

Using Awareness Raising in Syntactic and Semantic Errors to Foster Translation Performance among Majmaah University EFL Students

Eman Abdel-Reheem Amin

Department of English, College of Education Zulfi
Majmaah University, Majmaah, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

The present study aimed at developing English as a foreign language (EFL) college students' translation performance through raising their awareness of related syntactic and semantic errors. During the pilot study, the researcher analyzed fifty translated passages from students' assignments. The aim of this systematic analysis was necessary to build a list of their most frequent errors. Besides, a checklist was used to determine students' level of awareness of these errors. As a result, a program based on some metacognitive strategies was developed to raise students' awareness of syntactic and semantic errors to improve their translation performance. Metacognition awareness went through five stages of preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion. Students worked together in the process of translation to translate the given passages. They worked in pairs to proofread their translation by identifying their errors, correcting them, and finally editing their final copy. A pre-post translation test was developed to assess students' translation performance. Data obtained from the test was dealt statistically with SPSS software. The results indicated improvement in students' translation performance.

Key words: error analysis, metacognition awareness raising, metacognitive strategies, syntactic and semantic awareness, translation performance

Cite as: Amin, E. A. (2019). Using Awareness Raising in Syntactic and Semantic Errors to Foster Translation Performance among Majmaah University EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 10 (2) 196-212. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.16>

Introduction

Achieving Saudi Arabia's vision 2030 requires a flourishing economy that, in turn needs an education system aligned with the market needs. The English language as a medium language between cultures can contribute to the success of this vision (Alzahrani, 2017). Therefore, to meet the requirements of this vision, more focus is needed to promote English language teaching, and learning in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), in general, and to develop translation skills, in particular. This focus is necessary because translation plays a distinguished role in exchanging information between languages. It enables people to correspond ideas and culture regardless of their different languages. It enhances global interaction and mutual relationships in various fields such as the economy, technology, trade, culture, and education.

Translation into English enables learners to use their linguistic competence in producing target text. It reflects their competency in foreign languages. So, it can be used as a method for assessing English language learners' linguistic and communicative knowledge. Due to its importance, translation as a course is taught at the university level in language departments all over the world. It is a course that is incorporated in almost all study plans in colleges of education in KSA. In spite of its importance, translation is a complicated process. It requires a thorough knowledge of the source, and the target language such as their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features (Zengin, & Kacar, 2011). The process of translation incorporates problem-solving procedures because students face some problems during interpreting, decoding, and using equivalents in the target language. Translation can begin with challenges, for example, diction, grammar, construction and, cultural habits. Differences between languages in translation motivate students to solve semantics, syntactic or pragmatic problems (Yingxue, 2013). That is to say, in the process of translation, students can face some barriers or difficulties and problems. Such problems could result in frequent errors in translation in the word level, sentence level, and the whole textual levels (Kásroly, 2012). Some researchers suggest teaching students some translation strategies to facilitate their process of translation (Aly, 2004; Abd-Elshaheed, 2012; Nasr El-Din, 2010).

On the other hand, some researchers confirm the importance of conscious –raising in the frequent errors made by foreign language learners to help them correct these inaccuracies. When applied to translation, it results in producing an error-free product. To achieve this competency and proficiency in translation, researchers have studied and analyzed the causes of errors made by second or foreign learners due to the complexity or difficulties in the source or the target language. For example, (Studies of Adrienn, 2012; Al Karazoun, 2016; Na, 2005; Zaho, 2013). It is suggested to raise students' awareness of their errors to avoid them.

Among the suggested methods of awareness raising in aspects of language learning is the use of metacognitive strategies in language learning. Metacognition consists of the learners' understanding of their knowledge, and thinking processes. It also includes their ability to regulate their learning (Chamot, 2007). Metacognition strategies have aspects of awareness raising, namely executive management strategies, which can be achieved using some metacognitive strategies such as planning and organization, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation (Hartman, 2001a). Researchers confirm that teaching student these strategies result in better performance and achievements in their learning. In the field of translation, Studies of Echeverri (2015) and Yanqun (2015) conclude that metacognitive strategies improve students' translation competencies and performance.

Some researchers emphasize the importance of applying the metacognitive approach to error analysis that postulates consciousness-raising, awareness of error source and adopting an active approach to error correction (Hernández, 2001; O'Brien, 2015; Schraw, 2001; Umale, 2011). Applied to translation, metacognition monitoring and regulating one's errors in syntactic and semantic can lead to improvement in their translation (Abbasi & Karimnia, 2014; Prior, Kroll & Macwhinney, 2013; Utomo, 2016).

1. Research problem and hypotheses

Success in the translation course is one of the requirements for graduation from the English language department in Zulfi College of education, Majmaah University. Among the objectives of this course is to enable the students to produce error-free copies of translation on the word level, sentence level, and textual level. The pilot study results revealed that the students had frequent syntactic and semantic errors in translation. Moreover, they suffered from a lack of awareness of these errors (see the section of results for more details). Therefore, the present study tried to teach the students some metacognitive strategies to help them identify their frequent semantic and syntactic errors in translation and then providing them with feedback to raise their awareness of these errors. These procedures were necessary to help them self-correct their errors and thus develop their translation performance. To achieve this goal, students worked together in the process of translation in class and then completed their work via Google apps to proofread and edit their translation assignments. Hence, the study proposes the following hypotheses:

1. There are statistically significant differences between the means of the pretest and the post-test in translation performance in favor of the latter.
2. There are statistically significant differences between the means of the pretest and the post-test on syntactic features in translation performance in favor of the latter.
3. There are statistically significant differences between the means of the pretest and the post-test on semantic features in translation performance in favor of the latter.

2. Literature review

4.1 Teaching Translation

Translation is not only seen as a tool to develop foreign language competence and skills but also as a valuable and applied skill. Having translation skills can enhance learners' level in the language. Many theorists and educators agree on the importance of using translation activities in foreign language learning since it has beneficial effects to increase vocabulary knowledge, to develop writing performance and to enhance thinking skills (Károly, 2014; Mateo, 2015).

Due to its importance, translation pedagogy has been a subject of interest on behaves of researchers. Traditionally, translation pedagogy has been both prescriptive and product-oriented. Recently, researchers have proven that the best way to improve learners' translation performance is by recognizing how they produced the target text, i.e., by understanding the translation process. This tendency is referred to as the process-oriented translation approach. This approach is learner-centered and needs-based. It includes problem-solving methodologies involving a collaborative approach between teachers and learners or among learners themselves (Fox, 2000; Shreve, 2011).

"The translation process encompasses the thought process that is intended to solve a problem or make a relevant correction to change the source text to the target text" (Hansen, 2003, P. 26). Translation involves different types of problems. These problems are mainly linguistic ones, i.e., syntactical or grammatical, lexical or semantical and phonological (Enani, 2001; Teleiba, 2004) and pragmatic or cultural (DiFranco, 2000; Ghazala, 2012; Robinson, 2003). Consequently, they are the principal sources of difficulties and errors in the translation process.

4.2 Difficulties, problems and errors in translation

Some of the students' difficulty to translate may result from obstacles in the translation process itself. Among these obstacles are lack of comprehension of the text and shortage of available resources to look up for vocabularies, and new expressions and idioms; besides, the inability to identify their problems in translation and find possible compensation strategies, or difficulties in the production of the target language e.g. finding appropriate vocabularies, idioms, structures, grammar or equivalent cultural substitutions. All these elements result in multidimensional errors in translation (Debboune & Tebib, 2010; Solano-Flores, et al., 2009).

Analyzing errors enables teachers to understand the thinking process that the student is utilizing. Recognizing the reasons and sources for errors help teachers to focus on these aspects, and if the students are aware of them, they are introduced to the concept of metacognition. Syntactic awareness means the ability to understand the grammatical structures of language within sentences. If students are unaware of these grammatical structures and their correct use within sentences, they are likely to have errors in the writings. Therefore, it is necessary to teach the students to rectify some of the fossilized grammatical or syntactical errors (O'Brien, 2015). Syntactic awareness in translation results in producing an accepted translation in the target language. Semantic awareness means being aware of the potential and appropriate meaning along with its implication in a given context. Semantically, a single word can have more than one meaning. Errors in translating a meaning may result from uncertainty in synonymy, polysemy, homography, homophony, and homonymy and morphological ambiguity (Prior, et al., 2013).

Errors are significant in three ways as they tell the teacher what needs to be emphasized, how language learning progresses, and what prerequisites have to be achieved (James, 2013). Therefore, some previous studies in translation have been conducted in this respect. For instance, Na (2005) identifies the errors in the translation of topic-comment structures.. Adrienn (2012) reveals the recurring patterns of lexical, syntactic and textual errors in translations from English into Hungarian. Zaho (2013) investigates the reasons behind some errors in students English-Chinese translation by analyzing their mistakes in idiomatic usage, and the lack of knowledge in the cultural background. Ardeshiri and Zarafshan (2014) found that understanding the pragmatic aspects was the most frequent problem in translating from English into Persian. Al Karazoun (2016) concludes that linguistic errors of EFL students in translation are grammatical, discourse and lexical ones. Utomo (2016) classifies students' grammatical translation errors as those of omission, addition, selection, and ordering. Wongranu (2017) reports that students have syntactical and semantic errors in translation. All these studies agree on the importance of identifying the reasons behind students' errors in translation. They suggest teaching foreign learners some strategies or techniques to correct their errors. Moreover, it is recommended to raise students' awareness of their frequent errors in translation to avoid such types of errors.

Errors in translation can be successfully addressed by different strategies that can be used to solve various problems. Thus, translation strategies can be defined as potentially conscious plans for solving the translation problem. They can be forms of explicitly textual manipulation. For Chesterman (2016), they describe text-linguistic behaviors. They refer to the operation that a translator carries out during the formulation of the target text. They should be goal-oriented and problem-centered as well. In the translation process, some texts are translated without any problems and others that need application of strategies (Dimitrova, 2005). Munday (2016) outlines a taxonomy of translation strategies which includes comprehension, production, training, problem-solving, survival strategies and metacognitive strategies. Metacognitive strategies develop students' metacognition about translation and are used to overcome translation errors.

4.3 Translation and metacognition

Two types of metacognition are executive management strategies such as planning, monitoring and evaluation, and strategic declarative, contextual and procedural knowledge about their use (Hartman, 2001b). Metacognition includes aspects of awareness raising that can be achieved through the use of some metacognitive strategies such as self-monitoring, self-evaluation, planning and organization, and self-regulation (Chamot & Robbins, 2006; Crawford Saul, Mathews, & Makinster, 2005). Teaching the students these strategies helps them to be strategic learners. Those learners know how, when and why to use strategies, and are willing to learn much more about other ones. Furthermore, learners who use learning strategies have good achievements in their language learning (Beckman, 2002; Cohen, 2007).

Metacognitive strategies play significant roles in the language learning process since they help students become autonomous and self-regulated learners. As for the translation performance, monitoring and regulating one's errors in syntactic and semantic can lead to improvement in their translation achievement (Ardeshiri & Zarafshan, 2014). Angelone (2010) reports metacognitive strategy use at the textual level, behavioral level (problem recognition and its proposed solution and evaluation) and the locus of translation activity (comprehension, transfer, and production). Echeverri (2015) concludes that metacognition helps the students to become more responsible for their learning and consequently develops their translation performance. The study of Yanqun (2015) proposes a model of metacognition, and the results indicated a development in students' translation competencies by monitoring, regulating, and reflecting on the performance.

Metacognition strategies aim at solving translation problems to enable the students avoids errors in translation. These errors have been the subject of research in the field of applied linguistics and teaching methodology. To develop translation competency, it is necessary to consciously identify related errors and then determine the most appropriate solution for them. These steps are beneficial because the analysis of students' errors has advantages in the process of learning translation (Schaffner & Adab, 2000).

To sum up, this study focused on syntactic and semantic errors in translation. Its aim was raising students' awareness of their errors, i.e., their cause, and their method of correction to develop their translation performance. Translation performance in this study referred to students' ability to produce and transfer an acceptable and equivalent meaning in the target language (TL) with accuracy in selecting appropriate lexicon-grammatical items, words, tenses, linguistic

markers, cohesive devices and, sentence structure and style to achieve a balance between source text (ST) and target text (TT) . These objectives could be achieved by teaching the students some metacognitive strategies in translation. The context of the study utilized Google apps to facilitate students' work in translation. They worked collaboratively in groups through Google Docs to translate, edit and proofread their translation.

3. Methods

5.1 Participants

The participants of the present study were the 4th level (n= 48, Mean age = 18.5 years) female students enrolled at Introduction to Translation course ENG224. In the first semester 1439/1440 H, at the English language department, Zulfi College of Education, Majmaah University, KSA. They almost had the same level of proficiency in English according to their GPA, and their native language is Arabic. All the participants completed 128 credit hours of study in their study plan.

5.2 Research Design

This study adopted one group pre-posttest design.

5.3 Instruments

The instruments of the study included:

5.3.1. A translation test

This test aims to measure students' translation performance and their ability to avoid related syntactic and semantic errors. The test is divided into two sections. The first one includes twenty sentences that have syntactic and semantic difficulties from English into Arabic and vice versa. It is assumed that errors may occur because of such difficulties. Its total score is 40 marks. The second section consists of two short passages to translate into the target language. Thirty marks are assigned for each one to make a total out of 60 marks. Thus, the overall score of the test is 100 marks. The sentences and the passages used are from (Enani, 2005a; Ghazala, 2012).

5.3.2 A translation rubric for scoring the translation test.

The rubric measures two aspects of translation performance: the semantic – and syntactic features. The semantic ones are divided into three components: comprehension of the ST, transfer of meaning in the TT, and finding equivalents. The syntactic features include three criteria: sentence structure, grammar & style, and using equivalent lexical and functional categories. The total score of the rubric is 60 scores, 30 marks for each feature with a range of scores from 5 to 0 for every component. The rubric is based on Khanmohammad and Osanloo's Translation Assessment Rubric (2009, pp. 146-149) with some modifications and changes in division and description of items and scores.

5.3.3 The validity and reliability

Specialists in TEFL assigned the validity of the translation test. Some modifications were made according to their suggestions. The test-retest method was estimated to determine the reliability of the test. The correlation between the two applications was (0.79) which is significant at 0.01 level which means that the test is reliable.

The reliability of the translation rubric was measured by using inter-rater reliability. The Pearson correlation between the two scorers was (0.75) which is significant at 0.01 level.

5.4 The procedures

A Pilot study was conducted by applying a content analysis of 50 translated texts to identify the most frequent syntactic and semantic errors in translation from Arabic to English and vice versa. As a result, a list of these errors was developed, and then an awareness checklist was applied to check students' awareness of them.

5.4.1 Error analyses

Two raters identified the errors to avoid any bias in counting them. The Pearson correlation coefficient was ($r = 0.90$) at 0.01 level. Categorization of errors, frequency, percentage, and rank are represented in Table 1.

