International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation
ISSN: 2617-0299 (Online); ISSN: 2708-0099 (Print)
DOI: 10.32996/ijllt
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijllt

IJLLT
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Types of Errors Involved in the English-Arabic Translation of Research Abstracts

Maha Rasheed Hamdan Alanazi
Language Instructor, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Corresponding Author: Maha Alanazi, **E-mail**: ms.maharasheed@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT
This study seeks to shed light on the analysis of translation errors occurring in the abstracts of research papers by MA students in the College of Languages and Translation at Imam Mohamed Ben Saud Islamic University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The papers were translated from English into Arabic. A sample consisting of forty abstracts has been collected for this end. Liao's (2010) model of analysis has been used to classify and analyze the errors made in the translations. The final results of this study show that the most occurring errors made by students when translating their abstracts from English into Arabic are mainly language ones. The study puts forward a number of suggestions, which may be very helpful to future students to avoid making translation errors in such abstracts.

| KEYWORDS

Translation Error Analysis, Translation Quality Assessment, Abstract writing

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 15 June 2023 **PUBLISHED:** 23 June 2023 **DOI:** 10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.6.11

1. Introduction

Translation Error Analysis (TEA) and Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) are two similar approaches developed to identify translation errors and assess them. According to Vivanco et al. (1990), "translation implies two types of "knowledge": One refers to knowing how to interpret the designation and the meaning of a text in a given source language, and the other refers to knowing how to "re-produce" (to render) the designation and the meaning of a text in a given target language" (p. 540). Nord Christiane (2001), a very famous German theorist and a representative of the German functional approach to translation, defines translation errors in this way: "If the purpose of a translation is to achieve a particular function for the target addressee, anything that obstructs the achievement of this purpose is a translation error". (P. 74)

All Linguists and theorists interested in translation error analysis (TEA) have shown and presented their ideas about translation errors, what to be considered an error and what is not and the types and classification of error types. In the second chapter of this research, the literature review will shed light on some of those theories and studies, but eventually, the researcher chose only one clear and thorough classification to build this study on, which is the error types classification by Posen Liao (2010).

This study focuses on analyzing the errors MA candidates make when translating the abstracts of their MA projects from English into Arabic. Given that they are required to submit their projects with abstracts, MA candidates in Saudi Arabia are required to translate their research abstracts from English into Arabic. Some candidates did not attribute the abstracts of their MA projects due importance, and subsequently, their translations contained many translation errors. This study will seek to analyze those translation errors and suggest suitable remedies.

1.2 Problem of the Study

A preliminary analysis of some abstracts of MA theses/non-thesis projects, which were translated from English into Arabic, has shown that their translation contains errors of many types. Even though all the abstracts reviewed were of students who specialized

in the field of translation, many translation errors were identified. Some abstracts were not translated into the target language; instead, they were rewritten. Some abstracts contained obvious grammar and spelling mistakes and/or punctuation mistakes, and many abstracts were not fully translated; some of their parts were missing. The present piece of research will try to explore those translation errors in order to highlight their nature and suggest the most suitable remedies, in addition to presenting ways to cope with them.

1.3. Significance of the study

The results and final findings of this study will hopefully be of great help to Arab MA students. It could be a beneficial resource to help in the translation of MA abstracts from English into Arabic. This study will draw on the nature of errors and suggest possible satisfactory remedies for those errors, showing where errors mostly occur and how to avoid them. The researcher will highlight the importance of abstracts and their translations and will eventually present a number of error avoiding strategies while translating abstracts from English to Arabic and vice versa.

1.4. Research Questions

This study is an attempt to answer these questions, what are the types of errors involved in the English-Arabic translation of MA theses/non-thesis projects abstracts? and what are the possible remedies for those errors?

The study will answer the first question by exploring abstracts, extracting errors, and finding out every error type in order to show the most occurring errors and the least occurring errors. The study will try to find out the reasons behind the occurrence of these errors. In order to answer the second question, this study will try to present the most suitable remedies for the most occurring errors.

1.5. Organization of the research

This research consists of five chapters. The first one is an introduction, and it deals with Liao's (2010) model of error analysis and its application in this study. It also deals with the problem and significance of this study and raises the research questions involved and the answers needed.

Chapter two provides a view of the respective literature in the field of Translation Error Analysis. The researcher presented some theories and some studies in this field in order to show error analysis applications, error analysis taxonomies and the results other researchers have reached.

The third chapter draws on the method of this research, the procedure of collecting the sample and Liao's (2010)' tool of data analysis.

The fourth chapter presents the study findings by explaining error types, error frequency and error examples. This chapter also includes a thorough discussion of the results. The chapter ends with suggestions for suitable remedies for the most occurring errors.

The last chapter of this research concludes the study and puts forward a number of recommendations for further studies.

1.6. Research Methodology

The present research was motivated by the researcher's wish to explore the nature of errors occurring in the MA research abstracts when translated from English into Arabic. To pursue this purpose, the researcher has collected a number of MA thesis and non-thesis projects, all of which were conducted by students of the Department of Languages and Translation in the College of Languages and Translation at Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University over the last decade. The collected items were examined individually, and errors were extracted according to Liao's (2010) model for translation error analysis.

2. Literature Review

Translation studies have become an important field of science over the past few decades; as is the case with the other fields, translation needs assessment and evaluation. Many theorists and researchers have come up with ways and methods to assess and evaluate translation. Errors in translation are a subject discussed by theorists, who have tried to put forward some classifications of errors and ways to analyze them. Anthony Pym (1992), Juliana House (2010-2015) and Posen Liao (2010) are some of the famous theorists who discussed translation errors.

2.1. Translation Error Analysis Classifications

Pym (1992) states that errors may be attributed to numerous causes, such as "lack of competence, inappropriateness to the readership, and misuse of time"(Pym 1992, p.4). He also states that errors are located on numerous levels, such as language, Pragmatics, and culture. Pym classified translation errors into binary and non-binary errors. Binary errors refer to the

straightforward possibility of assessing a translation string as wrong and another one as right. He also makes it clear that "the correction of binary errors belongs to the language class and that of non-binary errors to translation class" (Pym 1992, p.5), even though he adds later that "both kinds of errors should be corrected in both situations." Pym (1992) clarifies his idea by saying that we say ("it's wrong!") to binary errors and ("it's correct, but…") to non-binary errors, suggesting that we mostly use binarism and non-binarism without knowing it.

Another important classification of translation errors is House's (1997; 2015) translation quality assessment revised model, which was inspired by Halliday's systematic-functional theory, where the focus is on the function rather than the structure of the language. House classified errors into overt and covert errors, overt translation errors contain a clear violation of the SL system or the ST profile, such as deviating from the ST meaning or loss of any segment of it in the target version, covert translation errors involve a violation of the TT profile, which is not purely linguistic and it cannot be easily discovered.

Posen Liao (2010) conducted a research study exploring students' translation errors entitled "An Analysis of English-Chinese Translation Errors and Its Pedagogical Applications". In this research, Liao started by collecting and identifying a large number of translation errors made by college students through an online teaching platform; he then described errors adequately and put them in a systematic typology. The results of this study showed that all translation errors could be divided into three main categories: language errors, rendition errors, and miscellaneous errors. (Table 1) shows the detailed error types proposed by Liao (2010).

Table 1: Error Analysis Model. Liao (2010)

1. Rendition Errors
R1: Misinterpreting the source text.
R2: Insufficient rendering, which differentiates the translation from the original text.
R3: Excessive rendering, which differentiates the translation from the original text.
R4: Subtle difference of meaning between the source and target texts; insufficient accuracy.
R5: Misinterpretation due to unawareness of terms.
2. Language Errors
L1: Grammatical mistake or ungrammatical syntax of target language
L2: Awkward expression, including ambiguous meaning, mismatch, redundant words and unnecessary repetition, etc.
L3: Inappropriate register.
L4: Excessive literal translation, which leads to ambiguous translation.
L5: Excessive free translation, which differentiates the translation from the original text.
L6: Incorrect character, improper punctuation marks or inconsistency in term translation.
3. Miscellaneous Errors
M1: Missing parts in the target text; omission.

The American Translation Association (ATA) (2009) have suggested an error taxonomy which is employed as a way of error identification and professional translation evaluation. The list contained 22 errors, and they are as follows: 1) Incomplete passage, 2) Illegible hand writing, 3) Misunderstanding of the original text, 4) Mistranslation into the target language, 5) Addition or omission, 6) Terminology, word choice, 7) Register, 8) Too freely translated, 9) Too literal, word-for-word translation, 10) False cognate, 11) Indecision in word choice, 12) Inconsistent, 13) Ambiguity, 14) Grammar, 15) Syntax, 16) Punctuation, 17) Spelling, 18) Accents and other diacritical marks, 19) Case (upper case/lower case), 20) Word form, 21) Usage and 22) Style and From (ATA, 2009, p. 17).

