

TRANSLATION ERROR ANALYSIS OF LEARNERS' TRANSLATIONS IN BISE MULTAN EXAMINATION 2020

Wafa Iqbal¹, Professor Dr Mamuna Ghani²

¹PhD Scholar, Department of Linguistics,
The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: wafaiqbal35@gmail.com

²Dean Faculty of Arts, Chairperson Department of Linguistics,
The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.



HEC
"Y"

Category

HJRS HEC Journal
Recognition System

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: December 10, 2023

Revised: January 31, 2024

Accepted: February 02, 2024

Available Online: February 06, 2024

Keywords:

Translation Assessment
Translation Teaching
Text Analysis
Systemic Functional Grammar
Translation Error Analysis

Funding:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Copyrights:

Copyright Muslim Intellectuals Research Center. All Rights Reserved © 2021. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



ABSTRACT

Translation is considered one of the most important skills in studying and learning a second or foreign language. It is termed as a skill or a craft which is thought to be enjoyed by those who aspire to grab a sound command of a second language. Translation holds an important place in the curriculum of English up till graduation in Pakistan; however, students face many problems in translating a text, especially at an intermediate level. This paper is based on a small-scale pilot project, which is part of my PhD Research Project that used systemic functional grammar to investigate a systematic method for analysing translation errors in the (intermediate level) learners' translations. The study investigates how SFG-based text analysis can be used for translation error analysis in the educational context, contrary to traditional structure-oriented analysis, based on the shared focus on meaning between translation studies and SFG. This study has taken the sample using cluster sampling randomly from learners' translations that they had done in BISE Multan English papers. The study discovered that it is possible to describe and classify errors in target texts using meaning systems and that the resulting error classification allows for an accurate explication of the nature of errors, which would otherwise be described simply as "incorrect and inappropriate" translations. This study is highly relevant for highlighting the difficulties and concerns encountered by English language teachers and examiners while they assess and evaluate students' translations.

INTRODUCTION

Checking or proofreading students' translations is a common task for most language teachers. Depending on the purpose or individual teaching style, the forms and methods of indicating errors may differ. Some teachers may simply use a wavy line to indicate "incorrect" parts and a straight line to indicate "correct but could be better" parts, which Kim labels as binary errors and non-binary errors, respectively. Others may correct each and every error and recommend their own method of translating problematic parts of

source texts. In either case, explaining or describing why problematic parts are identified as such is very difficult. Normally, classroom discussions are based on the teacher's opinions, if not judgments, which are based on his or her experience and intuition. This results in a very subjective, intuition-based assessment of learners' translations. Such a kind of assessment is also attributed to the complex nature of translation. It is also true that even professional translators frequently find it difficult to defend their translation choices when questioned. This situation may be explained by the fact that translation studies, particularly professional translator training, have a relatively short history despite the fact that translation as a human activity has a long history.

However, some translation scholars have recently made new teaching and assessment suggestions. Kiraly (2000) proposes a social constructivist approach to overcoming teacher-centeredness approaches. Bowker and Pearson (1999) present a corpus-based approach to evaluating student translations as a tool for evaluators to provide objective and constructive feedback to their students. Pearson (2003) demonstrates how a parallel corpus can help students deal with translation difficulties.

This study does not stand alone from these new approaches, but rather shows how to use SFG as a tool to supplement or even enrich them. Regarding expressions, collocations, and semantic prosody, the corpus-based approach is a helpful tool for reducing subjectivity in translation assessment. Kim (2009:123) concludes after reviewing scholars like Cao, Hatim and Mason that "the area of translation assessment has been under-researched [which] presents an enormous challenge to teachers who need to assess students' translations for both formative and summative purposes, and provide constructive feedback". Moreover, it suggests the use of SFL-based textual analysis of translations in order to deal with such afore-mentioned challenges.

However, the range of information that could be derived from the corpus could get even wider if the users' linguistic focus goes beyond the expression level to the systemic functional meaning-based level. This will enable the translation teachers or evaluators to be able to give explicit criteria for why and how one translation is better or worse than another translation, hence justifying their translation choices both in doing it as well as assessing it. The researcher makes the case for systemic functional grammar (SFG), which he bases on empirical research as the fundamental foundation for a thorough comprehension of meaning.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How can a meaning-oriented approach be used for translation error analysis of learners?
2. How can language teachers and examiners utilise systemic functional theory to make the process of translation assessment more systematic?
3. What type of errors are more frequent in translations of different groups of intermediate students in the BISE Multan examination?
4. What are the weaker and stronger areas as far as translations performed in BISE Multan by intermediate learners are concerned?