Table 1 . *Frequency, percentages, and rank of semantic and syntactic errors in translation*

| | Errors (Category) | Frequency | Percentage | Rank |
|-------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Syntactic errors | Sentence structure errors | 109 | %26.1 | 1 |
| | Word order errors | 80 | %19.2 | 2 |
| | Fragments and runs-on | 73 | %17.5 | 3 |
| | Errors in translating participles, adjectives, and adverbs | 42 | %10.1 | 4 |
| | Prepositional phrase errors | 40 | %9.6 | 5 |
| | Errors in translating conditional sentences | 38 | %9.1 | 6 |
| | Errors in translating tenses and passive voice | 35 | %8.4 | 7 |
| | Total No. of errors | 417 | | |
| Semantic errors | Direct translation from L1 | 145 | %23.5 | 1 |
| | Errors in Collocation choice | 90 | %14.6 | 2 |
| | Errors in translating metaphors and expressions | 87 | %14.1 | 3 |
| | Confused use of synonymy, polysemy, and monosemy. | 70 | %11.4 | 4 |
| | Errors in the word choice in the TL | 65 | %10.6 | 5 |
| | Misselection of prefixes and suffixes | 60 | %9.7 | 6 |
| | wordy sentences | 55 | %8.9 | 7 |
| | Borrowing and coinage | 44 | %7.1 | 8 |
| Total No. of errors | 616 | | | |

Table 1 presents the most common errors in translation. They include seven syntactical errors and eight semantic ones. As for syntactic errors, the most frequent one is sentence structure errors (26.1%). The rank shows the descending order of all of them. The majority of the students have semantic errors in direct translation from Arabic, collocation choice, translating metaphors and expressions, use of synonymy, polysemy, and monosemy, word choice, selection of prefixes and suffixes in the TL, wordy sentences, borrowing and coinage with percentages of 14.6, 14.1, 11.4, 10.6, 9.7, 8.9, and 7.1, respectively.

5.4.2 The list of syntactic and semantic errors

The list is based on frequent errors identified by the content analysis of students TT. It consists of fifteen syntactic and semantic errors. It was submitted to specialists in linguistics and TEFL (n= 10) to determine its validity.

5.4.3 A syntactic and semantic error awareness checklist

The checklist aims to determine students' level of awareness in syntactic and semantic errors. It consists of 20 items. The first ten sentences are translated into English, but the other ten ones are translated into Arabic. Each group of sentences is divided equally to include five syntactical errors and five semantic ones. Students were given a score of 3 on each sentence based on their identification of the error, giving a reason for that error, and correcting it. One point was assigned for each one. The total score of the checklist was 60 marks.

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of the checklist

| Dimensions | No. of participants | No. of items | Min. | Max. | Mean | SD |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------|------|------|-------|-------|
| Total | 60 | 20 | 14 | 35 | 25.43 | 5.546 |
| Syntactic errors | 60 | 10 | 8 | 19 | 14.39 | 2.93 |
| Semantic errors | 60 | 10 | 3 | 19 | 11.23 | 4.17 |

As shown in Table 2 the checklist was applied to a group of 60 students. The mean score for syntactic error is (14.39), and it is (11.23) for semantic errors. These means are lower than that of the checklist. This result indicates that before the experiment, the students lack awareness of the identified syntactic and semantic errors in translation.

5.4.4 The treatment

The present study lasted for 13 weeks during the first semester of the academic year 2018-2019. Table 3 shows the duration of the treatment. During the first week, the translation pre-test was applied to the study sample. The implementation of the program lasted for ten weeks. The introductory session was conducted in the second week. The third to the seventh weeks covered the syntactical errors in translation. The semantic errors in translation sessions were presented through the eighth to the eleventh weeks. An evaluation session was conducted in the twelfth week. The last week of the treatment was assigned to the post-test.

Table 3. *Framework of the study (duration of the treatment)*

| Week (1) | Week (2) | Weeks (3-7) | Weeks (8-11) | Week (12) | Week (13) |
|-------------|----------------------|--|---|-----------------------|---------------|
| Pre-test | Introductory session | Syntactical errors in translation sessions | Semantic errors in translation sessions | Evaluative session | Post- test |

5.4.4.1 Program description

An awareness- raising of syntactic and semantic errors in translation program was developed by the author of the study. This remedial program aims to improve students' translation skills by training them in using some metacognitive strategies to raise their awareness of syntactic and semantic errors in translation. The program consisted of ten sessions. Each session went through five stages of metacognitive strategy training to raise students' awareness of syntactic and semantic errors in translation and consequently develop their translation skills. The five stages were preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion. Metacognitive strategies included three components: planning, monitoring, and evaluation.

5.4.4.1.a Before translation

Preparation stage

In this stage, the teacher checked the students' prior knowledge about the related syntactic or semantic rule that might cause an error in translation. This step could be done by presenting some sentences with syntactic or semantic errors and asking the students to detect and explain the reason behind such errors. Finally, the teacher asked them about the strategies they could use to correct these sentences to produce a good translation.

Presentation stage

The teacher introduced two sentences and two version of translation for each one. One was an appropriate translation, and the other contained syntactic or semantic errors in translation. Besides, the teacher explained how and why to use planning, and monitoring strategies. Teacher modeled with thinking –aloud protocol how to detect the errors, explain the reasons for them and how to correct these errors to produce an acceptable translation.

5.4.4.1.b During translation

Practice stage

In this stage, students planed for their translation. First, they used advance organization strategy to skim the sentences or the text to be translated. Then they utilized advance preparation strategy by rehearsing the language needed for translating the given sentences into the target language. Next, students employed selective attention strategy to attend for words, idioms, and linguistic markers needed to perform the translation task.

Finally, students applied production-monitoring strategy by checking and correcting their translation. During this step, they worked in pairs to proofread their translation by identifying their errors, correcting them, and finally editing their final copy of the translation.

5.4.4.1. c After translation

In the evaluation stage

Students used an evaluation checklist to evaluate their translation process and their use of metacognitive strategies. They also wrote a notice about the errors they had done in their translation and how they corrected them. They should understand what the error was, what the reason was for it and how to correct it.

In the expansion stage

Students were given other translation assignments to translate some sentences and short passages collaboratively via Google Docs. Students were asked to comment and write the errors if they found them and correct them in the comment box in Google Docs.

5.4.4.2 Activities and tasks of the program

The translation exercises are adapted from the students' textbook "Translation as problems and solution" by Ghazala (2012). Further exercises are used from "Translation Manual" by Enani (2005a), and "The Science of Translation an introduction, with reference to Arabic-English and English-Arabic translation" by Enani, (2005b).

5 Results

6.2 . Pre-post translation test results

To test the first hypothesis, Paired samples t-test was used to analyze the differences between the means of the post-test and the pre-test on the translation test. Results are shown in Table 4. Hypothesis one "There are statistically significant differences between the means of the pretest and the post-test in translation performance in favor of the latter."

Table 4. Results of T-test between the means of the post-test and the pre-test of overall translation performance in the translation test

| Test | N | Means | S.D | T-value | DF | Sig*. |
|-----------|----|-------|-------|---------|----|-------|
| Pre-test | 48 | 44.64 | 10.45 | 16.59 | 47 | 0.00 |
| Post-test | 48 | 59.85 | 7.50 | | | |

Note. *P < 0.01

As shown in table 4, it is obvious that the mean of the post-test (59.85) is higher than that of the pre-test (44.64) where T-value is (16.59) which is significant a 0.01.

Paired samples t-test was conducted to test the second hypothesis. Results are shown in Table 5. Hypothesis two "There are statistically significant differences between the means of the pretest and the post-test on syntactic features in translation performance in favor of the latter."

Table 5. Results of T-test between the means of the post-test and the pre-test of syntactic features in the translation test

| Test | N | Means | S.D | T-value | DF | Sig*. |
|-----------|----|-------|------|---------|----|-------|
| Pre-test | 48 | 22.60 | 4.36 | 14.45 | 47 | 0.00 |
| Post-test | 48 | 28.68 | 4.30 | | | |

Note. *P < 0.01

Results of table 5 reveal that the mean scores of the students in the post-test are higher than that of the pretest, and as a result, the second hypothesis is accepted.

Paired samples t-test was used to test the third hypothesis. Results are presented in Table 6. Hypothesis three "There are statistically significant differences between the means of the pretest and the post-test on semantic features in translation performance in favor of the latter."

Table 6. *Results of T-test between the means of the post-test and the pre-test of semantic features in the translation test*

| Test | N | Means | S.D | T-value | DF | Sig*. |
|-----------|----|-------|------|---------|----|-------|
| Pre-test | 48 | 22.04 | 8.45 | 10.60 | 47 | 0.00 |
| Post-test | 48 | 31.16 | 5.19 | | | |

Note. *P < 0.01

Results of Table 6 show that the mean of the post-test is higher than that of the pretest (8.45) on the semantic features of translation. Thus, the third hypothesis is accepted.

6 Discussion

The findings of this study are in line with Angelone (2010) Abbasi and Karimnia (2011) , Al Karazoun, (2016), Echeverri (2015) Yanqun (2015) and Utomo (2016). The results of the posttest affirmed the hypotheses of the study. Identifying and analyzing syntactic and semantic errors in translation helped to focus on the points of weakness and trying to overcome them. The sessions of the proposed program of the study were directed to cover the most frequent errors in translation as identified by the results of the pilot study, Tables 1 & 2. All the errors that were classified in Table 2 could be categorized in a more broad classification of deletion, addition, improper selection, and formation. The same classification was utilized in the study of Utomo (2016). The results of Table 3 showed that the students before the treatment had little awareness of such errors.

Most of the errors were due to the interference between the first and the target language. Other errors were because of the students' insufficient mastery of the target language. In other words, there were two causes of students' errors. First, the intralingual errors those were due to interface between Arabic and English. Second, the interlingual errors that resulted from students' inadequate proficiency level in the target language. This result is supported by the findings of Al-Shormani and Al-Sohbani (2012) and Ngangbam (2016). Similar to the results of Aly (2004), students in this study had more errors in semantics rather than in grammar and sentence structures. On the contrary, the participants in Al Karazoun's research (2016) had more grammatical errors in translation followed by lexical and discourse errors. The findings of Wongranu (2017) showed that the students had more frequent and prominent syntactical errors than semantic ones in translation.

Addressing these errors by raising students' awareness of them helped to improve their translation proficiency and consequently their translation performance. Thus, the first hypothesis is confirmed as indicated in Table 4. This result is consistent with Mateo (2015) who proved the effectiveness of metacognition awareness of the occurrence of calques by studying cross-linguistic differences and similarities between students' native language and the TL in producing an accepted translation. El-banna and Naeem (2016) employed a translation common error remedial program

to help students avoid syntactic, semantic and pragmatic errors in translation from English into Arabic. Other previous studies also have emphasized the importance of error analysis in developing students' translation performance such as Abbasi and Karimni, (2011), Al Karazoun (2016), Utomo (2016) and Wongranu (2017). Thus, when the students become aware of the reasons and sources of their errors and how to correct them, their metacognition awareness is developed (O'Brien, 2015).

Using metacognitive strategies resulted in metacognition awareness raising in syntactic and semantic errors. Before translation, students used advance organization and selective attention strategies. During the translation process, students used production-monitoring strategy. After translation, they used self-evaluation strategy. Therefore, Students' improvement in translation was due to training them to use these strategies during the translation process. In other words, helping the students to use these executive management strategies raised their awareness of their translation errors, and consequently, they avoided them, and then their translation performance improved. Translation performance was reflected in the students' ability to produce and transfer an acceptable and equivalent meaning in the TL with accuracy, to some extent, in the syntactic and semantic levels. This result confirms the second and the third hypotheses of the study as shown in Tables 5 & 6.

Similarly, previous studies affirmed the effectiveness of using metacognitive strategies in improving translation performance. For example, Shreve (2006) pinpointed that expertise in translation is correlated with translators' metacognition. Bergon (2009) proved the role of metacognition in developing translation competence. The exploratory study of Angelone (2010) concluded that successful students used metacognitive strategies during all the levels of translation. The results of Echeverri (2015) and Yanqun (2015) showed that metacognitive strategies improved students' translation performance. On the contrary, the results of the present study are not in line with Shabani-Jadidi (2004) who found no significant differences in pre-post test results on the conscious raising of metacognitive strategies and students' abilities in translation.

The suggested program of this study is learner-centered and needs based. It followed the process approach towards translation that helped the systematic manipulation of students' errors. The sessions of the program went through three stages: before, during, and after translation. Besides, each stage was divided into one or two phases according to Chamot's (2007) model for teaching strategies. These phases were preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion. During each phase, the teacher trained the students on using metacognitive strategies to raise their awareness in translation errors to avoid and correct them in their final product of translation. Fox (2000) supported the use of the process approach in translation. The study of Amirian and Baghiat (2013) explained how the translation process is considered a metacognitive activity and they suggested developing metacognitive activities to develop translation among translators. Moreover, using metacognitive models in translation is suggested by the study of Yanqun (2015). Therefore, these studies are compatible with the present study.

The translation process was facilitated through the collaborative work in the stage of editing and proofreading the final product of translation. The program of the present study put into consideration the advantages of web2.0 tools, so students utilized Google Docs to edit their

translation together and to work collaboratively on their assignments. Writing comments and providing feedback on Google Docs helped to promote students' metacognitive awareness of their errors. Cooperative learning has also been found to activate metacognition as reported by the related study of Hernández (2001). In his research, students' awareness of grammatical and lexical errors was raised via Email.

Although the participants' overall performance in translation has improved, some of them still have errors in translation. The explanation of this result is compatible with the study of Shreve (2011) who pinpointed that translation has levels of comprehension, transfer, and production, and so errors can occur at any level of them. On the word level, few errors appeared in spelling or lexical choice. Those students showed errors on the sentence level such as sentence structure and fragments, and punctuation marks. On the paragraph level, the most frequent errors were related to the cohesive device and coordinate conjunctions. Those students had interlingual errors that were related to inadequacies in the target language. Therefore, it is recommended to have remedial programs in writing skills to those students. In translating into Arabic, students confused different forms of plural for two or more objects, especially with feminine and masculine ones. Other students had performance problems and errors in translation that were due to interference between L1 and the target language. Those intralingual errors need more practice to avoid them. This result is consistent with Ngangbam (2016) who concluded that students' syntactical errors were caused by mother-tongue interference. Another reason for their persistence errors was the direct translation from the Arabic language into English. This result supports the findings of Al-Shormani & Al-Sohbani (2012).

7. Conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions

Based on the findings of the study, raising students' awareness of their syntactic and semantic errors in translation resulted in enhancing their translation performance. Besides, developing metacognition awareness about errors developed their translation competencies and performance. Metacognition awareness raising in errors is better achieved through using metacognitive strategies. Enhancing translation performance by raising awareness of related errors went through aspects of metacognition. In the declarative knowledge level, students knew the causes of errors and how to correct them. In the procedural knowledge level, students applied the rules to correct their errors. In the production level, the students produced accepted translation by using executive management strategies. Collaborative work and following the process approach in translation are other causes for improving students' translation skills.

It is suggested for teachers to analyze and identify their students' errors in translation and adjust their methods of teaching accordingly. Teachers should put into consideration the necessity for metacognition awareness raising in syntactic and semantic errors in translation to improve their students' translation performance. Therefore, metacognitive strategies should be integrated into translation courses. It is also recommended to incorporate in translation course books a chapter or more exercises for editing skills, in both the first and the target language, to avoid errors in the transferring and production levels of translation. Translation courses should be learner and needs-based to address learners' needs and improve their translation performance accordingly.

This study was limited to syntactic and semantic errors in translation. Further studies need to study awareness of pragmatic errors and its related effect on translation proficiency. Other studies may suggest programs to raise students' awareness of the differences and similarities between the FL and the TL to overcome calques in translation. It is also suggested to examine whether gender difference may affect students' awareness of translation errors. The effectiveness of syntactic and semantic awareness raising in writing skills or speaking skills can be a further field for other studies. This study can be duplicated with other population to verify the results.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Deanship of Scientific Research at Majmaah University for supporting this research under project no. 38/8.

About the author:

Eman Abdel Reheem Amin is an assistant professor at department of English, Zulfi, Majmaah University, Saudi Arabia. She earned her Ph.D. from Benha University, Egypt. She is the author of several publications related to applied linguistics and English language teaching. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5806-0968>

References

- Abbasi, M., & Karimnia, A. (2011). An Analysis of Grammatical Errors among Iranian Translation Students: Insights from Interlanguage Theory. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 25(4), 525-536. http://www.europeanjournalofsocialsciences.com/issues/EJSS_25_4.html
- Abd-Elshaheed, B. (2012). *A Suggested program based on Social Constructivist Approach in translation for English majors at New Valley Faculty of Education*. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). New Valley Faculty of Education, Assiut University, Egypt.
- Adrienn, K. (2012). Translation Competence and Translation Performance: Lexical, Syntactic and Textual Patterns in Student Translations of a Specialized EU Genre. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31 (1), pp.36-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.05.005>
- Al Karazoun, G. A. (2016). A Linguistic Analysis on Errors Committed by Jordanian EFL Undergraduate Students: A Case of News Headlines in Jordanian Newspapers. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 170. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p170>
- Al-Shormani, M. Q., & Al-Sohbani, Y. A. (2012). Semantic Errors Committed by Yemeni University Learners: Classifications and Sources. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(6), 120–139. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n6p120>
- Aly, M. (2004). Translation strategies of EFL student teachers: A think aloud protocol-based case study. *An online ERIC Database Full text. No. ED490356. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED490356.*
- Alzahrani, A. (2017). Markets and Language Policy in Saudi Arabia: How the English Language can Contribute to the Success of the Saudi Vision 2030. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 5 (6), 1-12. <http://www.eajournals.org/journals/international-journal-of-english-language-and-linguistics-research-ijellr/vol-5-issue-6-december-2017>
- Amirian, Z., & Baghiat, M. J. (2013). Uncertainty and Uncertainty Management : The Metacognitive State of Problem-Solving of Professional (experienced) Translators and Students of Translation Studies. *International Refereed & Indexed Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 1(2), 223-242. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.403.6488>

- Angelone, E. (2010). Uncertainty, uncertainty management and metacognitive problem solving in the translation task. In G.M Shreve & E. Angelone (Eds.), *Translation and cognition*, (pp. 17-40). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ardeshiri, M. & Zarafshan, M. (2014). Students' Causes of Errors in Translating Pragmatic Senses. *International Journal of English and Education*, 3(4), 283-253. http://ijee.org/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/18.265143648.pdf
- Beckman, P. (2002). Strategy Instruction. *An online ERIC Database Full text. No.ED474302*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED474302.pdf>
- Bergen, D. (2009). The Role of Metacognition and Cognitive Conflict in the Development of Translation Competence. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 10 (2), 231-250. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.10.2009.2.4>
- Chamot, A. U. (2007). Accelerating academic achievement of English language learner: A synthesis of five evaluations of the CALLA model. In J. Cummins and C. Davison (Eds.), *Springer international handbooks of education international handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 317-313). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Debboune, Z., & Tebib, D. (2010). *Notes from the effectiveness of proofreading in minimizing mistakes in students' writing: The case of third year students*. (Published Ph. D dissertation). University of Constantine, Algeria.
- Chamot, A.U., & Robbins, J. (2006). *Helping struggling students become good language learners*. Washington, DC: NCLRC.
- Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of Translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Rev.ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cohen, A. D. (2007). Becoming a Strategic Learner in CALL. *Applied Language Learning*, 17(1), 57-71.
- Crawford, A., Saul, E. W., Mathews, S., & Makinster, J. (2005). *Teaching and learning strategies for the thinking classroom*. New York: International Debate Education Association.
- DiFranco, C. (2000). Translation and the Theory View. *Translation-Perspectives*, 11, 371- 391.
- Dimitrova, B. (2005). *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. Publishing Company 391.
- Echeverri, A. (2015). Translator education and metacognition: Towards student-centered approaches to translator education. In Y. Cui & W. Zhao (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching Methods in Language Translation and Interpretation* . pp. 297-323. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-6615-3.ch016s
- Enani, M. (2001). *English-Arabic translation: An introduction*. Cairo: Anglo Egyptian Bookshop.
- Enani, M. (2005a). *English-Arabic translation manual: level I*. Cairo: Anglo Egyptian Bookshop.
- Enani, M. (2005b). *The Science of translation an introduction, with reference to Arabic-English and English-Arabic translation*. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/hassanbekhithassan/docs/the_science_of_translation_by_m_en . Electronic Library of Torjoman
- Fox, O. (2000). The use of translation diaries in a process-oriented translation teaching methodology. In C. Schaffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *developing translation competences* (pp. 115-130). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing company.
- Ghazala, H. (2012). *Translation as problems and solutions: A textbook for university students and trainee translators* (9th ed.). Jeddah, KSA: Konooz Al-Marifa Company for Printing and Publishing.
- Hansen, G. (2003). Controlling the process: Theoretical and methodological reflections on research into translation processes. In F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating translation: Perspectives in process-oriented research* (pp.25-42). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing company.

- Hartman, H. (2001a). Teaching metacognitively. In H.J. Hartmen (Ed.), *Metacognition in learning and instruction: Theory, research, and practice* (pp.149 -172) .The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hartman, H. (2001b). Developing students' metacognitive knowledge and skills. In H.J. Hartmen (Ed.), *Metacognition in Learning and Instruction: Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp.33 -68) .The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hernández, M. (2001). Raising Student Awareness about Grammatical and Lexical Errors via Email, *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 14, 263- 281.
- James, C. (2013). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Károly, A. (2012). Translation Competence and Translation Performance: Lexical, Syntactic and Textual Patterns in Student Translations of a Specialized EU Genre. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31(1),36-46.
- Károly, A. (2014). *The role of translation in learning and teaching English as a foreign language: the case of EU translation*(Published Ph.D. dissertation). Eötvös Loránd University. Retrieved from: <http://doktori.btk.elte.hu/lingv/karolyadrienn/thesis.pdf>
- Khanmohammad H., O., M., & Osanloo, M. (2009). Moving Toward Objective Scoring: A Rubric for Translation Assessment. *JELS*, 1, 131-153.
- Mateo, R. (2015). A Reconceptualized Translation-Based Task as a Viable Teaching Tool in EFL Class to Avoid Calque Errors. *English Language Teaching*, 8, (7),13-29.: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n7p13>
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Na, P.P. Q (2005). Errors in the Translation of Topic-Comment Structures of Vietnamese into English. *Asian EFL Journal*,7 (3),1-30. http://asian-efl-journal.com/sept_05_ppqn.pdf
- Nasr El-Din, A.M. (2010). *A proposed program for developing translation strategies and skills of English department students in faculties of Education* (Unpublished Ph. D.dissertation). Faculty of Education, Mansoura University, Damietta Branch, Egypt.
- Ngangbam, H. (2016). An Analysis of Syntactic Errors Committed by Students of English Language Class in the Written Composition of Mutah University: A Case Study. *European Journal of English Language, Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1), 1-13.
- O'Brien, J. (2015). Consciousness-raising, Error Correction and Proofreading. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 15 (3), 85-103. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1064439.pdf>
- Prior, A., Kroll, J. & Macwhinney, B. (2013). Translation Ambiguity but not Word Class Predicts Translation Performance. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 16 (2),458-474. doi:10.1017/S136672891200027
- Robinson, D. (2003). *Becoming a translator: An introduction to the theory and practice of translation* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Schaffner, C., & Adab, B. (Eds.,) (2000). *Developing translation competence: Introduction*. USA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Schraw, G. (2001). Promoting general metacognitive awareness. In H. Hartman (Ed.), *Metacognition in Learning and Instruction* (pp. 3-16). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Shabani-Jadidi, P. (2004). *Generating a framework for translation metacognitive strategies*. (Published Ph.D. dissertation). Islamic Azad University Tehran, Iran.
- Shreve, E. A. (2011). Uncertainty management, metacognitive Bundling in problem- solving and translation Quality. In S. O'Brien (Ed.), *Cognitive Exploration of Translation* (pp. 108-129). New York: Continuum.

- Shreve, G. (2006). The Deliberate Practice: Translation and Expertise. *Journal of Translation Studies*, 9(2), 27-42. <https://www.bibsonomy.org/bibtex/1f912d6b8b94b97d55fabab391f5621e8/amb>
- Solano-Flores, G., Backhoff, E., Contreras-Nino, Luis A. (2009). Theory of Test Translation Error, *International Journal of Testing*, 9 (2), 78-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15305050902880835>
- Teleiba, A. (2004). *A Suggested Programme for Developing Some Basic Translation Skills of English Majors and its Effect on their Attitudes towards Translation* (Published Ph.D. dissertation). Qena Faculty of Education: South Valley University, Egypt.
- Umale, J. (2011). The effect of consciousness raising on errors in L2 question formation: An investigation of Omani students. *Arab World English Journal*, 2(4), 88-135. <https://awej-volume-2-no-1-january-2011/19-awej-volume-2-number-4-december-2011/67-dr-jaishree-umale>,
- Utomo, G. (2016). *An analysis of grammatical errors in translation texts of sixth semester English department students of FBBA in the academic year of 2012/2013* (Published Ph.D. dissertation). Retrieved from: <http://lib.unimus.ac.id>
- Wongranu, P. (2017). Errors in translation made by English major students: A study on types and causes. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences* 38, 117-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2016.11.003>
- Yanqun, Z. (2015). The Concept and Instruction of Metacognition in Translation Competence Development. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies*, 11 (1-2), 69-78 <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-3826673051/the-concept-and-instruction-of-metacognition-in-translation>
- Yingxue, Z. (2013). The Motivation of Problem-Based Teaching and Learning in Translation. *English Language Teaching*, 6 (4), 120-125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n4p120>
- Zaho, C. (2013). Analysis of Mongolian Students' Common Translation Errors and Its Solutions. *English Language Teaching*, 6 (3), 78-81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n3p78>
- Zengin, B., & Kacar, I. (2011). Turkish EFL Academicians' Problems concerning Translation Activities and Practices, Attitudes towards the use of Online and Printed Translation Tools, and Suggestions for Quality Translation Practice. *Turkish online Journal of Educational Technology- TOJET*, 10(2), 274-286. <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/53387>