

A Philosophical Analysis of ASL-English Bilingual Publishing

TERESA BLANKMEYER BURKE

Deaf academics whose work engages aspects of deaf community and populations are faced with the question of whether there is an ethical obligation to share their work with the relevant signing deaf communities in a more accessible format, such as their signed language. If so, this raises a host of complicated ethical issues around the hidden labor this obligation imposes in academic institutional structures that are not designed to support such work.

“Nothing about us without us” is a common slogan used in disability protests and advocacy movements.¹ It is not just a rallying cry but a normative judgment and prescriptive imperative. By normative, I mean it is a claim about what is the right thing to do ethically; by prescriptive, I mean it is a claim about what action one ought to take. For academics who use a signed language, a frequently occurring question is whether one has a moral obligation to share their work when the work features or concerns or otherwise affects signing Deaf people and their communities.

In this chapter, I begin by considering whether existing codes of ethics and professional expectations of conduct can provide guidance to signing academics. Following this, I ask whether such resources for the professoriate might satisfy the ethical obligations of signing academics, especially those working with deaf populations. This includes questions of what research findings should be shared, with whom, and how to share them. I then turn to the question of where to share one’s academic work, offering a brief sketch of what might count as a signed language text. To illustrate this, I present two projects I worked on and highlight the ethical and epistemological issues raised in the course of these endeavors. Finally, I conclude with some suggestions of future directions for others thinking through the philosophical issues raised in ASL-English bilingual publishing.

Codes of Ethics and Professional Expectations

What does it mean to say that one has moral obligations as an academic researcher or scholar? One approach might be to consider what ethical expectations are at play in the creation of academic products such as conference presentations, journal articles, and books. A starting point for this could be codified ethical expectations, such as the American Association of University Professors’

(2009) “Statement on Professional Ethics”² or the “Core Practices” of the Committee on Publishing Ethics (n.d.)³, which provide guidance for ethical scholarship and ethical publication standards.

Yet these guidelines are often written from a “god’s-eye view” that presumes a universal white, middle-class, cis-gendered (but presumably male), straight, able-bodied, and Hearing perspective. Race, ethnicity, gender, and disability orientations are not even named. An implicit argument for this approach is that not naming various identity perspectives contributes to the universality of the expectations of the professoriate with no exceptions; another perspective is that ignoring identity perspectives contributes to the ethical concerns of hidden labor conferred by various positions within the academy. Just because such obligations are unnamed does not mean that they are not present.

The reader might push back on my assessment of the universal view, noting that the American Association of University Professors’ “Statement on Professional Ethics” discusses scholarly obligations and other obligations of the professoriate, including the responsibilities to one’s subject (noted in item 5 of the statement) and to one’s institution (noted in item 4).⁴ While the statement is heavily influenced by the concept of academic freedom, it also considers the weighing and balancing of competing obligations. Taking these one at a time, the first section includes the ethical responsibility of the advancement of knowledge, including “[exercising] critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge” (American Association of University Professors 2009). While it does not designate who ought to be the recipient of such knowledge, judgment regarding the transmission of knowledge can also be found in other learned societies’ codes of ethic or conduct.

For example, the American Anthropological Association’s (2012) “Statement on Ethics”⁵ takes particular care to note the importance of the relationship between the researcher scholar and the research participant, and to articulate the responsibilities that fall on the anthropological scholar, given the nature of their work and positionality within many different kinds of social structures and communities: “Anthropologists must be sensitive to the power differentials, constraints, interests and expectations characteristic of all relationships. In a field of such complex rights, responsibilities, and involvements, it is inevitable that misunderstandings, conflicts, and the need to make difficult choices will arise. Anthropologists are responsible for grappling with such difficulties and struggling to resolve them in ways compatible with the principles stated here.”⁶

Signed language linguists are another group of scholars who have engaged substantially with signing deaf communities in their work. The Sign Language Linguistics Society (2016) has created an “Ethics Statement for Sign Language Research” that specifically takes up three issues: responsibility to deaf individuals, responsibility to deaf communities, and responsibility to scholarship and the public.⁷ Although this ethics statement does not specifically call for

researchers to translate the results of their research into the relevant signed language, it does contain the exhortation, “Sign linguists must also strive to make their research results available to the broader, non-specialized audience,” which, by extension, at least suggests the possibility that these results be made available to the individuals and communities on whom such research has been conducted.⁸

A Sense of Duty: Reciprocity and Justice

Professional codes of ethics created by various learned societies are one structure within the academy that can guide scholars. Such instrumental devices function as a mechanism for keeping scholars compliant with minimal expectations of ethical conduct. Accordingly, while it may be argued that scholars whose work involves or engages with signing Deaf communities *ought* to disseminate their research, it can also be argued that to call for this dissemination is to call for deaf academics to engage in supererogatory behavior. In other words, knowledge dissemination of products in signed language designed to be distributed to signing Deaf communities is a good thing in practice, but there is no duty to do this. Such dissemination goes beyond the ethical duties of the researcher and should only take place in certain narrowly defined contexts, such as those noted in the Sign Language Linguistics Society’s “Statement on Ethics,” where the language is the subject of the research.