RESEARCH BACKGROUND

In contrast to the majority of the research on assessing other language skills, such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening, testing the translation performance of EFL students has not received the attention it deserves. Some translation teachers now have serious difficulties evaluating their students' translation abilities as a consequence of this. House raises the fundamental issue of how we know when a translation is good In translation evaluation. (2001). However, there have been very few attempts to evaluate translation performance in a meaningful manner in comparison to the vast majority of studies conducted in second/foreign language testing. Schaffner blames the complicated nature of the translation for this lack of focus (2000). consequently, instructors frequently have to turn to "holistic" approaches in EFL situations in order to evaluate their students' translation efforts. This absence of resources in translation assessment may be explained by the fact that translation is a multidimensional and complicated phenomenon by its very nature (Angelelli, 2009).

SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR AND TRANSLATION STUDIES

Michael Halliday developed SFG in the 1950s and 1960s, influenced by Firth during the initial conceptual period. According to Williams (1994:1), Halliday and linguists such as Ruqaiya Hasan, Jim Martin, and Christian Matthiessen are still working on it. Translation scholars such as House (1997), Baker (1992), Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997), and Trosborg (1999) have used it in translation studies, particularly translation assessment (2002). Language is viewed as a series of levels or strata by systemic functional linguists, who use the term "realisation" to describe the relationship between strata.

SFG's approach to language is distinct from traditional grammar. According to Williams (1994:5), the most significant distinction between SFG and traditional school grammar is that of choice. He writes, "Whereas school grammars have prescribed the correct form, functional grammar views language as a resource – one which makes semantic choices available to speakers and writers". Systemic functional grammar is indeed a method that describes lexico - grammatical choices from verbiage systems in order to comprehend how language is used to recognise meaning (Butt et al 2000: 6-7). SFG has two fundamental concepts: first, a distinct meaning is construed through three simultaneous strands of meaning; second, a clause is a unit in which these meanings are combined (Halliday 1994:35). SFG relates meanings to meta-functions, and three such meta-functions are identified: ideational (resources for construing our experience of the world as meaning); interpersonal (resources for enacting our social roles and relations as meaning); and textual (resources for undertaking our social roles and relations as meaning) (resources for presenting ideational and interpersonal meanings as a flow of information in text).

SFG employs two types of grammatical labels: classes and functions. The classes include verb, noun, adjective, adverb, prepositional phrase, noun group, and so on, and names of functions, such as Participant, Process, Subject, Predicator, Theme, Rheme, and so on. A constituent that belongs to a single class can perform multiple functions in a sentence or clause. In a simple clause like My son broke a glass, the noun group, my son, serves three functions: Participant, Subject, and Theme. My son is the action's performer (Participant), the foundation for something (Subject), and the message's focal point (Theme). Talking about

the strong relation between translation studies and systemic functional linguistics, Kim et. al. Claim “the union between Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and TS is flourishing”. (Kim et. al., 2021)

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

This study is based on an SFG-inspired error analysis of 60 translations carried out by learners in the BISE Multan examination of English compulsory papers. The learners were students of intermediate part one, which is the first year. Fifteen translations were randomly selected from each group of students that is pre-medical, pre-engineering, ICS, Arts and I.Com, respectively, following the non-proportional cluster sampling technique. The data was collected following the research's ethical commitments, such as ensuring anonymity. Moreover, the data was analysed at the research site, which is the office of BISE Multan, after getting formal access to it from the authorities. The data is quantitatively analysed in terms of frequency analysis by using MS Excel. The source text was an extract from The Punjab board text book of intermediate part one which appeared in the BISE Multan examination of year 2020 in the paper of English compulsory. There are two source paragraphs used in this research study; one paragraph appeared in the morning paper, whereas the other did in the evening paper.

Source Text 1

Once, a king and a Persian slave were sailing in the same boat. The slave had never been at sea and never experienced any calamity. After some time, the boat was hit by a storm and started tossing. It was very inconvenient for the passengers. All remained quiet except the slave, who, in fear of being drowned, began to cry and tremble and created inconvenience for the others. The others tried to pacify him by kindness and affection, but he did not hear anybody. When the uneasiness lasted longer, the king also became displeased.

