may impact the quality of services provided and may contribute to oppression (Hall, 2018). The resilience of an individual can serve as a buffer against the risks of burnout (Lybarger, 2018). An exploration of the resilience and resiliency practices of interpreters will provide a greater understanding of the experiences of VRS interpreters.

Below, you will find answers to the most commonly asked questions about participating in a research study. Please read this entire document and ask any questions you may have before you agree to participate in the study.

**Why have I been asked to be in this study?**

As a past or present VRS interpreter, your input is crucial to have a full exploration of the experience of VRS interpreters.

**If I decide to participate, what will I be asked to do?**

If you are a past or present VRS interpreter, you will be asked to do these things:
Read this consent form. (5 minutes)
If you consent, proceed to answer the survey. (15-25 minutes)
In total, this study may take approximately 30 minutes in one session.

**What if I decide I don’t want to be in this study?**

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide you do not want to participate, please feel free to close out of this web page without completing the survey. If you decide to participate in this study, but change your mind while filling out the survey, you may close the web page at any time. Please note, once you have completed the survey, your answers will be
part of the anonymous compiled data and withdrawal from the study is no longer possible. Your
decision of whether or not to participate will have no negative or positive impact on your
relationship with St. Catherine University, nor with any of the students or faculty involved in the
research.

What are the risks (dangers or harms) to me if I am in this study?

Given the personal nature of the questions of the survey, you may be reminded of unpleasant
memories or stressful situations at work. The risk of momentary personal discomfort is possible,
though any specific risks are unforeseen. All survey data is anonymous, and participation can be
terminated at any time during the survey. Should any identifiable information be inadvertently
shared by a respondent, it will be de-identified by the researcher.

What are the benefits (good things) that may happen if I am in this study?

There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this research. However, an exploration of
what VRS interpreters do to reduce the impact of stress that may lead to burnout will add to the
growing body of knowledge about VRS interpreting. Learning what resiliency practices
interpreters implement and the perceived effectiveness may inform practice or may lead to
further research studies. Improved resilience by interpreters may also improve longevity in the
field and enhance the quality of interpreting services provided.

Will I receive any compensation for participating in this study?

You will not be compensated for participating in this study, but your participation is appreciated.

What will you do with the information you get from me and how will you protect my
privacy?

The information that you provide in this study will be collected and will be compiled with other
participants’ responses to look for themes emerging from the experiences of VRS interpreters.
The information will be analyzed, and discussion of the results will be shared through a thesis
publication and presentation. All information is anonymous, so your identity is protected. In the
event you disclose identifying information voluntarily, only I and the research advisor will have
access to the records, and it will be made unidentifiable. I will finish analyzing the data by June
2019, but the data collected will be anonymous so it will be kept indefinitely for possible future
studies that have yet to be designed. Any information that you provide will be kept confidential,
which means that you will not be identified or identifiable in any written reports, presentations or
publications.

How can I get more information?

You can feel free to contact me at amshaw049@stkate.edu. If you have any additional questions
later and would like to talk to the faculty advisor, please contact Erica Alley, Ph.D. at 651-690-
6018, elalley@stkate.edu, or by VP: 612-255-3386. If you have other questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher or research advisor, you may also contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St. Catherine University Institutional Review Board, at (651) 690-7739 or jsschmitt@stkate.edu.

You may keep a copy of this form for your records.

**Statement of Consent:**

By selecting "I consent; begin the study" below, you are saying,

“I consent to participate in the study and agree that my survey responses can be used in the research process and publication.

I have read this information, and my questions have been answered. I also know that even after proceeding to the survey, I may withdraw from the survey at any time by closing the internet browser. After the survey is submitted, participation in the study cannot be withdrawn as the information is unidentifiable.”

- I consent; begin the study
- I do not consent; I do not wish to participate
Appendix D. VRS Interpreter Online Survey

*An Exploration of VRS Interpreter Resilience

Study Title: An Exploration of VRS Interpreter Resilience

Researcher: Adella Shaw, NIC

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled “An Exploration of VRS Interpreter Resilience.” The study is being conducted by Adella Shaw, a graduate student in the Master of Arts in Interpreting Studies and Communication Equity (MAISCE) program at St. Catherine University in St. Paul, MN.

