Possible Reasons for Lexical Errors in English to Korean Translation: A Look at Student Assignments at the Postgraduate Level*

Vivian Lee

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea

Vivianlee2046@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

As part of the postgraduate course in translating and interpreting, students at Macquarie University in Australia carried out an analysis of errors found in translations by first semester students of the Translating Practice unit, from source language English into target language Korean. This article looks at the results of a part of the group analysis of empirical data which examined types of errors found in student translations to find possible reasons for such errors. The analysis found that a lack of competence in L2 (Language 2), a lack of equivalent lexical competence and simply a lack of care or negligence were all likely reasons for translation errors. An interesting point to note is that an error possibly caused by a lack of lexical competence in L1 (Language 1) was also found. This paper looks at the requirements needed to become a good translator, sheds light on lexical competence problems of training translators for the English and Korean language pair, while highlighting gaps between the two languages which potentially cause problems for translators, and emphasizing the need for translators to be aware of such gaps and possibly narrow, if not mend, them.

1. Introduction

Translating and Interpreting courses are becoming increasingly popular in South Korea, and a growing number of students are registering for postgraduate courses to train to become professional translators and interpreters. The author of this paper was a student in a class of 14 in the spring semester of 2009, and the numbers of full-time first semester students for the same course at the same university went up to 26 for the spring semester of 2011 and 30 for 2012. The postgraduate course in translating and interpreting at Macquarie University in Australia is offered in various language pairs, including the Korean and English pair. Translating Practice classes are offered in both language directions (Korean into English and English into Korean) from the first semester. It can be said that becoming an able translator requires a solid foundation of fundamentals, including but not limited to working competency in both languages of the language pair or pairs. While translators need to have lexical competence in their working languages, it is highly possible that translators-in-training are lacking in such a competence in either Language 1 or 2, or even possibly both.

In addition, for both student and professional translators, a common problem is the matter of equivalence in translation, both grammatically and lexically. With two such differing languages, achieving equivalence is an area which remains hugely discussed, and it can be said that there are some words which remain 'untranslateable' in both languages. In particular, the Korean

language is a complex language which is said to be ranked at the same level as Arabic in terms of difficulty, according to some Korean language linguists. The Korean language includes words which are from pure Korean (hangul), those which are derived from Chinese characters and those which are loan words from other languages. For translators working with these two languages, it may be difficult at times to know which word to select as an equivalence, which could then possibly lead to errors occurring during the process of translation.

This paper aims to discuss the possible reasons for lexical errors made by students working with L1, or Language 1 (Korean) and L2, or Language 2 (English). Possible reasons for lexical errors found in first semester student translation assignments will be looked at and discussed while contemplating related theories and taking into account the requirements needed to become a good translator, and how these are linked to lexical competence. The paper hopes to highlight the importance of lexical competence for translation studies students, and how this is affected by, or related to, other factors which are perceived to be prerequisites to becoming a good translator. Consequently, the paper also aims to shed light on how such errors and their analysis could aid the development of students studying translation.

2. The Required 'Competencies' of the Translator

It can be said that English and Korean are two vastly different languages, with different sentence structures, forms and overall grammatical formulations. There is also a great difference in levels of directness and indirectness, as the Korean language has different

forms, such as humble, honorific or formal and informal forms. While fidelity is an issue often discussed in relation to translating and interpreting, and it can be said that it is universally agreed that a 'good' translation is one which is 'faithful', a dilemma for many translators and interpreters is what to include and what to leave out in a message to enable clear and effective delivery. As Gile (2009) points out, "the most difficult problems with respect to fidelity and the resolution of ambiguity arise when target-language rules require information not provided by the source-language Text" (Gile 2009: 69). While it is pointed out that the problem occurs for some language pairs than others, an interesting fact to note is that the problems associated with LCII (Gile 2009) are more frequent for translations between Japanese and Western languages (Gile, 2009: 69). Although the example of Japanese and Western languages has been given, this could also be applicable to Korean and Western languages, as the Korean and Japanese languages share some similarities in their forms and structure.

While Jakobson (2004) gives descriptions of three types of translation: intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic, the type of interest for this paper is interlingual translation, also referred to as "translation proper" by Jakobson (2004), as this is the type of translation which occurs when verbal signs are interpreted between languages. As pointed out by Jakobson (2004), "there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units" (Jakobson 2004: 139) for interlingual translation, and this reinforces the dilemma facing translators working with two or more languages.

