Errors in Translation: A Comparative Study of Noun Phrase in English and Malay Abstracts

Ainul Azmin Md Zamin*, Raihana Abu Hasan

Department of English Language and Literature Kulliyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences International Islamic University Malaysia

Corresponding Author: Ainul Azmin Md Zamin, E-mail: ainul_azmin@iium.edu.my

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Abstract as a summary of a dissertation harbours important information where it serves to attract readers to consider reading the entire passage or to abandon it. This study seeks to investigate the *backward translation* of abstracts made by 10 randomly selected postgraduate students. This research serves as a guideline for students in composing their abstracts as it aims to compare the differences in noun phrase structure written in Malay as translated from English. It also analyses the types of errors when English noun phrases are translated to Malay. Preliminary findings from this pilot study found that translation errors committed were mainly inaccurate word order, inaccurate translation, added translation, dropped translation and also structure change. For this study, an exploratory mode of semantic analysis is applied by looking at noun phrases, the meaningful group of words that form a major part of any sentence, with the noun as the head of the group. Syntax is inevitably interwoven in the analysis as the structure and grammatical aspects of the translations are also analysed. They are examined by comparing English texts to its corresponding translation in the Malay language. Particularly relevant in this study is the need to emphasize on the semantics and syntax skills of the students before a good transaltion work can be produced. Language practitioners can also tap on translation activities to improve the learners' language competency.

INTRODUCTION

Translating abstracts is part and parcel of writing a thesis for any postgraduate student. Larson (1998) defines translation as "a change of form from the Source Language (SL) into the Target Language (TL) that refers to the actual words, phrases, clauses, and sentences of a particular language". As highlighted by Al-Hassan (2013), problems in translations do not only include lexical content and syntax, but also ideologies, values and ways of life in a given culture. Meaning is something that cannot stand on its own; it is always situated within a context and coexists in a form, be it a word, phrase or clause. It is also interwoven with other areas of language studies, from pragmatics to syntax, morphology, and even phonology where a tiny difference in sound can bring an entirely different meaning. Baker (2011) stated that non-equivalence in the target language is because the source language may have more specific terms (hyponym) while the target language only has general ones (superordinate). The best end product of a translation is a text that uses the normal language forms of the target language, that communicates as much as possible to the target language speakers the same meaning that was understood by speakers of the source language, and that maintains the dynamics of the original text. Thus, translations may fall in between this continuum; modified literal, inconsistent mixture, near idiomatic or completely.

Based on Larson's (1998) observations, a form can have several meaning components, such as plurality in English signified by the suffix –s which the Malay language does not. A form can also have several semantic features, for example, the features of the word *ewe* are [+sheep, +adult, +female] so *ewe* is translated as *bebiri betina dewasa* (or, literally, female adult sheep) in Malay since there is no one-word to represent *ewe*. The polysemy of a form is also different across languages. For example, the word *run* in "run a programme" versus "run in a race" cannot be translated using the same word *lari* in Malay. The two extremes of approaches to translation is from very literal, as in word-by-word translation without any effort to make them fit the structure of the target language, to the unduly free translation where the translator takes liberties with adding extraneous information that did not come from the original text at all (Larson, 1998).

Backward translation can be understood as the procedure of interpreting a document previously translated into another language back to the original language. Some researchers have even regarded this technique as being a quality control mechanism in maintaining good language performance (Mohatlane, 2014; Ozolin, 2009). It is evident that in the case of back translation among the student writers in Malaysia, the meaning that stems from the translations from English does

Table 1. Types of translation errors

Errors	Definition
Faithfulness	Translator must make sure the meaning remains constant and as close to the source text as possible when translating, and not to rewrite the text. It is about respecting the original text
Addition	Translator adds unnecessary information to his translation, whether for stylistic or clarification purposes
Omission	Translator omits certain information or even the intention contained within the original text from his translation
Literalness	Translator performs a direct translation, thus resulting in an awkward or unnatural rendition
Faux Ami	Translator confuses words that are similar in form but have different meanings or contexts of usage
Word Form/ Part of Speech	Translator's use of a word is only partially correct, where its root is right but the derived form is incorrect A part-of-speech error occurs when the translator changes the grammatical form of the original word
Syntax	Syntactic errors concern the arrangement of words or elements of the sentences
Usage	Translator does not follow the conventions of the target language when translating

Table 2. Types of noun phrases in malay

Common noun	Proper noun	Qualifier
Pronoun	Numeral	Determiner
Numeral classifier	Title/designation	Designation

Table 3. Comparison of noun phrase constituents between English and malay

English NP		Malay NP
(Inclusive) Determiner	Pre-Modifier	Quantifier (Inclusive)
Quantifier		
Describer		
Classifier		
Head	**Head**	**Head**
Qualifier	Post-Modifier	Classifier
		Describer
		Qualifier
		Determiner

not carry the same exact meaning in English. Some of the problems students may face in writing a translation may be rooted from the fact that certain words, phrases or expressions denoting facts or objects are ingrained in the source culture that they have no equivalences in the target language (Guerra, 2012). Although the task of translating may come naturally for some Malaysian students, many others can find it to be very challenging especially when the text is complicated or the translator's proficiency of both languages is not of equal level. In this study, the students involved were writers from technical background who have very little exposure to technical terminologies in Malay as their courses were mainly taught in English. Failure to understand the real meaning of the terminology often results in the misunderstanding of the concept of the subject. Semantics clearly has a significant role in translation. In addition to that, mistakes that a non-native speaker makes can sometimes be attributed to interference from his own first language as well as cultural differences (Al-Hassan, 2013). It is important to highlight that translation does not merely concern word choices, it is also about dealing with different grammatical structures of the languages.

In this study, semantics analysis is applied by looking at noun phrases (NP), the meaningful group of words that form a major part of any sentence, with the noun as the head of the group. The aim of the present paper is twofold: (1) to compare the differences in noun phrase structure of abstracts written in Malay as translated from English, and (2) to show the types of errors when English noun phrases are translated to Malay. Noun phrases are examined by comparing English texts to its corresponding translation in the Malay language. The goal of this study is to observe and appreciate the uniqueness of the phrase structure each language has and in turn have a better understanding of the translation errors among student writers. The findings will be significant for second language learners of English as it will unveil the difficulties the learners may face in understanding the NP of English when doing a backward translation and enumerate such errors committed in their writing. The results also may help teachers of English understand better the errors committed by their students when doing a transaltion involving the English language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Rubrics in assessment for translation

In the rubric for assessment of translation certification, the American Translators Association listed as many as 23 main categories of errors in translation on their website. The following are the selected errors that are deemed relevant to this study and could be observed at phrase level:

At a closer look, one can see that some of the categories overlap each other. For example, literalness and usage, as well as addition and omission are subsets of the faithfulness category. Farahzad (1992) in his article on promoting a rubric to assess translation work, emphasized that there should be two main features that examiners must not overlook; accuracy and appropriateness. The translation should convey the information in the source text precisely and it also should be fluent and correct in terms of structure.

In terms of using translation activities as part of language learning, Machida (2011) emphasized that translations may result in "available input" in class. She explained the three steps of translating from second language to mother tongue. Firstly, it is imperative to comprehend the second language. Then it is vital to search for the equivalent expressions in

their mother tongue and finally translators must synthesize both the first two steps to recapture the meaning of the original L2 text in L1. In her opinion, this is an ideal situation from a constructivism approach. The translation work provides provides opportunities for problem-solvings and triggers interesting communication among learners and peers.

Noun Phrase of English and Malay Languages

When studying semantics, it is almost inevitable to consider syntax especially when the analysis focuses on translation. This study limits its scope to noun phrases only. The structure of a noun phrase in the English language comprises (i) *determiner or referrer*, (ii) *describer,* (iii) *classifier*, (iv) *head,* and (v) *qualifier.* While linguists are familiar with the terms mentioned, *inclusives* may be quite new. *Inclusives* is a term used by Lock (1996) for words that refer to a complete group of things. It could be positive (e.g., *all, each, both, either*) or negative (e.g., *no, neither*). It is important to distinguish this from quantifiers because an English NP can have both a referrer and a quantifier, for example, *all five students*.

