

STUDENTS' TEXTUAL EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATING
INFORMATIVE TEXT FROM INDONESIAN INTO ENGLISH
(A Study of the Third Year Students of STKIP PGRI SUMBAR)

Wiwit Sariasih, Prof. Dr. M.Zaim, M.Hum.

Abstrak: Kemampuan menerjemah dapat diukur melalui aspek *textual equivalence* dari hasil terjemahan mahasiswa. Hal ini sangat penting karena penterjemah harus mempertimbangkan apakah teks yang dihasilkan sesuai dengan teks pada bahasa sumber dan informasi yang disampaikan tidak bergeser atau bahkan berbeda. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pada level manakah hasil tgerjemahan mahasiswa dapat dikategorikan berdasarkan *Textual Equivalence Level*. Penelitian ini berbentuk deskriptif dengan pendekatan kualitatif. Sampel penelitian adalah 55 orang mahasiswa tingkat 3 STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat yang telah lulus matakuliah translation I dan II. Data diambil melalui tes translation dalam bentuk teks informatif. Analisa data dilakukan dengan menggunakan dua buah rubrik yaitu *textual sub-component* dan *meaning oriented* dengan tiga indikator yaitu tema, struktur dan kohesi. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa 1) Hasil terjemahan teks informatif mahasiswa STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat berada pada tiga tingkat textual equivalence yaitu: *unacceptable translation, inadequate translation, dan barely adequate translation*. 2) sebahagian besar hasil terjemahan masuk dalam kategori *interpersonally inaccurate* (27,2%) dan *textually inaccurate* (34,5%). 3).

INTRODUCTION

A challenging effort for the translators is not merely transferring the meaning or message from the source text into the target text but also produce readable text in target language. The message in source text should be well distributed to the target text that it has similar information that the writer wish to communicate to the reader. The translator produces the text equivalent enough to the grammar and linguistic feature of the target text or the target text has textual equivalent to the source text that the reader of it can understand the text with ease. To produce the text that has textual

equivalence to the target text, the translator first should know what textual equivalence is and the type of it.

The textual equivalence of the target text would be used as the consideration for the teacher to decided whether students are able to translate the text in source language or not. The aim of providing the translation exercise/practice is not only to give a chance to students to translate the text but also train them to be able to translate the source text into target text, in other words they achieve a competence in translation. When students translated the text, they needed to recognize the type of

the text and what information that was delivered to readers. The practice of translating the text, especially informative text such as descriptive, exposition, and argumentative trained students to delivered the information or message from source text to target text.

Equivalence is the main concern for every translator in translation. The equivalence itself is distributed into semantic, grammatical, pragmatic, textual equivalence. The textual equivalence is viewed as the main concern in this research and would be defined in the term of equivalence and textual. The first is proposed by Hatim (2001: 15) 'Equivalence is taken to be the basis on which source language (SL) textual material is replaced by target language (TL) textual material'. Equivalence is conducted as the source language text being transferred into the target language text. Nevertheless in achieving equivalence, the translator should also pay attention much to the content, structure, and style as the message is conveyed into the target language text.

In accordance with Hatim, Koller (cited in Munday, 2001:60) defined textual translation as 'Any TL text or portion of text is observed on a particular occasion...to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text.' The translator, as signed by Koller, needs to observed the text before translating them starting from the word formation, context, cultural aspect and the content of the text. After examining those aspect the translator may transferred the message in source language equivalent enough to the target language.

Textual equivalence is not only in term of content but also in form and shape. Bassnet (2002, 33) states 'Textual (syntagmatic) equivalence, where there is equivalence of the syntagmatic structuring of a text, i.e. equivalence of form and shape'. Equivalence in form of target language is where adjective is transferred into adverbial as it is merit the form in target language text. The shape is related with whether passive would be transferred into active since it is the only way to have equivalence itself. Then, coherence and cohesion are closely related in forming the textual equivalence that the text would be understood by the reader if it has cohesion and coherence in forming it.

