

**School of Arts, Languages
and Cultures**

MA Programme Handbook

**Conference Interpreting
(MACINT)**

2012 - 2013

Programme Director:

Ms Jin Liu

First edition, June 2012

Please note, some information is subject to change.

For updates, please check our web page:

www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet

This Programme Handbook contains information relevant to the MA in Conference Interpreting (MACINT). Information relevant to all postgraduate taught programmes in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures (SALC) can be found in the School Postgraduate Taught Handbook, which should be read and used as a reference in conjunction with this Handbook. The School Handbook is available online here: www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet

MA in Conference Interpreting 2012 – 2013

Contents

1. Postgraduate Study in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures	5
2. The Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies	6
3. MA in Conference Interpreting (MACINT)	8
3.1. ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS	8
3.1.1. Admissions	8
3.1.2. MACINT Interpreting Aptitude Test	8
3.1.3. MA Structure	10
3.1.4. Life Cycle of an MA	11
3.1.5. Part-time Study	11
3.1.6. Teaching and Learning	12
3.1.7. Assessment and Marking Turnaround Times	13
3.1.8. Assessed Coursework Submission Deadlines	13
3.1.9. School Policy on Word Limits and Penalties	14
3.1.10. Extensions to Submission Dates	15
3.1.11. Diploma and Certificate Level	16
3.1.12. Management Bodies	16
3.1.13. Academic and Pastoral Support	16
3.1.14. References from CTIS Staff	17
3.1.15. Keeping in Touch	18
3.2. ACADEMIC ASPECTS	19
3.2.1. Aims and Learning Outcomes of the MA in Conference Interpreting	19
3.2.2. Programme Content	20
3.2.3. Progression to PhD	21
3.2.4. Policy for Auditing Classes	21
3.2.5. Academic Writing Course	21
3.2.6. Professional Development Workshop Series	21
4. Course Unit Descriptions	22
4.1. SEMESTER 1	22
ELAN 60211 Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies I	22
ELAN 61121 Interpreting Studies	22
ELAN 60531 Consecutive Interpreting I	23
ELAN 60761 Simultaneous Interpreting I	25
4.2. SEMESTER 2	27
ELAN 60212 Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies II	27
ELAN 60532 Consecutive Interpreting II	27
ELAN 60762 Simultaneous Interpreting II	29
ELAN 61132 Professional Development for Conference Interpreters	30

5. List of Staff Teaching and Research Specialisms	32
Appendix 1 Schedule of key dates 2012 -13	34
Appendix 2 MACINT Assessment Criteria	36
A 2.1. Assessment Criteria for Essay-based Assignments	36
A 2.2 Assessment Criteria for Reflective Reports	38
A 2.3 Assessment Criteria for Consecutive Interpretation + Critical Analysis	40
A 2.4 Assessment Criteria for Consecutive Interpreting	43
A 2.5 Assessment Criteria for Simultaneous Interpreting + Critical Analysis	45
A 2.6 Assessment Criteria for Simultaneous Interpreting	48
A 2.7 Assessment Criteria for MA Research Dissertations	50
A 2.8 Assessment Criteria for Practical Dissertations (Consecutive Interpreting + Critical Analysis)	52
A 2.9 Assessment Criteria for Practical Dissertations (Simultaneous Interpreting + Critical Analysis)	55

1. Postgraduate Study in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

The School of Arts, Languages and Cultures (SALC) is made up of seventeen different subject areas covering a diverse range of Arts and Languages disciplines.

Our work embraces the material, visual, linguistic, textual, social and performative dimensions of human society ranging from pre-historic times, through the classical and medieval periods, to the present day.

For students, we offer the advantages of belonging to a specific subject area combined with the extensive choice and variety of being within a large and multi-disciplinary school.

The School contains the greatest concentration of high-quality research and teaching in language-based disciplines in the UK. In the last Research Assessment Exercise (RAE 2008), SALC achieved an outstanding result, with at least 50% of its research being rated as 'world leading' or 'internationally excellent'. This result has placed SALC among the UK's leading Schools of its kind.

SALC brings together leading academics in Translation and Interpreting Studies, Linguistics and English Language, Middle Eastern Studies, Ancient Near Eastern civilisations and their languages, European and Far Eastern Languages. The School is also home to the Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies (CTIS), the Centre for Latin American Cultural Studies (CLACS), the Centre for Russian and Eurasian Studies, the Centre for Research in the Visual Cultures of the French-speaking World (CRIVCOF), the Centre for Chinese Studies (CCS) and the Institute for Linguistics and Language Studies.

The School combines the linguistic study of languages and translation studies with a wide range of cultural research (in literature, screen studies, critical theory, history and politics). This opens up possibilities for exciting interdisciplinary work which goes beyond the study of 'national' cultures and reflects the impact of globalisation on our disciplines. Regular research and graduate seminars are held within the School. Attendance at such seminars forms an important part of initiation into the world of scholarly research and is a valuable opportunity for contact with leading scholars in your field.

The University of Manchester is one of the largest in the country, and is able to offer excellent facilities to postgraduate students. The John Rylands University Library has internationally renowned holdings in Translation and Interpreting Studies and all of the major Modern and Middle Eastern languages and literatures. Its collections include many rare texts and provide an excellent base for advanced study and research.

Postgraduate students in the School have the use of the services offered through the Graduate School. Computing and IT facilities are available, with access to the Internet, on-line library catalogues and e-mail. The University Language Centre provides advanced facilities for enhancing linguistic skills where required; it also gives access to European satellite broadcasts and has a video and media library.

Links

- School of Arts, Languages and Cultures
<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk>
- Research in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures (RAE results)
<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/ourresearch/>
- The Graduate School
<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/graduateschool/>

- Research seminars in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures
<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/ourresearch/events/seminars/>
- University Language Centre
<http://www.langcent.manchester.ac.uk/>

2. The Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies

The Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies (CTIS) launched its first postgraduate programme in translation studies in 1995. With its unique combination of research and practice-oriented course units and the subsequent incorporation of interpreter-training options, our MA in Translation and Interpreting Studies (MATIS) is one of the longest-running and most comprehensive postgraduate degrees offered by a UK institution. On MATIS, translation course units cater for all language combinations and we offer course units in Consecutive Interpreting and Public Service Interpreting (PSI) for five and four language combinations, respectively.

Our offer was extended in 2011 with the launch of a highly specialised MA in Conference Interpreting (MACINT) which aims to equip students with the knowledge and skills for a career in conference interpreting.

On MACINT, students can study one of two profiles, reflecting the two distinct profiles of practising conference interpreters.

Profile 1: students who have English as their native language (A language) and two passive foreign languages (C languages). These students will be trained in both types of interpreting out of both C languages into their A language.

Profile 2: designed for students with Arabic, Chinese, French, German and Spanish as their native language (A language) and English as an active foreign language (B language), or English as their native language (A language) and Arabic, Chinese, French, German or Spanish as an active foreign language (B language). These students will be trained in both types of interpreting in both directions (i.e. B→A and A→B).

CTIS has an international reputation for the quality of its research and teaching activities. Their staffs has extensive and varied experience of teaching, researching and publishing in numerous areas of translation and interpreting theory and practice, including the following:

- Translation and Conflict, Translation and Activism
- Corpus-based Translation Studies
- Multimodality and Audiovisual Translation
- Social and Sociological Studies of Translation and Interpreting
- Text and Discourse, Text and Context
- Interpreting Studies
- Literary Translation
- Translation and Interpreting Profession and Training
- Scientific and Commercial Translation

The following are some examples of doctoral theses on interpreting recently supervised by CTIS staff:

- Interpreting and Translation Policy in UK Asylum Applications

- Babels, the Social Forum and the Conference Interpreting Community: Overlapping and Competing Narratives on Activism and Interpreting in the Era of Globalisation
- Modelling Competence in Community Interpreting: Expectancies, Impressions and Implications for Accreditation

In addition, there are a number of doctoral theses on interpreting currently in progress at CTIS:

- Healthcare Interpreters' Perception of their Position in the Field of Public Service Interpreting in Spain: A Bourdieusian Perspective
- Investigating Note-taking in Consecutive Interpreting - Using the Concept of Visual Grammar
- Dialogue Interpreting as Intercultural Mediation: Integrating Talk and Gaze in the Analysis of Mediated Parent-Teacher Meetings
- Interpreters' Mediation of Government Press Conferences in China: Participation Framework, Footing and Face Work

CTIS houses the Translational English Corpus (TEC), the largest computerised collection of translated English text anywhere in the world. This important research resource and a vibrant research environment attract visiting scholars from around the world.

In recent years, CTIS has hosted and/or co-organised a number of major international conferences, including *Translation and Conflict II* (2006) and *Corpus-based Translation Studies* (2003) and the *International Postgraduate Conference in Translation and Interpreting* (2010). CTIS was also co-organiser, with UCL, of the *Research Models in Translation Studies II* conference in April 2011 which attracted 180 delegates from 33 countries. In addition, CTIS organises a weekly research seminar attended by an audience of researchers, students and professional translators.

Links

- Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies
<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/subjects/tis/>
- MA in Translation and Interpreting Studies
<http://www.manchester.ac.uk/postgraduate/taughtdegrees/courses/bysubject/course/?code=07006>
- CTIS Seminar Series
<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/ourresearch/events/seminars/>

MA in Conference Interpreting (MACINT)

3.1. ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS

3.1.1. Admissions

Admission criteria for admission to the MA in Conference Interpreting (MACINT) are as follows:

1. An upper second class Honours degree or higher (or its overseas equivalent), in a relevant subject.
2. Successful completion of an aptitude test for conference interpreting

In addition, students who apply from overseas with non-UK qualifications should send a copy of their degree certificate, a transcript of their degree results with an officially authorised translation, and an indication of the marking scale relating to their degree. English language scores of IELTS 7 (with 7.0 in the writing element of the test) or TOEFL 600 (paper-based test), 250 (computer-based test) or 100 (internet-based test) are required for students whose first language is not English.

Candidates interested studying the MA in Conference Interpreting (MACINT) should in the first instance contact the Postgraduate Admissions Officer:

masalc@manchester.ac.uk

3.1.2. MACINT Interpreting Aptitude Test

Students taking the MACINT interpreting aptitude test will have to define their language combination in AIIC's (International Association of Conference Interpreters) terms:

- **Language A:** The interpreter's native language (or another language strictly equivalent to a native language), into which the interpreter works from all her/his other languages in both modes of interpretation, simultaneous and consecutive.
- **language B:** A language other than the interpreter's native language, of which she/he has a perfect command and into which she/he works from one or more of her/his other languages.
- **Language C:** Languages, of which the interpreter has a complete understanding and from which she/he works.

(AIIC Regulations governing admissions and language classifications, Article 7).

It is essential that students registering for the aptitude tests have English, Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, French, German or Spanish as their A-language, as conference interpreting demands a high degree of sophistication in the native language (A language), as well as in the foreign language (B/C language). **Students whose first language is not English must have their English scores in place before being invited to take part in the aptitude test.**

Format of aptitude tests for Profile 1 applicants (ACC)

This format pertains to students who have English as their native language (A language) and two passive foreign languages (C languages). These students will be trained in both types of interpreting out of both C languages into their A language.

The interpreting aptitude test takes place in two stages. The first part will test aptitude for interpreting from the C1 to the A language (e.g. French – English). If the candidate passes this part, he/she will be invited to take the second part of the test which will test interpreting aptitude from the C2 to the A language (e.g. Spanish - English).

Part 1

The candidate listens to a short, structured oral presentation in the first C language (approx. 4 minutes) and has 5 minutes to prepare a short oral summary of the main ideas in the A language. The oral summary should be approximately 2 minutes long. The candidate is permitted to take notes during the listening phase.

Duration: 10 minutes in total

Part 2

The candidate listens to a short, structured oral presentation in the second C language (approx. 4 minutes) and has 5 minutes to prepare a short oral summary of the main ideas in the A language. The oral summary should be approximately 2 minutes long. The candidate is permitted to take notes during the listening phase.

Duration: 10 minutes in total

Format of aptitude tests for Profile 2 applicants (AB)

This format pertains to students with Arabic, Chinese, French, German and Spanish as their native language (A language) and English as an active foreign language (B language). These students will be trained in both types of interpreting in both directions (i.e. B-A and A-B).

The interpreting aptitude test takes place in two stages. The first part will test aptitude for interpreting from the B to the A language (e.g. English – Chinese). If the candidate passes this part, he/she will be invited to take the second part of the test which will test interpreting aptitude from the A to the B language (i.e. Chinese – English).

Part 1

The candidate listens to a short, structured oral presentation in the B language (approx. 4 minutes) and has 5 minutes to prepare a short oral summary of the main ideas in the A language. The oral summary should be approximately 2 minutes long. The candidate is permitted to take notes during the listening phase.

Duration: 10 minutes in total

Part 2

The candidate listens to a short, structured oral presentation in the A language (approx. 4 minutes) and has 5 minutes to prepare a short oral summary of the main ideas in the B language. The oral summary should be approximately 2 minutes long. The candidate is permitted to take notes during the listening phase.

Duration: 10 minutes in total

Please note that if the candidate fails part 1, he/she will not be permitted to proceed to part 2 of the test. If successful, part 1 and 2 will take place in the same session with a short break for consultation by the examination panel.

Candidates in the UK will be invited to take this test at The University of Manchester. Those not based in the UK will be offered the opportunity to take this test remotely (via Skype). **Please note that you are responsible for ensuring that you have equipment which enables a fully-functioning Skype video-call connection to be set up with The University of Manchester** (see <http://www.skype.com/intl/en/features/allfeatures/video-call> for details on what equipment you require). The PG Office must receive email confirmation of attendance (masalc@manchester.ac.uk) with a valid Skype ID in advance for you to be admitted to the test (see <http://www.skype.com/intl/en/get-skype/> for details on how to set up a Skype account if you do not already have one).

3.1.3. MA Structure

The **MA in Conference Interpreting** consists of a total of 180 credits, divided as follows:

- **compulsory core course units** (totalling 120 credits)

ELAN 60211	Research Methods in Translation & Interpreting Studies I	(15 credits)
ELAN 61121	Interpreting Studies	(15 credits)
ELAN 60531	Consecutive Interpreting I	(15 credits)
ELAN 60761	Simultaneous Interpreting I	(15 credits)
ELAN 60212	Research Methods in Translation & Interpreting Studies II	(15 credits)
ELAN 61132	Professional Development for Conference Interpreters	(15 credits)
ELAN 60532	Consecutive Interpreting II	(15 credits)
ELAN 60762	Simultaneous Interpreting II	(15 credits)

- the **dissertation** (60 credits)

The dissertation will normally arise from one or more of the taught course units taken and will normally be supervised by an appropriate member of staff in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures.

The **Postgraduate Diploma** in Conference Interpreting consists of the 120 compulsory credits listed above. Postgraduate Diploma students do **not** complete a dissertation.

3.1.4. Life Cycle of an MA

Full-time MA students take the MA programme over **12 months**. The taught course units are completed over two semesters and the dissertation must be submitted by **2 September 2013**.

- **Semester 1** (17 September 2012 – 27 January 2013)
 - Interpreting Studies
 - Research Methods in Translation & Interpreting Studies I
 - Consecutive Interpreting I
 - Simultaneous Interpreting I

- **Semester 2** (28 January 2013 – 7 June 2013)
 - Research Methods in Translation & Interpreting Studies II
 - Professional Development for Conference Interpreters
 - Consecutive Interpreting II
 - Simultaneous Interpreting II

- **Dissertation** (June 2013 – 2 September 2013)

Part-time MA students take the taught course units over two academic sessions and submit the dissertation by September of the year following the end of the taught course units (**the programme lasts for 24 months in total**). The schedule for part-time students registering in September 2012 will be as follows:

- **Year 1** (17 September 2012 – 7 June 2013)
 - Interpreting Studies, Semester 1
 - Research Methods in Translation & Interpreting Studies I, Semester 1
 - Consecutive Interpreting I, Semester 1
 - Consecutive Interpreting II, Semester 2

- **Year 2** (16 September 2013 – 6 June 2014)
 - Simultaneous Interpreting I, Semester 1
 - Research Methods in Translation & Interpreting Studies II, Semester 2
 - Simultaneous Interpreting II, Semester 2
 - Professional Development for Conference Interpreters, Semester 2

- The **dissertation** period is from June of the second year (2014) to September (2014). The dissertation must be submitted by **1 September 2014**.

3.1.5. Part-time Study

Part-time study is strongly supported and is actively facilitated in the timetabling of teaching hours for the MA, wherever possible. However, prospective students should note that even part-time study requires a significant commitment of time, and that we do not recommend combining part-time study with a full-time job. If you are considering taking the programme part-time we encourage you to talk to us before you apply, to discuss your options. You should normally arrange with your employer to have at least two working days free per week to study for the MA.

3.1.6. Teaching and Learning

The MA in Conference Interpreting (MACINT) is a highly specialised programme in which you will experience a number of different types of teaching methods, group sizes and modes of contact with your tutors.

The practical interpreting units (*Consecutive Interpreting I and II*, *Simultaneous Interpreting I and II*) combine General Seminars attended by all MACINT students (in semester one) with language-pair specific tutorials. The tutorials allow you to work closely with fellow students who have the same language combination in smaller groups, while the seminars give you the opportunity to work in a truly multilingual and multicultural environment. In addition, each language combination will be allocated a weekly slot for group self-study sessions in the self-study lab. Assessment for these units is weighted towards end of course unit exams, accompanied by formative feedback on such tasks as reflective reports on your own interpreting performance (focusing on preparation and strategy use), sight translation, or interpreting in mock conferences. In each of these units, you will also be encouraged to submit online interpreting journals as part of your ongoing reflective practice. These additional forms of assessment and practice are designed to provide you and your tutors with a record of your progress, enabling you to track and solve problems as they arise.

The *Professional Development for Conference Interpreters* course unit is designed to complement the units in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting by putting your interpreting and organisational skills to the test in multilingual conferences. Each conference will be preceded by General Seminars to enable you to prepare effectively for each scenario. Collaborative learning plays a significant role in this unit.

E-learning forms a significant part of this programme and you will be guided in independent study in a structured manner, facilitated in part by completion of online interpreting journals. These sessions encourage self-reflexive learning and also nurture peer assessment and feedback skills and are facilitated by dedicated self-study materials placed on the Blackboard and by password protected access to the EU multilingual speech repository (see www.multilingualspeeches.tv).

The theoretical units (*Interpreting Studies and Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies I and II*) are taught in weekly 1.5 hour seminars. Assessed coursework will take the form of a variety of written assignments (annotated bibliography, speech analysis exercise, critical essays, and dissertation proposal). You will receive comprehensive feedback on all your assignments. In *Interpreting Studies*, the initial shorter essay is submitted towards the beginning of the semester with a view to enable targeted feedback to feed into the writing process of the second essay.

The MA dissertation can take two forms on MACINT. You can choose between (1) a research dissertation and (2) an interpreting plus critical analysis dissertation.

The research dissertation allows you to select and explore in-depth an issue in interpreting research which you find particularly interesting. This can involve a range of research methods and data, from a controlled experiment to authentic conference interpreting scenarios; from ST/TT analysis of interpreter output to ethnographically informed research into interpreting in specific contexts. An introduction to potential research methods and types of data analysis will be provided in *Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies II*. The extended format of the dissertation gives you

the freedom to build on your knowledge of interpreting research from the theoretical course units, under the guidance of your MA dissertation supervisor.

Alternatively, the interpreting plus critical analysis dissertation option gives you the opportunity to critically reflect on your own interpreting practice in an in-depth manner by addressing issues that arise in the context of your interpreting practice, using the meta-language developed in the theoretical course units. The scenario selected for your simultaneous or consecutive interpretation can be real, i.e. this can be an opportunity for you to undertake a real interpreting assignment or placement, record your performance, and reflect on issues that arise during that interpretation, with reference to scholarly literature. Equally, a hypothesised scenario can be presented in which a supervised recording of your interpretation of a speech or extracts from a selection of speeches can be critically analysed. This option allows you to further your professional practice, while reflecting on issues that impact on that professional practice.

3.1.7. Assessment and Marking Turnaround Times

All **theoretical course units** are assessed by coursework, rather than by written examination.

Specialist interpreting course units are assessed by a combination of assessed coursework and examination (see individual course unit descriptions for more details). **Please note that Semester 2 interpreting units (Consecutive Interpreting II and Simultaneous Interpreting II) are non-compensatable.**

The **pass mark for MA** coursework and the dissertation is 50%. The **pass mark for the Postgraduate Diploma** is 40%.

In line with the University's Policy on Feedback to Students, MACINT course unit conveners aim to provide feedback to students within 15 working days of submission. This will normally take the form of individualised feedback and a provisional mark. Where appropriate, course unit conveners may opt to supplement individual feedback with generic formative feedback which may be made available to students before they receive their individualised feedback and provisional marks.

Once marks have been issued to students, they can be changed only by the external examiners. **Confirmed marks** will not be made available to students until after the relevant meeting of the Examination Board.

3.1.8. Assessed Coursework Submission Deadlines

As the programme requires you to submit assessed essays or other assignments, you must observe the deadlines set out in the course unit descriptions (Section 4) and summarized in Appendix 1.

Coursework submission for individual course units on MACINT is either in hard copy or made electronically via Blackboard system. For specific pieces of coursework, you may be asked to submit your coursework in hard copy as two separate components or to submit three copies; if this is the case, you will receive clear instructions from the course tutor. Where course units use electronic submission procedures, these will also be explained to you in advance of the submission date.

Full details on how to submit your work can be found in the School's Postgraduate Taught Handbook. Please familiarise yourself with the procedures before your submission date.

Some course units may use the online submission facility in BlackBoard called TurnitinUK. If this is the case, the procedures will be explained in advance of the submission date.

You must submit **two hard copies** of your assessment to the Teaching and Learning Reception, A6 (ground floor) of the Samuel Alexander Building. Please note that the Postgraduate Office (S3.9) is unable to receipt assessed coursework.,

In addition, you must submit **one electronic copy** of your work to salc-assessment@manchester.ac.uk. Electronic copies of your work may be checked for plagiarism and / or word counts. It is also recommended that you keep a copy for yourself in case of loss.

Late Submission

Any assessed coursework submitted after the deadline (5pm on the day of submission) without good cause will incur a penalty determined by the lateness of its arrival:

- **ten marks will be deducted for the first day after the deadline**
- **ten additional marks will be deducted for each day thereafter (including weekends)**

If you are registered on units outside of the School, you should ensure that you are aware of the penalties that will be imposed for late course work submission for that School. Schools may operate different penalty schemes for late submission.

3.1.9. School Policy on Word Limits and Penalties for Coursework and Dissertations

All subject areas have agreed assessment lengths for written assessments (such as essays, reports etc.) within their degree programmes. At each level the target word count or range for a written piece is indicative of the optimum length required to compose a successful essay at that level, and is designed to correspond as closely as possible to the weighting that the assessment has within the course unit.

The purpose of enforcing word limits is (a) to ensure parity and fairness by creating a level playing field; (b) to help students produce well-focused and cogent written work; (c) to instil the discipline essential for real-life writing tasks, where word limits are often rigid; and (d) to ensure that students acquire the ability to edit their writing effectively and cut away inessential material, skills invaluable both for academic work and the workplace.

- students must observe the word limit specified for each assessment.
THE UPPER LIMIT IS AN ABSOLUTE MAXIMUM AND MUST NOT BE EXCEEDED (THERE IS NO '10% RULE')
- the word count for each piece of written work must be displayed clearly on the first page

- word count is here defined as including quotations and the footnotes or endnotes in the essay itself. It does not include the bibliography or any appendices. Appendices are for supporting, illustrative material only; they may not be used to elaborate or extend the argument
- material that exceeds the upper limit will not be read or considered in the marking

It is not expected that staff will check individual submissions unless they are concerned that the stipulated length has been exceeded. In such cases, markers may request electronic copies of work in order to verify the word count.

MA dissertations must indicate the word count at the bottom of the contents page (see *Guidance notes for the presentation of taught master's dissertations*, 3(b)). All other coursework exercises must indicate the word count at the end of the main body of the text. Students must remember, when calculating word counts using word-processing software, to include footnotes and endnotes in the calculation.

Failure to indicate the word count, or the provision of a false word count, may lead to disciplinary action. The School reserves the right to request an electronic copy of any work submitted, so that word counts may be checked by examiners. When work exceeding the word limit is marked, the mark given on the feedback form will include the appropriate penalty. The examiners' feedback form will indicate how the penalty has been calculated.

3.1.10. Extensions to Submission Dates

Extensions to the submission dates for submitted coursework (assessed essays and dissertations) may be sought where circumstances, outside of students' control, will delay the completion and submission by the published date.

Please note, individual course unit tutors cannot grant extensions to deadlines.

Please read the School's policy on Mitigating Circumstances in the Postgraduate Taught Handbook.

3.1.11. Diploma and Certificate Level

For students on the MA in Conference Interpreting, the Postgraduate Diploma and Certificate are possible **exit points**. Students registered for the MA who complete the taught component of the programme only (120 credits, at a pass mark of 40% instead of 50%), may be awarded the Postgraduate Diploma. Students completing only 60 credits' worth of taught course units (at a pass mark of 40%) may be awarded the Postgraduate Certificate.

The Postgraduate Diploma is also an **entry point**, i.e. it is possible to apply for a place on the Postgraduate Diploma. Upgrading from Diploma to MA status is possible if all course units are passed at Master's level (i.e. 50% or higher).

3.1.12. Management Bodies

TIS Academic Committee

All activities of the Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies are overseen by the discipline's Academic Committee, which normally meets twice per semester. The Academic Committee provides a forum for dialogue between TIS staff and student

representatives, where issues relating to MACINT and their development can be discussed. These may include, for example, the consideration of student feedback.

One student representative for MACINT is elected each year to ensure effective communication between staff and students and that our students have input into programme developments. The Programme Director will contact all students early in Semester 1 to organise the election of the representative.

SALC Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Committee

MACINT student representatives are also involved in the School PGT Committee, whose members are staff and student representatives from the different Subject Areas.

The School PGT Committee is directly responsible for admission procedures, regulations, and student progress and acts as the Examination Board for all taught postgraduate programmes. The MACINT student representative is invited to raise issues relating to their programme in the context of this meeting.

3.1.13 Academic and Pastoral Support

A personal tutor will be allocated to you early in semester 1. S/he will be available at advertised office hours each week during term time to advise on accessing any appropriate University support services. Your personal tutor can also offer advice and guidance in matters relating to your academic work. This may include support in developing your capacity to review, plan and take responsibility for your own learning through a structured process of personal development planning (PDP) (See the SALC PGT Handbook for more information on the PDP).

If you are experiencing difficulties or have questions about a particular course unit, in the first instance you should approach the relevant course unit tutor. If you wish to meet the course unit tutor, you should e-mail him/her to arrange a mutually convenient time to meet. The Programme Director is also available to discuss any issues you may wish to raise about the programme as a whole. Again, you should e-mail to make an appointment in advance.

Student Support and Guidance Service

The School of Arts, Languages and Cultures Student Support and Guidance Service is a support service of information and advice on matters relating to your academic work, progress and personal wellbeing. It is part of a network of student support services across the University and consists of a small team of Advisers.

The content of discussions is very varied including thoughts about changing programme, anxiety about coping with studies, time management, examination problems or the impact of outside events on a student's studies. If an Adviser is unable to help you directly, then they will normally be able to recommend someone who can.

To make an appointment to see an adviser, call into the Teaching and Learning Reception, (A6, Samuel Alexander Building), email salc-studentsupport@manchester.ac.uk or telephone 0161 306 1666.

The Student Support and Guidance Service also operates a drop-in service during term-time when prior appointments are not needed. Times will be available at the Teaching and Learning Reception and on the door of Student Support and Guidance Office (A15, Samuel Alexander Building).

Further information can be found at: www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/studentintranet

Further sources of advice and information on:

- IT training courses
- library skills training
-

can be reached via My Manchester at <http://my.manchester.ac.uk>

From time to time you may need to speak to someone about a range of different issues. In the table below you will find contact points for some common issues:

Question about...	Contact	Alternative Contact
... a course unit	Course Convener	MACINT Programme Director
... mitigating circumstances	Student Support and Guidance Office	MACINT Programme Director
... interruption of studies	Personal Tutor/ MACINT Programme Director	Student Support and Guidance Manager
... change of registration details	MACINT Programme Director	
... advice on dissertation plans	Relevant Specialisation Tutor	Research Methods Tutor
... PhD plans	CTIS PGR Director	MACINT Programme Director
... financial matters	Postgraduate Office	
... your Personal Development Plan (PDP)	Personal Tutor	MACINT Programme Director
... academic writing skills	Academic English Tutor	Personal Tutor

Further sources of advice and information on:

- IT training courses
- library skills training
- coping with studying
- personal problems (Counselling Service)

can be reached via the Student Portal at <http://www.studentnet.manchester.ac.uk/>

3.1.14. References from CTIS Staff

You will probably require a reference for employers or further study during or after your MA. While staff are happy to oblige, writing a reference takes some time. It is your responsibility to make sure that the referee is given accurate information about the programme/job for which you are applying.

If there is a form to be completed, make sure the lecturer receives it in good time, and that you have filled in your part of the form fully and accurately. You should usually provide a CV to help the lecturer write the reference. Lecturers are perfectly within their

rights to decline to write references, for example if the application is poorly prepared or unrealistic, or if the student is making multiple applications with no particular focus.

Referees are expected to be honest in their assessment. In nominating your referee, make sure that s/he is the best placed tutor to comment on your skills and performance.

3.1.15 Keeping in Touch

We like to keep in touch with our students after graduation, both because it is interesting to hear about the exciting jobs that our graduates go on to do, and because it enables us to forward the employment opportunities that we receive.

If you would like to be added to our alumni database and receive regular information on employment opportunities and CTIS activities, please e-mail the MACINT programme director with details of your personal e-mail address.

Please contact us after graduation to be included in our portfolio of graduate profiles, some of which are made available on the CTIS website at:

<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/subjects/tis/>

3.2. ACADEMIC ASPECTS

3.2.1. Aims and Learning Outcomes of the MA in Conference Interpreting

The Masters programme aims to:

- Equip students with the knowledge and advanced interpreting skills for a career in conference interpreting
- Provide specialist training in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting
- Provide a gradual transition into the professional world through practical, real-life interpreting tasks
- Provide guidance on professional conduct and ethics
- Enable students to reflect critically on their own and others' interpreting practice
- Equip students for further study and research

Intended learning outcomes of the Masters programme

Students should be able to:

- Demonstrate understanding of how conference interpreting (in consecutive and simultaneous mode) is used in various settings for a range of purposes
- Show familiarity with research issues in interpreting, including recent approaches, current problems, and potential future developments
- Apply recent research developments to the practice of interpreting, including processing models, speech organization and structure and the semiotics of verbal and non-verbal communication
- Critically reflect on the role of the interpreter in various settings and on their own and others' interpreting performance
- Provide consecutive interpretation of up to 8 minutes, according to language profile (AB or ACC) in a variety of settings on a range of topics
- Provide simultaneous interpretation of up to 20 minutes, according to language profile (AB or ACC) in a variety of settings on a range of topics
- Prepare effectively for interpreting assignments by combining lexical, terminological and domain-specific research
- Work effectively as part of a team
- Work on a number of tasks simultaneously and under time pressure
- Carry out an extended piece of work independently

3.2.2. Programme Content

Programme structure and credits	Credits
MA PROGRAMME	
Compulsory units	
Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies I	15
Interpreting Studies	15
Consecutive Interpreting I	15
Simultaneous Interpreting I	15
Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies II	15
Consecutive Interpreting II	15
Simultaneous Interpreting II	15
Professional Development for Conference Interpreters	15
Dissertation	60
Total	180
POSTGRADUATE DIPLOMA	
Compulsory units	
Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies I	15
Interpreting Studies	15
Consecutive Interpreting I	15
Simultaneous Interpreting I	15
Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies II	15
Consecutive Interpreting II	15
Simultaneous Interpreting II	15
Professional Development for Conference Interpreters	15
Total	120

The MA in Conference Interpreting provides highly specialized postgraduate training in conference interpreting and therefore all of the above units are compulsory. On the taught component of the programme, units can be split into theoretical (*Interpreting Studies, Research Methods I and II*) and practical units (*Consecutive Interpreting I and II, Simultaneous Interpreting I and II and Professional Development for Conference Interpreters*). However, care should be taken not to enforce an artificial division between theory and practice. As a result of the expertise of CTIS staff, you will be taught conference interpreting on the basis of research carried out in skill and expertise acquisition in Interpreting Studies. In addition, teaching and learning is informed by current research in Interpreting Studies on issues as diverse as cognitive processing and the social and ethical role of the interpreter. In turn, your interpreting practice should enable you to apply and critique theoretical notions by analysing and reflecting on tangible interpreting performance.

3.2.3. Progression to PhD

MACINT students considering a PhD in Interpreting Studies should aim for distinction level performance throughout the programme, particularly in the theoretical units and are advised to select the research option for the MA dissertation. Please feel free to discuss your plans with the CTIS Postgraduate Research Director, Professor Mona Baker (mona.baker@manchester.ac.uk)

3.2.4. Policy for Auditing Classes

Auditors (visitors, PhD students, MATIS students) may not attend language-specific interpreting classes, general seminars for consecutive and simultaneous interpreting or the Professional Development course unit. MACINT students may not attend language-specific interpreting classes which are not part of their selected profile, unless by previous arrangement with the course unit convenor and relevant language-specific tutor. There are no restrictions on attendance at theoretical course units.

3.2.5. Academic Writing Course

Academic writing skills in English are critical to students' success in the MA programme. Writing academic papers effectively requires not only an excellent command of English grammar, but also sufficient familiarity with essay-writing conventions in British academic contexts. A customised course on academic writing skills is run every Wednesday afternoon throughout Semester 1 and the first half of Semester 2 (see schedule details in the MACINT timetable).

Attendance at the Academic Writing Course **is highly recommended for all non-native users of English.**

3.2.6. Professional Development Workshop Series

In addition to the CTIS Thursday Seminars by leading translation and interpreting scholars, MACINT students learn about careers and current trends in translation, interpreting and related areas through interaction with established professionals who are invited to our Professional Development Workshop series.

4. Course Unit Descriptions

4.1. SEMESTER 1

ELAN 60211	Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies I	
15 credits	Semester 1	Theoretical
Tutor	Dr Luis Pérez-González	
Synopsis	<p>This course unit focuses on a range of relevant skills and methods in the context of translation and interpreting studies research and translation/interpreting analysis. Sessions and exercises (both assessed and non-assessed) are linked to translation and interpreting studies literature and analysis of texts, translations and interpretations. Topics covered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ research resources for translation and interpreting studies ▪ academic writing ▪ critical reading ▪ linguistic analysis for translation and interpreting studies. <p>A full course unit outline will be provided in class at the beginning of the semester.</p>	
Teaching	<p>This unit will be taught through 11 x 80-minute weekly seminars in Semester 1. Seminars will take the form of a lecture, followed by discussions of research case studies of translation and interpreting. The seminars are interactive, with students expected to come to class prepared to discuss questions on the curriculum contents listed above based on readings assigned by the tutor.</p>	
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assignment 1 (30%): A research bibliography, to be submitted 26 October 2012. ▪ Assignment 2 (70%): A text analysis exercise (2000 words), to be submitted 7 December 2012. 	

ELAN 61121	Interpreting Studies	
15 credits	Semester 1	Theoretical
Tutor	Dr. Morven Beaton-Thome	
Synopsis	<p>This course unit will offer students the opportunity to study contemporary theories of interpreting from the 1960s until the present time. A broad range of approaches will be studied, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ linguistic approaches ▪ cognitive and neurolinguistic modelling ▪ strategic approaches ▪ pragmatic and contextual approaches ▪ sociological and anthropological approaches ▪ ethics and committed approaches 	

	A full course unit outline will be provided in class at the beginning of the semester.
Teaching	This unit will be taught through 11 x 80-minute weekly seminars in Semester 1. Seminars will be interactive, with students expected to come to class prepared to discuss questions on the curriculum contents listed above based on readings assigned by the tutor.
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assignment 1 (Mock Essay): Optional. One essay of 1000 words on a prescribed topic to be submitted 9 November 2012. ▪ Assignment 2 (100%): One essay of 3000 words to be submitted 15 January 2013.

ELAN 60531	Consecutive Interpreting I	
15 credits	Semester 1	Practice-oriented
Tutor	Dr. Mouna Mannaa (course convenor), language-specific tutors	
Synopsis	<p>Consecutive Interpreting I is designed to provide you with an introduction to the practice of consecutive interpreting and a range of typical consecutive interpreting settings, with a view to enabling you to provide a consecutive interpretation of 5 minutes in both language directions selected.</p> <p>This course unit will cover the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ phases of Consecutive Interpreting (Listening & Analysis, Memory, Production) ▪ introduction to Note-taking for Consecutive Interpreting ▪ introduction to Consecutive Interpreting B/C1 – A and A-B/C2-A ▪ Consecutive Interpretation of types of speech that require consecutive interpreting (narrative, expository etc.) ▪ presentations of 5 minutes on current political affairs ▪ Consecutive Interpreting in formal contexts (e.g. Welcoming Speech, After-dinner speech, Inauguration speech, Award ceremony speech) ▪ cultural customs and linguistic expression in contrast (e.g. opening and closing patterns, toasts, intertextuality). <p>A full course unit outline will be provided in class at the beginning of the semester.</p>	
Teaching	<p>This unit will consist of four general two-hour seminars (in weeks 1, 2, 3 and 7) and 22 weekly language-specific practical sessions in semester 1 (11 for each language direction).</p> <p>The general seminars in weeks 1-3 will provide a general introduction to Consecutive Interpreting. They will be followed</p>	

	<p>by a note-taking workshop in week seven. The general seminars are complemented by weekly 1-hour language-specific sessions with language tutors for each language direction selected (C1 and C2 – A or B-A and A-B).</p> <p>Your interpretations will be frequently video-recorded for further analysis and feedback. General seminars and language-specific practical sessions will be interactive and you will be expected to interpret actively for your co-students.</p> <p>As part of your ongoing reflective practice, you will also be encouraged to submit online interpreting journals which will provide you and your tutors with a record of your progress, enabling you to track and solve problems as they arise.</p> <p>E-learning will form a significant part of this unit, with guidance given as to how to conduct independent study in a structured manner. This self-study will also be facilitated by dedicated self-study materials placed on the Blackboard and by password protected access to the EU multilingual speech repository (see www.multilingualspeeches.tv).</p>
<p>Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assignment 1 (30%): A 1,500 words reflective essay on your consecutive interpreting (B/C>A) of a 4 minutes speech, plus notes. A video recording of this consecutive interpreting should also be included. To be submitted by 23 November 2012. ▪ Exam 1 (35%): 4 minute Consecutive Interpreting Examination B/C1 – A, Exam Period (14-25 January 2013), specific date TBC. ▪ Exam 2 (35%): 4 minute Consecutive Interpreting Examination A-B/C2 – A, Exam Period (14-25 January 2013), specific date TBC. <p>Further information on assessment will be provided at the beginning of the semester.</p>

ELAN 60761	Simultaneous Interpreting I	
15 credits	Semester 1	Practice-oriented
Tutor	Dr. Morven Beaton-Thome (course convenor), language-specific tutors	
Synopsis	<p>Simultaneous Interpreting I is designed to provide students with an introduction to the practice of simultaneous interpreting and a range of typical simultaneous interpreting settings, with a view to enabling students to provide a simultaneous interpretation of up to 15 minutes in both language directions selected.</p> <p>This course unit will cover the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ phases and subcomponents of Simultaneous Interpreting (Listening & Analysis, Memory, Production) ▪ preparatory exercises for Simultaneous Interpreting B/C1 – A and A-B/C2-A (avoiding prosodic and semantic interference, clozing, cognitive shadowing, etc) ▪ Introduction to Simultaneous Interpreting B/C1 – A and A-B/C2-A ▪ Simultaneous Interpretation of various speech types (narrative, expository etc.) ▪ Simultaneous Interpreting in formal contexts ▪ strategies for Simultaneous Interpreting (décalage variation, chunking, syntactic and semantic anticipation, generalisation, telescoping) <p>A full course unit outline will be provided in class at the beginning of the semester.</p>	
Teaching	<p>This unit will consist of four general two-hour seminars (1, 2, 3 and 7) and 22 weekly language-specific practical sessions in semester 1 (11 for each language direction).</p> <p>The general seminars in weeks 1-3 will provide a general introduction to simultaneous interpreting and involve a number of preparatory exercises. They will be followed by a workshop on strategies in simultaneous interpreting in week 7. The general seminars are complemented by weekly 1-hour language-specific sessions with language tutors for each language direction selected (C1 and C2 – A or B-A and A-B).</p> <p>General seminars and language-specific practical sessions will be interactive and you will be expected to interpret actively for your co-students.</p> <p>As part of your ongoing reflective practice, you will also be encouraged to submit online interpreting journals which will provide you and your tutors with a record of your progress, enabling you to track and solve problems as they arise.</p> <p>E-learning will form a significant part of this unit, with guidance</p>	

	<p>given as to how to conduct independent study in a structured manner. This self-study will also be facilitated by dedicated self-study materials placed on the Blackboard and by password protected access to the EU multilingual speech repository (see www.multilingualspeeches.tv).</p>
<p>Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assignment 1 (30%): A 1,500 words reflective essay on your Simultaneous interpreting of a 5 minutes speech. A dual-track audio recording of this simultaneous interpreting should also be included. To be submitted by 23 November 2012. ▪ Exam 1 (35%): 8 minute Simultaneous Interpreting Examination B/C1 – A, Exam Period (14-25 January 2013), specific date TBC. ▪ Exam 2 (35%): 8 minute Simultaneous Interpreting Examination A-B/C2 – A, Exam Period (14-25 January 2013), specific date TBC. <p>Further information on assessment will be provided at the beginning of the semester.</p>

SEMESTER 2

ELAN 60212	Research Methods in Translation and Interpreting Studies II	
15 credits	Semester 2	Theoretical
Tutor	Dr. Rebecca Tipton	
Synopsis	<p>This course unit focuses on a range of skills and methods which are of relevance for translation and interpreting studies research and translation/interpreting analysis. The unit is designed to prepare students explicitly for their dissertation work. It also provides training in specific research methods, giving students the tools to evaluate existing research and to apply research findings appropriately in their own academic work. Topics covered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ research trends and the research process ▪ models and methods for translation and interpreting research ▪ application of knowledge and skills acquired on the MA programme when planning and executing MA dissertations ▪ preparation of an MA dissertation proposal. <p>A full course unit outline will be provided in class at the beginning of the semester.</p>	
Teaching	<p>This unit will be taught through 11 x 80-minute weekly seminars in Semester 2. Seminars will be interactive, with students expected to come to class prepared to discuss questions on the curriculum contents listed above based on readings assigned by the tutor.</p>	
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assignment 1 (30%): an outline MA dissertation proposal (500 words), to be submitted 1 March 2013. ▪ Assignment 2 (70%): A detailed MA dissertation proposal (3000 words), to be submitted 3 May 2013. 	

ELAN 60532	Consecutive Interpreting II	
15 credits	Semester 1	Practice-oriented
Tutor	Dr. Mouna Mannaa (course convenor), language-specific tutors	
Synopsis	<p>Consecutive Interpreting II is designed to further your practice of consecutive interpreting by building on the skills gained during Consecutive Interpreting I, with a view to enabling you to provide a consecutive interpretation of up to 8 minutes in both language directions selected.</p> <p>This course unit will cover the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extension of consecutive interpreting practice B/C1 – A and A-B/C2-A 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refinement of notetaking system for Consecutive Interpreting ▪ Consecutive Interpretation in various professional contexts, building on the formal contexts covered in Consecutive Interpreting I ▪ Implicit and explicit speaker intention ▪ Interpreter ethics and conduct in critical situations. ▪ Consecutive Interpreting in multilingual settings <p>A full course unit outline will be provided in class at the beginning of the semester.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Teaching</p>	<p>This unit will consist of 22 weekly language-specific practical sessions in semester 2. These will take the form of 11 x 1.5 hour sessions with language tutors for each direction selected (C1 and C2 – A or B-A and A-B). These extended taught classes are designed to allow you to explore more specialised contexts than the formal settings covered in Consecutive Interpreting I in semester 1. As part of this unit, you will also have the opportunity to provide consecutive interpreting in a mock conference.</p> <p>Your interpretations will be frequently video-recorded for further analysis and feedback. General seminars and language-specific practical sessions will be interactive and you will be expected to interpret actively for your co-students.</p> <p>As part of your ongoing reflective practice, you will also be encouraged to submit online interpreting journals which will provide you and your tutors with a record of your progress, enabling you to track and solve problems as they arise.</p> <p>E-learning will form a significant part of this unit, with guidance given as to how to conduct independent study in a structured manner. This self-study will also be facilitated by dedicated self-study materials placed on the Blackboard and by password protected access to the EU multilingual speech repository (see www.multilingualspeeches.tv).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assignment 1 (30%): Consecutive Interpreting in a mock conference. To be assessed in week 9 (15-19 April 2013), specific date TBC. ▪ Exam 1 (35%): 6 minute Consecutive Interpreting Examination B/C1 – A, Exam Period (20-31 May 2013), specific date TBC. ▪ Exam 2 (35%): 6 minute Consecutive Interpreting Examination A-B/C2 – A, Exam Period (20-31 May 2013), specific date TBC. <p>Consecutive Interpreting II is non-compensatable.</p> <p>Further information on assessment will be provided at the beginning of the semester.</p>

ELAN 60762	Simultaneous Interpreting II	
15 credits	Semester 2	Practice-oriented
Tutor	Jin Liu (course convenor), language-specific tutors	
Synopsis	<p>Simultaneous Interpreting II is designed to focus on simulating 'real-life' conference situations with the use of original audio and video recordings of conference material. By the end of the course unit, you will be able to provide a simultaneous interpretation of up to 20 minutes in both language directions selected.</p> <p>This course unit will cover the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Simultaneous Interpreting in 'real-life' conference settings (e.g. European Parliament plenary sessions, UN General assembly, press conferences, award ceremonies and political conferences) ▪ Deepening practice of Simultaneous Interpreting B/C1 – A and A-B/C2-A, with focus on different simultaneous techniques (e.g. simultaneous with text, chuchotage) ▪ Various simultaneous interpreting contexts (e.g. institutional interpreting, cultural interpreting, business interpreting and TV interpreting) ▪ Further development of strategies and trouble-shooting techniques for Simultaneous Interpreting (décalage variation, chunking, syntactic and semantic anticipation) ▪ Increased exposure to various speech types, accents and speaker opinions ▪ Continued engagement with ethics <p>A full course unit outline will be provided in class at the beginning of the semester.</p>	
Teaching	<p>This unit will consist of 22 weekly language-specific practical sessions in semester 2. These will take the form of 11 x 1.5 hour sessions with language tutors for each direction selected (C1 and C2 – A or B-A and A-B). These extended taught classes are designed to allow you to explore more specialised contexts than the formal settings covered in Simultaneous Interpreting I in semester 1. As part of this unit, you will also have the opportunity to provide chuchotage (whispered interpreting) in a Campus Tour.</p> <p>General seminars and language-specific practical sessions will be interactive and you will be expected to interpret actively for your co-students.</p> <p>As part of your ongoing reflective practice, you will also be encouraged to submit online interpreting journals which will provide you and your tutors with a record of your progress, enabling you to track and solve problems as they arise.</p> <p>E-learning will form a significant part of this unit, with guidance</p>	

	given as to how to conduct independent study in a structured manner. This self-study will also be facilitated by dedicated self-study materials placed on the Blackboard and by password protected access to the EU multilingual speech repository (see www.multilingualspeeches.tv).
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assignment 1 (30%): A 1,500-word reflective essay on the Chuchotage practice in a Campus Tour, plus glossary. Campus Tour to be held in week 5 (25 February-1 March 2013), specific date TBC, and the essay to be submitted by 15 March 2013. ▪ Exam 1 (35%): 12 minute Simultaneous Interpreting Examination B/C1 – A, Exam Period (20-31 May 2013), specific date TBC. ▪ Exam 2 (35%): 12 minute Simultaneous Interpreting Examination A-B/C2 – A, Exam Period (20-31 May 2013), specific date TBC. <p style="text-align: center;">Simultaneous Interpreting II is non-compensatable.</p> <p>Further information on assessment will be provided at the beginning of the semester.</p>

ELAN 61132	Professional Development for Conference Interpreters	
15 credits	Semester 2	Practice-oriented
Tutor	Dr. Rebecca Tipton (convenor), language-specific tutors	
Synopsis	<p>This unit will consist of four 2-hour multilingual conferences (in week 3, 6, 8, 10) and seven 2-hour General Seminars. This gives you an opportunity to put your experience into practice, in the form of four individual case-studies</p> <p>The course unit will cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Simultaneous Interpreting in multilingual settings (including relay interpreting and retour interpreting) ▪ Interpreting techniques specific to conference settings (e.g. variation of décalage during Q&A session, multiple speakers, relays, sight translation, working with visual aids) ▪ Simultaneous interpreting with text ▪ Preparation, glossaries and terminology ▪ Professional conduct and ethics ▪ Employment portfolio ▪ Effective booth and team work <p>Potential case studies include:</p> <p>Interpreting for international organisations (simulation of UN/EU set-up, international organisations and institutions, use of organisational terminology, conference technique, organisational databases and institutional memory)</p> <p>Freelance interpreting assignments (workflow from receiving the assignment to concluding individual performance reviews,</p>	

	<p>covering client and document management)</p> <p>Specialist/technical conference (focusing on the creation of glossary-based terminology, resources for research and specialist knowledge)</p> <p>The conference context (organisational issues, use of preparatory written materials and terminology in the in-process phase, simultaneous interpreting with text, interaction with delegates and booth mates, press conference, simulated after dinner speeches etc)</p>
Teaching	<p>This unit will consist of four multilingual conferences attended by students and tutors of all language groups, and seven General Seminars in which issues integral to good conference preparation and practice will be addressed.</p> <p>A number of students per multilingual conference will be nominated to act as coordinating interpreters. They will be responsible for coordinating the team of interpreters, distributing preparation material and for liaising between the interpreters and the client.</p>
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assignment 1 (30%): Minimum 4 entries of online reflective journals on mock-conferences. 500 words per entry, to be submitted by Friday of week 4, 7, 9, 11. ▪ Assignment 2 (70%): Post-course employment portfolio based on a hypothetical interpreting assignment required by a chosen employer/client. To be submitted by 10 May 2013.

5. List of Staff Teaching and Research Specialisms (CTIS)

Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies (core staff)

Mona Baker, BA (American University in Cairo), MA (Birmingham), DSc (UMIST): translation theory; narrative theory and framing; translation and global politics; socio-pragmatics; corpus studies. Author of *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account* (2006); author of *In Other Words: A Course book on Translation* (1992); editor of *The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* (1998, second edition 2008); editor of *Critical Readings in Translation Studies* (2010) and *Critical Concepts: Translation Studies* (4 Vols. 2009); editor of *The Translator: Studies in Intercultural Communication*. Vice President of the International Association of Translation and Intercultural Studies.

Maeve Olohan, BA (DCU), MA (DCU), PhD (UMIST): scientific, technical and commercial translation; corpus-based approaches to the study of translation; translation processes; translation pedagogy. Author of *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies* (2004); editor of *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I - Textual and Cognitive Aspects* (2000), co-editor of a special issue of *The Translator* (2011) on the translation of science.

Siobhan Brownlie, BA (Cant.), Grad Dip Arts (E. Cowan), PhD (UQ): Descriptive translation research; literary translation; translation of 19th and 20th century French literature into English; Franco-British relations; memory studies in relation to translation and intercultural communication. Author of articles in leading translation studies journals, including *The Translator*, *Target* and *Meta*.

Morven Beaton-Thome, MA (Heriot-Watt University), PhD (Heriot-Watt University), Training the Trainers in Conference Interpreting (ETI, Geneva): Interpreting studies; ideology in translation and interpreting; agency and identity in multilingual settings; Critical Discourse Analysis; Pragmatics; institutional and organisational ethnography; simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. Author of *Intertextuality and Ideology in Interpreter-mediated Communication. The Case of the European Parliament* (2007), articles in leading translation studies journals such as *The Translator*, and edited volumes. Freelance conference interpreter between German and English for public and private sector clients such as the German Centre for Political Education (bbp), Friedrich Neumann Foundation, BBC Radio 4, Saarländischer Rundfunk, ProLogis, Thyssen-Krupp Bilstein, Imola, Ecophon, UNESCO Biosphere Reserves.

Luis Pérez-González, Lic Phil (València), MA, MPhil (Birmingham), DPhil (València): Corpus linguistics; translator training; screen translation; forensic linguistics. Author of *Towards a Dynamic Model of Discourse: Issues of a Forensic-oriented Analysis of Spoken Interaction* (1999); editor of *Speaking in Tongues: Language across Contexts and Users* (2003); co-editor of *La traducción e interpretación en un entorno global* (2003). Features editor of *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*.

James St. André, BA (Boston University), MA and PhD (University of Chicago): translation studies; history of translation; translation theory and comparative literature; professional development; Chinese-English translation. Author of numerous articles in leading translation studies journals, including *The Translator*, *Target* and *Meta*; editor of *Thinking through Translation with Metaphors* (2010).

Christina Edwards, PGDip in Conference Interpreting Techniques (Polytechnic of Central London), PGDip in Interpreter Training (ETI, University of Geneva): Freelance conference interpreter from French, German and Russian into English. Positions held as Chief Interpreter at the International Labour Organisation (ILO), Permanent Interpreter at the UN Geneva and the ILO and Conference Interpreter at the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), Bangkok, as well as interpreter trainer at Westminster University. Member of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIIC) and AIIIC's VEGA network in support of young interpreters.

Jin Liu, BA (Renmin University of China), MA (Beijing Foreign Studies University): Freelance conference interpreter between Chinese and English serving both public and private sector clients, including the WHO, UNDP, American Chamber of Commerce, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Ministry of Health/Finance/Education/Environmental Protection of China, Chinese Banking Regulatory Committee, State Information Bureau, Château Margaux, Dom Pérignon, LVMH, Novell, Bayer, Oracle, BMW, ICBC, Moody's and Deutsche Bank. Positions held as Lecturer in Interpreting at Beijing International Studies University and interpreter trainer and language advisor for the Ministry of Defence, Singapore and the EU China Biodiversity Programme.

Catriona Howard, BA (Leeds Metropolitan University), MA (University of Leeds): EU accredited freelance conference interpreter (EU institutions and private market) and public service interpreter working from French and Spanish into English and English into Spanish. Previously interpreter trainer and programme manager MA Conference Interpreting, University of Leeds. Trainer on European Parliament Seminarium programme for new interpreting graduates and English Enhancement courses for European Parliament and UN interpreters.

Mouna Mannaa, BA (Damascus University), MA (University of Leeds), PhD (University of Salford): Translation theory; Translation and Interpreting training; Translation pedagogy. Freelance interpreter and translator between Arabic and English for private and public sector clients such as the National Health Service, Refugee Council, Leeds City Council.

Rebecca Tipton, BA (University of Manchester), MA (University of Bradford), PG Cert. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (University of Salford), PhD (University of Salford), DPSI (Chartered Institute of Linguists): interpreting and translation studies; public service interpreting; conference interpreting; interpreting pedagogy; sociology of interpreting; interpreting for charities and NGOs. Freelance translator and interpreter French and Spanish into English for clients including European Parliament, Michelin, SITA, BP Conservation, PSA Peugeot-Citroën, Paris Mint, HM Customs and Excise, and Manchester court, prison and probation services. Author of articles published in leading journals including *The Translator*, *International Journal of Language and Politics*, *Interpreter and Translator Trainer*.

Further CTIS staff details:

- <http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/subjects/tis/people/>

Further details of academic staff in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures and their research specialisms can be found at:

<http://www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/ourpeople/>

Appendix 1

Schedule of Coursework Submission Deadlines and Exams

MACINT course units 2012 – 2013

SEMESTER 1

Course Unit	Unit Code	Deadline					Weeks 14/01- 25/01/13
		26/10/12	09/11/12	23/11/12	07/12/12	15/01/13	
Research Methods in Translating and Interpreting Studies I	ELAN 60211	Ass. 1 30%			Ass. 2 70%		
Interpreting Studies	ELAN 61121		Ass. 1 0%			Ass. 2 100%	
Consecutive Interpreting I	ELAN 60531			Ass.1 30%			Exam 1 (35%) Exam 2 (35%)
Simultaneous Interpreting I	ELAN 60761			Ass. 1 30%			Exam 1 (35%) Exam 2 (35%)

Schedule of Coursework Submission Deadlines and Exams

MACINT course units 2012 – 2013

SEMESTER 2

Course Unit	Unit Code	Deadline						
		22/02/13	01/03/13	15/03/13	Week 15/04- 19/04/13	03/05/13	10/05/13	Weeks 20- 31/05/13
Research Methods in Translating and Interpreting Studies II	ELAN 60212		Ass. 1 30%			Ass. 2 70%		
Consecutive Interpreting II	ELAN 60532				Ass. 1 30%			Exam 1 (35%) Exam 2 (35%)
Simultaneous Interpreting II	ELAN 60762			Ass. 1 30%				Exam 1 (35%) Exam 2 (35%)
Professional Development for Conference Interpreters	ELAN 61131	Ass. 1 Part 1/4 (30% in total)		Ass. 1 Part 2/4 (30% in total)	Ass. 1 Part 3/4 (30% in total)	Ass. 1 Part 4/4 (30% in total)	Ass. 2 70%	

Appendix 2

A2.1. Assessment Criteria for Essay-based Assignments

Marks below 30%

The work fails to provide a competent description of the topic, and falls far short of a competent discussion. It is poorly structured and has no coherent argument. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Diploma or Master's level.

Marks 30-39%

The work is almost wholly descriptive. It displays no awareness at all of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units. It displays some potential to move from description to discussion of the topic and to structure a basic argument derived from this descriptive approach but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. The style and presentation are poor. There is little evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in Humanities have been understood, but communication is maintained. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Diploma or Master's level.

Marks 40-49%

The work provides a superficial discussion of the topic but remains predominantly descriptive. It demonstrates a basic grasp of the topic but is lacking in critical or analytical insight in general. It reveals a very limited awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, and no attempt is made to use such ideas in practice. An identifiable argument is discernible but this is poorly and inconsistently sustained. The style and presentation exhibit a large number of errors but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Master's level.

Marks 50-59%

The work demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the topic and can discuss it competently even if it is not able to develop complex ideas in relation to this topic. There is an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units accompanied by limited attempts to use them in practice. The approach is generally unambitious, but a coherently structured argument is in place and there is an awareness of relevant secondary literature. The work exhibits a certain number of errors of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles applicable to academic writing in Humanities is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

The work demonstrates thorough understanding of the topic, and provides a good discussion of it with appropriate examples. The work shows an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, supported by a sustained ability to use these ideas relevantly in critical practice. The argument will be clearly structured and the student has begun to develop new ideas on the texts or objects of study, revealing an ability to critically evaluate existing research in the area. There are few errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

The work demonstrates a sophisticated grasp of the topic supporting critical analysis with pertinent examples. An in depth awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units is relevantly applied in critical practice. The work is based on wide reading in a range of source materials and shows clear originality. The work goes well beyond the mere exposition of ideas, providing a consistently sustained and lucid argument. It demonstrates the ability to critically evaluation existing research on the object of study in a confident, directed manner giving evidence of very strong potential to complete a research degree successfully. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

The work shows extensive knowledge of both the topic and the academic context(s) in which it is applied, such that it begins to make a significant contribution at the forefront of scholarship in the given field. A complex, original and relevant application of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course unit is demonstrated in critical practice. There is clear evidence of an ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study as the basis for identifying and defining new fields of research. The work demonstrates considerable originality and is of publishable or near-publishable quality. The style and presentation are virtually faultless.

A2.2. Assessment Criteria for Reflective Reports

Marks below 30%

The work fails to provide a competent description of the practice and there is no evidence of any reflection on practice. It is poorly structured and lacks coherence. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Diploma or Master's level.

Marks 30-39%

The work is almost wholly descriptive. It presents the action or practice with little attempt to reflect upon it. There is little or no evidence of an ability to learn from the practice. The work displays some potential to move from description of skills to reflection but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. The style and presentation are poor. There is little evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in Humanities have been understood, but communication is maintained. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Diploma or Master's level.

Marks 40-49%

The work provides an account of the practice but remains predominantly descriptive. It shows a limited ability to learn from the practice but fails to explore in any detail the outcomes of reflecting on the practice. The style and presentation exhibit a large number of errors but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Master's level.

Marks 50-59%

The work demonstrates a reasonable ability to reflect on practice. An account of the action is presented competently and there are some indications of new understanding or new awareness gained through reflection, but perhaps without taking full account of complexity and contexts, or without showing sufficient awareness of how frames of reference shape both action and reflection. The approach is generally unambitious. The work exhibits a certain number of errors of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles applicable to academic writing in Humanities is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

The work demonstrates the ability to reflect competently on practice. The reflection is not simply descriptive but provides some evidence of the ability to engage critically with the action and the process of learning, with some discussion of the outcomes of the reflection. There is evidence of an ability to consider actions and decisions from more than one perspective. The report is clearly structured and appropriate examples are used to substantiate claims. There are few errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

The work demonstrates a sophisticated ability to reflect on practice. The reflection is dialogic and critical. The report shows the ability to interact critically with the contexts of the practice and to engage with the range of perspectives from which the action can be interpreted. The outcome of reflection, in the form of new understanding, is explored in depth. Claims are substantiated through examples, material presented in appendices, notes from reflection-in-action, etc. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

The work presents a complex, original and relevant reflection on practice. There is clear evidence that the principles of high-level reflection have been understood and applied and that both the action and reflection on it have considerably enhanced existing frameworks of understanding. The work demonstrates considerable originality and is of publishable or near-publishable quality. The style and presentation are virtually faultless.

A2.3. Assessment Criteria for Consecutive Interpretation + Critical Analysis

Marks below 30%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work fails to provide a competent description of the topic, and falls far short of a competent discussion. It is poorly structured and has no coherent argument. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Diploma or Master's level.
- *Consecutive Interpretation.* The consecutive interpretation is extremely poorly structured and delivered in an incoherent manner. Primary arguments in the source text are omitted in the target text and there is severe distortion of source text argumentation in the interpretation. There is no attempt to establish contact with the audience and clear difficulty in deciphering notes. The student requests excessive clarification of basic concepts or terms, indicating a lack of comprehension of the source text. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles of consecutive interpreting have been understood.

Marks 30-39%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work is almost wholly descriptive. It displays no awareness at all of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units. It displays some potential to move from description to discussion of the topic and to structure a basic argument derived from this descriptive approach but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. The style and presentation are poor. There is little evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in Humanities have been understood, but communication is maintained. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Diploma or Master's level.
- *Consecutive Interpretation.* The consecutive interpretation consists of a list of statements with very little attempt made to establish links between these and reproduce any kind of argument structure. There is evidence of repeated omission of basic speech elements and significant distortion of source text meaning by inversion or addition. The interpretation displays some potential to move towards a simple rendering of the topic and to reconstitute the basic argument of the source speech but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. There is very little attempt made to establish contact with the audience. Style and presentation are poor with obvious interference from the source language and there is little evidence that the principles and the purpose of consecutive interpreting have been understood, but communication does not break down completely.

Marks 40-49%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work provides a superficial discussion of the topic but remains predominantly descriptive. It demonstrates a basic grasp of the topic but is lacking in critical or analytical insight in general. It reveals a very limited awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, and no attempt is made to use such ideas in practice. An identifiable argument is discernible but this is poorly and inconsistently sustained. The style and presentation exhibit a large number of errors

but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Master's level.

- *Consecutive Interpretation.* The consecutive interpretation provides a basic summary of the source text but fails to render the argumentation structure and information hierarchy satisfactorily. The interpretation lacks explicit links of logical argument and operates on a rather superficial level. Audience contact is established but not continuously exploited. There is some hesitation and backtracking and difficulty in integrating the use of notes. Style and presentation exhibit a large number of weaknesses but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to consecutive interpreting have been understood.

Marks 50-59%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the topic and can discuss it competently even if it is not able to develop complex ideas in relation to this topic. There is an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units accompanied by limited attempts to use them in practice. The approach is generally unambitious, but a coherently structured argument is in place and there is an awareness of relevant secondary literature. The work exhibits a certain number of errors of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles applicable to academic writing in Humanities is predominant.
- *Consecutive Interpretation.* The consecutive interpretation demonstrates a reasonable understanding and rendition of most primary arguments and some basic secondary arguments. There is evidence of omission of detail and/or addition but no significant distortion of argument structure. Audience contact is established and maintained. The interpretation exhibits a certain number of slips of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles of consecutive interpreting is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work demonstrates through understanding of the topic, and provides a good discussion of it with appropriate examples. The work shows an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, supported by a sustained ability to use these ideas relevantly in critical practice. The argument will be clearly structured and the student has begun to develop new ideas on the texts or objects of study, revealing an ability to critically evaluate existing research in the area. There are few errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood.
- *Consecutive Interpretation.* The consecutive interpretation reproduces the overall structure of the original by rendering all primary arguments and most secondary arguments. The student is able to identify and reproduce rhetorical devices such as climatic structure or repetition. Audience contact is good and there are only a few slips in style and presentation. The interpretation demonstrates that the principles applicable to consecutive interpreting have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

- *Critical Analysis*: The work is focused and comprehensive, demonstrating a thorough and sophisticated grasp of the topic. The work is based on wide reading in a range of source materials and shows clear originality. The work goes well beyond the mere exposition of ideas, providing a sustained and lucid argument. An in-depth awareness of critical or theoretical ideas, such as those learned on the core course units, is demonstrated through relevant and consistent application in critical practice. The work demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study in a confident, directed manner, giving clear evidence of the candidate's ability to complete a research degree successfully. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.
- *Consecutive Interpretation*: The consecutive interpretation clearly renders all primary and secondary arguments and shows a high level of awareness of context. The ability to identify and reproduce sophisticated structuring and rhetorical devices is also displayed. Audience contact is established and exploited well with targeted use of notes. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the interpretation demonstrates that the principles of consecutive interpreting have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

- *Critical Analysis*: The work is excellent in every respect. It shows extensive knowledge of both the topic and the academic context(s) in which it is applied. A complex, original and relevant application of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units is demonstrated in critical practice. There is clear evidence of an ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study as the basis for identifying and defining new fields of research. The work demonstrates considerable originality and is of publishable or near-publishable quality making a significant contribution at the forefront of the discipline. The style and presentation are virtually faultless.
- *Consecutive Interpretation*: The consecutive interpretation shows sophisticated analytical and rhetorical skills on the part of the student. All levels of argumentation and information hierarchy present in the speech are rendered in the interpretation. Speaker intention and rhetorical effect are identified and interpreted in the target language with a high degree of sensitivity towards cultural and situational factors. Prosody is used in an exemplary way for rhetorical effect and style and presentation are virtually faultless. The interpretation is a prime example of the principles, techniques and devices of consecutive interpreting in practice.

A2.4. Assessment Criteria for Consecutive Interpreting

Marks below 30%

The consecutive interpretation is extremely poorly structured and delivered in an incoherent manner. Primary arguments in the source text are omitted in the target text and there is severe distortion of source text argumentation in the interpretation. There is no attempt to establish contact with the audience and clear difficulty in deciphering notes. The student requests excessive clarification of basic concepts or terms, indicating a lack of comprehension of the source text. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles of consecutive interpreting have been understood.

Marks 30-39%

The consecutive interpretation consists of a list of statements with very little attempt made to establish links between these and reproduce any kind of argument structure. There is evidence of repeated omission of basic speech elements and significant distortion of source text meaning by inversion or addition. The interpretation displays some potential to move towards a simple rendering of the topic and to reconstitute the basic argument of the source speech but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. There is very little attempt made to establish contact with the audience. Style and presentation are poor with obvious interference from the source language and there is little evidence that the principles and the purpose of consecutive interpreting have been understood, but communication does not break down completely.

Marks 40-49%

The consecutive interpretation provides a basic summary of the source text but fails to render the argumentation structure and information hierarchy satisfactorily. The interpretation lacks explicit links of logical argument and operates on a rather superficial level. Audience contact is established but not continuously exploited. There is some hesitation and backtracking and difficulty in integrating the use of notes. Style and presentation exhibit a large number of weaknesses but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to consecutive interpreting have been understood.

Marks 50-59%

The consecutive interpretation demonstrates a reasonable understanding and rendition of most primary arguments and some basic secondary arguments. There is evidence of omission of detail and/or addition but no significant distortion of argument structure. Audience contact is established and maintained. The interpretation exhibits a certain number of slips of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles of consecutive interpreting is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

The consecutive interpretation reproduces the overall structure of the original by rendering all primary arguments and most secondary arguments. The student is able to identify and reproduce rhetorical devices such as climatic structure or repetition. Audience contact is good and there are only a few slips in style and presentation. The interpretation demonstrates that the principles applicable to consecutive interpreting have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

The consecutive interpretation clearly renders all primary and secondary arguments and shows a high level of awareness of context. The ability to identify and reproduce sophisticated structuring and rhetorical devices is also displayed. Audience contact is established and exploited well with targeted use of notes. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the interpretation demonstrates that the principles of consecutive interpreting have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

The consecutive interpretation shows sophisticated analytical and rhetorical skills on the part of the student. All levels of argumentation and information hierarchy present in the speech are rendered in the interpretation. Speaker intention and rhetorical effect are identified and interpreted in the target language with a high degree of sensitivity towards cultural and situational factors. Prosody is used in an exemplary way for rhetorical effect and style and presentation are virtually faultless. The interpretation is a prime example of the principles, techniques and devices of consecutive interpreting in practice.

A2.5. Assessment Criteria for Simultaneous Interpretation + Critical Analysis

Marks below 30%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work fails to provide a competent description of the topic, and falls far short of a competent discussion. It is poorly structured and has no coherent argument. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Diploma or Master's level.
- *Simultaneous Interpretation.* The simultaneous interpretation is extremely poorly structured and delivered in an incoherent manner. Primary arguments in the source text are omitted in the target text and there is severe distortion of source text argumentation in the interpretation. There is no attempt to interpret for an audience and delivery is spasmodic with a high number of incomplete sentences. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles of simultaneous interpreting have been understood.

Marks 30-39%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work is almost wholly descriptive. It displays no awareness at all of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units. It displays some potential to move from description to discussion of the topic and to structure a basic argument derived from this descriptive approach but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. The style and presentation are poor. There is little evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in Humanities have been understood, but communication is maintained. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Diploma or Master's level.
- *Simultaneous Interpretation.* The simultaneous interpretation consists of a list of statements with very little attempt made to establish links between these and reproduce any kind of argument structure. There is evidence of repeated omission of basic speech elements and significant distortion of source text meaning by inversion or addition. The interpretation displays some potential to move towards a simple rendering of the topic and to reconstitute the basic argument of the source speech but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. There is very little attempt made to design the interpretation for the audience. Style and presentation are poor with obvious interference from the source language and there is little evidence that the principles and the purpose of simultaneous interpreting have been understood, but communication does not break down completely.

Marks 40-49%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work provides a superficial discussion of the topic but remains predominantly descriptive. It demonstrates a basic grasp of the topic but is lacking in critical or analytical insight in general. It reveals a very limited awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, and no attempt is made to use such ideas in practice. An identifiable argument is discernible but this is poorly and inconsistently sustained. The style and presentation exhibit a large number of errors but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the

Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Master's level.

- *Simultaneous Interpretation.* The simultaneous interpretation provides the basic content of the source text but fails to render the argumentation structure and information hierarchy satisfactorily. The interpretation lacks explicit links of logical argument and operates on a rather superficial level. There is interference from the source text on syntax and idiomatic expression. There is some evidence of audience design but this is not continuously exploited. There is some hesitation and backtracking and no evidence of interpreting strategies being employed. Style and presentation exhibit a large number of weaknesses but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to simultaneous interpreting have been understood.

Marks 50-59%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the topic and can discuss it competently even if it is not able to develop complex ideas in relation to this topic. There is an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units accompanied by limited attempts to use them in practice. The approach is generally unambitious, but a coherently structured argument is in place and there is an awareness of relevant secondary literature. The work exhibits a certain number of errors of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles applicable to academic writing in Humanities is predominant.
- *Simultaneous Interpretation.* The simultaneous interpretation demonstrates a reasonable understanding and rendition of most primary arguments and some basic secondary arguments. There is evidence of omission of detail and/or addition but no significant distortion of argument structure. Audience contact is established and maintained. There is evidence of emergency strategies such as compression being employed successfully. The interpretation exhibits a certain number of slips of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles of simultaneous interpreting is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

- *Critical Analysis.* The work demonstrates through understanding of the topic, and provides a good discussion of it with appropriate examples. The work shows an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, supported by a sustained ability to use these ideas relevantly in critical practice. The argument will be clearly structured and the student has begun to develop new ideas on the texts or objects of study, revealing an ability to critically evaluate existing research in the area. There are few errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood.
- *Simultaneous Interpretation.* The simultaneous interpretation reproduces the overall structure of the original by rendering all primary arguments and most secondary arguments. The student is able to identify and reproduce rhetorical devices such as climatic structure or repetition. Audience contact is good and there are only a few slips in style and presentation. There is evidence of the implementation of strategies such as anticipation. The interpretation demonstrates that the principles applicable to simultaneous interpreting have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

- *Critical Analysis:* The work is focused and comprehensive, demonstrating a thorough and sophisticated grasp of the topic. The work is based on wide reading in a range of source materials and shows clear originality. The work goes well beyond the mere exposition of ideas, providing a sustained and lucid argument. An in-depth awareness of critical or theoretical ideas, such as those learned on the core course units, is demonstrated through relevant and consistent application in critical practice. The work demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study in a confident, directed manner, giving clear evidence of the candidate's ability to complete a research degree successfully. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.
- *Simultaneous Interpretation:* The simultaneous interpretation clearly renders all primary and secondary arguments and shows a high level of awareness of context. The ability to identify and reproduce sophisticated structuring and rhetorical devices is also displayed. Audience contact is established and exploited well with strategies such as segmentation choice being implemented to achieve a well-structured target text speech. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the interpretation demonstrates that the principles of simultaneous interpreting have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

- *Critical Analysis:* The work is excellent in every respect. It shows extensive knowledge of both the topic and the academic context(s) in which it is applied. A complex, original and relevant application of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units is demonstrated in critical practice. There is clear evidence of an ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study as the basis for identifying and defining new fields of research. The work demonstrates considerable originality and is of publishable or near-publishable quality making a significant contribution at the forefront of the discipline. The style and presentation are virtually faultless.
- *Simultaneous Interpretation:* The simultaneous interpretation shows sophisticated analytical and rhetorical skills on the part of the student. All levels of argumentation and information hierarchy present in the speech are rendered in the interpretation. Speaker intention and rhetorical effect are identified and interpreted in the target language with a high degree of sensitivity towards cultural and situational factors. Prosody is used in an exemplary way for rhetorical effect and style and presentation are virtually faultless. Segmentation and décalage are employed in a sophisticated way to produce an idiomatic target text. The interpretation is a prime example of the principles, techniques and devices of simultaneous interpreting in practice.

A2.6. Assessment Criteria for Simultaneous Interpreting

Marks below 30%

The simultaneous interpretation is extremely poorly structured and delivered in an incoherent manner. Primary arguments in the source text are omitted in the target text and there is severe distortion of source text argumentation in the interpretation. There is no attempt to interpret for an audience and delivery is spasmodic with a high number of incomplete sentences. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles of simultaneous interpreting have been understood.

Marks 30-39%

The simultaneous interpretation consists of a list of statements with very little attempt made to establish links between these and reproduce any kind of argument structure. There is evidence of repeated omission of basic speech elements and significant distortion of source text meaning by inversion or addition. The interpretation displays some potential to move towards a simple rendering of the topic and to reconstitute the basic argument of the source speech but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. There is very little attempt made to design the interpretation for the audience. Style and presentation are poor with obvious interference from the source language and there is little evidence that the principles and the purpose of simultaneous interpreting have been understood, but communication does not break down completely.

Marks 40-49%

The simultaneous interpretation provides the basic content of the source text but fails to render the argumentation structure and information hierarchy satisfactorily. The interpretation lacks explicit links of logical argument and operates on a rather superficial level. There is interference from the source text on syntax and idiomatic expression. There is some evidence of audience design but this is not continuously exploited. There is some hesitation and backtracking and no evidence of interpreting strategies being employed. Style and presentation exhibit a large number of weaknesses but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to simultaneous interpreting have been understood.

Marks 50-59%

The simultaneous interpretation demonstrates a reasonable understanding and rendition of most primary arguments and some basic secondary arguments. There is evidence of omission of detail and/or addition but no significant distortion of argument structure. Audience contact is established and maintained. There is evidence of emergency strategies such as compression being employed successfully. The interpretation exhibits a certain number of slips of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles of simultaneous interpreting is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

The simultaneous interpretation reproduces the overall structure of the original by rendering all primary arguments and most secondary arguments. The student is able to identify and reproduce rhetorical devices such as climatic structure or repetition. Audience contact is good and there are only a few slips in style and presentation. There is evidence of the implementation of strategies such as anticipation. The interpretation demonstrates that the principles applicable to simultaneous interpreting have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

The simultaneous interpretation clearly renders all primary and secondary arguments and shows a high level of awareness of context. The ability to identify and reproduce sophisticated structuring and rhetorical devices is also displayed. Audience contact is established and exploited well with strategies such as segmentation choice being implemented to achieve a well structured target text speech. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the interpretation demonstrates that the principles of simultaneous interpreting have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

The simultaneous interpretation shows sophisticated analytical and rhetorical skills on the part of the student. All levels of argumentation and information hierarchy present in the speech are rendered in the interpretation. Speaker intention and rhetorical effect are identified and interpreted in the target language with a high degree of sensitivity towards cultural and situational factors. Prosody is used in an exemplary way for rhetorical effect and style and presentation are virtually faultless. Segmentation and décalage are employed in a sophisticated way to produce an idiomatic target text. The interpretation is a prime example of the principles, techniques and devices of simultaneous interpreting in practice.

A2.7. Assessment Criteria for MA Research Dissertations

Marks Below 30%

The work fails to provide a competent description of the topic, and falls far short of a competent discussion. It is poorly structured and has no coherent argument. It displays no awareness at all of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. No resubmission is permitted.

Marks 30-39%

The work is almost wholly descriptive. It reveals little awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units and makes no sustained or developed attempt to apply them in practice. The work displays some potential to move from description to discussion of the topic and to structure a basic argument derived from this descriptive approach but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. The style and presentation are poor. There is little evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood, but communication is maintained. No resubmission is permitted.

Marks 40-49%

The work provides a superficial discussion of the topic but remains predominantly descriptive. It demonstrates a basic grasp of the topic but is lacking in critical or analytical insight in general. It reveals some awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, but attempts to apply them in practice are inappropriate or confused. An identifiable argument is discernible but this is poorly and inconsistently sustained. The style and presentation exhibit a large number of errors but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Master's level.

Marks 50-59%

The work demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the topic and the discussion provides some evidence of analytical thought. The work also shows comprehension of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, but attempts to use these ideas relevantly in practice are limited in scope. The approach is generally unambitious, but a coherent argument is in place. There is an awareness of relevant secondary literature and ability to evidence assertions by reference to relevant literature/research. The work exhibits a certain number of errors of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

The work demonstrates a thorough understanding of the topic, and provides a good discussion of it with appropriate examples. The work shows an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, supported by an ability to use these ideas relevantly in critical practice. The argument is clearly structured and the students have begun to develop new ideas on the texts or objects of study, revealing an ability to critically evaluate existing research in the area. There is some evidence of potential for conducting research at a higher level, but this may not be wholly consistent. There are few errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

The work is focused and comprehensive, demonstrating a thorough and sophisticated grasp of the topic. The work is based on wide reading in a range of source materials and shows clear originality. The work goes well beyond the mere exposition of ideas, providing a sustained and lucid argument. An in depth awareness of critical or theoretical ideas, such as those learned on the core course units, is demonstrated through relevant and consistent application in critical practice. The work demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study in a confident, directed manner, giving clear evidence of the candidate's ability to complete a research degree successfully. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

The work is excellent in every respect. It shows extensive knowledge of both the topic and the academic context(s) in which it is applied. A complex, original and relevant application of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units is demonstrated in critical practice. There is clear evidence of an ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study as the basis for identifying and defining new fields of research. The work demonstrates considerable originality and is of publishable or near-publishable quality making a significant contribution at the forefront of the discipline. The style and presentation are virtually flawless.

A2.8. Assessment Criteria for Practical Dissertations (Consecutive Interpretation + Critical Analysis)

Marks Below 30%

Critical Analysis

The work fails to provide a competent description of the topic, and falls far short of a competent discussion. It is poorly structured and has no coherent argument. It displays no awareness at all of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. No resubmission is permitted.

Consecutive Interpretation

The consecutive interpretation is extremely poorly structured and delivered in an incoherent manner. Primary arguments in the source text are omitted in the target text and there is severe distortion of source text argumentation in the interpretation. There is no attempt to establish contact with the audience and clear difficulty in deciphering notes. The student requests excessive clarification of basic concepts or terms, indicating a lack of comprehension of the source text. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles of consecutive interpreting have been understood.

Marks 30-39%

Critical Analysis

The work is almost wholly descriptive. It reveals little awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units and makes no sustained or developed attempt to apply them in practice. The work displays some potential to move from description to discussion of the topic and to structure a basic argument derived from this descriptive approach but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. The style and presentation are poor. There is little evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood, but communication is maintained. No resubmission is permitted.

Consecutive Interpretation

The consecutive interpretation consists of a list of statements with very little attempt made to establish links between these and reproduce any kind of argument structure. There is evidence of repeated omission of basic speech elements and significant distortion of source text meaning by inversion or addition. The interpretation displays some potential to move towards a simple rendering of the topic and to reconstitute the basic argument of the source speech but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. There is very little attempt made to establish contact with the audience. Style and presentation are poor with obvious interference from the source language and there is little evidence that the principles and the purpose of consecutive interpreting have been understood, but communication does not break down completely.

Marks 40-49%

Critical Analysis

The work provides a superficial discussion of the topic but remains predominantly descriptive. It demonstrates a basic grasp of the topic but is lacking in critical or analytical insight in general. It reveals some awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, but attempts to apply them in practice are inappropriate or confused. An identifiable argument is discernible but this is poorly and inconsistently sustained. The style and presentation exhibit a large number of errors but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Master's level.

Consecutive Interpretation

The consecutive interpretation provides a basic summary of the source text but fails to render the argumentation structure and information hierarchy satisfactorily. The interpretation lacks explicit links of logical argument and operates on a rather superficial level. Audience contact is established but not continuously exploited. There is some hesitation and backtracking and difficulty in integrating the use of notes. Style and presentation exhibit a large number of weaknesses but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to consecutive interpreting have been understood.

Marks 50-59%

Critical Analysis

The work demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the topic and the discussion provides some evidence of analytical thought. The work also shows comprehension of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, but attempts to use these ideas relevantly in practice are limited in scope. The approach is generally unambitious, but a coherent argument is in place. There is an awareness of relevant secondary literature and an ability to evidence assertions by reference to relevant literature/research. The work exhibits a certain number of errors of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities is predominant.

Consecutive Interpretation

The consecutive interpretation demonstrates a reasonable understanding and rendition of most primary arguments and some basic secondary arguments. There is evidence of omission of detail and/or addition but no significant distortion of argument structure. Audience contact is established and maintained. The interpretation exhibits a certain number of slips of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles of consecutive interpreting is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

Critical Analysis

The work demonstrates a thorough understanding of the topic, and provides a good discussion of it with appropriate examples. The work shows an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, supported by an ability to use these ideas relevantly in critical practice. The argument is clearly structured and the students have begun to develop new ideas on the texts or objects of study, revealing an ability to critically evaluate existing research in the area. There is some evidence of potential for conducting research at a higher level, but this may not be wholly consistent.

There are few errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood.

Consecutive Interpretation

The consecutive interpretation reproduces the overall structure of the original by rendering all primary arguments and most secondary arguments. The student is able to identify and reproduce rhetorical devices such as climatic structure or repetition. Audience contact is good and there are only a few slips in style and presentation. The interpretation demonstrates that the principles applicable to consecutive interpreting have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

Critical Analysis

The work is focused and comprehensive, demonstrating a thorough and sophisticated grasp of the topic. The work is based on wide reading in a range of source materials and shows clear originality. The work goes well beyond the mere exposition of ideas, providing a sustained and lucid argument. An in depth awareness of critical or theoretical ideas, such as those learned on the core course units, is demonstrated through relevant and consistent application in critical practice. The work demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study in a confident, directed manner, giving clear evidence of the candidate's ability to complete a research degree successfully. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Consecutive Interpretation

The consecutive interpretation clearly renders all primary and secondary arguments and shows a high level of awareness of context. The ability to identify and reproduce sophisticated structuring and rhetorical devices is also displayed. Audience contact is established and exploited well with targeted use of notes. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the interpretation demonstrates that the principles of consecutive interpreting have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

Critical Analysis

The work is excellent in every respect. It shows extensive knowledge of both the topic and the academic context(s) in which it is applied. A complex, original and relevant application of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units is demonstrated in critical practice. There is clear evidence of an ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study as the basis for identifying and defining new fields of research. The work demonstrates considerable originality and is of publishable or near-publishable quality making a significant contribution at the forefront of the discipline. The style and presentation are virtually faultless.

Consecutive Interpretation

The consecutive interpretation shows sophisticated analytical and rhetorical skills on the part of the student. All levels of argumentation and information hierarchy present in the speech are rendered in the interpretation. Speaker intention and rhetorical effect are identified and interpreted in the target language with a high degree of sensitivity towards cultural and situational factors. Prosody is used in an exemplary way for rhetorical effect and style and presentation are virtually faultless. The interpretation is a prime example of the principles, techniques and devices of consecutive interpreting in practice.

A2.9. Assessment Criteria for Practical Dissertations (Simultaneous Interpretation + Critical Analysis)

Marks Below 30%

Critical Analysis

The work fails to provide a competent description of the topic, and falls far short of a competent discussion. It is poorly structured and has no coherent argument. It displays no awareness at all of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. No resubmission is permitted.

Simultaneous Interpretation

The simultaneous interpretation is extremely poorly structured and delivered in an incoherent manner. Primary arguments in the source text are omitted in the target text and there is severe distortion of source text argumentation in the interpretation. There is no attempt to interpret for an audience and delivery is spasmodic with a high number of incomplete sentences. The style and presentation are so poor as to seriously impair communication and there is no evidence that the principles of simultaneous interpreting have been understood.

Marks 30-39%

Critical Analysis

The work is almost wholly descriptive. It reveals little awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those learned on the core course units and makes no sustained or developed attempt to apply them in practice. The work displays some potential to move from description to discussion of the topic and to structure a basic argument derived from this descriptive approach but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. The style and presentation are poor. There is little evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood, but communication is maintained. No resubmission is permitted.

Simultaneous Interpretation

The simultaneous interpretation consists of a list of statements with very little attempt made to establish links between these and reproduce any kind of argument structure. There is evidence of repeated omission of basic speech elements and significant distortion of source text meaning by inversion or addition. The interpretation displays some potential to move towards a simple rendering of the topic and to reconstitute the basic argument of the source speech but it fails to achieve this in clearly identifiable respects. There is very little attempt made to design the interpretation for the audience. Style and presentation are poor with obvious interference from the source language and there is little evidence that the principles and the purpose of simultaneous interpreting have been understood, but communication does not break down completely.

Marks 40-49%

Critical Analysis

The work provides a superficial discussion of the topic but remains predominantly descriptive. It demonstrates a basic grasp of the topic but is lacking in critical or analytical insight in general. It reveals some awareness of theoretical or critical ideas such as those

learned on the core course units, but attempts to apply them in practice are inappropriate or confused. An identifiable argument is discernible but this is poorly and inconsistently sustained. The style and presentation exhibit a large number of errors but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been understood. The candidate may be permitted to resubmit (once only) and attempt to rectify faults identified if they wish to achieve a pass at Master's level.

Simultaneous Interpretation

The simultaneous interpretation provides the basic content of the source text but fails to render the argumentation structure and information hierarchy satisfactorily. The interpretation lacks explicit links of logical argument and operates on a rather superficial level. There is interference from the source text on syntax and idiomatic expression. There is some evidence of audience design but this is not continuously exploited. There is some hesitation and backtracking and no evidence of interpreting strategies being employed. Style and presentation exhibit a large number of weaknesses but there is some evidence that the principles applicable to simultaneous interpreting have been understood.

Marks 50-59%

Critical Analysis

The work demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the topic and the discussion provides some evidence of analytical thought. The work also shows comprehension of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, but attempts to use these ideas relevantly in practice are limited in scope. The approach is generally unambitious, but a coherent argument is in place. There is an awareness of relevant secondary literature and an ability to evidence assertions by reference to relevant literature/research. The work exhibits a certain number of errors of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities is predominant.

Simultaneous Interpretation

The simultaneous interpretation demonstrates a reasonable understanding and rendition of most primary arguments and some basic secondary arguments. There is evidence of omission of detail and/or addition but no significant distortion of argument structure. Audience contact is established and maintained. There is evidence of emergency strategies such as compression being employed successfully. The interpretation exhibits a certain number of slips of style and presentation but an adherence to the principles of simultaneous interpreting is predominant.

Marks 60-69%

Critical Analysis

The work demonstrates a thorough understanding of the topic, and provides a good discussion of it with appropriate examples. The work shows an awareness of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units, supported by an ability to use these ideas relevantly in critical practice. The argument is clearly structured and the students have begun to develop new ideas on the texts or objects of study, revealing an ability to critically evaluate existing research in the area. There is some evidence of potential for conducting research at a higher level, but this may not be wholly consistent. There are few errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood.

Simultaneous Interpretation

The simultaneous interpretation reproduces the overall structure of the original by rendering all primary arguments and most secondary arguments. The student is able to identify and reproduce rhetorical devices such as climatic structure or repetition. Audience contact is good and there are only a few slips in style and presentation. There is evidence of the implementation of strategies such as anticipation. The interpretation demonstrates that the principles applicable to simultaneous interpreting have been fully understood.

Marks 70-79%

Critical Analysis

The work is focused and comprehensive, demonstrating a thorough and sophisticated grasp of the topic. The work is based on wide reading in a range of source materials and shows clear originality. The work goes well beyond the mere exposition of ideas, providing a sustained and lucid argument. An in depth awareness of critical or theoretical ideas, such as those learned on the core course units, is demonstrated through relevant and consistent application in critical practice. The work demonstrates the ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study in a confident, directed manner, giving clear evidence of the candidate's ability to complete a research degree successfully. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the work demonstrates that the principles applicable to academic writing in the Humanities have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Simultaneous Interpretation

The simultaneous interpretation clearly renders all primary and secondary arguments and shows a high level of awareness of context. The ability to identify and reproduce sophisticated structuring and rhetorical devices is also displayed. Audience contact is established and exploited well with strategies such as segmentation choice being implemented to achieve a well structured target text speech. There are no substantial or recurrent errors in style and presentation and the interpretation demonstrates that the principles of simultaneous interpreting have been fully understood and internalised as good practice.

Marks above 80%

Critical Analysis

The work is excellent in every respect. It shows extensive knowledge of both the topic and the academic context(s) in which it is applied. A complex, original and relevant application of critical or theoretical ideas such as those learned on the core course units is demonstrated in critical practice. There is clear evidence of an ability to critically evaluate existing research on the object of study as the basis for identifying and defining new fields of research. The work demonstrates considerable originality and is of publishable or near-publishable quality making a significant contribution at the forefront of the discipline. The style and presentation are virtually faultless.

Simultaneous Interpretation

The simultaneous interpretation shows sophisticated analytical and rhetorical skills on the part of the student. All levels of argumentation and information hierarchy present in the speech are rendered in the interpretation. Speaker intention and rhetorical effect are identified and interpreted in the target language with a high degree of sensitivity towards cultural and situational factors. Prosody is used in an exemplary way for rhetorical effect and style and presentation are virtually faultless. Segmentation and décalage are employed in a sophisticated way to produce an idiomatic target text. The interpretation is a prime example of the principles, techniques and devices of simultaneous interpreting in practice.