



TRANSLATION ACCEPTABILITY AND READABILITY OF FOOD LABEL MADE BY ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS OF UNP FROM ENGLISH INTO BAHASA INDONESIA

Rani Fransisca & Havid Ardi

English Department

Faculty of Languages and Arts

State University of Padang

email: ranifransisca@gmail.com , havid_a@fbs.unp.ac.id

Abstract

Acceptability and readability are the aspects of translation quality. The objective of this research is to know the translation acceptability and readability made by the students' of English Department of UNP in translating food label from English into Bahasa Indonesia. This study used descriptive method. The data of this research is the translation product of food label made by English Department Students who take English-Indonesian Translation subject. The instruments of this study is translations test. To gain the trustworthiness of the instrument of the research was validated and the acceptability and readability were scored by involving raters. The finding of this study reveal that the score of translation acceptability and readability of food label made by the students is less acceptable but readable. The average score for the acceptability, students' translation acquired the average score of 2.26 which means less acceptable. Meanwhile, for the aspect of readability, the average score of translation made by the students is 2.62 means readable. It can be concluded that the English Department students still need to improve their translation competence.

Key words: translation, acceptability, readability, food label

A. INTRODUCTION

English as a language of international interaction has covered more than just for communication purpose but larger aspects in global scope, includes economical aspects. One of the most apparent indicators of globalization in economic field is export and import activity. As a result of the fact, a lot of brand, products, food are provided with label in English language in the markets throughout the world, including Indonesia. Label is a text printed in product package that lists detail description about the product (Wachidah et al, 2018). In Indonesia, imported products must use label in Bahasa Indonesia based on the regulation of *Peraturan Menteri Perdagangan Republik Indonesia No.73/M-Dag/Per/9/2015* about the obligation to include labels in Bahasa Indonesia.

Translation is the replacement of textual material in source language (SL), by equivalent textual material in the target language (TL) (Catford, 1965). However, Catford's definition relies on the 'replacement' of textual material which does not



reflect the nature of translation. As stated by Ardi (2015) underlying the notion from Newmark (1998), a source text cannot be replaced or transferred as it is into a target language without presenting the message inferred in the text. So, translation is not only about transferring words but it is more about transferring messages or meaning. Newmark (1998) asserts, translation is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text. In Indonesia, translation is offered by most English Department in universities, including Universitas Negeri Padang (UNP) as elective courses. In fact, one of learning outcomes of English Department of UNP is to prepare the students to be translators. Students taking these courses should pass various courses that will help them to produce good translation, such as reading and grammar. Therefore, they are supposed to be able to produce good translation product in various text types, such as, informative texts, vocative texts, expressive texts, etc (see Newmark, 1988 for details).

Since vocative texts play an important role in our daily life, English Department of UNP included this material as their translation practice. Food label is one of vocative texts that become part of important information provided in imported production (Cojocar, 2014). This information is also functioned as vocative text to attract the customers. Therefore, English Department students should be able to produce good translation. Translators must concern the quality of the translation produced. According to Nababan, et al (2012), the criteria to assess translation quality are accuracy, acceptability and readability.

Recently, a number of researchers have conducted studies about students' translation of vocative texts. The study conducted by Azahra (2013) analyzed students ability in translating manuals of medical equipment from English into Indonesian. Another research conducted by Hartati (2014) analyzed students' ability in translating advertisement. Hartati chose advertisement from magazine in Indonesian to be translated into English. However, lack of study which focus on food label. In fact, it is required based on the law. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a research about students' ability to produce acceptable and readability in translating food label, especially from English into Bahasa Indonesia.

This research seeks to analyze translation quality of food label made by students from English into Bahasa Indonesia based on the acceptability and readability.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

The research is designed as a descriptive study. The descriptive method is used since the purpose of this research is to describe and analyze translation acceptability and readability of food label made by students from English into Bahasa Indonesia. This research tries to find the answer the question whether the English Department students of UNP can produce good translation, especially in translating food label.

Data of this research were the translation products of food label made by English Department Students batch 2017. The students who involved in this test are taking translation course in 2019. Source of data are the English Department students majoring English Education who are taking English Indonesian

translation in 2019. This research used cluster sampling technique to get the sample as the informant of the research. For translation subject, the third year students are divided into three classes: Translation A, B and C. Translation B was picked as the sample with a total of 18 students.

This research analyses the acceptability and readability of students' translation and translation test was used as the research instrument to collect the data. The translation test focused on three big components of food label; ingredients of the food, nutrition facts and cooking instruction (tentative).

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Translation readability & acceptability of translation made by the students

From the translation test that held on October 4th 2019, there are 18 translation of food label made by the students. The translation were evaluated by three raters who assessed students' translation based on the acceptability and readability of the translation. The rating results of each rater were tabulated and resulting in separate results from each other. The final result of students' translation acceptability and readability were analyzed by calculating the mean score of the evaluation result done by the three raters.

After analyzing the data from the three raters, the findings of the research on students' translation acceptability and readability in translating food label are illustrated in the tables below.

Table 1. The Average Score of Students' Translation Acceptability

Students	R1	R2	R3	Average	Criteria
1	2.07	2.15	2.57	2.26	Less Acceptable
2	2.28	2.23	2.58	2.36	Less Acceptable
3	2.13	2.23	2.5	2.28	Less Acceptable
4	1.63	1.85	1.72	1.73	Less Acceptable
5	2.33	2.8	2.73	2.62	Acceptable
6	2.27	2.45	2.58	2.43	Less Acceptable
7	2.27	1.8	2.38	2.15	Less Acceptable
8	2.48	2.37	2.87	2.57	Acceptable
9	2.5	2.37	2.52	2.46	Less Acceptable
10	2.47	2.1	2.47	2.34	Less Acceptable
11	2.05	1.82	2.23	2.03	Less Acceptable
12	1.82	1.8	1.72	1.77	Less Acceptable
13	2.48	2.93	2.78	2.73	Acceptable
14	2.07	2.25	2.25	2.18	Less Acceptable
15	2.48	2.73	2.52	2.57	Acceptable
16	2.45	2.43	2.47	2.45	Less Acceptable
17	1.8	1.77	2.1	1.88	Less Acceptable
18	1.95	1.6	2.17	1.9	Less Acceptable
Translation Acceptability				2.26	Less Acceptable

Table 2. The Average Score of Students' Translation Readability

Students	R1	R2	R3	Average	Criteria
1	2.87	2.37	2.72	2.65	Readable
2	2.87	2.93	3	2.93	Readable
3	2.73	2.58	2.85	2.72	Readable
4	2	2	2.08	2.02	Less Readable
5	2.7	3	2.93	2.87	Readable
6	2.87	2.87	2.93	2.88	Readable
7	2.57	2.37	2.73	2.55	Readable
8	2.87	2.57	2.8	2.74	Readable
9	2.85	2.72	2.8	2.78	Readable
10	2.72	2.72	2.93	2.78	Readable
11	2.78	2.1	2.37	2.41	Less Readable
12	2.47	2.23	1.92	2.2	Less Readable
13	2.93	3	3	2.97	Readable
14	2.72	2.67	2.4	2.59	Readable
15	2.7	2.93	2.73	2.78	Readable
16	2.73	2.8	2.73	2.75	Readable
17	2.38	1.97	2.3	2.21	Less Readable
18	2.45	1.87	2.52	2.27	Less Readable
Translation Readability				2.62	Readable

The parameters proposed by Nababan, et al (2012) classify the score of each category into three scales; 1, 2 and 3. Because the data are mostly in decimal numbers, the researcher specified the scale into the three ranges as follows:

- Scale 3 is specified from score 2.51 up to 3.0 for acceptable / readable translation.
- Scale 2 is specified from score 1.51 up to 2.50 for less acceptable / less readable translation.
- Scale 1 is specified from score 1.0 up to 1.50 for unacceptable / unreadable translation.

The score for students' translation of food label shows that that the translation of food label made by the students are less acceptable but readable. For the aspect of acceptability, students' translation acquired the average score of 2.26, meanwhile, for the aspect of readability, the average score of translation made by the students is 2.62.

Furthermore, viewed from the components of food label translated by the students, the score for each component can also be drawn.