The purpose of this research is to explore VRS interpreter resilience, and the steps interpreters are taking to increase resilience.

This study is important because recent research reports VRS interpreters experience high amounts of stress and burnout (Bower, 2015). It has been suggested that burnout among interpreters may impact the quality of services provided and may contribute to oppression (Hall, 2018). The resilience of an individual can serve as a buffer against the risks of burnout (Lybarger, 2018). An exploration of the resilience and resiliency practices of interpreters will provide a greater understanding of the experiences of VRS interpreters.

Below, you will find answers to the most commonly asked questions about participating in a research study. Please read this entire document and ask any questions you may have before you agree to participate in the study.

Why have I been asked to be in this study?
As a past or present VRS interpreter, your input is crucial to have a full exploration of the experience of VRS interpreters.

If I decide to participate, what will I be asked to do?
If you are a past or present VRS interpreter, you will be asked to do these things:
Read this consent form. (5 minutes)
If you consent, proceed to answer the survey. (15-25 minutes)
In total, this study may take approximately 30 minutes in one session.

What if I decide I don’t want to be in this study?
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide you do not want to participate, please feel free to close out of this web page without completing the survey. If you decide to
participate in this study, but change your mind while filling out the survey, you may close the web page at any time. Please note, once you have completed the survey, your answers will be part of the anonymous compiled data and withdrawal from the study is no longer possible. Your decision of whether or not to participate will have no negative or positive impact on your relationship with St. Catherine University, nor with any of the students or faculty involved in the research.

**What are the risks (dangers or harms) to me if I am in this study?**
Given the personal nature of the questions of the survey, you may be reminded of unpleasant memories or stressful situations at work. The risk of momentary personal discomfort is possible, though any specific risks are unforeseen. All survey data is anonymous, and participation can be terminated at any time during the survey. Should any identifiable information be inadvertently shared by a respondent, it will be de-identified by the researcher.

**What are the benefits (good things) that may happen if I am in this study?**
There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this research. However, an exploration of what VRS interpreters do to reduce the impact of stress that may lead to burnout will add to the growing body of knowledge about VRS interpreting. Learning what resiliency practices interpreters implement and the perceived effectiveness may guide practice or lead to further research studies. Improved resilience by interpreters may also improve longevity in the field and enhance the quality of interpreting services provided.

**Will I receive any compensation for participating in this study?**
You will not be compensated for participating in this study, but your participation is appreciated.

**What will you do with the information you get from me and how will you protect my privacy?**
The information that you provide in this study will be collected and will be compiled with other participants’ responses to look for themes emerging from the experiences of VRS interpreters. The information will be analyzed, and discussion of the results will be shared through a thesis publication and presentation. All information is anonymous, so your identity is protected. In the event you disclose identifying information voluntarily, only I and the research advisor will have access to the records, and it will be made unidentifiable. I will finish analyzing the data by June 2019, but the data collected will be anonymous so it will be kept indefinitely for possible future studies that have yet to be designed. Any information that you provide will be kept confidential, which means that you will not be identified or identifiable in any written reports, presentations or publications.

**How can I get more information?**
You can feel free to contact me at amshaw049@stkate.edu. If you have any additional questions later and would like to talk to the faculty advisor, please contact Erica Alley, Ph.D. at 651-690-6018, elalley@stkate.edu, or by VP: 612-255-3386. If you have other questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher or research advisor, you may also contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St. Catherine University
Institutional Review Board, at (651) 690-7739 or jsschmitt@stkate.edu.

You may keep a copy of this form for your records.

**Statement of Consent:**

By selecting "I consent; begin the study" below, you are saying,

“I consent to participate in the study and agree that my survey responses can be used in the research process and publication.

I have read this information, and my questions have been answered. I also know that even after proceeding to the survey, I may withdraw from the survey at any time by closing the internet browser. After the survey is submitted, participation in the study cannot be withdrawn as the information is unidentifiable.”

- [ ] I consent, begin the study
- [ ] I do not consent, I do not wish to participate

**End of Block: Informed Consent**

**Start of Block: Demographics**

This study is an exploration of video relay service (VRS) interpreter resilience and resiliency practices. The researcher has requested some specific demographic questions for the purpose of possibly gaining a greater understanding of the experiences of VRS interpreters and specifically the experiences that people of unique backgrounds have while working in VRS. Themes related to resilience and resiliency practices, and specific demographics may emerge. Participation in the demographics portion and the study is optional, but greatly appreciated.