The literature on Malay syntax has not been developed as exhaustively as their counterparts in English language. An explanation of the Malay NP is given by Hassan (2001) in his book *Tatabahasa Bahasa Melayu.* According to him, types of noun that can make up a Malay NP are:

A noun phrase can consist of a single word or more than one word. The latter means that the noun that becomes the head of the phrase will have other words to modify it. These auxiliary words can be differentiated by their order of appearance, whether they pre-modify the head or post-modify the head. English is a language that is weighty in the pre-modifier part, while Malay is almost the exact opposite. The following diagram shows the order of the constituents of a noun phrase in English and Malay languages.

Table 4 below shows the example of a noun phrase in English and its equivalent translation in Malay. The regular members are the determiner, describer, and classifier. The rule-of-thumb that Malay speakers adhere to in any English to Malay translation is to reverse the order of a noun of either language so that, for instance, "those new ball-point pens becomes "pena-pena mata bulat baru itu." The head appears late in the English version but quite early in Malay. However, it is unusual for noun phrases to have these constituents appearing all at the same time. To give a clearer understanding of the differences between the two languages, phrases in both English language and Malay having all these constituents at the same time are provided below.

METHOD

This study favours the exploratory mode of research in an attempt to relate semantics to syntax. A comparison was made between the abstracts written by postgraduates from a local university in Malaysia and the corresponding translations in the Malay language. The research questions that guided this study are as follows:

i)   What are the differences found in the noun phrase structure when comparing the abstracts written by the students in English to the Malay translation and vice versa?

ii)   What are the errors the students make when English noun phrases are translated to Malay noun phrases?

Since the university is the leading institution in the engineering field in Malaysia, the abstracts were purposely chosen from graduates from the two main engineering faculties, namely the Faculty of Electrical Engineering and the Faculty of Civil Engineering. This pilot study focuses on only 10 samples that were selected from the institution's online repository, five of each faculty. The abstracts came from theses written by Master's students who graduated in the year 2016.

The source language of the abstracts is English while the target language is Malay, the native language of most of these writers. A small number of these writers, however, have Chinese language as their mother tongue and Malay as their second language by virtue of their formal schooling which incorporates the subject *Bahasa Melayu* into the curriculum.

It is interesting to note that it is quite unusual that English, as the second language of these students, is the source language, not the other way round. This goes back to Malaysia's curriculum which places importance of English almost the equal status as the national language. Therefore, the majority of the higher institutions adopt English as the main medium of instruction. This is mainly due to the fact that teaching materials are in English, lectures are conducted in English, and student assignments are required for submission in English as well. As a result, tertiary level students are more academically proficient in English. The translation of the abstract in Malay is a requirement for the university's publication of the thesis. Hence, these second language learners must put their natural skill as a translator to good use, performing what Kroll and Stewart (1994, as cited in Harley, 2014) termed as backward translation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the data was done qualitatively. Every sentence of the original abstracts was parsed into noun phrases; in some cases, the noun phrases within the qualifier were broken down further as well. Then, the abstracts of the target language were segmented and matched to the noun phrase units of the source language. From here, each segment was examined individually to see whether there were any differences in the meaning of words or in the structure between the

Table 4. Translation of malay phrase in comparison to English phrase

All	Those	Ten	New	Ball-point	pens		In that pencil box	Are mine.
Inclusive	*Determiner*	*Quantifier*	*Describer*	*Classifier*	Head		*Qualifier*	*Predicate*
Kesemua	sepuluh	pena-pena	mata bulat	baru	di dalam kotak pensel		itu	saya punya.
Inclusive	*Quantifier*	Head	*Classifier*	*Describer*	*Qualifier*		*Determiner*	*Predicate*

original text and the translation. These differences were labelled according to the following categories: (a) word order, (b) different translation, (c) added translation, (d) dropped translation, and (e) structure change. These categories are not unlike those suggested by the American Translators Association delineated earlier, except they have been compressed into smaller number of categories.

This analysis includes all constituents that make up a noun phrase. Since most prepositional phrases that conflate with qualifiers were separated from its main head and treated as a separate NP, prepositions are not covered in this analysis. Table 5 shows the number of errors found in each sample.

For the purpose of this article's explanation and interpretation, only 3 categories are covered in this discussion; inaccurate word order, added translation, and dropped translation. The analysis will not go into the alteration in translation and structure change. Alteration here means that the translation of certain words deviated from the original meaning in the source text. The category is more diverse compared to the other categories so naturally the frequency obtained is higher. In fact, the explanation of each variant may even warrant a separate report. Structure change, meanwhile, involves the NP as a whole and it has more to do with the structure at sentence level. The main focus of this paper is to analyse the errors in relation to the meaning of the translated NP.

Inaccurate Word Order

As shown in Table 4, inaccurate word order is not present in all samples. It is actually the crux of NP analysis from the syntactic point of view. The most classic way a translator would make mistake in the word order of a NP is to directly translate each word according to the English structure. When it is done in this manner, the head noun changes, so that the classifier becomes the head and the original head noun becomes the classifier. This is illustrated by the following excerpt from Sample 1 where the meaning was changed from "*Branch-line coupler*" to *coupler line branch*, marking it as an erroneous translation.

These figures are not representative of all the differences that exist in the samples. However, the frequencies as indicated from Table 4 should give an idea of which differences are regularly made by amateur translators. The differences were first vetted by the researcher who relies on her knowledge as a native speaker of Malay and a proficient learner of English as a second language, but not yet as a professional translator. The second layer of translation was vetted by an Asst. Professor of Linguistics who has more than 20 years of experience in teaching English.

When a NP is translated literally, it can also result in a change in the word category of the classifier. A classifier could be in the form of participles –ed, –en, or –ing such as Sample 2 (*defined*) and Sample 3 (*oriented*). In sample 2, not only did the translator directly translate the arrangement of the phrase, he also chose the wrong derived form of the particle, accidentally giving the meaning *radio definition software* (which should have been *radio bertakrif perisian*). The same occurred for another example where the first word was intact because of the use of the preposition "of" after it. In this case, the preposition does not need a translation in Malay but it allows the English NP to follow the arrangement of the constituents in Malay NP. As evident in Sample 3, "*Histogram of Oriented Gradients (HOG)*" should be more accurately translated as *Histogram Kecerunan Terorientasi*. Notice that "*histogram*" remained the head noun in both versions but only the classifier changed in meaning. The Malay version given by the translator was for *Gradient-Oriented Histogram*.

> *Software Defined Radio (SDR)*
> *Perisian Penakrifan Radio (SDR)*

(Sample 2)

> *Histogram of Oriented Gradients*
> *Histogram Berorientasikan Kecerunan*

(Sample 3)

In English, the classifier can be in the form of a compound adjective (first element is a numeral and the second a noun). There are several ways to translate this type of classifier in Malay. The method that is closest to the English phrase is by treating it as a normal classifier so that "*1.4 GHz frequency band*" in sample 4 can be translated as *jalur frekuensi 1.4 GHz*. Unfortunately, this was not the case in Sample 4. The second way needs a slight change in the English phrase. For example, by tweaking Sample 5 to *difference of 3.2% to 18%*, the Malay translation would be *perbezaan sebanyak 3.2% sehingga 18%*. But in trying to stay faithful to the original structure, the translator unfortunately made an error.

> *conventional design performance*
> *prestasi reka bentuk konvensional*
> *with 1.4 GHz frequency band,*
> *dengan 1.4 GHz jalur frekuensi,*

(Sample 4)

> *3.2% to 18% difference*
> *3.2% ke 18% perbezaan*

(Sample 5)

Both samples 6 and 7 showed an inconsistent arrangement of the Malay NP. The head and classifiers in Sample 6 were in the correct order but the describer, "particular/*tertentu*", was supposed to come after the classifier. This caused the describer to modify the head noun as a general entity, not

Table 5. Frequency of errors in each sample abstract

Errors	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	Total
Inaccurate word order	6	3	3	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	19
Inaccurate translation	6	3	5	9	10	4	6	5	11	1	60
Added translation	1	5	1	4	2	3	4	5	5	2	32
Dropped translation	2	7	3	9	8	6	5	2	10	4	56
Structure change	1	0	1	3	0	4	3	0	4	0	16

a head noun that has been narrowed down by the classifiers, thus changing the meaning of the original NP. The same case occurred in Sample 7. In the translation, the classifier "*bahaya//hazard*" modified the first head noun "*maklumat//information*" only, and excluded "*maklumat/reporting*", whereas the coma after the word "*reporting*" in the source text indicates that it is a compound head noun and so the pre-modifier will include both components of the compound noun.

> *and change its particular transmission or reception parameters*
> *serta menukar parameter tertentu sistem pemancar atau penerima*

(Sample 6)

> *such as hazard information and reporting, and training*
> *seperti maklumat bahaya dan laporan, dan latihan*

(Sample 7)

In Sample 8, although it can be considered as a minor error, the placement of the abbreviation "*(CO_2)*" is still inaccurate and could cause misunderstanding. It should have been placed immediately after "*karbon dioksida*" in the target text; otherwise, some readers might think that the abbreviation included the word "*global*". This is an illustration of what Farahzad (1992) mentioned in his study with regards the correctness of the structure when translations are done by students. A good translation will not only maintain the accuracy in meaning but also keep the structure of the sentence correct.

> *a significant source of global carbon dioxide CO_2 emissions.*
> *sumber besar karbon dioksida global CO_2.*

(Sample 8)

Added and Dropped Translations

Added and dropped translations are discussed together since they are similar in the sense that one text will not have certain words that its counterpart has. Added translations did not occur as frequent as dropped translations in the sample abstracts but they still carry some weight to the translation. Additions are what may lead to unduly free translations that are not considered acceptable by professional translators. In this analysis, a NP is categorized as having added translation when the target text contained words that were not found in the original text. In contrast, dropped translation means that certain words were omitted when meaning was being transferred to the target text. Some omitted words could cause small or no effect while others can distort the meaning of the phrase. In discussing omission of words, it is important to note that the English definite article is said to be unique and not easily translatable to other languages in the world. Malay is not an exception. The nearest we have is *kata penunjuk* (Hassan, 2001) or demonstratives. Thus, we will find that translators omit its translation in the Malay version most of the time unless it is necessary for that particular context. The omission of determiners is therefore not tallied in this analysis.

The first example of a dropped translation is found in Sample 9. The translator dropped the word "and" in the translation and thus "radio" became the classifier to "rangkaian/network", not to "teknologi/technology". Even with the omission of a mere function word, the meaning has changed.

> *an adaptive, intelligent radio*
> *network technology*
> *teknologi rangkaian radio*
> *penyesuaian pintar*

(Sample 9)
(Sample 10)

Sample 10 above involved major changes, including dropped translation, incorrect word order, and alteration in translation, not to mention the wrong spelling of "prototaip". This analysis would have highlighted several categories as listed by the American Translators Association. The translation made by the translator yielded this meaning: The modified prototype area of coupler line three-branch and four-branch line. He dropped the word "fabricated" when translating, causing the noun "kawasan/area" to be less specific. He also added the word "prototaip/prototype" in the translation. This addition is actually a reference to the couplers, which makes it redundant. However, the addition is interesting because the translator adopted a semantic concept called metonymy in his translation. A metonym is a word used in place of another with which it is closely connected (Yule, 2010). Prototype in the text was interchangeable with coupler, as deduced from the sentence immediately after Sample 10 in the original text where the translator used "Both prototypes".

Another example of the application of metonymy is found in Sample 11. This time the metonymy came in the form of a dropped translation. In the source text, the translator used the phrase "*a software algorithm*" but then dropped "*perisian/software*" in the translation. An algorithm is basically an instance of logic written in software so having "*software*" classifying "*algorithm*" could have been misconstrued by the translator as redundant, which led him to merge the classifier with the main noun in the target text.

> *does not come with a software algorithm*
> *tidak datang dengan algoritma*

(Sample 11)

A dropped translation could cause the noun it was supposed to modify to be less specific. Sample 12 is another occurrence that has the same effect. In the target text, the translator did not include "*terpendam/latent*" as the describer of the noun "*kesilapan//error*". Therefore, "*kesilapan diperingkat pengurusan*" is just as it is, *an error*, whereas the original meaning was specified as a "*latent error*". As a consequence, the meaning would have changed for readers who know the difference between a *latent error* and an *error*.

> *latent error at management level*
> *kesilapan di peringkat pengurusan*

(Sample 12)

In Sample 13, the qualifier for the phrase "*The result of the study*" was dropped in the translation so it became "*Keputusan/The result*" only. In this case, the translator is simply assuming that readers will easily refer results in an abstract as *the result* related to the study being reported, so the translator found the qualifier unnecessary. Within the same sentence, the translator also added the phrase "*yang diubahsuai*" to describe the "*bitumen*" when its equivalent word in English, *modified*, was not present in the original text. The addition provided clarity to the head noun. It could be regarded as either an explicitation of the noun or simply an addition that was not necessary.

The result of the study shows that bitumen
Keputusan menunjukkan bitumen yang diubasuai

(Sample 13)

Sample 14 is another example of a dropped translation. The word omitted was "*ujian/test*" for the second entity of the compound noun. This omission could have been disregarded if the translator had not added "*ujian/test*" to the third entity. This made the NP violates parallelism which is important in the cohesiveness of a text. The translator should have chosen to use "*ujian/test*" once only as the only head of the noun in the Malay construction.

Penetration test, softening point test and viscosity test
Ujian penusukan, titik lembut serta ujian kelikatan

(Sample 14)

Sample 15 and 16 are examples to demonstrate the difference between English and Malay. Empty subjects in English do not transfer in the Malay translation. Thus, the translated sentences started with a verb. This is because subjects in an English sentence are compulsory, whereas Malay is more flexible by not requiring a subject when it does not exist. Two examples of empty subjects are given in the following excerpts, which are "*it*" and "*there*", respectively:

it was found from previous studies
didapati daripada kajian sebelum ini

(Sample 15)

There are two main problems in this project
Terdapat dua masalah utam dalam projek ini

(Sample 16)

Translation has been proven to be a strategy used by learners in learning an L2 or even Lx (third language) (Harley, 2014; Dmitrenko, 2017). This study has proven that students who are native speakers can make errors in translating to their own L1. The occurrence of errors could be attributed to several factors. First, these students were not proficient in their L1 within the genre of technical texts. Although they use Malay (L1) in their daily communication, they have not been exposed to the use of L1 within the academic context as extensively as L2. This shows the importance of context because it can determine our proficiency regardless of whether it is our native language or second language. Next, instead of ascribing this problem to the proficiency level of their L1, it is possible that they are not equally proficient in both languages, hence the inaccurate translations stemmed from their difficulty to grasp the meaning of the technical terms in the L2. The existence of syntactic errors in their original English texts lends credence to this explanation.

The third explanation is related to parole versus langue. The translations written by native speakers could have been perceived and interpreted by themselves as correct. After all, they are native speakers and they have the technical authority to define their grammar and conventions. However, parole is meaningless on its own. Without adhering to the grammar rules set by langue, the meaning of the constructed forms in parole cannot be shared by other speakers (or in this case, readers). This shows the importance of following the rules of a language. Nevertheless, one cannot overlook the issue of subjectivity in interpretation. This limits the frequency listed in Table 4 as mere estimation and cannot be used as a statistics.

Based on the 10 samples of abstracts used for this study and benchmarking them against the continuum of approaches to translation as outlined by Larson (1998), the students were deemed to have ranged between modified literal and inconsistent mixture (of modified literal and near idiomatic). This is consistent with what Byrne (2012) reported in a study by de Camargo (2001) which found that literal translation is one of the most preferable strategy used in technical texts.

CONCLUSIONS

Using error analysis that focused on NPs has shed some light on the similarities and differences between an English NP and a Malay NP. In addressing the first research question, this study has discovered that the main differences are in the density of the pre-modifier (for the former) and post-modifier (for the latter). The above discussion has illustrated these differences clearly, retrieved from the various extracts of the students' translation work. This density, in turn, affects the arrangement of the constituents of both NPs, making them different and in some cases, the exact opposite of the other. The analysis has also helped in answering the second research question; the errors committed were mainly inaccurate word order, inaccurate translation, added translation, dropped translation and also structure change. The rule-of-thumb that a Malay learner would probably use in translating a NP, Malay to English and vice versa, is to reverse the order of words in the translated version but even this cannot be a blanket rule applicable to all NPs.

It is strongly recommended that the translation of NPs from English to Malay should be done delicately as an inaccurate placement of a constituent can cause a major change in the meaning of the translated NP in comparison to the original NP, as evident from the findings of this research. This calls for a more comprehensive teaching of semantics. Students need to understand meaning and how meaning relates to accurate and meaningful translation. The study of structure should also be more intensive if the aim is to produce competent writers of second language. Because the mastery of syntax of any language cannot be done easily, vigorous training is the only option for the learners. This study hopes to persuade scholars and practitioners in the language learning field to investigate the possibility of including the act of translating in their pedagogy. Although this present study is only limited to analyzing Malay and English noun phrases, it is a strong reflection of the students' second language competency. The discussion above focuses only on abstract in thesis writing among technical students. Therefore, there is a potential for future researchers to investigate the translation errors at various other levels of study in a particularly different setting. This may generate more research outcomes and suggestions.

REFERENCES

Al-Hassan, A., & Jordan, A. (2013). The importance of Culture: Should culture be translated? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 2*(2), 96-100.

American Translators Association. (n.d.). *Explanation of Error Categories (Version 2017)*. Retrieved from https://www.atanet.org/certification/aboutexams_error.php

Baker, M. (2011). *In other words: A course book on translation*. (2nd ed.) London: Routledge

Byrne, J. (2012). *Scientific and technical translation explained: A nuts and bolts guide for beginners*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cardoso de Carmogo, D. (2001). *Corpus-based translation research on legal, technical and journalistic texts*. Paper presented at the EST Congress in Copenhagen. 30 August to 1 September 2001.

Dmitrenko, V. (2017). Language learning strategies of multilingual adults learning additional languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *14*(1), 6-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1258978

Farahzad, F. (1992). Testing achievement in translation classes. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddergard (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting* (271-278). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Guerra, A. F. (2102). Translating culture: Problems, Strategies and Practical realties. *Art and Subversion, 1*(12), 1-27

Harley, T. A. (2014). *The psychology of language: from data to theory* (4th ed.). Hove, East Sussex; New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Hassan, A. (2001). *Tatabahasa Bahasa Melayu: Morfologi dan sintaksis untuk guru dan pelajar*. Bentong: PTS Publications & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.

Kroll, J.F. & Stewart, E. (1994) Category Interference in Translation and Picture Naming: Evidence for Asymmetric Connections between Bilingual Memory Representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33, 149-174.

Larson, M. L. (1998). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. Maryland: University Press of America.

Lock, G. (1996). *Functional English grammar: An introduction for second language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Machida, S. (2011). Translation in Teaching a Foreign (Second) Language: A Methodological Perspective *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(4), 740-746.

Mohatlane, E.J. (2014). Back-Translation as a Quality Control Mechanism in Sesotho Translation. *Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(2) 167-175.

Ozolin, U. (2009). Back translation as a means of giving translators a voice. *The International Journal for Translation & Interpreting Research*, *1*(2), 1-12.

Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.