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Abstract

The differences in two linguistic and cultural systems have made obstacles in translation. Thus, this research is aimed at analysing the translation technique used by the student in translating the narrative text. The data focused on the translation of The Tale of Tom Kitten from English to Indonesian done by ten students of BIPA (Indonesian for non-native speaker) Dharmasiswa at STIBA Saraswati Denpasar. The method of collecting the data in this research was direct observation method. It observed directly through the translation of the fable. There were two techniques used in collecting the data. The first was reading the English version of The Tale of Tom Kitten and the Indonesian translation done by the students. The second technique was choosing the sentences that represent the use of translation techniques in translating the narrative text. The data collected were analysed through descriptive qualitative method. The data analysed were the results of the research. The translation strategies used to translate the narrative text were analysed. The techniques of analyzing the data followed three steps. First, the data represented the translation strategies use in translation was noted. Then, it was analyzed the type of the translations techniques used to translate the sentences from English into Indonesian. The result found that there were four types of techniques used by the students to translate The Tale of Tom Kitten. They are literal technique, establish equivalent technique, reduction technique, and amplification technique.
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I. BACKGROUND

In daily life we often heard about narrative text. Narrative text is a story with complication or problematic events and it tries to find the resolutions to solve the problems. An important part of narrative text is the narrative mode, the set of methods used to communicate the narrative through a process narration. Narrative texts are found in every country and every language. In online Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, Hornby said that narrative is a spoken or written account of connected events; a story. (1974:219).

In translating narrative text, the translator may make some errors. It is firmly stated by Dulay, in his book “Language Two”. He stated that in the performance of learning could not learn without committing errors (1982:138). It means there is possibility to make errors in the practice of translating. The errors in translation are led by many factors, including interference. Menyuk (1971) stated on her book entitled The Acquisition and Development of Language, interference is the use of L1 components when using L2. This may happen in the field of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics.

Considering the theory proposed by Molina and Albir (2002) about five basic characteristics of translation technique, thus this research analyzed about the translation techniques used by the Darmasiswa students in translating The Tale of Tom Kitten.
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHOD

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework and concepts in this research discussed in one section. It covers two approaches namely the theory of translation acceptability and the theory of translation techniques.

The first approach is the theory of translation acceptability proposed by Larson (1984). According to Larson (1984), the acceptable translation is the one which:

a. Uses the normal language forms of the target language.

b. Communicates, as much as possible, to the target language speakers the same meaning that was understood by the speakers of the source language.

c. Maintains the dynamics of the original source language text.

The theory from Larson (1984) is supported by the theory from Nababan (2012) theory. He adds that acceptability is an important aspect in the translation process. The term acceptability refers to whether or not the translation has been revealed according to the target language rules, norms or cultures that apply. The concept of acceptability is important because although the translations is equivalent in its content or message, the translation can be rejected by the target reader if it is contrary toward the rules, norms, and cultures of the target language.

The second approach in this research is the techniques of translation. There are eighteen translation techniques stated by Molina and Albir (2000). They are:

a. Adaptation which means to replace a ST cultural element with one from the target culture.

b. Amplification means introduce details that are not formulated in the ST, information, explicative paraphrasing.

c. Borrowing means taking a word or expression straight from another language. It can be pure borrowing or naturalized borrowing.

d. Calque is literal translation of a foreign word or phrase, it can be lexical or structural.

e. Compensation shown to introduce a ST element of information or stylistic effect in another place in the TT because it cannot be reflected in the same place as in ST.

f. Description means to replace a term of expression with a description of its form or/and function.

g. Discursive creation means to establish a temporary equivalence that is totally unpredictable out of context.

h. Established equivalent can be categorized if the translators use a term or expression recognized (by dictionaries or language in use) as an equivalent in the TL.

i. Generalization means to use a more general or neutral term. It is the opposite of particularization.

j. Linguistic amplification means to add linguistic elements. This is often used in consecutive interpreting and dubbing.