An alternative approach might be not just to appeal to the statements on ethics of one’s professional and learned societies but also to consider the ethics of the other communities one belongs to. The scope of this chapter does not permit the analysis of various theoretical ethical foundations. My work as an applied ethicist has three influences: virtual theory, nonideal theory, and moral particularism. I have argued elsewhere that virtue ethics is a helpful lens with which to view the signing Deaf community, since the fine-grained aspects of identifying virtues in a particular context can sharpen differences between a mainstream hearing orientation and a Deaf-centric one.⁹

One behavior that is cherished within the signing Deaf spaces I have inhabited is information sharing. This is often the province of an educated deaf person who has sophisticated English literacy skills. Such a person gets called up in the signing Deaf community to share information that may be primarily available in English text, such as local news stories. While mainstream news programs are captioned, and there are now sources of news available in ASL (e.g., Daily Moth, DPAN), the latter tend to either focus on big national news stories or feature articles of particular interest to members of the signing Deaf community. Local journalism is rarely made available in ASL, so it is frequently a topic of interest that those in the Deaf community ask to be relayed and expanded on. This practice of information sharing is reciprocal and symmetrical between signed and spoken languages. For example, a deaf person who has learned ASL later in life

as a second language may miss key parts of the conversation in ASL. An ASL-fluent Deaf person will then take on the information-sharing role by clarifying and expanding on culturally relevant content and using code-switching to add more English-like grammar and mouthing to get the message across.

This behavior of information sharing is associated with a cluster of related virtues. These include the virtues of transparency, reciprocity, inclusive justice, and respect. Given the shared deaf experience of exclusion from communication, it is not difficult to see why this has emerged as a cherished value. Even if one is a signing Deaf person who is also a speech reader or a signing Deaf person with voice privileges, this remains a universally shared deaf experience.¹⁰ Setting is also important—the educational experiences of many deaf individuals frequently are framed as taking place in schools that are not portals to knowledge but rather places of partial inclusion and partial exclusion.¹¹

If a signing Deaf academic takes up these virtues as part of their moral outlook, these not only buttress the guidance provided in the learned society's statements on ethics but provide a path to moral reasoning that is deaf-centric. This may not be the case for signing hearing academics, whose landscape of moral virtues may not be highlighted in the same way. That said, an instructive analogue might be to look at how hearing signed-language interpreters have considered the virtue of reciprocity.¹²

What to Share?

Suppose the researcher has convinced themselves that they do have a moral obligation to share her research products with the signing deaf community. This raises the question of audience. Who is the audience? Is it other deaf academics, most of whom are adept in a written language that may not be their first language? This can be assumed due to the gatekeeping function of the PhD dissertation requirement to enter the professoriate—it is quite uncommon for a PhD dissertation to be produced in a signed language. The benefit to rendering an academic article written in English into signed academic ASL is that it may be more accessible to deaf academics, and those possibly aspiring to be deaf academics. The disadvantage of narrowing one's work to an extremely small group of "readers" is that the work and time cost of this endeavor does not advantage the scholar in the current academic climate, where little recognition is bestowed for translation of one's own work. Translation of another's work can be regarded as a scholarly endeavor, particularly in translation studies and adjacent fields.¹³

But wait—the goal here is not to assess how to reward the signing deaf academic but to examine the ethical issues regarding the dissemination of their findings in an accessible format. Why should the deaf academic care about the lack of recognition for doing this work? Here is where it gets a little tricky. Deaf academics do not exist in a vacuum, or even in a system that is designed to

support them. Instead, the system of academia reflects the experiences of those who initially had access to work within this system—namely, white hearing males. An especially pithy acknowledgment of this is the “coincidental” overlap of the tenure clock with the biological clock of those who can give birth. While adjustments have been made to the tenure clock system that allow for this, it should be noted that the system still permeates the academy. The analogy carries for the deaf academic, who exists within a system that has been established by hearing individuals (the vast majority of whom do not sign).