2.2. Research in the field of Translation Error Analysis

Ramadan Ahmed Elmgrab (2013), a researcher from the University of Benghazi, Libya, has conducted research presenting an updated argumentation about the criteria of evaluation for trainee translators, which was entitled "Evaluation of Translation Errors: Procedures and Criteria". The researcher stated that the first step consists in detecting students' translation errors. The instructor will then have to explain how the trainee translator has deviated from an adequate translation and which rules she/he has broken. Finally, the instructor should adopt evaluative measures and seek appropriate pedagogical assistance. Elmgrab suggested Five evaluation criteria, (i) the frequency criterion; (ii) the generality criterion; (iii) the intelligibility criterion; (iv) the interpretation criterion, and (v) the naturalness criterion. (Elmgrab 2013, p.60)

The Frequency Criterion is quantitatively oriented, and it assesses errors in terms of the number of their occurrence. The Generality Criterion is where evaluation should be performed in terms of the major/minor rules infringed; the more general being, the more serious. The Intelligibility Criterion holds that we are more likely to be comprehensible with the help of the meaning of words

without syntax than without syntactic structures without words. The Interpretation Criterion takes the ST as a point of departure. It is precisely about how far the trainee's interpretation of the ST personified in the TL is correct or deviant. The last criterion is The Naturalness Criterion, which Elmgrab explained as "the TT may not reflect the natural and idiomatic forms of the receptor language; this means that the TT does not read naturally for the TL reader as the ST does for the SL reader. It seems that problems relating to naturalness often arise when the text is of a covert type". (Elmgrab, 2013, p.63)

Maryam Jahanshahi (2015), an Iranian researcher who conducted a research study entitled "Error Analysis of English Translation of Islamic Texts by Iranian Translators", stated that translation errors occur as the result of incompetence in culture, syntax and/or semantics. She sought to analyze the type and frequency of the errors occurring in the English translations of Islamic texts by Iranian translators and analyse the possible causes of the errors. She selected 9 Islamic texts and their translations, then used Morgan's sample selection table to categorize errors based on the classification of error types developed by Liao (2010). The results of her study revealed that the register category was the most frequent error area; she found out that the most frequently occurring errors were from the category of language (according to Liao (2010) classification), where errors varied between inappropriate register, grammatical mistakes, awkward expressions, excessive literal translation and excessive free translation.

Another study in the translation error analysis field was conducted by two Iranian researchers, Mitra Eftekhar and Peyman Nouraey (2013). Their research was entitled "Commercial Translation Error Analysis: A Case Study of Iranian Products". In this study, the researchers investigated the errors occurring on Iranian product labels. They used a corpus of three-hundred translated home appliance labels designed for Iranian products manufactured between 2010 and 2012. They placed each and every sample under its possible category of errors according to Keshavarz's (1993) model of error analysis. The results of the analysis revealed that "over half of the total number of the labels under study were erroneous ones, either 'grammatically', 'semantically', or 'pragmatically'."(Eftekhar and Nouraey, 2013).

One of the important studies in the field of error analysis was conducted by Canan Terzi and entitled "An Analysis of Dissertation Abstracts in Terms of Translation Error and Academic Discourse". This study is based on evaluating English abstracts of MA and PhD dissertations published in the Turkish language and on identifying translation errors and problems concerning academic style and discourse. The researcher selected a corpus of 90 abstracts of MA and PhD dissertations both from Turkish-speaking researchers and English-speaking researchers. He analyzed the abstracts of these dissertations in terms of translation issues and academic discourse and style. The findings indicated that Turkish-speaking researchers rely on their translation skills while writing their abstracts in English. The researcher found out that all of the English abstracts produced by Turkish-speaking researchers were one-to-one translations of the Turkish versions and that a few of the abstracts included one or two sentences that were not available in the Turkish version.

Minghe Guo, a researcher from China who was interested in the field of TEA, published 2012 a research paper titled "Analysis on the English-translation Errors of Public Signs". He stated that "the frequent problems in the translation of public signs degrade China's international status as a major role on the global platform."(Guo, 2012, P.1). The researcher indicated that public signs should at least meet the following specifications: correct spelling, brief and concise language style, the choice of appropriate words, the use of frequent words and the consideration of cultural differences. After analyzing public signs in China, the researcher found out that the most frequently seen translation errors are: incomprehensible Chinese, inconsistency in the translation of naming, spelling mistakes, redundancy, change or the loss of information, inappropriate choice of words, mistranslation on the cultural level, and grammatical mistakes.

Taher Sarhady (2013), a researcher who used error analysis to assist translation teaching, conducted a study titled "The Efficacy of Error Analysis on Teaching Translation". In this study, the aim was to diagnose and remedy university students' problems in translation. The researcher gave the students a test comprising a set of intentionally knotty Persian sentences to be rendered into English. After analyzing the data, he found out that "the majority of participants have transferred SL structures into TL texts negatively."(Sarhady, 2013). The results of this study showed that students made a number of different errors such as: passivation, errors in tense, errors in thematization, ambiguity, overgeneralization, word displacement and others. The researcher stated that a group of students left some sentences blank without any answer, which the researcher explained as an avoidance strategy due to the student's lack of knowledge in that conjunction.

Another study in the field is one conducted by Changhua Zhao, a Chinese researcher who studied translation error analysis as a way to improve language learning. The article titled " Analysis of Mongolian Students' Common Translation Errors and Its Solutions" was published in 2013. In this article, Zhao investigated the problems of Mongolian English learners by analyzing some errors in their English-Chinese translation. The analysis summed up students' errors in four major categories: students' inflexible use of translation skills, mistakes in idiomatic usage, inflexible and boring statements and the lack of knowledge of the cultural background. The author stated that translation is an important way to test the students' understanding; he concluded by

suggesting some basic solutions such as: effective student-teacher communications, strengthening the necessary grammar training, and encouraging students' flexible use.

3. Methodology

3.1. Sample of the Study

The sample of the study originally consists of 43 English and Arabic abstracts from forty MA theses/non-theses projects defended at the Imam University over the last decade. The sample was collected and photocopied from the Library of Prince Sultan, which is located at the University of Imam Muhammad bin Saud. It was reduced to 40 texts, as it excluded one that was a total paraphrase where the source text was completely different than the target text, and two other texts, as they were error free and were not helpful to the research.

The texts were numbered from A1 to A40. The researcher started analyzing each abstract individually, underlining every error and classifying it according to Liao's (2010) model of translation error analysis. Every error detected was underlined in both ST and TT.

The next step was creating an (excel 2016) table to count the occurrence of errors. The table contained twelve columns of error types and forty rows, each representing an abstract from A1 to A40.

3.2. Data Analysis

In order to answer the first research question: "What are the types of errors involved in the English-Arabic translation of MA theses/non-thesis projects abstracts?" Liao's 2010 error types classification table was used. The analysis identified errors and then classified them.

3.2.1. Identifying errors

Every abstract and its translation were first reviewed several times, and all errors detected were underlined without referring to any error classification. This step of the analysis tried to identify those erroneous sentences and words in terms of meaning, structure, grammar, style, etc.

3.2.2. Classifying errors

The analysis of the data is based on Liao's (2010) translation error analysis model. The latter classifies types of errors into three main groups: rendition errors, language errors, and miscellaneous errors. The study proceeds by detecting the error and identifying its type particularly. The next step is typing down those errors in the fields they belong to (Table 2). and eventually, the final results are calculated.

4. Results and Discussion

The translation error analysis of abstracts translated from English into Arabic in this study resulted in detecting a number of various errors. Depending on Liao's error analysis model (2010), errors were classified as Rendition, Language, or miscellaneous errors.

Table 2 below contains the occurrence of all errors; error types are coded as in (Table 1) where R means Rendition error, L means Language error, and M is Miscellaneous error.

Abstracts	Rendition Errors					Language Errors						Miscellaneous Errors
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	M1
A1	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	4
A2	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	1	2
A3	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	2
A4	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0
A5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4
A6	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1
A7	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
A8	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	2
A9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
A10	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
A11	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0

A12	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A13	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
A14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
A15	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
A16	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	5
A17	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0
A18	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
A19	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
A20	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
A21	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
A22	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0
A23	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0
A24	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
A25	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
A26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A27	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
A28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
A29	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
A30	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	1
A31	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
A32	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
A33	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
A35	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0
A36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A37	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
A38	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
A39	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
A40	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
total	6	22	15	19	2	19	22	2	6	24	27	35

The first group, rendition errors, includes all the errors that occur because of the way a translator renders/transfers a word or a sentence from one language to another. All rendition errors are shown in (Table1). The most occurring rendition error is R2, which is "Insufficient rendering, which differentiates the translation from the original text", and it occurred 22 times, while the least occurring one is R5, "Misinterpretation due to unawareness of terms", which only occurred two times.

The second group is language related errors, and they are the most occurring ones. They include all the grammatical mistakes and awkward expressions. The most occurring error in the language errors group is L6, "Incorrect character, improper punctuation marks or inconsistency in term translation". This error type was detected 27 times; the least occurring language error type is L3, " Inappropriate register".

Miscellaneous errors, which in this study and according to Liao (2010) represent only omission, and in this case, 35 omission errors were detected, which represents the least percentage of all the error types, which is 18%.

The charts below show that 50% of errors detected in the abstracts are categorized as Language errors, 32% of errors are rendition errors, and 18% of errors are miscellaneous ones. The number of errors detected and categorized as rendition errors is 64, which is 32% of the total errors. The second type of error is Language errors, which are errors caused by any language-related problem, and they were a total of 100 errors, which represents 50% of errors. The last type is Miscellaneous errors, and in this research, only omission was considered as a miscellaneous error; there were 35 omission errors detected, making the percentage of 18%.

The following table contains some of the most occurring errors. The first column represents the code of the abstract; the second one contains the type of the error; the third column is the source text (ST); the fourth column is the target text (TT); and the last column is the suggested remedy or the better and correct translation for every error. In (Table 3), errors might occur in the source text or in the target text, and the remedy could be for only one or for both texts.

No	A no.	Error type	Error (ST)	Translation(TT)	Remedy
1	A1	Mismatch	This research examines ...	يركز هذا البحث على ...	يختبر هذا البحث ...
2	A2	Grammatical mistake	The study explains how ...	ويشرح الباحث بعد ذلك ...	وتوضح الدراسة بعد ذلك ...
3	A2	Omission	academic professors and freelance translators ...	أساتذة الجامعة والمترجمين .	أساتذة الجامعة والمترجمين المستقلين ...
4	A3	Mismatch	This study examines ...	فإن هذا البحث يقدم ...	تختبر هذه الدراسة ...
5	A3	Grammatical mistake	Intends to shed light ...	يسلط الضوء على ...	ينوي تسليط الضوء على ...
6	A4	Excessive rendering	In general, this study focuses on the topic of translating idioms.	يركز هذا البحث عموماً على الموضوع الرئيسي: ترجمة التعابير الاصطلاحية .	، يركز هذا بشكل عام البحث على ترجمة التعابير الاصطلاحية .
7	A4	Excessive rendering	The idioms in the novel ...	التعابير الاصطلاحية الواردة في النسخة الانجليزية من رواية ...	التعابير الاصطلاحية في رواية ...
8	A4	Mismatch	The translation strategy used ...	الطريقة المتبعة في الترجمة ...	الاستراتيجية المتبعة في الترجمة ...
9	A5	Mismatch	Based on exploring Three ...	تعتمد الدراسة على اكتشاف ثلاث أنواع ...	تعتمد الدراسة على استعراض ثلاثة أنواع ...
10	A5	Grammatical mistake	This study describes ...	تصف الدراسة الطريقة ...	تصف هذه الدراسة ...

One of the most occurring errors is a mismatch, where both TT and ST are referring to the same intended idea, but the two words are different. For example, the word “examines” was translated into (يركز) or (يقدم). Also, the word "focuses" was mismatched with (يعتمد) or (يسلط الضوء على).

Many grammatical mistakes were detected, and the dual in some sentences was mistakenly translated. Gender in Arabic was one of the awkward translation mistakes found. Sentence ordering is one of the grammar mistakes detected, such as the translation of “While the other book talks about “ into "بينما الكتاب الآخر فيتحدث عن" where it should be translated into " بينما يتحدث الكتاب الآخر عن". Another grammatical mistake is translating "intends to shed light" into "يسلط الضوء على" when it should be translated into "ينوي تسليط الضوء على".

Punctuation marks proved a little challenging for some researchers. The comma in both languages was either overused or never used. Some researchers used the Arabic comma (،) instead of the English one (,) in the TT, and some abstract writers did the opposite. Some punctuation marks were put in the middle of sentences in a random way, and that might be a typing mistake to which they did not pay attention.

Due to the fact that all the abstracts analyzed are of Arab students, the translated abstracts were easier to write, and they included extra information and/or extra explanation of certain points. This type of mistake was considered either excessive free translation or excessive rendering.

The most occurring errors were language ones, this field in Liao's model (2010) consists of 6 types of sub errors, and they are as follows: (L1) Grammatical mistake or ungrammatical syntax of target language. (L2) Awkward expression, including ambiguous meaning, mismatch, redundant words and unnecessary repetition, etc. (L3) Inappropriate register. (L4) Excessive literal translation, which leads to ambiguous translation. (L5) Excessive free translation, which differentiates the translation from the original text. (L6) Incorrect character, improper punctuation marks or inconsistency in term translation.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Conclusion of the study

The final results of this study show that the translated abstracts contained some translation errors. The committed errors were of several types. Some errors were serious and resulted in creating a target text of a completely different meaning; some errors were not very significant but reflected the translator's weakness in translation.

The fact is that most of the occurring errors are language ones, which raises the question of how translators deal with their own texts (the abstracts). Failure to understand the meaning of the target text is not the main cause behind these translation errors because all translators are working on their own texts. The complete, neat, and error free abstracts are a mirror of the work that follows. MA students should be equipped with the skills of writing abstracts and translating them.

This study faced certain limits, mostly concerning the samples, as they were collected from one specific University, which is Imam Muhammed bin Saud Islamic University in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Also, all 40 abstracts were from the MA department in the College of Languages and Translation. This was intended in order to have an equal sample on all aspects.

5.2. Recommendation for further studies

This study will hopefully be very helpful to future MA students translating their abstracts from English into Arabic. The results showed that the need to focus on abstract writing is an important issue. Indeed, the knowledge of writing abstracts in the first place and then translating them properly is as important as the rest of the work.

It is recommended for other researchers who are interested in the field of error analysis to further investigate this topic and probe into the reasons behind committing translation errors by translation MA students.

Researchers who are interested in writing strategies and techniques are advised to look further into the art of crafting abstracts since it seems to be a neglected field of study.

Funding: This research received no external funding.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Guo, M. (2012). Analysis of the English-translation Errors of Public Signs. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(6). doi:10.4304/tpls.2.6.1214-1219 http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol02/06/17.pdf
[2] House, J. (1977). A Model for Assessing Translation Quality. *Meta: Journal Des Traducteurs, 22*(2), 103. doi:10.7202/003140ar
[3] House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment Past and Present*. New York: Routledge, Print.
[4] House, J. (2009). *Translation. Oxford*: Oxford University Press. Print.
[5] Jahanshahi, M. (2015). Error Analysis of English Translation of Islamic Texts by Iranian Translators. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*. 238-25 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281440349_Error_Analysis_of_English_Translation_of_Islamic_Texts_by_Iranian_Translators
[6] Liao, P. (2010). An analysis of English-Chinese translation errors and its pedagogical applications. *Compilation& Translation Review. 101-128. 28p.* http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/60845359/analysis-english-chinese-translation-errors-pedagogical-applications
[7] Mitra E and Peyman N (2013). Commercial Translation Error Analysis: A Case Study of Iranian Products. *Linguistics and Literature Studies 1*(2): 55-60, 2013. Web. http://www.hrpub.org/download/201309/lls.2013.010201.pdf
[8] Nord, C. (2005). Text Analysis in Translation. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Rodopi. Web. www.aston.ac.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?alId=100805
[9] Pym, A. (1992). Translation Error Analysis and The Interface with Language Teaching. *The Teaching of Translation, Ed. Cay Dollerup & Anne Loddegaard, Amsterdam: John Benjamins,* 279-288. usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/training/1992_error.pdf
[10] Sarhady, T. (2013). The Efficacy of Error Analysis on Teaching Translation. *Modern Journal of language teaching methods (MJLTM): 26 - 32 Web.*www.ugr.es/~portalin/articulos/PL_numero22/4%20%20DIANA%20PRESADA.pdf
[11] Terzi, C. & Arslanturk, Y. (2014). An Analysis of Dissertation Abstracts in Terms of Translation Errors and Academic Discourse. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies 2*(4), 1-11. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.686.1108
[12] Vivanco, H. & Carlos Palazuelos, J. & Hörmann, P. & Garbarini C. & Blatrach, M. (1990). Error analysis in translation: a preliminary report. Meta: *Translators' Journal*. www.rechercheisidore.fr/search/resource/?uri=10670/1.9fcccb
[13] Williams, M. (2009). Translation Quality Assessment. Mutatis Mutandis 2.1: 3 - 23. Web.
[14] Zhao, C. (2013). Analysis of Mongolian Students' Common Translation Errors and Its Solutions. *English Language Teaching. 538-542.* http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/244