On the other side, Baker (2011: 181-202) describes the textual equivalence in more detail that she only viewed coherence as the element that hold textual equivalence much. As the cohesion devices-reference, substitution and ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion- are highly applied in target language text; the textual equivalence would be achieved as well.

While Baker focus on cohesion in achieving textual equivalence, Munday (2001: 47) cited Koller's (1979) description of textual equivalence in his book 'Introducing translation studies'. The textual equivalence is described in more specific into: denotative equivalence, connotative equivalence, lexical choices, text- normative equivalence, pragmatic equivalence, and formal equivalence.

Among those classifications of textual equivalence, the text-normative equivalence is related to the text types that is informative text. Bell and Koller classification of

textual equivalence is very general and do not explain in more detail about the elements that can be used to measure whether the text has achieve textual equivalence or not. Baker, in one point, has given more specific explanation toward the textual equivalence that is; by analyzing the translation above word level. She proposes that textual equivalence can be measured through the coherence and cohesion. Thus, Baker opinion toward textual equivalence becomes the foundation in this research since it is also related with PACTE and Kelly statement about textual competence that it covers, theme, cohesion, and structure.

Even though students know they should keep the message of target text equivalent to source text but the textual equivalence is not something which is easy to achieve. Moreover, whether the target text has transferred the source text meaning or not, and how students' textual equivalence would achieved using certain rubric need to be investigated especially in translating Indonesian text into English. Therefore this study was conducted to find out Students' textual equivalence in translating Indonesian text into English which is distributed into these questions:

1. How was the theme, textual cohesion and the structure of the source text translated into the target text based on the textual equivalent rubric?
2. What were the categories of students' translation based on meaning-oriented criteria in translating the text from Indonesian into English?
3. What were categories of translation meaning oriented criteria for each level of textual equivalence gained by students?

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted under the descriptive design that it aims to describe and classify students' textual equivalence in translating Indonesian Text into English. Related to the purpose of finding out the category of students' textual competence, students' translation was analyzed and reported just as the way it was. This research was conducted to find out the textual equivalence achieved by students after studying translation I and II, where Translation I is focused on translating English Text into Indonesian and Translation II is focused on translating Indonesian Text into English.

The population of this research was 312 students of 2011 academic year of English Department of STKIP PGRI West Sumatera who had studied about translating the English text into Indonesian text in Translation I and translating Indonesian Text into English in Translation II subject. The sample was taken by using simple random sampling with 55 students who were chosen as the sample of the research.

The instrument used in this research was Translation test consisted of two text: descriptive and expository genre of informative text. The data were analyzed using two different rubrics; Textual Sub-Component rubric of Angelelli (2009) and Meaning-Oriented rubric of Kim (2009).

RESULT

1. Translating Theme, Structure and Textual Cohesion from Source Text into Target Text

There were two texts that were analyzed to find out to which scale that each of them belong to. The indicators which

were used for both texts were theme, structure, and textual cohesion. It was found that the students' translations were matched to three scales of textual equivalence namely (from lowest level to middle level): unacceptable translation, inadequate translation, and barely adequate translation. The translation is categorized as unacceptable when the theme in source text was transferred differently in target text that made the message changed. Inadequate

translation meant the theme were transferred to target text by adopting the structure of source text that made the message difficult to be understood while in barely adequate translation the translator had considered the structure of target language even though in some parts it was oddly placed. Those classifications were determined based on the analysis of textual theme, sentence structure and cohesion of the text as shown in table 1.