k. Linguistic compression is to synthesize linguistic elements in the TT. This is often used in simultaneous interpreting and in sub-titling.

l. Literal translation means to translate a word or an expression word for word.

m. Modulation means to change point of view, focus or cognitive category relation to the ST, it can be lexical or structural.

n. Particularization is to use a more precise or concrete term. It is the opposite of generalization.

o. Reduction means to suppress a ST information item in the TT. It is the opposite of amplification.
p. Substitution (linguistic, paralinguistic) means to change linguistic elements for
paralinguistic elements (intonation, gesture) or vice versa.
q. Transposition is to change a grammatical category.
r. Variation means to change linguistic or paralinguistic elements (intonation, gesture) that
affect aspects of linguistic variation: changes of textual tone, style, social dialect,
geographical dialect, etc.

The theories are supported by review of related literature. Literature review shares
with the reader the result of other studies that are closely related to the one being undertaken.
It provides a framework for establishing the importance of the study as well as a benchmark
for comparing the results with other findings (Creswell, 2009:25). Thus, in this section some
information is taken from a study and two articles from previous researchers. The relevant
studies reviewed are presented below:

The first research that is related to this study is written by Boushaba (1988) entitled
―An Analytical Study of Some Problems of Literary Translation: A Study of Two Arabic
Translation of K. Gibran’s The Prophet.” The study is concerned to the problems of literary
translation namely: subjectivity in the interpretation of the original message, the question of
stylistic faithfulness and flexibility as regards the form of the original text and the extreme
notion of the impossibility of an adequate translation. Her study is similar to this study in
terms of the analysis of the problems or obstacles in translation process. However, it has
different specification. Her study is focused on literary translation, but this study will focus
on narrative text. The other difference between her study and this study is that her study
described the translation process including subjectivity, stylistic, and extreme notion but this
study will explain about translation techniques using the theory of Molina and Albir (2002).
However, her study and the present one are similar in terms of method and technique of
analyzing data which use descriptive research design. According to the result of the study, it
showed that there were three problems in literary translation. They were subjectivity in the
interpretation of the original message, the question of stylistic faithfulness and flexibility as
regards the form of the original text and the extreme notion of the impossibility of an
adequate translation.

The research of Dharma (2010) entitled “Problems Encountered by Students of
English Department at Muhamadyah University of Malang in Translating English Text into
Indonesian” was conducted using descriptive research design. All of the data analyzed are in
the form of sentences. His research is similar to this research; both analyze the problems or
obstacles in translation process. The data source on his research was taken from fourty-nine
students of sixth semester at English Department of Muhamadyah University of Malang. He
gave questionnaire and test to the students. However, this research use the translation of ten
Dharmasiswa students about English narrative text translated into Indonesian. The findings
showed that the students faced the problems of diction, polysemy, and homonym.

Last, the article written by Utami (2016) entitled “The Obstacles In Translating The
two Goats Done by BIPA Students of La Denpasar”. The writing is focused to analyze the
translation of The Two Goats from English into Indonesian done by BIPA students in La
Denpasar BIPA School and the factors led the obstacles done by the students. Her article is
similar to this study that it will focus on the obstacles of translation process. In spite of that
this study will also analyse the techniques of translation used by the students to translate the
data. In her research the data is focused on the translation of English fable entitled The Two
Goats from English into Indonesian done by ten students of BIPA School La Denpasar. However, the data in this study will use the translation of English narrative text The Tale of Tom Kitten done by ten Dharmasiswa students of STIBA Saraswati Denpasar. At last, it was
found that the obstacles faced by the students are the interference of Indonesian sentence structure, overgeneralization and lack of students’ knowledge about the English culture. The factors led the obstacles faced by the student are the cultural factors, linguistic factors, and the students’ preference in translating The Two Goats from Indonesian into English.

2.2 Research Method
The data in this study was taken from the Dharmasiswa students’ translation of English descriptive text entitled The Tale of Tom Kitten. The descriptive text is in English and it was translated into Indonesia by ten Dharmasiswa students. The students were still studying Indonesian in STIBA Saraswati Denpasar. Those ten students were chosen to translate the narrative text in order to examine their translation, to identify the translation techniques used by them, and to compare the constituent structure of the narrative text from source language to the target language.

