

Course Title	: Conference Interpreting
Course Code	: TRA4326
Recommended Study Year	: 2 to 4
No. of Credits/Term	: 3
Mode of Tuition	: Tutorial
Teaching Hours	: 3-hour tutorial per week in the language laboratory
Category	: Elective (Category A)
Prerequisite	: Nil
Co-requisite	: Nil
Exclusion	: Students passed TRA4301 Advanced Interpreting (C- E) or TRA4302 Advanced Interpreting (E-C) are not allowed to take this course
Exemption Requirement	: Nil

Brief Course Description:

This course is designed to lay the foundation for knowledge and skills of simultaneous interpreting. Simultaneous interpreting is often the mode of interpreting used for international conferences. Through the course, students will be trained to equip with the techniques and skills for performing simultaneous interpreting with authentic materials and in simulated settings.

Language of instruction: English / Chinese

Aims:

This course provide students with an overview of conference interpreting. A variety of practices of simultaneous interpreting in simulated settings will be provided in order to enhance students' knowledge of the profession of conference interpreting and ability in simultaneous interpreting.

Learning Outcomes (LOs):

Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. demonstrate proficiency in simultaneous interpreting in different settings, including interviews, conferences and meetings;
2. summarise/paraphrase ideas received in the source language and have them presented systematically and confidently in the target language to the audience;
3. demonstrate a critical awareness of their own performance by identifying their strengths and weaknesses; and
4. use analytical skills and creativity in solving problems encountered during interpreting practices.

Indicative Content:

1. Knowledge and analysis of oral discourse;
2. Core interpreting skills: active listening, summarising, paraphrasing, multitasking, etc.;
3. The principles of simultaneous interpreting;
4. Ear-voice-span management;
5. Collaborating with partners in interpreting booths;
6. Critical analysis of simultaneous interpreting performance; and
7. Preparation of interpreting tasks, e.g., conducting background research and compiling glossaries.

Teaching Method:

Discussions, demonstration, and in-class practice.

Measurement of Learning Outcomes:

Students' progress towards the learning outcomes will be measured by means of:

1. Interpreting performance in laboratory sessions in terms of accuracy and completeness, fluency of delivery, use of language (including grammar, syntax and diction), and the quality of voice, articulation and poise; [LOs 1-4]
2. Quizzes (simultaneous interpreting tasks in mock meetings); [LOs 1-4]
3. A mock conference (students will take turns to present on a designated topic, at which time other students will interpret simultaneously in a mock conference setting; and [LOs 1-4]
4. An examination on simultaneous interpreting from Chinese to English and vice versa. [LOs 1-4]

Assessment:

Examination (simultaneous interpreting): 30%

Continuous assessment: 70%

- Three quizzes (45%):
 - * simultaneous interpreting [5% for effectiveness of non-verbal delivery and 10% for interpreting performance] (15%)
- Mock conference (15%)
 - * Contribution and participation in the mock conference, e.g. material preparation and conference presentation (7%), and interpreting performance (8%)
- Class performance (10%)

Readings:

- Angelelli, C. & Jacobson, H. (Eds). 2009. *Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies: A Call for Dialogue between Research and Practice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bartlomiejczyk, M. 2006. "Strategies of Simultaneous Interpreting and Directionality". *Journal of Interpreting*, 8 (2): 149-174.
- Chernov, G.V. 2004. *Inference and Anticipation in Simultaneous Interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gambler, Y., Daniel G., & Christopher T. 1997. *Conference Interpreting: Current Trends in Research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gile, D. 2009. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Huang, J. 1995. "Translating for international conferences", in Chan Sin-wai and David E. Pollard (Eds.), *An Encyclopedia of Translation*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Jones, Roderick. 1998. *Conference Interpreting Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Lambert, M. & Barara Moser-Mercer. 1994. *Bridging the Gap: Empirical Research in Simultaneous Interpretation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nolan, J. 2005. *Interpretation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pöchhacker, F. 2004. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, F & M. Shlesinger. 2002. *The Interpreting Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Schutte, Rainer. 1995. "Interpretation", in Chan Sin-wai and David. E. Pollard (Eds.), *An Encyclopedia of Translation*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

周兆祥、陳育沾，1988，《口譯的理論與實踐》，香港：商務。
林超倫，2012，《實戰同傳(英和互譯)》，北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司。
劉敏華，2008，《逐步口譯與筆記》。台北：書林。

Important Notes:

- (1) Students are expected to spend a total of 9 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 6 hours of personal study) per week to achieve the course learning outcomes.
- (2) Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in course work, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is “the presentation of another person’s work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student’s own work”. Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.
- (3) Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.
- (4) To enhance students’ understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course “Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness” is available on <https://pla.ln.edu.hk/>.

Assessment Rubrics for Examination (30%)

	Excellent	Good	Basic	Inadequate
Accuracy (15%)	Close to perfection; one or no interpreting errors. (13-15%)	Highly effective; no more than three minor errors. (9-12%)	Generally cover major ideas, with three or four errors. Missing one or two points. (5-8%)	Weak recapture of contents, and has more than four major errors. Missing points often. (1-4%)
Articulation (5%)	Perfectly poised, clear articulation; proper volume. (5%)	Clear articulation but not as polished; slightly uncomfortable at times. (4%)	Occasionally inaudible, not projecting voice. (2-3%)	Obviously nervous and cannot be heard; monotonous. (1%)
Clarity & Pacing (5%)	Master clarity of speech; steady rate; enthusiastic; confident. (5%)	Sentences are mostly coherent, and they flow easily; comfortably paced. (4%)	Hesitant and uneven paced; some sentences are incomplete, frequent hesitant pauses. (2-3%)	Mumbles, repeated self-correction, cannot focus on the ideas presented. (1%)
Diction style (5%)	Words are chosen for their precise meaning and style. (5%)	With a few exceptions, words are chosen for their precise meaning and style. (4%)	Vocabulary is somewhat limited or inappropriate. (2-3%)	Difficulties with appropriate vocabulary; display little stylistic variation. (1%)

Note: Marks allocation is suggestive only; subject teachers can make changes where necessary.

Assessment Rubrics for Continuous Assessment (70%)

	Excellent	Competent	Basic	Inadequate
Accuracy (30%)	Close to perfection; one or no interpreting errors. (25-30%)	Highly effective; no more than three minor errors. (18-24%)	Generally cover major ideas, with three or four errors. Missing one or two points. (11-17%)	Weak recapture of contents, and has more than four major errors. Missing points often. (1-10%)
Articulation (20%)	Perfectly poised, clear articulation; proper volume. (17-20%)	Clear articulation but not as polished; slightly uncomfortable at times. (13-16%)	Occasionally inaudible, not projecting voice. (8-12%)	Obviously nervous and cannot be heard; monotonous. (1-7%)

Clarity & Pacing (10%)	Master clarity of speech; steady rate; enthusiastic; confident. (9-10%)	Sentences are mostly coherent, and they flow easily; comfortably paced. (6-8%)	Hesitant and uneven paced; some sentences are incomplete, frequent hesitant pauses. (4-5%)	Mumbles, repeated self-correction, cannot focus on the ideas presented. (1-3%)
Diction style (10%)	Words are chosen for their precise meaning and style. (9-10%)	With a few exceptions, words are chosen for their precise meaning and style. (6-8%)	Vocabulary is somewhat limited or inappropriate. (4-5%)	Difficulties with appropriate vocabulary; display little stylistic variation. (1-3%)

Note: Marks allocation is suggestive only; subject teachers can make changes where necessary.

Assessment rubric:

	EXCELLENT (A Range) 80-100%	GOOD (B Range) 65-79%	FAIR (C Range) 50-64%	PASS (D Range) 40-49%	FAIL (F Range) 0-39%
Conception of argument (40%)	Project has a clearly articulated thesis that is analytically interesting and original; the analysis is perceptive.	Project meets most of the criteria listed in the column to the left, but is lacking in one or more of them—or accomplishes all of them at a slightly lower level than excellence.	Project has an identifiable thesis, but it may be obvious or uninteresting, and not particularly original; the analysis is superficial.	Project has an identifiable thesis, but it is uninteresting and not at all original; there is little analysis.	Project does not have any identifiable thesis.
Use of research method and supporting evidence (30%)	Project provides ample evidence in support of its thesis; showing serious research; evidence is well-connected to the thesis; documentation is exceptionally clear, as in the use of footnotes and references.	Project provides significant amounts of supporting evidence, well-connected to the thesis; some parts may not be clearly related to the central thesis; documentation is mostly clear.	Project provides some supporting evidence, but less than enough; only a small amount of research is conducted; there is an obvious amount of irrelevant detail; documentation is incomplete or not clear.	The evidence in the project relates only weakly to the thesis; hardly any research is done; the evidence is poorly documented.	The evidence in the project is irrelevant. The student does not apply any research methodology in the thesis.
Organization and presentation (20%)	All sections relate clearly to the central thesis; individual sections have a clear focus; structurally very satisfying; clear connections between sections; the order in which the ideas are presented makes sense.	Nearly all sections relate clearly to the central thesis in a clear manner; all or most individual sections have a clear focus; structurally satisfying; the order in which the ideas are presented makes sense.	Most sections relate to the thesis in a clear manner, most individual sections have a clear focus, and the order in which the ideas are presented generally makes sense.	Most sections do not relate to the central thesis in a clear manner; structurally confusing; ideas not presented in the proper order; connection between ideas not clear or satisfying.	The thesis is completely incoherent and disorganized.
Language use (10%)	Project displays excellent English language skills, with very few grammatical and usage errors, and is perfectly understandable.	Project contains minor errors in grammar and usage, but the writing is clear and generally understandable.	Project contains several minor errors and/ or a few major ones; the writing is mostly clear but may be difficult to understand in places.	Project contains numerous writing errors that are serious enough that the thesis is very difficult to understand.	The English is extremely poor and thesis is incomprehensible.