

JIHOČESKÁ UNIVERZITA V ČESKÝCH BUDĚJOVICÍCH
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
ÚSTAV ANGLISTIKY

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

INTERFERENCE V PŘEKLADECH NĚMECKÝCH RODILÝCH
MLUVČÍ DO ANGLIČTINY

INTERFERENCE IN ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF GERMAN
NATIVE SPEAKERS

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Jana Kozubíková Šandová, Ph.D.

Autor práce: Tereza Kučerová

Studijní obor: Anglický jazyk a literatura, Německý jazyk a literatura

Ročník: Třetí

2015

Prohlašuji, že svoji bakalářskou práci jsem vypracovala samostatně pouze s použitím pramenů a literatury uvedených v seznamu citované literatury.

Prohlašuji, že v souladu s § 47b zákona 111/1998 Sb. v platném znění souhlasím se zveřejněním své bakalářské práce a to v nezkrácené podobě elektronickou cestou ve veřejně přístupné části databáze STAG provozované Jihočeskou univerzitou v Českých Budějovicích na jejích internetových stránkách, a to se zachováním mého autorského práva k odevzdanému textu této kvalifikační práce. Souhlasím dále s tím, aby toutéž elektronickou cestou byly v souladu s uvedeným ustanovením zákona 111/1998 Sb. zveřejněny posudky školitele a oponentů práce i záznam o průběhu a výsledku obhajoby kvalifikační práce. Rovněž souhlasím s porovnáním textu mé kvalifikační práce s databází kvalifikačních prací Theses.cz provozovanou Národním registrem vysokoškolských kvalifikačních prací a systémem na odhalování plagiátů.

České Budějovice 28.4.2015

Podpis:

Anotace

Tato práce pojednává o jevech interference v překladech německých rodilých mluvčích do angličtiny a soustředí se zejména na negativní a pozitivní transfer a jeho průběh na různých úrovních jazyka. Výzkumný vzorek tvoří překlady středoškolských studentů, které jsou zkoumány prostřednictvím Kontrastní analýzy a Analýzy chybovosti. Práce se zabývá frekvencí výskytu a druhem chyb, kterých se studenti v překladech dopustili. Cílem práce je identifikovat jevy interference, stejně jako položky s největší mírou chybovosti a zjistit jaký druh interference se vyskytuje v překladech nejčastěji a proč. Autorka v práci zohledňuje také vlivy spojené s učením se cizího jazyka.

Abstract

This work aims at examining the interference in German-English translations of German native speakers and discussing the negative and positive transfer on different levels of language. The research is focused on translations of secondary school students and deals with types and frequency of errors they made when translating. Contrastive and error analysis are applied as research methods. The goal of this work is both to identify language levels and items with the highest error rate and to answer the query which kind of interference and why appears in final translations most often. The author takes into account also the aspect of second language learning.

Poděkování

Chtěla bych poděkovat Mgr. Janě Kozubíkové Šandové, Ph.D. za vedení mé bakalářské práce, cenné rady a odborný dohled. Děkuji také Mgr. Ivanu Rokosovi za pomoc při získávání údajů pro výzkumnou část práce.

Obsah

1. Introduction.....	7
2. Methodology and research data	8
3. Contrastive analysis	9
3.1. Terminology.....	9
3.2. Research methods of contrastive analysis.....	10
3.2.1. Prediction of errors on lexical – semantic level	11
3.2.2. Prediction of errors on morphologic level.....	15
3.2.3. Prediction of errors on syntactic level.....	18
3.2.4. Prediction of errors on stylistic level.....	20
4. Error analysis	22
4.1. Terminology.....	22
4.2. Research method of error analysis	23
4.2.1. Analysis of lexical-semantic level.....	24
4.2.2. Analysis of morphologic level	30
4.2.3. Analysis of syntactic level	35
4.2.4. Analysis of stylistic level	38
5. Results evaluation	39
5.1. Evaluation of CA and EA methods.....	39
5.2. Errors' frequency	40
5.3. Table summary of errors.....	42
5.4. Types of errors and their general occurrence	45
6. Conclusion	47
7. Appendix.....	49
7.1. Source text.....	49
7.2. Translation by an American n.s.	50
7.3. Translation by a British n.s.	51
7.4. Sample of students' translations.....	52
8. Sources	62

1. Introduction

This work deals with the issue of interlingual and intralingual interference occurring in the process of acquiring English as a second language by German native speakers. I chose this topic since it is significant in the field of linguistics as well as translation theory and foreign language learning. I drew inspiration from one of the most respected Czech linguists prof. Libuše Dušková who is, beside other things, occupied with the contrastive studies of Czech and English language. Yet, owing to the fact that I do not major in Czech I opted for contrasting English and German languages. In my work I would like to apply my mind to the following issues. First, I would like to determine the most problematic language items and identify language levels where errors are most frequently made. Second, my aim is to determine source of errors made in translations and to discuss the merit of contrastive and error analysis. Finally, I hope to find out whether the fact that English and German are sister languages makes it easier for a German n. s. to learn English or rather if there is a stronger influence of positive or negative interference in the process of translating from German into English. My research will be based on English translations of a book excerpt provided by German native speakers.

2. Methodology and research data

In pursuit of relevant and precise output data I opted to combine quantitative and qualitative research methods. In the first part of my work I am going to use contrastive analysis, with the aid of which I will try to predict the mistakes I expect the students to make in the given text. In the second part, using error analyses, I will be concerned with the evaluation of errors really made by students and I plan to classify them according to their occurrence at different levels of language. Subsequently, errors are to be statistically processed and will be commented upon on their type and indicators. In conclusion, I am going to decide if there is a higher number of errors caused by interlingual or intralingual interference, and on which language levels they predominate.

As previously mentioned, this Bachelor work concentrates on unidirectional translation from German into English and on the difficulties a German n. s. is confronted with during the process of translation. This paper also takes into consideration the issues concerning second language learning which implies that the sample data have to meet two basic requirements. Firstly, the data must be provided by a German n. s. since the object of the research is the German-English interference. Secondly, the data is to be gained from students who are not professional translators but still have sufficient language proficiency to be able to translate the given text.

For these reasons university students who have reached the C1 level in English had seemed to be the best target group. However, when I had gathered and scrutinized their translations I realised that they are of such a high quality that it was hard to find some errors, let alone interlingual interference. On account of this I decided to target secondary school students who are between fifteen and seventeen years old. All these students have been studying English language at least for seven years, so that their level of English falls within the B1/B2 scope of international language competence. My presupposition was that they are not completely aware of the misleading similarity between German and English yet, but on the other hand have already overcome the initial stadium typical of beginners. Hence it follows that I can focus mainly on persistent errors which usually occur with more advanced learners.

The source text consists of a short book excerpt written in form of a diary. In the excerpt colloquial German is used. The research brings into focus lexical items as well as syntactical and grammatical constructions. The source text was distributed among

students of different high schools in Germany and Austria and they were asked to translate it into English within the time of 45 minutes. Translations were made during the lesson and students were allowed to use dictionaries. The final research data is comprised of 62 translations, though 11 of them are incomplete.

3. Contrastive analysis

3.1. Terminology

My research falls within the area of contrastive linguistics and translational studies. To begin with, I would like to give a brief overview of the history and development of both of them and explain the basic terminology.

As Pan Wenguo and Tham Wai Mun (26) state, the term *contrastive linguistics* was first proposed by American anthropologist Benjamin Lee Whorf. But it was an American expert on modern linguistics, Robert Lado, who developed the first workable contrasting process and therefore is considered the founding father of contrastive linguistics (Lado 67). Contrastive linguistics is often identified with its main method *contrastive analysis (CA)* owing its current form to British linguist Carl James (2) who defined it as “an interlingual linguistic approach which seeks to contrast a pair of languages and identify their differences and similarities, being more interested in differences between languages than in their likenesses”. The main goals of contrastive linguistics are to facilitate the process of foreign language learning and to predict and prevent making mistakes when translating (Pan Wenguo and Tham Wai Mun 32). According to James (4), there are two more branches of interlingual linguistics - which are *error analysis (EA)* and *translation theory*. While contrastive analysis focuses on predicting errors, error analysis tries to classify them and explain possible reasons which caused their origin (Corder 22). Translation theory is concerned with the ways in which “texts from one language are transformed into comparable texts in another language” and which role language interference plays in this process (James 4). Language interference describes the situation when the target language form produced by an L2 learner deviates from the codified norm of L2, because of contact between both languages (Kupsch-Losereit 543).

3.2. Research methods of contrastive analysis

As the name suggests, contrastive analysis is a method where two languages are contrasted with each other. In regard to this I am going to contrast the original German text with two translations of English native speakers. In compliance with CA I would like to focus on the differences rather than similarities between the mentioned languages. However, to be able to determine the differences and from them the resulting errors one has to start with similarities. On the grounds of lexical, semantic, syntactic or phonetic resemblance I try to specify the most critical items where errors can be expected. First of all, I have to carry out the contrasting of the English and German language in general.

Tertium comparationist - the fact that the languages which are to be compared have something in common is, according to Chesterman (57), the prerequisite for comparing or contrasting two languages. At first sight, contemporary German and English language might seem not to have much in common. However, upon taking a closer look at them we will find out that they are patterned on similar language principles. As Conner Linton (28) states, the explanation can be traced back to their long mutual influence and historical reasons, one of them being the German invasion. This invasion conditioned a significant impact on the original Celtic languages and gave rise to Old English, which became the sister language of Old German. During the centuries Old English was changing over time, up to the late seventeenth century when it developed into Modern English. Compared to Modern German, Modern English lost its inflection, grammatical gender and case markers so that the most apparent similarities disappeared (Connor Linton 36). Nevertheless, the common features given by the membership to West Germanic language family are still evident and exert influence over learners as well as translators.

As has been demonstrated, the fact that both languages belong to the same language family meets the comparability criterion. But there is no clear and generally respected theory describing the steps of contrastive analysis. One of the contemporary linguists, Professor Tomasz Krzeszowski (13) in his contrastive generative grammar suggests creating an Initial Identity Hypothesis such as in our case - *There is a similarity between German and English on all levels of language*. After that he advises to test under what conditions does the hypothesis hold and what are the constraints of anticipated similarity between the given languages.

I will work on Corder's (12) assumption that errors are just evidence of testing such hypothesis by an L2 learner and I try to predict errors I suppose the students will make in the given translations. However, to be able to do so I need at least one English translation provided by an English n. s. serving as a base and more or less reliable translation. Due to my attendance of Translation seminar in Augsburg (Germany) I gained from local teachers two translations of the above mentioned text - one from a British native speaker and the other from an American one. Owing to this I can take into account American as well as British vocabulary.

3.2.1. Prediction of errors on lexical – semantic level

At first sight, the most alike structure in both languages is vocabulary. The similar form and orthography of words with Germanic origin can either help the translator to assign the verb, quickly and easily, its proper meaning or it can lead him/her to the wrong estimation of correspondence between English and German words with different origin.

a) Transparent words

Regarding the first possibility, there is a group of words which facilitates a student's process of translation. These words are called *transparent words* and as Grady's (2) definition says "they are two words that have a similar spelling and the same meaning".