Demographic Info:
What is your age?

○ 18-24 years old
○ 25-34 years old
○ 35-44 years old
○ 45-54 years old
○ 55-64 years old
○ 65-74 years old
○ 75-84 years old
○ 85-94 years old
○ 95-104 years old
○ Prefer not to answer

How would you describe your gender identity?

☐ Cisgender woman (identify as sex assigned at birth - female)
☐ Cisgender man (identify as sex assigned at birth - male)
☐ Transgender man
☐ Transgender woman
☐ Trans spectrum
☐ Agender
☐ Gender non-conforming
☐ Genderqueer
☐ Other identity: specify

☐ Prefer not to answer
How would you describe your sexual orientation: (Select all that apply)

- Lesbian
- Gay
- Bisexual
- Straight
- Asexual
- Pansexual
- Polyamorous
- Monogamous
- Other: Specify in the blank provided

Prefer not to answer
With which racial and ethnic group(s) do you identify? (Select all that apply)

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- White
- Asian
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Other racial or ethnic group not listed above: Specify in the blank provided
  
  __________________________________________________________

- Prefer not to answer
How do you describe your disability/ability status? We are interested in this identification regardless of whether you typically request accommodations for this disability. *(Select all that apply)*

- □ A sensory impairment (vision or hearing)
- □ A learning disability (e.g. ADHD, dyslexia)
- □ A long-term medical illness (e.g., epilepsy, cystic fibrosis)
- □ A mobility impairment
- □ A mental health disorder
- □ A temporary impairment due to illness or injury (e.g., broken ankle, surgery)
- □ A disability/ability not listed above: Specify in the blank provided

---------------------------------------------------------------------

- □ I do not identify with a disability or impairment
- □ I prefer not to answer

---------------------------------------------------------------------

I identify as: *(Select all that apply)*

- □ Hearing
- □ Hard of Hearing
- □ Late Deafened
- □ Deaf
- □ Coda / Deaf Parented
- □ Other: Specify in the blank provided

---------------------------------------------------------------------

- □ Prefer not to answer

---------------------------------------------------------------------
How would you describe your language Identity? (Select all that apply)

☐ English as a First Language
☐ English as a Second Language
☐ English has a Third Language
☐ ASL as a First Language
☐ ASL as a Second Language
☐ ASL as a Third Language
☐ Bilingual
☐ Trilingual
☐ Other language status not listed above: Specify in the blank provided

__________________________________________________________________________

☐ Prefer not to answer

How long have you been a VRS interpreter?

☐ Less than 1 year
☐ 1-4 years
☐ 5-9 years
☐ 10+ years
☐ Prefer not to answer

Are you Nationally Certified through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Skip To: Q15 If Are you Nationally Certified through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID)? = Yes
Skip To: Q17 If Are you Nationally Certified through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID)? = No

What certification(s) do you hold? (Select all that apply)
When achieved?  *(Type the 4 digit year in the blank provided below)*

☐ NIC ________________________________

☐ NAD III (Generalist) - Average Performance

☐ NAD IV (Advanced) - Above Average Performance

☐ NAD V (Master) - Superior Performance

☐ NIC Advanced ________________________________

☐ NIC. Master ________________________________

☐ Certificate of Interpretation (CI)

☐ Certificate of Transliteration (CT)

☐ Comprehensive Skills Certificate (CSC)

☐ Educational Certificate: K-12 (Ed:K-12) (National Certification by EIPA Level 4+)

☐ Specialist Certificate: Legal (SC:L)

☐ Oral Transliteration Certificate

☐ Master Comprehensive Skills Certificate (MSCS)

☐ Reverse Skills Certificate (RSC)

☐ Interpretation Certificate (IC)
☐ Transliteration Certificate (TC)

☐ Specialist Certificate: Performing Arts (SC:PA)

☐ Oral Interpreting Certificate: Comprehensive (OIC:C)

☐ Oral Interpreting Certificate: Spoken to Visible (OIC: S/V)

☐ Oral Interpreting Certificate: Visible to Spoken (OIC: V/S)

☐ Conditional Legal Interpreting Permit-Relay (CLIP-R)

☐ EIPA 5.0+ ________________________________

☐ Other: Specify __________________________________________________

☐ Certified Deaf Interpreter

What other credentials do you hold?