Source Text 2

Margaret was wondering what she could do to help. She did not know. Then up came old Stephen from the lands. "We're finished, Margaret, finished! Those beggars can eat every leaf and blade off the farm in half an hour! And it is only early afternoon; if we can make enough smoke, make enough noise till the sun goes down, they will settle somewhere else perhaps."

As a first step, the target text (translation of the learner) was analysed by the researcher by first translating it back to the source language; then, it was divided into clauses. In general, a clause may be defined as a meaning unit that includes a verbal group that functions as a Process. Each clause of the back-translation was then comparatively analysed in relation to the clause in the original text according to the three different Hallidayan meta-functions, namely ideational, interpersonal and textual. Definition of back-translation

The following SFG-based errors are identified in translations of learners:

1. Ideational error

Logical (taxis), existential (process, participant, circumstance)

2. Interpersonal error

(Finite, mood, wh, vocative, adjunct)

3. Textual error (thematic error, taxis)
4. Syntactic error (placement error)
5. Tense error
6. Mistranslation
(Participant, process, circumstance all three errors)
7. Modifier error (adjective related)
8. Constituent error (when a constituent is not translated)
9. Omission (when the whole clause is not translated)
10. Word-level equivalence error
11. Word choice error
12. Idiomatic error (when student literally translates)
13. Addition
14. Preposition error
15. Unfinished (multiple omission)
16. Ambiguous (wrong sense conveyed)
17. Irrelevant

Back-translation or reverse-translation is an extensively employed validation tool in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural disciplines such as psychology, translation studies, language studies like linguistics, international marketing, educational assessment, health-related fields like quality-of-life research, and international nursing research, among other international research contexts. Typically, researchers verify the accuracy of translated texts, such as legal documents, research articles, tests and surveys, by using back translation. The process entails translating the text again into the original language. If there are no discrepancies between the back-translation and the source text, the translation is regarded as 'equivalent'. The evaluation of the quality of students' translations in this study relies on the back-translation method in order to determine whether the meaning conveyed in the 'target text' is equivalent to the meaning and style of SL (Said, 2002). Tyupa highly recommends using this technique: "One of the most popular methods to assess the quality of translation is the back-translation technique" (2011:35). Back-translation is a complex translation process that fluctuates based on the research area and the aims of using it. It is vital to note that back-translation is never utilised as a stand-alone technique. Back-translation is a complex translation process that fluctuates based on the research area and the aims of using it. It is vital to note that back-translation is never utilised as a stand-alone technique. Rather, it is combined with some other theory. This study uses Systemic functional theory along with the technique of back translation to do the error analysis of learners' translation produced by them in BISE Multan papers.

In order to provide a back-translation tool for evaluating the translation quality of the learners, the aim of this research is to provide a theoretical framework. Obviously, trying to provide a complete framework in just one piece would be overly ambitious and unlikely to succeed. My doctoral work mostly focuses on it.

ASSESSING THE INFLUENCE OF RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

Types of Errors	Medical Students	I Com Students	Arts & ICS Students	Engineering Students	Total Errors
Process Error	13	4	6	14	37
Participant Error	0	2	1	3	6
Circumstance	6	9	0	3	18
Logical	1	0	0	0	1
Finite	1	3	1	9	14
Mood	0	0	1	0	1
Wh	0	0	0	0	0
Vocative	0	0	0	0	0
Adjunct	0	0	0	0	0
Thematic	9	0	2	9	20
Placement Error	2	1	4	2	9
Tense Error	10	1	2	23	36
Mistranslation	0	3	0	0	3
Modifier Error	0	7	4	0	11
Constituent Error	11	9	5	2	27
Omission Error	2	11	14	2	29
Word Choice Error	18	11	16	19	64
Idiomatic Error	2	0	0	4	6
Addition Error	37	23	12	31	103
Preposition Error	7	1	2	1	11
Unfinished Error	2	5	7	6	20
Ambiguous	5	1	6	5	17
Irrelevant	0	5	0	5	10
Total	126	96	83	138	443

The table indicates the number of errors which students made in their particular translations. The number of errors of students of each group, that is, Medical, Arts, Icom, Arts, ICS and Pre-engineering, are presented separately in the columns. The last column shows the total number of each error type made by the students in their translations.

