

READERS' RESPONSES TO THE READING OF TRANSLATIONS OF CHILDREN'S STORY

Engliana¹, Adityaratri Indrapratiwi², Raden Mas Ransang³

Faculty of Language and Arts, Universitas Indraprasta PGRI

¹engliana@unindra.ac.id, ²nekochan_kawaii@yahoo.com, ³dannytheron12@gmail.com

Abstrak

Tujuan tulisan ini adalah untuk mengetahui reaksi para orang dewasa terhadap dua versi terjemahan bahasa Inggris-ke-Indonesia dari cerita pendek anak-anak dan untuk menjelaskan reaksi para pembaca pada dua versi terjemahan. Pertanyaan wawancara fokus pada strategi penerjemahan loan words atau borrowing. Sepuluh orang tua dengan anak-anak secara sukarela membaca dan menanggapi bacaan terjemahan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa para pembaca berpikir akan lebih baik bagi para penerjemah untuk tidak menerapkan prosedur meminjam (borrowing) dalam menerjemahkan cerita anak-anak karena akan menghalangi makna yang mengakibatkan perasaan tidak nyaman membaca cerita kepada anak-anak mereka.

Kata Kunci: reaksi pembaca, terjemahan cerita anak, teknik meminjam, kesepadanan, ekuivalensi

Abstract

The goals of this paper are to seek the readers' reactions, having gone through the two versions of English-to-Indonesian translations of children's short story, and to explain the readers' reactions to the two versions of the translations. The interview questions focus on the loanword or borrowing translation strategies employed by the student translators. Ten parents with children volunteered to read and respond to translation reading. The results show that the readers thought it would be better for the translators not to apply the borrowing procedure in translating children's stories as it will hinder the meanings resulting in an uneasy feeling of reading the story to their children.

Keywords: reader reaction, children story translation, borrowing, equivalence.

INTRODUCTION

Reader-dependency notion or reader's response relies on the conception or belief established from readers or addressees. Eco (1981) had predicted that these days, "the text theories have shifted toward pragmatics," which means that people are beginning to see that the importance of the texts lies in the reading instead of the generating of the texts. He further emphasized that the problem of reading does not refer to the interpretation anymore, yet it is slightly "concerned with the more formidable questions of the recognition of the reader's response [italics added] as a possibility built into the textual strategy" (Eco, 1981). Therefore, if the reader's response to the reading of a text is immensely important, how important is it to the text resulting from translation? Any kind of responses derived from the action of reading a particular, individual text –

especially the translated text may create and evoke similar thinking or notion from the reading. Nevertheless, it also can evoke different thinking towards the same text from other readers. It is, then, an equivalence in a translated text that is equally as important as the original text.

In translation, equivalence is subject to a long debate among translation scholars. Jakobson sees the concept of equivalence is as “languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they may convey” (as cited in Munday, 2016, p. 61) in the level of gender, of aspect, and semantic fields. Nida (2003) considers that “the success of the translation depends above all on achieving equivalent effect or response” within these four basic requirements: (1) making sense; (2) conveying the spirit and manner of the original; (3) having a natural and accessible form of expression; (4) producing a similar response (as cited in 2016, p. 68). The premise is that any translation must aim to achieve equivalence to the Source Language Text (SLT) on account of the interaction between the schematic awareness of the reader and the textual understanding of the text. The criterion of the quality of the translation is then how to build the closest sets of dynamic interactions between schemas in the mind of the Target Language Text (TLT) readers through the textual form. Thus, the translator's decision-making and creative thinking in identifying equivalent words should be compatible with the expectations of the reader's assumptions concerning the context and his/her ability to infer the relevant message from it.