Table 1. textual equivalence level gained by students based on its indicator

No.	Thematic	Structure	Cohesion	Textual Equivalence	Frequency	
					Text I	Text II
1	Ideas does not flow together/unrelated	SL structure than TL	Lack of cohesion as error in grammar, lexis and clause	Unacceptable translation	37	37
2	Ideas frequently awkward/does not flow together	Awkward and Frequent oddly place elements	Lack of cohesion as error in grammar	Inadequate translation	11	13
3	Generally organized similar with TL as signed in SL	Occasionally similar with TL text and oddly place statement	Lack of cohesion as error in grammar	Barely adequate translation	7	5

From the two different texts given to the sample-descriptive text (text 1) and expository (text II)- indicated that the quality of translation was poor that most

translations were categorized into unacceptable where only few were categorized into barely adequate translation as shown in table 2 below:

Table 2. Level of textual equivalence in Text I and Text II gained by students

No	Textual Equivalence	Text I		Text II	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%

1	Unacceptable translation	37	67 %	37	67,3 %
2	Inadequate translation	11	20 %	13	23,6 %
3	Barely adequate translation	7	13 %	5	9,1 %
4	Total	55	100%	55	100%

The result showed that students' translation in both texts-descriptive and expository were approximately the same. Most students' translation was in low level or known as unacceptable translation.

2. Categories of Students' Translation Based on Meaning-Oriented Criteria Rubric.

The second rubric that was used in this research was meaning oriented criteria rubric proposed

by Kim. This rubric used by reducing the point for each error found in translation; major error and minor error. The point was 45 that were reduced 2 up to 5 depending on the error itself for each sentence in the text. Reducing the point was related with the major error (lexis, clause, and text) and Minor Error (spelling and grammar) that gave impact to the theme, structure, and cohesion of the text.

Table 3. Score gained by samples for each classification

No.	Categories	Score	Frequency	%
1	Experientially Inaccurate	15 - 24,5	14	25,6 %
2	Experientially Unnatural	15 - 28	8	14,5 %
3	Interpersonally Inaccurate	4 - 12	17	32,8 %
4	Interpersonally Unnatural	11,5	1	1,8 %
5	Logically Inaccurate	19,5 - 20,5	4	7,3 %
6	Textually Inaccurate	7.5 - 15	8	14,5 %
7	Textually Unnatural	10 - 21	3	3,6 %
8	Total		55	100%

The table above presents seven classifications that were found in students' translation by using meaning oriented criteria. Those classifications were found both in text I and text II. The scores which were stated there were the result of point deducted in major and minor errors.

3. Categories of Translation in Meaning Oriented Criteria for Each Level of Textual

Equivalence Gained by Students.

The textual equivalence was examined not only using textual sub-component rubric but also meaning oriented rubric. By finding the relation between two rubrics, it was found that there were three levels or scales of textual equivalence, those are: unacceptable translation, inadequate translation, and barely

adequate translation. In unacceptable translation the most error was categories as interpersonally inaccurate and textually inaccurate. Experimentally unnatural

translation was mostly found in inadequate translation, while experientially inaccurate translation was mostly found in barely adequate translation as shown in table 4 below.

Table 4. the translation based on textual sub-component and meaning-oriented criteria

No.	Textual Equivalence	Meaning-Oriented	Text I		Text II		
			F	%	F	%	
1	Unacceptable Translation	Experientially Inaccurate	7	12,7	3	5,5	
		Experientially Unnatural	-	-			
		Interpersonally Inaccurate	12	21,8	14	25,5	
		Interpersonally Unnatural	-	-			
		Logically Inaccurate	-	-			
		Textually Inaccurate	18	32,7	20	36,4	
		Textually Unnatural	-	-			
2	Inadequate Translation	Experientially Inaccurate	3	5,5	2	3,6	
		Experientially Unnatural	5	9,1	9	16,4	
		Interpersonally Inaccurate	-	-	2	3,6	
		Interpersonally Unnatural	3	5,5	-	-	
		Logically Inaccurate	-	-	-	-	
		Textually Inaccurate	-	-	-	-	
3	Barely Adequate Translation	Experientially Inaccurate	-	-	-	-	
		Experientially Unnatural	3	5,5	2	3,6	
		Interpersonally Inaccurate	-	-	1	1,8	
		Interpersonally Unnatural	2	3,6	-	-	
		Logically Inaccurate	2	3,6	2	3,6	
		Textually Inaccurate	-	-	-	-	
4	Total			55	100	55	100

Table 4 showed that in unacceptable translation the target texts were categorized into experientially inaccurate and textually inaccurate. It means the knowledge and practice can not successfully help students in translation. Textually inaccurate indicated that the message in target text was different with source text. meanwhile, interpersonally inaccurate indicated that the students have lack of knowledge and practice.