☐ BEI

☐ QUAST

☐ EIPA 3.5-5.00

☐ Other not listed above: Specify ______________________________________
Do you hold State Licensure?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Prefer not to answer

Display This Question:
If Do you hold State Licensure? = Yes
Which state(s)? (Select all that apply)

☐ Alabama
☐ Alaska
☐ Arizona
☐ Arkansas
☐ California
☐ Colorado
☐ Connecticut
☐ Delaware
☐ Florida
☐ Georgia
☐ Hawaii
☐ Idaho
☐ Illinois
☐ Indiana
☐ Iowa
☐ Kansas
☐ Kentucky
☐ Louisiana
☐ Maine
☐ Maryland
☐ Massachusetts
According to Bower (2015) "burnout is a condition in which people suffer from a negative change in feelings, attitude, and expectations, and which may result in fatigue and reduced work abilities."

Using this definition, have you experienced burnout working as a VRS interpreter?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Prefer Not to Answer

Display This Question:
If According to Bower (2015) "burnout is a condition in which people suffer from a negative change i... != No

Are you currently experiencing burnout from work as a VRS interpreter?

○ Yes
○ Maybe
○ No
Display This Question:  
If Are you currently experiencing burnout from work as a VRS interpreter? ! = No

What degree of burnout are you currently experiencing due to your work as a VRS Interpreter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Very Mild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display This Question:  
If According to Bower (2015) "burnout is a condition in which people suffer from a negative change i... = Yes

“What degree of burnout have you experienced in your time as a VRS interpreter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Very Mild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While experiencing burnout, do you believe your quality of your work as VRS interpreter:

- Significantly Improves
- Moderately Improves
- Mildly Improves
- Remains the same
- Mildly Decreases
- Moderately Decreases
- Significantly Decreases
What is your current work status in VRS?

- Full Time
- Part Time
- No Longer Working In VRS

Display This Question:
If What is your current work status in VRS? = No Longer Working In VRS

Reason for no longer working in VRS? (Select all that apply)

- Schedule Conflicts
- No longer enjoyed work in VRS
- Mental burnout
- Physical burnout
- Other job opportunity
- Other: Specify in the blank provided

- Prefer not to answer

Display This Question:
If What is your current work status in VRS? = No Longer Working In VRS

How long did you work in VRS?

- ▼ 3 months or less ...
- 15+ years

Display This Question:
If What is your current work status in VRS? = No Longer Working In VRS

Please answer the following questions as you would if you were still working the last 6 months of your time in VRS.
Display This Question:
If What is your current work status in VRS? = No Longer Working In VRS

Average per week for the last year:
- 40+ hours per week
- 30-40 hours per week
- 20-29 hours per week
- 10-19 hours week
- 0-9 hours per week
- Prefer not to answer

Display This Question:
If What is your current work status in VRS? != No Longer Working In VRS

How long have you work in VRS?
- ▼ 3 months or less ... 15+ years

Display This Question:
If What is your current work status in VRS? != No Longer Working In VRS

Average per week during the last 12 months worked in VRS:
- 40+ hours per week
- 30-40 hours per week
- 20-29 hours per week
- 10-19 hours week
- 0-9 hours per week
- Prefer not to answer

End of Block: VRS Questions

Start of Block: VRS Work Load
Within the past year, have you significantly increased or decreased your VRS workload?

- Yes
- No

Display This Question:
If Within the past year, have you significantly increased or decreased your VRS workload? = Yes

Did your workload:

- Increase
- Decrease

Reason? (Select All That Apply)

- Schedule availability
- Other job opportunity
- Mental Burnout
- Physical Burnout
- Financial Need
- Company Need
- Other: Specify in the blank provided

Prefer not to answer

Skip To: Q32 If Reason? (Select All That Apply) = Mental Burnout
Display This Question:
If Reason? (Select All That Apply) = Physical Burnout

Did the reduction of hours reduce your feelings of mental burnout?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Display This Question:
If Reason? (Select All That Apply) = Physical Burnout

Did the reduction of hours reduce your feelings of physical burnout?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

End of Block: VRS Work Load

Start of Block: Other Perspective

Do you hold another position (besides interpreter) at the VRS company for whom you work?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Prefer not to answer

Display This Question:
If Do you hold another position (besides interpreter) at the VRS company for whom you work? = Yes
What area do you or have you worked in?