The method of collecting the data in this research is direct observation method. It is observed directly through the Dharmasiswa students’ translation. There were two techniques used in collecting the data. They are:
1. Reading. To read the English version of The Tale of Tom Kitten and Dharmasiswa students Indonesian translation of the text.
2. Choosing. To choose the sentences represented the used of translation techniques in translating the narrative text.

After the data collected, they were analyzed. The data analyzed were the results of the research. The techniques of analyzing the data followed two steps.
1. Note taking. The data represented the used of translation techniques in translating The Tale of Tom Kitten were noted.
2. Comparing. The constituent structure from the source language and the target language were compared.

III. RESULT AND ANALYSIS
In this section, the translation of The Tale of Tom Kitten done by Dharmasiswa students was analysed. There are fifty data found, but there are only five data used as the representative data in this research. In each data the translation techniques used in translating those terms were identified. Then, the constituent structure of the source language and the target language of the narrative text were compared.

Data 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Language (SL)</th>
<th>Target Language (TL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once upon a time there were three little kittens, and their names were Mittens, Tom Kitten, and Moppet. (Potter, 2006:06)</td>
<td>Pada suatu hari ada tiga anak kucing kecil, dan nama mereka adalah Mittens, Tom Kitten, dan Moppet. (Tamas Lotos/Hungarian; 27 March 2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sentence in SL above is translated using literal translation method by the translator. It is because it considered as word per word translation. The translation is acceptable because based on Larson’s theory (1998), the sentences in both SL and TL use normal language form. Thus, both sentences in SL and TL communicates the same meaning in Indonesian. So, they maintain the dynamic of both languages, (Larson:1998).
The second data is exactly using the same technique as the previous data. It is translated using literal translation method by the translator. The sentence in source language is translated word per word into Indonesian. The translation is acceptable because based on Larson’s theory (1998), the sentences in both SL and TL use normal language form. Thus, both sentences in SL and TL communicates the same meaning in Indonesian. So, they maintain the dynamic of both languages.

Data 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Language (SL)</th>
<th>Target Language (TL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First she scrubbed their faces (this one is Moppet).</td>
<td>Pertama dia menggosok wajah mereka (yang ini adalah Moppet).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potter, 2006:08)

(Helena/Polish /Hungarian; 27 March 2019)

The phrase played in the dust in SL above is translated into bermain di debu. It is clearly shown that this sentence is translated using literal translation as it is translated word per word. But in this case the sentence failed to get the closest natural equivalent in Indonesian. Played in the dust is better to translate into bermain debu. Omission translation technique is needed in this sentence. However, the translator failed to create an acceptable translation since it doesn’t maintain the dynamic of both languages.

Data 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Language (SL)</th>
<th>Target Language (TL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They had little fur coats of their own; and they tumbled about the doorstep and played in the dust.</td>
<td>Mereka punya mantel bulu mereka sendiri, dan jatuh dekat ambang pintu, dan bermain di debu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potter, 2006:06)

(Ivana Dalecka/Slovakian; 27 March 2019)

The word expected in English is translated into menunggu in Indonesian. The translator used established equivalent method in translating the word. It is the same as the word fetched is translated into mengumpulkan in Indonesian. The translation is acceptable because based on Larson’s theory (1998), the words expected and fetched uses normal language form when it is translated into target language menunggu and mengumpulkan in Indonesian. Thus, those words in English communicates the same meaning to the in Indonesian. So, when it is combined in the sentences it maintains the dynamic of the source language that is English.
**Menyisir** is the literal translation of *to comb* in English. But the translator translate the word *brushed* in English into *menyisir* in Indonesian. The translator used established equivalent method in translating the word. The translator chose the word *menyisir* instead of *menyikat* in Indonesian, which sounds more natural in target language. The translation is acceptable because based on Larson’s theory (1998), the words expected and fetched uses normal language form when it is translated into target language *brushed* and *menyisir* in Indonesian. Thus, those words in English communicates the same meaning to the in Indonesian. So, when it is combined in the sentences it maintains the dynamic of the source language that is English.

