ERRORS IN INDONESIAN-ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS BY STUDENTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION PROGRAM

*M Fajar Kurniawan Lubis **Masitowarni Siregar **Indra Hartoyo

ABSTRACT

This research was aimed to analyze errors made by students in translating Indonesian text to English using the classification made by Gentzler. The subject of this research was students who took Translation subject in 2018/2019 academic year in English Education study program in State University of Medan. The instrument of collecting data was a translation test from Indonesian to English consisting of three genres: narrative, descriptive, and analytical exposition. 30 students were divided into 3 groups of 10, each translating different genres. The errors in translations were classified into five types of errors as classified by Gentzler. The result showed that inversion, omission, addition, deviation, and modification errors were found in students' translations. Deviation and modification errors formed 90% of all errors combined. The errors were caused by interlingual and intralingual interference. They were collocational errors, choosing inappropriate meaning when looking up the dictionary, word per word translation, and overgeneralization.

Key words: Translation, Errors in Translation, English Education Study Program

^{*}Graduate status

^{**}Lecturer status

INTRODUCTION

Background of Study

Translation is an important part of language in order to communicate and convey information and culture between nations. Translation is transfer of meaning from the source text to target text. According to Nida & Taber (1982), "translation consists of reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalence of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style."

Translation is also important in helping students to help students' language acquisition. Translation use in classroom to facilitate second or foreign language learning is called pedagogical translation. Leonardii (2011) posits that pedagogical translation can be used at any level of proficiency and in any educational contextas a valuable teaching method and to support the four traditional language skills: speaking, listening, writing, and reading. As such, English Department in general and English Education Study Program in particular offers Translation as one of the courses.

Unfortunately, as future teachers who will use pedagogical translation, students of English Education Study Program still make errors in their translations.

Indonesian schools' English curriculum includes short and long functional texts to be learned by the students. Similarly, in order to prepare future teachers, Translation course in English Education Study Program of State University of Medan also includes functional texts (Siregar, 2018). In this study, narrative, descriptive, and analytical exposition were picked to be translated by the students and analyzed.

The researcher intended to conduct the study to analyze the errors made by students of English Education Study Program in their translations. The research aimed to answer: 1) What types of errors were made by the students in translating narrative, descriptive, and analytical exposition Indonesian texts to English? 2) How are the errors realized in narrative, descriptive, and analytical exposition texts translations?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Errors and Error analysis

Errors in the context of language learning are noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker. They reflect the competence level of the speaker and are systematic, i.e. they occur repeatedly and can not be recognized by the speaker themself. As such, errors can not be self-corrected by the speaker. (Corder in Gass & Selinker, 2008)

Analyzing the errors made by students provides a window to see the learners' current knowledge level. Corder in Brown (2000) noted that "learners' errors provide evidence how language is learned or acquired, what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in the discovery of the language". This analysis of errors is simply called error analysis.

Error analysis typically consists of 5 or 6 steps according to Gass & Selinker (2008). They are collecting the data, identifying the errors, classifying the errors, quantifying the errors, analyzing the source of errors, and potentially remediating the problem.

Classification of Errors

The classification of errors differ from one study to another depending on the focus of the study. This study focused on the meaning and used the classification used by Gentlzer as was used in Salam (2017). The errors are classified into inversion, addition, omission, deviation, and modification of meanings.

Inversion of meaning happens when the meaning found in target text directly contradicts the meaning in source text. Addition of meaning is the presence of an idea which is not present in the source text in the target text. Conversely, omission of meaning is the omission of an idea in source text. Deviation of meaning is a change of meaning from source text to the target text. Modification of meaning happens when the expression in English does not convey a clear meaning or choosing incorrect derivation.

Causes of Errors

According to Gass & Selinker (2008), there are two main causes of error within an error analysis framework: interlingual and intralingual. Interlingual errors are those which can be attributed to the native language (i.e., they involve crosslinguistic comparisons). Intralingual errors are those that are due to the language being learned, independent of the native language.

Interlingual errors between Indonesian and English for example may happen because of the noun phrase structure. In Indonesian, noun phrases with adjective come in the form of N-Adj, for example: baju baru, mobil merah. In English, noun phrases with adjective come in the form of Adj-N, for example: new dress, red car. This difference may be causing error where the learners form English noun phrase as in Indonesian, i.e. *dress new, *car red.

Intralingual errors may happen due to overgeneralization of rules. A learner who has learned that regular past participle is formed by adding -ed to the verb may generalize this rule and apply it to irregular verb. That is, learner produce *runned, *catched, and *singed because they have not learned that not all verbs have regular past participle form. Another example is in pluralisation and applying -s/es to nouns with irregular plural form like child, tooth, and goose.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was a qualitative descriptive research conducted by identifying and analyzing the errors found in translations made by students. It followed the steps in error analysis as proposed by Gass & Selinker (2008): collect the data, identify errors, classify errors, quantify errors, and analyze the errors. The errors were classified into classification by Gentzler, consisting of inversion, addition, omission, deviation, and modification of meaning.

The subject of the study was students of English Education Study Program who took Translation course in 2018/2019 Academic Year. Thirty (30) students were taken randomly from one out of five classes who took the course in 2018/2019 Academic Year.

The instrument was translation task in the form of a long functional text in the narrative, descriptive, and analytical exposition text to be translated into English. Each genre of text was translated by 10 students.

After the data was collected, the researcher identified the errors made and classify them to Gentlzer's classification. The number of errors was counted and the percentage of each type compared to total number of errors was calculated. Finally, the source of errors were analyzed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Research Findings

Narrative text

The following table is the summary of errors found in students' translation of narrative text.

Error type Number of errors by student Average Inversion 0(0%)Omission 1.4 (21.5%) Addition 0 (0 %) Deviation 2.1 (32.3 %) Modification 3.0 (46.1 %) Total 6.5 (100%)

Table 1 Errors in translation in narrative text

Deviation and modification forms the majority of students errors, combined forming 78% of all errors. Examples of the erros found can be seen in the following table:

Table 2 Errors examples in narrative text

Source text	Student	Error type	Explanation
	Translation		
Abah tinggal di	Abah lived in a	Omission	Omission of the meaning
rumah yang cukup	big house		cukup (big enough house,
besar	Abah lives in a		pretty big house)
	big house		
Perlahan tapi	Slowly,	Omission	Omission of the meaning

pasti,			pasti (slowly but surely)		
Mereka hidup	They live	Modification	Misformation of the		
rukun dan	<u>harmonious</u> and		adverb 'harmoniously'		
berkecukupan	well off.				
	They life	Modification	Misformation of the		
	harmonious and		adverb 'adequately'		
	<u>adequate</u>				
Suatu hari, rekan	One day, his	Modification	Misformation of the verb		
kerja Ayah	business partner		'betrayed'		
mengkhianatinya	traitorous him				
Abah tinggal di	father life in one	Modification	Misformation of noun		
rumah yang cukup	of house big		phrase 'big house'		
besar			(modifier – head)		
harta pribadi	Abah's family's	Deviation	Change of meaning from		
keluarga Abah	personal property		direbut (seize, take) to		
berhasil	he won		'win', suggesting a		
direbutnya			positive context		
rekan kerja	Abah's partner	Deviation	Change of meaning from		
Abah	abuse him		betrayal to abuse		
mengkhianatinya.					

The omission errors were clustered in the same sentence *Abah tinggal di rumah yang cukup besar* by omitting the modifier *cukup* (pretty, enough). Modification of errors were mainly made by misformation of word or using incorrect derived form or word class, such as using <u>life</u>, <u>harmonious</u>, and <u>adequate</u> when they should be <u>live</u>, <u>harmoniously</u>, and <u>adequately</u>.

Misformation of noun phrase by putting the modifier after the noun (<u>house big</u>) was also found. This happens because of interference from Indonesian syntax in which the modifier is placed after the noun.

Deviation errors were changes in meaning. It was found that these were mostly caused by choosing incorrect word in context in the dictionary, thus changing the meaning. For example, in the sentence <u>Ayah memulai usahanya lagi</u>, a student translated <u>usaha</u> (meaning business or trade in this context) to <u>effort</u> and another student translated it to <u>attempt</u>.

Descriptive text

The following table summarizes the errors found in students' translation of descriptive text:

Table 3 Errors in translation in descriptive text

Error type		Number of errors by students							Average		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Inversion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.1 (1.5%)
Omission	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0.5 (7.4 %)
Addition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Deviation	2	3	2	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.1 (16.4%)
Modification	3	9	7	7	0	3	11	6	4	0	5.0 (74.6%)
Total	5	13	9	7	6	5	11	7	4	0	6.7 (100%)

Modification and deviation error formed the majority of errors, totaling 90% of all errors. Examples of the errors can be seen in the following table

Table 4 Errors examples in descriptive text

Source text	Student	Error type	Explanation
	translation		
letaknya yang tidak berada di pusat kota	located in the city center	Inversion	Inversion of meaning from NOT in the city center to in the city center
suasana belajar mengajar akan lebih nyaman karena terhindar dari kebisingan kendaraan	Student also comfortable in learning process	Omission	Omission of a clause (because of little/no traffic noise)
SMA Negeri 2 Tuban memiliki luas tanah seluas kurang lebih satu hektar	This school has wide ground less than 1 hectare	Deviation	Change of meaning from area to wide ground
	have a wide land around 1 hectare	Deviation	Change of meaning from area to wide land
seluas kurang lebih satu hektar	less than 1 hectareless of 1 hectare	Deviation	Change of meaning from approximately to less than
dan lima bangunan utama	& five <u>building</u> important	Modification	Misformation of noun phrase
sekolah terbaik di	school the	Modification	Misformation of noun

Tuban	best in Tuban		phrase	
	volleyball			
languagusali	square		Incorrect collocational	
lapangan voli	volleyball yard	Modification	use (volleyball court)	
	volley field			
	student able	Modification		
nasauta didik mamnu	to explorate the		Misformation of verb explore	
peserta didik mampu mengeksporasi	lesson			
pelajaran	students able			
peiajaran	to <u>exploration</u>		-	
	lesson			

Some students made deviation errors in translating <u>luas tanah</u> to <u>wide land</u>, <u>large field</u>, and some other variation of it. This was likely caused by translating the Indonesian phrase <u>luas tanah</u> (area) by translating the individual words <u>luas</u> (wide, large) and <u>tanah</u> (ground)

Intralingual interference were seen in translation of <u>mengeksplorasi</u> translated to <u>explorate</u>. The student incorrectly generalized –ate verb forming suffix to <u>explore</u>. Some interlingual interference also where some verbs ending in –ate are translated to Indonesian with suffix –asi, for example discriminate (*diskriminasi*), allocate (*alokasi*), and intimidate (*intimidasi*). These interferences can also be seen in <u>mendaftar(registrasi)</u> as <u>registrate</u> and <u>fasilitas</u> as <u>facilitate</u> or fasilitate.

Collocational errors caused errors in phrases such as lapangan voli, lapangan basket, and lapangan bola. Students translated lapangan as <u>field</u> or <u>ground</u> (general open area) and not as a phrase in which *lapangan* means play area and should be translated according to the sport, i.e. volleyball court, basketball court, and soccer/football pitch.

Analytical Exposition Text

The following table summarizes the errors made by students in analytical exposition text.

Table 5 Errors in translations in analytical exposition text

Error type		Number of errors							Average		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Inversion	()	()	()	0	()	()	()	0	()	()	0
Omission	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	()	0	0.2 (5.4 %)
Addition	()	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	()	0	0.1 (2.7 %)
Deviation	2	2	3	1	1	4	2	2	()	0	1.7 (45.9 %)
Modification	0	0	6	0	2	3	2	4	0	0	1.7 (45.9 %)
Total	3	2	9	2	4	7	4	6	0	0	3.7 (100 %)

Deviation and modification errors fomed total of 91.8 % of all errors. The following table contains some examples of the errors made by students in translating analytical exposition text

Table 6 Errors examples in analytical exposition text

Source text	Student Translation	Error type	Explanation
Setiap negara	Some of country	Deviation	Change in meaning
mempunyai tim	have each national		from all countries
nasional masing	group		having their own
masing			national team to only
			some.
mengibarkan	flutter his	Deviation	Change in meaning
bendera nasional	national country		because of contextual
negaranya	flag		difference.
			Collocational error.
adalah	national <u>profit</u> to	Deviation	Change in meaning.
keuntungan dalam	support		Choosing incorrect
mendorong	is <u>a luck</u> in		word from dictionary
nasionalisme	encourage		
bangsa	is <u>a profit</u> in		
	providing		
Bendera dan lagu	Flag and	Deviation	Change in meaning
kebangsaan adalah	<u>nationality</u> is a		from national anthem to
simbol suatu	symbol of a state		nationality

Negara	Flag and national sing Flag and nationalism song Flag and song of nationalism	Modification	Collocational use is national anthem	
Perlombaan olahraga ini diikuti oleh warga	This event sport followed by citizen This competion was followed by residents	Deviation	Change in meaning. Choosing the incorrect word from dictionary	
kehormatan untuk dirinya sendiri	<u>honourable</u> to itself	Modification	Misformation of the noun honour/honor	
Olahraga tidak hanya membuat badan kuat dan sehat	Sport not only to make our body strong and <u>health</u>	Modification	Misformation of adjective healthy	
Perlombaan olahraga	Event sport	Modification	Misformation of noun phrase	

Choosing incorrect word or meaningfrom dictionary created deviation errors where the chosen word is not the correct word to use in the context. This can be seen in *keuntungan dalam mendorong nasionalisme* (advantage/benefit in this context) translated to <u>profit</u> (*keuntungan* in economic context.

Recapitulation

The result of each genre is recapitulated in the table below

Table 7 Errors recapitulation

Error type	Narrative	Desriptive	Analytical	All genre
	text average	text average	exposition	average
			text average	
Inversion	0	0.1 (1.5%)	0	0.03 (0.5 %)
Omission	1.4 (21.5%)	0.5 (7.4 %)	0.2 (5.4 %)	0.70 (12.4 %)
Addition	0	0	0.1 (2.7%)	0.03 (0.5 %)
Deviation	2.1 (32.3 %)	1.1 (16.4 %)	1.7 (45.9 %)	1.30 (23 %)
Modification	3 (46.2 %)	5 (74.6 %)	1.7 (45.9 %)	3.16 (56.1 %)
Total	6.5	6.7	3.7	5.63

As can be seen in the table, all error types were found in this study. Omission, deviation, and modification errors were found in all genres while inversion and addition errors were only found in descriptive and analytical exposition text respectively.

In all three genres, deviation and modification errors formed the majority of the errors. Combined they form 88%, 91%, and 91% of all errors for narrative, descriptive, and analytical exposition text respectively. As a whole, they formed 90.6% of all errors.

The ratio between modification and deviation error was found to be higher in descriptive text compared to analytical and narrative texts. This was likely due to higher frequency of nominal phrases and interlingual interference in forming nominal phrases.

The errors were caused by interlingual and intralingual interferences. Interlingual interferences included collocational error, misformation of noun phrase and using wrong class of word, choosing incorrect meaning from dictionary, and translating a phrase word per word. Intralingual intereference included overgeneralizing rules, resulting in misformation of words.

Discussion

After analyzing the data, it was found that deviation and modification errors formed the majority of errors in all three genres. Combined, they comprised 90 % of all errors found in the students translation. This is in line with the study by Salam, et al. (2017) who studied translation errors using crowdsourcing, in which deviation and modification of meaning were the majority and formed 73.2% of all errors. In descriptive genre in particular, modification errors found were almost quadruple the number of deviation error. In the other two genres, deviation and modification had similar number of errors.

The causes of errors were grouped into interlingual and intralingual interference. Interlingual interferences found were collocational errors, not choosing the correct meaning when looking up from dictionary (profit for keuntungan when the context calls for benefit), and translating a phrase word per

word, and misformation of noun phraseslike rumah besar to house big which is using Indonesian syntax of placing adjective after the noun as opposed to English syntax of adjective before the noun. Intralingual errors were found in which some students generalized the verb forming suffix incorrectly. The causes of errors were similar to Cuc (2018) and Popescu (2013) who found that the most common errors were rendition of lexical items and collocational errors and attributed them to both interlingual and intralingual interference.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

It can be concluded that the types of errors found in students' translations were inversion, omission, addition, deviation, and modification errors. Omission, deviation, and modification errors were present in all three genres. Deviation and modification errors formed the majority of all errors. The errors were caused by interlingual and intralingual interferences Interlingual interferences included collocational error, misformation of noun phrase and using wrong class of word, choosing incorrect meaning from dictionary, and translating a phrase word per word. Intralingual intereference included overgeneralizing rules, resulting in misformation of words.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusions the suggestions are for the students to read more text in English to internalize the collocations and syntax of English. The teachers are suggested to give more focus on differences between Indonesian and English syntax and collocations by providing more text to read and encouraging the students to read more.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Douglas H. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, 4th ed.*New York: Longman
- Gass, Susan and Selinker, Larry. 2008. Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course. New York: Routledge
- Cuc, Pham Thi Kim. 2018. "An Analysis of Translation Errors: A Case Study of Vietnamese EFL Students". *International Journal of English Linguistics Vol 8 No 1 2018* pp. 22-29.
- Leonardii, Vanessa. 2011. "Pedagogical Translation as a Naturally-Occuring Cognitive and Linguistic Activity in Foreign Language Learning". *Annali Online di Lettere-Ferrara Vol 1-2 2011* pp. 17-28.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Taber, Charles R. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill
- Popescu, Teodora. 2013. "A Corpus-based Approach to Translation Error Analysis. A Case-study of Romanian EFL Learners". *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 83 (2013) pp. 242-247.
- Salam, Zainar M, *et al.* 2017. "Translation Errors Made by Indonesian English Translators in Crowdsourcing Translation Application" in *ELT Worldwide Vol.4 No. 2 2017* pp. 1-15.
- Siregar, Masitowarni. 2018. Bahan Ajar Translation I. Medan: UNIMED
- Siregar, Masitowarni. 2018. Bahan Ajar Translation II. Medan: UNIMED