Table 3. The Average Score of Food Label

Food Label	Acceptability	Readability
Ingredients	2.19	2.6
Nutrition Facts	2.39	2.75
Cooking Instruction	2.2	2.51
Average	2.26	2.62

Ingredients

Ingredients is the component of food label which lists the materials or substance contained in the food. It mostly consists of noun phrases. From the data analysis, ingredients translated by the students are mostly less acceptable with the mean score of 2.19 but readable with the mean score of 2.6.

Datum no. 033

ST	Ingredients Enriched Wheat Flour (niacin, iron, thiamine and riboflavin), Egg, Starch, Salt, Potassium Carbonate, FD&C Yellow No. %, and less than 0.1% of Sodium Benzoate.
TT	Komposisi Tepung terigu diperkaya (niasin, zat besi, tiamin, dan riboflavin), telur, pati, garam, kalium karbonat, pewarna makanan warna kuning No. 5 dan Sodium Benzoat.

The mean score for this translation is 3 for acceptability and 3 for readability. All three raters give score 3 for the acceptability and readability. Therefore, this translation belongs to good translation which is acceptable and readable. It means the message from the source text is accurately conveyed to the target text. The translation sounds natural and fulfills the linguistic norms of target language. Moreover, the translated text is easy to understand.

Datum no. 072

ST	Ingredients Potato Flakes, Dehydrated Potatoes (Potatoes, Mono and Diglycerides, Sodium Acid Pyrophosphate, Citric Acid added as a preservative).
TT	Bahan-bahan kentang palsu, kentang dehidrasi, mono and diglycerides, asam empedu natrium ditambahkan sebagai pencegahan.

The translation above belongs to poor translation. R1 gives score 1 for acceptability and score 2 for readability. R2 gives score 1 for the two aspects while R3 gives score 2 for the two aspects. It means, the translation is unacceptable and unreadable. Most of the the parts in the source text are translated incorrectly and there are some ambiguous diction used in the translation, such as the phrase “potato flakes” which is translated into “kentang palsu” and “citric acid added as preservative” translated into “asam empedu natrium ditambahkan sebagai pencegahan.

Nutrition Facts

Nutrition facts is the component of food label which provides detailed information about a food’s nutrient content. From the data analysis, nutrition facts translated by the students are mostly less acceptable and readable. The average

score for the aspect of acceptability is 2.39 which corresponds to criteria of less acceptable and the average score for the aspect of readability is 2.75 which corresponds to criteria of readable translation.

Datum no. 099

ST	<p>Nutrition Facts</p> <p>Serving Size: 56.7</p> <p><u>Serving Per Package: 7</u></p> <p>Amount Per Serving</p> <p>Calories: 112</p> <p>Calories from Fat: 2.8%</p> <p>% Daily Value*</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>Total Fat 1g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Saturated Fat 0g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cholesterol 0mg</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sodium 40mg</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Carb 23g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dietary Fiber 1g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Protein 4g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vitamin A: 0%</td> <td style="text-align: right;">Vitamin C: 0 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Calcium: 1 %</u></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>Iron: 8 %</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>*Percent Daily Values are based on a 2,000 calorie diet. Your daily values may be higher or lower depending on your calorie needs.</p>	Total Fat 1g	1 %	Saturated Fat 0g	0 %	Cholesterol 0mg	0 %	Sodium 40mg	2 %	Total Carb 23g	8 %	Dietary Fiber 1g	3 %	Protein 4g	8 %	Vitamin A: 0%	Vitamin C: 0 %	<u>Calcium: 1 %</u>	<u>Iron: 8 %</u>
Total Fat 1g	1 %																		
Saturated Fat 0g	0 %																		
Cholesterol 0mg	0 %																		
Sodium 40mg	2 %																		
Total Carb 23g	8 %																		
Dietary Fiber 1g	3 %																		
Protein 4g	8 %																		
Vitamin A: 0%	Vitamin C: 0 %																		
<u>Calcium: 1 %</u>	<u>Iron: 8 %</u>																		
TT	<p>Informasi Nilai Gizi</p> <p>Takaran Saji: 56.7</p> <p><u>Jumlah sajian perkemasan: 7</u></p> <p>Jumlah per sajian</p> <p>Energi: 112</p> <p>Energi dari lemak: 2.8%</p> <p>% AKG</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>Lemak total 1g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lemak jenuh 0g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kolesterol 0mg</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Natrium 40mg</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Karbohidrat total 23g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serat pangan 1g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Protein 4g</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8 %</td> </tr> </table>	Lemak total 1g	1 %	Lemak jenuh 0g	0 %	Kolesterol 0mg	0 %	Natrium 40mg	2 %	Karbohidrat total 23g	8 %	Serat pangan 1g	3 %	Protein 4g	8 %				
Lemak total 1g	1 %																		
Lemak jenuh 0g	0 %																		
Kolesterol 0mg	0 %																		
Natrium 40mg	2 %																		
Karbohidrat total 23g	8 %																		
Serat pangan 1g	3 %																		
Protein 4g	8 %																		

