Taiwan Journal of TESOL
Vol. 16.1, 67-98, 2019 DOI: 10.30397/TJTESOL.201904_16(1).0003

CHINESE-TO-ENGLISH BACK-INTERPRETING PRACTICE IN THE UNDERGRADUATE EFL CLASSROOM: TASK DESIGN AND LEARNERS' PERSPECTIVES

Yinyin Wu

ABSTRACT

Back-interpreting practice refers to interpreting the translated version of a speech back to its source language. The learning opportunities provided by back-interpreting practice can be explained by Swain's (1985) comprehensible output hypothesis, Laufer and Hulstijn's (2001) involvement load hypothesis, and Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis. In the present study, back-interpreting tasks, blended regularly into the undergraduate EFL classroom for 12 weeks, involved 43 high-intermediate to advanced learners working in pairs and interpreting the Chinese translation of English spoken discourse back into English. They then learned useful expressions from the original English discourse before discussing relevant topics in small groups. Two task types—role plays and chain games—were created to avoid monotony. Qualitative data from focus-group interviews were analyzed to understand 12 lower-level speakers' and 11 higher-level speakers' perceptions of the two task types and of the practice in general. Results showed that the format of role plays primed learners to put themselves in the listeners' shoes by focusing on the gist and avoiding literal interpretation. However, the problem of incomprehensibility still existed for some lower-level speakers, and some higher-level speakers might have slacked off by being vague, failing to exhaust their linguistic resources. On the other hand, chain games engaged learners more because higher concentration, faster responses, and language flexibility were required. The format also facilitated more collaboration and peer-learning. Back-interpreting practice exposed learners' blind spots and enhanced their awareness of native-like expressions. The practice may address the challenges of large class size and heterogeneous oral proficiency levels witnessed in EFL contexts.

Key Words: Chinese-to-English back-interpreting, materials for English oral training, task-based language teaching

INTRODUCTION

Translation, currently regarded as a communicative skill featuring pragmatic and functional use of language, can play a complementary role to communicative language teaching (CLT) (Liao, 2003). As an umbrella term that covers a wide range of classroom practices, CLT sets the developing of learners' communicative competence as its primary goal, focusing on not only linguistic forms, but meanings and functions (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Translation in a communicative language class means not going back to the old-fashioned linguistic approach that does not enhance second language (L2) learners' communicative competence, but activating learners' limited target language resources by translating "in an authentic, intelligent, and contextualized manner" (Van Dyk, 2009, p. 206). Translation and interpreting activities with a modern twist, i.e., dealing with stretches of discourse and communicative needs, can be a resourceful pedagogical tool, preventing monotony in the language classroom (Zohrevandi, 1994).

CLT is characterized by use of authentic materials and tasks for meaningful communication, as well as group and pair work that facilitates negotiation of meaning and interaction in different social contexts (Celce-Murcia, 2014). Interpreting activities featuring interactive pair work, authentic communicative contexts, and pragmatic use of language can serve as meaningful tasks in a language class, facilitating message-oriented language use. Although message-oriented teaching is the focus of current teaching approaches (including CLT), language-oriented teaching plays a supporting role (Brown, 2007). This is in line with the spirit of "focus on form", an emerging integrated approach denoting "a primarily meaning-focused instruction in which some degree of attention is paid to form" (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 281). Nation and Newton (2008) suggest that in an EFL setting, where learners' opportunities to be exposed to and to practice L2 outside the classroom are limited, less than a quarter of the classroom time should be devoted to language-focused learning.

Back-interpreting practice can be designed to involve both meaning-focused and language-focused components in teaching L2 speaking, with language-focused learning playing a supporting role. Back-interpreting practice refers to interpreting the translated version of a speech back to its source language. In the present study, with Chinese being the first language (L1), the learners worked in pairs and interpreted the Chinese translation of English spoken discourse back into English. They then learned useful expressions from the original English discourse before

discussing relevant topics in small groups. In other words, back-interpreting tasks conditioned the learners to engage in message-oriented language use before language-focused learning.

A communicative language class in the EFL context often faces the challenge of large class size (e.g., Chen & Goh, 2011). Large class size and heterogeneous language abilities in one class were found to moderately frustrate college language teachers in Japan (Sugino, 2010). Furthermore, large class size may lead to insufficient time for speaking practice and insufficient feedback from instructors. Although pair work and small group discussions can increase speaking time for individuals, it is impossible for an instructor to monitor the oral output of every student at any given time. A class with varied oral proficiency levels may also see an uneven degree of oral contribution from students. Back-interpreting practice may address these challenges by having the original English discourse serving as native speakers' feedback and by conditioning learners regardless of proficiency levels to engage in an equal amount of oral interpreting practice.

The present study aims to create back-interpreting tasks that are theoretically sound and can be regularly incorporated into the undergraduate EFL classroom and to explore learners' perspectives on the practice.

Theoretical Underpinning for Back-interpreting as a Learner Task

The learning opportunities offered by back-interpreting tasks can be explained by Swain's (1985) output hypothesis, Laufer and Hulstijn's (2001) involvement load hypothesis, and Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis.

Swain (1985) postulates the importance of comprehensible output (or pushed output) for language acquisition. According to Swain, comprehensible output serves the functions of engaging learners to use their linguistic resources meaningfully, to use alternative means to get their intentions across, to convey messages clearly, coherently, and appropriately, to test out their hypotheses to see if their expressions work, to "move from semantic processing to syntactic processing" (p. 249), and therefore comprehensible output facilitates language acquisition. Interpreting practice, with its focus on achieving communicative goals, is a form of comprehensible output. The ideas to be interpreted are usually more complicated than, or at least different from, what learners have in

mind, so learners have to stretch their linguistic resources to get the message across. Interpreting practice pushes learners out of their comfort zone because they cannot hide behind short responses and simple answers.

Back-interpreting tasks highly involve learners' motivation and cognition. Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) propose a task-induced involvement load hypothesis to explain and predict how a task can induce effective retention of unfamiliar L2 vocabulary when processed incidentally. According to the researchers, "involvement" is a motivational-cognitive construct composed of three factors: need, search, and evaluation. "Need," the motivational component, refers to learners' drive to meet task requirements. "Search" and "evaluation," the cognitive dimensions, are "contingent upon noticing and deliberately allocating attention to the form-meaning relationship" (p. 14). More specifically, "search" refers to searching for the L2 word form for a concept or searching for the meaning of an unfamiliar L2 word, while "evaluation" means assessing whether a form-meaning pair fits its context. A task including all three components means having a higher involvement load, and thus promoting vocabulary acquisition. L1-to-L2 back-interpreting is a task that encourages a high level of involvement load. Learners have the "need" to get the pre-planned messages in L1 across via "searching" for readily available L2 language items that match the intended messages while simultaneously "evaluating" the items appropriateness in a given context.

