摘　　要

　　纠正性反馈按照反馈的方式可以分为直接反馈和间接反馈，元语言解释反馈是间接反馈中的一种反馈策略。本研究涉及直接反馈和元语言解释反馈。目前，学界的主流观点充分肯定了纠正性反馈在二语学习过程中的积极作用。然而，将直接反馈和元语言解释反馈进行比较的研究尚少，且少有研究聚焦于直接反馈和元语言解释反馈对非英语专业大学生汉译英翻译成绩的影响。

　　因此，本研究试图回答以下两个问题：1）直接反馈和元语言解释反馈能否有效提高非英语专业大学生的汉译英翻译成绩？2)直接反馈和元语言解释反馈能否有效减少非英语专业大学生的汉译英翻译错误？研究者以 2019 年，2020 年以及 2021 年的五套大学英语四级真题中的汉译英段落翻译为测试工具，以西北师范大学大二年级非英语专业的两个班级（A 班 27 人，采用元语言解释反馈；B 班 32 人，采用直接反馈）共计 59 名学生为实验对象。要求每位参加实验的学生完成每一篇翻译任务并上交，学生每次上交作业后，研究者为每一篇翻译任务中出现的错误提供反馈，以学生的第一篇翻译任务为前测数据，以每位学生的第五篇翻译任务为后测数据。实验结果表明：

　　1．直接反馈和元语言解释反馈均有效提高了非英语专业大学生的汉译英翻译成绩，没有显著性差别。

　　2．直接反馈和元语言解释反馈均有效减少了非英语专业大学生的汉译英翻译错误。直接反馈对减少句法错误以及技术性错误的效果优于元语言解释反馈，而元语言解释反馈对减少词法错误和修辞错误的效果优于直接反馈。

　　由以上实验结果可得出以下结论：直接反馈和元语言解释反馈可以有效提高非英语专业大学生的汉译英翻译成绩并且可以有效减少非英语专业大学生的汉译英翻译错误。教师需要根据翻译错误类型选择反馈方式以期更好地促进学生汉译英翻译成绩的提高。

关键词：直接反馈；元语言解释反馈；翻译成绩；非英语专业大学生

ABSTRACT

Corrective feedback is widely used in second language acquisition. According to the strategies of giving feedback, it can be divided into direct feedback and indirect feedback. Metalinguistic explanation feedback is one of the indirect feedback strategies. Metalinguistic explanation feedback and direct feedback are involved in this research. Until now, majority of linguistics affirm the positive role of corrective feedback played in second language acquisition process. However, there are few studies focus on comparing the effectiveness of metalinguistic explanation feedback and direct feedback, and few studies focus on the effectiveness of metalinguistic explanation feedback and direct feedback on translation achievement and grammatical errors on non-English majors.

Therefore, this study aims to answer the following two questions: 1) Can direct feedback and metalinguistic explanation feedback improve non-English major students' Chinese-to-English translation achievements effectively? 2) Can direct feedback and metalinguistic explanation feedback reduce non-English major students' Chinese-to-English translation errors effectively? The researcher used translation tasks in five pieces of the CET-4 Tests in 2019, 2020 and 2021 as the instrument. Taking two classes of non-English majors in their sophomore year of Northwest Normal University (27 students in Class A, receiving metalinguistic explanation feedback; 32 students in Class B, receiving direct feedback), a total number of 59 students as subjects. All students were asked to complete and submit five pieces of translation tasks in total. After students handing in their translation tasks each time, the researcher provided feedback for the errors in each piece of translation task, taking the errors in students' first translation tasks as the data of pretest and the errors in students' the fifth translation tasks as the data of post test. The experimental results showed that:

1. Both direct feedback and metalinguistic explanation feedback effectively improved non-English major students' Chinese-to-English translation achievements, and no significant difference existed.

2. Both direct feedback and metalinguistic explanation feedback effectively reduced non-English majors' Chinese-to-English translation errors. Direct feedback was better than metalinguistic

explanation feedback in reducing Syntax Errors and Mechanical Errors, while metalinguistic explanation feedback was better than direct feedback in reducing Morphology Errors and Rhetorical Errors.

Therefore, direct feedback and metalinguistic explanation feedback can improve non-English major students' Chinese-to-English translation achievements. Also, they can reduce non-English major students' Chinese-to-English translation errors. Teachers need to choose appropriate feedback strategies based on translation error types in order to improve non-English majors' translation achievements better.

Keywords: direct feedback; metalinguistic explanation feedback; translation achievements; non-English major students

CONTENTS

List of Figures

List of Tables

Chapter One Introduction

This chapter briefly illustrates the research background, research significance, research purpose and the structure of the thesis.

1.1 Research Background

Translation, as one of the essential skills in college English learning and teaching, is difficult for students to grasp, for it requires students' comprehensive knowledge ability, including grammar rules, sentence structures and expression habits of target language. Students are always required to understand the Chinese text first and then to translate the core information of the Chinese text into English, while during the translation process, students will make errors due to misunderstanding of certain points of Chinese text and the misuse of English expressions. To avoid or reduce the amount of errors and to produce a high-quality translation task, students need to combine their prior knowledge language and fully understand the requirements of translation task, which actually is demanding for certain amounts of non-English majors.

Although translation is an essential skill for college students, it is neglected in real teaching practice compared with others like listening, speaking, reading and writing. In some colleges, they even do not consider translation as a formal lesson to teach in their curriculum plans. Teachers need to finish their teaching syllables in a semester as scheduled or even in advance. The above two points may be the main reasons for neglecting translation teaching in colleges. Similar to writing, translation exercise usually appear in the exercise part by the end of each unit, and it will be arranged as homework for students to finish in their spare time. What's more, the sentences that need to be translated are always chosen from reading passages. When students are required to finish those exercises, most students tend to extract the sentence from the reading passage as it is or only replace certain phrases that share similar meanings in the chosen sentences. For students, doing translation exercises in such a way is useless for improving their translation ability. Besides, teachers do not provide specific feedback concerning students' translation tasks due to the large amount of translation tasks and limited time. From this point of view, we can see that doing such translation exercises will

be of little use for the improvement of students' translation achievement and for the reduction of the translation errors in the the CET-4 Test.

Hence, feedback on college students' translation tasks plays a vital role in facilitating their ability to translate Chinese text into English one. During the process of English teaching practice in colleges, teachers tend to adopt evaluative feedback and corrective feedback. The former one refers to teachers who would like to show marks or provide general comments like "good expressions, pay attention to the spelling of certain words, too many simple sentences" and so on at the end of students' translation papers. However, because students are less exposed to the scoring criteria of the translation part in the the CET-4 Test, they have difficulty in inferring the drawbacks they need to improve. Also, the feedback provided by teachers is not targeted enough for each student to know how to revise their drafts clearly. Besides the shortcomings mentioned above, there is another essential reason why evaluative feedback is not commended. With the deepening of curriculum reform, developmental evaluation, which advocates that more attention should be paid on the facilitating function of feedback, has become popular in English teaching. In order to improve each student's translation performance as soon as possible, teachers should give feedback as concise and helpful as possible according to each student's translation tasks and their language level at present.

Corrective feedback can be divided into different types. Researchers have found that different types of corrective feedback on a certain learning task can also be showed in multiple results. Generally speaking, students who receive direct feedback tend to do better in language accuracy and have high error correction rates (Brown, 1980; Long, 1990; Scrivener, 1994; James, 2000; Ferris, 2004), but the positive effects fade quickly with time goes by (Krashen & Terrell, 1993). However, indirect feedback, like metalinguistic explanation feedback tends to have a long term positive effect on students' error correction (Su, 2015). Actually, research results differ from one to one for the complexity of the second language acquisition. Some other factors, including the individual ability of learners, motivation to learn and emotional factors also play significant roles in the English learning process. Besides, a large number of researches and findings are conducted in the context of foreign countries (Sheen, 2007; Bitchener, 2008). English are taught as their second language, which means

English in those countries are used as working language. Students there possess more opportunities to communicate in English, while in China, English is taught as foreign language, the only occasion for students to access English is to listen to the teacher in English teaching classes. Therefore, the subjects in those studies are different from our Chinese learners in learning background, so the research findings can not be transferred simply to our English teaching practice. What's more, majority of researches that take students in junior or senior high schools, and non-English majors in college as subjects both concentrate on students' error correction on writing skill instead of translation skill. Although we all confirm that, as the production of English learning, translation and writing do have something in common, some differences exist.

Therefore, providing written corrective feedback, which is involved in the latter chapters in detail, seems a better way to meet students' needs in translation learning. As a tool that is frequently used in second language acquisition process, written corrective feedback, to some extent, does work in narrowing the gap between the interlanguage of students and the correct structure of target language. Corrective feedback requires teachers first to analyze different types of errors students made and illustrate how to correct the errors, which actually is a good channel for students to notice the gap between interlanguage forms and target language forms (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002).

However, scholars have been debating heatedly concerning the question whether corrective feedback has positive effective effect on students' language learning. Linguists named Edmondson (1985) and Schulz (1996) acclaimed that corrective feedback was a good way to promote learners' language acquisition process by helping them form good learning habits. To prove the effect of corrective feedback, there were some linguists did empirical studies and concluded the following conclusions: 1) corrective feedback can improve students' ability to use target language accurately, which in turn would motivate them to learn confidently (Brown, 1980; Long, 1990; Scrivener, 1994; James, 2000; Ferris, 2004). Oppositely, Krashen and Terrell (1993) did not think the corrective feedback was necessary for learners and thought that the errors would be reduced or disappear gradually with the language learning process. How to make a balance between accuracy and fluency in