Vitamin A: 0% Vitamin C: 0 %

Kalsium: 1 % Zat besi: 8 %

*Persen angka kebutuhan gizi
berdasarkan kebutuhan energi
2.000 kkal. Kebutuhan energi
anda mungkin lebih tinggi atau
lebih rendah.

The mean score for the acceptability and readability of this translation is 3.0 because all the three raters give score 3 for the two aspects. They rate 3 for acceptability and 3 for readability. Therefore, this translation belongs to good translation which is acceptable and readable. It means the meaning from the source text is accurately conveyed to the target text. The translation sounds natural and fulfills the linguistic norms of target language. Moreover, the translated text is easy to understand.

Cooking Instruction

Cooking instruction is the component of food label which explains a series of procedure to make or cook the food. Cooking instruction is tentative because it is usually provided only on food packages that need to be processed or cooked first. From the data analysis, cooking instruction translated by the students are mostly less acceptable but readable. The average score for the aspect of acceptability is 2.2 which corresponds to criteria of less acceptable and the average score for the aspect of readability is 2.5 which corresponds to criteria of less readable.

Datum no. 164

ST You'll need: 1 Tbsp butter (or coconut oil)

Instructions

1. Combine 3 Tbsp hot breakfast, butter and 1 cup water in saucepan and bring to a boil
2. Turn off heat and stir mixture until smooth
3. Let rest 1-2 minutes for best texture

For thicker breakfast, use less water or add extra mix. Keto Hot Breakfast will be thin at first and may be take up to 5 minutes to thicken. This is normal.

Microwave: Mix ingredients from step 1 above in microwave safe bowl. Microwave for 1-2 minutes. Stir until smooth. Let rest 1-2 minutes for best texture.

60 calories: For a remarkably filling 60-calorie breakfast loaded with

fiber, omit the butter or coconut oil from step 1 above and just add water.

TT Yang dibutuhkan: 1 sdm mentega (minyak kelapa)

Petunjuk

1. Campurkan 3 sdm hot breakfast, mentega, dan segelas air di dalam panci kemudian didihkan
2. Matikan api dan aduk hingga lembut
3. Diamkan 1 hingga 2 menit untuk hasil terbaik

Agar lebih kental, gunakan lebih sedikit air. Pada awalnya Keto Hot Breakfast akan encer, sekitar 5 menit kemudian akan kental. Ini biasa terjadi.

Microwave: Campurkan komposisi dari langkah pertama diatas di mangkuk microwave. Microwave selama 1-2 menit. Aduk hingga lembut. Diamkan selama 1-2 menit untuk tekstur terbaik.

60 kalori: Untuk sarapan hanya 60 kalori yang mengandung serat, hindari penggunaan mentega atau minyak kelapa pada langkah pertama diatas dan hanya tambahkan air.

R1 and R3 rate 2 for acceptability and 3 for readability while R2 rates 3 for acceptability and readability. Therefore, this translation belongs to good translation which is acceptable and readable. It means the meaning from the source text is accurately conveyed to the target text. The translation sounds natural and fulfills the linguistic norms of target language. Moreover, the translated text is easy to understand. R1 rates 2 for accuracy because there is a part of the source text that seems deleted, that is for the clause "...use less water or add extra mix" translated into "...gunakan lebih sedikit air".

Datum no. 252

ST Cooking Instructions:

Pour contents of one pouch in 1/2 cup (4 oz.) of boiling water. Stir until well mixed. Add 1 tablespoon (1 oz.) of water for thinner consistency. Cover and let stand for about 1 minute. Stir and enjoy.

TT Instruksi memasak

Tuangkan bumbu dalam satu kantong 1/2 cangkir berisi air mendidih. Aduk sampai dicampur. Tambahkan 1 sendok makan (1 oz) air untuk konsistensi yang tipis. Berlindung dan biarkan berdiri selama sekitar 1 menit. Aduk & nikmati.

The translation above belongs to poor translation. R1 and R2 give score 1 for the acceptability and readability while R3 scores 2 for acceptability and readability. It means, the translation is unacceptable and unreadable. Most parts in the source text are translated incorrectly and there are some ambiguous diction used in the translation that really distract the meaning of the source text, such as the sentence "Add 1 tablespoon (1 oz.) of water for thinner consistency" translated into "Tambahkan 1 sendok makan (1 oz) air untuk konsistensi yang tipis" and "Cover and let stand for about 1 minute" translated into "Berlindung dan biarkan berdiri selama sekitar 1 menit".

From, the results of this research, it can be compared to the results of the other researches analyzing students' translation in translating other vocative texts by Azahra (2013), Hartati (2014) and Ramadhani (2014). Moreover, these researches also analyzed translation ability of English Department students. The study conducted by Azahara (2013) indicates that the ability of the students in translating manual equipment is mostly moderate (72%). Hartati (2014) concludes, the ability of the students in translating advertisement is moderate with percentage of 68% students have moderate ability. Ramadhani (2014) concludes her research with the finding that most students (80%) have moderate ability in translating advertisement. Moreover, it also indicates that the students still also need translation theory (Ardi, 2012) especially the strategy in translating vocative text (Cojocar, 2014) and reading ability to be able to translate well (Rahemi & Ardi, 2013).

However, since these three researches focus on the ability of students in translation. It is different with this research which focuses on the acceptability and readability of the translation product. The study conducted by Nur'azizah (2015) also analyzed English Education Department students' translation in translating vocative text that is Barack Obama's political speech. However, Nur'azizah focused her study more on translation process; the strategy used by the students in their translation and the difficulties they encountered. Nur'azizah's study briefly explain about the translation products which were assessed based on criteria of acceptable and unacceptable. The result is also different with this research that most of the translation of speech made by the students (65%) are acceptable or in other words, the quality is good.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research concludes that the translation of food label made by the students are less acceptable but readable. The average score for the acceptability, students' translation acquired the average score of 2.26 which means less acceptable. Meanwhile, for the aspect of readability, the average score of translation made by the students is 2.62 means readable. It is suggested that English Department of UNP provides a more intensive learning of reading involving various types of text, not only essay texts which present long and complex sentences but also short functional texts with various native expressions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ardi, H. (2015). *Pengantar Terjemahan (Introduction to Translation)*. Padang: Sukabina Press.
- Ardi, H. (2012). Is theory of translation needed to build students' translation competence? *International Conference on Languages and Arts*, 320-328
- Azahra, C. (2013). *An analysis of the Third Year Students' Ability in Translating Manuals of Medical Equipment from English into Indonesian at the English Department of Bung Hatta University*. Thesis. Bung Hatta University.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Hartati, L. L. (2014). *An Analysis of Students' Ability of Fourth Year in Translating Advertisement Text on the Magazine from Indonesian into English at Bung Hatta University*. Thesis. Bung Hatta University.
- Nababan, M. R., Nuraeni, & Sumardiono. (2012). "Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan". *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 24(1), 39-57.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Cojocar, O. (2014). Strategies for Translating Vocative Texts. *Cultural Intertexts*. 2014;1(2):287-295
- Pemerintah Indonesia. (2015). Peraturan Menteri Perdagangan Republik Indonesia No.73/M-DAG/PER/9/2015 tentang Pencantuman Label dalam Bahasa Indonesia pada Barang. Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal.
- Rahemi, E.F., Jufri, Ardi, H. (2013). The correlation between reading comprehension and translation ability: A correlational study on fourth year students at English Department of UNP. *Journal of English Language Teaching* 1 (2), 178-186.
- Wachidah, S., Khatimah, Y.R., & Diyantari. (2018). *Buku Guru Bahasa Inggris. Think Globally Act Locally. SMP/MTs Kelas IX*. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.