Chinese-to-English back-interpreting tasks entail having English source texts serving as native-speakers' feedback to learners. After learners exhaust their linguistic resources to convey pre-planned messages during interpreting, they read and listen to the original English discourse. Presumably, their attention would be drawn to the parts where they have encountered difficulties during interpreting, enhancing their "noticing" of useful linguistic items and structures. Schmidt (1990) proposes that noticing is essential for converting input into intake in L2 learning. Awareness is necessary for noticing, and studies have shown an association between awareness and learning (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Chinese-to-English back-interpreting practice should raise learners' awareness of the gap between their interlanguage and native speakers' English and should enhance their noticing of useful language items as well as interlingual and intercultural differences.

The above-mentioned three hypotheses—Swain's (1985) output hypothesis, Laufer and Hulstijn's (2001) involvement load hypothesis, and Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis—have been used to explained

how explicit L1-L2 contrastive instruction and translation as a form-focused activity facilitated incidental vocabulary acquisition. In Laufer and Girsai's (2008) study, 75 high school students with Hebrew as L1 were assigned to three instructional conditions: message-focused instruction, non-contrastive form-focused instruction, and contrastive analysis and translation (CAT). It was found that the CAT group significantly outperformed the other two groups on both the immediate and one-week delayed tests, in which single target words and target collocations were both tested in terms of passive and active recall of word form and word meaning. Laufer and Girsai drew on three theories to explain the CAT group's successful recall and retention of vocabulary: pushed output hypothesis (i.e., translation tasks required learners to stretch their linguistic resources), involvement load hypothesis (i.e., translation tasks strongly activated all three components of involvement—need, search, and evaluation, and thus left stronger memory traces), and noticing hypothesis (i.e., the target items became salient in the input). This experimental study showed that contrastive analysis and translation activities could be successfully incorporated into a communicative classroom because they engaged the learners' cognition and motivation more than the other two forms of instruction.

L1-to-L2 back-interpreting tasks may engage learners in similar ways by stretching their linguistic resources, engaging their motivational and cognitive aspects of learning, and raising their awareness of native-like expressions.

Interpreting in Language Teaching and Learning

Translation for the purposes of language teaching and learning has seen a revival in recent years (Laviosa, 2014). Translation can help lower-proficiency learners produce higher quality compositions (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1992), and translating witty advertisements can be a method for teaching creative writing (Laviosa, 2007). Contrastive analyses of parallel corpora may enhance learners' intercultural competence (Sidiropoulou & Tsapaki, 2014), while subtitling can raise learners' awareness of cultural, intercultural and pragmatic aspects of communication (McLoughlin & Lertola, 2014).

Interpreting in the language classroom, however, is under-practiced and under-researched. It is probably because interpreting is a highly-professional, cognitively-demanding activity that requires mastery of at

least two languages, understanding of their cultures, general world knowledge, and specialized knowledge in certain areas. Generally, interpreters are trained at the graduate level, where they have a greater command of L2, and are motivated to make a career out of it. To teach interpreting at the undergraduate level, instructors would encounter quite a few challenges, such as insufficient L2 proficiency, insufficient background knowledge, low learning motivation, and large class size (Davis & Liao, 2009).

Despite these difficulties, attempts have been made to use interpreting as an alternative in-class activity when teaching L2. For example, Zohrevandi (1994) suggests that consecutive interpreting can be conducted in groups of three, with students taking turns to be the English speaker, the L1 speaker, and the interpreter; these role plays can be recorded for subsequent analysis. Van Dyk (2009) outlines a more specific and comprehensive method to implement sight translation (a hybrid form of translation and interpretation) activities in the language classroom, highlighting the strategic component in communicative competence by teaching learners communication strategies to enhance their adaptiveness and flexibility during sight translation practice (Van Dyk, 2009).

Lee (2014) designed a set of computer-assisted interpreter training methods involving sight translation and consecutive interpreting for undergraduate EFL learners in Korea. Although the training was offered in two interpreting courses, the course goal was not about cultivating professional interpreters, but enhancing learners' English speaking and listening abilities with a focus on meaning-based communication. Lee's Korean-to-English (L1-to-L2) sight translation exercises were in the form of back-interpreting, where the short passages to be interpreted from Korean had their original versions in English. After students completed a sight translation task from Korean into English, the original English passage was shown on the screen, allowing students to compare it with their interpreting output. In Lee's opinion, "the English version immediately following students' sight translation served as the equivalent of a native speaker teacher working exclusively with the student" (p. 108). Lee's Korean-to-English consecutive interpreting exercises also had model English versions serving as private, immediate feedback. Lee observed that this form of feedback in both sight translation and consecutive interpreting exercises were "effective in lowering the affective filter of Korean students who do not feel comfortable being assessed in public" (p. 118). Questionnaire data showed that these

exercises were largely well-received by the learners.

Yagi (2000) also acknowledged the constraints of teaching English speaking in an EFL context, where there is no authentic need to use English for communication and where shy students tend to produce short responses even when they are given the chance to speak. She argued that interpreting tasks provided students with a genuine need to communicate in the foreign language. Her modified simultaneous interpreting (SI) drill effectively enhanced learners' English speaking performance on the same task. In Yagi's pretest-posttest experiment, 16 Arabic female sophomores were divided into an experimental group and a control group. Both groups listened to the same English passage, discussed its content and language use, and then retold the passage for pretest, which showed no significant difference between the two groups in terms of dysfluency, size of the word list, idiomaticity, and idea loadedness. The experimental group then drilled on SI in the form of back-interpreting of the same passage from its Arabic translation into English for 30 minutes, while the control group practiced retelling the passage in English to one another for the same amount of time. The posttest had the participants give a full recount of the same passage, and the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group on fluency, vocabulary size, idiomaticity, grammatical complexity, and idea density.

The success of the experimental group in Yagi's (2000) study may also be explained by output hypothesis, involvement load hypothesis, and noticing hypothesis. SI back-interpreting drill conditioned the experimental group participants to interpret every message without leaving out details, and therefore the drill involved the learners cognitively and motivationally more than the retelling practice of the control group, who might get away with giving a vague summary of the passage. Because no details could be left out, the experimental group participants might be more poignantly aware of the gap between their English interpreting output and the original English. To narrow this gap, they might be more motivated to pay attention to precise language items and use them in their next attempt of SI drill. On the other hand, the control group participants might feel comfortable with getting the message across with their current levels of English proficiency.

The SI drill in Yagi's (2000) study was a one-time intervention, and the drill did not involve collaborative learning. Furthermore, the learners' perspectives were not examined. There is a need to design interpreting tasks that preserve the authentic, communicative, and interactive nature of

interpreting, and that can be blended seamlessly and regularly into the communicative language classroom. This study aims to design theoretically valid back-interpreting tasks, and to explore learners' perceptions of different task types and of the practice in general. The two research questions of this study are as follows:

1. What are the learners' perceptions of the two task types—role plays and chain games—created for this study?
2. What are the learners' perceptions of back-interpreting practice in general?

METHODS

The present study is part of a larger experiment on the effects of interpreting strategy training on EFL learners' oral proficiency[1]. After receiving "interpreting strategy instruction," the participants applied interpreting strategies to Chinese-to-English back-interpreting practice.

This section will start with a description of the participants, followed by a detailed explanation of teaching materials, task design, and teaching procedure, and will end with data collection and analysis.

Participants

The 43 participants, 18 males and 25 females, were non-English-major freshmen from two intact classes (22 and 21 students each) taught by the researcher in the spring semester of 2016 at a top-ranked university in Taiwan. Both classes had the same course name with identical teaching materials, procedures, activities, and assignments.

In the subject of English in the General Scholastic Ability Test (college entrance examination), 72 per cent of the participants achieved the top scaled score of 15, while the rest had 14. Therefore, they were high-intermediate to advanced EFL learners. It should be noted that college entrance examinations in Taiwan are mainly paper-and-pencil examinations testing students' English vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, and basic writing competence. This implies that the participants might be high-achievers in reading and writing, but their

[1] Please see Wu (2017).

speaking proficiency could vary. Heterogeneous oral proficiency levels and relatively large class size often lead to challenges in teaching speaking in the EFL context. How back-interpreting tasks may address these challenges will be discussed at the end of this paper.

Teaching Materials

Materials for back-interpreting tasks in the current study featured both academic and non-academic English. Academic-oriented back-interpreting tasks were based on video recordings and transcripts of the "Justice with Michael Sandel" lecture series—one of the most popular Harvard courses available online. Sections from the lecture series featuring topics that I deemed relevant and interesting to undergraduates were selected. Each section, about 10 minutes long, contained two types of discourse styles: narrative and argumentative. The narrative part was where Professor Sandel introduced a case or a story to be discussed, and the argumentative part was where Harvard students gave comments or engaged in debates. The lecture series is an example of how English speakers structure their thoughts, elaborate on their opinions, provide counter-arguments, and express disagreements. Non-academic back-interpreting tasks were adapted from movies, reality TV shows, and documentaries. The materials for back-interpreting practice were authentic in the sense that they were long stretches of spoken discourse, mostly spontaneous, rather than unrelated sentences pulled together for the sake of interpreting drills.

With regard to the production of Chinese translation for back-interpreting practice, I either revised the readily available translation, or translated the texts from scratch myself.

Task Design

To avoid monotony, two back-interpreting task types were created: role plays and chain games. Both task types had students work in pairs (Students A and B) to maximize practice time and to enhance collaborative learning.

The content of Figure 1 is based on "Justice with Michael Sandel" Episode 5[2] on the topic of commercial surrogacy. Professor Sandel first

[2] Link to the video clip and English transcript is available at http://english-chiba-

described a case of commercial surrogate motherhood that wound up in court, followed by four Harvard students—Patrick, Evan, Anna, and Kathleen—expressing their opinions on the issue.

Figure 1 illustrates the format of role plays, which are similar to information gap tasks. Students A and B got their respective worksheets with different segments to be interpreted. (For clarity sake, the content of the worksheets in Figures 1 and 2 is shown in its original English.) Student A's worksheet contained the Chinese translation of the first half of the narration of the case (labelled Part 1), as well as Patrick's and Anna's responses (labelled 1 and 3, respectively). Student B's worksheet contained the second half of the narration (labelled Part 2), as well as Evan's and Kathleen's arguments (labelled 2 and 4, respectively). See Appendix 1 for the complete worksheets in Chinese for this role play.

Student A Worksheet	Student B Worksheet
Part 1 It began with William and Elizabeth Stern, a professional couple, wanting a baby, but they couldn't have one on their own...to bear the child, and then to give baby to the Sterns.	**Part 2** Well you probably know how the story unfolded...how many think the right thing to do would've been not to enforce that contract?
1. Patrick: It's a binding contract. All the parties involved knew the terms of the contract before any action was taken. It's a voluntary agreement... So, it makes sense that, if you know what you're getting into beforehand, and you make a promise, you should uphold that promise in the end.	**2. Evan:** Well, I mean, I agree. I think contracts should be upheld when, when all the parties have all the information. But, in this case, I don't think there is a way a mother, before the child exists, could actually know how she's gonna feel about the child... So that's my argument.
3. Anna: I also think that a contract should generally be upheld, but I think that the child has an inalienable right to its actual mother...because I think that bond created by nature is stronger than any bond that is created by, you know, a contract.	**4. Kathleen:** I disagree. I don't think a child has an inalienable right to her biological mother. I think that adoption and surrogacy are both legitimate trade-offs...you can't apply coercion to this argument.

Figure 1. The format of role plays

u.jp/youtube/contents/05.html. Link to the Chinese translation is available at http://www2.myoops.org/main.php?act=course&id=2258#lec5.

In role plays, a pair played the roles of different speakers in the video clips, as well as taking turns to be the interpreter and the listener. The interpreter had to exhaust his or her English resources to get the message across, while the listener had to listen to the interpretation and then summarize in English as a comprehension check. The pair was not allowed to peek at each other's worksheet, but to rely only on oral communication. Take Figure 1 as an example. Student A interpreted Part 1 of the case from Chinese into English, while Student B listened and then summarized in English. Student B then interpreted Part 2 of the story, while Student A listened and then summarized in English. Student A then interpreted Patrick's comment (1), while Student B listened and then summarized. Student B then interpreted Evan's opinion (2), while Student A listened and then summarized. They continued the practice in the same way with Anna's comment (3) and Kathleen's argument (4). The purpose of summarizing each other's interpreting output was to ensure that the output was comprehensible enough for the listener to get the gist. If the summary was off, the interpreter had to give it another try until the meaning was clear. Role plays were used predominantly in class.

Figure 2 illustrates the format of chain games. The content is based on "Justice with Michael Sandel" Episode 3 [3] on the topic of wealth redistribution. In the narrative part, Professor Sandel used Bill Gates and Michael Jordan as examples of wealthy people, followed by Harvard students arguing for or against the idea of taxing the rich. See Appendix B for the complete worksheet in Chinese for this chain game.

[3] Link to the video clip and English transcript is available at http://english-chiba-u.jp/youtube/contents/03.html. Link to the Chinese translation is available at http://www2.myoops.org/main.php?act=course&id=2258#lec3.

...
A: Michael Jordan is not as wealthy as Bill Gates,
B: but he did pretty well for himself.
A: His income alone in one year was $31 million
B: and then he made another $47 million
A: in endorsements for Nike and other companies.
B: So his income was, in one year, 78 million.
A: To require him to pay, let's say a third of his earnings to the government
B: to support good causes like food and health care and housing education for the poor,
A: that's coercion.
B: That's unjust.
A: That violates his rights.
B: And that's why redistribution is wrong.
A: Now, how many agree with that argument?
...

Figure 2. The format of chain games

Chain games were different from role plays in two major ways. First, both Students A and B had the same copy of the complete Chinese translation, so both of them could see the full text. Second, the layout was different. A complete Chinese sentence or half of a Chinese sentence served as one interpreting unit. Each unit was labelled A or B, indicating that the pair needed to take short turns to interpret. This layout conditioned the learners to pay close attention to what their partners said, so that they formed a complete English sentence together, or used shorter, self-contained sentences to make it easier for their partners to continue.

Chain games were created to avoid monotony and to deal with a speaking problem common to Chinese EFL learners: producing long but incomprehensible sentences. When speaking English, learners may get stuck in the middle of a sentence, not knowing how to finish what they have started due to word retrieval problems or insufficient grammar knowledge. When this happens, they may either abandon the intended message, leaving the sentence unfinished, or try to finish the sentence with a grammatically incorrect structure, resulting in fragmented and incomprehensible output. Chain games condition learners to be mindful of how they start and end a sentence, and to convey ideas with simpler and shorter sentences.

Teaching Procedure

Back-interpreting practice was blended into the weekly 150-minute writing and speaking course for 12 weeks, with 10 weeks devoted to role plays and two to chain games. The length of the practice ranged from 10 to 25 minutes each week, with 17 minutes on average.

Back-interpreting practice was regarded as Step 1 of oral training, and it was complemented by the following steps: The learners (2) watched the English video clips on which back-interpreting tasks were based; (3) read along with or repeated after the speakers in the video clips with transcripts in hand; (4) highlighted useful chunks of words on transcripts; and (5) discussed relevant topics in small groups.

Before back-interpreting practice, fun clip(s) related to the theme of the week might be played as a warm-up; however, relevant vocabulary was not taught. As part of a larger study on interpreting strategy training on EFL learners' oral proficiency, back-interpreting practice was designed to be a chance for students to apply interpreting strategies, such as paraphrasing and explaining, to get the message across without knowing the exact terms for some concepts. Furthermore, there was no time limit on either role plays or chain games. I moved on to Step 2 when I observed that most pairs had finished their practice. It also happened that back-interpreting practice usually took place 20 minutes before the break, so that pairs that needed more time to do the exercise could finish their practice and take a shorter break.

These five steps, involving both message-oriented language use and language-focused learning, correspond to output hypothesis (Swain, 1985), involvement load hypothesis (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), and noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990). Learners first engage in message-oriented back-interpreting practice by producing comprehensible interpreting output with their current English proficiency levels (Step 1), the process of which should highly involve their motivation and cognition. Through watching the original English video clips (Step 2), repeating after the speakers (Step 3), and highlighting useful expressions on transcripts (Step 4), learners should notice the difference between their English output and native speakers' English, and appropriate use of English may become salient in the process. Steps 2 to 4 are language-focused learning. Finally, learners share their own ideas on the same or relevant topics during small group discussions (Step 5), during which they may build on the arguments they have just interpreted, refer to the content they have just watched, and

use the expressions they have just highlighted. The message-oriented small group discussions are also opportunities for comprehensible output. With the two task types and this five-step procedure, learning opportunities should be sufficient.

Data Collection and Analysis

Qualitative data, collected through semi-structured focus group interviews, were analyzed to examine the lower- and higher-level speakers' perceptions of back-interpreting practice. The bottom 35% and the top 35% of the participants in each class were distinguished based on their oral proficiency informally assessed at the start of the semester; therefore, there were four separate sessions of focus group interviews—two for the lower-level speakers (12 people in total[4]) and two for the higher-level speakers (11 people in total[5]). The four separate interviews, lasting 70-80 minutes each, were conducted by me in Chinese and followed the same procedure with identical prompts to explore the learners' perceptions of the entire interpreting training. This paper only reports their comments concerning back-interpreting practice.

The qualitative content analysis of the learners' perceptions followed the four phases proposed by Dörnyei (2007): (a) transcribing the data, (b) pre-coding and coding, (c) growing ideas, and (d) interpreting the data and drawing conclusions (p. 246). Two major categories of perceptions were identified: (1) the pros and cons of role plays and chain games; and (2) how back-interpreting practice in general affected the learners' English learning. The participants' comments were translated into English by the researcher.

---

[4] A total of 15 lower-level speakers participated in the interviews. However, the comments from three participants were excluded from the analysis because a formal rating of the participants' oral proficiency conducted later showed that they belonged to the intermediate-level group. Therefore, comments from 12 lower-level speakers were included in the data analysis.

[5] A total of 14 higher-level speakers were supposed to be in the interviews; however, one did not show up. In addition, the comments from two participants were excluded from the analysis because the formal rating of the participants' oral proficiency showed that they belonged to the intermediate-level group. Therefore, comments from 11 higher-level speakers were included in the analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The learners' perceptions of the two task types will be expounded first in terms of pros and cons (Research question 1), followed by their perceptions of back-interpreting practice in general (Research question 2).

Pros and Cons of the Two Task Types

The format of role plays enhanced learners' awareness of the existence of listeners. This audience-oriented mindset encouraged interpreters to consider both the messages to be conveyed and how well the messages were received. In other words, learners started to focus on the comprehensibility of their interpreting output. Comments from three lower-level speakers showed that this audience-oriented mindset did not come naturally. Their learning process started from literal translation, struggling with finding the right words, being afraid of leaving out any message, to finally getting used to seeing the whole picture and letting go of some minor details so as to provide a more easily comprehensible output for the sake of the listeners. As Ivy (L)[6] explained:

> If I provided literal translation, others [the listeners] couldn't understand me because of fragmented messages. So [role plays] trained us to find the gist, to use a few simple sentences to cover the content of the [designated] segment.

Two higher-level speakers described how role plays were like communication training, conditioning them to be more mindful of the messages they put across, so that their listeners could understand and provide an adequate summary. As Adele (H) commented:

> I think role plays were interesting. Sometimes role plays were based on debates, so it was like having real debates with my partners. ... In role plays, both sides must understand each other, so it was a great way to train communication in English. One had to not only express oneself, but make sure that others understand so that they could respond accordingly.

---

[6] The participants' names reported in the present paper are pseudonyms, with their levels of oral proficiency being marked as L (Low) or H (High).

According to Witte, Harden, and Ramos de Oliveira Harden (2009), both language learners and translators (a broad term that includes interpreters) are faced with the task of "making sense" (p. 2), either for oneself or for a particular audience. Back-interpreting practice in the form of role plays forced learners to bear their audience in mind, facilitating the process of making sense for listeners. However, making sense might not always be achieved, as three lower-level speakers reported the problem of incomprehensibility. One addressed the issue from the perspective of the interpreter, and the other two the listeners. As Sue (L) admitted:

> I feel that [as the interpreter] I sometimes produced a long segment of interpreting output, but my partners did not seem to comprehend, so I might need more practice.

