

AN ANALYSIS OF ERRORS IN ENGLISH ABSTRACTS
TRANSLATED BY THAI UNIVERSITY GRADUATE STUDENTS

A MASTER'S PROJECT
BY
LADAWAN HENGWICHITKUL

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts degree in English
at Srinakharinwirot University
October 2006

การวิเคราะห์ข้อบกพร่องจากบทคัดย่อภาษาอังกฤษที่แปลโดยนิสิตปริญญาโทมหาวิทยาลัยไทย

บทคัดย่อ
ของ
ลดาวัลย์ เฮงวิจิตรกุล

เสนอต่อบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ เพื่อเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษา
ตามหลักสูตรปริญญาศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ
ตุลาคม 2549

ลดาวัลย์ เสงวีจิตรกุล. (2549).การวิเคราะห์ข้อบกพร่องจากบทคัดย่อภาษาอังกฤษที่แปลโดยนิสิต

ปริญญาโทมหาวิทยาลัยไทย. สารนิพนธ์ ศ.ศ.ม. (ภาษาอังกฤษ). กรุงเทพฯ: บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย
มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ. คณะกรรมการควบคุม: ผศ. ดร. ทิพา เทพอักษรพงศ์,
ดร. นิตยา สุขเสรีทรัพย์, และมิสเตอร์ปีเตอร์ เฟเซอร์.

สารนิพนธ์ฉบับนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อวิเคราะห์ข้อบกพร่องจากบทคัดย่อภาษาอังกฤษที่แปลโดย
นิสิตปริญญาโทมหาวิทยาลัยไทย โดยศึกษาจากบทคัดย่อภาษาอังกฤษที่แปลโดยนิสิตปริญญาโท
จำนวน 14คน ใช้เวลาในการแปล 3 ชั่วโมง โดยเน้นที่การศึกษาประเภทของข้อบกพร่องที่เกิดขึ้นบ่อย
และ สาเหตุของข้อบกพร่อง จากการศึกษาพบว่า บทคัดย่อภาษาอังกฤษที่แปลโดยนิสิตปริญญาโทมี
ข้อบกพร่องในระดับประโยค 9 ชนิดคือ 1. การใช้เครื่องหมาย วรรคตอน (21.08%) 2.ประโยคที่ยังไม่
สมบูรณ์ (19.12%) 3. วิเศษณานุประโยค (16.67%) 4. กรรมวาจก (16.35%) 5. สัมพันธานุประโยค
(14.81%) 6. กาล (12.25%) 7. หน้าที่ของคำ (9.64%) 8. Parallelism (7.84%) 9. ความสัมพันธ์ของ
ประธานและกริยา (5.39%) สาเหตุหลักที่พอจะเดาได้ของข้อบกพร่องคือ โครงสร้างที่แตกต่างกัน
ระหว่างภาษาอังกฤษและภาษาไทย และความซับซ้อนทางโครงสร้างประโยค ของภาษาอังกฤษ

AN ANALYSIS OF ERRORS IN ENGLISH ABSTRACTS
TRANSLATED BY THAI UNIVERSITY GRADUATE STUDENTS

A MASTER'S PROJECT
BY
LADAWAN HENGWICHITKUL

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts degree in English
at Srinakharinwirot University
October 2006

Ladawan Hengwichitkul. (2006). *An Analysis of Errors in English Abstracts Translated by Thai University Graduate Students*. A Master's Project, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University. Advisor Committee: Assistant Professor Dr. Tipa Thep-Ackrapong, Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup and Mr. Peter Fayers.

The purpose of this master's project was to analyze errors at the sentential level in an English abstract translated by 14 Thai university graduate students within three hours. The study focused on examining major types and frequency of errors, and some plausible explanations to account for them. The research results revealed that there were nine major types of errors: punctuation (21.08%), run-on and fragment (19.12%), participial phrase which included the present participle (16.67%) and the past participle (12%), passive voice (16.35%), relative clause (14.81%), tense (12.25%), parallel structure (9.64%), parts of speech (7.84%), and subject-verb agreement (5.39%) respectively. There were two major explanations to account for the sources of errors: the differences between the Thai and English languages and the difficulty of the English syntax.

AN ANALYSIS OF ERRORS IN ENGLISH ABSTRACTS
TRANSLATED BY THAI UNIVERSITY GRADUATE STUDENTS

A MASTER'S PROJECT
BY
LADAWAN HENGWICHITKUL

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts degree in English
at Srinakharinwirot University
October 2006

Copyright 2006 Srinakharinwirot University

The Master's Project Committee and Oral Defense Committee have approved this Master's Project as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in English of Srinakharinwirot University.

Master's Project Advisor

.....

(Assistant Professor Dr. Tipa Thep-Ackrapong)

Chair of the Master of Arts degree in English

.....

(Dr. Prapaipan Aimchoo)

Oral Defense Committee

..... Chair

(Assistant Professor Dr. Tipa Thep-Ackrapong)

..... Reader

(Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup)

..... Reader

(Mr. Peter Fayers)

This Master's Project has been approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in English of Srinakharinwirot University.

..... Dean of the Faculty of Humanities

(Assistant Professor Chaleosri Pibulchol)

October, 2006

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I am deeply grateful to my advisor, Assistant Professor Dr. Tipa Thep-Ackrapong, for her patience, valuable comments, guidance and inspiration. My gratitude is expressed to Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup, my co- advisor, for her kind assistance and comments. I also feel grateful to Mr. Peter Fayers for his advice.

I am most grateful to Mrs. Primprai Supapodok, the school director of Patai Udom Suksa School, my workplace, for her endless kindness and support. Moreover, I thank all my colleagues at the school for their encouragement during my study.

My special thanks go to Dr. Prathuangsook Youngsathien for her constant help and encouragement throughout the study.

My thanks go to all my friends for their assistance and unfailing encouragement. Finally, I am indebted to my parents and my sister for their love and support.

Ladawan Hengwichitkul

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Objective of the Study.....	2
Significance of the Study.....	3
Scope of the Study.....	3
Definition of Terms.....	3
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	6
Abstract Writing.....	6
T-unit Analysis.....	8
Variability of Error.....	9
Classification of Error.....	10
Previous Studies.....	14
3. METHODOLOGY.....	19
Procedure.....	19
1. Collecting Data.....	19
2. Data Analysis.....	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Chapter	Page
4. FINDINGS.....	22
5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION.....	29
Conclusion.....	29
Discussion.....	30
Application.....	31
Limitations of the Study.....	31
Suggestions for Further Studies.....	31
REFERENCES.....	33
APPENDIX.....	36
BIODATA	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Types of errors at the sentential level in all samples.....	23

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

In order to have an abstract for a research paper, Thai graduate students usually translate a Thai abstract into English. In translating such, they usually make a lot of errors because Thai and English are extremely different.

Errors are different from mistakes in the sense that errors systematically occur in the second language learning, while mistakes non-systematically occur in the first language (Corder, 1981). Moreover, in making errors, usually the learners are not aware of them, or if they are, they do not know how to correct them. Unlike errors, learners are aware of mistakes, and know how to correct them (Brown, 1987).

Previously, errors in the audio-lingual approach were regarded as something undesirable. The teachers were taught to get rid of them for fear that they might influence the learners to develop an undesirable habit of using those errors. However, later on, errors were regarded as evidence of learning strategies, as necessary stages of language learning (Corder, 1967:167).

In translation, errors are pretty much the same as those in second language acquisition. They are clear examples of several problems: first, interference of the source language in the target language, second lack of comprehension of the source language, and third inadequate communicative competence or performance in the translator's target language and finally lack of extralinguistic background (Arnold D J, 1995).

There are many studies of errors in translation that have benefited the second language learning. Haded (1998: 56) claims that an error analysis will be more practical and theoretically helpful if researchers classify the types of errors in the target language, identify the point of difficulty, explain the causes of errors with respect to cross linguistic influence and suggest ways of correction. However, research on errors in translation especially between Thai and English has rarely been conducted. Therefore, the main focus of the current research was to study errors in an English abstract translated by Thai university graduate students. The results of the study can help Thai translators to understand problems of translation from Thai into English and can help teachers and students to improve their translation.

In short, this study aimed to analyze errors in an English abstract translated by Thai university graduate students. It focused on types, frequency of errors and plausible explanations to account for them. The results can be guidelines to help students, teachers and translators who have to deal with translating abstracts from Thai into English.

Objectives of the Study

This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What types of errors are found in a research abstract translated by Thai university graduate students?
2. What is the frequency of each type of error found?
3. What are plausible explanations to account for those errors?

Significance of the Study

The findings of the study are beneficial as follows:

1. They will reveal the frequency of each type of error found in translating a research paper abstract by Thai university graduate students so that the translators can focus their attention on those errors.
2. They can be used as guidelines for other studies in writing and translation.
3. They can be used as guidelines for instructors to improve their teaching of writing and translation.

Scope of the Study

1. Fourteen English abstracts translated by Thai university graduate students were analyzed.
2. The analysis criteria were mainly based on the linguistic differences between Thai and English proposed by Thep-Ackrapong (1994).
3. The errors were identified, but they were not corrected.

Definitions of Terms

The key terms used in this study are defined as follows:

1. A t-unit

A t-unit refers to an independent clause and all its dependent clauses (Hunt, 1970: 4-5; Gaies, 1980: 56). For example:

The boy climbed up the hills (1 t-unit).

He did not study hard, but he passed the exam (2 t-units).

Although her friend has invited her to a party, Jane does not want to go (1 t-unit).

2. Sentential errors

Sentential errors refer to errors wrongly translated from Thai into English by the participants in the study. Mostly they are violations of the English grammatical rules involving the subject-verb agreement, part of speech, participial phrase, relative clause, passive voice, parallel structure, punctuation, number, run-on and fragment. For example, the following is an error in passive voice.

*This research was aim to study the history, origin, and meaning of the names of the temples at ...

3. Interference

Interference refers to a direct transfer of a rule in language learners' mother tongue to second language acquisition (Chaika, 1982: 228). In this study, it usually refers to the interference from the Thai language on the participants' translation.

4. Interlanguage

Interlanguage refers to the type of language produced by second-and foreign-language learners who are in the process of learning a language (Selinker, 1972).

5. Target language

The target language refers to the language which a person is learning, in contrast to the first language or mother tongue. In this study, it refers to English.

Overview of the Study

This study aimed at analyzing errors in an English abstract translated by Thai university graduate students. Chapter 2 discusses the related literature of abstract writing, t- unit analysis, variability of errors, classification of errors and previous studies on error analysis. Chapter 3 presents the research method. Chapter 4 offers the results of the study. It shows types and frequency of errors as well as plausible explanations to account for them. Chapter 5 discusses the results of the analysis, pedagogical implications of the findings and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, abstract writing, t-unit analysis, variability of errors, classifications of errors and some previous research related to error analysis in translation are reviewed to provide the background in this study.

Abstract Writing

The American National Standards Institute (2006) defines an abstract as “an abbreviated, accurate representative of contents of a document, preferably prepared by its author(s) for publication.” The abstract writing is composed of types of abstracts, approaches to writing abstracts and linguistic features of abstracts.

Types of Abstracts

There are three types of abstracts: a conference abstract, an abstract in a journal and a research paper abstract (Swales & Feak, 1994: 210). In this study, only the research paper abstract is concerned. This type of abstract is a brief summary designed to inform readers what they will get if they read the whole research. Although an abstract appears in the first section of a paper, it should be written last. Other sections have to be completed before selecting and summarizing the essential information from them.

Approaches to Writing Abstracts

Swales and Feak (1994) point out that there are two approaches to writing abstracts in research. First, the “result-driven” abstract which concentrates on the research findings and what might be concluded from them. Second, the research paper

summary, which summarizes each section of the research: purpose, method, findings and conclusion and discussion.

In brief, abstract writing is a concise summary of a document that highlights and identifies major points covered in the work such as the content, scope of the writing, methodology used, findings, and conclusions. There are three types of abstract writing: a conference abstract, an abstract in a journal and a research paper abstract. The approaches to writing abstracts are result driven and research paper summary.

Linguistic Features of an Abstract

It is suggested that the information in an abstract should follow the structure of the research article including introduction, method, results and discussion. Swales (1990) suggests that abstract writing often follow the pattern mentioned above with a general introductory statement followed by the method, then results and discussion. A similar list is provided by Graetz (1985), who claims that the most common structure of an abstract is problem, method, results and conclusion. She also points out that an abstract usually has particular linguistic features. It is characterized by the use of the past tense, third person, passive and the non- use of negative. It avoids subordinate clauses, but uses phrases instead of clauses, and words instead of phrases. It avoids abbreviations, jargon, symbols and other language shortcuts which might lead to confusion. It is written in tightly worded sentences, which avoid repetitions, meaningless expressions, superlative adjectives, descriptive details, examples and footnotes.

According to Bhatia (1993: 78), an abstract consists of four moves after the research. The first move is introducing the purpose. This move gives a precise indication of the author's intention, thesis or hypothesis which forms the basis of the research being reported. It may also include the goals or objectives of the research or the problem that the author wishes to tackle. The second move is describing the methodology. In this move, the author gives a good indication of the experimental design, including information on the data, procedures or method(s) used and, if necessary, the scope of the research being reported. The third move is summarizing results. This is an important aspect of an abstract where the author includes his/ her observations and findings and also suggests solutions to the problem, if any, posed in the first move. The fourth move is presenting a conclusion. This move is meant to interpret the result and draw inferences. It typically includes some indications of the implications and applications of the present findings (Bhatia, 1993: 77-79).

In short, an abstract is a brief summary of a report or a research that gives the reader concise information of the full text. In writing an abstract, there are four moves: introducing the purpose, describing methodology, summarizing results and presenting the conclusion.

T-unit Analysis

A t-unit refers to an independent clause and all its dependent clauses (Hunt, 1970: 4-5). The idea of a t-unit was first proposed by Hunt in 1965 as a measuring device to analyze syntactic maturity in the first language development especially of children's writing. Then it has been applied in many studies of second language learning to characterize the syntactic nature of linguistic input and to assess the syntactic maturity of learners' written production (Gaies, 1980: 53).

According to Gaies (1980), the t-unit analysis can be used to measure only syntactic growth in both first and second languages, but not the communicative ability or the appropriate choice of styles in writing. In the case of second language, there are two limitations. First, the t-unit can be used with some levels of learners. Second, it cannot distinguish between the low proficiency learners and the high proficiency learners clearly. Despite those limitations, t-unit analysis can still offer the picture of the nature of second language acquisition and its relationship to first language acquisition. Moreover, it reveals that not only the process of t-unit lengthening, but also the stages in that process are consistent in the first and second language acquisition (Gaies, 1980: 58).

In short, t- unit analysis is a way to measure syntactic development. It is a good index for measuring syntactic growth in first and second languages. Therefore, it should be applicable to analyze translated texts produced by English as a second language learners.

Variability of Errors

According to Bley-Vroman (1983), in error analysis, there are a lot of variants found in a text produced by an English as a second language (ESL) learner. In other words, a language learner may make errors of one construction at one time, but may use it correctly at some other times. Those variants should be considered when we analyze errors since learners sometimes write one error wrongly, other times correctly. For example, in analyzing the passive voice, a participant of the current study wrote the following:

The main parts were ordered from high to low

*This research was aim to study the history, origin, and meaning of

It can be seen that the same participant produced correct and wrong passive voice constructions in the same data. The variability of errors shows that in the process of learning a language, errors fluctuate. If the number of errors decreases, it shows that the learner is about to reach the target language norms. On the other hand, if the number of errors is large, it means that the learner is still at the beginning stage, or far from the target language norms.

Therefore, in analyzing errors in this study, the proportion of errors was based on the total occurrence of such particular grammatical structure. That is if there were 104 passive voice structures found in the data, but there were only 17 structures that were wrongly used, it would indicate that the participants were close to the norms of the target language.

In short, variability of errors should be considered when we analyze translated texts produced by language learners since they sometimes translated one error wrongly, but other times correctly. If the number of errors decreases, it indicates that the learner is about to reach the language target norms. On the other hand, if the number of errors is large, it shows that the learner is far from the language target norms.

Classification of Errors

In this study, errors were analyzed at the sentential level. They were further classified as subject-verb agreement, tense, parts of speech, participial phrase, relative clause, passive voice, parallel structure, punctuation, run-ons and fragments. The classification is elaborated as follows:

1. Subject-verb Agreement

In English, the subject and verb must agree in number and tense; however, in Thai, there is no rule indicating such. Therefore, Thai learners may make errors

concerning the subject-verb agreement. For example:

เขาดื่มนมก่อนนอนเป็นประจำ

*He usually drink milk before going to bed.

2. Tense

In English, the tense is used to show the relation between the action or state described by the verb and the time which is reflected in its form. Although, in Thai, the adverb of time is used to indicate the time when the event occurs, the changing form of verb is not required. For example:

*I go to Australia last year.

ฉันไปออสเตรเลียปีก่อน

3. Parts of Speech

In English, words are classified into eight parts of speech: the verb, noun, pronoun, adjective, adverb, preposition, conjunction, and interjection. Each part of speech has rules to constrain how the word is used. In Thai, there are parts of speech such as verb, noun, adverb, preposition, conjunction, and interjection. Nevertheless, there are no rules to change the form of word in Thai. In English, there are many rules to change the word form. They are complicated and confusing for Thai learners. For example:

สวนสวย

*It is a beauty garden.

4. Participial Phrase

A participial phrase is a short form of a relative clause. In Thai, there is no equivalent of the participial phrase. The closest is the Thai relative clause, which is simpler, no change of verb forms involved. In English the rules governing the construction of a participial phrase are very complex. For example:

Running along the street, the man saw an accident.

The subject deleted in the participial phrase, *running along the street*, must be the same as the subject in the dependent clause, *the man saw an accident*. Moreover, the subject is the doer of the action run; therefore the verb must take the V + ing form.

If the deleted subject in the participial phrase is the receiver of the action in the verb, the past participle is used. For example:

Hit by a car, the man collapsed on the street.

In this case, the man receives the action *hit*.

Because of the complexity of the rules governing the construction of participial phrases, the Thai participants in the study would have a hard time using the structure and might use it wrongly.

5. Relative Clause

The relative clause is a clause that modifies a noun in a sentence, or a noun phrase. In Thai, the relative clause is not as complex as that in English. Thai relative pronouns are ที่ ซึ่ง อัน, which are devices to combine two sentences. Thus, Thai learners may be confused with the English relative clause. For example:

*The policeman carried the child who arm was broken.

6. Passive Voice

The passive voice in English is more complicated than that in Thai. It involves many grammatical rules. For example, the grammatical subject is the

receiver of the action performed by the verb. Then there is the verb *to be*, which is used to show agreement with the number of the grammatical subject and to the tense used. After that the action performed is shown in the past participle. Finally the doer of the action is shown after the preposition *by*. Obviously, there are many rules involved in the passive voice in English. In Thai, the construction is usually used with the particle ถูก or โดน followed by a verb, the form of which is not changed.

Therefore, the Thai passive voice is not as complicated as that in English.

7. Parallel Structure

Parallel structure is the use of the same pattern of words to show that two or more ideas have the same level of importance (Greenbaum & Quirk, 1990: 262). However, Thai learners are not well aware of this structure rule. Hence, they may make errors concerning the rule of parallelism. For example:

? John is handsome and taller than Brian.

8. Punctuation

Punctuation marks are the use of special signs in writing. In English, there are a lot of punctuation marks that have their specific functions (Crowther, 1995: 1079-1080). Nevertheless, Thai does not have the sentence boundary and Thai punctuations do not affect the structure as in English. Most punctuation marks are not needed in Thai. Therefore, many Thai learners do not know how to use English punctuation marks and always make errors about them. For example:

*Melanie the teacher will go to Singapore next month.

9. Run-ons and Fragments

Run-ons and fragments are types of errors that are related to a sentence. Thai does not have a specific sentence boundary, so many learners may make errors concerning run-ons and fragments. For example:

*Jeff loves to draw flowers are pretty. (a run-on)

*When Jeff draws flowers. (a fragment)

In short, there are nine major discrepancies at the sentential level between English and Thai. Moreover, some English grammatical rules are very complicated for Thai learners such as passive voice, participial phrase, relative clause and subject-verb agreement. Therefore, Thai learners always make these types of errors when they translate Thai into English.

Previous Research on Error Analysis

Errors Made by L2 Writers in English

There are a number of studies related to errors made by L2 writers in English. Undoubtedly, as pointed out by Gaies (1980), certain errors that are found in L2 writing either do not appear or appear far less frequently in L1 writing. The following research studies were divided into two groups: writing and translation.

Duskova (1969) analyzed errors made by Czech adult learners of English. She intended to determine the influence of their background language on their English learning. The results showed that the interference from Czech was explicit in errors of word order as well as English sentence construction. Duskova (1965), therefore, concluded that although the characteristics presented in the examples were unacceptable in English, they could be acceptable in Czech.

Bardovi-Harlig and Bofman (1989) examined differences in syntactic complexity, and error distribution and types among ESL students. The students were from two groups: those who had passed a university placement examination and those who had not. Errors were divided into three super-ordinate categories: syntactic,

morphological, and lexical-idiomatic. The findings indicated that a significant difference in errors per clause between the passed and non-passed groups were in lexical errors, not in syntactic or morphological errors. Bardovi-Harling and Bofman (1989) found no significant difference in the number of errors across language groups. They also found that error types seemed to be the same for passed and non-passed groups.

Kroll (1990) studied errors and gave accuracy scores on the basis of total number of words/total number of errors. She intended to examine differences between students' writing in class and at home since writing in class was made under a time constraint but not writing at home. Errors were categorized into 33 different types such as whole sentence or clause aberrance, verb missing, run-on sentence, parallel structure, relative clause, word order, tense-aspect, subject-verb agreement, lexical/phrase choice, word form, preposition, article, punctuation, etc. The results revealed that there were no significant differences in terms of error ratios. However, there was a high correlation of errors between in class and at home essays in terms of distribution of errors.

Kepner (1991) studied students' journals to examine higher-level propositions and surface-level errors. The informants were second-year university Spanish students. Types of feedback on journals included message-related and surface-error correction. As a result, students who received message-related feedback had significantly much higher level proposition. However, there was no difference between the groups in terms of surface-level errors.

Yang (1994) analyzed writing errors made by the ESL students of Los Angeles Harbor College. The data were collected from the students' actual writing. Then the writing was analyzed to detect any errors made by the individual students.

The results indicated that there were four kinds of writing errors: grammar, spelling, lexicon and punctuation. Yang (1994) also suggested that grammatical errors were the most serious, next spelling, then punctuation, and finally lexical errors.

In Thailand, there were some studies which analyzed errors in English writing. For example:

Abdulsata (2000) analyzed errors at both sentential and word levels found in second- year English major students' compositions of Srinakharinwirot University. The results revealed that there were ten types of errors. The errors found in the sentential level were subject- verb agreement, tense, singular and plural nouns, relative clause, punctuation and fragments and run-ons. The errors found at the word level were article, preposition, diction and adjective. Abdulsata points out that the students were preoccupied by the different rules governing Thai and English languages. They could not differentiate the different structures of the two languages properly, nor could they use them correctly in their compositions.

The six studies above were related to the writing of ESL learners. They gave useful information in analysis of errors in writing and revealed types of errors made by ESL learners. However, most of them gave only a few guidelines on how to determine an error and did not give explanatory account for the source of each type.

The following studies are all about translating Thai into English.

Ubol (1981) analyzed errors in English compositions and texts translated from Thai into English of the first-year students and the third-year English majors at Prince of Songkhla University. The informants in this study consisted of 150 first-year students and all of the third-year English majors studying at Prince of Songkhla University in 1978. The 150 first-year students were assigned to write an English composition of about 200 words in 50 minutes. Four months later, 100 first-year

students and the third-year English majors were asked to translate a Thai article entitled “My Future Plan” into English. They had 50 minutes to translate the article of about 200 words into English. It was found that errors in punctuation of the third-year English majors (1.5%) was less than those of the first-year students (3.2%) probably because they had learned English longer than the first-year students. On the other hand, it seemed that the third-year English majors had more errors regarding parts of speech such as the tense, pronoun, conjunction, and adjective than did the first-year writers because they produced more complex sentences than the other.

Songjarapanit (1985) studied errors in three reports translated from Thai into English. The errors in the reports were analyzed at two levels: structural and lexical. The structural errors were divided into four categories: intralingual--errors occurred because the target language's structure was wrongly used due to its difficulties, interlingual--errors resulting from the interference of the learner's mother tongue, dual errors--errors occurred because the learner did not apply the target language's rules, and finally, lack of transfer--errors resulting from wrong use of the target language structure. The lexical errors were categorized as wrongly translated words, wrong choice of words and common confusing words. The results indicated that the intralingual errors were the most frequently found. The percentage was 79.91. Dual errors, interlingual errors and lack of transfer were 9.01, 8.15, and 2.93 percent respectively. The frequency of lexical errors was wrong choice of words (64.72 percent), wrongly translated words (20.59 percent), and common confusing words (14.71 percent).

Noojan (1999) analyzed errors found in English thesis abstracts of 12 Thai literature and 24 educational measurements theses at Srinakharinvirot University. The errors were analyzed at two levels: sentential and word. The results revealed that there

were 11 major types of errors found in the Thai literature abstracts. Six errors at the sentential level were the subject- verb agreement, participles, relative clauses, parallelism, punctuation and fragments or run-ons. Five errors at word level were the modifier, article, preposition, diction and misspelling. The same types of errors at the sentential level plus the passive voice were found in educational measurements abstracts. Errors at the word level found in educational measurements abstracts were also the same as those found in Thai literature ones.

The research studies above are all related to error analysis in translating from Thai into English. They gave useful information in the analysis of errors especially in classifying types of errors made by ESL learners.

In short, this chapter consists of research on the abstract writing, t-unit analysis, variability of errors, classification of error and previous studies. The abstract writing is composed of types of abstracts, approaches to writing abstracts, linguistic features of abstract. T-unit analysis proposed by Hunt (1970) was used in analyzing the data. The variation theory (Bley-Veroman, 1983) was applied to describe the variants in error analysis. The classification of errors at the sentential level includes the subject-verb agreement, tense, parts of speech, participial phrase, relative clause, passive voice, parallel structure, punctuation and run-ons and fragments. Finally, the previous studies concern errors in writing and translating of ESL learners in other countries and Thailand.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the method to conduct the research is presented. There are two steps including accumulation and analysis of the data. The procedures to analyze the text into t-units and error classifications are presented.

Procedures

The following steps were taken to conduct the research.

1. Collecting data

The data in this study were collected from a translation class. Fourteen graduate students were assigned to translate a Thai research abstract into English. The Thai abstract was translated under the following conditions: three hours in translating, and the abstract was translated without the use of dictionaries.

2. Data Analysis

The procedures to analyze the data were as follows:

2.1. Each abstract was analyzed by using Hunt (1970) t-unit analysis.

a. A simple sentence was counted as one t-unit

Example 1: This study was presented in a form of descriptive analysis (1t-unit).

b. A compound sentence combined by coordinating conjunctions and correlative conjunctions was counted as two t-units.

Example 2: Some temples were added the phrases at the end of their names, but some were not (2 t-units).

c. A complex sentence combined by subordinating conjunctions was counted as one t-unit.

Example 3: The results showed that there were 24 temples in Bangkok Metropolis (1 t-unit).

2.2. Errors found in the abstracts were analyzed at the sentential level.

Types of errors at the sentential level were classified as follows:

1. Subject-verb agreement
2. Tenses
3. Parts of speech
4. Participial phrase
5. Relative clause
6. Passive voice
7. Parallel structure
8. Punctuation
9. Run-on and fragment

2.3 Each type of error at the sentential level in the data was calculated in percentage.

$$\text{Percentage of each type of errors} = \frac{\text{Total number of errors}}{\text{Total t-units of each sentence structure used}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Percentage of each type of errors} = \frac{\text{Total number of errors}}{\text{Total number of occurrences of that particular / type of structure}} \times 100$$

2.4. The percentage of errors of each type is individually shown in tabular form.

2.5. The sources of the errors were discussed.

In this chapter, the method to analyze an English abstract translated by Thai graduate students has been discussed. First, the abstract was segmented by using t-unit analysis (Hunt, 1970). Then the errors were classified into types. Finally, each type of error at the sentential level in the data was calculated in percentage and explanations to account for the errors are offered.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In chapter 4, the findings of the study are presented. The error types and samples of each type are presented in tabular form. There are 10 tables reporting all findings of the study. Table1 shows types of errors: subject-verb agreement, tense, parts of speech, participial phrase, relative clause, passive voice, parallel structure, punctuation, run-ons and fragments, and frequency of occurrence. Examples of each type of errors are discussed. Also, plausible explanations to account for sources of the errors are presented.

Table 1: Types and Frequency of Errors at the Sentential Level

Type of Error	Frequency of Occurrence	Frequency of Errors
1. Punctuation	204 (100%)	43 (21.08%)
2. Run-ons and Fragments	204 (100%)	39 (19.12%)
3. Participial Phrase		
3.1 Present Participle	12 (100%)	2 (16.67%)
3.2 Past Participle	25 (100%)	3 (12%)
4. Passive Voice	104 (100%)	17 (16.35%)
5. Relative Clause	27 (100%)	4 (14.81%)
6. Tenses	204 (100%)	25 (12.25%)
7. Parallel Structure	83 (100%)	8 (9.64%)
8. Parts of Speech	204 (100%)	16 (7.84%)
9. Subject-verb Agreement	204 (100%)	11 (5.39%)

Table1 shows the types and frequency of errors at the sentential level. Firstly, punctuation marks were used in 204 t-units, but 43 punctuation marks were errors. That is the students made 21.08% of errors of all the punctuation used. Secondly, of all the 204 t-units in the data, 39 t-units or 19.12% were errors with run-ons and fragments. Thirdly, in terms of participial phrases, of all 37 participial constructions found, 12 were considered present participle, while 25 were past participle. In the present participial

constructions, 2 out of 12 or 16.67% were erroneous. In the past participial constructions, 3 out of 25 or 12% were erroneous. Fourth, regarding the passive voice, of all 104 passive constructions, 17 (16.35%) were errors. Fifth, with regard to the relative clause, of all 27 relative structures found, only 4 (14.81%) were found erroneous. Sixth, in terms of tenses, of all 204 t-units, 25 (12.25%) were found with errors. Seventh, regarding the parallel structure, of all the 83 t-units, only 8 (9.64%) was found with errors. Eighth, in parts of speech, of all the 204 t-units, 16 (7.84%) were errors. Finally, with regard to the subject-verb agreement, of all the 204 t-units analyzed, only 11 (5.39%) were considered errors.

In short, there were nine types of errors namely subject-verb agreement, tenses, parts of speech, participial phrase, relative clause, passive voice, parallel structure, punctuation, and run-ons and fragments. They can be divided into two groups. The structure of the first group: subject-verb agreement, tense, participial phrase, parallel structure, and run-ons and fragments, does not exist in Thai. The second group: punctuation, passive voice, relative clause, and parts of speech, exists in Thai but it is complicated for Thai learners. Therefore, they always make these types of errors when they translate Thai into English.

There are two major explanations to account for the sources of errors: the differences between the Thai and English languages and the difficulty of the English syntax.

Punctuation

In punctuation, the result reveals that the learners made a lot of errors in punctuation marks. Forty-three errors or 21.08% were found. It may be concluded that in

Thai, punctuation is not realized as a grammatical rule, so the learners may be careless in using punctuations. For example:

*They were arranged in the chronological

There was no period at the end of the sentence.

Run-ons and Fragments

In run-ons and fragments, thirty-nine errors or 19.12% were found. From the examples, it may be assumed that learners misunderstood English and Thai sentential concepts. In Thai, a sentence without a subject or beginning with a conjunction can be considered a sentence, but it is not acceptable in English. Moreover, the learners may have translated the abstract from Thai into English word by word. By this way, run-ons and fragment can easily occur. For example:

*Having or not having extra words in a temple's name.

Participial Phrase

Errors in the present participle were found with 2 errors or 16.67%, while errors in past participle were found with 3 errors or 12%. It was found that the participial phrase was rarely used in the learners' English abstracts. Probably the learners are not aware of how to use the participial construction. For example:

*The name of each temple was changed depend on the legend, environment or situation at that time.

*In term of meanings of name, it was found that the meanings of 24 temples' names use in the present showed 3 aspects

Passive Voice

In the passive voice, the data show that the passive voice was used quite frequently but only 17 errors (16.35%) were found. The learners made errors because they forgot to change the verb to the participial form. For example:

*1. The main parts were order from high to low important as following

*2. This research was aim to study the history, origin, and meaning of the names of the temples at

Relative Clauses

In relative clauses, from Example 1, it seems that learners did not realize that the relative pronoun *which* must have a preposition in front of it if it modifies a place. From Example 2, learners used it after the relative pronoun '*which*'. It may be assumed that the English structure may be complicated for Thai learners. For example:

*1. This research was aimed to study the historical background and meanings of temples' name in Pranakorn district, Bangkok Metropolis which the researcher employed a qualitative research

*2. In some cases, there would not have such words which it would show the different meanings.

Tenses

In tenses, twenty-five errors or 12.25% were found. From the examples; it can be assumed that the learners did not realize what tense was used in the abstract writing. According to Swales (1990), the linguistic feature of an abstract is usually written in the past tense. For example:

*1. Furthermore, the research shows that there are 3 phrases attached at the end of some temples' names.

*2. The research explores that the definition of 24 temples' names have 3 meanings.

Parallel Structure

In parallel structure, this type of error was found with 8 errors or 9.64%. Probably the learners were not aware of the importance of parallel structure in English writing. The errors may result from the differences between the source and the target languages. In Thai there is no grammatical rule about parallel structure. Therefore, learners may not be aware of it. For examples:

*1. Some temples' names did not reflect both the level and land of temples, but it reflects the different meaning.

*2. In addition to the temples' names, it was found that the names of twenty- four temples are indicated three aspects

Parts of Speech

In parts of speech, 16 errors or 7.84% were found. Errors in parts of speech mostly occurred in the use of adjectives. It is plausible that adjective used in English is different from that in Thai. The adjective must be in the adjective form to modify the noun in English. For examples:

*1. This study aimed to investigate the history background of the temples' names in

*2. Quality research approach was used in the study.

Subject-Verb Agreement

In subject-verb agreement, 11 errors or 5.39% were found. It revealed that the learners hardly made this type of errors but still some occurred. For example:

*1. Research findings shows that there are totally 24 temples in Pranakorn district, Bangkok metropolis.

*2. The results showed that there was 24 temples in district, Bangkok metropolis.

In conclusion, nine major types of errors were found: punctuation (21.08%), run-ons and fragments (19.12%), participial phrase which included the present participle (16.67%) and the past participle (12%), passive voice (16.35%), relative clause (14.81%), tenses (12.25%), parallel structure (9.64%), parts of speech (7.84%), and subject-verb agreement (5.39%) respectively. The most frequent type of errors that students made was punctuation marks while the least frequent type was parts of speech. The errors made may arise from these two reasons. First, Thai learners seemed to be influenced by Thai. Second, the English sentential structure is more complicated than that in Thai.

Therefore, it can be assumed that Thai mother tongue and the complication of English structure interfered with translating Thai abstract into English.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the data which were analyzed are discussed. Then discussion, applications and limitation of the study are presented. Finally, suggestions for further studies are included.

Conclusion

This study aimed to analyze errors found in an English abstract translated by 14 Thai university graduate students. First, the errors were classified into types. Then they were calculated in percentage and calculated for frequency. It was found that the types of errors found were as follows: punctuation (21.08%), run-ons and fragment (19.12%), participial phrase which included the present participle (16.67%) and the past participle (12%), passive voice (16.35%), relative clause (14.81%), tenses (12.25%), parallel structure (9.64%), parts of speech (7.84%), and subject-verb agreement (5.39%).

The most frequent type of errors that students made was punctuation while the least frequent type was parts of speech. Errors may arise from these two reasons. First, Thai learners seemed to be influenced by their mother tongue. Second, the English sentential structure is more complicated than that in Thai. Thus, it can be assumed that the Thai mother tongue and the complication of English structures interfered with translating of the Thai abstract into English.

Discussion

The results of the study revealed that the difficulties of Thai translators in translating Thai into English were the English grammatical rules that differ from those of Thai language. It can be assumed that most errors are the results of the differences in terms of sentence structures and grammatical rules between the two languages.

The results of this study support the previous studies conducted by Noojan (1999) that the difficulties of ESL and EFL learners in translating from the source language into the target language are the differences between the source and target languages.

In the study by Noojan (1999), the errors found in Thai literature and educational measurement research abstracts were far greater than the number of errors found in this study. For example, the errors in subject- verb agreement were found 60.90% in Thai literature research abstracts but only 5.39% in this research. The errors in the relative clause were found 36.10% in educational measurement research abstracts but 14.81% in this study. There are two reasons to account for the differences in the results.

First, the participants in the study of Noojan (1999) were from Thai literature and educational measurement majors. They did not study as many English lessons as the graduate students in this study did. Second, the English major learners did a lot of translating tasks in their routine study. They sometimes did it correctly, but other times they did not. Eventually, their errors gradually decreased. It means that they were about to reach the target language norms. On the other hand, the Thai literature and educational measurement learners studied English one or two courses as basic subjects. They did not have many chances to translate Thai texts into English, so they did a lot of errors.

In short, the results of this study show nine major types of errors found in English abstracts and give plausible explanation to account for those errors that Thai and English languages are different and the English syntax is difficult for Thai learners. In addition, the results support previous studies by Noojan (1999).

Application

1. The findings of the study can be guidelines for Thai English teachers to apply in English writing or translation class. For example, punctuation is the most frequent type of errors made in this study, so the teachers should assign students exercises related to English sentential concept and sentence boundary.
2. Thai English teachers should distinguish the different structures and grammar between Thai and English languages so that students can understand these differences and know how to produce sentences in English correctly.

Limitations of the study

The study had the following limitations:

1. The data of the study were only of a small group, so the results may not be generalized.
2. The rhetorical pattern of the abstract was not investigated in this study.

Suggestions for further studies

1. In this research, only 14 pieces of translated works of one abstract translated by Srinakharinwirot graduate students were analyzed. There should be a study analyzing English abstracts translated by Thai graduate students from other universities in Thailand.

2. In this research, the plausible explanations for the errors were based on the typological differences between Thai and English languages. There should be a study analyzing other features of the two languages such as the rhetorical pattern.

3. There should be a study investigating effective strategies in teaching and learning translation from Thai into English.

The researcher believes that error analysis in translating abstracts of graduate students will help improve Thai students' translating abilities. As Corder (1981) says errors are evidence of learning strategies. When learners produce fewer errors in the target language, they will be able to translate better sentences and better translated texts.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

English

- Abdulsata, Puwaret (2000). *An errors analysis of Srinakharinwirot University second-year English major students' compositions*. Thesis, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Srinakharinwirot University, Photocopied.
- Basil, Hatim and I. Mason. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. London : Longman.
- Bhatia, Vijay K. (1993). *Analysing genre*. New York: Longman.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1983). The comparative fallacy in interlanguage studies: The case of systematicity. *Language Learning*, 33, 1-17.
- Brown, H. (1987). *Principle of language learning and teaching*. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ. : Prentice- Hall.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 5: 161-9.
- Chaika, Elaine. (1982). *Language: The social mirror*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Corder, S. Pit. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duskova, L. (1969). On source of errors in foreign languages. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 7, 11-36.
- Gaies, Stephen J. (1980) T-unit analysis in second language research: Applications, problems and limitations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 53–60.
- Hunt, Kellogg W. (1970). *Syntactic maturity in schoolchildren and adults*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 35, 1.

- Kanteesan, Jiranan (2004). *Syntax and cohesion development: An analysis of Thai students' journal entries*. Master's Project, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Srinakharinwirot University, Photocopied.
- Noojan, Kannika (1999). *An errors analysis in English abstracts of Srinakharinwirot University graduate students*. Thesis, M.A. (English). Bangkok: Srinakharinwirot University, Photocopied.
- Songjiarapanit, Krangjit. (1985). *An error analysis of technical report translation*. Thesis, M.Ed. (English). Bangkok: Srinakharinwirot University. Photocopied.
- Swales, John M. (1993). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, John M. and Christine B. Feak. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor, MI. : Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Thep-Ackrapong, Tipa. (1990). *Fossilization: A case study of practical and theoretical parameters*. Doctorial Dissertation, DA. (English). Illinois: Illinois State University. Photocopied.

Thai

ทิพา เทพอักษรพงศ์. “การแปลเบื้องต้น.” พิมพ์ครั้งที่3. กรุงเทพฯ: จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย. 2544.

APPENDIX

THE SAMPLE DATA

An analysis of the temples' names in Pranakorn District, Bangkok Metropolis was aimed to study the history and meaning of the temples' names in Pranakorn District, Bangkok Metropolis. The qualitative research method was used in this research. The data was documentary and field data, which was collected from 47 local resource persons, by the researcher. The study was presented as descriptive analysis.

The results showed that there were 24 temples in Pranakorn District, Bangkok Metropolis. They were categorized as 22 Theravada (Thai temple), one Mahayana (Chinese temple), and one Sikh temple. Each temple had a long historical background. Their names were changed by their environment or important events in each era. Therefore, there were 54 legends in the history which were related to their names, from the most to the least important as follow; 1) person, family names, and titles, 2) religious places and holy things, 3) local plants, 4) events, legends, and folk tales, 5) geographical areas, 6) local buildings and places, 7) careers, and tool, and 8) locations.

The research found that the current meanings of 24 temples' names represented three characterizations, from the most to the least important as follow; 1) names, family names and titles of the persons, 2) religious places and holy things, and 3) events, legends and folk tales. It also found that the title of the temples, for some cases, there were attached phrases at the end of their names; Warawihanra Rajawarawihanra, and Rajawarawihanra which defined their classes and categories. The attachment of these phrases reflected the meaning of their names.

This research was aimed to study the history, origin, and meaning of the names of Pranakorn District in Metropolitan Bangkok. The raw data gathered from 47 local resource persons were analyzed qualitatively. The results were presented in a descriptive manner.

The results showed that there were 24 temples at Pranakorn District in Metropolitan Bangkok which were subsequently classified into three namely: Thai Buddhism Theravada (Thai temples); Thai Buddhism Mahayan (Chinese temples); and Sikh temple, with 22, 1, and 1 temple (s), respectively. Each temple had an ancient history. Changes to names were done depending on various environmental conditions or to keep it updated with new trends. This led to the creation of 54 different versions of history of meaning the temples. In this research, 8 main points were considered in naming temples arranged in the order of importance: 1) person, surname, and social rank; 2) place of worship and sacred things; 3) kind of a local tree; 4) historical record and folk tales; 5) geographic location; 6) constructions and the local area; 7) occupations and tools; 8) location of the temple.

Of the 24 temples studies, the temples' names were identified and presented in the order of frequency: 1) person's name, surname and title; 2) a place of worship and sacred things; and 3) historical record and folk tales. Moreover, it was found that had ways of identifying its rank and kind such as Voraviharn, Rajavaraviharn, Rajavoramahaviharn, while other did not have. Thus, the presence or absence of rank and kind differentiated the interpretation of the meaning of names of each temple

The purpose of this study was to investigate the historical background and meaning of the temples' names located in Pranakorn District, Bangkok Metropolis by using a qualitative research method. The data used in this study were documental and field data collected by the researcher. The forty-seven local resource persons were used and presented the finding in the method of descriptive analysis.

The research results showed that there were total twenty- four temples in Pranakorn District, Bangkok Metropolis. They were divided into twenty-two Buddhist temples in Theravada sect (Thai temple), one temple in Mahayana sect (Chinese temple), and one Sikh temple. Each temple had a long legend including the chance of temples' names influenced by the environment or situation of that period. There fifty- four legends of temple's name that caused eight points of giving name. They were arranged in the chronological order of significance: 1) person, family name and rank 2) temple and holy spirits 3) local trees 4) event, legend and folk tale 5) geography 6) local buildings and places 7) occupations and instruments 8) location.

In term of the meaning, twenty- four temples' names shows three characteristics of meaning that are arranged according to frequency of finding: 1) showing the meaning of person, family name and rank 2) showing the meaning of temple and sacred things 3) showing the meaning of events, legends and folk tale. Besides, it is found that some temples have phrases to attach the end of the name such as Worawihan, Ratchaworawihan, and Ratchaworamahawihan: However, some temples do not have. The attachment affects different meaning.

BIODATA

BIODATA

Name: Ms.Ladawan Hengwichitkul

Date of Birth: January 25, 1978

Place of Birth: Burirum

Address: 512/36 Paholyothin58 Paholyothin Road, Saimai Bangkok
10210

Education Background:

2006 Master of Arts (English) from Srinakharinwirot University

1998 Bachelor of Arts (English) from Ramkhamhaeng
University

1995 Certificate of Science (Math- Science) from Wangnumyen
Wittayakhom School