In general, translation of one’s own work does not reap much reward in the academy. If one does opt to engage in this work as a moral imperative, the result is time and energy away from projects that would result in more reward, whether these are academic projects or personal projects. While academic, this work is more likely to be viewed as an act of service than scholarship in most US academic systems.

How to Share It?

Once a signing deaf academic has decided that they have a moral obligation to share their research with other signing deaf individuals, whether other deaf academics or members of the signing deaf community at large, the next question is how it ought to be shared. This raises ethical questions connected with copyright, production, and academic language modeling. In this section, I will address each of these in turn.

The typical copyright agreement for authors usually does not include a statement regarding the author’s right to translate the work into a signed language as a matter of accessibility or disability accommodation. This emphasis on accessibility is distinct from the question of translation, which can be included in contractual language and may have constraints that have been developed with written versions of spoken languages in mind. If the audience is an academic one (or even if it is not), additional copyright issues arise regarding the logistics of housing: Where will such a document reside? Will it be open access? Will it be located on the publisher’s website? The academic’s institutional repository? Will the publisher or the academic be responsible for quality control and web maintenance?

Questions of production involve resource allocation issues of time and money. While it is possible to throw up a green screen backdrop and record oneself signing from a laptop or phone, an unedited or lightly edited video recording is more likely to be perceived as an information academic product (e.g., vlog) than as a research document summary. Additionally, not all academics have sophisticated or even sufficient video editing skills. Although deaf academics typically have more experience seeing themselves on video (especially before the pandemic) due to the wide use of videophones, this experience is helpful in

giving one a sense of the parameters of the signing space, but it usually doesn't involve careful management of lighting for production purposes. Since the novel coronavirus pandemic's shift to virtual teaching, signing and nonsigning academics have acquired an increased sense of what is needed to make a streaming video more engaging, including strategic use of lighting. Case in point, my standing desk setup has nine sources of light, including two natural light sources that are managed throughout the day. Again, streaming video and vlogging are roughly equivalent to teaching (or giving a talk) and blogging. The production value requirements are low, and it is assumed that the person who is doing the speaking or unedited writing is doing this on their own without a production crew. While there are some academic blogs that provide editing and some peer feedback, this is not common practice. In order to produce polished and sophisticated published content in ASL, it is helpful to pull in others, just as is done with editorial support in written English academic publications.

Let me recount my experience of working with the *Deaf Studies Digital Journal* (*DSDJ*) to produce an (as yet unpublished) ASL article. *DSDJ* is one of very few peer-reviewed academic journals that publish bilingually in ASL and written English. Articles may appear in ASL, English, or both languages. The process of reviewing is done in both languages, with both ASL and English articles reviewed in shortened versions, rather than full length. This is in part due to a desire for equity—the production of ASL content is much more labor intensive, involving multiple individuals, and the current resource structure at Gallaudet University, where *DSDJ* is housed, is such that the production costs of accepted ASL articles come under the *DSDJ* budget, rather than being allocated to individual faculty members who are working on their own articles. This decision to treat submissions in different modalities differently is just one acknowledgment of the inequity experienced by signing deaf academics.

The economic and temporal costs of production are entwined with the issue of academic quality. Academic print publishing requires peer review, revision, copyediting, and proofreading. What might this look like for publishing in ASL? Is it necessary to require a similar means of production with checks and balances? As with most instances of translation, the issue is not whether the content of the scholarly argument passes muster, but whether the content of the translation sufficiently conveys the original.

If the goal is to produce an academic ASL article that is equivalent to the English version, it is possible that an ASL master (an individual who is fluent in ASL and can produce academic ASL and discuss editorial choices) may be needed. Who will do the translation is another matter—should the signer be the original author? This will depend on the ASL skills of the author. The bias of US academia toward mastery of written English can have the resultant effect of filtering out promising signing deaf academics from the pipeline if they are not English natives and need some support for their writing. Currently the structure

of the academy does not provide (in general) such support for ASL or English. Even Gallaudet University, which has a mission statement proclaiming its commitment to two official languages of ASL and written English, is still building such infrastructure for its faculty.¹⁴

Additionally, there are other matters of quality control—if an ASL master is hired to focus on the academic ASL content, they may not have the background and training to assess the nuances of the disciplinary norms and how to adjudicate those with the requirements of the discipline. This is also a challenge for interpreters, which I have explained in a blog entry in *Disabled Philosophers* (Burke 2011), using the philosophical term *de re* as an illustration.¹⁵ While these distinctions can be parsed through discussion between the original author and the ASL master, this becomes more challenging when neither has the sophistication of the other's domain. This is, of course, a problem of translation generally, but it can be more time consuming when it must be done in a language that does not have a widely accepted written version.

As a case in point, when I am working with translators who have rendered my work into German or Spanish, I often have discussions with them in written English about the choice of a given word or phrase—while my knowledge of German and Spanish is not that of a native, I have read enough philosophical texts in both languages to have a sense of how things are worded. My work is usually translated in Deaf studies publications, so the translator is not an expert in my academic discipline—setting up a situation somewhat analogous to the ASL master challenge. When such discussions about phrasing or word choice occur in ASL, the author and master often either must make videos and send them back and forth, which takes more time and advance notice to set up than typing on a keyboard, or make an appointment to have a conversation about the ASL choices in real time. Making a video requires that one has sufficient lighting conditions and perhaps privacy, depending on the setting and one's concerns about sharing research before it is published. This may be further complicated depending on where the language resides on the high-context-to-low-context continuum.¹⁶

Phonocentrism and Chirocentric Sign Language Publications

In 2018 I participated in a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute titled “The Book: Material Histories and Digital Futures.”¹⁷ This institute brought together scholars from various humanities disciplines, including book arts, book history, literary criticism, and library sciences, and a smattering of other humanists, including ones from environmental studies, philosophy, and English. The research question I brought to this seminar was, “What does a book written in a signed language look like?” My lens for this question was metaphysical: In thinking about the *form* of a book, what would make a book

a signed language book? This is a different sort of question from what makes a book have signed language *content*. My proposal suggested that there were four different forms of signed language books in ASL, the signed language I am most familiar with. These were the following: books that are written in one of the many sign writing systems developed to represent ASL, books written in English using ASL gloss, books written in ASL-friendly English, and books created in a hybrid of ASL and English, which may be electronic or made with more traditional materials.

The forms of ASL books that currently exist are an answer to a different question: What forms do currently existing signed language books take (in ASL)? To answer the question of possible forms for signed language books more generally requires a shift in focus from those books that feature signed language content to the existent and potentially existent metaphysical and ontological forms of said books.

My first attempt to consider what would make a book a signed language book was to look at the different forms of signed language books. The earliest versions included codex structured bilingual dictionaries, though usually these dictionaries had asymmetrical content and were severely abridged. These typically had alphabetized groupings of the dominant written language words accompanied by drawings of a corresponding sign, meaning that someone who knew the dominant language could use these as a dictionary, but the books lacked organization for people who were not literate in the dominant language. Sometimes these books provided a one-to-one correspondence with the manual alphabet and written alphabet. It should be noted that the manual alphabet is predicated on the written version of the spoken alphabet (i.e., a phonetic alphabet).

These books followed the material structure of books at the time—they used paper or similar material on which drawings of signed language words and written, spoken language text appeared. These pages were usually bound between covers that protected the pages—the first iteration of the form of a signed language book replicates the materiality of books written by spoken language users. This is not surprising, since a uniform system of writing signed languages had and has yet to emerge—they were phonocentric, not chirocentric.

The invention of film provides a way to record stories in signed languages. As Deaf studies scholars know, the National Association of the Deaf, in the early 1900s filmed several signers in a variety of contexts in response to their concerns that signed languages were potentially en route to becoming endangered.¹⁸ Yet this raises a somewhat different metaphysical question: Is a filmed story in signed language a book? If so, are there relevant features that distinguish a filmed spoken language storytelling event and a filmed signed language storytelling event as a book? Is the difference in modality sufficient for such a claim? One criterion for a videobook to be a signed language book might be that it must contain a frozen (fixed) text similar to that of an audiobook. This is one example of this

stipulation, but the lack of a standard sign writing system raises the question of whether more than one modality is required.¹⁹ With audiobooks, the original source book text is in the written modality of the English language, which is then transformed into spoken English when it is read. For videobooks, the original source text is often identical with the video product.

The innovation of digital recording and editing brings forth a few chirocentric examples of bilingual ASL-English books. Recently, three book models have broadened the idea of the signed language book. *The Baobab*, produced by the Gallaudet Visual Language and Visual Learning Center (Malzkuhn et al. 2013), is a bilingual ASL-English digital children's book with English text and watercolor pictures containing a central image of a signer who recounts the story on the page in ASL.²⁰ The book includes an English-to-ASL lexicon, which allows the budding reader to look up the English word and see (read) the word (sign) and definition in ASL. Yet, like so many ASL-English projects, this is an asymmetrical lexicon that does not allow the reader to look up the ASL word and find the English word and English definition.

The psychology textbook *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology* uses a different approach to making the written English text accessible in ASL with the development of an ASL companion volume.²¹ The ASL companion volume is a separate video text that features summary vignettes by native ASL speakers with academic training in the field (see, e.g., Harris and Williams 2017). Authorship for each version, English and ASL, is separate. This partnership model is one that may be instructive for signing deaf academics wishing to make their work accessible in ASL.

Yet another approach is that used by the *DSDJ*, the ASL-English bilingual academic journal, which was founded by and first edited by H. L. Dirksen Baumann and is now edited by Patrick Boudreault.²² While it is an academic journal and not a book, I believe its publishing model could easily be adapted to a book format. Each article is presented bilingually as one document in the table of contents, with ASL video and English text provided in separate translations.

Proof of Concept: *The Signed Language Book Metabook*

Where does a signed language book begin? Can a “pure” sign language book exist, and if so, what is the material form of such a book? In addition to writing about the philosophical aspects of ASL publishing, during the National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute I attended, I was also required to create a book for an exhibition that would take place at the end of the program at the Salt Lake City Main Library.²³ My book project was a proof-of-concept book—I wanted to explore the possibility of creating a book in ASL without using any English text. This would create a new category of ASL books in addition to the four I had listed earlier. This new category of signed language book

would exist solely in the video format of ASL, with no English or spoken language text. While the material books published in written forms of signed language text also contain no English, the book form I attempted uses video clips as frozen text rather than a written system. One might liken this to an audiobook read by the author, with one critical difference—instead of the book being produced in one modality and converted to another modality, this book is produced in the same modality as the final form. I titled this proof of concept work *The Signed Language MetaBook*.

The first order of business was to choose a publishing platform that would (as much as possible) minimize the English content in the structure of the book. I opted to use Scalar, a free open-source online publishing program from the Alliance for Networking Visual Culture (n.d.) “designed to make it easy for authors to write long-form, born-digital scholarship online.”²⁴ While there were certain English formatting constraints I could not get around, such as the table of contents, I was able to make the table of contents bilingual, adding video clips of the book sections in ASL to the English “skeleton” structure. These short video clips showed fingerspelling of each chapter’s title. One challenge in producing bilingual content is the variability of translation. In part because I wanted to focus on philosophical concepts that had a rich history in English (more on this later), I opted to fingerspell the titles of these chapters.

In order to move toward what I have called Deaf philosophy,²⁵ each chapter’s content was produced in ASL using iMovie and saved on Vimeo. My process for developing my thoughts and arguments in ASL paralleled my writing process in English. That is, I usually spend a lot of time thinking about what I want to produce before I ever start to capture it on a screen (written or signed). This includes sharpening the questions I want to ask, considering what the structure of my argument looks like (I often end up assigning parts of the argument in space as I think through it, whether that is in English or ASL), and thinking through objections and replies to various iterations of the arguments and subarguments. Although I did not consciously set out to follow my English language approach to thinking philosophically, I did set for myself the expectation that my philosophical thinking would include argumentation. Having taught philosophy in ASL for seventeen years at Gallaudet, I have developed a philosophical style in this language.²⁶

The Scalar platform has its limitations, and I expected that the response of my colleagues and others viewing *The Signed Language Book Metabook* (all hearing, none fluent in ASL) might be to critique the structure of the design of the book, since we had spent a considerable amount of time talking about the metaphysics and ontology of book structure. The feedback I most often received was a request for a translation of *The Signed Language Book Metabook*, despite my initial description of my project as one that would not involve any English. This ironic response, given the context of my project, is worth mulling over in light of the ethical issues I raised earlier about access to research and scholarship

on signing deaf communities. It not only positions academic English language access as an entitlement but also illuminates the question of whose labor will go into this access. It is not likely that a nonsigning academic will embark on a course of ASL study in order to access this work.

ASL Core Philosophical Lexicon Dictionary

Before my proof-of-concept signed language book experiment, I worked with a team to produce a more traditional kind of ASL digital book, a dictionary of philosophical signs in academic ASL. As with *The Signed Language Book Metabook*, this project was conceived through a deaf-centric frame, involving a signing subject matter expert (me); four ASL masters, including two who had previously studied philosophy at the college level; three hearing sign language interpreters who, combined, had several decades of experience interpreting philosophy courses taught in spoken English by nonsigning hearing professors at the Rochester Institute of Technology; a video camera crew to capture the discussions (there were three cameras in the room as we worked so that all conversations would be captured); and a website designer and editor. The labor for this project in the initial phase required ten people. Contrast this to the proof-of-concept book, in which I did the bulk of the work and only needed a cameraperson to assist with the video filming, which just needed to be sufficient to establish the concept and not done at the polished level required for academic publication.

The question of what counts as deaf-centric is complex and goes beyond the scope of this chapter. I will sketch out my reasons for why the originally titled “Philosophical Lexicon in ASL” project ought to count as a deaf-centric endeavor. This project was originally proposed by Miriam Lerner, an interpreter for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf at the Rochester Institute of Technology, using an in-house small grant fund from the Rochester Institute of Technology. Lerner and I corresponded for years before the project began, in part because she was so insistent that the project of generating an ASL lexicon for academic philosophy needed to have native and near-native signers at the center. I was initially hesitant to participate. Even though I have been teaching philosophy in ASL at Gallaudet University for nearly two decades, I am not an ASL-native signer and do not have the native language intuition that many of my colleagues do at Gallaudet. That said, I did come around to acknowledge Lerner’s point that since there were no native ASL speakers with doctorates in academic philosophy, I was uniquely positioned to work on this project. Despite my L2 status, my knowledge of academic philosophy, including my experience teaching it in English and in ASL, when combined with the depth of knowledge of our ASL masters, would result in the needed expertise.

What made this project deaf-centric was not only the all-deaf team at the heart of generating content but our commitment to developing a process that

prioritized the collaborative effort of the ASL masters, with their native language users' intuition, my expertise as the philosophy content expert, and the interpreters' collective experience interpreting philosophy classes. From the very first word we discussed a definition for (*aesthetics*), we were heavily engaged in being respectful of the history of language appropriation in deaf education, the oppressive nature of sign creation by nonnative users of the language, and the specific and narrow aim of this project, which was to provide ASL vocabulary for deaf students and their interpreters in undergraduate general education philosophy courses. If others found it useful and it received uptake in the deaf academic community, that would be a side benefit, but it was not the primary aim.

Two other observations about this project deserve attention. First, for deaf academics who wish to embark on a similar project, this kind of work typically does not count as scholarship but rather falls under service to the profession. In the US tenure track, academics are evaluated in three areas: research, teaching, and service to the profession. Service is the least prestigious category, and junior academics are cautioned to invest the bulk of their time in research and teaching rather than service—at least until they have obtained tenure. Despite the philosophical issues that emerged during the course of this project, including applied ethics and applied epistemology—both of which fall under my research agenda—there was little work-related incentive for me to pursue this project. The second observation is tied to the theme of hidden labor for deaf academics that I've woven throughout this chapter. If projects like this are needed (and I think that the need is indisputable), and ought to be carried out in a deaf-centric way in order to mitigate concern about cultural and language appropriation, then this is a task for deaf academics. At present, deaf academics who take on such specialized signed language lexicon projects are not rewarded for this labor under the current system of evaluating academics. This means that the system for how deaf (and disabled) academics are evaluated needs to be revised, and probably overhauled, in order to provide equity in the academy.

Future Directions

In this chapter I have identified several topics that could benefit from further analysis, beginning with the question of what the ethical obligations are for scholars who are bilingual in ASL and English to share our work as academics with the signing Deaf community. If the work of academics belongs to society, as I believe it does, the question of access and inclusion must be addressed. This will require the academy to evaluate its structural audism, including the impact of hidden labor and the absence of robust structures for evaluating the work of signing deaf academics in particular, who are called on to provide service through representation and as members of the signing deaf community who have unique access to information.

The COVID-19 pandemic brought an awareness of social inequity to the mainstream in a variety of ways, most notably in the areas of health care and education. The racial reckoning groundswell that captured the attention of the world in response to the murder of George Floyd raised awareness of the impact of race on this inequity. The social upheaval of the pandemic has provided an opportunity for all of us to evaluate current social structures, including those in the academy, and to develop law and policy that attempt to address these inequities, including those of ableism and audism. It is my hope that academics and educators will seize this moment to call for transformative change—*carpe diem!*

