

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Previous Studies

This section presents several previous studies carried out by other researchers that are related to error analysis on EFL learners' translation from Indonesian to English. These previous studies are used as references to conduct this research.

The first previous study was taken from an article entitled "*An Error Analysis Case Study: Out of Context Translation of Persian Sentences into English for Elementary EFL Learners*" by Khoshhal (2017). Khoshhal analyzed the errors committed by 20 elementary-level EFL learners using a qualitative method. In order to analyze the errors, Khoshhal translated 10 English sentences from learners' textbook into Persian. Then, students were asked to translate those sentences back into English. The findings showed that the most frequent errors committed by the students were the errors in the use of articles which contributed 20% of the total errors, followed by the wrong uses of verbs with a percentage of 18.66%, and the wrong use of tense as much as 10.66%.

Wongranu (2017) also analyzed the errors committed by EFL learners in his study, "*Errors in translation made by English major students: A study on types and causes*" using a qualitative approach. The study involved 25 EFL learners at Kasetsart University, Thailand. The participants were given 9 exercises of translating Thai sentences into English, but only seven out of nine practices were

collected. The findings of the study suggest that the highest number of errors concerned errors in countability (20.16%), followed by errors involving determiners (14.21%), and errors in the use of tense (10.78%). A follow-up interview was conducted to discover the possible causes of the committed errors. According to the results, students' anxiety to complete the task and students' low self-confidence in their English proficiency are the primary causes of errors in translating.

In the subsequent year, Al-Halawani wrote an article entitled "*Error analysis: A Case Study of Malaysian Efl Learners*". He attempted to identify, describe and explain the errors made by EFL learners at one of the universities in Malaysia. He used a qualitative method for this study. A total of 38 participants were assigned to translate Malay sentences into English using a news story chosen from a news portal which is consisted of 235 words. The findings indicated that errors in word selection or collocational clash were the most-frequently-made errors, followed by errors in word order or use of awkward expressions, and errors in the use of verb tenses with a total percentage of 32.08%, 12.74%, and 11.85% respectively.

Cúc (2018) in his qualitative study entitled "*An Analysis of Translation Errors: A Case Study of Vietnamese EFL Students*" conducted an analysis error involving 36 Vietnamese students majoring in English Linguistics who were given the task to translate Vietnamese text into English. The instrument was taken out from an article constructed of 300 words. The findings of the study revealed that the most frequent errors found were translation errors (including distorted meaning, addition,

omission, and inaccurate renditions of lexical items) which contributed 48,37% of the total errors and linguistic errors with 44,08% (including the selection of words (lexical choice), the arrangement of words and phrases (syntax), and the juxtaposition of words (collocation)).

An article entitled “*Translation Errors in Students’ Indonesian-English Translation Practice*” written by Koman, Hartono, and Yuliasri (2019) discussed errors made by English Education Study Program in Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES) students in translating texts from Indonesian to English. This study utilized a descriptive qualitative method to analyze the data collected. The pre-test of the Indonesian-English translation course was analyzed as the object of the study. Moreover, the authors also used questionnaires and interviews to find out the causes of the errors. Findings suggest that students mostly made grammatical errors (14,3%) and syntactic errors (12,1%). There is also faithfulness error which took 10,2% while the other error categories took place under 10%.

There are several similarities between those five previous studies above, one of which is they analyzed the error made by EFL learners who are learning English as their primary study. The participants majored in English Education study program at different universities. Some studies classified the errors into more general categories, while others classified the errors into more specific classes. Nevertheless, according to the previous studies above, the most prominent errors found in EFL learners’ translation from Indonesian into English are as follows consecutively: syntactic errors (chiefly tenses, determiners, word order, and

agreement rules), lexical errors (particularly wrong selection of words), and discourse errors (awkward expressions). As compared to the previous studies, this current study aims to analyze the errors made by EFL learners in upper secondary education who learn English as one of the compulsory subjects rather than as the primary subject.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 The Definition of Translation

There are many definitions regarding translation. House (2015) defined translation as “the result of a linguistic-textual operation in which a text in one language is re-contextualized in another language.” Putri (2019) stated that translation is a process of altering a text from one language called the source language (SL) into another language called the target language (TL). Newmark (1988), on the other hand, argued that the process of translation is not merely changing the text from one language to another but also carrying the essential meaning of the text without changing it.

The text is reconstructed in such a way that the linguistic elements and the structure of the text change, but the meaning of the text remains the same. This process requires knowledge, skills, art, and taste of the translator (Newmark, 1988). Accordingly, the translator has to possess more than adequate knowledge about the language as well as the culture of the target language to employ proper language choice and construction in translating the text equipped with creative thinking and imagination.

Thus, it can be concluded that translation is a process of transmitting and altering texts, ideas, and meanings from the source language (SL) into the target language (TL) without changing the original meaning using the translator's cultural knowledge and interpretation by considering other related disciplines as a means of cross-cultural communication.

2.2.2 The Steps of Translation

There are three steps in translating a text (Suryawinata & Hariyanto, 2003):

1. Analysis of Source Language Text

First and foremost, the translator has to conduct a surface analysis of the source language text by examining every bit of the structure including the construction of sentences, clauses, phrases, and words. After examining the text concisely, the translator needs to interpret the main idea of the text. To fully identify and decipher the meaning embedded in the text, the translator has to read the text in the source language as a whole by considering the context. After doing this step, the translator can proceed to the next step.

2. The Transference of Message

The next step to do is to grasp the message contained in the content that the author intended to convey. This step is conducted after the translator successfully comprehends both the structure and the meaning of the text in the source language. Then, the meaning and the message of the text are transmitted from the source language into the target language. The translator has to make sure that the message

is still equivalent to the original message although the language and the whole structure change.

3. Restructuration

The last step is restructuration which involves reconstructing the structure and transforming the message from the source language text into the target language precisely. This step has something to do with the translator's language style. The text has to be properly translated without changing the original meaning of the text and the language used should be appropriate to the target reader of the text.

2.2.3 The Definition of Error

Brown (2006) differentiated between mistake and error. A mistake refers to a faulty performance, it is the result of learners' poor performance influenced by many factors such as slips of the tongue and faux pas despite having adequate linguistics knowledge. Thus, a mistake can be self-corrected when the speaker making the mistake realized he had made a mistake or when the mistake is brought to attention. Error, on the other hand, is made because of learners' lack of competence in the linguistics aspect of the target language and even sometimes their source language. Learners who make errors cannot self-correct themselves because they do not know the correct substitution.

While errors are made out of ignorance, mistakes are the failure of language use even though the learners have known or learned about it. Mistakes happen due to some internal as well as external factors that affect learners' knowledge of the

language pattern. Accordingly, the meaning conveyed in the erroneous sentences is inadmissible.

2.2.4 Error Analysis

Various approaches have been utilized in order to analyze errors, one of which is error analysis (EA). According to Sari (2016), error analysis is useful especially for language teachers to determine what a language learner needs to be taught and it also provides learners the information about what he or she lacks in learning a language. Brown (2006) stated that error analysis puts an emphasis on the significance of errors in learners' interlanguage systems as it is believed to affect the occurrence of grammatical errors (Puspita, 2019). According to Erdogan (2005), error analysis concerns with learners' performance. He argued that learners' cognitive process reflects how learners employ and put into practice the input acquired from the target language.

2.2.5 Levels of Error

According to Thornbury (1999), errors can be categorized into lexical errors, grammar errors, and discourse errors.

1. Lexical Errors

The translator may choose inequivalent words from the target language when translating a text from the source language since different cultures can lead to different functions and meanings (El-Farahaty, 2016). This error is related to lexical errors. In general, lexical errors refer to the distortion of second language rules

related to lexical items. Word classes such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs as well as phrasal verbs, adverbial phrases, and idioms are considered lexical items. Errors involving those lexical items are studied as lexical errors (Llach, 2011). This kind of error involves error in word formation, collocation, and wrong word choice.

Lexical errors are divided into two types based on lexical errors taxonomy (James, 1998): formal errors of lexis and semantic errors in lexis. The former is further divided into three sub-classes namely formal misselection, formal misformations, and distortions. Meanwhile, the latter is divided into two sub-classes, they are confusion of sense relations and collocational errors.

2. Grammar Errors

It is important to be able to distinguish between lexical items and grammatical items. While lexical items are associated with content words, grammatical items are associated with function words (Boye and Bastiaanse, 2018). Learners may also make grammar errors such as using inappropriate verb form and tense as well as constructing the improper structure of the sentence. This level of error is related to morphology and syntax.

Morphology errors are associated with learners' failure to comply with the rules of grammatical words including prepositions, articles, and conjunctions (Llach, 2011). Other grammatical words include pronouns, affixes, and auxiliaries. Finch (2000) defined syntax as "the study of rules governing the way words combined to form sentences". This kind of error arises due to learners' confusion regarding part of

speech and learners' lack of target language competence, especially the knowledge involving larger-than-words construction including phrases, clauses, and sentences (Nuraini, Hanafiah, and Lubis, 2020).

3. Discourse Errors

Discourse errors are associated with “the way sentences are organized and linked in order to make whole texts” (Thornbury, 1999). Errors made at this level happen due to the inappropriate use of context. Thus, it is essential for translators to use lexical items and syntactic structure in the right context.

2.2.6 Types of Errors

2.2.6.1 Lexical Errors Taxonomy

James in 1998 proposed a lexical errors taxonomy by classifying lexical errors into two major classes namely formal errors of lexis and semantic errors in lexis. One of many ways to classify lexical errors is by categorizing them in terms of the sorts of knowledge of words that people possess which are then elaborated in detail as follows:

1. Formal Errors of Lexis

Formal errors of lexis deal with the morphology of the word (how to spell and pronounce a word), the syntactic behavior, the functional or situational restrictions, and the frequency (how likely the word is to be used). In classifying this class of errors, James (2013) divides it into three categories:

1) **Formal Misselection**

This category refers to two or more words that are similar in terms of form (spelling) and sound (pronunciation) or can be called synforms, confusibles, or confusable. The similarity between these two or more words can be identified by looking at the number of syllables, stress pattern, word class, initial part, phonemes in common, as well as phonemes with shared features. Below are the classifications of formal misselection:

- a. Suffix type (e.g. that's very considerable [considerate] of her)
- b. Prefix type (e.g. I really unlike [dislike] any kind of lies, white lies are included)
- c. Vowel-based type (e.g. his failure does not effect [affect] his determination to success)
- d. Consonant-based type (e.g. the doctor advices [advises] me to take a long rest)

2) **Formal Misformations**

James (2013) describes formal misformations as the errors committed by learners in which the erroneous words do not exist in their first language. Learners made their own language or known as interlanguage as the words are either derived from their first language or created from the resources of the target language.

Furthermore, James (2013) classifies this sub-class as follows:

- a. Borrowing: words adopted from L1 without any modification and therefore become the new 'host' code.
e.g. she is such a matre woman ('gold digger' ← L1 Indonesian *matre*)

- b. Coinage: words derived from L1 that are adjusted to the structure of the target language.

e.g. my parents are crying happy tears because they are really proud of my prestasion ('achievement' ← L1 Indonesian *prestasi*)

- c. Calque: words resulting from the literal translation of the words in the first language.

e.g. I cannot go to the party tonight because I enter wind ('catch a cold' ← L1 Indonesian *masuk angin*)

3) Distortions

As opposed to formal misformations that are considered interlingual errors, distortions are considered intralingual errors. These errors are produced without recourse to the resources of the first language (James, 2013). Thus, the outcomes cannot be found in the target language or are non-existent words in the target language. Below are the five sub-types of distortions:

- a. Omission (e.g. when he relized [realized] he has made a mistake, it was too late)
- b. Overinclusion (e.g. I haven't seen such a beautifull [beautiful] flower!)
- c. Misselection (e.g. this fried rice is the most delitous [delicious] fried rice I've ever tasted)
- d. Misordering (e.g. the gril [girl] looks so confused)
- e. Blends (e.g. I always feel dizzy every time I see a deephth [deep+depth] blue sea)

2. Semantic Errors in Lexis

James (2013) classifies semantic errors in lexis into two main types described as follows:

1) Confusion of Sense Relations

There is substantial neurolinguistic evidence that humans have an “internalized knowledge of the properties of words” in a collection of extremely sophisticated neural circuits called the mental lexicon (Al-Dala’ien, Mudhsh, and Al-Takhayinh, 2015). It is believed that words are stored in the mental lexicon. As a result, it is feasible to attempt to classify lexical errors in relation to these systems. There are four sub-classes of this kind of error:

- a. Using hypernym (a more general term) where hyponym (a more specific term) is required.
e.g. the herdsman [shepherd] forgot to tend his sheep.
- b. Using too specific term (hyponym) where a more general term (hypernym) is needed.
e.g. it’s always crowded around my school because there are many mansions [houses] surrounding the school.
- c. Using inapt co-hyponym.
e.g. he is my niece [nephew].
- d. Using the wrong near-synonym (two or more words that are semantically related but are distinct in terms of connotation, denotation, emphasis, implicature, or register (James, 2013; DiMarco, Hirst, and Stede, 1993)).
e.g. I find him really ridiculous [unusual].

2) Collocational Errors

Collocation is defined as a couple of words that are commonly used together (James, 2013). There are three levels of collocation:

- a. Semantically determined word selection (e.g. *crooked stick* instead of *crooked year*)
- b. Statistically weighted preferences (e.g. *large appetite* is more preferable than *big appetite*)
- c. Arbitrary combinations (e.g. *make noise* and *make a choice*, not *create noise* and *create a choice*)
- d. Irreversible binomials (e.g. *one and only* and *cause and effect* not *only and one* and *effect and cause*)

2.2.6.2 Surface Strategy Taxonomy

Based on surface strategy taxonomy, learners may change surface structures of the target language by omitting or adding unnecessary elements or items, misforming as well as misordering them (Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982). This taxonomy highlights the surface structures of language are altered by learners in specific and systematic ways. This premise is also related to the concept that learners' cognitive process underlies the way learners construct and develop their interlanguage. According to surface strategy taxonomy, errors can be classified into 4 subtypes:

1. Omission

Omission occurs when a must-appear element is absent. In this case, the morpheme such as the bound morpheme *-s/es* which functions as the marker for the third

singular person is frequently omitted. For example, the sentence is written as *She always go to school by bike* instead of *She always goes to school by bike*. Another example is the absence of an article such as the indefinite article *a*. For instance, the sentence is written as *He is student* instead of *He is a student*.

2. Addition

Addition occurs when a must-not-appear element is present. It is the “result of all-too-faithful use of certain rules” (Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982). They prompted that addition can be categorized into three sub-types as follows:

- a. Double markings: a redundant use of an element that is required to omit in the construction. This kind of addition typically occurs when two tense markers and sometimes two or more negators instead of one are used in a sentence. For example, one may write the following sentences as *She didn't told me* and *They don't know nothing* instead of *She didn't tell me* and *They don't know anything* or *They know nothing*.
- b. Regularization: an overgeneralization of certain rules. This addition usually happens in irregular verbs in which the learners apply the rules of regular verbs by adding the suffix *-ed*. For example, the past tense form of *put* is written as *putted* instead of *put*.
- c. Simple addition: includes other additions that do not belong to either double marking or regularization such as an addition of an unnecessary word. For example, learners may write *I'll wait for you in here* instead of *I'll wait for you here*.

3. Misformation

Misformation occurs when the wrong form of lexeme or structure is used. The learners may incorrectly complement an item in a word. Dulay, Burt, and Kreshen (1982) divided this type of error into three subtypes:

- a. Regularization: incorrect use of regular marker in an irregular one. For instance, plural marker *-s* in irregular nouns is used when it is not required such as in the word *gooses* which should have been written as *geese*.
- b. Archi-forms: a wrong selection of a member of class forms to represent others. The practical example is the use of the nominative pronoun *he* in the sentence *I would like to meet he*. The nominative pronoun *he* in that sentence is used by learners to represent the entire class including the objective pronoun *him*.
- c. Alternating forms: relatively unrestricted interchange of various members of a class with one another. When there are only two ‘members’ involved, the combination can be in the [right + wrong] forms of a particular construction or [wrong + wrong] forms or [right + right] forms. The last one, however, is not included in this type since it is not of a particular interest to Error Analysis. The example of the first case would be *she doesn't know* and *she no know* alternate in learner's interlanguage. Meanwhile, the occurrence of *I eaten my lunch* alongside *I have ate my lunch* in learner's interlanguage is the example of alternation of the second case. In conclusion, it is possible that one of the variations is correct while the other is incorrect [right + wrong], or both might be incorrect [wrong + wrong], or both could be correct [right + right]. However, only the erroneous one is the concern of Error Analysts. As

a result, alternating forms is neither an error category nor even a subtype in and of itself, and therefore it will not be analyzed in this case study.

4. Misordering

Misordering occurs when an element is placed in the wrong place. This type of error may arise due to the difference between learners' L1 and L2 construction. For instance, learners may write *I wonder what are they doing right now* instead of *I wonder what they are doing right now*. Another example is the sentence *We watch often the video* in which it should be written as *We watch the video often* or *We often watch the video*.

2.2.6.3 Morpho-Syntactic Errors Taxonomy

Another classification of errors that focuses more on the errors on grammar level is the Morpho-Syntactic Errors Taxonomy. Some typical morpho-syntactic errors suggested by Keshavarz (2012) are wrong use of plural morpheme, wrong use of parts of speech, wrong use of tenses, wrong sequence of tenses, wrong word order, using *it is* instead of *there is*, misplacement of adverbs, errors in the use of prepositions, wrong use of prepositions, errors in the use of articles, wrong use of articles, wrong use of active & passive voice, wrong use of conditional sentences, double negation, wrong use of negative imperative, errors in the use of relative clauses & relative pronouns, subject-verb inversion in WH-questions, subject-verb inversion in indirect questions, wrong use of verb groups, and errors due to lack of concord or agreement. Some of the errors were also divided into smaller types.

2.2.7 Sources of Error

Linguists have proposed some possible sources of error over the past years. The common possible sources of error argued by linguists are interlingual and intralingual errors (James, 2013; Richards and Schmidt, 2010; Brown, 2006). The writer will focus on those two major potential sources of error accordingly.

1. Interlingual Error

Interlingual error or interlingual transfer is also called interference. Interference is experienced when the rules of learners' mother tongue or the learners' L1 interfere with the language system of the target language (the second or foreign language). The more differences in language rules, the more difficulties learners face when learning the language, and the greater the chance learners experience interlingual error. Researchers believe that this kind of error can be predicted and therefore can be prevented to arise.

The followings are the five sub-types of interlingual errors proposed by Keshavarz (2012):

a. Transfer of Phonological Elements of L1

The difference between L1 and L2 phonological elements may affect the learners' pronunciation as well as spelling. For example, Indonesian EFL learners tend to pronounce the word *school* as /skol/ instead of /sku:l/ since Indonesians always pronounce the letter *o* as /o/, even though there are two *os* they still pronounce it as /o/ not /u/. As a result, the spelling of *school* is also distorted, such as *schol* or *scholl*.

b. Transfer of Morphological Elements

The transmission of morphological traits from the learner's mother tongue might cause errors in translating texts from source language into target language or vice versa. For instance, there is no plural morpheme in Indonesian and therefore Indonesian EFL learners might make errors in nouns and quantifiers agreement. An example of the error caused by the transfer of morphological elements of L1 will be the omission of plural marker -s in *There are **two plate** on the table.*

c. Transfer of Grammatical Elements

In learning a second or foreign language, students have a tendency to transfer not only phonological and morphological elements but also grammatical elements from their first language to those of the target language. Considering the fact that there are no tenses in Indonesian, Indonesian EFL learners tend to apply the same grammatical rule into English. For instance, instead of using past simple tense to talk about an event in the past, the students use the simple present tense. This case can be exemplified in the following sentence: *They **go** to school by bus yesterday* instead of *They went to school by bus yesterday.*

d. Transfer of Lexico-Semantic Errors

There are two sub-categories of this source of errors:

1) Cross-association: the learners employ the same word in two different contexts in the target language since their first language only has one word that is equivalent to two or more words in the target language (e.g. *tinggal* in Indonesian can be translated as *stay* or *leave* in English depending on the contexts).

2) False cognates: the learners use the word in their native language instead of the word in the target language because the words have the same or similar form yet has different meanings (e.g. *mental* in Indonesian means *bounce off*; however, *mental* in English is of or relating to the mind).

e. Transfer of Stylistic and Cultural Elements

The last source of errors related to interlingual errors is the transfer of stylistic and cultural elements of the learners' first language. For example, in Indonesian, there is a term to address someone older as *kak*. The sentence *I don't know, Brother* as the translation of *Saya tidak tahu, Kak* is an example of erroneous sentence produced by the transfer of stylistic and cultural elements of Indonesian.

2. Intralingual Error

Intralingual error or intralingual transfer happens due to the confusion experienced by learners and the failure of comprehending the target language system that differs from the one they have in their L1. Learners may apply certain rules to other rules. According to Brown (2006), intralingual transfer is an aftermath of overgeneralizing the target language rules. That being so, this kind of error is not caused by the rules of the source language but rather the rules of the target language itself. Usually, intralingual error is related to developmental error. According to Keshavarz (2012), there are other sources of errors besides interlingual and intralingual errors namely language-learning strategies and communication strategies. On the other hand, James (2013) categorized them under intralingual

errors. In conclusion, there are two sub-categories of intralingual errors: learning strategy-based errors and communication strategy-based errors.

a. Learning strategy-based errors

This source of errors is divided into some sub-types:

- 1) Overgeneralization: the learners extend the application of a grammatical rule or construction beyond its permissible uses due to their insufficient comprehension of and exposure to other structures of the target language. As a result, one form in a set is overused while others are underutilized.
- 2) False analogy: the learners utilize certain items of the target language they have acquired in inappropriate circumstances, incorrectly supposing that the new item acts similarly to those items. False analogy might be regarded as a sub-type of overgeneralization.
- 3) Misanalysis/false concept hypothesized: the learners misinterpret the TL, creating a hypothesis or presumption about an L2 item that is not based on their L1 knowledge, although it may be reinforced by the learners' L1.
- 4) Ignorance of rule restriction: the learners fail to conform to target language structure restrictions because they are ignorant of the constraints and exceptions.
- 5) Hypercorrection: the learners over-monitor their L2 output and seek to be consistent because they are afraid of being wrong, resulting in incorrect and erroneous forms.

6) Faulty categorization: the learners incorrectly classify the items of the target language.

7) Simplification: the learners eliminate sentence components, resulting in simpler language constructions of the target language requirements.

b. Communication strategy-based errors

There are three sub-categories of communication strategy-based errors:

1) Holistic strategies: the learners assume that “if you can say X in the L2, then you must be able to say Y” (James, 2013). Due to the absence of the required form, the learners may use a near-synonym, hypernym, antonym, or even coined word. It should be noted that several L1-based CSs, such as language switch and calque, exist.

2) Analytic strategies: the learners attempt to express the unknown notion or idea in an indirect manner by using an excessive amount of words, which is known as circumlocution.

3) Avoidance strategies: the learners, afraid of taking risks, avoid using a difficult word or structure and therefore use a simpler word or structure instead. Sometimes, they simply omit the difficult word or structure.

2.2.8 The Importance of Error Analysis

According to Khansir (2012), error analysis may provide some advantages to help identify learners’ difficulties as well as learners’ needs while learning a language and handling learners’ errors in the classroom. The importance of error analysis is summarized as follows:

1. EA helps teachers to identify learners' errors as well as the causes or sources of errors, and thus minimize the errors to occur.
2. EA helps teachers to investigate whether remedial teaching is necessary.
3. EA reflects learners' language learning progress, both the success and the failure.
4. EA helps teachers devise the sequence and the strategy of language teaching by considering the level of difficulties that learners face.