DISCUSSION

1. Theme, Structure and Textual Cohesion Found in Target Text Related With Textual Equivalence

The analysis toward students' translation showed that it can be classified into three scales or levels at below part of the rubric; unacceptable, inadequate and barely adequate translation. It can be inferred that the quality of translation were not satisfied enough on the basis of theme, sentence structure, and textual cohesion. The three level of textual equivalence were presented by first; the error in positioning the theme of the sentence and the text as well. It means the students did not comprehend the source text and identify the theme that caused the theme totally differ and the message could not be caught by the reader.

The finding indicated that students have poor knowledge of positioning the theme of the source text in target text. The evidence gave an impression that students directly translate the text before comprehending the text.

Since the source text was in their first language or mother tongue, they just read the text without trying to comprehend it or find the topic or theme that should be transferred. It was in accordance with Angelelli's (2009) statement that what makes translation unacceptable because translator failed or could not identify the theme of source text and transferred it to target text.

The translator gave more attention in translating every word in source text into target text and assumed that the meaning had been transferred successfully. It was found that in inadequate translation scale the theme in target text was different with the source text, even though it was only in a few sentences. It made the text sound awkward and ideas can not flow smoothly. The finding has accordance with Campbell (1998) study about textual competence where he found that the target text which were categorized as substandard sounded awkward as the translator did not aware of theme in translating the source text.

Second, textual cohesion cannot be separated with the thematic structure of the text. What topic or ideas of the text is, related with the theme and how the idea in the text flows, related with the cohesion of the text. The students seemed focused on distribution of words in target text than the theme or message. Grammatical classes such as noun, verb, adverb, etc. are based primarily on the forms of words and their distribution in sentences but unfortunately might caused inappropriate transfer or message

(Nida, 2001:55). The text was unacceptable translations since most sentences did not showed which word had a function as subject, predicate, and object. It is related with Colina (2003) study about Cohesion devices error in translation. She found that as translators tried to achieve cohesion they neglected the whole message of the text and in vice versa. However, the textual cohesion cannot stand alone since the message and thematic structure is also carried by the cohesion in the text.

Third, most textual structure of target text adopted the structure of source text that made the information unclear. It was found that the translators who tended to focus to grammar lose the theme or it appeared different with source text and those who were aware of theme neglected the grammar of target text. Waddington (2001) found that translator often forgot that the sentence structure of target text and source text may different to each other. As a consequence the reader of target text could not comprehend the text.

The fact that students used curriculum 2008 that did not provided basic knowledge for translation such as syntax and semantic had caused poor translation competence. Those subjects were at least provided the knowledge of the structure of sentence and how it affected the deep meaning. Moreover, the theory of translation only discussed for 5 to 6 meeting (stated in syllabus) and the rest meeting was practicing translation. The theory of

translation cannot be separated with translation practice. In other words, every time the students translate the text, it should be followed by discussing the product relating with the theory of translation. It was strengthening by Munday (2001:7-9) that training or teaching translation should be supported with the curriculum and syllabus that provided students with knowledge that they need in translation practice.

The capable teacher or trainer with knowledge and experience in translation is also necessary. During the practice the teacher or trainer would be able to discuss about the inappropriateness and inaccurate found in students translation with theory related to it. The evidence found in STKIP that the teachers for translation were changed in every semester and they had low intention in translation contributed to the poor translation produced by students. These three things became indicators for successful or failure of teaching and training the translator. Thus, setting up the syllabus with supported teacher in translation is urgent.

2. Categories of Students' Translation Related with Meaning-Oriented Criteria Rubric.

Errors in lexis, clause and text would affect the target text message. Error in lexis was not only in single word but also in compound word. The evidence showed that error in translation caused by the theme of the text a little bit different or definitely different with source text. It

indicated that the translator had weaknesses in grammar and sentence structure in target text and need to sharpen their knowledge. It was stated by Kim (2002: 147-148) that the translator especially the students might need lots of practice and increase knowledge which was needed in translation. Kim found that translator should be introduced to text analysis to measure his/her own weaknesses as error occurs.

