An "Eye-Opening" Learning Experience: Language Learning through Interpreting and Translation

Masato Takimoto
(Masato.Takimoto@arts.monash.edu.au)
Monash University, Australia

Hiroko Hashimoto
(Hiroko.Hashimoto@arts.monash.edu.au)
Monash University, Australia

Abstract

This study investigates the learning experiences of university students who studied advanced-level Japanese through interpreting and translation. In particular, it looks into the reasons why students generally evaluate their learning experiences positively, utilising the concept of Intercultural Language Learning proposed by Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino and Kohler (2003) as a theoretical framework. The interview discourses of 10 volunteer students who were enrolled in the subject show that students are engaged in active learning through interpreting and translation activities. Interpreting and translation encourage learners' 'intercultural exploration,' which in turn promotes a deeper understanding of both L1/C1 and L2/C2. In addition, interpreting and translation require learners to work within various constraints, which actually encourages intercultural language learning among students. Furthermore, the study indicates that the students felt that they acquired various skills including "cognitive skills" (The Asian Languages Professional Learning Project [ALPLP], n.d.). We therefore argue that interpreting and translation are suitable for language teaching at the university level.

1 Scope of the paper

This paper examines the benefits of using interpreting and translation in Japanese language teaching at the university level. The subject under investigation is taught at an advanced level at an Australian university, and utilises interpreting and translation as core activities. A pilot study (Takimoto & Hashimoto, 2008) based on the analysis of the subject evaluations of 58 students and interviews with eight past students clearly indicated that an overwhelming number of learners evaluated language learning through interpreting and translation positively. In particular, the study revealed that students valued frequent interactions and the relevance of the materials as being most enjoyable and beneficial. It was also found that students engaged in the cyclical process of noticing, reflection and output. However, we feel that many teachers in language subjects at any level will surely attempt to make materials relevant, as well as to introduce interactive activities as much as possible. Nevertheless, even when compared with the other subjects which we ourselves teach, the degree of students' satisfaction with these aspects in this particular subject seemed to be rather striking.

This led us to speculate that students might have experienced something significant that is different from their experiences in other language subjects, while at the same time they enjoyed inte-

ractions and relevant materials per se. And as a result, active interactions and materials used in class may have accelerated students' active learning. Therefore, the main objective of this paper is to further investigate the reasons for students' satisfaction in depth, by closely examining the nature of the students' experiences. To this end, we investigate what the students thought they were learning through participating in the interaction and by using the relevant materials, based on an analysis of the interview discourses in detail. Our assumption, based on the findings of the pilot study, was that students were in fact engaged in "deep learning" (Biggs & Tang, 2007) by undertaking the interpreting and translation activities. As the discussion below shows, the interview data support this hypothesis. We will, therefore, argue that interpreting and translation can be powerful tools for language learning. In more specific terms, in order to support our position, we will investigate the following aspects: the reason why students view their experience favourably; the reason why students engage in learning; and the reason why students see this subject to be different from other language subjects.

2 Review of the literature

Translation has been utilised for a long time as a means of second language teaching (Fotos, 2005, p. 268). However, in recent times, translation has been considered to be an outdated method to be used in class, probably because of its association with the earlier *grammar-translation* approach. At the same time, the use of the first language (L1) in class has also been criticised and discouraged in some circles. However, translation can indeed be used in class "more imaginatively" to complement the direct method (G. Cook, 1998, p. 119). Moreover, G. Cook (2007) maintains that translation is useful in language teaching, because of its cognitive, pedagogical, and functional benefits. Interestingly, he also points out that there are few research studies to prove such usefulness. The number may be limited but there are some prior studies which have investigated the benefit of translation in language learning, albeit they are usually limited to translation (written) and do not touch upon interpreting (spoken).

For example, Uzawa (1997) investigated the usefulness of a translation task for second language (L2) acquisition. The study was based on the analysis of 21 Japanese ESL learners' use of L1, especially the process of translation and its effect on L2 production. She utilised think aloud protocols in an experimental setting where each participant was asked to undertake a translation task of a short Japanese text into English. The study concludes that the learners generally do not produce literal translations and that translation is indeed useful for language learning because learners use L2 more 'generatively' and 'creatively' in the task. However, the study was based on one translation task. Furthermore, it only discusses translation at the sentence level, or at the passage level at best, rather than understanding translation within the wider context (i.e. genres, functions, intercultural communication etc.). Tudor (1987) reports the usefulness of translation tasks, based on his own teaching experience. The study focused on two types of activities (oral presentation and text study-discussion) which involved translation (German into English). These activities were used to teach English for Specific Purposes to adult business people and academics. He maintains that learners' L2 production ability can be 'stretched' by utilising translation. At the same time, he argues that it promotes more awareness of learners' own L2 capability. In the context of university level language teaching, Machida (2008) discusses the effectiveness of using translation in a university Japanese language class of 26 students by utilizing a questionnaire survey as well as analysing tests. Her study indicates that it is worthwhile to consider the inclusion of translation as a useful teaching method. The study by Machida was based on a subject for advanced learners who had completed core subjects at an Australian university. Consistent with Machida's view that translation is suitable for advanced-level subjects, Snell-Hornby (1985) maintains that translation requires such a high level of proficiency that its introduction at the early stage of language learning is not supported. The subject under investigation in this paper is also offered at the advanced level, as explained below. Unlike the prior studies mentioned here, the focus of this paper is placed upon the dynamic learning process of students. This study also looks into in-

terpreting which has not been sufficiently documented in the area of foreign language teaching to date.

Due to the nature of interpreting and translation, learners are inevitably required to use both L1 and L2 in class. (Note that the term L1 here refers to English and L2 to Japanese, but because of the diversity of the student body, L1 for many students is not actually English.) Although it is often considered that the use of L1 in language class should be avoided, some studies suggest that L1 use even in non-translation activities can be beneficial for language learning. Swain & Lapkin (2000), for instance, examined the use of L1 (English) in a pair work task of 22 pairs of grade eight students in a Canadian L2 (French) immersion class. They maintain that L1 functions as an important communication tool at the cognitive and social levels. It enables students "to focus attention on language form, vocabulary use, and overall organisation" (Swain & Lapkin, 2000, p. 268), as well as promotes collaboration between students. Similarly, V. Cook (2001) emphasises various useful ways to use L1 in class. In particular, L1 can provide scaffolding for students to help each other. As discussed below, our position is also that use of both L1 and L2 promotes learners' learning at least for the group which we are focusing upon. In any case, it is inevitable that interpreting and translation activities require learners to consider both L1 and L2.

3   Theoretical framework

In this paper, we utilise *Intercultural Language Teaching* (ILT) (e.g. Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003) as the main theoretical framework. First and foremost, ILT promotes the integration of the notions of culture, language and learning. In other words, these three aspects not only complement each other, but also generate synergy. The following four activities are considered to be fundamental: the teaching of linguaculture or links between language and culture; the comparison between the learner's first language/culture and target language/culture; intercultural exploration; and finding one's own "third place" between cultures (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003, p. 24). The framework was initially developed to enhance LOTE (Languages other than English) class activities in Australian schools. Our study is an attempt to apply this framework to a university-level subject.

One of the most important aspects that require attention is that ILT rejects the notion of the "native speaker" norm as unrealistic, and instead advocates a "bilingual speaker" as the norm. In other words, the ultimate goal for a learner is not to become a native speaker of L2 but to become a competent bilingual speaker who is comfortable dealing with the people and culture where L2 is used. Such a bilingual speaker is only possible if the learner deeply understands not only the target language and culture, but also his/her own language and culture. This further implies that ILT places emphasis on learners' native language and culture (C1). That is to say, it is deemed critical to actively compare L1/C1 and L2/C2 (target culture). Therefore, "intercultural exploration" is considered to be indispensable for ILT. More concretely, active participation, which enables a learner to notice and reflect differences and similarities between L1/C1 and L2/C2, is regarded as crucial. Learning is accelerated by going through a back-and-forth "intercultural" interaction across languages and cultures. Pedagogy for ILT is based on the following five principles, which are: (1) active construction; (2) making connections; (3) social interaction; (4) reflection; and (5) responsibility (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003, p. 64–65). Another important aspect is that ILT values the development of cognitive skills, including problem-solving and critical and analytical thinking (ALPLP, n.d.).

4   Method of study

In this paper, we utilise the interview discourse which was collected through semi-structured interviews with volunteer students. The interviews were conducted in 2007 by one of the researchers during the teaching semester, while the other taught the subject. Due to the university research ethics requirements, names of the participants were not disclosed to the other researcher until the

final results were confirmed and released. A total of 21 students (out of 53) participated in the research, and an interview was conducted three times per student (at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the semester) at the interviewer's office. All interviews were digitally audio-recorded. The interview aimed at documenting students' learning experiences through interpreting and translation, and each interview lasted between ten and 40 minutes. The topics covered a wide range of areas which included: students' prior language learning experiences, various instances of noticing through learning; difficulties or issues students were facing; interesting activities in and outside the class; or the class dynamics.

At the conclusion of the semester, the whole student body was grouped according to their final marks. That is to say, we grouped them as follows: the top one-third (18 students); the middle one-third (17 students); and the bottom one-third (18 students). For this paper, we examine the interviews with those students who belong to the middle one-third. We chose the middle group because the likelihood of bias arising from the students' actual class performance (in terms of overall marks) on their views in the interview was considered to be the smallest. Of the 21 participants, ten students actually fell into the middle group, and we therefore use the interviews with these ten students as the data for this paper. Therefore, the findings discussed here may not be entirely relevant, for example, to the rest of the participants, let alone to those students who did not participate in the study. The ten students are diversified in terms of their academic majors, year level, history of Japanese language studies, age, sex, and so on. The data were transcribed for detailed analysis. With repeated reading of the transcripts by both authors, fuller explanations for our earlier findings (Takimoto & Hashimoto, 2008) have emerged. We then assigned a code and categorised the topics for further in-depth analysis. Some illustrative examples will be given in this paper. All names used here are pseudonyms.

5   The subject and students

The subject under investigation is entitled "Japanese 10." Those students who completed Japanese at the Australian high school certificate level typically start their university studies from Japanese 5, in which case Japanese 10 will be their 6th semester (or the third year) subject. While it is difficult to use external benchmarks to indicate the language level of the learner, roughly speaking, students at this level possess proficiency equivalent to Japanese Language Proficiency Test 2 grade. The subject does not aim at providing instruction for the purpose of educating professional interpreters and translators, unlike the programs offered at the postgraduate level at some Australian universities. Rather, it is considered to be a subject for students to further consolidate their language skills, as well as serving as a stepping stone or introductory subject for students' future study in interpreting and translation. As a matter of fact, each year, a few students who take this subject actually proceed to the postgraduate interpreting and translation studies program at the same university. Another aspect that distinguishes this subject clearly from those professional programs is that it covers both interpreting and translation, while interpreting and translation are usually taught separately at the professional level. Moreover, while it is the norm to translate only into one's L1, in this unit, students engage in both directions (i.e. from L1 into L2, as well as from L2 into L1). This is due to the fact that the subject aims at covering all four macro skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing. Interpreting activities are mainly (but not exclusively) related to the development of learners' speaking and listening, while translation is utilised primarily for both reading and writing.

The background of the students is truly diversified. A very competent student may take this subject as a first-year subject, while the majority are third-year students. As being the case on any campus in Australia, there are many international and migrant students, in particular, from Asian countries. Furthermore, this class usually has several native Japanese speakers, including students from Japan or residents of Australia. Background speakers, or those whose parent/s is/are Japanese native speakers, can also be found in the class. Therefore, the distinction of L1 (English) and L2

(Japanese) is problematic for many of the learners. However, for the purpose of this paper, we use these terms simply to indicate these two languages.

The subject consists of four contact hours per week over thirteen weeks (i.e. a total of 52 class contact hours). Two hours are devoted to each of the interpreting and translation modules. Within these, there are a variety of activities, including in-class translation activities, discussion on translation strategies, translation theory presentation, interpreting practice, live dialogue interpreting and so on. The form of the activities also varies: there are many group activities, as well as pair and individual work. In the translation module, students have opportunities to translate different kinds of texts and media which include: news clips, *manga*, animation/movie (subtitling and dubbing), literature, advertisements, and business documents. The interpreting module also incorporates materials that are relevant to real-life situations. For example, students may have to interpret conversations between a Japanese real estate agent and an English speaker who tries to find accommodation in Japan, or between an Australian doctor and a Japanese tourist who caught a cold. Heated and live discussions are typical in class using both L1 and L2, on such topics as the ethical issues for an interpreter, the translator's role in intercultural communication, or the meaning of intercultural mediation. Students are also encouraged to reflect upon the processes of interpreting and translation. For example, when submitting a translation assignment, they are required to attach a commentary in which they discuss various translation issues, problems encountered, or the strategies adopted. (Although the minimum requirement is 100 English words or 200 Japanese characters, many students attach an essay of several hundred words/characters for each assignment.) Teachers correct the translation, make comments, and discussions are then held in the subsequent class.

6 Findings

6.1 Eye-opening experience through activities

First and foremost, the interviews with the ten students all show that the students enjoyed their experience of studying Japanese through interpreting and translation. There were no participants who reported otherwise. One student. Katherine, summarised her experience as follows: "It's like an eye-opener because I never thought much about interpreting and translating before the class." Angela also claimed that "it's just opened my eyes." Luke reported that "there's more to translating and interpreting than I ever really imagined." As one can see from these comments, some students did not have any expectations about interpreting and translation, while other students found interpreting and translation quite different from their initial stereotypical notions about them. Also, many students stated that they simply enjoyed interpreting and translation. There seem to be various reasons for their evaluations, but one that is obvious derives from the fact that students need to move between L1/C1 and L2/C2 when undertaking translational activities.

6.2 Exposure to both L1/C1 and L2/C2

ILT encourages the learners to compare L1/C1 and L2/C2 in order to notice the differences and similarities. In other words, by moving between the two, learners are able to become more aware of the cultural and linguistic "gap" (Kramsch, 1998, p. 30). Indeed, the interview data show that the students constantly engage in comparisons at various levels. At the early stage of the course, most students began by attempting to 'transpose' one language into another. However, soon after they start studying interpreting and translation, they came to appreciate the fact that direct or literal translation does not work, which is evidenced by the students' reports in the interviews. Sandra, for example, elaborated this as follows: "Those phrases I can think of intuitively in English, they can't translate." This noticing of the fact that the gap makes it difficult to interpret and translate directly connects to their (re-)realisation that culture and language are so closely interrelated. Therefore, students gradually 'sense' that they must take linguistic as well as cultural requirements

into consideration when interpreting and translating. One student reported her experience of translating a business document as follows:

> Excerpt (1)
> […] when we did the business letter [in Japanese], it was very, lots of *keigo* [honorific expressions], very formal, and you couldn't just directly translate, if an Australian person was reading it, it would just sound awful, really over the top, and fake, and so you had to make it, not less polite, but just a little less extreme […] and that required knowledge of Australian culture and understanding the Japanese culture and why they were, they weren't trying to be over the top, that's just how you do it in Japan, and it wasn't just about what they were saying in Japanese, it was what they were saying behind it. (Lily)

This student has noticed that understanding both C2 and C1 is crucial for a 'good' translation. In other words, in order to produce an acceptable translation, one cannot avoid considering the target audience and culture, which forces him/her to compare those with the source culture/audience. Similarly, Sally reported as follows: "There's so much cultural knowledge you need to have to translate written work." Angela, too, reported that she noticed "how important relationship between cultures is when you're translating between languages." One can see the benefit of translation activities clearly here, in particular within the framework of ILT. By undertaking interpreting and translation activities, the students learn (not as knowledge but as experience) "how the languages cross-over" (Lily). Interestingly, although students reported that they learned how to view the culture and language through interpreting and translation by active movement between L1/C1 and L2/C2, few students reported that they actually studied culture per se in this subject.

6.3 Dynamic movement between L1/C1 and L2/C2

As discussed above, interpreting and translation require students to move between L1/C1 and L2/C2. However, such movement is not simple but very dynamic. In other words, students experience very active "intercultural exploration" (Liddicoat, 2002). They move back-and-forth between two cultures/languages and engage in noticing. One student (Lily) said that she used to hate reading the English translation of *manga* (Japanese comics) because things were often changed from the original. However, she reported as follows: "Now I understand why people change things and what they take into consideration, and I liked knowing that." This clearly indicates that her experience directly contributes to a real-life understanding of a translator's actions. Similarly, Angela noticed that headlines in newspapers were created totally differently in Australia and in Japan. While they rely on "lots of clichés" in Australia, Japanese headlines "get straight to the point with the stats and figures." This, of course, suggests that it is important to consider such differences when translating. However, it appears more important to acknowledge that Angela had discovered the characteristics of her own culture/language through this translation activity. She claimed as follows: "I've never stood back and looked at Australian newspapers from that perspective […] yeah, it's been really interesting in that regard." As one can see from the examples here, students' movements are not static. They notice the difference and then reflect, and apply it to their real life situations. That is to say, what they learn does not stop in class. While Lily came to apply her noticing to understand the translator's strategies for translating *manga* based on her reflection, Angela began to see her own culture from a new point of view due to her engagement in noticing.

6.4 Interpreting and translation as activities with rules and constraints

Even if the movements of the students between L1/C1 and L2/C2 are dynamic, there are many restrictions when considering interpreting and translation. It appears that such constraints actually work as positive factors to promote students' learning. It is because students are required to play the language 'competition' with various rules, which may result in their sense of achievement, as well as satisfaction. One student, Lily, claimed as follows: "There're a lot more things in consider-

ation to take than just directly translating the words." Needless to say, the biggest constraint is the fact that there is a source text. Students cannot create a message without taking the original into account. They are required to say/write what the original says. This further means that students are "denied resort to avoidance strategies and obliged to confront areas of the L2 system" (G. Cook, 1998, p. 119). In addition, a number of students reported that it was difficult but at the same time important to understand "the nuances behind it" (Lily) or "a deeper meaning than the superficial words" (Melanie). Not only the linguistic difficulty, but cultural aspects can also work as great constraints, as discussed in the above sections. Furthermore, Lily pointed out that understanding the readership or target audience is also critical. That is to say, as the comment in Excerpt 1 suggests, approaches to interpreting/translation can be influenced or sometimes determined by the intended receiver of the message. Because of these and other constraints, many students identified necessary skills for successfully carrying out interpreting and translation. Melanie explained as follows:

> Excerpt (2)
> There's so much [in interpreting], […] you need to be able to think on the spot, you need to be clear, concise, you need to have a good grasp of both languages, you need to pay attention, have a good eye for detail, you need to pay attention to what people are saying, and try and communicate that as best as you can, with all the nuances that the words, not just the meaning behind the words […] you have to have brains to do it […] it's definitely one of the hardest things I've ever done.

The same student pointed out that the following are important for translation: to be patient; have good research skills; an eye for detail; and various strategies for going about things. Similarly, Kara explained that multi-skills are needed for interpreting and translation, stating as follows: "Because it's not just the language, it's the skill needed to do all those things at the same time."

Many students also mentioned that they have actually learned various skills to overcome these rather challenging constraints. For interpreting, for example, Melanie reported that she learned through various activities that there was always a possible solution to overcome a hurdle, and said: "I think it made me realise that there are ways around what seems like an impossible." Similarly, Katherine reported as follows:

> Excerpt (3)
> […] whether it be interpreting, or whether it be translating, just because somebody says something in a certain way, doesn't mean it can't be translated in a slightly different way and still have the same meaning, so I thought that was really important, just because it means that you're not just going to suddenly stop and go, oh I don't know what that word is, I'm not going to say it, it teaches you how to alter your way of thinking so that you can express what they are saying, just in a different way […] by the end, everybody could translate everything, we just used different words and different expressions.

Katherine's realisation is closely related to another important thing she noticed: "I think the main thing I learned was that there are an array of answers, not just one answer."

Because of the various constraints, and also of numerous possibilities in terms of solving a problem, students came to realise that it is not only language proficiency that matters. Creative strategies, for example, are often required for overcoming interpreting and translation issues. Katherine explained this well: "Even if you are proficient in a language, translation and interpreting is a totally different matter, it's like starting from the beginning again." Anyone in class can contribute and participate, including those students who are usually quiet, for instance, due to the lack of confidence in terms of language competency. It is often these students who come up with innovative strategies. We consider this aspect quite important for those students who have studied the same foreign language for a number of years. It is because interpreting and translation can provide them with an opportunity to learn the language with a different and fresh approach.

As mentioned above, for every homework translation task, students are required to submit a commentary either in their L1 or L2 along with the translation. Teachers choose interesting com-

ments made by various students, and distribute the list in class as a handout, when another level of comparison or noticing is observed. This time, students compare their own strategies, processes or products with those of other students. Jenny's comment reflects this well. She says: "The examples of good things and you look other people's, oh my God, they are much better than I used." This process appears to further encourage students' motivation to reflect in depth to produce even better outcomes. Any student, regardless of their language proficiency level within the class, can provide the most interesting strategies or solutions. Also in class or group discussions, students participate actively using both L1 and L2. Such interaction is invaluable in itself. However, it is the content that is critical. In other words, the students enjoy interactions in this subject because they enjoy interpreting and translation which are the focus of the interaction. Furthermore, they engage themselves in interpreting and translation because they face many constraints that must be overcome by searching for creative solutions which are not necessarily limited to linguistic knowledge. In addition, there are always a number of solutions, which makes the students seek an even better alternative. This seemingly challenging process itself appears to be the source of the students' engagement as well as enjoyment.

6.5. *Acquisition of sustainable skills*

The students reported that they thought they were learning the Japanese language, and that the subject was valuable for their development of language skills. For example, Oscar mentioned as follows: "Though challenging, because of this unit [subject], […] I can upgrade my level [of Japanese]." However, the students appeared to have developed skills that are more at the global level, in addition to language skills, which is evidenced by many of the comments quoted above. Such skills are similar to what are called "cognitive skills" within ILT, which include critical thinking, analytical thinking, problem-solving, and skills to make connections in their learning (ALPLP, n.d., p. 6). Crozet and Liddicoat (2000) argue that it is of critical importance for language learners to be equipped with the strategies that can be applied in future to solve problems, simply because it is not possible to teach everything in class. They, therefore, maintain that the 'process' of learning, which enables students to choose and apply a suitable strategy in different situations, must be taught. The investigation in this paper shows that students felt that they were in fact learning the process of learning through interpreting and translation, which involves the application of both L1/C1 and L2/C2. They also reported that they were learning various skills that are required in such a process. These sorts of skills as well as the processes are not knowledge per se. Therefore, once students acquire them, these skills and processes may stay with them for a longer period of time, even after they forget the language itself.

7 Conclusion

Throughout this paper, we have attempted to consider reasons why the students enjoyed studying Japanese through interpreting and translation, based on interviews with ten students. The study suggests that it is neither the interaction nor relevant materials themselves that promote intercultural language learning. Rather, in this study, it is interpreting and translation that activate more lively interactions and that make the materials more relevant. In other words, introducing interactions and using relevant materials in class may be useful techniques for ILT, but these techniques may not work well unless proper activities are chosen. In this sense, the study indicates that it is suitable to incorporate interpreting and translation at least for advanced-level Japanese language teaching at university. Firstly, interpreting and translation promote 'intercultural exploration' between L1/C1 and L2/C2. By actively moving between the two languages and cultures, students are able to become aware of the relationship between culture and language, and develop a deeper insight into L2/C2 as well as into L1/C1. The study also suggests that the nature of interpreting and translation assists the learner's active participation. When undertaking interpreting and translation tasks, students are forced to work within a set of rules and constraints. Furthermore, in order to

solve various translation issues and to produce a good 'product,' students are required to utilise not only linguistic but also various other resources available. At the same time, they may be required to be creative from time to time to overcome such issues. The fact that there is no one 'correct' answer for interpreting and translation also makes students further engage in noticing and reflection. This is directly related to lively interactions in and outside of the class, because these activities are considered to promote healthy and friendly competition amongst the students. Another significant finding is that interpreting and translation can contribute to the student's acquisition of skills that are sustainable, including analytical and critical thinking, problem-solving skills, as well as general interpreting and translation skills. However, it is important to analyse the rest of the interview data which were not investigated in this paper in a future study to further confirm these findings. This study has confirmed the usefulness of the ILT framework for analysing the subject investigated here. Furthermore, this study shows that ILT's "five principles" (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003, pp. 64–65) are at work for this particular subject in question, which appears to result in the overall satisfaction of the students' learning experience.

Within the framework of ILT, the finding of a "third place" (Kramsch, 1993) is regarded as the ultimate objective for intercultural language learners. The third place is defined as "a position between the two cultures from which one can interact comfortably with people from the other culture while maintaining one's own identity" (ALPLP, n.d., p. 17). In the interview, one student, Katherine, reported as follows: "You have your Japanese mind, you have your English mind, but trying to cross between them is very difficult without training." It is not possible to evaluate if she had been successful in acquiring strategies to actually 'cross' between them. However, one can recognise her effort in finding a new space which is neither the 'Japanese mind' nor the 'English mind,' which is remarkably similar to the notion of the 'third place.' It is therefore possible to state that, at least for this student, the subject examined in this paper was helpful in promoting the awareness of or the noticing of the existence of such a space.

References

The Asian Languages Professional Learning Project [ALPLP]. (n.d.). *Getting started with intercultural language: A resource for schools: Based on teachers' ideas and experiences from the Asian languages professional learning project*. Retrieved August 30, 2007, from http://www.asiaeducation.edu.au/alplp/pdf/alplp.pdf

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead, England: McGraw-Hill.

Cook, G. (1998). Use of translation in language teaching In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 117–120). London: Routledge.

Cook, G. (2007). Viewpoint: A thing of the futur: Translation in language learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(3), 396–401.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402–423.

Crozet, C., & Liddicoat, A. (2000). Teaching culture as an integrated part of language: Implications for the aims, approaches and pedagogies of language teaching. In A. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Teaching languages, teaching cultures* (pp. 1–18). Canberra: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.

Fotos, S. (2005). Traditional and grammar translation methods for second language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 653–670). Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (1998). Priviledge of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography* (pp. 16–31). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liddicoat, A. (2002). Static and dynamic views of culture and intercultural language acquisition. *Babel, 36*(3), 5–11.

Liddicoat, A., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A., & Kohler, M. (2003). *Report on intercultural language learning*. Retrieved August 30, 2007, from http:// ww1.curriculum.edu.au/nalsas/pdf/intercultural.pdf

Machida, S. (2008). A step forward to using translation to teach a foreign/second language. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5*(Suppl. 1), 140–155.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1985). Translation as a means of integrating language teaching and linguistics. In C. Titford & A.E. Hieke (Eds.), *Translation in foreign language teaching and testing* (pp. 21–28). Tübingen: G. Narr.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 251–274.

Takimoto, M., & Hashimoto, H. (2008, August). Noticing and intercultural langauge learning: A study of advanced-level Japanese learners. Paper presented at the Language Management Workship: Probing the Concept of Noting, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

Tudor, I. (1987). Using translation in ESP. *ELT Journal, 41*(4), 268–273.

Uzawa, K. (1997). Problem-solving in the translating process of Japanese ESL learners. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 53*(3), 491–505.