DISCUSSIONS OF ERRORS WITHIN VARIOUS META-FUNCTIONS

Examples of translation errors or poor translation selections in each individual meta-function are presented in this section. Each example comes with a back-translation (BT) of the target text and an analysis of the sentence or clause complex in the source text (ST). The problematic passages are in bold font for emphasis.

Student I

Source Text:	Back Translation:
Margaret was wondering what she could do to help.	Margaret was very upset , and how could she help now?

There is an addition error as the adjunct “very” is added as a modifier of the process “upset” in the Back-Translation of the learner’s translation.

Process error is in the Back-translation of the learner’s translation as “Wondering” became “upset”, which is a shift from mental process type to relational process type.

“Could” became “can” in the Back-Translation; this is a change in the modal verb which performs interpersonal metafunction in the text.

The ST uses the clause “What she could do...” to show Margret’s concern about what she could do to be helpful in the situation; BT uses the phrase “how can”, referring to the capacity and capability of “Margret”. Hence, these two Wh words have different implications. It is termed a Wh-error.

This clause also has an error named an Addition; the Back Translation has the addition of the word “now”, which is a reference to the time, although this circumstance was not part of the original text.

Source Text: She did not know.	Back Translation: She did not know.
--	---

There is no error in this sentence.

Source Text: Then up came old Stephen from the lands.	Back Translation: The old Stephen came from the fields .
---	---

The ST uses the circumstance “lands”, whereas BT replaces it with “fields”; the former means land that is fertile, whereas the latter means crops cultivated soil. This is termed a circumstantial error.

Source Text: "We're finished, Margaret, finished!"	Back Translation: "We're finished, Margaret, finished!"
--	---

There is no error in this sentence.

Source Text: Those beggars can eat every leaf and blade off the farm in half an hour!	Back Translation: These locusts have eaten all the leaves and will soon clear the fields in an hour and a half!
---	---

The ST uses the metaphor “beggars” while the student, using his knowledge of the whole story (out of which extract is given for translation), has translated them to “locusts”. This error of the participant is termed an idiomatic error.

The ST clause “beggars can eat” is in present indefinite tense whereas BT “have eaten” is in present perfect tense, hence resulting in tense error. “Blade off the farm” is not translated as a Constituent Error. Moreover, there is an error of addition; the clause “will soon clear the fields” in the BT of the learner is added, which was not part of the original text.

Every leaf became all the leaves.

Source Text: And it is only early afternoon; if we can make enough smoke, make enough noise till the sun goes down, they will settle somewhere else perhaps.”	Back Translation: And now it's just noon . If we make enough smoke only , then maybe they will leave, maybe they won't come here again .
---	---

There are many additional words in the BT which were not present in the Source text. These errors are termed as Addition. The first error is of the word “now”, which represents circumstance in the text. There is also an addition of the modifier “only” in the BT. The addition of an unrelated clause, “won’t come here again”, is termed as an irrelevant error. Instead of early afternoon, BT uses “just noon” This misrepresentation of time in the BT is termed a circumstantial error.

Student II

Source Text: Once, a king and a Persian slave were sailing in the same boat.	Back Translation: Once upon a time , a Persian king went on a trip .
--	--

There is an addition of the phrase “upon a time” in the themed slot of the BT; the theme of ST, “Once a king and a Persian slave”, is not properly translated, and by this additional phrase, the theme in BT became “Once upon a time”. There is an addition error as well as a thematic error in the BT clause.

The modifier Persian is modifying the participant slave in the ST which is misplaced in the back translation and is modifying king. This is a placement error of a modifier in the BT.

The phrase “were sailing” is replaced by the phrase “went on a trip” in the BT. Going on a trip is altogether a different experience which is talked about in the BT means recreation. There is a process error in this clause where the auxiliary verb is left out by the learner. Along with the constituent error of the missed-out phrase “in the same boat,” there is also an addition of the circumstance “trip”, which was not part of the original text.

Source Text: The slave had never been at sea and never experienced any calamity.	Left out by the learner
--	-------------------------

The clause is not translated by the learner and is termed an omission.

Source Text: After some time, the boat was hit by a storm and started tossing.	Back Translation: He was travelling on a ship that wave storm came from the sea.
--	---

The clause of the ST begins with the phrase “after some time,” representing circumstance “as a marked theme. The ST uses the process “hit” to refer to the calamity of the storm hitting the boat of the passengers, but BT uses the process “came”. There is also an addition of a modifier “wave” in the BT. The second clause “and started tossing” is not translated by the learner. This is an omission error.

Source Text: All remained quiet except the slave, who, in fear of being drowned, began to cry and tremble and created inconvenience for the others.	Back Translation: An Iranian slave started to make a lot of noise. One of the men said that if you ask me to make him quiet, then I will make him quiet.
---	--

There are multiple irrelevant additions of clauses in the BT.

Source Text: It was very inconvenient for the passengers. All remained quiet except the slave, who, in fear of being drowned, began to cry and tremble and created inconvenience for the others. The others tried to pacify him with kindness and affection, but he did not hear anybody. Source Text: When the uneasiness lasted longer, the king also became displeased.	Back Translation: One of the men said that if you ask me to make him quiet, then I will make him quiet. That man threw the Iranian into the sea, and when a slave was about to drown, he put him into the sea, and when he was about to drown, he put him into the sea, and he sat into one corner silently, and like this sea storm stopped. A man should also control bad situations, and the long trips to the sea were covered.
--	---

There are multiple irrelevant additions of clauses in the BT.

Student III

Source Text: Once, a king and a Persian slave were sailing in the same boat.	Back Translation: Once upon a time a Persian king was going on a trip with the minister.
--	--

There is an addition of the phrase “upon a time” in the themed slot of the BT; the theme of ST, “Once a king and a Persian slave”, is not properly translated, and by this additional phrase, the theme in BT became “Once upon a time”.

The modifier “Persian” is modifying the participant slave in the ST which is misplaced in the back translation and is modifying king. This is a placement error of a modifier in the BT.

The phrase “were sailing” is replaced by the phrase “was going on a trip” in the BT. Going on a trip is altogether a different experience which is talked about in the BT means recreation. There is a process error in this clause along with the finite error of the auxiliary verb “was”.

The circumstance “in the same boat” is replaced with the phrase “with the minister”. Along with the constituent error of the missed-out phrase “in the same boat,” there is also an addition of the accompaniment phrase “trip with the minister,” which acts as a circumstance in the BT which was not part of the original text.

Source Text: The slave had never been at sea and never experienced any calamity.	Left out by the learner
--	-------------------------

The error is called an omission error, as the translation is left out by the learner.

Source Text: After some time, the boat was hit by a storm and started tossing.	Back Translation: He was travelling on a boat when a storm of sea waves came, and one Iranian minister started to make a lot of noise. One of the men said that if you ask me to make him quiet, then I will make him quiet.
--	--

The clause of the ST begins with the phrase “after some time,” representing circumstance as a marked theme, but BT has an unmarked theme “, he”. The ST uses the process “hit” to refer to the calamity of the storm hitting the boat of the passengers, but BT uses the process “came”.

There is also an addition of a modifier “wave” in the BT. The second clause, “and started tossing,” is not translated by the learner.

Source Text: All remained quiet except the slave, who, in fear of being drowned, began to cry and tremble and created inconvenience for the others.	Back Translation: An Iranian minister started to make a lot of noise. One of the men said that if you ask me to make him quiet, then I will make him quiet.
---	--

There are multiple irrelevant additions of clauses in the BT.

Source Text: It was very inconvenient for the passengers. All remained quiet except the slave, who, in fear of being drowned, began to cry and tremble and created inconvenience for the others.	Back Translation: One of the men said that if you ask me to make him quiet, then I will make him quiet. That man threw the Iranian into the sea, and when a slave was about to drown, he put him into the sea, and
--	--

The others tried to pacify him with kindness and affection, but he did not hear anybody. Source Text: When the uneasiness lasted longer, the king also became displeased.	when he was about to drown, he put him into the sea, and he sat into one corner silently, and like this sea storm stopped. Man should also control bad situations and long trips to the sea.
---	---

There are multiple irrelevant additions of clauses in the BT.

FINDINGS

The following section presents the findings of the data.

Addition and Process-Related Word-Choice Errors: Most Common Errors

The technique of back-translation was used to analyse learners' translation errors; in order to do that, systemic functional linguistics was used. The discrepancies between the back-translation and the original passage reveal the nature and type of errors committed by the students. The errors were observed using systemic functional linguistics, which is a meaning-oriented theory. The results of the translation error analysis show that the majority of the learners committed process-related errors, misplaced modifiers, and finite errors. Upon further interrogation, process, circumstantial, and participant-related errors revealed that students struggled to find an appropriate word in the target language for the process, participant, or circumstance.