NOTES

- 1 James I. Charlton, *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment*, (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2000), 3.
- 2 American Association of University Professors, “Statement on Professional Ethics”, (Washington, DC: AAUP, 2009), <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>.
- 3 Committee On Publishing Ethics, “Core Practices”, (Hampshire, United Kingdom, 2017), date accessed May 1, 2022. <https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>.
- 4 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics.
- 5 American Anthropological Association, “Statement on Ethics”, (Arlington, VA: AAA, 2012). <https://ethics.americananthro.org/category/statement/>.
- 6 AAA Statement on Ethics.
- 7 Sign Language Linguistics Society, “Ethics Statement for Sign Language Research”, (SLLS, 2016), <https://slls.eu/slls-ethics-statement/>.
- 8 SLLS Ethics Statement, Section 3.
- 9 Teresa Blankmeyer Burke, “Regret: Considerations of Disability” in *The Moral Psychology of Regret*, Ed. Anna Gotlib, (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2020), XX. Teresa Blankmeyer Burke, “DEAF-HEART: Virtue Ethics and Signed Language Interpreting”, unpublished paper, (presented to Yale University Minorities and Philosophy, 2014), 2–3.
- 10 David R. Meek, “Dinner Table Syndrome: A Phenomenological Study of Deaf Individuals’ Experiences with Inaccessible Communication,” *Qualitative Report* 25(6) (June 2020):1676–1694.
- 11 Naomi Caselli, Wyatt C. Hall, and Jonathan Henner, “American Sign Language Interpreters in Public Schools: An Illusion of Inclusion that Perpetuates Language Deprivation,” *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 24 (2020): 1323–1329.
- 12 Rico Peterson, “Deaf Interpreters and Repatriation,” Street Leverage, accessed May 9, 2022, [streetleverage.com. https://streetleverage.com/tag/reciprocity/](https://streetleverage.com/tag/reciprocity/).
- 13 Modern Language Association, “Evaluating Translations as Scholarship,” accessed May 9, 2022, [mla.org. https://www.mla.org/Resources/Advocacy/Executive-Council-Actions/2011/Evaluating-Translations-as-Scholarship-Guidelines-for-Peer-Review](https://www.mla.org/Resources/Advocacy/Executive-Council-Actions/2011/Evaluating-Translations-as-Scholarship-Guidelines-for-Peer-Review).
- 14 Conversation with Dr. Patrick Boudreault, Editor of DSDJ, November 2, 2020.
- 15 Teresa Blankmeyer Burke, “Teresa Blankmeyer Burke” in *Disabled Philosophers*, September 13 2011, accessed May 9, 2022. <https://disabledphilosophers.wordpress.com/2011/09/13/teresa-blankmeyer-burke/>.
- 16 Naomi Sheneman, “Deaf Interpreters’ Ethics: Reflections on Training and Decision-Making,” *Journal of Interpretation* 25(1) (2016): Article 8, p. 7. <https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol25/iss1/8>.

- 17 National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute, "The Book: Material Histories and Digital Futures," accessed May 30, 2022. <http://www.slcc.edu/neh/>.
- 18 Sherman Wilcox and Corrine Occhino, "Historical Change in Sign Languages" in *Oxford Handbooks Online* (Linguistics, Sign Languages). Online publication date November 2016.
- 19 James Shokoff, "What is an Audiobook?," *Journal of Popular Culture* 34(4) (Spring 2001): 171–181.
- 20 Melissa Malzkuhn, Kristen Harmon, Benjamin Bahan, and Wanda Riddle. April Jackson-Woodward (storyteller) and Yiqiao Wang (conceptual artist), *The Baobab* (Washington, DC: Motion Light Lab, 2013), vl2storybookapps.com/the-baobab. Note: This work is the product of a collaborative team. While all of the individuals who participated in creating this work are listed on the website, I've opted to cite this by interpreting the "story by" section to be roughly equivalent to authors, and have noted others in parentheses.
- 21 Raychelle Harris and Felicia Williams, "Introducing the ASL Volume for Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology Textbook" (Washington, DC: ASLized, April 5, 2017), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LLfaaraxvpw>.
- 22 *Deaf Studies Digital Journal*, <https://deafstudiesdigitaljournal.org/>.
- 23 NEH Summer Institute Exhibition, "The Book: Material Histories and Digital Futures," July 2018, <http://www.slcc.edu/neh/institute-exhibition.aspx>.
- 24 Scalar, <https://scalar.me/anvc/scalar/>.
- 25 Teresa Blankmeyer Burke, "Doing Philosophy in American Sign Language: Creating a Philosophical Lexicon," in *Philosopher*, Ed. Meena Krishnamurty. <https://politicalphilosopher.net/2015/04/10/featured-philosop-her-teresa-blankmeyer-burke/>.
- 26 Burke, "Doing Philosophy in American Sign Language."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alliance for Networking Visual Culture. n.d. Scalar. Accessed October 10, 2022. <https://scalar.me/anvc/scalar/>.
- American Anthropological Association. 2012. "Statement on Ethics." AAA Ethics Forum, November 1, 2012. <https://ethics.americananthro.org/category/statement/>.
- American Association of University Professors. 2009. "Statement on Professional Ethics." <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>.
- Burke, Teresa Blankmeyer. 2011. "Teresa Blankmeyer Burke." *Disabled Philosophers* (blog), September 13, 2011. <https://disabledphilosophers.wordpress.com/2011/09/13/teresa-blankmeyer-burke/>.
- Burke, Teresa Blankmeyer. 2014. "DEAF-HEART: Virtue Ethics and Signed Language Interpreting." Unpublished paper presented to Yale University Minorities and Philosophy.
- Burke, Teresa Blankmeyer. 2015. "Doing Philosophy in American Sign Language: Creating a Philosophical Lexicon." In "Featured Philosop-her: Teresa Blankmeyer Burke," in *Philosopher* (blog), edited by Meena Krishnamurty, April 10, 2015. <https://politicalphilosopher.net/2015/04/10/featured-philosop-her-teresa-blankmeyer-burke/>.
- Burke, Teresa Blankmeyer. 2018. *The Signed Language Book Metabook*. In "The Book: Material Histories and Digital Futures," National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute, June 17–July 13, 2018, Salt Lake Community College. <https://www.slcc.edu/neh/institute-exhibition.aspx>.
- Burke, Teresa Blankmeyer. "Regret: Considerations of Disability." In *The Moral Psychology of Regret*, edited by Anna Gotlib, 203–220. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Caselli, Naomi, Wyatt C. Hall, and Jonathan Henner. 2020. "American Sign Language Interpreters in Public Schools: An Illusion of Inclusion that Perpetuates Language Deprivation." *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 24:1323–1329.

- Charlton, James I. 2000. *Nothing about Us without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Committee on Publishing Ethics. n.d. "Core Practices." Accessed October 10, 2022. <https://publicationethics.org/core-practices>.
- Harris, Raychelle, and Felicia Williams. 2017. "Introducing the ASL Volume for Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology Textbook." YouTube video, 3:25, posted by ASLized!, April 5, 2017. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LLfaaraxvpw>.
- Malzkuhn, Melissa, Kristen Harmon, Benjamin Bahan, and Wanda Riddle. 2013. *The Baobab*. Story told by April Jackson-Woodward. Concept art by Yiqiao Wang. Washington, DC: Motion Light Lab. <https://vl2storybookapps.com/the-baobab>.
- Meek, David R. 2020. "Dinner Table Syndrome: A Phenomenological Study of Deaf Individuals' Experiences with Inaccessible Communication." *Qualitative Report* 25 (6): 1676–1694.
- Modern Language Association. n.d. "Evaluating Translations as Scholarship: Guidelines for Peer Review." Accessed October 10, 2022. <https://www.mla.org/Resources/Advocacy/Executive-Council-Actions/2011/Evaluating-Translations-as-Scholarship-Guidelines-for-Peer-Review>.
- Peterson, Rico. 2015. "Deaf Interpreters and Repatriation." *Street Leverage*, July 14, 2015. <https://streetleverage.com/tag/reciprocity/>.
- Salt Lake Community College. 2018a. "The Book: Material Histories and Digital Futures." National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute, June 17–July 13, 2018. <http://www.slcc.edu/neh/>.
- Salt Lake Community College. 2018b. "The Book: Material Histories and Digital Futures." Exhibition of the National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute, July 2018. <http://www.slcc.edu/neh/institute-exhibition.aspx>.
- Sheneman, Naomi. 2016. "Deaf Interpreters' Ethics: Reflections on Training and Decision-Making." *Journal of Interpretation* 25 (1): article 8. <http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/joi/vol25/iss1/8>.
- Shokoff, James. 2001. "What Is an Audiobook?" *Journal of Popular Culture* 34 (4): 171–181.
- Sign Language Linguistics Society. 2016. "Ethics Statement for Sign Language Research." <https://slls.eu/slls-ethics-statement/>.
- Wilcox, Sherman, and Corrine Occhino. 2016. "Historical Change in Signed Languages." In *Oxford Handbook Topics in Linguistics*. Online publication date November 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhdb/9780199935345.013.24>.