The phrase *in clean pinafores and tucker* is translated into *dengan gaun dan baju pelapis* by the translator. He used the technique of reduction in translating the sentences. This translation is acceptable according to Larson’s theory that in both language it communicates the same meaning. It succeed to get the closest natural equivalent in the target language, although the translator also used reduction technique to translate the source language. The result is the word *clean* is not translated literally. The translator omitted the translation of the word *clean* in the target language. Otherwise, the translator translate it into *dengan gaun dan baju berlapis* in Indonesian. The word *dengan gaun dan baju berlapis* in the target language is already maintain the dynamic of the meaning in the source language. The translator did not get any problems in translating the verbs since his translation is acceptable in the target language. Based on London Institute of Linguistic (in Hasnawi, 2003), this is happened because the translator has practical experience in translating from related fields which is beneficial in avoiding the problems.
The sentence *this is Tom Kitten* is not translated in the target language by the translator. He used the technique of reduction in translating the sentences. This translation is acceptable according to Larson’s theory that in both language it communicates the same meaning. It succeed to get the closest natural equivalent in the target language, although the translator also used reduction technique to translate the source language. Although the sentence *this is Tom Kitten* is not translated, it can be understood by the picture presented on the book and by the previous sentences. So that the translator omitted the translation of the sentence *this is Tom Kitten* in the target language. It is already maintain the dynamic of the meaning in the source language. The translator did not get any problems in translating the verbs since his translation is acceptable in the target language. Based on London Institute of Linguistic (in Hasnawi, 2003), this is happened because the translator has practical experience in translating from related fields which is beneficial in avoiding the problems.

**Data 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Language (SL)</th>
<th>Target Language (TL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kitten was very fat, and he had grown; <em>several button burst off.</em></td>
<td>Tom yang gemuk, dia menjadi lebih besar <em>jadi beberapa kancingnya lepas.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potter, 2006:11 )

(Lidia Cano/Spanish; 27 March 2019)

The data 8 above was translated using linguistic amplification method which was adding some linguistic element in the term. The source language *several button burst off* is translated into *jadi beberapa kancingnya lepas*. The translator added the word *jadi* in target language to make it sounds more natural so it can maintain the dynamic of both languages. This translation is acceptable according to Larson’s theory that in both language it communicates the same meaning.

**Data 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Language (SL)</th>
<th>Target Language (TL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom was very naughty, and he scratched.</td>
<td>Tom adalah kucing yang nakal dan dia mencakar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potter, 2006:09 )

(Ladislav Vontsemu/Slovakian; 27 March 2019)

The data 9 above was translated using linguistic amplification method which was adding some linguistic element in the term. The source language *Tom was very naughty* is translated into *Tom adalah kucing yang nakal*. The translator added the word *kucing* in target language to emphasize the description of the character Tom so it can maintain the dynamic of both languages. And also this sentence use reduction technique of translation. The word *very* is not translated in the target language. Yet it’s still understandable from the word *mencakar* which shows that the cat is very naughty. This translation is acceptable according to Larson’s theory that in both language it communicates the same meaning.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

After the data were analyzed it can be concluded that there were four techniques used in translating the narrative text *The Tale of Tom Kitten* from English into Indonesian. They are literal technique, establish equivalent technique, reduction technique, and amplification technique. Some of the translation are not acceptable since it doesn’t the closest natural equivalent in the target language, in this case is Indonesian. Yet, most of the translation are acceptable, because the translators have a
sense of discrimination in order to decide the most suitable equivalent term from the literature of the field or from dictionaries and by the translator who has wide knowledge of the subject matter of the source language text. The translation techniques affect the result of the translation, are classified by comparison with the original affect the micro-unit of text, are by nature discursive and contextual, and are functional.
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