



Investigating Writing Competence in Arabic-to- English Translation An Error Analysis of Third-Year Translation Students' Texts

Samah MESSAOUR

Batna 2 University (Algeria)

s.messaour@univ-batna2.dz

Houda BOUHIDEL

Batna 2 University (Algeria)

h.bouhidel@univ-batna2.dz

Abstract

The present study investigates the most frequent EFL writing competence errors among third year translation students in the Department of Translation at Batna 2 University. Employing a quantitative error analysis approach, it is hypothesized that errors in the Arabic into English translations produced by these students stem from deficiencies in the EFL communicative competence particularly writing. The study findings confirm that students' errors in written translation are partly due to defects in their EFL linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competences. Accordingly, it is recommended that those core competences be given priority in the translator trainee context.

Article info

Received

July 02;2025

Accepted

August 10;2025

Keyword:

- ✓ Writing Competence
- ✓ Translation Competence
- ✓ EFL Writing Errors
- ✓ Translator Training



• Introduction

Throughout centuries, translation played a significant role in the transmission of knowledge given the fact that this process had long coexisted with intercultural communication. In today's globalized, multidimensional world witnessing increased technological advancements and economic development, the need for intercultural communication become a necessity leading translation to impose itself as a required discipline. Therefore, the need for a certain expertise in translation turned to be a *Must* to produce accurate, faithful translation.

Competent translators should have a specific profile interpreted into a set of sub-competences including *bilingual, extra-linguistic, instrumental, translation, and strategic competences* (PACTE 2003, 2017). More specifically, bilingual competence is indisputably the central competence around which the remaining competences, monitored by strategic sub-competence, revolve and become functional (Li, 2001, cited in Barani & Karimnia, 2014, p.2).

Furthermore, it is largely agreed that translation is a process and a product (Gile, 1995; Nida & Taber 2004). During the process, the translator has to adhere to the appropriate target language (TL) standards to ensure accurate text translation; any resulting product of the translated text could be ensured with those errors? In accordance to these questions, it is hypothesized that errors in the translations produced by third year translation students from Arabic into English could be attributed to the lack of effective communicative competence in writing related to the linguistic, discourse, and the sociolinguistic aspects.

The study is significant as it presents insights about the most frequent errors resulting from weaknesses in the target language writing competence as a prerequisite in translating into English thereby reemphasizing the priority that

inconsistencies in the products mirror weaknesses in the process. This implies that efficient translation is the outcome of the perfect command of the target language writing skills since translators encode a source language (ST) text to decode its content into the target language through writing. A mission that is even more complex when it is a question of translating texts from Arabic into English due to the fact that English is a foreign language in the Algerian educational context, and Arabic writing system greatly differs from the English.

Considering the above-mentioned scenario, the aim of the present paper is to explore the major foreign language writing errors committed by third year translation students in the Department of Translation, at Batna 2 University when they translate texts from Arabic as their source language into English as the target language. The identified errors are classified and categorized in accordance to their typology following the American Translators Association (ATA) framework, version (2022). The study will answer the following research questions. What are the most frequent writing errors committed by third year translation students? To what extent do those errors impact students' translation process? And how accuracy of the final

this later should receive in the training of future translators. This should lead to reconsider the design of the appropriate foreign language profile of future professional translators and to rethink and reshape the syllabus, the approach, as well as the strategies meant to meet the specific needs of this category of learners.

Nonetheless, the study limits its scope to only one foreign language sub-skill; reading comprehension, being of equal importance, is not targeted in this study for it treats errors generated from translation

from English into Arabic. Additionally, the focus in this study will be on errors resulting from EFL writing competence excluding errors related to the already mentioned sub-competences suggested by the PACTE (2003, 2017) research group.

• **Literature Review**

2.1 Translation Competence (TC)

Translation is a form of linguistic mediation, in which the content of a foreign language text (the original) is transferred into another language by creating in this language an information and communication equivalent text as suggested by Colina (2015) who advances that «translation refers to the process of, or the product resulting from, transferring or mediating written text(s) of different lengths (ranging from words and sentences to entire books) from one human language to another» (p. 3). As a profession, translation coexisted with humanity since the first attempts to cross language and culture boundaries to ensure knowledge share and exchange. As a discipline, Munday (2016) confirms that translation scholars approached translation from a scientific perspective only in the late 1980s when the notion of Translation Studies was introduced in Holmes' essay *The Name and the Nature of Translation Studies* (1972) to delimit the foundational theoretical and descriptive scope of translation.

Among the critical axes focused in Translation Studies, the sub-competences required in the training of future translators i.e. Translation Competence was emphasized (Bell, 1991; Hatim and Mason, 1997; Pym, 2003; Hurtado, 2017). As such, the notion of Translation Competence emerged to clarify and delimit «the knowledge and abilities translators need to translate correctly, and what enables them to perform the cognitive operations necessary to develop the translation process and the tasks required in professional settings.» (Hurtado 2017, p.12)

Translation Competence then encompasses all skills required to achieve an accurate text rendition. Scholars' attempts to figure out the essential components of Translation

Competence came in a form of different models including the Process in the Acquisition of Translation Competence and Evaluation (PACTE) TC Model (2003, 2017), Göpferich's TC Model (2009), The European Master's in Translation (EMT) Model (2009), and the later European Master's in Translation (EMT) Revised Model (2017). Though each model suggests a different conception of the components of TC, there is agreement that it is considered to equal an even partial competence in two languages i.e. bilingual competence. A synthesis of those models suggests TC to include the following sub-competences placed in a hierarchical mode:

- **Bilingual Competence** involving the communicative competence in the source language and the target language

- **Translation Competence** including enough knowledge about translation methods, procedures, techniques and strategies

- **Thematic Competence** dealing with subject-field knowledge, terminology, and encyclopedias

- **Technological Competence** including the required knowledge in the usage and manipulation of the computer-assisted translation, high-tech devices and applications used in the different services of translators

- **Strategic Competence** allowing the translator to plan the translation process, to monitor the final product, to overcome translation issues resulting at any level of translation

2.2 Bilingual Competence

Bilingual competence has then been recognized as essential in translating texts from a source language into a target language. The forgoing elements of TC emphasize that translation is purely a language-based process implying that the deeper the translator's knowledge of the language systems, the more competent he or she will be (Clouet 2010).

In the field of Applied Linguistics, bilingual competence refers to the capacity to communicate in two different languages i.e. the individual's knowledge of comprehension and production of two languages effectively through listening, reading, writing, and speaking, and how to apply this knowledge to achieve different aims i.e. proficiency (Francis, 2012). This overall language proficiency is termed communicative competence in which a multitude of components interact to lead to the efficient use of the language.

As far as the present study is concerned, Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) four model components of communicative competence is opted for. The framework suggested the following sub-competences to be at the essence of competence in language.

- **Linguistic Competence** : the knowledge of the norms that lead to an accurate oral and written production of language (grammar, mechanics of the language, vocabulary, syntax, morphology, and phonetics)

- **Discourse Competence**: the consideration of text typology and genre (rhetorical organization) in idea expression, using coherence techniques to guarantee smooth movement between ideas, and choosing the text-appropriate cohesive devices in structuring the language to link idea logically

- **Sociolinguistic Competence**: considering the sociocultural background to ensure appropriate language production and to avoid ambiguities in idea expression

- **Strategic Competence**: the selection and usage of techniques to overcome language-generated gap, or compensate for miscommunication difficulties

2.3 FL Writing Competence in Translation

The major concern of this study is to investigate those commonly produced errors in the final product of the translation process which is presented in a text written in English language; however, the focus will be on only one sub-competence of students' communicative competence namely EFL writing. According to Nida & Taber (1982),

the translation process is composed of three stages: (1) *an analysis and comprehension* of the source language text via reading skills being part of bilingual competence, (2) *a transfer process* including the use of procedure and techniques related to the already acquired knowledge of TC, and (3) *a restructuring process* which requires the translators to adhere to the TL writing norms to guarantee proper communicative competence. The same view is adopted by Stansfield et al. (1992) who consider accuracy of the transferred message of the source text, and the appropriate expression in the target text as the basic distinctive parameters of accurate translation.

Additionally, translators are specific language writers in view that text production reflects the final product of the translating process. In this respect and since the emergence of Translation Studies, definitions of translation tried to shed light on the enormous responsibility of translators as text writers whatever their specialized field might be. For instance, Gile (2009) holds that:

Technical translators are required to be able to write publishable texts, that is, to have professional writing skills besides being able to perform the transition from one language to the other. As for literary translators, their writing skills must indeed be similar to those of literary writers. (p. 9)

However, writing in a foreign language is by itself a highly demanding intellectual process that combines skills with decision-making at different levels. Hayes & Flower (1981) Process Approach to writing considers that writing is not a linear, straightforward process; it a complex task that necessitates *the analysis of the rhetorical situation of the text* (audience, aim, text genre and type, tone), *planning* i.e. ideas exploration and shaping (generation, selection, relevance and organization of ideas), *translating* i.e.

extending the outlined ideas into a text (syntax, grammar, word choice), *revising* the drafted text, (reviewing coherence, cohesion elements, style and register appropriateness), and *edition* (norms and conventions of the mechanical aspects of the language use related to punctuation, capitalization, formatting, and spelling).

All of the preceding conceptions combined would suggest a taxonomy of what would constitute FL writing competence in the translation context. The present study finalized conception could help design FL writing competence elements that are in harmony with the components of communicative competence and translation competence stated in the previous sections. In view of that, the translator's FL competence in writing, for which the current study is undertaken, embraces the following components:

• **Linguistic Competence i.e.** understanding and using grammar rules to write correct syntactic structures (phrases, clauses, sentences and their combination strategies), selecting and employing appropriate words and terminology, respecting the conventions of text format and mechanics (punctuation, capitalization, abbreviations)

• **Discourse Competence i.e.** maintaining text flow by coherence (correct sequencing strategies and unity), employing varied cohesive devices to link sentences (synonymy, reference, substitution)

• **Sociolinguistic Competence i.e.** taking clear decisions related to audience specificities, text

genre and typology, writing aim, tone and style(academic, non-academic)

• **Strategic Competence i.e.** the ability to manage any generated writing process issues

to repair instances of miscommunication in writing (paraphrasing, finding alternative structures).

2.4 EFL Writing Errors in Translation

Systematic errors constitute the direct signal of deficiencies in the learning process; the consideration of these errors is paramount to detect their origins and help teachers in designing the best ways to avoid their occurrence in the learning process. The American Translators Association (2022) classified errors produced by trainee translators into three categories as shown in table 1 including (1) *target language proficiency errors*, (2) *context and meaning transfer errors*, and (3) *writing quality errors*. The ATA taxonomy error model was selected for its convenience with the constituents of communicative competence in the EFL writing provided in the Applied Linguistics literature. Nonetheless, errors resulting from the translation process (faithfulness, literalness, misunderstanding, and unfinished translation) are not applicable to the present study; attention is directed to FL writing competence errors.

Table 01. a Summary of The American Translators Association Classification of Common Translation Errors

Type of Errors	Explanation
Target Language Proficiency	
Grammar	A sentence in the translation violates the morphosyntactic rules of TL.
Syntax	The arrangement of words or other elements of a sentence does not conform to the syntactic rules of TL.
Word Form/ Part of Speech	The root of the word is correct, but its form (e.g. number or case of noun or pronoun) is incorrect or nonexistent in the target language.
Spelling	A word in the translation is spelled/used incorrectly according to TL conventions.
Capitalization	The conventions of the target language concerning upper and lower-case usage are not followed.

Punctuation	The conventions of the TL regarding punctuation are not followed.
Context and Meaning Errors	
Addition	The writer introduces superfluous elements of meaning.
Omission	One or more elements of meaning in the ST are left out in TL.
False-friends	Words of similar form but dissimilar meaning across the language pair are confused.
Ambiguity	Either the source or target text segment allows for more than one semantic interpretation, where its counterpart in the other language does not.
Cohesion	The text is hard to follow because of the inappropriate or incorrect use of idea and sentence linking devices.
Writing Quality	
Register	The language level or degree of formality is not suitable for the implied target audience of the passage.
Style	Choices of grammatical structure or other elements are incompatible for the type of publication or other functional use specified by the TL.
Illegibility	The text cannot be easily read because of poor handwriting, and formatting.

• **Methodology**

The current study employs an Error Analysis Approach which is based on the process of determining the causes, nature, and consequences of language aspects that are non-functional due to inconsistencies in the learning process (James, 1998). Relying on a quantitative methodology, the aim of this study is to investigate the most frequently committed EFL writing proficiency errors among translation students at the Translation Department, Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages, Batna 2 University during the academic year 2024/2025. The rationale behind relying on a quantitative error analysis research design relates to the nature of the investigated issue. The study primarily seeks to statistically quantify the most frequent errors, to classify them according to FL writing competence and the ATA framework, to identify their nature, and to provide a deeper analysis of the origins of each category of error.

The investigated population is third year translation students whose semester one translation Arabic into English examination papers constituted the corpus of the analysis. In the total, there were two third year translation groups containing 66 students; the examination papers of one group were randomly selected, which constitutes 50 % of the whole population. This random selection would ensure that all students' papers would have equal chance for analysis without being selective in terms of the quality of the translated material.

• **The Study Corpus**

The data sources were taken from the fourth part of the Arabic to English translation examination (Appendix) which is an extract from a letter by Mohammed Salah Seddik , one of the pillars of Arab-Islamic culture and a prominent Algerian thinker whose influence both in action and writings on the Algerians during the colonial period remained memorable. The letter was written in Arabic and students were required to translate it into English within an allotted examination timing of ninety minutes.

Students relied only on their personal competences in translation and FL writing to produce the final translated version of the letter; no dictionaries or additional electronic devices were allowed during the examination. There were thirty three examination papers for analysis which was undertaken in four steps. Initially, papers were analyzed to highlight FL writing proficiency errors. Then, errors were labeled in accordance to ATA taxonomy,

- **Analysis and Discussion of the Data Obtained from the Corpus**

.1 Analysis and Discussion of the TL Errors in the Language Proficiency

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of TL Proficiency Errors

Types of Errors	Frequencies	Percentages
Grammar	133	28.05%
Syntax	90	18.98%
Spelling	37	7.80 %
Capitalization	79	16.66%
Punctuation	135	28.48%
Total	474	100 %

The first set of sub-competence that is prioritized in ATA taxonomy of translation errors relates to the overall TL language

proficiency. Examples for each category are provided in the table below, followed by the result analysis of each category.

Table 3. Examples of TL Proficiency Errors

Types of Errors	Category	Examples Extracted from the Corpus
Grammar	word class error	<i>nationality leader</i> instead of <i>national leader</i>
	incorrect tense form	<i>knows</i> instead of <i>knew</i>
	faulty plural forms	<i>ladys, mens</i> instead of <i>ladies , men</i>
	incorrect relative pronoun	<i>people which</i> instead of <i>people who</i>
	faulty past participle form	<i>knowed</i> instead of <i>known</i>
Syntax	fragment	The Algerian sons and daughters.
	run-on sentences	He knew a number of intellectuals, I appeal you.....
	incorrect word order	We one people are long lived united.
Spelling	fused sentences	Algerians do not make mistakes in the future we are one nation.
	letter omission	wich, enemies
	letter addition	groupe
	vowel change	heretage
Capitalization	unjustified capitalization	SAW
	removed capitalization	ben baddis, algeria
Punctuation	no quotation marks	Oh, sons of dear Algeria....
	removed / erroneous apostrophes	<i>dont /d'ont</i> instead of <i>don't</i>

According to the results displayed in table 2, learners' major TL sub-competence difficulties originate from the mechanical

aspects of the English language including punctuation (28.48%) and capitalization representing 16.66 % of the committed

errors. This high frequency of punctuation errors is due to the learners' ignorance of the norms and importance of punctuation in English language. In fact, punctuation signals are like the road-map that guide readers in text-comprehension as such missing punctuation marks make the text hard to be understood. The most commonly noticed punctuation errors include the over-usage of commas, erroneous apostrophes, missing ending punctuation signals, inappropriate use of ellipsis, and quotation marks omission.

Another important aspect of mechanics, which presents an area of challenge to third year translation learners, includes capitalization; this feature is specific to English language and none-existent in the Arabic one. The text to be translated into English contains twelve proper nouns which must take initial word capital letters in English; additionally, all sentences require initial capital letters. Learners committing this mistake either wrote proper nouns in small letters or started their sentences without capitalizing the first letter of the first word in each new sentence. Other minor instances of capitalization errors involve unjustified usage of capital letters as shown in table three.

Grammatical errors are ranked second after errors in the mechanical aspects of TL with a frequency of 28.05 %. Grammatical knowledge provides learners with the basic mechanisms that make the language functional and accurate; therefore, inconsistencies in grammar impact the overall structure and meaning of the produced text. Grammar errors made by

third year translation learners vary from subject-verb disagreement , faulty verb conjugation including mistakes in verb tense, aspect, modality, and voice, incorrect word class usage such as incorrect pronoun, determiners, verb , and adjective use.

Structures such as phrases, clauses, and even sentences that do not conform to the TL syntactic conventions represent 18.98 % of language proficiency errors found in the translated versions of the students. Syntax main focus is on the logical, correct arrangements of sentence constituents in accordance to the standards of English language; in this respect, students should clearly know how words and other language elements should be integrated in the different types of phrases, clauses, and sentences in order to write correct structures. They should also be aware about the existing morphosyntactic differences between Arabic and English to produce correct structures. Defects in the syntactic TL system led to the production of structures that are, for instance, run-on sentences, fragments missing essential components, including misplaced or dangling modifiers, or containing word order errors. Spelling, word formation and writing according to the standards of English language, is a less problematic area for students due to their long contact with English as a foreign language. The low percentage (7.80%) of those learners who misspelled words in English were confused because English language is not a pure phonetic system i.e. many words pronunciation differ from their spelling. As such, letter omission, addition, word-ending, double-letter words, and even

a change in the vowel sounds of words were among the spelling errors of those learners.

.2 Analysis and Discussion of the TL Transfer Errors at the Word/Phrase Level

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of TL Transfer Errors at the Word/Phrase Level

<i>Types of Errors</i>	<i>Frequencies</i>	<i>Percentages</i>
Addition	00	00%
Omission	97	40.24%
False-friends	00	00 %
Ambiguity	29	12.03%
Cohesion	115	47.71%
Total	241	100%

The ATA also presented a classification of errors that result from the learner's incapacity to express a given idea in the target language or to find the exact word

that is context-appropriate. These errors are also related to defects in the foreign language writing competence. Table 5 presents examples of some errors extracted from the study corpus.

Table 5. Examples of TL Meaning Transfer Errors

<i>Types of Errors</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Examples Extracted from the Corpus</i>
Omission	word / phrase omission	التسامح – الإخاء- رجال الفكر – لا تمثل قيم شعبنا (do not represent our nation ' s values - intellectuals- brotherhood- tolerance)
Ambiguity	pragmatic ambiguity	Beat the enemies who want to break our people unity.
	lexical ambiguity	In its heart instead of its essence We should not let the unjust enter between us.
Cohesion	no subordinators	He knew intellectuals and brave men, I want you to ...
	faulty substitution	We should preserve the unity of our nation who shouldn' t vanish...

The obtained results show that a high percentage 47.71 % of students finds it difficult to rewrite the translated idea cohesively. Cohesion allows not only writers to clarify the logical relationship between ideas by selecting the right cohesive devices , but more importantly helps the readers follow the flow of ideas and understand the text. Consequently, learners are required to select and use a multitude of those devices to express ideas smoothly. Any non-usage or misuse of cohesive

devices will impact text production and comprehension directly; thereby, impacting the quality of the translated text.

Omission of different ideas from the original text in Arabic represents another type of errors committed by translation students with a percentage of 40.24%. This error cannot be attributed to the deficiencies in text comprehension since the original text is written in the learners' mother tongue, so logically it resulted from the lack of lexis in English language. The

examples on table 5 are simple, clear words in Arabic, yet attempts to find the exact equivalents in English failed.

Ambiguity errors sound to have less impact on the quality of the translated text of learners; only 12.03 % learners wrote sentences, phrases and even words that can be understood and interpreted in different ways which led to confusion in meaning. In this case, students considered the meaning in Arabic and transferred it into English

without analyzing its correctness in English language. Addition of extra-textual ideas that might impact text unity as well as false-friends errors are not found in the analyzed corpus. This can be explained by the fact that the letter content was clearly understood, so students remained focused in terms of ideas; furthermore, the origins of English and Arabic are totally different allowing occasional errors in false friends.

.3 Analysis and Discussion of the TL Errors in Writing Quality

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of TL Writing Quality Errors

<i>Types of Errors</i>	<i>Frequencies</i>	<i>Percentages</i>
Register	19	37.25%
Style	23	45.09 %
Illegibility	09	17.64%
Total	51	100 %

The ATA final aspect of text production involves the quality of the text in terms of register, style and illegibility. Some examples of these errors are summarized in table 7.

Table 7. Examples of TL Writing Quality Errors

<i>Types of Errors</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Examples Extracted from the Corpus</i>
Register	informal contracted forms	Mustn't, don't, shouldn't we, our nation, our people
	personal pronouns	Hold the point of ...
	colloquial expressions	
Style	inappropriate tone	Oh, lovely Algeria's sons and daughters ...and the majority of the leaders and also men of the nation and also the members of... Our people must never and ever separate because of any low standards that do not represent our values.
	overusage of coordination	
	wordiness	
Illegibility	unclear letter formatting	The letter is presented as one block.
	unclear handwriting	Line spacing and margin indentations are not considered .
		a mixture of script and cursive lettering styles

Style, one of the most complex features in writing, is challenging to 45.09% learners. Indeed, it is not always evident for a foreign language learner to take the correct decisions concerning the appropriate text style which relates to precision in word choice, sentence structure, variety, and fluency, the overall

tone and voice of the text, and the inclusion of specific textual features such as citing, dialogue, and descriptions. Audience, aim, text genre and type, as well as the scope of the discussed topic are all determining parameters that orient the selection of the appropriate style. Any wrong decision in the

forgoing parameters will result in an error in style even if the norms for language proficiency and meaning re-expression and transfer are respected.

To craft the final translated product, register is also important. Register refers to the level of formality in the original text that the translator has to maintain all along the target text with a careful adjustment of all language features to its required register. 37.25 % errors related to register are noticed in the corpus of the 33 learners. Knowing how to adopt the right register for a given context and audience is essential for any translator. Perhaps, this sub-competence is among the basic skills that should receive more attention in the field of translator training.

The last item in ATA framework refers to improper text formatting and illegible handwriting found in only nine examination papers representing 17.64%; this fact distracts the readers' concentration while reading. In this concern, learners' awareness should be raised to the importance of correct formatting and presentation as part of quality translation.

The above-reported results show that attaining accurate translation from Arabic into English is a complex process requiring a certain proficiency level and skills mastery in the different aspects of the FL writing. It was noted, for example, that some components of EFL writing are more challenging for translation learners than others. Accordingly, grammar, syntax, coherence, mechanics, style as well as register are among the most problematic writing skill areas. These finding confirm the hypothesis set in the introductory section of

the study; in effect, the lack of effective communicative writing competence particularly in the linguistic, discourse and the sociolinguistic aspects would lead to different types of errors in the text translated into English language thereby impacting the quality of the translated text.

6. Conclusion

The present study was undertaken to examine areas of EFL communicative competence that are challenging to third year translation students in Arabic into English translation using the ATA taxonomy of translation errors. Empirical evidence from this study demonstrates that those translation errors are related to deficiencies in the learners' communicative competence in writing, specifically in the *linguistic competence* (grammar, syntax, mechanics), *discourse competence* (elements of coherence, cohesive devices, clarity in meaning expression), and *sociolinguistic competence* (register, style, audience, aim analysis).

This situation is understandable since translation is the outcome of a long, complex process; this latter is basically a pure language operation. Therefore, it sounds reasonably logical to deduce that defects in the language system, the process, would certainly impact the final translated text, the product. Then, it is worth mentioning that unless students attain the required level in EFL writing competence, their translations will remain inconsistent.

In view of the study findings, some recommendations are suggested to researchers in the field of TC, curriculum designers, and EFL teachers in the

educational institutions concerned with the training of future professional translators. Researchers in the field of Translation Competence are required to undertake more in-depth studies in the field of EFL competences to provide more comprehensive theoretical frameworks that highlight the most essential language competences that would constitute the framework to delimit the profile of a future professional translator.

Similarly, within the current educational context, curriculum designers are not only supposed to propose the course plan that focuses on developing the linguistic, discourse, and sociolinguistic knowledge in the EFL writing, but also they need to raise learners' awareness towards the differences between Arabic and English language writing systems by suggesting comparative courses to ensure proper usage of both languages, specifically in text-translation between Arabic and English.

Furthermore, language teachers responsible for acquainting learners with the basic knowledge in the foreign language are called to orient their efforts and align their teaching to enhance the already mentioned competences in this specific category of learners. Teachers are further required to focus on the most problematic language sub-competences in the writings of translation learners. By continuous detection and analysis of the errors produced during the EFL and translation courses, teachers will identify the sub-competences that should be reinforced such as grammar, syntax, cohesion, coherence, style in the context of

this study, and will find out practical remedial strategies to reduce the amount of the committed errors thereby assist learners in attaining accurate competence in writing for a better preparedness to meet the requirements of translation professionalism and expertise.

Bibliography List

1. American Translation Association, (2022). Explanation of Error Categories. <https://www.atanet.org/certification/> (consulted on 01-05-2025)
- 2. Barani, M & Karimnia, A (2014) An investigation into Translation Students' English Reading Comprehension Skills and Strategies: a Cross-Sectional Study. *Elixir Ling.&Trans.* 73 (2014) 26257-26262 <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/> (consulted on 14-06-2025)
- 3. Canale, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication*. London: Longman.
- 4. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1 (2), 1-47. Oxford University Press
5. Colina, S. (2015) *Fundamental of Translation* Cambridge University Press
6. Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* (Rev. Ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
7. Hatim, B & Mason, I (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.

8. Ho. Y. Y. C. (2020) Communicative Language Teaching and English as a Foreign Language Under- Graduates' Communicative Competence in Tourism English. Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education. 27, 1-16 <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/> (consulted on 25-05-2025)
9. Hurtado Albir, A. (2017). Translation and Translation Competence. In A. Hurtado Albir (Ed.), Researching translation competence by PACTE group (pp. 3-33). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.127.01hur> (consulted on 14-06-2025)
10. James, C. (1998). Errors in Language Learning and Use. Boston: Addison Wesley Longman
11. Maria .P.A.L (2011) Lexical Errors and Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing . MGP Books Group
12. Munday, J. (2008). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications. 2nd edn. London and New York: Routledge
13. Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. First Edition. Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd
14. Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R. (2004). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Foreign Language Educational Press, Shanghai
15. PACTE. (2003). Building a Translation Competence Model. In F. Alves (Ed.), Triangulating translation: Perspectives in process oriented research (pp. 43-66). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.127.06pac>.
- (consulted on 01-05-2025)
16. PACTE. (2017). PACTE Translation Competence model, A Holistic, Dynamic Model of Translation Competence, Pacte Group, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 35-44. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.127.02pac>. (consulted on 03-06-2025)
17. Waddington, C. (2001). Different Methods of Evaluating Student Translations: The question. Journal des traducteurs, 46(2), 311–325. <https://doi.org/10.1072/btl.004583ar>. (consulted on 03-06-2025)

8. Appendix

4 . اليك رسالة الشيخ المجاهد محمد الصالح الصديق . ترجمها الى اللغة الانجليزية.

" يا ابناء الجزائر الحبيبة و بناتها الماجدات اناشدكم انا المجاهد محمد الصالح الصديق الذي عرف بن باديس و عميروش و الحاج الاخضر و عبد الحميد مهري و مولود قاسم و فرحات عباس و كريم بلقاسم و يوسف بن خدة و احمد بن بلة و هواري بومدين و معظم قادة الثورة و العديد من رجال الوطنية و الوطن كما عرف عددا من رجال الفكر و الثقافة اناشدكم ان تنزعوا عنكم وساوس الشيطان و تحبطوا كيد الكائدين المتربصين بوحدة شعبنا و وطننا و ان تعتصموا بالله و بوحدة شعبنا الذي لا يجب ان تنزعزع بفعل شرذمة ضالة لا تمثل قيم شعبنا و لا اصالته ولا تحمل في قلوبها روح الاسلام السمحة و تعاليمه التي جعلت رسول الله يكون قدوة لنا في التسامح والاخاء و المحبة." لا تخطئوا يا ابناء الجزائر في المستقبل ... نحن شعب واحد .

عاشت الجزائر موحدة ... و دام شعبها قويا ملتحما متحدا ضد من عاداه مؤازرا كل من اخاه .