Eason (L) felt that he could not grasp the main point because he could not quite understand the interpreters' rendering. And Dave (L) admitted daydreaming as the listener:

> In role plays, a segment [to be interpreted] might be long. Although we could still come up with a summary in the end, sometimes when my partners were interpreting, I thought, "When is it going to end?!" And if I couldn't understand them at the beginning, I would space out.

One reason for comprehension failure might be fragmented literal translation provided by interpreters, usually those with lower oral proficiency. Voice interference from other groups might also compromise one's concentration. Only one higher-level speaker, Bonnie, mentioned the problem of incomprehensibility from the listener's angle. However, through her description, we can see her effort in getting the messages across as the interpreter and in rephrasing her partners' interpreting output as the listener.

> In role plays, when we saw Chinese words that we might get stuck on, sometimes we [as the interpreters] might be vague and move on, but that would lead to comprehension failures on the part of the listeners, so then we would start to use alternative ways to get the meaning across, thinking about ways to explain the ideas so that our partners could understand. We knew our partners couldn't understand us just by the look on their faces, so we would try to make sure they

> understood. Sometimes, [as the listener] I could not understand my partners' interpreting output, so I would try to rephrase the ideas [that I had heard] in accordance with my understanding as much as possible and ask for their confirmation. Sometimes I might be wrong [in my summary], and when this happened my partners would try their best to explain [the ideas] for me, so I feel this was like communication training.

Not every higher-level speaker tried as hard as Bonnie, though. Two higher-level speakers reported getting away with being vague. As Cindy (H) confessed:

> If I demanded myself to be precise and to translate every single word, [my interpreting] would be very choppy. So when my partners could not see my worksheets, sometimes I wouldn't be that accurate. I would just smoothly express [the meaning], which was a bit lazy on my part. But because we had seen examples from [professional] interpreters' performance, I felt there was nothing wrong with it. For example, I wouldn't be very specific about what kind of disaster it was. I just used the word "disaster" and moved on. I think it was not unacceptable.

Using a more general term, such as "disaster," to replace the precise term "hurricane" was an interpreting strategy taught to the learners before back-interpreting practice. During interpreting strategy instruction, the participants witnessed how professional interpreters, who were on the verge of cognitive overload at the time of simultaneous interpreting, used generalization (or being vague) when encountering word retrieval difficulties. Cindy seemed to feel guilty about not being precise, but she also understood that in back-interpreting practice, they were expected to express the sense of the messages while maintaining adequate fluency.

Chain games, on the other hand, seemed to counter the potential pitfalls of role plays. With significantly shorter interpreting units, learners were under more time pressure and had to concentrate more, thus reducing the chances of daydreaming. With both Students A and B having the same printed texts in hand, learners could not be vague and skip many details, but to engage in collaborative learning, as reported by both lower- and higher-levels speakers. They helped each other out when encountering expression difficulties, and they learned something from their partners' interpreting output.

The enhanced concentration was mentioned by three lower-level speakers and two higher-level speakers. As Sue commented:

> I like chain games more than role plays because two people took turns to say one sentence at a time. Maybe the first person produced the first half of an English sentence, but the verb was not produced yet, so I had to listen very carefully in order to add a verb in the second half of that sentence. ...so I feel it [chain games] trained us to be responsive.

Mason (H) described how the restricted format of chain games was like a controlled exercise, forcing him to concentrate more:

> Sometimes the sentence [to be interpreted] was not a complete one; it was cut in the middle, so it [the activity] forced me to listen to what my partners said. I had to pay attention to the last word they produced, so that I could keep [the sentence] going with words like "that," "where," or conjunctions. It's a bit like controlled exercise. We had to listen to what our partners said, to their grammar, and then continued from there. I think this is what makes chain games really cool.

Picking up where partners had left off could be applied to one's English speaking, as mentioned by two higher-level speakers. Mary (H) described this as follows:

> ...This [continuing what one's partner had said] can be applied to the situations where I want to express something, and I can produce a [part of the] sentence the moment I have something in mind. But to finish this sentence, I have to come up with something that can connect [what I want to say next] with what I have started with. In other words, I have to try to complete the sentence that I have just produced. So chain games are quite useful.

The shorter interpreting segments in chain games may be somewhat similar to spontaneous speech production, which tends to be "structured around short thought units or quasi-clauses based on the constraints of breath and of spoken language processing" (Hughes, 2011, p. 86). By practicing producing shorter and self-contained sentences and finishing one's partner's sentences in chain games, learners might be more adaptable when facing the constraints of spontaneous speaking.

This adaptability induced by the restricted format of chain games was mentioned by three lower-level speakers and six higher-level speakers. As Mia (L) said:

> Chain games were sentence-based, and each segment was short, so when our partners finished their designated segment, we had to quickly come up with a way to continue, so the skills of being flexible really had to be applied...

Bill (H) described how this flexibility might be useful for future jobs:

> When you saw the [Chinese] text, you probably already knew how you were going to interpret it, but your partner might not start the sentence the way you had imagined, so after you heard [his/her interpretation], you had to rethink the main point [of that particular sentence], and you had to come up with a way to continue what he/she had said. This [flexibility] can be applied to both workplace and translation. That is, [there are occasions where] what others say is not what you have in mind, and [what matters is] how you are going to cope with it, to change your way of saying things.

Another major advantage of chain games was collaborative learning. With the same printed texts in hand during chain games, learners could help each other out or brainstorm together when they encountered unknown words, whereas in role plays, Students A and B held different worksheets, so listeners could only wait politely while interpreters worked out the difficult parts themselves, leading to the possibility of daydreaming. Three higher-level speakers mentioned about how they helped each other out during chain games. As George (H) commented:

> Sometimes what I like [about chain games] was that: I might get stuck over a term in a sentence, or my interpretation [of that term] was not very precise, but sometimes my partners would give me suggestions or help me out. And then I would know how others might interpret [the same sentence], and maybe we [together] could find a better way to express this sentence.

Collaborative learning referred to not only helping each other out but also learning from each other because others' interpretations might be

different from one's own hypotheses. One lower-level speaker and four higher-level speakers mentioned how chain games allowed them to learn from their partners. Larry (L) explained as follows:

> With regard to lexical choice, our range [of vocabulary] is limited. But when we practiced with others, we heard their ways of interpretation, and we might realize, "Oh, that's how you use [those words]!"

Adele (H) had similar perception:

> We all have certain English sentences and structures that we tend to use. Through this format [of chain games], we can change a little bit, such as changing subjects or grammar, so that when we speak English, we may gradually become more resourceful and flexible, not being constrained by our usual way of speaking all the time.

Only one negative comment was associated with chain games. As Adrian (H) admitted:

> ...sometimes I didn't care what my partner had said. I just focused on my designated segments and did the interpretation, and he would accept [my interpretation]...This might have something to do with my personality and his personality; both of us were like: "Whatever."

It is possible that no matter how engaging a task might be, learners' personal factors, such as personality traits, motivation, attitude, and proficiency levels, may influence their learning processes.

In sum, the listener-oriented mindset induced by the format of role plays helped both lower- and higher-level speakers to focus on the comprehensibility of their interpreting output. Although comprehensibility could not always be achieved by lower-level speakers, some of them learned to avoid literal translation and to convey at least the gist to ensure that listeners understood. Higher-level speakers could usually convey the gist and complete the task smoothly, but the disadvantage was that they might stay within their comfort zone by skipping the details that posed potential challenges during interpreting.

On the other hand, with shorter interpreting units and a more restricted format, chain games conditioned both lower- and higher-level speakers to concentrate more, respond faster, leave out fewer details, and be more

flexible in word choice and sentence structures. With Students A and B having the same printed texts in hand, learners could assist each other to overcome expression difficulties and learn from their partners' ways of interpretation.

It seemed that role plays trained learners to see the bigger picture, while chain games induced higher involvement load, facilitating pushed output in both meaning and form more powerfully than role plays. The two task types might complement each other.

General Perceptions of Back-interpreting Practice

The practice, regardless of task types, was expected to raise learners' awareness of the form of English, such as vocabulary and useful chunks of words, via comparison of one's interpreting output with the original native speakers' English. Comments from five lower-level speakers and four higher-level speakers in group interviews confirmed the raising of awareness. Ivy (L), for example, compared the different levels of attention paid to vocabulary and expressions between the condition with back-interpreting practice and the hypothetical one without:

> If we had watched those video clips [without back-interpreting practice first], we might have heard [the message] without registering the parts [expressions] we had not yet mastered. Even if we heard those chunks of words, we still wouldn't have paid much attention to the way they were used. But after we did back-interpreting practice, we would pay particular attention to those chunks, and memorizing those chunks became easier.

For William (L), back-interpreting practice was like learning from mistakes:

> Our interpreting output might contain mistakes, but to accomplish the task, we used alternatives first, which might not be very precise, so [the process of back-interpreting] left stronger impressions in mind.

It seems that back-interpreting practice allowed learners to test out their own hypotheses of expressions before comparing their hypotheses with the "correct answers," i.e., native speakers' English. This process is in line with Swain's (1985) explanation of how comprehensible output

engages learners, who test out their hypotheses during meaningful negotiations to see if their expressions work. The two comments above also seemed to confirm Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis and Laufer and Hulstijn's (2001) involvement load hypothesis, i.e., back-interpreting practice exposed one's weaknesses and therefore made some language items salient, which in turn left stronger memory traces in learners' minds.

Adrian (H) explained how back-interpreting practice raised his awareness of his blind spots:

> If I hadn't done interpreting first, but just to repeat after the speakers and then highlight [chunks on transcripts], it would have been like doing reading comprehension exercises back in high school—you just read and underlined unknown vocabulary and useful expressions. …If I hadn't done interpreting first..., I would have assumed that I could express those ideas as smoothly as those native speakers. I wouldn't have known my blind spots. That's the biggest difference.

Cindy (H) also described how the process of back-interpreting drew her attention to the gap between her English interpretation, which was comprehensible enough, and native speakers' English:

> The largest impact interpreting practice had on me was: I knew that the English I produced was grammatically correct most of the time, that there was nothing wrong with my sentences, and that the meaning I tried to convey was the same [as those native speakers on the video clips], but native speakers just wouldn't put it this way. …If there had been no comparison [between my English interpretation and the original English], I would probably have continued to speak the same way like I used to.

The four comments above from both lower- and higher-level speakers echoed Lee's (2014) observation in his Korean-to-English computer-assisted interpreting training, in which students "seemed to have a native speaker teacher scaffolding them all the time" (p. 118). Native speakers' English sometimes was not as complicated as learners had thought. Three lower-level speakers and two higher-level speakers expressed their surprise in discovering that native speakers' English could be quite plain and simple. To describe this discovery, Clara (L) coined the expression "one scaring oneself," which resonated with two other members in that

group interview session. She explained:

> It [the English content of the video clips] was beautifully translated into Chinese…Maybe out of habit, the Chinese we produce tends to be polished as well…but the original English was actually very simple. Yet when I first read those Chinese words, I thought, "Oh no, how should I interpret this?" Actually, those concepts in English were very simple. So we could boil it [Chinese] down to its original [meaning] …we could transform the Chinese into simpler Chinese first before interpreting that [simpler Chinese] into English. The process [of interpreting] became easier that way. So sometimes it's the case of me scaring myself. [Researcher: How did that influence your English speaking?] I [later] felt less nervous when I read those [Chinese] words, because I realized those words represented simple concepts… they might be complicated terms, but they represented simple ideas that could be expressed in simple English. So interpreting and speaking became easier.

Back-interpreting practice raised the learners' awareness of precise expressions, of their blind spots, and of the mismatch between their English and native speakers' English, which sometimes was not as fancy as learners' had thought. Awareness of this discrepancy may facilitate changes of learners' interlanguage. As Gass and Selinker (2008) say, "If one is going to make modifications in one's grammar, one must first recognize that changes need to be made. Thus, readjustment of one's grammar is triggered by the perception of a mismatch" (p. 483).

CONCLUSIONS

The five-step oral training procedure featuring back-interpreting tasks in the present study was designed to involve both message-oriented language use and language-focused learning, as well as facilitating comprehensible output, involving learners cognitively and motivationally, and raising learners' awareness to the gap between their interlanguage and native speakers' English.

Qualitative analysis of focus group interview data indicated that role plays induced an audience-oriented mindset, priming the learners to see the forest for the trees, rather than producing detail-oriented literal translation at the expense of comprehensibility. However, the

disadvantage for lower-level speakers was that comprehensibility might not always be achieved. As for higher-level speakers, although they could usually convey the gist of an interpreting segment more easily than lower-level speakers, they might get away with being vague, failing to push their limits by exhausting their linguistic resources. On the other hand, chain games seemed to motivationally and cognitively engage the learners more because the format required a higher concentration level and faster responses. Chain games, similar to controlled exercises, more powerfully induced pushed output because fewer messages could be left out, and the format forced the learners to be flexible message-wise and syntactic-wise. Furthermore, chain games facilitated more collaboration and peer-learning. Back-interpreting practice in general exposed the learners' "blind spots" and enhanced their awareness of native-like expressions, which sometimes were not as sophisticated as learners had imagined.

As mentioned in the introduction, an EFL classroom may face the challenges of large class size and varied oral proficiency levels, which may lead to insufficient instructor feedback and uneven levels of participation from students. Two components in back-interpreting practice may complement instructor feedback. First, in role plays, comprehension check in the form of summarizing each other's interpreting output could be counted as peer feedback. However, since incomprehensibility may still be a problem for both interpreters and listeners, instructors may demonstrate how each interpreting segment in role plays can be summarized after pair practice. Second, the step of highlighting useful chunks of words after back-interpreting practice may serve as a form of corrective feedback. Peer feedback (via summarizing practice) and corrective feedback (via comparing one's interpreting output with the original English) may compensate for the fact that an instructor cannot monitor all students' speaking output at any given time. Furthermore, with students working in pairs in back-interpreting tasks, both high- and low-achievers can get an equal amount of practice in oral output.

For future applications of back-interpreting as a standalone practice in an EFL classroom, relevant vocabulary and its usage can be taught first, or students might be frustrated with constant word retrieval problems. As for the choice of format of back-interpreting practice, it may depend on the nature of practice materials. If the section to be interpreted involves multiple speakers having a conversation or a discussion, the format of role plays would be more authentic. If the section to be interpreted involves one speaker only, such as a TED talk or a lecture, chain games may be

used. If the course is about academic spoken English and the teacher wishes to use episodes from "Justice with Michael Sandel" for back-interpreting practice, then the narrative parts where the professor describes cases to be discussed can be practiced in the form of chain games, while the argumentative parts where the Harvard students engaging in debates can be practiced in the form of role plays. Alternatively, both formats can be used in one class session. For example, after learning relevant vocabulary, students practice back-interpreting the first time in the form of role plays, which train them to convey at least the gist. After students watch the original English video clips (Step 2), repeat after the speakers (Step 3), and highlight useful expressions on transcripts (Step 4), they may practice the same section the second time in the form of chain games, which reinforce the expressions they have just learned. Finally, they engage in small group discussions on relevant topics (Step 5) to extend what they have learned from back-interpreting practice.

The participants' comments confirmed that back-interpreting practice followed by highlighting useful word chunks raised their awareness of the form of language. However, we do not know whether these perceptions can be supported by quantifiable data on the actual use of noticed language items in speaking. To have concrete data on learners' learning processes and learning outcomes, future studies can analyze the frequency and variety of the targeted language items used in learners' weekly oral practice and end-of-term oral proficiency tests. Alternatively, recall and retention tests on targeted language items can also be implemented weekly or monthly to obtain quantifiable data on the effects of back-interpreting practice on vocabulary and collocation acquisition. A pretest-posttest experiment can also be carried out to see if regular back-interpreting practice can transform the targeted language items from input into intake and then into actual speech production in unpracticed speech elicitation tasks more effectively than the condition without back-interpreting practice. The relationships among input, noticing, intake, and actual speech production of word chunks via the route of back-interpreting practice are worth further exploration with the support of quantitative data.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2014). An overview of language teaching methods and approaches. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed., pp. 2-14). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.

Chen, Z., & Goh, C. (2011). Teaching oral English in higher education: Challenges to EFL teachers. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *16*(3), 333-345.

Davis C. M., & Liao P. (2009). Teaching college level interpretation in Taiwan. *Compilation and Translation Review*, *2*(1), 151-178.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hughes, R. (2011). *Teaching and researching speaking* (2nd ed.). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: Translation versus direct composition*. *Language Learning*, *42*(2), 183-209.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(4), 694-716.

Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 1-26.

Laviosa, S. (2007). Learning creative writing by translating witty ads. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *1*(2), 197-222.

Laviosa, S. (2014). Introduction. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *8*(1), 1-7.

Lee, T. (2014). Using computer-assisted interpreter training methods in Korean undergraduate English classrooms. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *8*(1), 102-122.

Liao, P. (2003). The study of using translation in foreign language teaching. *Studies of Translation and Interpretation*, *8*, 225-244.

McLoughlin, L. I., & Lertola, J. (2014). Audiovisual translation in second language acquisition: Integrating subtitling in the foreign-language curriculum. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *8*(1), 70-83.

Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2008). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129-158.

Sidiropoulou, M., & Tsapaki, E. (2014). Conceptualisations across English-Greek parallel press data: A foreign language teaching perspective. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *8*(1), 32-51.

Sugino, T. (2010). Teacher demotivational factors in the Japanese language teaching context. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *3*, 216-226.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Van Dyk, J. (2009). Language learning through sight translation. In A. Witte, T. Harden, & A. Ramos de Oliveira Harden (Eds.), *Translation in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 203-214). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Witte, A., Harden, T., & Ramos de Oliveira Harden, A. (2009). Introduction. In A. Witte, T. Harden, & A. Ramos de Oliveira Harden (Eds.), *Translation in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 1-12). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Wu, Y.-Y. (2017). *A study of Chinese-to-English interpreting strategy training on Taiwan college-level EFL learners' English oral proficiency* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan.

Yagi, S. M. (2000). Language labs and translation booths: Simultaneous interpretation as a learner task. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *13*(2), 154-173.

Zohrevandi, Z. (1994). Translation as a resource: Teaching English as a foreign language. In R. De Beaugrande, A. Shunnaq, & M. H. Heliel (Eds.), *Language, discourse, and translation in the West and Middle East* (pp. 181-187). Philadelphia, PA: J. Benjamins.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the editor and anonymous reviewers of the *Taiwan Journal of TESOL* for their constructive comments to help improve earlier versions of this paper. The author's sincere gratitude also goes to Dr. Posen Liao for his continuous support throughout this project.

CORRESPONDENCE

Yinyin Wu, Department of Foreign Languages and Applied Linguistics, National Taipei University, Taiwan
Email address: yinyin50@gmail.com

PUBLISHING RECORD

Manuscript received: May 4, 2018; Revision received: October 5, 2018; Manuscript accepted: November 6, 2018

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Worksheets in Chinese for role plays

Student A Worksheet

Part 1

William 和 Elizabeth Stern 夫妻都是專業人士，想要孩子，卻沒辦法自己生；Mrs. Stern 的健康狀況生小孩會有風險。他們去一家不孕症診所，診所安排他們認識 Marybeth Whitehead。Marybeth 二十九歲，有兩個孩子，先生是清潔工。她看到診所刊登的廣告來應徵代理孕母。雙方達成協議，簽了契約，William Stern 同意付 MaryBeth Whitehead 一萬美金的費用，再加上全部開銷，交換條件是，Marybeth Whitehead 同意透過人工授孕，把 Mr. Stern 的孩子生下來，然後交由 Stern 夫婦撫養。

....

1. Patrick:

這是有約束力的契約，締約的各方都清楚條款內容，然後才採取行動。這是自願性的協議，那位母親本來就知道自己在做什麼。大家都是智力正常的成年人，不管學歷高低，所以照理來說，如果你事前就已經清楚條件，也做了承諾，最後就應該要遵守諾言。

....

3. Anna:

我也認為在一般情況下，契約的法律效力應該獲得承認，但我認為小孩對生母擁有不可剝奪的權利。我認為如果母親願意，這孩子就應該享有「擁有其母」的權力，因為我認為自然生成的連結比契約所締結的連結更加牢固。

Student B Worksheet

Part 2

接下來發生什麼你們大概心裡有數：Marybeth 生下孩子後改變心意，她決定要把孩子留下來。案子進了紐澤西州的法庭。我們暫且擱下法律問題，只談道德問題。你們多少人認為在「嬰兒 M」的案例中，應該要承認契約的法律效力，並強制執行？多少人認為正確的做法是不強制執行？

....

2. Evan:

我是同意啦。我認為如果締約各方都資訊充足，就要承認契約的法律效力。但在這個案例裡，我認為母親在孩子出生前，是不可能知道她對孩子會有多少情感，所以我不認為這位母親充分知情：她還不認識即將誕生的小孩，也不知道她會多愛那個小孩，這是我的看法。

....

4. Kathleen：

我不同意，我不認為小孩對生母擁有不可剝奪的權利，我認為收養和代孕都是具有合法性的取捨，而且我同意之前同學說的：這是自願性的協議，剛剛有個人這麼說。這是自願性的協議，不能說是強迫。

Appendix B. Worksheet in Chinese for chain games

(Page 1)

A: 你們大部分會說，
B: 那麼有錢的人應該讓我們抽稅，
A: 來滿足貧民的迫切需求，
B: 貧民缺乏教育或是食物，
A: 或是缺乏像樣的住房，
B: 他們比這位首富更需要這些。
A: 如果你是一名功利主義者(utilitarian)，你會怎麼做？
B: 你會採取什麼樣的賦稅制度？
A: 你會馬上把財富重新分配，對吧？
B: 因為你知道，
A: 身為一名良善的功利主義者
B: 只拿一點點，
A: 對方幾乎不會注意到，
B: 但這將大幅提昇那些社會底層人民的生活及福利。
A: 但請記得，自由意志論者說(libertarian)
B: 我們不能就這樣把大家的喜好和滿意標準加總起來，
A: 我們得尊重個人
B: 如果他的財物取之有道，
A: 沒有違反其他任何人的權利，
B: 符合「獲取正義」（justice in acquisition）
和「轉讓正義」（justice in transfer）這兩個原則，
A: 那麼這麼做[把財富重新分配]就是不對的，
B: 拿走他的財物等同於強制。
A: Michael Jordan 雖然不像 Bill Gates 那麼有錢，
B: 但他也闖出自己的一片天。
A: 他一年光是收入就有$31,000,000
B: 然後又為 Nike 和其他公司代言，
A: 代言的收入是$47,000,000
B: 所以他一年的總收入是$78,000,000
A: 如果規定他把三分之一的收入交給政府
B: 來支持人道目標，像是食物、健康照護、居住和貧民教育，
A: 這就是強制，
B: 就是不正義，
A: 違反了他的權利，
B: 這就是為什麼重新分配是錯的。
A: 有多少人認同這個立場？
B: 為了試著幫助窮人而重新分配財富是錯誤的？
A: 有多少人不同意這個論點？

Harvard Student 1: (Page 2)

A: 我認為像 Michael Jordan 這樣的人得到了…

B: 我們談的是在社會裡工作的這個情況，

A: 他們都從社會獲得了比一般人更大的禮物，

B: 所以也有更大的義務來回饋，

A: 透過重新分配回饋社會。

B: 也就是說，你可以說 Michael Jordan 就跟那些每天在洗衣房裡工作十二、十四小時的人一樣努力，

A: 只是他得到的更多，

B: 說這一切都是憑他自己的本事，

A: 我覺得這是不公平的

Harvard Student 2:

A: 我叫 Joe，我收集滑板，

B: 我已經買了一百個滑板，

A: 我居住在一個有 100 人的社會中，

B: 只有我擁有滑板。

A: 突然間大家都決定要一個滑板，

B: 於是他們都跑來我家，

A: 拿走了我九十九個滑板，

B: 我認為這是不正義的。

A: 當然，在某些情況下，

B: 我認為有必要忽視這種不正義

A: 也許還寬恕這樣的不正義

B: 比如有人生命垂危，

A: 那這種不正義先擺一邊也許是必要的，

B: 但要記得，這樣還是在從事不公義的行為，

A: 因為我們拿走了人們的財物或資產。

B: 我認為這是不公義的。

A: 我的確認為這是偷竊行為，

B: 但也許寬恕這種偷竊行為是必要的。

A: 這是偷竊，因為…至少以我的觀點，

B: 還有以自由意志論者的觀點來看，

A: 他的財物取之有道，

B: 所以那是屬於他的，

A: 因此剝奪他的財物在定義上就是竊盜。

大學部 EFL 課堂上口譯形式的中進英回譯練習：任務設計與學習者觀點

吳茵茵
國立臺北大學

口譯形式的回譯練習，是把已經翻譯完成的演說，用口譯的方式翻回原語言。回譯練習帶來的學習機會可由以下三種理論解釋：Swain（1985）之可理解輸出假設、Laufer and Hulstijn（2001）之投入量假設，以及 Schmidt（1990）之注意假設。在本研究裡，回譯練習在大學部 EFL 課堂上固定實施，為期 12 週，參與者為 43 位中高級至高級程度的英語學習者。練習方式為兩人一組，把英語口語語篇的中文譯稿用口譯的方式翻回英語，再從英語原文當中學習實用的表達方式，最後小組討論相關議題。為了避免單調，研究者設計兩種任務類型：角色扮演及接龍遊戲。本研究採用焦點團體訪談及質性資料分析的研究方法，探索 12 位口語程度較低者與 11 位口語程度較高者對於兩種任務類型及整體回譯練習的想法。分析結果顯示角色扮演的形式促使學習者為聽者著想而著眼大意、避免直譯。然而，有些口語程度較低者仍有可能譯得令人難以理解，或聽不太懂對方的口譯。有些口語程度較高者則可能偷懶而粗略帶過，沒有窮盡自身的語言資源。另一方面，接龍遊戲讓學習者更為投入，因為必須更為專注、反應更快、語言更為靈活。接龍的形式也促進互助合作與同儕學習。口譯形式的回譯練習暴露學習者的盲點，提升他們對於道地表達方式的意識。EFL 情境裡可能遇到的挑戰為班級人數過多及學生口語程度不一，而口譯形式的回譯練習有助於教師面對這兩項難題。

關鍵詞：中進英回譯、英語口語訓練教材、任務教學法