Error in spelling and grammar was an indication of both knowledge and practice. Kim (2002: 146) states that error in grammar and spelling occurred as the translator had lack of practice in translation. However, the syllabus informed that students had adequate time for practice translation that the error can reduced. It seemed that the practice was not provided with assessment toward the quality of students' translation and discussed the caused of poor transferred of message. The evidence presented in table 9 that most of translation categorized into textually inaccurate indicated that students had lack of comprehension toward the source text which also might be caused by lack of knowledge that needed in translation such as syntax, semantic and grammar. On the other side, experientially unnatural translation indicated the practice of translation that explores students' knowledge was not adequate enough.

3. Categories of Translation in Meaning Oriented Criteria for Each Level of Textual Equivalence Gained by Students.

The finding showed that students' translation in unacceptable level was mostly categorized into textually inaccurate and experientially unnatural. It indicated that the failure to achieve acceptable translation was caused by both knowledge and practice of translation. The students were not provided with the knowledge that they need in translation. An adequate practice followed by discussion would help students identify their own weaknesses and allowed them to improve their translation by avoiding the same mistake. The same evidence was also found in level of barely adequate translation.

The comfortableness that the source text was written in students' mother tongue trapped the students into the pattern that translation was 'easy'. They thought that they did not have a problem in comprehending the text as they usually found in translating the text written in foreign language. Meanwhile the lecturers seemed did not check students' comprehension toward the source text. The fact that lecturers did not use certain rubric in assessing students' translation was assumed they could not provide enough information about students' progress and achievement.

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

1. Most of the translation was classified into unacceptable translation and only few of them classified into barely adequate translation.

2. There were 7 categories of students' translation based meaning-oriented rubric; experientially inaccurate, experientially unnatural, interpersonally inaccurate, interpersonally unnatural, logically inaccurate, textually unnatural and textually inaccurate.
3. After analyzing students translation by using textual equivalence and meaning-oriented rubric it was found that in unacceptable translation mostly categorized into textually inaccurate in both text that the error was caused of lack of knowledge and practice. Interpersonally inaccurate translation was also found mostly in unacceptable translation of textual equivalence rubric.

B. Implication

From the data analysis and finding of the research there were several implications that had been found. Those are:

1. Theory of translations should be introduced to the translator trainee before they start practicing translation for the first time.
2. Knowledge which is needed in translation should be provided to the translator by designing the syllabus and material in translation subject.
3. An adequate time for practicing translation is also needed.

C. Suggestions

It can be inferred that the students' translation of Indonesian informative text into English was unsatisfied enough. They still had lack of knowledge in translating

the text. Besides, and adequate practice in translating the text in different types is also needed. Thus, it was suggested that first, the translator trainer or lecturer has better observed the knowledge that the translator trainee have before asserts them to translation practice. It will be direct the trainer and lecturer to examine the syllabus used at present whether have to be recomposed or not. Second, the translator trainer should be directed to move from translating word to word to translating the text. The translator, of course, also needs to comprehend the text. Third, the lecturer should introduce the textual equivalence to students, what it is, how to achieve it, and what weaknesses that they have in translating the text. The lecturer and students should practice to use the textual rubric as well

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aiwei, Shi.2004.The Important of Teaching Cohesion in Translation on a Textual Level: A Comparison of Test Score Before and After Teaching. **Translation Journal Volume 8, No.2 April 2004.**
[URL:http://accurapid.com/journal/28edu1.htm](http://accurapid.com/journal/28edu1.htm)
- Anderson, Gary. 2005. **Fundamental of Educational Research.** London: Taylor and Francis Library.
- Angelelli, Claudia V. 2009. Using a Rubric to Assess Translation Ability: Defining the Construct, **in Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies**

- (*American Translation Association*). Edited by **Angelelli, Claudia V, and Jacobson, Holly E.** Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Bell, Roger T. 1991. **Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice.** London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Bachman, Lyle F. 1990. **Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, Mona. 2011. **In Other Words: a course book on translation.** London: Routledge
- Bassnett, Susan. 2002. **Translation Studies.** New York: Routledge
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. **Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices.** New York: Pearson Education Inc.
- Campbell, Stuart. 1998. **Translation into the Second language.** London Longman Group Ltd.
- Colina, Sonia. 2003. Towards an Empirically-based Translation Pedagogy in **Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking Translation Pedagogy (American Translator Association)** Edited by **Baer, Brian James and Koby, Geoffrey S.** Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Evans, Ruth. 2001. Metaphor of Translation in **Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies** edited by **Baker, Mona.** London: Routledge
- Gay, L.R and Airasian, Peter. 2000. **Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application.** New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc
- Gile, Daniel. 2009. **Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training (revised edition),** Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company
- Hatim, Basil and Munday, Jeremy. 2004. **Translation: An advance resource book.** New York: Routledge
- Hale, Sandra. 2012. **Improvement to NAATI Testing: Development of a conceptual overview for a new model for NAATI standards, testing and assessment.** South Wales: University of New South Wales
- Hatim, Basil. 2001. **Teaching and Researching Translation.** Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Kim, Mira. 2009. Meaning-Oriented Assessment of Translation: SFL and Its Application to Formative Assessment in **Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies (American Translation Association).** Edited by **Angelelli, Claudia**

- V, and Jacobson, Holly E.** Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Kumar, Ranjit.1996. **Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginner.** Australia: Addison Wesley Longman Australia Pty Limited
- Lodico, Marguerite G., Spaulding, Dean T., and Voegtle, Katherine H.2006. **Methods in Educational Research: Theory and Practice.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Minelli, Elena.2005. Punctuation Strategies in the Textualization Of Femininity: Virginia Woolf Translated into Italian. **New Voice in Translation Studies 2001 vol. 26**
- Montalt,V. Ezpelata, P, and Garcia, I. 2008. The acquisition of Translation Competence Through Textual Genre. **Translation Journal, 12 (4), October 2008**
- McMillan, James H. And Schumacher, Sally 2001, **Research in Education : A Conceptual Introduction,** New York:Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2001. **Introducing Translation Studies : theories and applications.** New York; Routledge
- Newmark, Peter. 2006. **A Textbook of Translation.** London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Nida, Eugene, A.2001.**Context in Translating.** Amsterdam and London:John Benjamin Publishing Company
- PACTE Group.2011. Results of the validation of the PACTE translation competence model: Translation problems and translation competence, **in Methods and Strategi of Process Research: Integrative approaches in Translation Studies Edited by Alvstad, Cecilli. Hild Adelina, and Tiselius Elisabet.** Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company
- Pym, Anthony. 2010. **Translation and Text Transfer: an essay on the principles of intercultural communication.** Tarragona: Intercultural studies group
- Olshanskaya, Natalia. 2003. After (Issac) Babel: Teaching Communicative Competence for Translation **in Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking Translation Pedagogy (American Translator Association) Edited by Baer, Brian James and Koby, Geoffrey S.** Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Jhon Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Ritchie, Jane and Lewis, Jane. 2003. **Qualitative Research**

Procedure. London: Sage publications Ltd

Yin, Robert K.2011. **Qualitative Research from Start to Finish.** New York: The Guilford Press.

Zainurrahman (ed.). 2009.The Theories of translation: from history to procedures **Journal of Philosophy of Language and Education** (<http://zainurrahmans.wordpress.com>)

Waddington, Christopher.2001.Should Students' Translation Be assessed Holistically or Through Error Analysis. **Hermes, Journal of Linguistics no. 26-2001**

Waddington, Christopher. 2001. Different methods of evaluating student translations: the question of validity. **Meta 46(2): 331-325.**

Widdowson, H.G. 2004. **Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis.** Malden: Blackwell Publishing.