Nida (1964) examines various 'scientific approaches to meaning' and focuses centrally on the idea that rather than have an orthographic fixed meaning, words acquire meaning in relation to context and can produce varying responses according to culture. The

meaning of words is categorized into linguistic meaning, referential meaning, and emotive meaning. Linguistic meaning is borrowed from Chomsky's model; referential meaning refers to the denotative dictionary meaning, and the emotive meaning, the connotative meaning. An interesting point to note is that Nida (1964) gives the example of plotting relationship terms such as grandmother, mother, cousin and so forth, in accordance with the values of sex, i.e. male or female, generation, i.e. the same, one part, two or more apart, and lineality i.e. direct ancestor or descendant or not. While substantial time has passed since Nida's theories were introduced, it can be said that the example of relationship terms is applicable to the Korean and English language pair, as translation of these terms between the two languages would involve searching for equivalents between the SL and TL, and this would require considerations of factors such as sex and age. Moreover, it can be said that the above mentioned ideas are useful for translators working with two languages which have different structure and form, not to mention address and kinship terms, such as English and Korean. The ideas can be tied in with Cheong's (2001), who gives examples of how some words are 'untranslatable' due to lack of categorization, such as the English word 'home', and how it can pose problems for translators when converting into Korean. Cheong (2001) points out that 'home' has different scales and can be used to refer to more than one location or a location imbued with emotional attachment of the people living there, causing a lexical gap between English and Korean.

While contemplating the above matter of dealing with languages which differ greatly in structure, form, address and kinship terms, a question which naturally arises is equivalence in translation. Over the generations, various theories relating to equivalence have been introduced. For both professional translators and those who are

training to become translators, it is important to understand and be able to apply theories in relation to equivalence to translating practice. Nida (1964) discarded older terms of translation such as 'literal', 'free' and 'faithful' translation, and instead used 'two basic orientations' or 'types of equivalence' (Nida 1964: 159), which are formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence "focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content⋯ One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language" (Nida 1964: 159). Therefore, it can be said that the message of the source text is strongly emphasized in formal equivalence, as the focus is on form and content, and translation into the target text should be as close to the source text as possible. Dynamic equivalence, on the other hand, is achieved when "the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message" (Nida 1964: 159). This equivalence focuses on the naturalness of the target text, and defines the goals of dynamic equivalence as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message" (Nida 1964: 166). Such an approach considers the adaptation of grammar lexicon and cultural references to be essential in order to achieve naturalness, and the target text language should not show interference from the source language: the 'foreignness' of the ST setting is minimized (Nida 1964: 167-8). A common difficulty faced by students of translation studies is the achieving of 'naturalness' in a target text. While this problem occurs more often in the L1-L2 direction, it does also occur in the L2-L1 direction and this can be seen in translated texts where the source text has a strong influence on the target text.

However, for both student translators and those training them, it

is important to be aware of the differences between theories and to know which can be applied to one's working languages. For example, Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) comparative analysis of English and French looks at different translation procedures, and among those outlined their definition of the process of borrowing can also be applied to English and Korean, as it is common to see SL words transferred directly to the TL. However, the authors deem literal translation, or "word-for-word translation" (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 33-5), to be the most appropriate process for good translation. While borrowing, as mentioned above, can be applied to the English and Korean language pair, literal translation may not be as applicable, as word-for-word translation has been found to be problematic with vastly differing language pairs.

In addition to such an awareness and ability to apply relevant theory to translation practice, translators need to be equipped with a "communicative and textual competence in at least two languages and cultures" (Kelly 2005, in Kelly 2008: 72), and therefore it can be said that this is naturally a goal for both students of translation as well as their lecturers when training them. Kelly (2005) also points out that the 'area' which translations should be able to cover should cover "both active and passive skills in the two languages involved, together with awareness of textuality and discourse, and textual and discourse conventions in the cultures involved" (Kelly 2005, in Kelly 2008: 72). Therefore, while lexical competence can be considered a basic yet fundamental aspect of translation, it is interlinked with other needed factors as aspects, and it can be said that one stems from the other. Not only do translators need competence in all the areas discussed above, but there are also specific issues within those areas which need to be considered. Another issue included in the concept of translator competence is cultural and intercultural

competence. Kelly (2005) defines 'culture' here as something which includes "encyclopaedic knowledge of history, geography, institutions and so on of the culture involved (including the translator's or student's own)" in addition to "values, myths, perceptions, beliefs, behaviours and textual representations of these. Awareness of issues of intercultural communication and translation as a special form thereof is also included here" (Kelly 2005: 32-33, in Kelly 2008: 73).

Kelly further states that

> "It is similarly essential to remember that for the translator, cultural competence must refer to all the cultures she or he works with professionally, including his or her own. Paradoxically, knowledge of one's own culture(s) is often extremely passive; explicit awareness of it often arises as competence in, and understanding of, other cultures develops, allowing distancing and comparison." (Kelly 2008: 76).

Factors such as cultural and intercultural competence may appear to be separate from lexical competence, but lexical knowledge of a given language entails knowledge of the culture of the given language, and therefore can be looked at from the point of view that lexical competence leads to cultural awareness and knowledge, and vice versa. Therefore, while students should have competence at a lexical level, this is by no means the extent to the requirements of a training translator, but rather one of the basic and fundamental components needed for the making of a good translator - competence in various areas is needed, but lexical competence can be seen as one of the most basic and primary 'competences' required of students of translations. There is no argument that the lexical competence of translators is very important in order to produce good translation results. Lexical competence is defined as:

"the ability to recognize and use words in a language in the way that speakers of the language use them. Lexical competence includes understanding the different relationships among families of words and the common collocations of words." (*Definition of lexical competence* 2005).

While it is not likely that student translators will all begin a course in translation studies equipped with such an ability, it is indeed important for them to be aware of this need and work continuously towards such competence from an early stage.

While Ronowicz et al (2005) acknowledge the fact that "unless a source language text has been well understood, a good translation cannot be produced" (Ronowicz et al 2005: 581), Gile (1995) mentions the point that "In order to account more fully for comprehension, the basic comprehension requires another element besides knowledge of language and extralinguistic knowledge, namely deliberate analysis" (Gile 1995: 80). Therefore, simply having knowledge of the working languages is insufficient for a translator, and it cannot be assumed as a given that one has extensive knowledge and comprehension of one's first language. Bell (1991) discusses the Frequent Lexis Store (FLS) according to which the initial stages of processing the source language text include visual word recognition, followed by processing in what Bell (1991) calls the "syntactic analyser". This syntactic analyser contains a Frequent Structures Store (FSS) and Parser, as well as a Frequent Lexis Store (FLS) and a Lexical Search Mechanism and the Frequent Lexis Store is defined by Bell as "···a mental (psycholinguistic) correlate to the physical glossary or terminology database, i.e., an instant look-up facility for lexical items both words and idioms." (Bell 1991: 47).

It is often the case that with translators one of the working

languages is usually a second language, and therefore while a thorough grasp of the first language is crucial, it is equally important that the translator has a deep and sound comprehension and competence in the second language. Robinson (1989) points out that knowing a word involves knowing that it has a particular meaning, as well as knowing how it can be, and is, used. While Robinson's ideas are based primarily on ESL learners, the idea can be applied to the analysis of errors made by translators, as it can be seen that at times lexical errors occur when words of a similar meaning are used but do not contain the exact same equivalence.

Therefore, to summarize there are many sources of existing literature which highlight the fact that translators need an all-round combination of lexical and cultural knowledge, awareness and competence, and a good translation should be one which contains equivalence and fidelity. However, this could be seen as being more idealistic than realistic, as it is seldom that two translation tasks are exactly the same, and each new translation task usually brings with it exposure to, and requirements of, new lexical and cultural knowledge. In addition, as pointed out by Gile (2009), in many cases knowledge is acquired on an ad hoc basis, and for each new task a translator soon realizes that their pre-existing knowledge is insufficient to cover the task in question (Gile 2009: 129). It can be said though, that as both student translators and those training them, we can, and should, continuously strive towards achieving as close to this combination of required competencies as our capacity allows.

3. Lexical Errors

While the ideas presented in the previous section look at the combined competences required of the translator, they all relate in some way to the question this paper is dealing with; that is, while lexical competence can be said to be one of the most fundamental requirements of a translator, this competence is affected by, and interlinked with, the other competencies mentioned above. Taking this into consideration, this paper will define errors to be those which lack lexical equivalence in SL and TL. While the author believes that ultimately a 'good' translation should adhere to Nida's dynamic equivalence theory (1964), for this paper the equivalence at lexical level will be looked at and discussed.

It is useful to consider Gile's (1995) assertion that "depending on the individual's changing experiences with a variety of domains tackled in translation assignments over longer periods of time, the contents of FSS and FLS⋯are variable over time." (in Ronowicz et al 2005: 582), as it can be said that the lexis store of translators varies depending on individual, and the difference could be attributed to the translator's experience, as the more experience a translator has, the wider the range of domains they will likely have covered. If we combine this idea with Robinson's (1989), which discusses the idea of a 'word store' and its 'storekeeper': the lexicon is "a word store of listed items" (Robinson 1989: 246) and if this 'store' is to be used, supplemented, updated and drawn on, then a 'storekeeper' is needed, then we can remember the fact that both translation students and professional translators are likely to have a different lexis store, and that this changes over time. However, at the student level, it is important for translators-in-training to be aware of the occurring lexical errors and to be able to recognize and correct them.

4. Methodology

The error analysis study was undertaken as part of the research methods module of the postgraduate course in Translating and Interpreting at masters degree level at Macquarie University, Australia. The error analysis was carried out by eight research methods students on a total of 36 translations of eight different source texts which were translated from English into Korean by first semester students of the course for the translating practice (English into Korean) unit. The research methods students were in their final semester of the Masters course. The texts were provided to students as photocopied hard copies, with the markings and comments written by the lecturer in charge.

Errors were recorded onto an Excel document by each student, and the errors were divided into Lexical and Syntax groupings, with sub-categories for each grouping. For the Lexical grouping, these were: Wrong Word, Loan Word, Wrong Terminology and Collocation. For the Syntax grouping these were: Part of Speech, Ending, Voice, Word Order, Agreement and Incomplete Sentence. There were also two additional subcategories, addition and omission. Students analyzed the texts provided to them and recorded errors found on the Excel document. Once this was completed, each student submitted their Excel file to the lecturer in charge, who in turn sent the students all the collected Excel documents. Students then decided which area they were interested in exploring based on the results of the data and gave individual presentations outlining this.

As an extension of the above analysis activity, the author of this paper then used the data from the analysis of the text which she analyzed, and the error examples were then divided into separate tables according to possible reasons for error. These will be discussed

in the following sections while drawing upon existing literature from the earlier part of the paper.

5. Results

A total of 535 errors were found during the error analysis activity and these errors were sorted according to error type, along with the number of each given error and its percentage. The results showed that 69.52% of the errors were those of a lexical nature, while 29.98% were syntax ones. The number of lexical errors totaled 372, and for syntax errors the number was 155. Overall, the lexical error type with the most frequency was wrong word, with a total of 274 (51.21%), followed by wrong terminology with 54 errors (10.09%), collocation with 26 (4.86%) and lastly loan word with 18 (3.36%).

While the above results are from the overall group analysis, the author of this paper will focus on the part which were analyzed by herself, and the results will be discussed in the following section. The translations of the Korean text are by the author of this paper, and romanization of Korean words follow the romanization guidelines of The National Institute of the Korean Language, and have been underlined. The parts of the sentences reflecting the errors have been presented in bold for clarity.

Table 1. Lexical error examples

Source Text	Translated as (wrong word error) with Korean into English translation
1. After Gates **outlined** creative capitalism in a speech at Davos, Switzerland, in January,	빌게이츠가 지난 1월 스위스 다보스포럼 기조연설에서 '창조적 자본주의'를 **주장한** 이후, After Bill Gates **asserted** 'creative capitalism' at a keynote speech at the Davos Forum in Switzerland,

2. It has **worked like a dream**, and the book will be out by the end of the year.	놀랍게도 이 **계획은 일사천리로** 진행되어 당초 계획했던 책이 올해 안에 출판될 예정이다. Surprisingly, this plan progressed **with great speed** and the planned book will be out by the end of the year.
3. It has worked like a dream, and the book will be out **by the end of the year.**	작업이 쉽게 풀려 **올해 말쯤에는** 책이 출판될 예정이다. The work went smoothly and the book will be published around **the end of the year.**
4. I started a website on the topic with the Tom Sawyer-ish intention of inviting distinguished economists, journalists and ordinary people to discuss their reaction to Gates' notion and then turning it all into a book.	나는 창조적 자본주의라는 개념에 대해 톰소여가 그러했듯이 다른 사람들, 가령 유명한 경제학자와 저널리스트를 비롯하여 대중들의 도움을 받아, 책으로 편찬하고자 블로그를 만들었다. I started a blog to turn it into a book (as Tom Sawyer did) and got help from other people, for example the public including well-known economists and journalists.
5. The remarkable thing is the variety of objections to what seems like **an idea that's hard to dispute**	희한하게도 **흠잡을 데가 하나도 없을 것 같았던** 창조적 자본주의에 대해 악플이 봇물을 이루어졌다. Strangely, there were floods of malicious comments about creative capitalism, which seems like **something impossible to find faults with.**
6. The remarkable thing is the **variety of objections** to what seems like an idea that's hard to dispute	희한하게도 흠잡을 데가 하나도 없을 것 같았던 창조적 자본주의에 대해 **악플이** 봇물을 이루어졌다. Strangely, there were floods of **malicious comments** about creative capitalism, which seems like something impossible to find faults with.
7. There are some, of course, who find anything Gates does or says **nefarious.**	물론 어떤 사람들은 빌 게이츠의 말과 행동이 모두 **철저한 계산에서 나왔다고** 생각한다. Of course, some people think everything Bill Gates **say or does comes from thorough calculation.**
8. the **bottom line**	극빈층 The **extremely poor**
9. and the book will **be out** by the end of the year.	내가 쓴 책은 연말에 **출간된다.** The book I wrote is being **published** at the end of the year.
10. The remarkable thing is the **variety of objections to what seems like an idea** that's hard	놀랍게도 많은 사람들은 **게이츠를 반대하고 있다.** Surprisingly, many people were **against Bill Gates.**

to dispute	
11. Last year the Los Angeles Times reported indignantly that while the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation was busy saving lives from malaria, **Africans** continued to die of other causes.	작년 LA 타임즈는 빌 앤드 멜린다 게이츠 재단이 말라리아로 고통받는 이들은 돕고 있을때 **아프리카는** 다른 이유로 죽어가고 있다고 보도했다. Last year the LA Times reported that when the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation was helping those suffering from the pain of malaria, **Africa** was dying of other reasons.
12. Beyond **slogans**	빌 게이츠 회장의 **주장** 외에도 aside from chairman Bill Gates' **assertions**
13. If it carries **a real cost** to stockholders, then Friedman has a point.	그러나 만약 창조적 자본주의가 주주들에게 진짜 **이익을** 가져다준다면, 프리드먼이 간파한 것이 맞다. However, if creative capitalism really brings **profit** to stockholders, then Friedman's summary is correct.
14. the **Bill & Melinda Gates** Foundation	빌과 멜린다 재단 the **Bill and Melinda** Foundation
15. creative **capitalism**	창조적 **민주주의** creative **democracy**
16. **conservatism**	**평범한** 보수주의 **Common/average** conservatism

The error examples have been grouped according to likely reasons for occurrence, and discussed in the following section.

6. Discussion

This section will look at the error sentences by group, and will discuss likely reasons for occurrence. In this section, the author has divided the reason of lack of lexical competence into three groupings. The first grouping is lack of lexical competence in L2 (Table B), which would be students' second language, English, for this particular error analysis study as the study was conducted on translations done from English into Korean. The second grouping is lack of lexical competence in L1 (Table C). For this error analysis, this would be the

students' first language, Korean. For the third grouping, the author of this paper has produced a table demonstrating examples of errors which could possibly have arisen out of an equivalent lexical competence in L1 and L2 of the translators (Table D). It is important to point out that while Tables B, C and D all show errors caused by possible lack of equivalences in L1 and L2, they have been divided and grouped accordingly to the side they seem more affected by (either L1 or L2), with Table D presenting an example of a possible lack of equivalent competence in both.

Table A shows errors which occurred not out of lack of competence in L1 or L2, but seemingly out of carelessness or negligence. This seems to be the most basic and primary reason for errors caused by student translators, and is not related to lexical competence.

Table A. Errors Possibly Caused by Lack of Care or Negligence

Source Text	Translated as (wrong word error) with Korean into English translation
1. Last year the Los Angeles Times reported indignantly that while the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation was busy saving lives from malaria, **Africans** continued to die of other causes.	작년 LA 타임즈는 빌 앤드 멜린다 게이츠 재단이 말라리아로 고통받는 이들은 돕고 있을 때 **아프리카는** 다른 이유로 죽어가고 있다고 보도했다. Last year the LA Times reported that when the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation was helping those suffering from the pain of malaria, **Africa** was dying of other reasons.
2. the **Bill & Melinda Gates** Foundation	빌과 멜린다 재단 the **Bill and Melinda** Foundation
3. creative **capitalism**	창조적 민주주의 creative **democracy**

For the error examples above, the error seems to have arisen from carelessness during the translation process. Therefore, if the student had taken more care over checking the accuracy of the translation, this error could most possibly have been avoided. For sentence number 3 in Table A, the ST and TT words are too different for the error to have been caused by a lack of lexical competence, and therefore it can be assumed that this error was caused by a lack of care either during the translation process or during the subsequent editing/proofreading.

While some examples caused by carelessness or negligence have been presented, most of the wrong word errors from Table 1 seem to have been caused by insufficient lexical knowledge.

Table B. Errors Possibly Caused by Lack of L2 Lexical Competence

Source Text	Translated as (wrong word error) with Korean into English translation
1. After Gates **outlined** creative capitalism in a speech at Davos, Switzerland, in January,	빌게이츠가 지난 1월 스위스 다보스포럼 기조 연설에서 '창조적 자본주의'를 **주장한** 이후, After Bill Gates **insisted** 'creative capitalism' at a keynote speech at the Davos Forum in Switzerland,
2. It has **worked like a dream**, and the book will be out by the end of the year.	놀랍게도 이 **계획은 일사천리로** 진행되어 당초 계획했던 책이 올해 안에 출판될 예정이다. Surprisingly, this plan progressed **with great speed** and the planned book will be out by the end of the year.
3. It has worked like a dream, and the book will be out **by the end of the year.**	작업이 쉽게 풀려 **올해 말쯤에는** 책이 출판될 예정이다. The work went smoothly and the book will be published around **the end of the year.**
4. I started a website on the topic with the Tom Sawyer-ish intention of inviting distinguished economists, journalists and	나는 창조적 자본주의라는 개념에 대해 톰소여가 그러했듯이 다른 사람들, 가령 유명한 경제학자와 저널리스트를 비롯하여 대중들의 도움을 받아, 책으로 편찬하고자 블로그를 만들

ordinary people to discuss their reaction to Gates' notion and then turning it all into a book.	었다. I started a blog to turn it into a book (as Tom Sawyer did) and got help from other people, for example the public including well-known economists and journalists.
5. The remarkable thing is the variety of objections to what seems like **an idea that's hard to dispute**	희한하게도 **흠잡을 데가 하나도 없을 것 같았던** 창조적 자본주의에 대해 악플이 봇물을 이루어졌다. Strangely, there were floods of malicious comments about creative capitalism, which seems like **something impossible to find faults with.**
6. The remarkable thing is the **variety of objections** to what seems like an idea that's hard to dispute	희한하게도 흠잡을 데가 하나도 없을 것 같았던 창조적 자본주의에 대해 **악플이** 봇물을 이루어졌다. Strangely, there were floods of **malicious comments** about creative capitalism, which seems like something impossible to find faults with.
7. There are some, of course, who find anything Gates does or says **nefarious.**	물론 어떤 사람들은 빌 게이츠의 말과 행동이 모두 **철저한 계산에서 나왔다고** 생각한다. Of course, some people think everything Bill Gates **say or does comes from thorough calculation.**
8. the **bottom line**	극빈층 The **extremely poor**
9. **conservatism**	**평범한** 보수주의 **Common/average conservatism**
10. Beyond **slogans**	빌 게이츠 회장의 **주장** 외에도 aside from chairman Bill Gates' **assertions**
11. If is carries **a real cost** to stockholders, then Friedman has a point.	그러나, 만약 창조적 자본주의가 주주들에게 **진짜 이익을** 가져다 준다면, 프리드먼이 간파한 것이 맞다. However, if creative capitalism really brings profit to stockholders, then Friedman's summary is correct.

It can be assumed that one of the main possible causes for errors in translation is a lack of lexical competence in L2, which would be English for this error analysis, as the translation sources used for this study consisted of translation assignments carried out by first semester students for English into Korean, L2 into L1.

Second language acquisition is closely interlinked with this area. Although some translators may have been brought up in a bilingual environment, such as in the case of Koreans born and/or raised overseas in English speaking countries, the majority of English and Korean translators in Korea are more often individuals born and raised locally with a good competence and/or background in L2. Therefore, it is only natural that the question of second language acquisition is included in this discussion.

Choi (2005) looks at semantic context effects in forward and backward word translation by Korean English learners. Choi (2005) mentions that words in languages may be connected in two different ways, and that English-Korean translation pairs, such as school and '학교' (hakgyo), may be connected directly when the words form an association in the process of learning L2. While Choi's (2005) study focuses on forward and backward translation, it is interesting to note that the study concludes with the point that translation performance is affected by L2 proficiency. This idea could be applicable to the wrong word examples shown in Table B. It can be said that the errors in the example sentences could have possibly been caused by a lack of proficiency in L2 on the translators' behalf. For example, with number 8, it appears that the student misunderstood the meaning of 'the bottom line' and misinterpreted it to mean 'the extremely poor'. With sentence number 4, the Korean translation reads awkwardly, and it is not clear exactly 'what' was done in the manner of Tom Sawyer. With sentence number 9, it

could be possible that the student had intended to differentiate conservatism with compassionate conservatism, which was contained in the source text. However, if that were the case other word choices would have been more appropriate than '평범한' (pyeongbeomhan), which is closer in meaning to 'common', 'plain' or 'average'. The other sentences show translation errors which are most likely to have arisen from either a) a lack of lexical competence in L2 or b) a lack of understanding of the general context. If we go back to Nida's (1964) theory of how words acquire meaning in relation to context, it can be said that a lack of understanding or awareness of context resulted in students' translation errors at a lexical level. Choi's (2005) point that translation performance is affected by L2 proficiency is also highly relevant here.

Table C. Errors Possibly Caused by Lack of L1 Lexical Competence

Source Text	Translated as (wrong word error) with Korean into English translation
1. and the book will **be out** by the end of the year.	내가 쓴 책은 연말에 **출간된다.** The book I wrote is being **published** at the end of the year.

It is often thought that native speakers are fully competent in their first language, and that their lexical competence is sufficient in this first language. However, simply being a native speaker of a language does not necessarily make an individual a good translator. There are some cases when individuals are not fully lexically competent in their first language. Translators tend to feel more at ease with their L1, and naturally have higher competency in L1 as opposed to L2. However, there are cases where translators could have a lack of lexical competence in L1, which could then lead to wrong word errors.

Table B shows an example of a wrong word error possibly caused by a lack of lexical competency in L1. While such errors may not be as frequent or common as those caused by a lack of lexical competency in L2, it appears that these errors do exist. In this example, the student translator was looking for the word 'publish' and used the word '출간' (<u>chulgan</u>) for the translation into L1. While '출간' (<u>chulgan</u>) can also be considered equivalent to the English word 'publish', it is more appropriate for the publishing of newspapers and magazines rather than books.

Presas (2000) points out that translators must achieve sufficient mastery of their working languages. While Presas' study focuses on bilinguals, it is worth noting that it was found in studies carried out with novice translators that transfer mechanisms are "extremely rudimentary: frequently consisting of automatic 1:1 associations, almost always restricted to the lexical level." (Presas 2000: 27). In the example of wrong word error demonstrated here, errors may arise from the lack of lexical competence in L1, and this could greatly hinder lexical competence in L2, as in most cases L1 is the language in which translators are more proficient.

Therefore, if Presas' idea is to be applied to this situation, it can be said that such a 1:1 association between the two languages first needs to be achieved perfectly at a lexical level before advancing onto more developed transfer mechanisms. It would be fair to say that the above example shows how a failure at 1:1 association between the two languages has resulted in a wrong word error.

Presas' (2000) idea can also be applied to Table D. The author of this paper has presented the error here to demonstrate a possible cause of wrong word error caused by a lack of equivalent lexical competence in both L1 and L2.

Table D. Errors Possibly Caused by Lack of Equivalent Lexical Competence in L1 and L2

Source Text	Translated as (wrong word error) with Korean into English translation
1. After Gates **outlined** creative capitalism in a speech at Davos, Switzerland, in January,	빌게이츠가 지난 1월 스위스 다보스포럼 기조연설에서 '창조적 자본주의'를 **주장한** 이후, After Bill Gates **insisted** 'creative capitalism' at a keynote speech at the Davos Forum in Switzerland,

In the example above, it can be said that a lack of equivalent lexical competence is the possible reason for wrong word errors. Potter at al (1984) discuss two different hypotheses: word association hypothesis and concept mediation hypothesis. The former is that "new words in the second language are associated with the words in the first language, and as long as the second language remains weaker than the first, then the association is used in understanding and speaking the second language." (Potter et al, 1984: 23). The latter is that second language words are "not directly associated with first-language words, but instead are associated with the nonlinguistic concept common to the two words." (Potter et al, 1984: 23). With the example in Table D, it is possible that a weaker L2 has resulted in such word association for the words in the source text.

As this paper has pointed out, becoming or being a translator requires a varied, and at times, complicated combination of both innate and acquired skills. Lorscher's (2005) study showed that non-professional translators (i.e. advanced language learners) produced translations which were neither equivalent in sense to source language texts nor grammatically or stylistically acceptable texts on their own. It is emphasized that the deficits were not caused by lack of competence as it was even the case for texts in the subjects' first language. While the study focused on translation

strategy, it is worth highlighting the study supports the fact that simply possessing the knowledge of two languages is insufficient to carry out the task of translation.

For translators and students of translation working with the Korean and English language pair, it is also important to possess an awareness of the theories associated with translation, and the ability to apply these to the actual act of translating. Drawing back on Nida's (1964) example of relationship terms, a translators working with Korean and English would need to find a suitable equivalence for terms which have emotive or connotative meanings, and the ability to do this successfully would require awareness and competence of both lexical and cultural knowledge. In addition, the error example sentences show how a lack of lexical competence in L1, L2 or both can result in errors, and a lack of lexical competence or knowledge of the cultures of the languages one is working with can result in a lack of equivalence or naturalness in the finished target text. In addition to the above mentioned factors, translators need to ensure they have fully understood a source language text before translation has been attempted, and as Table B shows, a lack of understanding of L2 words or expressions has resulted in errors in translation. In addition to understanding, students also need 'extralinguistic knowledge' (Gile 2009), in particular deliberate analysis of the source language text one is working with.

As pointed out by Gile (1995), a translator's FSS and FLS are likely to change over time and such changes are largely dependant on experience in, and variety of, domains to which the translator becomes exposed. Therefore, it can be said that students are likely to build up their lexical competence with experience of translation practice.

While it may be agreed that the occurrence of lexical errors in the

translations of student translators is inevitable, raising awareness of the importance of equivalence between the ST and TT, as well as knowledge of relevant translation theories, is vital for a student's learning progress. The more translation practice a student is given, the more varied their lexis store is likely to become, and the more domains covered, the more varied their extralinguistic knowledge is likely to be.

The author of this paper does not believe the occurrence of lexical errors in student translations can be eliminated or prevented, and nor should they be, as the discovery and analysis of such errors can contribute towards a translator's development. Through exercises involving editing and correcting of errors, students are likely to become more experienced in recognizing such errors, which will in turn enable them to reduce, if not completely avoid, making the same mistakes in the future. Therefore, instructors teaching translation classes can maximize this development by allowing increased exposure to error analysis and correction. The author believes this is beneficial to both learners and teachers, as development in translation and its studies is a continuous, acquired process.

7. Conclusion

Possible reasons for lexical errors found in first semester student translation assignments have been discussed for this paper, including lack of lexical competence in L1, L2, lack of equivalent lexical competence and simply lack of care or negligence on behalf of the student. Due to the distinct differences between English and Korean, is can be said that achieving lexical competence in both L1 and L2 is not an easy task to accomplish. Referring back to Cheong's

(2001) example of the lack of 'translatability' of certain words between Korean and English, it is important for translation studies students and their lecturers to be aware of such gaps, and think of possible ways to fill them. As translators, it is very important to continue to work towards bridging such lexical gaps continuously throughout their career. Such gaps could be filled, or made smaller by, improved lexical competence. With improved lexical competence in both L1 and L2, translators will be able to reduce the frequency or amount of errors and produce increasingly professional target language texts. Although some words may be 'untranslatable', improved lexical competence and a stronger FSS and FLS would help reduce the gap as much as possible, and remedy the problem of 'untranslatability' with a word or expression which is as close to the SL as possible. Due to the fact that the students who participated in the study are mostly Korean native speakers whose L2 is English, working towards even better L2 comprehension will serve to enhance their lexical competence, and consequently their translation competence.

As the paper has suggested in previous sections, students will be able to accumulate knowledge, both linguistic and extralinguistic, through practice and experience. While it may be impossible to prevent the occurrence of all errors, instructors should turn these errors into an opportunity for student development.

This paper has its limits in that firstly, the error analysis was carried out on a limited number of source texts, which may not be representative or extensive. Also, the nature of the texts themselves may have had certain characteristics which could have led to a frequency in certain error types. The same limitations apply to the text analyzed by the author for this paper. However, despite the limitations, this paper should serve to allow room for the

contemplation of lexical competence and its consequent connection to other factors needed for a good translation, reasons for difficulties or limitations in such areas of competence, and consideration of these factors when either training students of translation or when training to become a translator.

REFERENCES

Bell, Roger (1991) *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.

Cheong, Ho-Jeong (2001) How to Bridge Lexical Gaps as Reflective of Different Categorization Systems: Assessing Chunking-up and Chunking-down Tactics. *Journal of Translation Studies 2*. (2), Fall 2001: 187-221.

Choi, Eun-suk (2005) Semantic Context Effects in Forward and Backward Word Translation by Korean Learners of English. *Second Language Studies*. 24(1), Fall 2005: 1-23.

Sil International (Updated last: 15 september 1998) Visited 02 february 2012, <http://www.sil.org/LinguaLinks/languagelearning/OtherResources/ GudlnsFrALnggAndCltrLrnngPrgrm/WhatIsLexicalCompetence.htm>.

Gile, Daniel (1995) *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gile, Daniel (2009) *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training Revised edition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jakobson, Roman (2004) On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. *in*: Lawrence Venuti, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 180-92.

Kelly, Dorothy (2008) Mobility Programmes as a Learning Experience for Translation Students: Development and Assessment of Specific Translation and Transferable Generic Competences in Study Abroad Contexts. *In:* john Kearns, Ed. *Translator and Interpreter Training: Issues, Methods and Debates*. London/New York: Continuum, 66-87.

Lorscher, Wolfgang (2005) The Translation Process: Methods and Problems of its Investigation. *Meta: Translators' Journal*. 50 (2): 597-608.

Nida, Eugene (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Presas, Marisa (2000) Bilingual Competence and Translation Competence. *in:* Christina Schaffner and Beverly Adab, eds. *Developing Translation Competence*, amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 19-32.

Potter, Mary c.., So, Kwok-fai, von Eckardt, Barbara and Feldman, Laurie b. (1984) Lexical and Conceptual Representation in Beginning and Proficient Bilinguals, *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior.* (23): 23-38.

Robinson, Peter j. (1989) A Rich View of Lexical Competence, *ELT Journal.* (43): 274-282.

Ronowicz, Eddie, Hehir, Joanna., Kaimi, Toshihiro, *et al..* (2005) Translator's Frequent Lexis Store and Dictionary Use as Factors in SLT Comprehension and Translation Speed – a comparative study of professional, paraprofessional and novice translators. *Meta* 50 (2): 580-596.

Vinay, Jean-paul and Darbelnet jean (1995) Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. (translated by Juan c Sager, and M.-J. Hamel) collecton. Juan c Sager, and M.-J. Hamel, eds. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins