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ABSTRACT
Knowledge about what the learners’ know is part of teaching process, since the knowledge would be the clue for teachers in designing lesson material as well as method. Error analysis then becomes a common practice for language teachers to elicit what the learners have acquired. Translation is a kind of language skill which requires both linguistic and non linguistic knowledge. Thus studying students’ language used in their translation would be beneficial for teachers. This study is aimed at finding error on the students’ translation. This finding should give a description about the students’ obstacles in translation process. The writer took randomly ten (10) translation result of the students at English Education Program of FKIP UIKA Bogor as the sample data. Error analysis procedure is used; i.e. identifying, describing, explaining, and finding the cause of the error. The study found that students made some lexical errors such as miss spelling and inappropriate word choice. This is assumed to be caused by students’ lack of knowledge on spelling, word formation, word equivalence, and different point of view in Indonesian and English expressions. The grammatical error found are the use of affixes, verb, word order, and auxiliaries. The practice of omitting and adding was also found. Some shows the students’ effort to avoid the word due to their difficulties in putting the correct word in the construction. Others show that they are trying to use translation strategy, i.e. modulation to anticipate the difficulties in having literal translation. All findings should give an illustration that students need to be equipped more with the knowledge about how both source and target language operate to express meaning.
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INTRODUCTION
The study of translation is very useful language education. The translation process which is not simple has provided evidence of the various difficulties faced by translators in the translation process. The difficulty can arise from the different characteristics of the source text language and target text language. Translators must master both aspects; linguistic and non-linguistic aspects. Linguistic aspects include phonological, morphological, semantic, and syntactic and non-linguistic aspects such as culture both in source and target languages. In order to carry out translation work properly, a good translator should have translation efforts. According to Hoed (2006), a translator is required to have three conditions, namely (1) knowing broad or general knowledge (and special knowledge if he has to translate a technical text), (2) having the intelligence to understand a text and see quickly the ‘logic’ of the text that must be translated, and (3) have the ability to rhetoric, namely the ability to manipulate language to produce a translation that is equivalent, accurate, and acceptable to the reader (or listener).

Related to the explanation above, the English Language Education Study Program, FKIP UIKA Bogor, has launched a 'Translation' course of 4
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(four) credits which are given in 2 (two) semesters. The giving of courses is intended so that students can become good translators. In connection with the three requirements put forward by Hoed above, the question arises whether the students have met the criteria as good translators. Of course this is interesting to discuss further, in accordance with Newmark’s (1988) statement that translation criticism is an important component in translation courses, because, firstly it can increase competence, secondly it can expand knowledge and understanding of foreign languages and the topics discussed, the third helps add ideas about translation. Furthermore, Newmark said that a translation result can be assessed by several authorized parties, namely: (a) examiners paid by the company; (b) head of section or company; (c) clients; (d) translator critic; (e) readers for published works.

The author realizes that there are many things that students must master in the translation process. What they already know and what they don't yet are important questions to improve the performance of student translation results. For this reason, it is necessary to study various things that become obstacles for students in translating. These constraints can be interpreted from the results of their translation. This is like what is done in an analysis study of the intermediate language (interlanguage) which is intended to determine the ability of the target language of the learner's translator from the errors shown from their language production.

The study should initiate further studies on the impact of knowledge on the topic and the translator’s expertise in understanding the logic of the text. According to the author, this study is important as an effort to improve the process of giving this course in order to achieve the goals that have been set out in the curriculum, which is to provide students with translation skills. The description of a student's ability to produce an acceptable form of language can be used to develop a curriculum that combines language skills and translation

LITERATURE REVIEW
This literature review discusses several things related to the subject of this paper as follows:

Aims of Translation
In looking at the translator's purpose, we must look at whether he removes some parts of the text that are not in line with his thoughts, or maybe they exaggerate which results in a longer text. We can also see how far he deculturalized and replaced it with the target language culture. We can deduce what the translator meant after we assumed why the translator used the procedure. In this case we can empathize in seeing the translator, that there must be a distinction between translators who have a specific purpose and translators who are less competent both on the topic and the language of origin.

As mentioned in the background section, the translator referred to in this paper is a translator learner, so whatever he does, namely either adding or removing content from the source language, is not intended to adjust to his ideology, but because of his lack of competence. This is especially interesting if we relate it to the translation process.

Translation Process
Hoed et al (1993) explain that the translation process is carried out in stages in order to produce a good translation. The stages of translation are as follows:

The first stage is analysis phase. At this stage the translator learns the source language text both in terms of form and content. Since the system of the source language and the target language is different, the translator's attention should be directed to the grammar of the
source and to look for its equivalent in the target language. Grammatic and semantic aspects such as structure, word order, meanings between words and word combinations, original and figurative meanings are things that must be analyzed so that the translator gets a good understanding of the message.

The second is the transfer stage. It is done initially from the translator's mind. The translator must not immediately divert short sentences that do not appear to have a meaningful relationship. The language element that connects sentences containing old and new information is very important. Contents must be retained. The third is conformity. In one language there are always at least three main levels, namely the professional variety, the everyday variety, and the popular variety. For that the translator must be able to compile the text in accordance with the prevalence in this variety. Matching is best done in teams, according to Hoed et al. (1993). There are two translation procedures, namely transposition and modulation (Hoed, et al. 1993). The transposition procedure is (Newmark, 1988) is a translation procedure that involves changing the grammatical form from the source language to the target language. Modulation is the search for equivalents and variation settings through setting or changing points of view, perspective or changing categories of thought. Judging between the source language and the target language, Newmark classifies translation into eight types, namely word-for-word translation, faithful translation, semantic translation, adaptation, free translation, idiomatic translation, and communicative translation.

All translation knowledge should be acknowledged by translators to make the translation process at optimum rate. The ability in translating may perceive the language competence also. A professional translator must have acquired the two languages being transferred well. Even though not necessarily that language learners must be translators, the process of translation itself has supported language learning. Investigating the result of learners’ translation may be useful to identify how the learners know the language. Moreover under the condition that the students are not prepared for being a translator specifically but to be able to use the language learnt in many different purposes.

Comparing Translation Result
In comparing the translation results with the original language, we should classify by title, structure, including paragraph structure and sentence links, shifts, metaphors, words related to culture, translationese, proper names, word- neologisms, words that cannot be translated, ambiguity, level language, and where relevant, meta language, and sound effects. In this case, criticism must be in the form of a discussion of the problem of translation, and not merely presenting 'what is the correct translation'. The assessor must be able to find roughly what made the interpreter choose another expression. This section is at the heart of evaluating translation works.

In this paper, due to limited space and time, the writer will take one of the aspects being compared, namely the language level aspect. In addition, this also departs from the assumption that the translators studied are learners who are still in the process of translating the source language into the target language.

Judging the Translation Result
Translation can be judged based on the accuracy of references and pragmatics of the translation results using translating standards. If the translation is not clear in the original version, one must first consider whether an important "invariant" element in the text is
represented. If the purpose of the text is to sell, influence, prohibit, or express feelings, then this goal is the key to the invariant existence.

After identifying the successful results of the translation against its objectives, we can judge against our standards of pragmatic and referential accuracy. The most important question is the quality and extent of the lack of meaning in the translation work. Furthermore, the translation result can also be assessed as a 'writing', which is separate from the original: if the text is non-individual the text is informative or persuasive, you hope that the text is neat, elegant, and acceptable. If the text is personal and authoritative, we must judge how well the translator captures the idiolects of the original text, no matter whether it is cliché, natural, or innovative. What makes a translation work good or not is still a matter of debate, but usually translator judges often use criteria rather than norms. One of the criteria is that the translation results fulfill the purpose or function of the text. Newmark pointed out that several text functions include expressive, informative, vocative, aesthetic, fatigue, and metilingual functions. Kridalaksana (1998) observes that Nida and Taber in Newmark provide guidance in assessing the goodness of translation results, namely when it is made with an orientation to the reader or listener, and if the emphasis is clear, is it more on the source language or target language. Furthermore, he suggested some guidelines for assessing translation results as follows:

- Translation must show that the translator has high proficiency in the source language
- Translation must show that the translator has high proficiency in the target language
- Translation must show that the translator has sufficient knowledge of the material it translates
- Translation must show that the translator is familiar with the methods and techniques of translation.

In addition, Newmark (1988) classifies the way of assessing translation into four dimensions, namely (1) translation as a science, namely assessment in terms of pure language. The translation results can be said to be true or false based on linguistic criteria; (2) translating as a result of a method, which is an attempt at translation to achieve a suitable equivalent and meet reasonableness in the target language; (3) translation as an art, which is related to aesthetic translation. This translation is not only for message transfer, but also for creation; (4) translated as an appetite. This concerns the translator's personal choice.

Words and Context

According to Newmark (1988), translators are never out of words. They translate by word based on word. However, words can never be separated from the context of language, reference, culture, and personal. The linguistic context can be in the form of collocation, or more broadly in the form of sentences in the form of metaphors, sometimes words are also linguistically limited by units that are larger than sentences, especially for concept words that are continuously used and modified from one paragraph to the next.

Reference context is related to the topic of the text. Certain words are used specifically for certain topics. Meanwhile, the cultural context is related to the way of thinking and behaving in the language-speaking community. Individual context means that the word
used is the idiom of the speaker. So, it is possible that the words used by the translator are context-bound, some are looser.

Another problem for translation is collocation. In linguistics, collocation is defined as the existence of lexical items as individual habits. Examples of collocations in English are:

- Adjective plus noun: heavy labor, economic situation
- Noun plus noun: nerve cell, government security
- Verb plus object: pay a visit, win a victory

Apart from that there are many more collocations in English, translators often work hard to find appropriate collocations that can be used in a particular context. A sentence is an important translation unit. Below the sentence are clauses both finite and non-finite. Within the clause there are cohesive collocations.

All the review on the theories related to the process and judgment of translation is meant to open the understanding that translating is a complicated process. This study is not meant to go deeper in understanding the process itself but to make description on the errors, especially lexico-grammatical error in the learners’ translation. The description may imply the area of linguistic and non-linguistic aspects that the students likely to have the error.

**Error Analysis**

One of the characteristics of learner language is that it contains errors. Error in linguistics according to J. Richard et al. (2002) is the use of a word, speech act or grammatical items that are imperfect. It means that the form is not acceptable as the standard form. Many experts agree that it is the result of incomplete learning. By the definition it can be said that learner language implies their competences of the language. Hendrickson (1987) stated that errors are ‘signals’ that indicate an actual learning process taking place and that the learner has not yet mastered or shown a well-structured competence in the target language. So there are many benefits in studying the errors made by language learners.

Based on Corder (1976) errors provide important advantages for teachers, researchers, and learners. Teachers could conduct a systematic analysis on students’ achievement so that they could identify what the learners are lack of for further reinforcement. Researcher may find the description on how language is learned or acquired, and what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in his discovery of the language. Learners making errors is one important process in language learning.

**Error analysis is popular in teaching practice.** There have been some procedures in doing error analysis. One of them was proposed Van Elk as quoted by Nababan (1993). Identifying, describing error, explaining error, evaluating error, and revising error. The process of identifying is selecting the deviant forms from the accepted forms. In this way, it is easier to make evaluation of the kinds of error also the possible causes. The result then becomes the valuable data to conduct further teaching strategies and make any remedial teaching to reduce the error.

**Error Analysis on Translation**

Based on Baker (1992) most of Errors in translation is caused by non-equivalence between the source and target languages. Error may indicate how competent a translator is. He needs to have linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge. It means that a translator should be well acquainted with both the source and target language, and also the knowledge of the world. The
result of a translation reveals the way the translator thinks of the world. Translation errors according to Sigrid Kupsch-Losereit in Nord (1997) are the deviant form related to the function of the translation, the coherence of the text, the text type or text form, linguistic conventions, culture- and situation-specific conventions and conditions, and the language system. To identify the error, a comparison of the translation result and the acceptable form of the target language should be made.

A study on the error in translation was made by Wongranu (Wongranu, 2017) for 26 Thai English students of the third year of a university. The data were collected from the students' exercises and examinations. Interviews and stimulated recall were also used to determine translation problems and causes of errors. The data were analyzed by considering the frequency and percentage, and by content analysis. The results shows that the most frequent translation errors were syntactic errors followed by semantic errors and miscellaneous errors respectively. The causes of errors found in this study included translation procedures, carelessness, low self-confidence, and anxiety. He suggested that teachers should pay attention more on the problematic points.

This study tries to describe the errors found in students’ translation from Indonesian to English. The identification gives an overview about what the students have learnt and the area of difficulties that the students encounter in communicating in target language.

**METHOD**
The main question in this study is the students’ obstacle in performing translation. To be more specific, this study focuses more on lexico-grammatical errors. This small study aims to get an overview of the obstacles faced by students in translating. Using qualitative methods, the data required is the English translation result of students from Indonesian text. 10 (ten) samples of the translation results of students were taken. The results of student translations were assessed based on the acceptance of the target language form (English) as seen from grammatical acceptability, lexical acceptability, and information equivalence.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**
The following is the source language, bahasa Indonesia which should be transferred into target language, English, by the learner translator.

Pilih (2)bacaan yang (3)sesuai (4)kemudian (5)bagikan (6)kepada (7)mahasiswa. (8)Dalam hal ini (9)bacaan (10)tidak harus (11)difotokopi (12)kemudian (13)dibagi (14)kepada (15)mahasiswa, (16)akan tetapi (17)dapat (18)dilakukan dengan (19)memilih (20)topic (21)atau (22)bab (23)tertentu (24)dari (25)buku teks. (26)Usahakan (27)bacaan itu (28)bacaan yang (29)memuat (30)informasi (31)umum (32)atau yang (33)tidak detail, (34)atau (35)bacaan yang (36)memberi (37)peluang (38)untuk ditafsirkan (39)dengan berbeda-beda.

The students were given about fifteen minutes to write the translation of the text. To identify in detail, the text were parsed per word. There are about 39 words in the text. The students’ translation result were identified based on the coding mark. Thus it was identified the unacceptable form of the translation result that the students performed in the target language.

**Grammatical and Lexical Error**
The language unacceptability observed in this study is grammatical and lexical unacceptability. Meanwhile, another element is the presence of reduction or addition of content words in the translation results. To make it easier, the authors number all content words in the
source text. Furthermore, match it with the target language, namely whether it is appropriate or not with the source language data. At this stage the authors conducted a formal analysis to find out the errors that appeared in these three aspects. In the grammatical aspect, the choice of words is seen as the suitability of the form of the word with its position in the sentence, both inflectional and derivational. Meanwhile, lexical disapproval is viewed from the appropriateness of the word semantically in a series of sentences.

The next step to take was to examine whether the formal disapproval was a feature of the translator's inadequacy or was a strategy in overcoming problems in translation equivalence.

In the following, the authors present the results of the recapitulation of errors made by translating learners which are divided into three error categories.

### Table 1 Translation Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Lexical Errors</th>
<th>Grammatical Errors</th>
<th>Reduction and Addition</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(4), (10)</td>
<td>(33), (39)</td>
<td>(2/+), (23/-), (26/-), (28/-), (29/+</td>
<td>(than, mustn’t) (undetailed, differentially), (material, particular, try, reading, must)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(39/+</td>
<td>(Consider), (undetailed), (way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>(8), (9), (10), (17), (27), (31), (35)</td>
<td>(1), (2), (5), (9), (11), (13), (18), (23), (27), (29), (31), (35), (38), (39)</td>
<td>(2/+), (26/-)</td>
<td>(in case, read, must not, to get, read, universal, read), (To choose, read, given, read, copying, given, do, chapter certain, read, to contain, information universal, interpretation, with different, (material, try)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>(10), (26), (28), (29), (33), (35), (38)</td>
<td>(3), (18), (39)</td>
<td>(25/-), (28/-)</td>
<td>(Must not, trying, material, loads, clear, material, discussed), (that suitable, to do, by differences), (book, reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>(3), (5), (13), (10), (18), (26), (29), (38),</td>
<td>(11), (18), (39)</td>
<td>(2/+), (26/+), (33/+),</td>
<td>(Which according to, share, shared, should not, worked, as well as possible, include of, explore), (been, can worked, as differently), (material, make, something)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(5), (10), (13), (38)</td>
<td>(2/+), (9/+), (33/+), (35/+</td>
<td></td>
<td>(divide, shouldn’t, divide, perceived), (material, material, specific,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the data exposure in table 1, it can be seen that there are 38 types of lexical errors, 30 grammatical errors, and 31 cases of adding and reduction information. Furthermore, the error description is described below.

**Lexical Errors**

The lexical error referred to here is an error in choosing a word that does not fit the context. In the data sample there is a selection of the following words: A (than, mustn't), B (Consider), C (in case, read, must not, to get, read, universal, read), D (Must not, trying, material, loads, clear, material, discussed), E (Which according to, share, shared, should not, worked, as well as possible, include of, explore), F (divide, shouldn't, divide, perceived), G (so, specific, identified), H (concern, share), I (dividing, must not, to effort), J (And), (distributed, student, try, the passage).

The author identifies the type of lexical error likely to be caused by a spelling error as found in the word 'than', which should be in that context the word 'then'. Another reason is the translator's minimal knowledge of changes in word forms that result in changes in meaning, such as the words 'must' and 'must not'. The choice of the word 'must not' is based on the literal translation of 'must not'. In English must not does not mean 'tidak harus' but 'dilarang', so in this context the acceptable form is 'doesn't have to'. When referred to in the source language text, what is meant is 'bacaan tidak harus disalin', not 'bacaan tidak boleh disalin' so the use of 'doesn't have to' doesn't have to be copied 'which means' tidak perlu disalin' is closer to bacaan tidak harus dikopi 'rather than 'tidak boleh disalin'. Likewise, the writer considers the word 'should not' as inappropriate, because it means 'tidak seharusnya' or 'sebaiknya jangan'.

Another cause is the asymmetry of the availability of terms in the source language and target language. It can be seen from the choice of word 'divide', and "share" for the source language translation 'bagikan'. In Indonesian, the word 'bagi' can be used in a number of contexts, including 'membagi/berbagi tempat duduk’ in English 'share the seat', 'bagilah kelas dalam beberapa kelompok’ in English 'divide the class into groups', 'bagikan kertas' in English 'distribute the paper'. The source text of this research is 'bagikan (reading material) to students, so the word that is accepted is' distribute or 'give', because it is the object that is distributed or given to another object. Meanwhile the word "divide" is not suitable because "divide" refers to the division of the object itself. Likewise for the word 'share' in this case refers to dividing objects to be shared, so the
emphasis is on the common ownership of objects. So it is not suitable, because the actors (parties who share) do not jointly have (use) reading material. The word 'give' is more likely to be used in this context, because the meaning of 'bagi' in that context is actually 'give'. Since the object is clearly 'students', materials are given to each of them. The word 'give' in English can represent the event of that incident. The word 'bagikan' in Indonesian is used for both singular and plural numbered objects, for example 'berikan baju ini untuk istrimu' or 'berikan baju ini untuk anak-anakmu'.

Likewise in the use of the word 'worked' for 'dilakukan'. The English word for 'mengerjakan' is 'to perform' or 'to do' which means 'mengerjakan'. The word 'work' means 'bekerja'. This word describes a condition, it does not require an object. Whereas 'do' describes events and requires objects. So in this context the words 'performed' or 'done' are more acceptable because there are implicitly objects (if they are active sentences). The use of the word 'work' is probably due to the similarity in the meaning of the root word in the source language, namely 'kerjaa' for the target language words 'do' and 'work'.

**Grammatical Error**

Grammatical errors that can be identified in this study are: A (undetailed, differentially), B (undetailed), C (To choose, read, given, read, copying, given, do, chapter certain, read, to contain, universal information, interpretation, with different, D (that suitable, to do, by differences) E (been, can worked, as differently), F, G, H, I (in photocopy, no detailed, reading provide), J, (distributed, student, try, the passage).

Some of the grammatical errors found in this study were the use of affixes, use of verbs, word placement, subtraction of auxiliary verbs. It identifies errors in the use of affixes, both inflectional and derivational. Examples of inflectional prefix errors such as 'undetailed' for the source language 'not detailed'. The prefix – un in English means no, and is an inflectional affix, which does not change the word class. However, the use of the prefix is limited, that is, it cannot be added to all words. -Un’ is usually coupled with an adjective, such as unable, unavoidable, uncertain, unimportant. Although there appears to be an attempt by the translator to change the word 'detail' as a verb / noun to an adjective 'detailed' (derivational), the combination of the prefix –un is not acceptable in English. An example of a derivational affix error is the word 'differentially'. The addition of the '-ly' suffix changes the adjective to adverb of manner. Meanwhile "diffential" is the word "noun" in English so the form "differentially" is not acceptable in English.

Errors in using passive verbs are found in the words in photocopy, copying, to do, to work. This example illustrates that the translator has not mastered the verb form in the passive voice. The accepted forms in English are copied, done, and worked (using the word 'worked' is also a lexical problem). Another mistake in using the verb is the verb to infinitive. The use of the verb 'to infinitive' at the beginning of a command sentence is not allowed in English. The word 'select' at the beginning of a sentence without a subject in the source language indicates a command sentence. In English, a command sentence is expressed as a verb without 'to'. A respondent also uses the third form verb 'given' for the command sentence verb 'give'.

This study also identified an error in sorting words as they appear in 'chapter certain' and 'information universal'. The rule of structure for noun phrases in English is MD while in Indonesian it is 'DM'. This shows that the translator has not mastered the noun phrase pattern in the target language.Subtraction of auxiliary verbs also appears in sub-
clauses and passive sentences. In the sub clause 'that suitable' there should be 'auxiliary be (is)', in the verb phrase to do (ne) and 'to worked' in the passive form it should be 'to be done' and 'to be performed'. The cases of addition and subtraction in this study are: A (particular, try, reading, must), B (way), C (material, try), D (book, reading), E (material, make, something), F (material, material, specific, material), G (particular, try), H (please, then, not, not), I (then, it, or), J (particular, particular, not, not).

Addition or subtraction is common in translation. The addition or subtraction can show the strategy used by the translator as well as the competencies they have. Additions and subtractions in translation cannot be done if there has been a corresponding meaning.

In this study, several reductions can be identified from the source language of 'reading material' to 'material' or 'text' only. This reduction can reduce the meaning because the word "reading material" appears at the beginning of a paragraph so that if only "material" is used, it can have various meanings, namely it can mean other materials besides reading. Likewise with the use of text, it can mean spoken text. So this omission does not represent a strategy for obtaining meaning equivalence but can on the contrary reduce meaning.

Omission is also done for the word 'try'. Perhaps this omission was done because the translator found it difficult to combine 'try' with a noun. The word try is usually followed by the infinitive in English, for example try to read, try to speak, and so on. In the source language text the word "try" is followed by a clause, this makes translation literally very unacceptable, as in 'try the reading is the text....' A more acceptable form is 'Try that the reading is the text....'. Of course this is a more complex construction so that the translators may not have mastered it.

The case of adding the word 'please' at the beginning of a command sentence can add meaning, namely 'politeness'. In the source language there is no attempt at it. So this addition is not an attempt to find a match. It is possible that the translator is not yet 'sensitive' to the change in meaning brought about by the addition of the word.

There are cases of addition and subtraction which have serious implications for shifting the meaning as contained in '… information that is not general or detailed' from the source text '… general or in-detail information'. Incorrect addition and subtraction of "notes" or incorrect placement of "notes" can result in fatal translation errors.

In this case there is also a good addition strategy, for example '… in different way' for the source language 'with different'. The addition of 'way' and the change of 'adverb of manner' to 'prep + adjective + noun' are common forms in the target language and clarify the meaning. Another example is the addition of the word "should" to compensate for the omission of "try" which is an equal effort. "It should consist ..." is a translation of 'try to read the reading that contains ....'. Should in English means 'suggestion' or suggestion. So the meaning of the sentence implicitly means 'try'.

CONCLUSION
Based on the analysis above, it can be concluded that students experience various obstacles in the translation process. Errors in vocabulary selection can be caused by students' lack of knowledge of spelling, changes in word forms, asymmetry of word equivalents, and similarity of basic words in the source language and target language. Meanwhile, the grammatical errors identified were the use of affixes, use of verbs, word placement, and subtraction of auxiliary verbs. This error also indicates the translator's lack of knowledge of the rules of the target language. In the case of subtraction and
addition, the author finds that this is done by the translator in an attempt to find equivalence. The result is that someone experiences a shift in meaning as a result of the reduction or addition. But there are those who use addition and subtraction to get a more equivalent meaning.

The constraints that are reflected in these various types of errors can show that the translation process is a complicated process, which requires not only the translator to master the rules of the language but also to use words that are appropriate to the context. Errors due to lack of translator competence can have fatal consequences, namely shifting the meaning of the translation results from the original text. For this, translators need to be equipped with sufficient knowledge.
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