The German pronoun *alle* and its English counterpart *all* demonstrate clearly the agreement in spelling and meaning of both words which should be helpful for a translator. A German translator however mustn't forget to add the preposition *of* (*all of*) to the English pronoun or they have to put in front of it the determining pronoun *they* (*they all*). Otherwise the intended meaning of German "*die...alle*" will be misunderstood. The proper translations in this case requires certain experience and that is the reason why I predict the students would make a mistake like "all want me to move out" which does not communicate the appropriate meaning.

Another example is the English verb *to be* whose third person singular form (it) *was* resembles the German form (es) *war*. The same case represents the English conjunction *when* which is phonetically very similar to the German conjunction *wenn*, containing also the same meaning. These words are so called *true cognates* and they should prevent the students from making errors in this area.

b) False friends

Nevertheless, when a German learner or translator automatically translates a German word into a phonetically analogous one in English they might easily make a mistake. The thing is that not all words are allowed to be translated unequivocally without considering the discrepancy in meaning. Sometimes it is quite hard to distinguish transparent words from *faux-amis*, also called *false friends* because false friends are “two apparently transparent words that have a completely different meaning” (Grady 1).

As a typical example can be given the German pronoun *man* which stands for a non-specific general subject. On the basis of graphical similarity, a German translator might match it with the English word *a man* which would result in the restricted meaning referring merely to a representative of male gender.

However, as pointed out, not always is the boundary between transparent words and false friends clear-cut. Thus, German verb *lernen* could be generally considered both a false friend and a transparent word. However, in our text it is *faux-amis* since the mechanical translation as *to learn* does not meet the meaning requirements. In the context this verb means *to train*, that is “to gain skills for a particular job or activity” so that it cannot be translated as transparent word *to learn* meaning “to gather knowledge” (OALD 1643). Almost the same situation is represented by the verb *hören* which means both “to perceive with ears” and “to listen or obey someone” (OALD 719). Still, the only possible translation in the text represents the English word *to listen* for the author of the text desires to express that they do not want to take notice and follow his parents’ nagging. Unlike the transparent verb *to hear* in English which would signify that he just covers his ears.

A further instance where a German translator can be misled by the graphical resemblance is also the German verb *beenden*, which could subconsciously tempt the translator to use similar English word *to end* despite that the word *to finish* is required in the given context.

A possible exchange based on similarity might be made in the very last sentence “Mutti und Vati sind fast durchgedreht”, where the German word *fast* meaning *almost* has the same graphic form as the English adjective *fast*.

It can also happen that a low achiever is apt to confuse the word *spinnen* with its English counterpart *to spin* denoting under certain circumstances the same meaning, namely “to make thread from wool or cotton” (OALD 1485). However, in the sentence “Die spinnen wohl!” has the verb *spinnen* figurative meaning *to be nuts* or *to be crazy*. This idiom belongs to those words which can bemuse the translator because they are literary untranslatable into English. Another possible, but quite improbable error at the B1 language level might be the mistaking of the German pronoun *wen* with the English conjunction *when*. In this case the resemblance is purely phonological since German *wen* stands for English *who* but we cannot totally exclude this error. An interesting example is the prepositional phrase *in der Firma* which is according to both native speakers translated as *at work* not *in the firm* as a German native speaker may have expected. The explanation probably lies in the kernel information of the utterance. The narrator intends to express in the first place that they held a farewell party in the place where they had been doing their job. The connection *at work* corresponds to this meaning whereas the phrase *in the firm* evokes the idea of a farewell party in a snobbish business or company which does not fit the fact that he worked there within his internship.

Another proof of the misleading impact of analogy is the following literal translation “I have become a lot of presents” of the sentence “Ich habe viele Geschenke bekommen” probable to be made by a German n. s. The translation is derived from verb which fundamentally differs from the right translation “I got a lot of presents”. Again it comes out of the false friends issues and translators must pay attention to it.

c) Cross-associations

However, what should a German translator do when there are two or more possible English translations of one German word? In this case, they just have to choose the best one on the basis of their knowledge. And that is exactly the case when a cross-association error can easily occur. In other words, by cross-association there are more possible counterparts in the target language for the one word in the source language (Cole 2).

Similarly, the translation of the German verb *erzählen* meaning *to narrate/ to relate sth* may pose a problem for a translating student, as it has additionally a second meaning *to*

communicate sth/ to tell sth. It could be recognised only from the context which of these options should be finally used by a translator

One may also not omit the trickiest group of potential cross-associations and those are substantives such as *Beruf* or *Stelle*. These have many possible translations, e.g. German *Beruf* means profession, occupation, job or career in English and each of these have in English slightly different meaning. An experienced user of English knows that only the translation *career* can be used in the text. The students will face the same problem with the German word *Stelle* denoting the meaning of place, spot, job, location etc. The probability that they will choose the right word (*a job*, according to both n. s.) increases with their language experience and competence level.

Yet, not only substantives and verbs are so problematic. There is also a special case of the pronoun *man* already mentioned above. Not only can it be translated as *a man* into English, but it also cannot be translated in one obvious way. Its translation depends on the interpretation of context. In our text it is to be found just once in the sentence “[...] wenn man eine Absage bekommt” and English native speakers translated it using the pronoun *you*, that is “[...] when you get a rejection letter”. Other possibilities are *I*, *one* or the use of passive voice.

d) Words with no counterpart in target language

The contrary problem to cross-associations is the situation when for a word in the source language there is no suitable word in the target language. This instance applies primarily for German particles. English does not have such a rich system of particles as German does and it is also impossible to translate all of them with one corresponding word. Sometimes we can use paraphrases to convey the right meaning, another time it is better to leave the particle completely out (Liefländer-Koistinen 551). For instance, the particle *doch* in the sentence “Ich bin doch aber erst 18 Jahre geworden“ cannot be translated into English at all. Similarly, for the particle *ja* in the sentence “du hast ja auch noch deine Eltern” there does not exist any partner particle which the students maybe won’t know and that is why they probably attempt to translate it in some way.

On the contrary, the particle *wohl* in the clause “die glauben wohl [...]” could be translated in more ways - directly as *probably* or *maybe*, or we can use the indirect

expression “they seem to think”. But I do not suppose the students to use such advanced means.

e) Idioms

Another critical field in translation comprises idioms. Idioms are expressions whose meaning cannot be derived from the individual words (OALD 771). We need to know the corresponding idiom in the target language otherwise the translation won't work in the text. As will be shown in a moment, to transfer idioms word for word from the source language into the target language would produce utterly catastrophic results. I identified the following sentences as idioms or pseudo idioms: “Mach dir mal nichts draus!”, “Es wird schon werden”, “Hat was für sich” and the phrase „[...] welcher Beruf mir liegt“.

The first one „Mach dir mal nichts draus!“ was translated by a n. s. as “Don't worry about it” and “Take is easy”. Both of these translations are set phrases. The other two are not typical idioms but still belong to this group, since they cannot be translated word for word. The phrase “Es wird schon werden” was interpreted by both of the n. s. in a slightly different way. A British n. s. translated it as “You'll get there” and brought into focus the writer of the diary, whereas an American n. s. proposed a more general translation “It will work out”. For the translation of the German phrase “[...]welcher Beruf mir liegt” the n. s. suggested again two options, namely “Which career would be the best for me” or “Which career does best suit me”. The translation of the sentence “Hat was für sich” also requires creativity and good appraisal of a translator. Native speakers offered two versions „That does sound good“ and the more idiomatic parallel „That's a bonus“. There are definitely more possible translations of these idioms but a translator has to be careful as there is not indefinite number of them. On account of this I assume that the error rate in this group will be high.

3.2.2. Prediction of errors on morphologic level

Errors on the morphologic level are very difficult for CA to predict since many of them do not appear because of interlingual interference but due to the learner's imperfect language skills. Under this category fall *errors in inflection* such as omission of *-s* to a verb in the third person singular, omission of plural *-s* by nouns, erroneous identification of regular verb and use of the affix *-ed* etc. As well as these mistakes that

are almost impossible to predict for the CA, a great amount of morphological errors are to be expected in the use of tenses the same as by the tricky group of modal verbs.

a) Tense

Concerning the amount of tenses in both languages, the tense system in English could be a really misleading area for a German native speaker. On the one hand, English as well as German disposes of present, preterit, perfect, past perfect and future tense, though their usage and meaning differ quite obviously from their German counterparts. Moreover, unlike the German tense system there are more tenses in English which cannot be matched with any German complement, not to mention the fact that English has always at its disposal a simple and continuous form. However, in comparison to the above mentioned errors in inflection, it is more likely in this group that the CA will succeed in predicting those errors based on pseudo-similarity in tense form.

An extremely tricky sentence, even for inexperienced tr., seems to be the following one "Ich bin doch erst 18 Jahre geworden". Here from a grammatical point of view we are confronted with the past tense though to translate the sentence in English the past tense would result in a translation such as "But I was only 18 years old" which would be wrong. This is the reason why a translating student should follow primarily the meaning and focus on the situation change which is in English expressed by present perfect. The right version according to both native speakers is "But I have only just turned 18".

Also following subordinate sentence could be a tough proposition for a translator "sobald ich meine Lehre beendet habe". The grammatical tense is perfect, but subjective tense expresses the future and the best way to translate it into English is undoubtedly the present simple tense, since there cannot be the past simple after the conjunction "as soon as". However, according to the British translator there is also a possible version in the present perfect which emphasis the end of the process – "as soon as I have finished".

The semantic tense shift is necessary to be considered also in the sentence "Der nächste Brief ist bestimmt eine Zusage". The word for word English version would be "In the next letter is surely positive news", yet this translation is semantically incorrect and a translator has to use the future tense with the auxiliary verb *will* in order to meet the requirements of the context. To sum up problems of English future tenses we should

take into consideration that the future can be expressed by means of *going to*, *will*, *present simple* and *present continuous* while German has just two future tenses of which the second one is used very rarely. Additionally, the German present tense can represent the future using additional words which mark the future – in this instance “*der nächste*”. Likewise, the clause “*die helfen dir ja noch*” is bound to be converted in the future tense. Here the determining word is “*noch*”.

Furthermore, it will be hard for the students to recognise that the best suitable translation in English is a conditional form for both of the n. s. translated the sentence as “Then I wouldn’t have to listen to my parents [...]”. Regarding the students’ English level it can be predicted that most students won’t identify the conditional here and will translate the sentence in the future or present tense as “Then I won’t have to listen to my parents” or “Then I don’t need to listen to my parents.” The same tense difficulty contains the sentence “[...] *welcher Beruf mir liegt und so*” which the students could be liable to translate as “which career (will) suit me and so on” instead of the right version “which career would suit me”.

b) Modal verbs

As with tense errors, modal verbs belong to a critical group where errors are to be expected. For instance the sentence “*Dann brauche ich auch nicht mehr das Gelabere von meinen Eltern hören*“ invites misinterpretation. The verb „*nicht brauchen*“ means „not have to“, but the students will be probably inclined to misuse it as “not need” or “mustn’t” due to the semantic resemblance.

Further difficulty might occur in the translation of subordinate clause “*die glauben wohl, dass ich ausziehen will*”. The grammatical tense of the above mentioned clause is the present tense and the form *will* is the first person singular of the modal verb *wollen*. Though the clause undoubtedly expresses a future action, a German translator is not allowed to mismatch the German modal verb *wollen* meaning *to want* with the English future tense expressed by the auxiliary verb *will*. The supposed translation then would be “they probably think that I will move out” which is out of sense. Aside from the fact that it would be an example of auxiliary verb confusion, it shows also the case of faux-amis.

c) Indirect speech

There are just a minimum of sentences using indirect speech in the excerpt, yet one of them is especially tricky. The reason is that the German sentence “Dann haben die mir wieder erzählt, dass es keine Stellen gäbe und ich nur eine kleine Unterstützung erhalte“ contains the subjunctive preterit *gäbe*. Nevertheless, in English the subjunctive has almost disappeared and we use the present simple instead as in the sentence “There are no jobs” or we can apply alternatively the past simple “There were no jobs”. However, both native speakers used the present simple and put in brackets the past simple version. CA can only guess whether or not the students will be confused by this sentence.

All in all, we have to take into consideration that the translating students may not have the necessary scale of knowledge, or their mind could be at that moment blank. In such cases, they might think up completely new words, make a mistake in orthography or falsely transform German words into English. Nevertheless, that is something we cannot precisely forecast by the use of CA.

3.2.3. Prediction of errors on syntactic level

The main and probably the most error-tempting area at the syntactic level of language is word order. In comparison to German, the word order in English is fixed so as to help the distinguishing of clause constituents. This is not always easy since English uses minimal inflection and it has no declination which is why it cannot distinguish the cases. Yet, the basic sentence pattern *subject, verb, object* is as common for German as it is for English but there is much more variability in the position of adverbials in German. So it is probable that the basic structures will be correctly translated by students but those which are more complicated can tempt them to various errors.

a) The position of adverbials

The order of adverbials in German is quite different to English. The order of time adverbials is totally reversed; it occupies the first place in German, whereas in English the adverbial of time is the last one according to the system – adverbial of manner, place and time. It is thus easy to predict that learners whose knowledge is not yet deeply embedded will be susceptible to arranging the adverbials according to the German system, that is: temporal, causal, modal and local. But still, also in English there is some variability in the sequence of adverbials depending on the information we want to

stress. So when a German n. s. translates the sentence “Heute war mein Geburtstag” as “Today was my birthday” it cannot be marked as an error.

b) Word order after conjunctions

In order to take into consideration all possibilities one has to consider word order after conjunctions. It may happen that a German n. s. will use after the conjunction *that* the same word order as after German conjunction *dass*. In such a case, the verb would be at the end of the sentence which is, in English, unacceptable. The same might occur after the conjunction *as soon as* - counterpart to *sobald*, after *when* - counterpart to German *wenn* and by many others not mentioned in the text.

But even though there is a regular word order after some conjunctions in German (and, but, or,..) we have to consider that in German (with the exception of questions) the object always precedes the verb which is a feature that a German learner could theoretically falsely transfer into their translation.

c) Questions and question tags

For a German n. s. it is particularly difficult to cope with English question tags and the operators *do* and *did*. In German the function of a positive question tag adopts partly the flavour particle *doch* used in answer to a negative question. Under mentioned conditions it expresses the agreement or simply *yes*. Supposing that a German n. s. is not aware of the many possibilities of translating the particle *doch*, he would probably produce its erroneous translation in the context “Will ich aber gar nicht! Oder vielleicht doch?”. The estimated wrong translation would be “But I really don’t want to. Or maybe yes?” instead of the right version “Or maybe I do?”. The American translator provided a different translation but the principle of a question tag remained unchanged “But that’s not what I want! Or maybe it is?”.

d) Sentence structure

As well as tense problems in the sentence “die wollen alle, dass ich ausziehe” a German translator can encounter also structural difficulties. Specifically, a difficulty might be caused by the choice of a subordinate clause structure. If a German translator wanted to provide a verbatim translation of this sentence, they would have to produce a translation such as “everyone wants that I will move out”. However, the only right translation is

“everyone wants me to move out”. There is apparently a shift in the whole structure and the finite verb in German is substituted by the infinite English verb. As well as this, the German conjunction *dass* is omitted and not literally translated as *that* which was appropriate in the previous clause “Die glauben wohl, dass ich ausziehen will”. The reason is that in our sentence there is just one verb (ausziehen) and no other modal verb is engaged, in contrast to the above mentioned sentence (wollen + ausziehen). It follows that the original subject in the German sentence (I) becomes the object of English sentence (me). Also, the conjunction *dass* is substituted by the infinitive phrase “to move out”.

e) Ellipsis

Ellipsis is the act of deliberate leaving out a word or words from a sentence but only when the meaning can be understood without them. For instance, in the German sentence „War eigentlich ganz toll“ the subject *es* was left out, but the utterance is still understandable. The same works with the omitted conjunction *dass* in the sentence, „[...] ,dass es keine Stellen gäbe und (*dass*) ich nur eine kleine Unterstützung erhalte“. In the sentence „Ich habe schon eine Menge Bewerbungen geschrieben, aber (*ich habe*) noch keine Zusage erhalten“ two words, namely *ich habe* were left out. However, it is practically inadmissible to leave out part of a verb in an English sentence so the informality has to be expressed in other ways. A subject mustn't be omitted excluding the situation when there is one common subject for two words as in the sentence “Everyone stands around me and (everyone) expects that [...]”. In contrast to this, the conjunction *that* might be omitted in English.

3.2.4. Prediction of errors on stylistic level

The stylistic level of language reveals to us much about the style and stylistic features of the text. As for our excerpt, its register is highly informal and there are some colloquial expressions, vulgarism and non-standard vocabulary. In the text we can identify also jargon used between employees and employers. The estimation of contrastive analysis states that many students won't be able to discern the formal and informal register. Also they may be faced with the problem of finding a proper counterpart to those words based on jargon.

a) Register

The register can be marked by the use of certain synonymous expressions such as, for example, the quantifiers which are possible to be translated by means of the English words *lots of* or *many*. The first one signals the higher and more formal register, unlike the second one which stands for a more colloquial register. Here a translator has to take into account the measure of the formality of the text and choose the more colloquial quantifier which is in this case *a lot of*. Thus the form “I got a lot of presents” is the most appropriate as the text is an abstract from a diary, which means from an informal text.

The informal status is evident also in the sentence „Hat (et)was für sich“ where the first two letters are omitted, as is also true in the sentence “Mach dir mal nichts d(a)raus.” The corresponding translation should therefore be informal, which is of course very difficult to allow for. The informal register is reflected in the non-standard word order too. This is most easily observable in the clause „Will ich aber gar nicht!” which does not match the regular word order in exclamatory sentences. Nonetheless, the translator mustn't forget that we can scarcely express informality through the word order in English.

b) Non-standard vocabulary

As it is a diary of an adolescent, some non-standard expressions fitting to the age, lifestyle and the way of speaking appear in the excerpt. These are the most challenging for every translator, since the literal meaning of such words is often suppressed or it can happen that such expressions do not exist in the target language at all. Then a translator has to work with the context and search for some suitable expression that would meet the semantic requirements of the problematic word. The fact that there are many different ideas of how to translate such items is confirmed by the variety of native speakers' translations. Here are the German sentences and their suggested English counterparts:

- 1) “das Gelabere” – “blabbering”, “nagging”, “nonsense”, “lectures”
- 2) „Die spinnen wohl!” – „They must be crazy!“, “They must be nuts.”, “They are so stupid.”

3) “Bescheuert!” – „For God’s sake!“, „It’s so stupid.“

4) “durchgedreht sein“ – “to lose it“, “to be really upset”, “to go crazy”

4. Error analysis

4.1. Terminology

Error analysis is a method developed by British linguist S.P. Corder in the 1960s (Nickel 3). In comparison to CA, it has the capacity to distinguish and examine two types of errors – *performance errors* and *competence errors* (Corder 10). These two kinds of errors differ mainly in their origin. Whereas competence errors are “noticeable deviations from the adult grammar of a native speaker” caused mainly by interlanguage transfer, performance errors are products of chance circumstances (Brown 218). Another American linguist Larry Selinker (178) expands on the origin of performance errors and explains that they can stem from the immediate psychical or physical states of a learner/translator such as tiredness, illness, emotional or concentration imbalance, lack of motivation etc. As Corder (22) states, another reason for the occurrence of performance errors might be “the influence of one target language item upon another” which he calls *intralingual transfer*.

Similar concept of intralingual errors is provided by Jack C. Richards (197) who instead of performance errors uses the term *developmental errors*. He agrees with Corder that these errors originate within the structure of the target language and adds that they reflect the learner’s competence at a particular stage of learning (Richards 198). He hints to the fact that developmental (performance) errors are to be found frequently in learners’ outputs regardless of their mother tongue (Richards 198).

Some researchers also elaborate on the systematic strategies of L2 learners who, by means of them, try to produce as acceptable structures as possible and test the boundary of L2 possibilities (Cowan 115). To these processes belongs simplification, overgeneralisation, disregarding of target language rules, fossilisation, avoiding too difficult structures, paraphrases etc. (Richards 199). Due to these processes errors can originate and Corder (25) divided them into four classes based on the forms they appear in. They are completely independent of the language level they were made on and relate to both performance and competence errors. The four classes consist of *errors of omission, addition, selection* and *ordering* (Corder 25). Errors of omission and addition

reflect the situation when some letter, word or structure was either left out of the translation or conversely added somewhere where it is not acceptable. Errors of selection originate in the situation when the “wrong item has been chosen in place of the right one”. Finally, errors of ordering shows structures in which items were incorrectly sequenced (Corder 26). These are categories of errors that the teacher or reader comes in contact with from second language learners.

S.P. Corder was also convinced that errors are not only the result of linguistics interference but “a device the learner uses in order to learn” (Spillner 6). Corder (18) assumes that “the spontaneous speech of the second language learner with its own grammar” sharing the rules of target language, is a language created by the learner and he calls it *idiosyncratic dialect*. Nevertheless, this model is better known under the name *interlanguage* as suggested by Selinker, the father of the Interlanguage hypothesis (Spillner 4).

Interlanguage hypothesis was the first approach which described the process of learning language as a series of learners’ active attempts to produce a target language norm (Selinker 175). In this process learners are highly influenced by their native language and they try to produce utterances in L2 by means of the overgeneralisation of linguistic items and rules from their NL which they erroneously apply in L2 (Selinker 175). Such attempted production of an L2 norm results in “a separate linguistic system based on the observable output” which is called interlanguage (Selinker 176). Selinker (177) considers Interlanguage a source of fossilised errors in the learner’s final language production. He further asserts that interlanguage is influenced by a latent psychological structure which consists of five central processes (Cowan 146). These are language transfer, transfer of training, strategies of L2 learning, strategies of L2 communication and overgeneralisation, and they are also the source of fossilised linguistic phenomena (Selinker 177).

4.2. Research method of error analysis

During the contrastive analysis I was trying to predict errors which the students are supposed to make with a certain level of probability, now I am going to evaluate the errors which were actually made. My goal is to compare the quality and quantity of the errors made with those I predicted in order to determine to which extent CA is useful and reliable. I will follow the same categories as those in contrastive analysis and

additionally will I try to specify the errors according to the motives which caused their occurrence.

I intend to approach the assessment of errors from a quantitative point of view, which means that I make a table for each individual word or grammatical phenomena. Every table will contain the total number of translations of a given word (some translators did not manage to translate the whole excerpt), the total number of erroneous translations regarding the specific word/phenomena and the sum of every single error occurrence. Based on these data I subsequently count the occurrence of errors in all words and phenomena and I express them in percents.

4.2.1. Analysis of lexical-semantic level

In agreement with contrastive analysis, the majority of errors in this category occurred not only because it is a broad and very tricky part but also on account of interlingual interference between German and English. This resulted in a high number of errors in group of false-friends, particles and idioms and on the other hand, through transparent words, we became conscious of positive transfer.

a) Transparent words

In accordance to expectations of CA, I identified almost no errors made in the branch of transparent words such as for example pronouns. One exception is the German pronoun *alle* which 28,1% of students translated simply as *all* denoting in the context the meaning of *everything*, instead of the intended meaning *all of them* or *they all*. On the other hand, 15% of students used only the translation *they* and thus narrowed the meaning and left out the reference to the writer's family. Apart from this, no errors were made either in translation of the conjunction *wenn* (when) or in the translation of the past simple tense of the verb *to be* (*ich war* -> I was). Despite the general positive interference by transparent words, there is one representative which demonstrates that transparent words might also cause misleading errors. It is the verb *mitbringen* whose correct translation *to bring with* was ignored by half of the students and 33,9% of them used the verb *to take* instead. It is not unlikely that this error is related to hypercorrection.

Some transparent words also temp to simplifications. A classic example is the German word *Eignungstest* meaning *an aptitude test* in English. The transparency here allowed

19,3% of translators to transfer the word simply as *a test* apparently without bothering about the narrowed meaning. The phrase “and so on” serves as proof of a strategic avoidance of difficult items resulting in the omission of the final sentence part “[...]welcher Beruf mir liegt *und so*”. In spite of the fact that the translation is very similar just additionally including the preposition *on* - “and so on”, 83,9% of students failed to translate it.

b) False friends

Whereas in the group of transparent words CA proved to be really successful, regarding the faux-amis group its effectiveness decreased. With some of the critical words students made relatively small amount of errors or just noticeably less than was expected. Specifically, in the German word *man* (non-specific general subject) none of the students spoiled the translation, the verb *beenden* (to finish) was translated as *to end* by only 13% of them, the fourth case of the pronoun *wer* (whom) was mistranslated by 14,5% and the phrase *in der Firma* (at work) 16% of the students got wrong.

On the other hand, by verbs such as *hören* or *lernen* the prediction of contrastive analysis was fruitful. There were 71% of errors made when translating the verb *hören* as *to hear* whereas the right counterpart appropriate in the context was *to listen*. But, unquestionably, the trickiest word proved to be the verb *lernen* which was by 81,5% of students transferred as *to learn* whereas the context enables two possible translations and these being *to train* or *to do an apprenticeship*.

What is really interesting is the incorrect translation of the verb and tense in the sentence “Ich habe viele Geschenke bekommen”. CA pointed out the possible confusion of the verb *bekommen* and *to become* on the ground of formal similarity which however misled only 8% of students. Evidently, more misleading for the students was the tense that, when literally translated, reminded them of German but unfortunately produced completely different sense. 48% of translators provided the translation “I have got a lot of presents” by the use of which they totally changed the meaning and also mistranslated the tense. Yet this error is evidently situation-conditioned, as in another sentence “[...] wenn man eine Absage bekommt” almost all students translated the verb correctly and none of them used the verb *to have got*.

EA provided us with few others, though less important, errors based on German-English language transfer. One of them is the confusion of the English word *than* with the German conjunction *dann*, meaning *then*. Nevertheless, students failed to translate this word in just 14,7% of translations. A more significant correlation could be found between the verbs *to await* and *to wait*, representing wrong translations of the German verb *erwarten*. This interchange occurred in 19% of students, and 13,8% of them translated the verb illogically by means of *to think*. All of these examples represent so called selection errors.

c) Cross-associations

This section is probably the most abundant, since it comprises one-to-several correspondences of words in the target language. It is really difficult and practically impossible for contrastive analysis to predict which words will cause problems most often. When supposing that there is an obvious candidate for an error, EA persuades us from time to time the exact opposite. A case in point is the verb *erzählen* whose two possible meanings are *to tell* and *to narrate*. Despite this, only 6,8% of students made a mistake here. The reason for a low CA success rate is that cross-associations belong to performance errors, being the representative of intralanguage interference which CA cannot predict.

On these grounds there are actually a huge number of potential errors and also the praxis shows that students use a broad scale of words with the same basic meaning, differing just in the situation-related connotation. One of many examples is the translation of the German noun *Abschied*, meaning in this context *a farewell party* which could be, under different circumstances, transferred to *good-bye party*, *farewell* or *leave-taking*. More than half of the students (56,5%) translated the noun as *a farewell* which is, according to both native speakers, the wrong solution because it is limited only to the abstract concept. What is really interesting is the translation of the German noun *die Lehre* (apprenticeship) which seems to be quite clear from the context. Yet the outcome is surprisingly incorrect, because the students applied mostly two words which refer to the second meaning of the noun *die Lehre*, namely *Lehre* as ideas of a particular person or group about religion, society or politics. In English this meaning may be conveyed by means of two words *doctrine* and *teaching*. The translation *doctrine* was used by 16,1% of students and *teaching* by 18,7% of them, however almost half of

students correctly used the word *apprenticeship*. It is a shining example of the fact that sometimes a correct translation is difficult to provide even with a dictionary. In this case translators have to beware of selection errors.

Apart from nouns, students also got one conjunction wrong, namely *sobald* meaning *as soon as*. 61,3% of them used the similar conjunction *when* which was probably brought about by their semantic similarity.

Restricted vocabulary is likely to be the reason why 22,8% of students transferred the verb *ausziehen* (to move out) as *to leave* or by use of the paraphrase *to leave home*. I also noticed the students had a tendency to use phrasal verbs. Though at the same time it was evident that this subject matter had not been fully absorbed yet as students either attached a wrong adverb to the verb (take out, move off) or they left it completely out – *to move*. Three students even used the second meaning of the verb *ausziehen* which is *to get undressed* or *to take off*. Similarly, the use of phrasal verbs was examined in the sentence “es hat geklappt”. Here it was crucial to capture the figurative meaning and the best translation provided by a n. s. was “It has worked out”. A great number of students felt that there is a phrasal verb which fits the content, they were only not capable of using the verb in its correct form which is why 55,4% of them chose just the full verb *to work*. These errors could be called errors of omission and are results of the simplification process.

The next word that was evidently difficult to translate precisely is the quantifier *eine Menge* (tons of/loads of). It is possible that the students were not able to judge the intensity of German and English quantifiers and due to this were content with the most employed ones, specifically *a lot of* and *many*. It is worth mentioning that a higher number of them (55,6%) estimated correctly that a more fitting and more informal variant is the quantifier *a lot of*, 33,9% of them wrote *many* and the rest other different eventualities.

The group of cross-associations contains also special kind of words which are culturally specific and technical terms. One of these words with the highest number of incorrect translations is the noun *Zusage* (positive answer, offer). The reason why almost all students made a mistake in this word may be easily explained on the grounds of practical nonexistence of a simple word for this term in English. Hence it follows that it is also difficult for an English n. s. to translate this word and so it is no wonder that

32,2% of students used as an equivalent the noun *commitment*, 15,7% the noun *consent*, and the rest of students invented several other translations. The analogical situation occurred by the noun *Absage* (rejection letter) where 36,9% of students believed that English equivalent is the word *cancellation*, 17,1% chose *refusal* and in addition numerous other translations appeared. Yet the most striking example is the noun *Beruf* that 71% of students translated falsely as *job* whereas the only correct translation fitting the context is *career*.

d) Words with no counterpart in target language

As the contrast analysis suggested, some of the particles cannot be matched to one specific English counterpart and often it is better to leave them untranslated. Nevertheless, what CA did not foresee is the fact that a great number of students left without translation many other particles that could have been and, more so, should have been translated. In the sentence “Will ich aber *gar* nicht!” all the students simply ignored the existence of intensifying particle *gar* and made an error of omission. Likewise in the clause “Ich habe *schon* eine Menge geschrieben” only 13% of students bothered with some translation of the flavour particle *schon*. The same scenario occurred in the sentence “Die helfen dir ja *noch*” where 82,2% of translators failed to express the particle *noch*. The question of why 80,6% of students did not pay attention to the translation of *noch* in the sentence “[...] aber *noch* keine Zusage erhalten” seems to stay unanswered too. As well as *noch* there is also the translation of the negation particle *nicht mehr* which 80,6% of students passed with indifference.

In comparison to the previous failures, the omission of the particle *doch* in the sentence “Ich bin *doch* aber erst 18 Jahre geworden” seems to be more understandable because the students faced the translation of a flavour particle, conjunction and an adverb in the row which sounds rather complicated in English. As for the clause “*Doch* nicht [...]” the 78% high absence of *doch*-translation might be clarified by means of a completely different function of *doch* in both sentences which could have bewildered the translators. An extraordinary high number of students (80,6%) also disregarded the particle *wohl* in the phrase “die glauben wohl, dass [...]” where the particle determines the level of certainty and notably modifies the meaning of the utterance.

Furthermore, the subclass of conversational and focus particles stayed, in large, without translation. 75,8% of translators ignored the translation of conversational particle

eigentlich and 72,5% of them translated the sentence “When *wieder* nichts passiert ist” without the second word meaning *again*. This group excellently demonstrates the learning strategy characterised by avoidance of difficult items; however it is not easy to say whether a greater role is played by interlingual or intralingual interference.

e) Idioms

As was already mentioned, idioms are a pretty tricky group for translators since it is usually quite hard to find the right counterpart for them in a foreign language with regard to the slightly different logic of both languages. Considering the fact that there are more possibilities of how to translate an idiom, it is really demanding to decide which solution is still correct and where the error of selection has been made. Yet one thing is indisputable, namely that idioms mustn't be converted literally. This means that all 38,7% of students who used the verbatim construction “(It) has something for itself” when translating the idiom “Hat 'was für sich” were completely wrong. Perceptibly better were those who used a loose translation or paraphrase as for example “That's great/nice/good”. From the impartial point of view these translations are also not completely appropriate but at least it is obvious that 16,1% of students who suggested them truly thought about the sense of the sentence. Just as with this idiom so the next one “Es wird schon werden” excludes the use of a literal translation. Despite this 12,3% of students attempted to use the literal form “It will already be” even though the translation expresses a completely different meaning. The majority of remaining students resorted to paraphrases such as “It will be good/ok/alright” which are relatively acceptable. However, for 17,5% of them this sentence was such an insurmountable translation problem that they plainly skipped it.

In comparison to the previous idioms, the expression “Mach dir mal nichts draus!” was not especially challenging as only 33,3% of students translated it incorrectly and moreover just one of them attempted to use the verbatim translation “Make nothing out of it”. The rest of the mistaken translators suggested quite logical, though nevertheless inaccurate, translations as for example “Don't be angry” or “Don't care about it”. The last idiom appeared in the often used sentence “Das Beruf macht mir Spass” which should have been translated loosely as “I enjoy my career”. However, the negative transfer exerted a strong influence on the students and 27,3% of them were seduced to the verbatim translation “The career makes me fun” which is unfortunately wrong. On

the whole, contrastive and error analysis reached an agreement about the difficulty of this linguistic area.

4.2.2. Analysis of morphologic level

The morphologic level of language is apparently a broad area where a great number of intralingual mistakes could be made. The findings of EA also confirmed this presupposition even though comparatively small amount of mistakes were detected by CA.

a) Tense

CA showed a relatively high success rate in the prediction of tense-errors, namely in those places where the German perfect tense appeared or in passages where the German present tense communicated the future. These were critical parts of the German-English interference by which errors of selection and the tendency towards simplification came to being. Although in most cases the context had strictly determined the tense and had not allowed to apply any other, many students often picked another tense. As an instance of performance error, the most frequently misused tense happened to be the present tense which can be explained on the basis of the students' inadequate language skills or generalisation.

Present simple

As a "universal" tense, the present simple was applied by almost 63% of students in the sentence "Die wollen alle, *dass ich ausziehe*" replacing the correct infinitive construction "They all want me to move out".

However, not always was an anticipated wrong tense use the main difficult proposition. For example in the sentence "Ich bin doch aber erst 18 Jahre geworden" the expected tense which should have been falsely applied was the past simple and yet 91,9% of students chose the present simple.

In comparison to this, and exactly as was expected by CA, the necessity of replacing the German present tense with the English future tense using *will* was not noticed by 50% of students in the sentence "Der nächste Brief ist bestimmt eine Zusage" and by 27,3% of them in the sentence "[...] die helfen dir ja noch". They let themselves be misled by interlanguage interference and translated these sentences in the present simple.

As I have already mentioned, one of the trickiest sentences is “Dann brauche ich auch nicht [...]hören”. Despite the fact that the sentence is written in the present simple, it requires a conditional translation using *would*. As a result 93,4% of students were taken in by this inconsistency and used the present simple instead. The same instance is represented by the sentence “[...] welcher Beruf mir liegt” where the translation with *would* is necessary but 75% of students did not recognise this and used the present simple again.

What is quite surprising is an error made in the clause “Ich habe viele Geschenke bekommen”. The German tense as well as context propose the use of the past tense and despite this 58,1% of translators decided to use the present simple. It is possible that they were confused by the word *today* which stands at the beginning of the previous sentence and reminds of presence.

One of the students’ errors which is hard to understand is the 50,3% prevalence in the use of the present simple in the sentence “(ich habe) noch keine Zusage erhalten”, since the word *noch* utterly prods into choosing the present perfect translation “I haven’t got a positive answer *yet*”. The present simple as a favourite tense of 48,4% students dominated also in the sentence “Wenn wieder nichts passiert ist [...]” which should have been translated with the use of the present perfect. Even more students, precisely 61,8%, went for the present simple in the subsequent sentence “[...]und ich eine Absage erhalten habe”. However, in this case the choice is quite excusable for the following sentence is written in the present simple and the action relates to a recent event. 27,3% of students correctly intuited that the described process of getting a rejection letter precedes the act of feeling sorry for that, though instead of the present perfect they applied the past simple here.

The final time that the present simple was massively but falsely used, namely by 67,3% of students, appeared in the sentence “[...]und ich nur eine kleine Unterstützung erhalte”. Although the grammatical tense is a present one, the real tense which aims to be expressed is the future tense. The factor that could have given rise to this error might be the preceding clause which contains a subjunctive and so contributes to the ambiguity of the whole tense concept.

Past simple

A reasonably easily explicable error occurred in the sentence “[...] sobald ich meine Lehre beendet habe”. According to CA the estimated tense that should have been used incorrectly was the past simple and in compliance with this 38,7% of students chose this tense. The students were possibly deceived by the German past tense and did not realise that after the conjunction *as soon as* the present simple should be used.

No matter how narrowly, still more students (39,3%) decided to use the past simple rather than the present simple (37,5%) when translating the clause “[...] dass es geklappt hat”. However, in relation to the context this sentence requires the present perfect be used in the translation because the preceding part of the sentence “Everybody stands around me and expects that [...]” strongly applies to the presence and change of the action.

Present perfect

A much more logical error occurred in sentences written in the German perfect tense which could have reminded the students of the English present perfect. This was of course a misleading association. The highest error rate of the above mentioned type occurred in the sentences “Wozu habe ich denn drei Jahre gelernt?” and “[...] dass ich gelernt habe und [...]”. In the first one, the number of present perfect translations rose to 77% and in the second sentence reached the height of 54,4%.

As if translated through a copy machine seems to be the sentence “Heute habe ich [...] gefeiert” where, probably due to the analogy with German tense formation, 33,9% of students went for the present perfect. The reason why 22,6% of them decided to use the present simple may be explained again on basis of the linking word *today* which the students might have associated with the present.

The same analogical error most likely motivated the misuse of the present perfect in the sentences “Denen habe ich erst erzählt [...]” and “dann haben die mir wieder erzählt [...]”. In both cases this tense was used by 18,3% of students instead of the correct past simple.

b) Modal verbs

The section of modal verbs is complicated not only for German native speakers, but also for many others since a simple distortion of a verb form or an inappropriate use of modality can change the whole meaning of the utterance. With respect to Richards's statement (274) that errors common for many foreign language learners are caused by intralanguage interference, I would range modal verbs to this group. If we take account of the possibility that a modal verb could be simultaneously a full verb as for example the verb *need* it is really not hard to make an error of selection. In the sentence "Dann brauche ich auch nicht mehr das Gelabere von meinen Eltern hören" the situation is the more misleading as the German full verb *brauchen* corresponds with the English full verb *to need* (to require). However, the negative verb form *to need* in English as well as the negative verb form of *brauchen* in German contain the second modal meaning, namely *don't have to*. While in German such modal meaning signals the presence of another full verb, in English the modal negative form (needn't to = need not to) visibly differs from the full verb negative form (don't need). Despite this, 24,6% of students misused the form "don't need" meaning "not to be in need of sth". Also those who chose the right form "I needn't to" had troubles with the right tense given by n. s. as a conditional form "I wouldn't have to". Yet, regardless of the tense and the wrong negative form, a relatively small amount of students let themselves be misled by the content matter as CA presupposed. Mentioning the content matter I have in mind the impact of interlanguage interference and another English verb expressing obligation or necessity - the modal verb *must*. Nevertheless, this verb exists only in a present form and its negative form *must not* (= *mustn't*) stands for another modal meaning being *not allowed to*. The negative form with *must* was wrongly used in 9,8% of translations.

A shining example of the mismatch based on graphical similarity is the confusion of the German modal verb *wollen* (want) with the English auxiliary verb *will* expressing the future tense. This confusion actually belongs to the group of faux-amis since this verb exchange takes place mostly in sentences where the German first person singular (*ich will*) is interchanged with the formally same verb *will* irrespective of their various meanings. This happens merely in 11,1% of translations which shows that for modal verbs intralanguage interference is more apparent.

c) Inflections errors

Although one would assume that in this group a huge number of mistakes would be made, it has been demonstrated that the percentage of mistakes actually made in our text was quite low. This applies naturally not to all kinds of morphologic mistakes. I want to mention just the most important groups where mistakes were to be found. Most of them can be ranged between errors of omission, addition and the special categories of overgeneralisation and fossilisation which are typical here. Surprisingly, the highest percentage of morphologic errors, namely 11,9% of them, were made in the connection of the indefinite article and a noun beginning with a vowel as for example *a aptitude test*, *a acceptance* or *a apprenticeship*. This error points out to the lack of students' grammatical competence and it is startling to a certain extent because a German n. s. normally does not face difficulties in the use of articles. The percentage of errors made in the use of participle is also relatively high. From the statistics it emerged that 7,2% of students are not able to put together the right form of the past or present participle. Most of them either applied some distorted form of the participle or they just used the infinitive instead of the participle. These are forms which occurred most frequently: *I've celebrate*, *you've get* and *I've learnd*. In this group overgeneralisation occurs most often.

Another group of errors whose occurrence surpassed the level of 5% are errors caused by the omission of the copula verb *be* in the process of tense building. A typical instance is omission of the verb *be* in present continuous sentences "everyone standing".

Now I want just briefly summarise other errors whose occurrence was slightly higher than 2%. Among these belongs the omission of plural ending of nouns such as *an application* or *a present*, errors made in adjective-noun agreement - *much gifts*, or the confusion of adjective and adverb - *first/firstly*, *terrible/terribly*. The last ones are examples of error of selection.

Similarly, in another category characterised by a lack of agreement between the subject and verb, a minimum of errors were detected. 1,2% of 2% of mistakes concerned the omission of the third person singular mostly in the sentence "Alle stehen um mich herum und *erwarten* [...]". I found many sentences where the first verb was used in agreement with the subject, but the second verb was not in agreement, which was

presumably caused by the distant position of subject. The last group I would like to mention briefly are irregular verbs in whose formation 2,1% errors were found.

In the text occurred also many spelling mistakes, but it is really difficult to classify them or to treat them appropriately. On that account, I'm limiting my essay to the enumeration of those which turned up most frequently. Those are distortions of the verb *want* (wount, won't), *live* (leave, life), *believe* (belive) or *happen* (happend). Additionally, students often incorrectly omitted or added some letter to a word as for example *allone*, *wich* (which), *positiv* or *maby*. A great deal of these mistakes could be ascribed to the performance errors which mean a lack of students' attention or to the misleading effect of phonology. After all, the morphologic level of language is definitely one of the most treacherous.

4.2.3. Analysis of syntactic level

In this category CA seems to grasp though there are some points where its prediction came partially true. As a possible explanation can serve that CA is capable of predicting only errors of interlingual origin, nevertheless errors on syntactic level are of mixed inter- and intralingual origin.

a) Sentence structure

The structure of English and German sentences differs of course in various points and also in this case it holds true that a verbatim translation inspired by the native language is ordinarily not the best solution. However, the merit of CA in this area is to be questioned since it tends to predict also structure errors which are never or very rarely made, whereas others leaves without notice. Moreover, in this area it is probably more obvious the influence of intralanguage interference as well as English level and the personal language feeling of individual translator. All in all, both performance and competence errors can appear typically in the form of an ordering error.

The fact that just a small number of students are aware of the misleading effect of interference is reflected in the following translation. Almost 71% of students transferred the sentence "Ich glaube, die wollen alle, dass ich ausziehe" as "I think everybody wants that I move out". Some of them apparently found this structure strange but still were not able to transfer it correctly, so they omitted the first subordinate clause and 17,7% provided the translation "They think that I want to move out". This version is

rather disorganised and grammatical persons are interchanged which results in a distorted meaning when compared to the correct version “I think that everybody wants me to move out” where the subject of the second German subordinate clause (ich) changes into object of the English sentence (me).

Surprisingly 14,5% of students decided to use more formal structure in the clause “Heute war mein Geburtstag”. It manifested itself when they added into the clause the *it*-subject which led to the sentence “Today *it* was my birthday”. This translation is not impossible, since in this case *it* stands for *anticipatory-it* and represents a subject extraposition. Otherwise the construction “Today was my birthday” is completely right as the adverbial of time can stand at the beginning when it emphasises the time of the given action.

The next interesting solution of sentence structure translation is the sentence “Die wollen mit mir einen Eignungstest machen, welcher Beruf mir liegt und so”. The problem here is contained in the fact that the German sentence is written in the spoken form. In formal German there should be added one more subordinate clause “Die wollen mit mir einen Eignungstest machen, *um zu wissen*, welcher [...]”. If the students had been confronted with the preceding sentence, they would have probably translated it correctly using the translation “They want me to do an aptitude test *to see/find out* which career would suit me.” Unfortunately, 53,6% of them did not add this in-between-sentence and they produced a flawed translation “They want me to do an aptitude test which career would suit me.” So they made an error of omission. Further, 63,2% of students did not pay respect to English syntax rules and in the first part of the sentence did not transfer the prepositional phrase “die wollen mit mir” into “they want me to do”, but they kept the prepositional phrase also in English. The final product was then “They want to do an aptitude test with me” which contains also the second and more likely meaning that they want to cooperate with me when doing the test. That is the final product of the error of addition.

b) Prepositional relations

In the field of prepositional relations could be also identified some errors often inflicted through faux-amis confusion. A typical example is the prepositional phrase “beim Arbeitsamt” which 21,5% of students translated as “by the job centre” in place of the correct “at the job centre”. Furthermore, the error in the phrase “von meinen Eltern”

lays in the erroneous assumption that the preposition is determined by the noun. That is why 40,3% of students used the translation “from my parents”. However, the right translation is based on the verb valence, namely “*listen to* my parents” or “the jabbering *of* my parents”. This is an instance of competence error but it can also point to performance error in the form of selection error.

c) Questions and question tags

The field of questions requires being regarded as a problematic part mainly because in German there are no operators and as a consequence word order and inversion can cause problems. In the only question in the text “Wozu habe ich denn drei Jahre gelernt?” 56,9% of students omitted the inversion and translated it by use of declarative sentence word order.

Owing to the fact that the German language does not have at its disposal auxiliary verbs, it is not always easy to recognise the structure requiring auxiliary verbs in English question tags. This may lead to simplifications or the disregarding of the target language's rules. In other words to translate the clause “Oder vielleicht doch?” literally as interlanguage interference advises us, would produce an unacceptable translation “Or maybe yes?” instead of the correct one “Or maybe I do?/Or maybe it is?”. Regardless of this 37,7% of students used the translation “Or maybe yes?” and 32,8% of them provided similar version “Or maybe?”. Unfortunately, both of these are wrong the same as the form “Or I will?” whose origin comes back to the previous sentence “But that’s not what I want?” (in German “Will ich aber gar nicht”) where some students confused the German verb *wollen* with English future tense *will*. Owing to this they used the translation “Or I will?” instead of the intended one “Or I want?” being of course also wrong but still semantically more corresponding to the context. In this case CA showed a quite high predictive level.

d) Ellipsis

In this subclass EA met the expectations of CA which had foreseen that the conjunction *that* would be often omitted in English translations, which is a sign of positive language transfer. Also in the sentence “Everyone stands around me and (everyone) expects that [...]” the second subject was mostly skipped. The idea to leave out the subject the same as in German sentence “War eigentlich ganz toll” occurred luckily to a minimum of

students and constructions such as “Was actually quite good” were very scarcely to be found.

To sum it up, on the syntactic level of language CA failed to predict errors correctly because it did not foresee many errors in word order, and conversely, predicted errors that were not made in reality. In other words, almost no errors occurred in the position of adverbials, word order after conjunctions and ellipsis.

4.2.4. Analysis of stylistic level

As with syntactic level, also here CA has only limited competence. Even if it can predict words liable to complications it is not within its power to determine the character of anticipated errors. One of the reasons could be that, similar to the morphologic level, errors on stylistic level are mostly the outcome of intralanguage interference.

a) Register

Considering register, the rate of semantically correct words which are translated into the informal register as the text requires varies depending on individual cases. For example the verb *erhalten* was mostly correctly translated by means of the informal version *to get* instead of the formal version *to receive*. On the other hand 53,2% of translating students used the formal quantifier *many* in favour of the more informal *a lot of* in the phrase “viele Geschenke”. In both cases we speak about errors of selection.

b) Non-standard vocabulary

Into this group belongs for example the word *Gelabere* which could be translated in many ways for illustration: *blabbering*, *nagging* or *lectures*. As evidence that it was really difficult for students to translate this word there were a high number of them - 22,6% who completely avoided it. Obviously they did not have any idea of how to transfer it, which points to their lack of competence and therefore is an error of omission. Another case in point is the German phrase *durchgedreht sein* which could be identified only from the context as *to be really upset*, *to be berserk* or *to go crazy*. Many a student was right in the choice of the adjective, just the copula verb was not always correct. 20,4% of students used the connection *to be crazy* which does not fit the informational context that the parents went berserk after the discovery that their child cannot find the work. It means that they had not been mad before. Almost as acceptable

would be then considered the translation *to get crazy* which was applied by 14,3% of translators.

5. Results evaluation

5.1. Evaluation of CA and EA methods

Up to this date, linguists cannot reach an agreement about the importance, effectiveness and use of CA and EA. Some of them claim that CA is not useful anymore as it fails to predict some errors (Corder 11), whereas others declare CA to be an indispensable part of EA (Schachter 361). But wherein lays the problem? In the golden times of CA, also called transfer analysis, it was generally believed that all errors can be clarified by means of interlanguage interference (Nickel 5). However, many linguists headed by teachers called attention to the fact that there is a quantity of errors which cannot be explained on the grounds of interlanguage transfer (Cowan 110). This led to the question - what gives rise to non-interlingual errors then? S.P. Corder offered the answer and explanation of this problem in the form of error analysis. Nevertheless, also EA is not ideal and it contains some issues it is criticised for. For instance Richards (201) mentions that “CA can predict errors that fail to materialise but it is equally true, that EA can fail to recognise errors which have materialised”.

As we have already applied both research methods I would like to appraise their effectiveness based on real data. At first, using CA we successfully predicted some errors that the students subsequently really made. The highest success rate was found in errors of competence caused by language transfer which comprise cross-associations, language switch errors, false friends, and phonetically as well as semantically conditioned errors. Regarding language levels, CA was most predictive at the semantic-lexical level and least at the syntactic level.

Nevertheless, by the use of EA we recognised additional errors that CA did not forecast, so that EA proved to be a much more useful tool for errors detection. With its aid we were able to find errors of competence as well as errors of performance but it was not always easy to distinguish between them for they are often displayed in the same form or they are of mixed origin. For example in German negative sentence “Ich will nicht” it is hard to determine which factor contributed most to the incorrect translation “I won’t”. It could have been either the interlingual interference with the negative form of English

auxiliary verb *will*, semantic-phonetic interference due to the English verb *to want* or the wrong application of the German rule relating to the question formation which is of intralingual origin. Chiefly, with performance errors we can hardly draw a line between mistakes made due to insufficient language competence, intralingual interference and those induced by psychical or physical state of the translator. As a result, the application of EA showed us that it is able to count errors' incidence on almost all language levels, with only the morphologic level being difficult to manage, but on the other hand it stays often unsuccessful when explaining the origin and cause of an errors' occurrence.

From the above mentioned facts we can draw few conclusions. Practical findings speak in favour of linguists who claim that CA fails to predict an important number of errors. Simultaneously the results do not support the opinion that EA is able to account for all errors. To give a reason, CA is capable of predicting only those errors stemming from the interference between the source and target language, namely interlingual errors or competence errors. In other words, it entirely disregards errors which could not be explained by means of interlingual transfer and these are errors of performance.

5.2. Errors' frequency

Altogether in the translations I found 4340 errors (N =4340). In order to assess the level with the highest error incidence, I counted the absolute frequency using the formula $f = x_i/N$, where x_i expresses the number of errors on single language levels. As a result, the majority of errors, namely 54,6% occurred on the lexical - semantic level, 32% of them on morphologic level, 9,7% on syntactic level and the remaining 3,7 % on stylistic level. Yet, it is also interesting to know in how many cases did the students make an error within the single language levels, in other words to determine the relative error frequency on every language level. The statistics state that the students made 57,8% of the errors that were possible to be made on a stylistic level, remarkably lower is the percentage of lexical-semantic errors, namely 29%. Further, 21,5% errors were listed on a syntactic level and finally circa 18,8% errors were of morphologic origin.

When we focus on groups with the highest error rate within the given excerpt, nobody can argue that the highest error rate occurred with particles, specifically 69,1% students were wrong in their particles' translations. A similar error rate (67,3%) occurred on the stylistic level in the group of non-standard vocabulary. Actually even higher was the error rate of question and question tags, however this result is skewed on account of the

minimal data sample which creates only 14,3% of all syntactic errors. Additionally, more than half of the students made errors in the group of false friends (55,2%) and idioms (55,1%), yet we have to take into consideration the fact that the sample data of false friends include only 16,1% of all lexical-semantic errors and with idioms merely 6,2% errors on the same language level. Nevertheless, it is positive that a similar result was expected by CA.

As for the lowest errors scores, three of them appeared, maybe a bit surprisingly, on the syntactic level. The absolutely lowest error rate, namely 2,6% was noted with the group including the position of adverbials, 5,6% errors were made in word order after conjunctions and only 6,7% treated wrongly the case of ellipsis. Quite surprisingly, only 6,2% of errors were generally made by inflections which points to the fact that the influence of intralingual interference is relatively low. Yet, there is one group which did not meet expectations; that is the class of transparent words. With transparent words, 38,6% of students made an error which is by a group influenced mainly by positive transfer is a wonder. However, there was a really restricted sample of transparent words in the text, so the result might be partially distorted.

5.3. Table summary of errors

Evidence of hypothetical errors and number of partly incomplete translations regarding the single groups and phenomena

	Hypothetical errors in 1 translation	Number of incomplete translations
transparent words	7	5
cross-associations	95	13
false friends	9	13
particles	21	9
tense	27	13
modal verbs	9	6
indirect speech	1	0
inflections	cca 70	13
non-standard vocabulary	3	8
register	2	13
position of adverbials	5	4
word order after conjunctions	9	12
questions + q. tags	1	0
structure	10	11
ellipsis	3	2
prepositional relations	8	6
idioms	5	3

Errors in different subclasses of language levels

Group	Hypothetical errors (H)	Real errors (Re)	% of errors in the group (Re/H)	% of errors on lex-sem. Level (Re/LS)
transparent words	412	159	38,60%	6,8%
cross-associations	5611	864	15,40%	36,40%
false friends	692	382	55,20%	16,10%
particles	1185	819	69,10%	34,50%
idioms	282	147	52,10%	6,20%
Lexical-semantic errors	8182	2371 (LS)	29,00%	100%

Group	Hypothetical errors (H)	Real errors (Re)	% of errors in the group (Re/H)	% of errors on morph. Level (Re/MO)
tense	1833	853	46,50%	61,60%
modal verbs	495	185	37,40%	13,40%
indirect speech	50	4	8%	0,30%
inflections	more than 5000	341	max. 6,2%	24,70%
Morphologic errors	circa 7378	1388 (MO)	18,80%	100%

Group	Hypothetical errors (H)	Real errors (Re)	% of errors in the group (Re/H)	% of errors on stylistic level (Re/ST)
register	104	43	41,30%	26,80%
non-standard voc.	173	117	67,30%	73,20%
Stylistic errors	277	160 (ST)	57,80%	100%

Group	Hypothetical errors (H)	Real errors (Re)	% of errors in the group (Re/H)	% errors on syntactic level (Re/SY)
position of adverbials	302	8	2,60%	2%
word order after conjunctions	468	26	5,60%	6,10%
questions + question tags	61	60	98,40%	14,30%
structure	530	214	40,40%	50,70%
ellipsis	179	12	6,70%	2,90%
prepositional relations	416	101	24,30%	24%
Syntactic errors	1956	421 (SY)	21,50%	100%

Total summary of error rate

	Real errors (Re)	% of errors on the lang.level (Re/T)
Lexical-semantic level	2371	54,60%
Morphologic level	1388	32%
Stylistic level	160	3,70%
Syntactic level	421	9,70%
Total number of errors (T)	4340	100%

5.4. Types of errors and their general occurrence

But which errors occur with a higher frequency – performance errors or errors of competence? To remind the reader, performance errors are the result of faulty or incomplete learning of the target language, physical and psychological state of the learner and intralingual interference (Corder 10). Hence it follows that every translation is influenced by the specific physical and psychological state of the translator which inevitably leads to a certain amount of mistakes. It is remarkable that in the case of intralingual errors we can identify errors generally made by almost all learners of English as a second language, irrespectively of their mother tongue (Richards 274). Such typical mistakes would be the lack of subject-verb agreement, omission of third person singular “s”, forms of irregular verbs or phonetic distortions. These are arguments for the prevalence of intralingual errors.

However, when we think of the strong form of CA as well as of interference hypothesis, they both claim that most errors made by second language learners are produced due to the influence of the native language on the foreign language. With respect to our excerpt, we can judge of course only the specific German-English interference. The question is therefore – do German translators/learners more often face performance or competence errors? It has already been said that just to recognise both errors types is very difficult and one type of error could be in one language intralingual and in another interlingual (Schachter, Celce-Murcia 280). But on the grounds of the collected data I came to conclusion that interlingual errors (errors of competence) appeared significantly more often than errors of performance.

So we attained the knowledge that in translations from German to English interlanguage interference dominates. Now this itself suggests a question - is there a stronger negative or positive interference with regard to the fact that German and English are sister languages? To define our terms, *positive interference* means that a native language facilitates the process of foreign language learning owing to its similar structure or logical organisation, but these similarities might at the same time mislead a learner astray (Dušková 26). In such cases we talk about *negative interference* which brings into focus errors made in the foreign language which were inflicted by the native language.

Many people would probably automatically suppose that the relatedness of the two languages has to facilitate the learning/translating process which would work in favour of positive transfer. The response is maybe astonishing but everything is suggestive of the fact that negative interference is predominant. Positive transfer occurred only with transparent words, and partly on the syntactic and stylistic level. This means that the relationship between the German and English language probably more complicates German and English n. s. the learning process of the opposite L2 than facilitates it. This result also supports the study of Kupsch-Losereit (545) who stated that the influence of negative language transfer is more probable in cases where there is a relatively weak contrast between the native and target languages because the translator has a tendency to use assimilation strategies. Still, we cannot generalise this statement for all learning stages, since the influence of the mother tongue is different at various stages of second language learning (Kufner, 127). So we have to restrict our finding to the intermediate L2 learners of English.

6. Conclusion

To sum up, with the use of contrastive analysis we can foresee only errors caused by interlanguage interference; all the others stay, for our observation, hidden. Therefore it is almost impossible to predict performance errors, which explains why the lowest success rate of CA can be found on the morphologic level. One can partly forecast syntactic errors, but the greatest success is with the prediction of lexical-semantic errors. Furthermore it is really interesting that some errors pointed out by contrastive analysis were almost not observed in the translations. These relate to the errors including position of adverbials, word order after conjunctions or ellipsis. When applying CA we have to take into consideration that differences in the amount and also the division of errors occur with various researchers as there are neither generally valid approaches to error prediction nor criteria for error classification. All in all, the application of CA is also highly subjective and does not provide us with generally relevant results.

In comparison to CA, the method of error analysis seems to be more useful, yet it is sometimes almost impossible to determine whether some structure is already erroneous or not. However clear the quantitative results of EA seem to be, one mustn't forget that they are dependent on the sample range. Supposing the sample to be too small, also the percentage of errors' occurrence is distorted, which is the reason why I counted the error rate of single groups within the given text as well as the error rate of every group within the appropriate language level. To give a concrete example, if the occurrence of idioms' errors in the given excerpt is 52,1% and the occurrence of idioms' errors on the lexical-semantic level is only 6,2%, we can infer that this result is relative and cannot be further generalised. So we have the overview of students' success rate relating to the given text and also the kind of general knowledge about the proportion of errors' occurrence at various language levels as well as the number of errors made on single language levels. However, I am aware of the fact, that neither the gained results nor the errors' rate are precise and cannot be used as general indicators of errors in the English language. The aim of the quantitative analysis was just to provide some data in which my final results could be grounded.

Furthermore, it is hard to comment on the occurrence of interlanguage or intralanguage errors in our excerpt because their sources are not equivocally determined. Nevertheless, it can be said that a significantly greater amount of words were influenced

by negative rather than by positive transfer. Negative transfer was most obvious on the lexical-semantic level of language and it played a considerable role on the syntactic level too. Intralanguage interference appeared almost on all language levels but its prevalence occurred mainly on the morphologic level, primarily in spelling and tense formation.

The absolute majority of errors - specifically 54,6% occurred on the lexical-semantic level of language and the minority - namely 3,7% were made by students on stylistic level. Yet, considering the relative error rate with respect to the amount of hypothetically erroneous items in the given text, the most misleading proved to be stylistic level (57,8%) whereas on others language levels errors occurred with similar frequency.

7. Appendix

7.1. Source text

Rosige Aussichten

12. Juni

Heute war mein Geburtstag. Ich habe viele Geschenke bekommen. Ich glaube, die wollen alle, dass ich ausziehe. Ich bin doch aber erst 18 Jahre geworden. Die glauben wohl, dass ich ausziehen will, sobald ich meine Lehre beendet habe. Will ich aber gar nicht! Oder vielleicht doch? Naja! Alleine wohnen? Nach Hause kommen, wann ich will, mitbringen, wen ich will, essen, was ich will. Dann brauche ich auch nicht mehr das Gelabere von meinen Eltern hören. Hat was für sich. Ich werde es mir überlegen.

23. Juni

Heute habe ich in der Firma Abschied gefeiert, war eigentlich ganz toll. Ich habe schon eine Menge Bewerbungen geschrieben, aber noch keine Zusage erhalten. Das ist so furchtbar, wenn man eine Absage bekommt. Alle stehen um mich herum und erwarten, dass es geklappt hat. Wenn wieder nichts passiert ist und ich eine Absage erhalten habe, bemitleiden sie mich. „Mach dir mal nichts draus! Der nächste Brief ist bestimmt eine Zusage.“ Oder: „Es wird schon werden, du hast ja auch noch deine Eltern, die helfen dir ja noch.“

20. September

Heute war ich beim Arbeitsamt. Die wollen mit mir einen Eignungstest machen, welcher Beruf mir liegt und so. Denen habe ich erst einmal erzählt, dass ich gelernt habe und mir dieser Beruf Spaß macht. Die spinnen wohl! Wozu habe ich denn drei Jahre gelernt? Doch nicht, wieder was Neues zu lernen! Bescheuert! Dann haben die mir wieder erzählt, dass es keine Stellen gäbe und ich nur eine kleine Unterstützung erhalte. Mutti und Vati sind fast durchgedreht.

7.2. Translation by an American n.s.

Bright Prospects

June 12

Today was my birthday. I got a lot of presents. I think that everyone wants me to move out. But I just turned 18! They probably think that I want to move out as soon as I finish my apprenticeship. But that's not what I want! Or maybe it is? Hmmm. To live alone? To come home whenever I want, to bring whomever I want with me, to eat whatever I want. Then I wouldn't have to listen to my parent's nagging anymore. That does sound good. I'll think about it.

June 23

Today I had my farewell party at work; it was actually really nice. I've already sent out several applications, but I haven't received a positive answer yet. It's so terrible when I receive a rejection letter. Everybody stands around me, expecting that it's worked out. When nothing has changed and it's just a rejection letter, then everyone feels sorry for me. „Don't worry about it! Next time you'll definitely get good news.“ Or they say, „It'll work out—and you still have your parents, and they'll help you for sure.

September 20

I was at the unemployment office today. They want to give me an aptitude test to see which career would be the best fit for me and so on. I told them then that I had done an apprenticeship and that I enjoy the career I've chosen. They're crazy! What was the point of doing three years of training? I definitely don't want to train for something new again! It's so stupid! Then they told me again that there aren't any jobs and that I will only receive a small amount of support. Mom and Dad almost lost it.

7.3. Translation by a British n.s.

Bright prospects

12th June

Today was my birthday. I got a lot of presents. I think they all want me to move out. But I've only just turned 18! They seem to think I want to move out as soon as I've finished my apprenticeship. But I really don't want to! Or maybe I do? Living on my own? Coming home when I want, having whoever I want over, eating what I want. Then I wouldn't have to listen to my parents blabbering on anymore. That's a bonus. I'll think about it.

23rd June

Today I had a leaving party at work, it was actually quite good. I've already sent off tons of job applications but I haven't had any good news yet. It's awful when you get a rejection. Everyone crowds around and expects me to have gotten the job. And if there's still no good news and I've got a rejection letter they try to console me. "Don't worry about it! You'll definitely get it next time." Or, "You'll get there, you've still got your parents after all, they're still there to help."

20th September

Today I went to the job centre. They want me to do an aptitude test to see which career would suit me and so on. I told them straight away that I'm qualified and that I enjoy my chosen career. They must be crazy. Why did I train for three years then? Definitely not so I could start from scratch again. For God's sake! Then they told me again that there aren't any jobs and that I'll only get a small allowance. Mum and Dad nearly lost it.

7.4. Sample of students' translations

12. July (40)
Today was my Birthday. I become much gifts. I think they all want that I ^{dislike} leave. But I get only 18 years old. They think I leave, when I finish my doctrine. But I don't want! Or maybe? Leave alone? Come home, when I want, take with me who I want, eating ^{what} ~~when~~ I want.
Then I doesn't must hear on my parents. That has something for yourself.
I will thinking about it.

23. July
Today ~~was~~ we celebrat my Farewell in the Company, what was great. I has written a lots of Applications, but I don't get Commitment. That's horrible when you only get cancellations. Everybody stand around and thinking that it folded. When again nothing folded and I only get cancellations everybody fel sorry to me and ~~say~~ Don't angry the next letter is a Commitment and you also have your parents who help you?

20. Septembe
Today I was by the Employment exchange. They want that I do a Aptitude test, for which work Profession was what for me. At first I tell them that I have learn and that I have fun by this work. They are spinning! Why I learn three years? Not a new one! Stupid! They tell me again there no work for me and I only get a little help.

My mother and were not happy about it.

But I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

and I will never forget the way you were just

4

Romy outlook

12th June

Today was my birthday. I have got a lot of presents.

I think everybody want that I move off. But I'm already 18 years old. They think that I ~~will~~ will move off when I ~~have~~ have finished learning. But I don't want this. Or maybe will I? Well! Live for my own? Coming home whenever I will, look with me who I want to, eat what I want to eat. Then I haven't to hear about the speaking of my parents. This has something. I will think about it.

23th June

Today I have celebrated a great party at the company for looking off.

I have written a lot of applications, but without a positive message. ~~It's~~ ^{it's} horrible to get a bad message. Everybody stands around me and think that it works. If it doesn't work they feel sorry for me. "Don't cry! The next letter, of course, is a good message." Or: "It will work, your parents will help you."

20th September

Today I was at the job center. They will make a aptitude test with me which job is good for me. First I have said that I have learned and the job is funny. They are crazy! For what have I learned three years long? Not to learn something new! Silly! Then they have told me that there is no job and I only get a small support. My mother and father nearly are cracked up.

A good view

6

12. June

Today was my birthday. I've got many presents. I think, they want that I'm moving out. But I'm just 18 years old. They think I want to move out when I finished my apprenticeship. I don't want!

Or maybe yes? Well. Living alone? Come home when I want, bring friends when I want and eating what I want. Then I don't have ~~to~~ to hear the ~~pat~~ jabbering from my parents. That would be great. I think about it.

23. June

Today we celebrated my resignation in my firm, it was great.

I have written many applications but didn't get any commitment.

It's so horrible to get a negative reply. Everybody expects that all is running good. If it don't work, and I get a negative reply again, they feel sorry for me. "Don't be afraid. The next letter will be a commitment." Or: "It will be good, you have your parents, they take care of you."

20. September

Today was by the employment exchange. They want to make an aptitude test, which job I should choose and so on.

I told them that I have learned and that I love my job.

They are crazy! I have learned for three years, for what?

For sure not to learn something new. Stupid! Then they told me, that they have no job for me and I just get a little support. Mom and Dad getting very angry.

Rosy outlook

10

12th June

Today was my birthday. I get a lots of presents. I think, that all want, to leave my home. But I only 18 years. I think, that I would like to leave my home, as soon as my Teaching ends. But I don't want. Or perhaps yes? Well! Alone live? Come home, when I want, bring, when I won't, food, what I will. Than I don't hear the hooney from my parents. Has something for themselves. I think about it.

23rd June

Today I have celebra... my Farewell in the company, it was great. I have written so many applications, but no appeal. It's horrible, to get a cancellation. All the people stand around of me and expect, that it has folded. When nothing happens and I got a cancellation, they pity me. "Don't worry! The next letter is certainly an application." Or: "It will be ok, you have your parents, they help you."

20th September

Today I was at the employment exchange. They want to make an aptitude test with me, which job is good for me. I told them, that I learned a job and I liked them. The spin well! Why I have learned 3 years? That not, that I learn something new! Stupid! Than they told me, that they have no job and I get a little support. Mum and Dad are hanged.

June 12

Today is my birthday. I've got a lot of presents. I think they all want me to get undressed. But ~~that~~ I'm only 18 years old. They already think that I would like to undress as soon as I can finish my apprenticeship. But I won't that. Or maybe yet? Well? Life alone? To come home whenever I like, bring anyone in my house, and eat what I like whenever I would like to do this. So then I haven't to hear what my parents always says. That have something for oneself. I will think about that.

June 23

Today I have celebrated my farewell in the company, that was really great. I've written a lot of applications, but I haven't got consent. That is very horrible when I get a refusal. Everybody stands around me and look at me expectant. When I already get nothing or a refusal they always pity me. They says things like "at the next time you get something" or so on.

September 20

Today I was at the job center. They want me to make a aptitude test, to find out which jobs suits me. I have told only once that I have learned and me makes this job fun. They are stupid? What I have learned 3 years? But not, again to learn something new. Stupid? Then they told me again that no jobs would be there and I only get it a little support. Mum and Dad almost cry.

23

Rosy Outlooks

12th June

Today was my Birthday. I got many presents. I think they want that I move. But I am just become 18 years old. They think perhaps that I want to move after ^{my} ^{solved} apprenticeship. But I don't want to! Or maybe want? Whatever! Living alone? Come home when I want, take with me who I want, eat what I want. Then I don't need to listen to the talk of my parents. Got something. I will think about it.

23rd June

Today I celebrate my Goodbye in the firm, was actually very nice. I wrote already many job applications but I didn't get an answer yet. That's horrible to get a regret. All standing around me and expect that it happen. When again nothing happen and again get a regret they pity me. "Don't care about! The next letter is definitely a acceptance." Or: "It will get well you've got also your parents, who help you yet."

20th September

Today I was at the employment centre. They want to do a aptitude test with me, which job fit to me and such things. I told them that I had learned already and that I like that job. They're nuts! What for had I had learned three years? Not for learning something new! Daft! Then they told me again that there are no jobs and that I just get less aid, Mum and Dad get almost none.

Rosy view

24

12th of June

Today was my birthday. I get lot's of presents. I think, they want all, that I move out. But I am just 18. They think, they I want to move out, when I finish my work. But I don't want it! Or maybe ~~may~~ maybe yes? Well! To live alone? To come home, whenever I want, bring, who I want, eat, what I want. Then I don't need to hear this "Blablabla" from my parents. This has something. I would think about it.

23th of June

Today I have celebrate in the firm, it was actually good. I have written a lot of applications, but no acceptance. That is so horrible, when you get a refusal. All are standing around me and wait for, that it ~~works~~ has worked. When nothing is going right and I got a refusal, they felt sorry. "No problem! In the next letter will be an acceptance." Or: "It will be good, you also have your parents and they will help you."

20th of September

Today I was at the job centre. They want me to do such an aptitude test, that I can find out, what job is good for me and so. An I talked to them, that I have learned something and this job make me happy. They were absolutely crazy. For what I have learned for three years? Just not, to learn something new! Stupid! Then they have told me that it gives no jobs and I just get a little support. Mother and father were turning round!

Rosy outlook

38

12. Juni

Today was my Birthday. I became a lot of presents. I think, they like that I leave. But I am eighteen years old. They think I will leave when I end my doctrine. But that's not true or is it true? Living alone? Coming home, when I want and who I want. Eating what I want. I don't hear my parents.

23. Juni

Today we celebrate my farewell in the company. That was great. I have written many applications, but I don't have a promise yet. That's so terrible when you get a refusal. They are all standing around you and they wait for a new job for me. When it's a refusal they pity me like "Don't worry, the next is a promise. Or your parents are helping you."

20. September

Today I was at the employment exchange. They would like to do a fitness test with me. Because they would find out what job is the best for me. I said to them what I have learned and that the job is great fun. I have learned three years. For nothing? They told me that there is no job for me.

and my mother and father are not very happy about that.

I want to study hard and get a good job. I will leave when I am 18 years old. I will study hard and get a good job. I will leave when I am 18 years old.

I want to study hard and get a good job. I will leave when I am 18 years old. I will study hard and get a good job. I will leave when I am 18 years old.

I want to study hard and get a good job. I will leave when I am 18 years old. I will study hard and get a good job. I will leave when I am 18 years old.

8. Sources

Brown, Douglas. *Principles of Language Teaching and Learning*. London: Longman, 2000.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne and Jacquelin Schachter. "Some Reservations Concerning Error Analysis". *Second Language Learning: Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Related Aspects*. Ed. Robinett, Betty Wallace and Jacquelyn Schachter. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1983. 274-280.

Cole, Stacey. "Semantic Errors in Translation". *One Hour Translation*, 2008. Web. 4 Dec. 2014. Retrieved from: <http://www.onehourtranslation.com/translation/blog/semnatic-errors-translation#sthash.XXrUpttt.iV8nQszB.dpuf>

Connor Linton, Jeff, ed. *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.

Corder, Stephen Pit. *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.

Cowan, J. Ronayne. "Toward a Psychological Theory of Interference in Second Language Learning". *Second Language Learning: Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Related Aspects*. Ed. Robinett, Betty Wallace and Jacquelyn Schachter. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1983. 110 – 116.

Dušková, Libuše. „On Sources of Errors in Foreign Language Learning“ in IRAL 7 (1983). 11-36.

Chesterman, Andrew. *Contrastive Functional Analyses*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998.

Freudenstein, Reinhold, Ed. *Error in Foreign Languages: Analysis and Treatment*. Marburg: Informationszentrum für Fremdsprachenforschung, 1989.

Grady, Kate. "Transparent words or Faux-amis?". *TranslationDirectory.com*. Portal for Language Professionals and their Clients, 2003. Web. 4 Dec. 2014. Retrieved from: <http://www.translationdirectory.com/article147.htm>

James, Carl. *Contrastive Analyses*. Harlow, Essex: Longman Group Ltd, 1980.

James, Carl. "The Exculpation of Contrastive Linguistics". *Second Language Learning: Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Related Aspects*. Ed. Robinett, Betty Wallace and Jacquelyn Schachter. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1983. 88-98.

Krzeszowski, Tomasz. *Contrastive generative grammar: theoretical foundations*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1979.

- Kufner, Herbert L. „English-deutsche Interferenzen am Beispiel der Modalverben.“
Sprachliche Interferenz: Festschrift für Werner Betz zum 65. Geburtstag. Ed. Kolb, Herbert.
Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1977. 127-137.
- Kupsch-Losereit, Sigrid. “Interferenz in der Übersetzung“. *Übersetzung: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*. Ed. Wiegand, Herbert Ernst. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004. 543 – 550.
- Lado, Robert. *Linguistics Across Cultures*. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1975.
- Liefländer-Koistinen, Luise Joensuu. „Modalpartikeln als Übersetzungsproblem.“
Übersetzung: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. Ed. Wiegand,
Herbert Ernst. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004. 550 - 554.
- Nickel, Gerhard, ed. *Papers in Contrastive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971.
- Palmberg, Rolf. *A Select Bibliography of Error Analysis and Interlanguage Studies*.
Slottsgatan: Abo Akademi, 1980.
- Pan Wenguo and Tham Wai Mun, eds. *Contrastive Linguistics: History, Philosophy and Methodology*. London: Continuum, 2007.
- Richards, Jack C., “A Noncontrastive Approach to Error Analysis” in *English Language Teaching Journal*, 25 (1971). 197-209, Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Selinker, Larry. “Interlanguage”. *Second Language Learning: Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Related Aspects*. Ed. Robinett, Betty Wallace and Jacquelyn Schachter. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1983. 176-189.
- Spillner, Bernd. *Error Analyses: A Comprehensive Biography*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1991.
- Turnbull, Joan, ed. *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.