- [ ] Management
- [ ] VP Training
- [ ] Technical Support
- [ ] Marketing
- [ ] Professional Development
- [ ] Other: Specify in the blank provided

________________________

- [ ] Prefer not to answer

End of Block: Other Perspective

Start of Block: 9 - Item RES Instructions
**9-Item RES Instructions**: Below you will find a number of statements about how you think about yourself and the way in which you usually respond to difficult situations. Please indicate to what extent each statement applies to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have confidence in myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can easily adjust in a difficult situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to persevere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After setbacks, I can easily pick up where I left off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am resilient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can cope with unexpected problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can handle a lot at the same time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Block: 9 - Item RES Instructions

Start of Block: Work Enjoyment
Do you enjoy coming to work in VRS?

○ Yes
○ No
○ Prefer not to answer

End of Block: Work Enjoyment

How often do you enjoy coming to work?

○ Never
○ Rarely
○ Occasionally
○ Neutral
○ Often
○ Very Often
○ Always

Start of Block: Resilience

There are a variety of definitions for resilience, but for the purpose of this study we will use the definition provided by the American Psychological Association: resilience is “the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats, or even significant sources of stress” (American Psychological Association, 2010, p. 2).

How would you rate your level of resilience?

○ Not resilient at all
○ Not Very resilient
○ Neutral
○ Pretty Resilient
○ Extremely Resilient
Resiliency practices are the activities and disciplines that can positively impact resilience. Self-care and coping skills are other commonly used terms for some of the practices that develop resilience. There are some common areas that resilience can be developed: Cognitive, Spiritual, Professional, Emotional and Physical.

Do you currently do anything that promotes your own resiliency?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Display This Question:
If Do you currently do anything that promotes your own resiliency? = Yes

In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply)

☐ Cognitive
☐ Physical
☐ Emotional
☐ Professional

Display This Question:
If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Physical

End of Block: Resilience
Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do?  *(Select All That Apply)*

- [x] Stretching Arms and Hands
- [ ] Yoga
- [ ] Breathing Exercises
- [ ] Eye Movement Exercises
- [x] Eating Healthy Snacks on Breaks
- [ ] Working Out Three or More Times a Week
- [ ] Walking On Breaks
- [ ] Using Modified Positioning (Such as a unique chair or standing desk)
- [x] Having a Balanced Diet
- [ ] Participate in recreational activities with a team
- [ ] Regular Sleep Habits (approx. 7 or more hours daily)
- [ ] Drink Water (approx. eight, 8oz glasses daily or more)
- [ ] Other: Specify in the blank provided

________________________________________________

Other: Specify in the blank provided

---

Display This Question:

If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience?  *(Select All That Apply) = Physical*
How often do you do this type of resiliency practice:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)</th>
<th>Multiple Times a Day</th>
<th>A Few Times Day</th>
<th>Once a Day</th>
<th>Once Every other Day</th>
<th>A Few Times a Week</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>Every Other Week</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>Once a Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= Stretching Arms and Hands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Yoga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Breathing Exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)

- Eye Movement Exercises
- Eating Healthy Snacks on Breaks
- Working Out Three or More Times a Week
Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)
- Walking On Breaks
- Using Modified Positioning (Such as a unique chair or standing desk)
Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Having a Balanced Diet

= Participate in recreational activities with a team

= Participate on an Athletic Team
Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)

- Regular Sleep Habits (approx. 7 or more hours daily)
- Drinking Enough Water (approx. eight, 8oz glasses daily or more)
- Other: Specify Is Not Empty
  Other: Specify
If Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)
Other: Specify Is Not Empty
Other: Specify

Display This Question:
If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Physical
How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?
| Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =  |
| Stretching Arms and Hands |
| Stretching Arms and Hands |
| Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Yoga |
| Yoga Practices |
| Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Breathing Exercises |
| Breathing Exercises |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Beneficial at All</th>
<th>Somewhat Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Extremely Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Eye Movement Exercises

Eating Healthy Snacks on Breaks

Working Out Three or More Times a Week
Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =

Walking On Breaks

Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =

Using Modified Positioning (Such as a unique chair or standing desk)

Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =

Having a Balanced Diet
Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =
- Participate in recreational activities with a team
- Participate on an Athletic Team

Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =
- Regular Sleep Habits (approx. 7 or more hours daily)
- Regular Amounts of Sleep

Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =
- Drink Water (approx. eight, 8oz glasses daily or more)
- Drinking Enough Water
If Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) Other: Specify Is Not Empty

Other: Specify

If Physical Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) Other: Specify Is Not Empty

Other: Specify

End of Block: Physical Resiliency Practice

Start of Block: Cognitive Resilience

Display This Question:

If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Cognitive
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? *(Select All That Apply)*

- Meditation
- Mindfulness Practice (practicing awareness of emotions and thoughts and triggers)
- Use Of A Mantra
- Mental Exercises or Games (such as Crosswords, Sudoku...)
- Reading
- Actively Learning Something New
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)
- Coping Skills While In A Call (such as: reminding yourself that you are an interpreter and not the active participant experiencing the level of distress or the deliverer of oppression by remaining present by wiggling your toes or placing an object between yourself and the screen...)
- Other: Specify in the blank provided

Display This Question:

*If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? *(Select All That Apply) = Cognitive*
How often do you do this type of resiliency practice:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Resiliency Practice:</th>
<th>What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Times a Day</td>
<td>Meditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few Times a Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Day</td>
<td>Mindfulness Practice (practicing awareness of emotions and thoughts and triggers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Every Other Day</td>
<td>Use Of A Mantra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few Times a Week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Other Week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few times a month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Meditation
- Mindfulness Practice
- Use Of A Mantra
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Mental Exercises or Games (such as Crosswords, Sudoku...)

- Mental Exercises

Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Reading

- Reading

Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Actively Learning Something New

- Beginning
- New Learning
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Coping Skills While In A Call (such as: reminding yourself that you are an interpreter and not the active participant experiencing the level of distress or the deliverer of oppression by remaining present by wiggling your toes or placing an object between yourself and the screen...)

Coping Skills While In A Call
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =
Other: Specify in the blank provided
Other: Specify
Invalid Logic
Click Here to Edit Logic
Other: Specify

Display This Question:
If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Cognitive

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Meditation</th>
<th>Not Beneficial at All</th>
<th>Somewhat Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Extremely Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Mindfulness Practice (practicing awareness of emotions and thoughts and triggers)</th>
<th>Not Beneficial at All</th>
<th>Somewhat Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Extremely Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Use Of A Mantra</th>
<th>Not Beneficial at All</th>
<th>Somewhat Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Extremely Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =
- Mental Exercises or Games (such as Crosswords, Sudoku...)
- Mental Exercises
- Reading
- Actively Learning Something New
- Beginning New Learning
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Coping Skills While In A Call (such as: reminding yourself that you are an interpreter and not the active participant experiencing the level of distress or the deliverer of oppression by remaining present by wiggling your toes or placing an object between yourself and the screen...)

Coping Skills While In A Call
Cognitive Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Other: Specify in the blank provided

Other: Specify

Invalid Logic Click Here to Edit Logic
Other: Specify

End of Block: Cognitive Resilience

Start of Block: Emotional Resilience

Display This Question:
If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Emotional
Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? *(Select All That Apply)*

- Cultivating Gratefulness
- Journaling
- Investing in family relationships
- Investing in friendship relationships
- Praying
- Meditating
- Creating made up happy endings when you don’t know the outcome of a situation
- Listening to music to calm yourself
- Deep Breathing/Controlled Breathing...
- Counseling
- Other: Specify in the blank provided

Display This Question:

*If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience?* *(Select All That Apply) = Emotional*
How often do you do this type of resiliency practice:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Multi Times a Day</th>
<th>A Few Times Day</th>
<th>Once a Day</th>
<th>Once Every other Day</th>
<th>A Few Times a Week</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>Every Other Week</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>Once a Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)**

- Cultivating Gratefulness
- Journaling
- Investing in family relationships
- Investing in friendship relationships

Cultivating Gratefulness

Journaling

Investing in family relationships

Investing in friendship relationships
Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =

- Praying
- Meditating
- Creating made up happy endings when you don’t know the outcome of a situation
- Listening to music to calm yourself
Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Deep Breathing/Controlled Breathing...

Counseling

Other: Specify in the blank provided

Display This Question:
If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Emotional
How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)</th>
<th>Not Beneficial at All</th>
<th>Somewhat Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Extremely Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating Gratefulness</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journaling</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in family relationships</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in friendship relationships</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praying</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Meditating</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Creating made up happy endings when you don’t know the outcome of a situation</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Listening to music to calm yourself</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Deep Breathing/Controlled Breathing...</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Counseling</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Other: Specify in the blank provided
Other: Specify

Emotional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Other: Specify in the blank provided
Other: Specify

End of Block: Emotional Resilience

Start of Block: Spiritual Resilience

Display This Question:
If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Spiritual
Spiritual Resiliency Practice: What do you do? *(Select All That Apply)*

- Praying
- Meditation
- Yoga
- Attending faith organization gatherings
- Small group religious gatherings
- Reading religious texts
- Believing in a greater purpose
- Other: Specify in the blank provided

Other: Specify in the blank provided

---

Display This Question:

*If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Spiritual*
How often do you do this type of resiliency practice:
| Spiritual Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Praying |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Praying           | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               |

| Spiritual Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Meditation |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Meditation        | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               |

| Spiritual Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Yoga |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Yoga              | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               | □               |
Spiritual Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =

- Attending faith organization gatherings

- Small group religious gatherings

- Small group spiritual gatherings

- Reading religious texts

- Reading spiritual texts
**Spiritual Resiliency Practice:**
**What do you do?** (Select All That Apply) = Believing in a greater purpose

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Believing in a greater purpose

**Spiritual Resiliency Practice:**
**What do you do?** (Select All That Apply) = Other: Specify in the blank provided

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other: Specify

**Spiritual Resiliency Practice:**
**What do you do?** (Select All That Apply) = Other: Specify in the blank provided

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other: Specify
Display This Question:

If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Spiritual
How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spiritual Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)</th>
<th>Not Beneficial at All</th>
<th>Somewhat Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Extremely Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Spiritual Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)

- [ ] Attending faith organization gatherings
- [ ] Small group religious gatherings
- [ ] Small group spiritual gatherings
- [ ] Reading religious texts
- [ ] Reading spiritual texts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice: Spiritual Resiliency</th>
<th>What do you do? (Select All That Apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Believing in a greater purpose</td>
<td>[ ] Believing in a greater purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: Specify

End of Block: Spiritual Resilience

Start of Block: Professional Resilience
Display This Question:
If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Professional

Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)

☐ Deliberate skill development
☐ Mentoring
☐ Daily professional skill development goals
☐ Intentional relationship building with colleagues
☐ Reading leadership materials
☐ Engaging in a variety of assessments
☐ Expanding base knowledge/schema through participation in unfamiliar events…
☐ Other: Specify in the blank provided

☐ Other: Specify in the blank provided
How often do you do this type of resiliency practice:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily professional skill development goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Multipl
e Times a Day | A Few Times Day | Once a Day | Once Every other Day | A Few Times a Week | Once a Week | Every Other Week | A few times a month | Once a Month |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =

- Intentional relationship building with colleagues

- Reading leadership materials

- Engaging in a variety of assessments
**Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)**

- Expanding base knowledge/schem a through participation in unfamiliar events...
- Expanding base knowledge/schem a through participation in unfamiliar events...

**If Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)**

- Other: Specify Is Not Empty

Other: Specify

**Display This Question:**

If In what areas do you make opportunities to promote your own resilience? (Select All That Apply) = Professional
How beneficial is this practice for you in maintaining resiliency and limiting the impact of stress?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply)</th>
<th>Not Beneficial at All</th>
<th>Somewhat Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Extremely Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate skill development</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Mentoring</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Daily professional skill development goals</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) = Intentional relationship building with colleagues</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Resiliency Practice: What do you do? (Select All That Apply) =

Reading leadership materials

Engaging in a variety of assessments

Expanding base knowledge/schema through participation in unfamiliar events…
Do you believe you have:

- O Active Coping Skills - You are intentional about doing something to improve the situation.
- O Avoidance Coping Skills - You avoid and procrastinate dealing with challenges.
- O I don't know. I haven't considered my coping skills I use when I encounter challenges.
- O Prefer not to answer

Which statement best describes you:

- O I am aware of several resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) and I implement them regularly.
- O I am aware of several resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) and I do not implement them regularly.
- O I am not aware of specific resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) so I cannot implement them regularly.

My level of resilience influences my interactions with callers ________.
• Strongly agree
• Somewhat agree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Somewhat disagree
• Strongly disagree

---

**Display This Question:**

If Which statement best describes you: = I am aware of several resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) and I implement them regularly.

Or Which statement best describes you: = I am aware of several resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) and I do not implement them regularly.

To where would you attribute your main knowledge of these skills?

- [ ] VRS Work - Management
- [ ] VRS Work - Workshops provided
- [ ] VRS Work - Mentor
- [ ] Family Upbringing
- [ ] Counseling
- [ ] Leadership Training
- [ ] Personal Research
- [ ] Other: Specify ________________________________
- [ ] Other: Specify ________________________________

---

**Display This Question:**

If Which statement best describes you: = I am aware of several resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) and I do not implement them regularly.
What is the reason for not implementing the resiliency practices?

- [ ] They are not effective for me
- [ ] I do not have time to do them at work
- [ ] I lack the discipline to perform them
- [ ] I feel uncomfortable doing them at work
- [ ] I do not have time outside of work
- [ ] I do not make time to do them outside of work
- [ ] Other: Specify in the blank provided

Display This Question:

If Which statement best describes you: = I am not aware of specific resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities) so I cannot implement them regularly.
What do you believe are contributing factors to why you are not aware of specific resiliency practices (coping skills, self-care activities)?

☐ My lack of motivation to learn.

☐ I'm not interested in learning them because they are not necessary for me.

☐ I'm not interested in learning them because they are unfounded.

☐ I don't need to know the names of what I already do to be successful. I perform some of these activities, but never would have labeled them "resiliency practices, coping skills, or self care activities."

☐ Lack of tools provided by VRS management

☐ Lack of tools provided by VRS provider workshops

☐ Lack of continuing education in the interpreting Field

☐ Family upbringing

☐ Lack of tools taught in counseling

☐ Lack of engagement in leadership training

☐ Lack of personal research

☐ Other: Specify in the blank provided

__________________________________________________________________________

☐ Other: Specify in the blank provided

__________________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Resilience, Coping-Skills, Self-Care

Start of Block: Actions at Work

Have you ever decided to go against the guidelines of the company you work for or the rules of the FCC for your own self-care?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Prefer not to answer
Have you ever decided to go against the guidelines of the company you work for or the rules of the FCC for the benefit of the callers?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

Have you experienced any barriers in doing the resiliency practices you need for resilience at work?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
Have you experienced support from your employer in developing and maintaining resiliency?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

What areas of resiliency practice do you feel **most** supported your employer? *(You may choose two):*

- Cognitive
- Spiritual
- Physical
- Emotional
- Professional
- Prefer not to answer

What areas of resiliency practice do you feel **least** supported your employer? *(You may choose two):*

- Cognitive
- Spiritual
- Physical
- Emotional
- Professional
- Prefer not to answer
Do you know your primary motivation for working in VRS?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Prefer not to answer

Display This Question:
If Do you know your primary motivation for working in VRS? = Yes

What is your primary motivation for working in VRS?

- [ ] Financial
- [ ] Flexibility
- [ ] Stability
- [ ] Challenge
- [ ] Diversity of callers
- [ ] Diversity of content
- [ ] Communication Equity
- [ ] Keeping my skills fresh
- [ ] To have experience in the setting so I can appropriately teach about it
- [ ] Other: Specify in the blank provided

End of Block: Actions at Work

Start of Block: Additional Thoughts?

Any other thoughts you would like to share about your experience as a VRS interpreter as related to burnout, resilience, and resiliency practices?
End of Block: Additional Thoughts?
Appendix E.
Appendix F.