The majority of these errors were related to semantic aspects of language rather than errors in the form and structure of language. These errors indicate that learners committed errors of the aforementioned types as a result of poor and inappropriate word choice, which fail to convey the sense of the original passage. These findings also revealed that students lacked vocabulary, which is why they used incorrect processes, participants, and circumstances. These findings also refute the widely held belief that students simply memorise and cram translations; rather, they are partially bilingual, with receptive bilingualism outperforming performative bilingualism. They can understand the source text but are unable to produce it, so their receptive abilities are refined, but their constructive skills are only partially developed.

Science Students Are Better Translators

The study discovered surprising results that invalidate the common belief that arts students are less skilled in translating a text from English to Urdu because they are less proficient in English as compared to science students (pre-medical and pre-engineering). It is widely assumed that students in the science group (particularly pre-medical and pre-engineering) are more competent in translation-related activities that are part of the English language course. One reason for this assumption is that the elective subjects of these groups, such as Physics, Biology, and Chemistry, are taught in English, and the merit of admission to the science group is higher. However, the findings show that translations of pre-medical and pre-engineering students have a higher number of errors than translations of other student groups such as Arts, I Com, and ICS. According to the findings, pre-engineering students have the highest number of errors, accounting for 30% of total errors among all groups. The table shows that the total number of errors made by pre-engineering students is 138. Pre-medical students make the second most errors in translation, with a total of 126. The total percentage of errors made by pre-engineering students in comparison to errors made by students in other groups is 29%. The findings also show the error frequency of students in other

groups. I Com students made 96 errors in total, which is 21% more than the percentage of errors made by students in other groups. This is the third-highest number of errors. Despite common belief, the findings show that the translations of Arts and ICS students have had the lowest number of errors when a comparison was made to the errors of other groups' students. These students' translations contain 83 errors. These students have the lowest percentage of errors (20%) of any group.

DISCUSSION AND APPLICATIONS IN TRANSLATION TEACHING

Using SFG, this study discovered that it was possible to categorise and classify errors in target texts based on meaning, which will further reveal the nature of translation problems and frequent errors. In this pilot study, errors were identified at the clause rank, but it would certainly be worth studying beyond the clause in a follow-up study. The majority of the errors found were categorised as belonging to different metafunctions.

The results emphasise how students and teachers can use this meaning-based approach to translation. To begin with, this type of error classification allows translation and language teachers to identify common problems that students have with a particular text or with specific clauses.

Although teachers should judge this, knowing what the main issues are is critical when developing a lesson plan and emphasising discussion points in class, where time is limited. Teachers can also use this information for the provision of corrective systematic feedback on individual errors of the students.

This meaning-based approach to translation encourages the learners to think "critically and systematically" about their translation options and articulate reasons for their choices, contributing greatly to their development as independent professionals. This is because feedback on students' translation errors is based on systematic linguistic knowledge rather than one's judgmental subjective opinion, which enables students to make informed translation decisions. Such a meaning-based, functional approach to language in general and to translation, in particular, can help to broaden their conceptual horizons, particularly if their prior language learning experience was concentrated on a set of rules of language rather than functions of language, and this experience unreasonably influences their translating. Once such information and abilities are understood, it will be highly beneficial for the learners, as well as these can serve as practical instruments that translators might utilise in order to finally defend their translation choices. With the use of this categorisation, teachers can also provide each student with systematic feedback on their language proficiency, highlighting their areas of relative strength and weakness.

One translation may not be sufficient to identify weak areas, but if incorrect patterns are noticed repeatedly, it would be a good sign. Because they have an immediate need for it before moving on to the next level, many students request feedback in the area of language competency.

Julian House asserts that Hamburg University's translation programs are not intended to prepare students to work as translators but rather to increase their general English competence (House 1986:182). In addition, if it is understood that translating is not a rule-based word-to-word rendition but rather a process of meaning construction that necessitates ongoing negotiation as well as selection and that linguistic skill is only one component of translation competence, it might not be a bad choice. Insisting that the ability to translate is a useful one in language training.

Catford criticises the main flaw of the "Grammar Translation Method," which he calls to be a 'universally condemned one', which is the poorly used translation as well as grammar. He does not blame the use of translation as problematic but rather as a poorly used and handled translation. He states that Translation is not inherently dangerous, provided that its nature is understood, its use is strictly regulated, and it is a skill that should be taught to students. (Catford, 1965: ix)

It cannot be assumed that student translators are entirely proficient in both L1 and L2, according to Kiraly (1995:26) and Nord (1997:74), two scholars who have written about educational challenges regarding translation. However, there is still a critical question of what to teach and how to teach in order to increase future learners' language proficiency. Pym argues that "efforts to establish the specific methods in which not just translation should be taught, but also the way languages should be taught" should be given strategic priority (2003:492). According to this study, understanding SFG can help you deal with those challenges. The relationship between translation studies and SFG has been brought to light as a result of this research. The Firthian linguistics view of language is shared by many translation theories, according to Kiraly (1995:53), including those of House (1977) and Neubert (1968, 1973), but "its implications have yet to be incorporated into a systematic approach to translation teaching and learning." The general challenge of how to incorporate SFG into the language training curriculum (based on translation-related items) should receive more attention, given the concordance between translation studies and SFG. Theoretical and/or practical deficiencies in translation studies can be filled by research efforts like this modest study, which will eventually advance both translation studies and other pertinent fields. This research is applicable for highlighting the problems and issues in the assessment and evaluation of students' translations by English language instructors and examiners.

CONCLUSION

In line with what was previously predicted, the study has added to the body of knowledge about translation studies from a systematic and linguistic perspective by looking into a crucial but understudied topic, namely the textual meaning in translation, and for the first time exploring it from a systemic functional point of view. Its theory-based account of textual meaning in translation enriches the knowledge of the phenomena of translation, which is the first of its two most significant contributions. Because they may directly and methodically explain the ambiguous parts of translation, enhanced textual insights can be a useful tool for professional translators and translation teachers who wish to move toward a meaning-oriented and systematic approach to translation assessment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research paper has been extracted from the PhD thesis entitled "Investigating Errors in Learners' (English-Urdu) Translation: A Study Based On Systemic Functional Linguistics" by Ms Wafa Iqbal, supervised by Professor Dr Mamoonah Ghani and has been published in the partial fulfilment of the requirement of the degree of doctorate of philosophy in linguistics from the department of Linguistics, the Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan.

REFERENCES

- Angelelli, C. (2009). Using a rubric to assess translation ability: Defining the construct. *American Translators Association Scholarly Monograph Series*, 26(6),13-47. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xiv.03ang>.
- Bowker, L. (1999). Exploring the potential of corpora for raising language awareness in student translators. *Language Awareness*, (8-3),160-173.
- Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S., & Yallop, C. (2000). *Using Functional Grammar*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- House, J. (2001) 'How do we know when a translation is good?' In E. Steiner and C. Yallop (Eds) *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 127–160.
- House, J. (1986). Acquiring translational competence in interaction. In J. House and B. Shoshana (Eds), *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies*, (179-191). Tübingen: Narr.
- Kiraly, C. (1995). *Pathways to translation*. Kent & London: The Kent University Press.
- Kiraly, Donald C. 2000. *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Nagyp János 2022 Mira Kim, Jeremy Munday, Zhenhua Wang & Pin Wang (Eds.). (2021). *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Translation Studies*. Bloomsbury Academic, 242 pp. ISBN:978-1-3500-9186-3. © Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Pearson, Jennifer. 1999. Using Specialized Comparable Corpora to Evaluate Student Translations. In PALC '99: Practical Applications in Language Corpora, eds.Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Patrick James Melia, 541-552. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Pearson, Jennifer. 2003. Using parallel texts in the translator training environment. In *Corpora in Translator Education*, eds. Federico Zanettin, Silvia Bernardini and Dominic Stewart, 15-24. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Pym, Anthony. 2003. Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age. In *Defence of a Minimalist Approach*. Meta 48: 481-497.
- Said Mashadi. 2002. Menilai Terjemah. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sastra Bahasa* vol. 7 no. 2 (Dec. 2002), page 56.
- Schäffner, Christina. 2002. *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training: Status, Needs, Methods*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Tyupa, Sergiy (2011) *Back-translation: Theoretical Framework and Practical Implications*. (Doctoral dissertation. Jagiellonian University, Kraków).
- Williams, Geoff. 1994. *Using Systemic Grammar in Teaching Young Learners: An Introduction*. Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia.