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Abstract

Traditionally classroom instruction of simultaneous interpreting has replicated the working environment of conference interpreters (Cenková, Gile, Mackintosh, Moser-Mercer). Additionally, interpreting classes require low enrollment and are taught in special laboratories. Current financial issues faced by universities (e.g. budget cuts, program merging/closure, hiring freeze) resulted in fewer resources and thus, the need to “be creative.” The purpose of this study is to demonstrate how interpreting instructors, asked to teach simultaneous and consecutive interpreting (outside conference settings) in academic environments that do not have laboratories equipped with simultaneous booths and teacher console, have taken advantage of technology to cope with limited resources. In this paper we report on data collected during three years of teaching simultaneous and consecutive interpreting as part of a certificate in Translation and Interpreting Studies in a public university in California. The findings have implications for interpreting teaching and learning as well as for course/program design.
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Introduction

Interpreting “can be defined most broadly as interlingual, intercultural oral or signed mediation, enabling communication between individuals or groups who do not share, or do not chose to use, the same language(s) (Pöchhacker & Shlesinger 2). Simultaneous and consecutive interpreting traditionally used in conference settings (e.g. United Nations, European Parliament) are currently needed in many other settings (e.g. the courts, hospitals, churches, schools) to serve the needs of a diverse community.

International migration has increased significantly over the last few decades. People continue to move from developing countries to more developed ones in search for better job opportunities. Others go from industrialized nations to countries in transition, or developing countries as companies localize their production and continue to search for more conveniently priced labor.
This increased mobility triggers a need for interpreting in all the resulting interactions. This need, outside the traditional conference settings, resulted in the emergence of community interpreting (Carr et al; Harris; Roberts). Community interpreting is a form of language mediation that aims to meet the communicative needs of linguistic minorities who must access services in the host society and do not speak the societal language.

To meet this demand for language mediation, new Translation and Interpreting (T&I) programs have emerged, some within academia and others as training courses in different areas of industry (e.g. hospitals or telephone companies (Language Line Services)). Within Academia, interpreting courses or programs have been housed in Foreign Language Departments (Hague; US College Search), or in the Departments of Communication (e.g. University of Maryland), Comparative Literature (e.g. University of Massachusetts at Amherst) and some in their own departments (e.g. Monterey Institute of International Studies). According to the survey of the American Translators Association, there are university programs in T&I in 71 countries: 12 in Belgium (seven of which are CIUTI members), 54 in Brazil, 14 in Canada (1 CIUTI), 18 in China, 12 in Colombia, 33 in France (2 CIUTI), 26 in Germany (5 CIUTI), seven in Mexico, 30 in Spain (2 CIUTI), 28 in the United Kingdom (4 CIUTI), and 56 in the United States (CIUTI) (ATA). Another study published on TISAC.COM counts up to 103 programs in the United States going from “various translation classes” at Utah Valley University, a “Summer Translation Institute” at Western Michigan University, a Certificate in medical interpreting at New York University (SPCS), a “Certificate in Translation and Interpreting” at San Diego State University and many others, to an MA in Translation and Interpretation or Conference Interpretation at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, and a Ph.D in Translation Studies from Kent State University (TISAC 1). This shows that programs vary in content, duration and recognition as part of academic offerings or training on tricks of the trade in industry.

Some of these new programs/courses are devoted to preparing interpreters beyond the conference setting that was the goal of the first and more traditional curricula. These new interpreting programs offer more variety to account for the needs of the growing language industry. For example, aiming to develop general skills that can be applied to various types of interpreting (e.g. medical, community, court), some courses teach students about cross-linguistic communication and ways of speaking in the courts, the schools, the community or the hospital. These new offerings also answer the MLA call to re-conceptualize the study of foreign languages (MLA) and the principles of the New Standards for Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages in the 21st Century (ACTFL). As a result, an increasing number of schools and universities are eager to attract a variety of bilingual students and heritage
speakers and add to their traditional language offerings new courses relevant to the demands of the job market.

Certificate Program in Translation and Interpreting at SDSU

This program, housed in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese Languages and Literatures, mostly focuses on the acquisition of skills needed to interpret and translate and provides students with a brief background on T&I theory. It offers two concentrations: translation and interpreting (English-Spanish) and requires the completion of 15 units (Spanish & Portuguese Department).

To be admitted to the certificate students have to demonstrate a degree of bilingualism and literacy to work with the two languages. Pre-requisites in writing for both Spanish and English are demonstrated by a grade of B or better in Rhetoric and Writing Studies 305W (or by passing the Writing Proficiency Assessment with a score of 10 or above), and Spanish 301 (Advanced Conversation and Reading), 302 (Advanced Conversation and Writing), and/or 350 (Advanced Spanish Grammar). In addition, students must complete an interpreting skills admission test over the telephone consisting of three short tasks with a grade of B or better. The students who do not meet the pre-requisites have to take a home 4-hour admission exam to determine their proficiency levels in both English and Spanish. After they have been admitted, students take the five courses of the Certificate which can be done in two semesters:

- SPAN 491 Introduction to Translation Studies (3 units)
- SPAN 492 Translation Theory (3 units)
- SPAN 493 Advanced English-Spanish/Spanish-English Translation (3 units)
- SPAN 594A Consecutive English-Spanish Interpretation (3 units)
- SPAN 594B Simultaneous English-Spanish Interpretation (3 units).

Students must complete the 15 units with a GPA of 3.0 or better. Upon completing the 15 units of coursework, students take a departmental comprehensive examination to receive the certificate.

The T&I certificate at SDSU does not to prepare students to work in a specific setting (e.g. to work in the courts, hospitals, schools or conferences). The student-learning outcomes of the certificate focus on basic skills needed to perform interpreting tasks regardless of the setting.

The Study

The study took place over six semesters in a period of three years between 2010 and 2012. Using a questionnaire (see Appendix 2), data was collected
at the end of each semester in the two interpreting classes of the Certificate in T&I, namely SPAN594A Consecutive Interpreting and SPAN594B Simultaneous Interpreting.

**Materials and Procedures**

The material used in this study was a questionnaire specially designed for the students taking consecutive and simultaneous interpreting courses. It has two main goals: 1) to investigate which technology the students believe had contributed most to their learning, and 2) to learn which of the different types of materials used in class the students found most conducive to foster their learning. The questionnaire (see Appendix 2) had eight items. The first five targeted social factors to obtain background information on the students (e.g. gender, age, interpreting experience). The last three questions were designed to elicit information on the usefulness of technology and materials and their impact on students’ learning. Students completed the questionnaire during the last session of each semester in electronic format and uploaded it as they had done with previous assignments.

**Participants**

Most of the participating students are SDSU graduates and undergraduates. In addition to Spanish, students come from Business, Nursing, and Education. Others are individuals from the community who enroll through Extended Studies. Some are heritage speakers, others learners of Spanish as L2. They vary in their language proficiency and degree of bilingualism (e.g. some are balanced bilinguals and others are English dominant). Most of them are first generation university students. Their motivation for taking the courses and learning interpreting varies: some want to help their communities; or to advance in their place of employment; and others need a class to fulfill a language requirement and finish their bachelor’s degree.

**Setting**

The interpreting classes are taught once a week for three hours in the evening to accommodate work schedules. The classes meet in a general language laboratory equipped with Mac computers. Such a lab has many advantages over a regular classroom (with none or very limited technology) or a smart classroom (equipped with one computer with access to internet and with projecting capacity). The Mac lab has 32 stations that allow various configurations (individual, pair or groups of 4/6) to meet the needs of programs and instructors. As one can see in Picture 1 below, the stations are close to each other, which sometimes results in distractions as students can hear each other’s renditions. To minimize this, all stations have a Logitech USB Clear Comfort headset and are set up to maximize recording quality, both audio and video.
Innovation: Implementing Technology to Teach Interpreting Skills

In simultaneous interpreting we teach students to concentrate and listen actively to a message, process the information, and speak at the same time as they listen to the message they are interpreting. In the consecutive interpreting class, students also must concentrate, listen actively, and process the information, but they add the component of note-taking as the rendering does not happen simultaneously. Instead the interpreted rendition occurs after the speaker has uttered the original message. Traditionally interpreting is taught in specialized laboratories where all students can perform at the same time and instructors can offer individual feedback simultaneously, without interrupting performance of the whole group. Given that access to such a laboratory was not possible, we explored technological solutions to emulate specialized interpreting classroom settings.

In our study, both the simultaneous and consecutive interpreting classes were taught using the following technology:

- Moodle (see Appendix 3)

Moodle (Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment) is a software that resides on a university server and is set up by the instructor as a specific class for the whole semester. As students take their places to participate in the course, they first log in with their student ID and the number of their computer station to the Moodle class. They do not need to use the same stations every week. The Simultaneous and consecutive Interpreting classes on Moodle consist of 16 weekly meetings. For each week, the instructor uploads materials and creates activities and students record and upload their
interpreting practice corresponding to each activity. Examples of activities are audio or video files of speeches, interviews, discussions that the students open on their workstation, record their interpreting, and upload to Moodle.

• **Elluminate Live (see Appendix 3)**

On the first page of the Moodle classroom there is a link to Elluminate Live. This is a web conference program that allows for all connected parties to listen to one another and to the instructor. Using Elluminate Live, the instructor presents the topic of the exercise in which the students are going to interpret (e.g. obesity), followed by students’ discussion on specialized content and terminology. In this way, students brainstorm and prepare the topic together before they start interpreting.

• **Sound Studio (see Appendix 3)**

Sound Studio is a recording program that allows for recording, editing and producing an audio file. The students record their renditions of the exercise presented to them. At the end of the recording the students save their file in a MP3 format and upload it to the Moodle class. All uploaded recordings can be used in class for discussion to illustrate issues. In addition they are available for the instructor who can make comments and grade the students’ performance.

• **Listentech Portable Equipment (see Appendix 3)**

Sometimes in simultaneous interpreting classes the instructor uses a portable interpreting equipment from Listentech.com. This allows students to listen to a speech presented by another student, an invited guest, or the instructor and record their interpreting directly on Sound Studio (see Appendix 4). The advantage of the portable equipment is that it uses short waves, meaning that the sound goes directly into the students’ headsets. This avoids the buffering and some minor sound distortion caused by the fact that the sound has to go up to a web-based server such as Elluminate and then come back to the students’ headsets. This portable equipment is commonly used by professional interpreters on field trips/visits, allowing students to practice with authentic professional equipment that they will use once they graduate. The drawback of using this portable equipment often is that only one student (the “interpreter”) can work at a time. This is, however, good for feedback on performance, as the whole group comments on the only student performing.
A Typical Simultaneous Session

This data comes from week eight of the Fall 2012 Simultaneous Interpreting course. To give students time to prepare and emulate a professional environment where meeting topics are known in advance, topics are announced at least one week in advance. The topic for Week eight was obesity. The class consisted of one presentation made by the instructor (obesity in the world), four students’ presentations (TV program for weight loss; dietician recommendations to eat healthy; child obesity and obesity in Mexico), and a video presentation entitled “Obesity in the US” presented by the former Surgeon General, David Satcher. This video had been uploaded on Moodle previous to week 8.

Asking students to present on a topic gives them the opportunity to use their public-speaking skills as they perform in front of the class. Some brought a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate their speech, others had written notes but they were not allowed to read from them. Instructor and students’ presentations were preceded by a group brainstorming exercise to anticipate the content of each of them. When the presentation was in Spanish, the brainstorming exercise was done in English, and vice versa. The goal of this anticipation exercise was to activate the lexicon and specific terminology. Before students started interpreting the video, they also brainstormed on its content to activate some more terminology then, they listened together to some segments (the first six minutes). Listening to the first segment was followed by a discussion on terminology and concepts that the students had identified as potential difficulties for their interpreting performances (e.g. they did not know how to express the difference between overweight and obesity). After this discussion the same segment was re-visited, but this time it was broken into smaller units containing a couple of ideas. The instructor appointed a student to interpret each of these smaller segments immediately after the discussion. As a big group, using the connectivity on Elluminate Live, students and instructor gave feedback to the student performing that particular short segment. For this part of the exercise the video recording was broadcast through the lab loudspeakers and shown on a screen. The class did this exercise until they reached the end of the six-minute segment. Students were then ready to go back to the beginning of the tape and interpret the first 10-12 minutes, half of which had already been discussed and the other half had not. For this longer segment, students no longer heard the incoming video on loudspeakers. Instead, each student interpreted the video residing on Moodle at his/her station using his/her individual headsets. The students recorded all the segments of their interpreting exercises using Sound Studio. Once the recording was complete, the students saved it on their desktop before uploading it to Moodle as one of the activities for the day.
As reported by students, one of the main advantages of this system was that all were working at the same time. They were involved. One drawback reported by the instructor was that he did not have the possibility to listen to the original and the students at the same time. The only feedback possible from the instructor was to play a recorded exercise on the loudspeaker once it has been uploaded on Moodle and comment on the performance of one for the benefit of all students. Not all students enjoyed having their performances broadcasted and their weaknesses singled out.

Results

*Question One* is asking for the name of the participant and is not required.

*Question Two: Sex Distribution*

A total of 81 students (68 female/13 male) in the simultaneous interpreting class and 102 students (77 female/25 male) in the consecutive interpreting class participated in the six-semester study (see Graph 1: Female/Male ratio). This ratio is consistent with the characteristics of the population of practicing interpreters (Angelelli).

![Graph 1: Female/Male ratio](image-url)
Question Three: Age Group

In terms of age, 53% of students reported to be between 18-25 years, 22% between 26-30 years, 17% between 31-35 years, 6% between 36-40 years, and 2% over 40 years (see Graph 2: Age Distribution)

Question Four: Interpretation Experience

In terms of previous experiences in interpreting, of the 102 students in the consecutive class, 64 had no experience, 35 had less than one year (usually some informal interpreting at their place of work or for their families), and three had between one and three years of experience in interpreting in their workplace. In the Simultaneous Interpreting class, 53 students reported no experience, 25 less than one year, and three between one and three years of experience in their workplace (see Graph 3: Experience in Interpreting)
In terms of motivation (Question Five) students fell into three categories: those who wanted to have interpreting skills to help their families (46%), those who wanted to advance in their place of employment (36%) and those who needed to fulfill a language requirement (18%).

**Question Six: Ranking of the Type of Materials used in the Class.**

Following the organization of materials offered by Pöchhacker, materials were divided in three main categories according to the mode of delivery: live, video, and audio. The students were asked to rank the materials on a scale from one to five (one being the least favorite and five the preferred one) (Pöchhacker, “Teaching Practices”). The materials presented “live” consisted of seven different types (see Graph 4: 1 to 7). Those were: 1) a written text read by the instructor, 2) an impromptu presentation made by the instructor, 3) a written text read by a student, 4) an impromptu presentation made by a student, 5) an invited guest, 6) a written text “oralized” by a student, 7) a written text “oralized” by the instructor (an “oralized” text is a written text that is presented as if it were an oral presentation, the person presenting it is using the text as the base of information to talk about the topic of the text rather than reading it verbatim). The next category of materials was the videos (see Graph 4: 8-10). They consist of (continuing from previous numbers): 8) the recording of an invited guest who speaks in an impromptu
way, 9) presentations made during a real conference, and, 10) a panel
discussion of experts broadcast on the Internet. Finally, the audio materials
(see Graph 4:11-15) were: 11) an audio recording of a text/speech read by
the instructor or a student, 12) an audio recording of a presentation made
at a conference with the text of the recording available to be used as sight
interpreting (i.e. when the interpreter has the written document in advance
and can use it during the oral presentation for reference), 13) a recording
of a radio broadcast consisting of an impromptu discussion,14) an audio
recording of a presentation at a conference, and 15) an audio recording of a
student presentation from a previous semester. In order to help the students
understand what each category represents, one column entitled “Example
of texts/speech” was added. It gives an example of the texts/speeches that
were used for each category on a specific semester. Appendix 3 shows the
Questionnaire with the examples corresponding to the fall 2012 Simultaneous
class (SPAN 594B).

Graph 4 shows the results of students’ rankings of the materials. Students
reported a strong preference for live speeches over video and audio ones.
In addition they preferred audio to video. They ranked live materials (such
as Live speech read by teacher: column 1; Live impromptu presented by
teacher: column 2; Impromptu discussion on Internet, video format: column
10; Impromptu audio broadcast: column 13) and invited speaker (column 5)
presentations. They rejected artificial situations such as a text oralized by the
teacher (column 7).

Graph 4: Types of Material used in Teaching Interpreting
Question seven: Which technology used in class do students prefer?

The students were asked to rank the technologies used in class (ranking them from one, least favorite, to five, the preferred choice). The goal was to see if students could identify how the different technologies supported each of the skills learnt for interpreting (e.g. anticipation, active listening, delivering). The results did not show any clear preference for one technology over another. All students reported the use of technology helped their learning. Graph 5 shows the averages for the rankings of all participants.

Graph 5: Use of Technology

Question Eight: How Technology has Helped Students Improve in the Different Tasks Needed for Interpreting?

Students were asked how the use of technology in the classroom has improved the way they 1) prepare a topic; 2) build terminology; 3) receive feedback, and 4) improve their interpreting skills using a scale (Not at all, A little bit, Somewhat, Quite a bit, Very much). Of the 183 participants, 94% reported technology improved from somewhat to very much the way they prepare a topic; 69% their terminology building; 84% the feedback they received from the instructor, and 66% their overall interpreting skills (see Figure 1 and Graph 6). As unsolicited additional comments students reported technology had made the teaching and learning of interpreting skills more fun, even though very challenging. Table 1 illustrates the breakdown of the
183 responses in percentages and graph 4 shows a graphical representation for easy comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in %</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a topic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build terminology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive feedback</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve your simul skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Impact of the use of Technology (in %)

Graph 6: Impact of Technology
Discussion and Conclusion

Unlike traditional classes of interpreting in which each student works from an isolated booth, this study was conducted with all participants sharing a lab/classroom. As we have seen in the description of the setting, being in the same room has some advantages as all students benefit from feedback given by instructors. It became clear, however, that because some students were not used to performing in public and receiving feedback in front of the group, this format calls for student training to avoid feelings of face-threatening. A considerable advantage of the use of technology is that the 32 stations could be anywhere in the world as long as there is an internet connection. This lends itself to remote teaching of interpreting. In the teaching environment where this research was conducted technological developments, such as recording capacities and communication software used together with internet access have challenged traditional views on teaching simultaneous and consecutive interpreting.

As more schools and universities are educating interpreters to meet the various needs for court, medical, over-the-phone, community interpreting, this article has demonstrated how technology can be used to teach interpreting in the absence of traditional interpreting laboratories. The results of this study show that the use of various technologies to teach both consecutive and simultaneous interpreting (such as Moodle, Elluminate Live, Sound Studio, Internet, and portable equipment ) allows all students enrolled in a course to work at the same time while receiving some feedback from each other and from the instructor. Students’ responses indicate that they value technology and they believe it contributes to their learning.

More importantly, as universities are considering virtual learning environments, the type of technology described in this article allows for remote teaching and learning. The courses described in this article could be used in a variety of programs delivered in urban or rural sites, targeting individualized or group learning.
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NOTES

1 CIUTI: CIUTI is the French acronym for the international association of university institutes with translation and interpretation programs. It was initiated in 1960 and has currently 42 members in 19 countries.
Appendix 1: Certificate in Translation and Interpreting - SDSU

Requirements for the Certificate:

1. Prerequisites: RWS 305W, and either Spanish 350, Spanish 381, or Spanish 391. In case you do not have the prerequisites, you will have to show an equivalent level in both English and Spanish demonstrated by Entry Test (to be arranged with Program Director).


Upon completing the 15 units of coursework, the student must take a departmental examination for the certificate. Upon successful completion of the examination, the student will be awarded the certificate. Up to nine units in the certificate program may be counted toward the major in Spanish and six units may be counted toward the minor in Spanish.

Here is the link to our website for the Translation & Interpretation Program requirements: http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/dept/spanish/

Please see department web page for complete information – http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/dept/spanish/undergraduate/certificate.htm
Appendix 2: Student Questionnaire (Fall 2012)

Simultaneous Interpreting
Modes of input

Dear Students,
I would like to have your input on the Simultaneous course and the use of technology in that course.
I would appreciate if you could turn this back to me in the next 2 days.
[Please highlight in color ALL the options that apply to you. Your name will be kept confidential]

1) Name: _______________________________

2) Sex:
   Male
   Female

3) Age group:
   18-25
   26-30
   31-35
   36-40
   Above 40

4) Interpretation Experience:
   A: No Experience
   B: Less than 1 year
   C: 1/3 years
   D: 3/5 years
   E: Over 5 years

5) Motivation for taking the course. Describe your main reason why you took the Simultaneous Interpreting course.

_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
6) Please rank the following material used in our class. I have indicated an example for each in the second column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of texts/speeches</th>
<th>Student’s preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five most frequent modes of input presentation</strong> [1 is the least preferred and 5 the preferred mode]. Numbers can’t be repeated. <strong>Mark only 5 boxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘live’ in class:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written text read by teacher</td>
<td>-Non-communicable diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impromptu by teacher</td>
<td>-Health and obesity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written text read by student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impromptu by student</td>
<td>-Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invited lecture</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text oralized by student</td>
<td>-Ocean Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text oralized by teacher</td>
<td>-Least Developed Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video material</td>
<td>invited lecture rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio material</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference rec</td>
<td>PROE conference on Marine Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/Internet broadcast rec.</td>
<td>WHO Margaret Chan at Davos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio recording of text read on tape by teacher /someone else</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio recording with text on tape</td>
<td>Honjo: Psychology of child and adolescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio recording of radio broadcast</td>
<td>Mexican Health system - Español en el mundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio recording of conference proceedings</td>
<td>Akio Morita from Sony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording of presentation</td>
<td>Terrorism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7) Please indicate which technology used in class you prefer. *Five most preferred technologies [1 is the preferred one and 5 the least preferred]. Numbers can’t be repeated.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Student’s preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moodle</td>
<td>Uploads recording on server for file exchange and correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elluminate</td>
<td>Allows direct reception of sound from source [microphone/computer] into headset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable simultaneous Equipment</td>
<td>Allows direct reception of sound from source [microphone] into headset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Studio</td>
<td>Allows recording and safeguarding of audio files on computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Allows access to listening, recording and safeguarding software, as well as internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [please specify]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Has the use of technology improve the way you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve your simultaneous interpreting skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ___________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
Appendix 3: Technology used in the Interpreting Courses at SDSU

- **Elluminate Live!** is a web conferencing program developed by Elluminate Inc. Elluminate "rented out" virtual rooms or vSpaces where virtual schools and businesses can hold classes and meetings.

  ![Elluminate Live!](image1)

- **Moodle** (abbreviation for Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment) is a free source e-learning software platform, also known as a Course Management System, Learning Management System, or Virtual Learning Environment (VLE).

  ![Moodle](image2)
Our Simultaneous Interpreting Class on Moodle

Recording Software: SoundStudio

Record, edit, and produce your audio
Portable Equipment from Listentech.com