In the process of rendering the equivalent words, however, the translator has to make certain decisions that may affect word choice and - sometimes - changes in language forms of the TLT in order to achieve the equivalence of meaning. This situation is easy to say that “translation changes everything” (Venuti, 2012) as it is many times impossible to maintain the fidelity of SLT forms while translating their meanings to the readers of other languages. At this moment, the translator should remember that meaning should be carried out in the target language; it is the main goal for him or her in producing the translation. For meaning to successfully arrives in the target readers, the translator may have to look for translation act – decision making and creative thinking – to serve on the basis of communicative purposes: the emphasis on the text of the creation came from strategic communication ideas, which ideally would contribute to the vision of the most equivalence between the text and the translated edition. (Meidasari, 2014). The main idea is to “bridging text to mind” (Scott, 1994).

Xu (2016) proposes to make use reader's response for ‘judging’ equivalence level of translated text – as he remarks that “translation equivalence should be judged and managed based on the reader's response” (2016, p. 104). Xu applied his principles by making a comparison between two Chinese translations of Ulysses from English to Chinese. His remark confirms what Eco had mentioned earlier back in 1981 that the pragmatic level of the text would become the concern and the epicentral issue of a text. Another importance of the reader-dependency notion of translated text of literary texts is presented in the study done by D'Edigio (2015) investigated the reader's reception of translated literary texts and to explore the reader's expectations concerning literary works. She compiled British, American, and Italian online book reviews noting on the English version of Andrea Camilleri's *La forma dell'acqua* ('The Shape of Water') and the Italian version of Stephen King's *Joyland*.

In addition to that, Brooks and Browne (2012) suggest “that because of a range of cultural positions factors into students' meaning-making”; the importance of children's interpretation of the meaning of the message and the honest depiction of the story is

strongly influenced by the reading of the storybooks, as well as the ability of children to interpret the meaning of the message and the honest depiction of the story. Mining the storybook is as essential as understanding the function of the book when the books arrive on the hands of the translators.

The same duty to convey the same message to the target readers is to be done with a realization of the vital message contained in the books. Thus, the role of translators here is not only as of the ‘transmitter’ of the message but also as readers. Tai (2011) mentions that “their double role, as a reader of the source text and ‘author’ of the target text, gives them a different perspective than that of the general reader in the literary process, so that they have an immense possibility of dialogue with the text.” The comparison of texts in other languages necessarily requires the concept of Equivalence. Equivalence has been one of the central topics in translation, although its explanation, relevancy, and relevance within the field of translation concept had heated conflict. In the attempt to research translation equivalence in terms of the reader’s response, the paper intends to find a convincing explanation of possibilities and use regarding translation equivalence and other related fields if necessary. Martin (2018) shows that the lexical choices presenting Islamic teaching concepts are mostly inadequate for children's characters, as well as children's target readers. These choices raise a concern about the understandability of the stories; yet, the verb choices representing Islamic rituals are more child-reader-oriented. The importance of building a corpus of children’s story writers across the world will eventually help the translation of children’s books possible to “reflect the essence” of the original writers’ lexis choices (Malmkjaer, 2018). Thus, we suggest that the reader’s response is the best statement embracing views of new developments in translation reports in a deep communicative frame of reference. Some of today’s most critical theories on translation equivalence regarding the reader’s reaction can be demonstrated through this preliminary study.

Other studies have shown that borrowing and loan words are the most common strategies for both professional writers and (student) translators to deal with difficult-to-translate words (Anam & Nirmala, 2019; Tamburian et al., 2019; Winarto, 2018). Among many translation strategies in translating children’s stories, we would like to see correctly if borrowing/loanwords/loan-translating procedure – as part of the direct translation strategy – work best for translating onomatopoeic words and other cultural items, or proper names occurring in the English language children’s story into Indonesian text. In order to find out if the (student) translators had applied suitable translations to the cultural content of the original text, including onomatopoeic words, which also considered carry a load of cultural expressions, these questions: What are the reasons for readers to choose one translation is better than the other?, and How important is borrowing strategy come into play?a.

RESEARCH METHOD

Several things to prepare for gathering information on readers’ reactions toward translation works are as follows: the TLTs of the story in Indonesian and researcher’s notes. The SLT is not a subject to discuss in the interviewing the volunteers as to keep their focuses on reading the Indonesian texts – thus, avoiding them to compare the SLT and TLTs and hinder the purpose of this research.

The SL and TL Texts

The original text is the story *Angus and the Ducks* (AD) adapted by Leonard Kessler (Flack, 1959); it is a 488-word short children story using simple vocabulary items and

grammatical constructions as well as high narrativity, which made it easy to read and the story is straightforward for children to read and understand. Apart from the simple narrativity, there are some onomatopoeic words, proper names, and compound phrases that occurred in the original text. The words 'quack' and 'woo-oo-oof' co-occur in the text. While compound phrases such as 'Things-Which-Don't-Come-Apart' and 'Things-Outdoors' only show three occurrences in total. The two translations were selected carefully among many students' translation results. The criterion for selecting the TLTs was that both translations should provide the dissimilarities of onomatopoeic translation results.

Procedure

The researchers interviewed random volunteers, yet with a single requirement that they should be parents with young children aged 5 to 7. We decided to come up with ten volunteers to involve in this current research. The volunteers were asked to patiently read two Indonesian versions of AD (both translations translated the title into Angus dan Bebek (AB)). Once they finished reading the two texts, the researchers asked them to write their answers on a piece of paper provided earlier. A short conversation started after they returned the answers to the researchers. The conversation is to support data to their answers. The interview and the entire data collection procedures were conducted in the Indonesian language. These questions are adapted from studies conducted by Klaudy (1996) on translation and the reader's responses (Károly, 2006, slide 6). The results of these questions are collected and organized into tables and will be posed unto the equivalents effect or response within these four basic requirements (Nida, 2003): (1) making sense; (2) conveying the spirit and manner of the original; (3) having a natural and accessible form of expression; (4) producing a similar response.

Table 1 Questions to the respondents

No.	Questions
1	What are the differences between the two translations?
2	Which one is better? Why?
3	What do you think of the borrowings? Are they necessary?
4	Why? (referring to answer given at question no. 3)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The following results are displayed into five parts based on the questions posed to the participants, while the discussion section will be in two subsections related to the research questions of this current article.

Results

Table 2 Translation of proper name

No.	TLT 1	SLT	TLT 2
1	Lalu bebek-bebek itu diberhentikan oleh palung air dibawah sebuah pohon <u>mulberry</u> .	Soon the DUCKS stopped by a stone watering trough under a mulberry tree.	Angus mengikutinya Kemudian bebek-bebek itu terhenti karena ada pot batu yang berisi air yang mengalir sebuah

Burung-burung bernyanyi di pohon <u>mulberry</u> .	Birds sang in the <u>mulberry</u> tree.	pohon <u>mulberry</u> . Angus berhenti juga. Burung bernyanyi dipohon <u>mulberry</u> .
--	---	---

Table 3 Translation of phrasal words

No.	TLT 1	SLT	TLT 2
1	<p>Angus juga penasaran tentang <u>benda-benda yang diluar</u> tapi dia tidak dapat banyak mencari tahu tentang itu karena sebuah tali pengikat.</p> <p>Dia penasaran tentang <u>benda-benda yang terpisah</u> dan <u>benda-benda yang tidak terpisah</u> seperti sandal dan tali selempang pria dan benda-benda yang seperti itu.</p> <p>Angus penasaran tentang banyak tempat dan banyak hal. Dia penasaran tentang apa yang ada di bawah sofa dan di sudut yang gelap dan siapa anjing kecil yang didalam cermin.</p>	<p>Angus was also curious about <u>Things-Outdoors</u> but he could not find out much about them because of a leash.</p> <p>He was curious about <u>Things-Which-Come-Apart</u> and those <u>Things-Which-Don't-Come-Apart</u>, such as SLIPPERS and gentlemen's SUSPENDERS and things like that.</p> <p>Angus was curious about many places and many things: He was curious about WHAT lived under the sofa and in dark corners and WHO was the little dog,</p>	<p>Angus juga ingin tahu dengan <u>Hal -Diluar ruangan</u> tapi dia tidak bisa mencari tahu banyak tentang itu karena ditali.</p> <p>Dia ingin tahu tentang <u>Hal-Yang-Datang-Terpisah</u> dan <u>Hal-Yang-Tidak-Datang-Terpisah</u>; Seperti SANDAL dan TALI SELEMPANGAN dan hal-hal seperti itu</p> <p>Angus ingin tahu dengan banyak tempat dan banyak hal: Dia ingin tahu tentang APA yang hidup dibawah sofa dan dalam sudut gelap dan SIAPA anjing kecil yang ada didalam cermin.</p>

Table 4 Translation of onomatopoeic words

No.	TLT 1	SLT	TLT 2
1	<p>Bunyi itu biasanya bersuara seperti ini: Quack! Quack! Quack!! Quack!! Quack! Quack! Quack!! Matahari membuat pola cahaya melalui celah dedaunan menuju rerumputan Bebek-bebek</p>	<p>The noise usually sounded like this: Quack! Quack! Quack! Quack!! Quack! Quack! Quack!!! The sun made patterns through the leaves over the grass. The DUCKS talked together:</p>	<p>Tapi terkadang terdengar seperti: kuek! kuek! kuek!kuek!kuek!! Kuek! Kuek! Kuek!!! Matahari membuat pola diatas rerumputan melalui dedaunan.Bebek-bebek itu bersuara</p>

	itu berbicara bersama: <u>Quack!</u>	Quack! Quack! Quack! Quack! Quack!	bersama: <u>kuek! kuek!</u> <u>kuek!</u>
2	Tapi terkadang itu bersuara seperti ini: Quackety! Quackety! Quackety! Quackety!	But sometimes it sounded like this: Quackety! Quackety! Quackety! Quackety! Quackety!	- - - Kuek!
3	<u>Lalu</u> Angus <u>berkata</u> : WOO-OO-OOF!!! Angus <u>berkata</u> : WOO- OO-OOF!!!	Angus <u>said</u> : WOO-OO- OOF!!! Then Angus <u>said</u> : WOO-OO-OOF!!!	Angus <u>mengonggong</u> woo-oo-oof!!!
4	Lalu: HISS-S-S-S-S-S- S!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-S-S!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-S-S!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-S-S!!!	Then: HISS-S-S-S- S-S-S!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-S-!!!	- Lalu: HISSSSSS-S-S-S- S-S-!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-S-!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-!!! HISS-S-S-S-S-!!!

Discussion

To those people not acquainted with translation business, one might assume that translating highly specialized books in the medical field could be very complex and require a specific level of knowledge, not just of the medical field, but also of the target language. Moreover, indeed, the hypothesis could be true. However, one might also expect that, when some books may seem simple, like children's storybooks with simple grammar and vocabulary, it could not be any complication at all. As a matter of fact, faithfully understanding children's stories can be very difficult. From the results in the previous section, the translation of some expressions, i.e., onomatopoeic words are not as easy as it may seem. For example, the hissing sounds in Table 4 are not translated into the language of the target culture. Perhaps, the student translators did not know what the equivalent expression in hissing sounds made by ducks in the first place is.

Table 5 Question 1: What are the differences between the two translations?

Respondent	Answers
R1	Language use
R2	The differences are from the use of " <i>kuek</i> " on text 2; text 1 uses "quack." Text 1 also uses " <i>anjing kecil</i> ."
R3	Language use; text 2 is closer to Indonesian-like text
R4	Text 1 is a bit difficult to understand, especially for children
R5	Text 1 is challenging to understand and also the language use is not easy to read
R6	The first story is difficult to understand

R7	The first story is difficult to understand
R8	The first story is rough in translation; the second one is better
R9	Story 2 is consistent with the original text using capital letters on some words
R10	The language use, there is a part of the story missing in story 1.

From overall responses, the first translation is not the most favorable for these parents to read. They noticed that the student translator did not translate some words and the flow of the Indonesian translation is sounded like the source text as respondent eight pictured as “rough” translation compare to the other translation is “better” as it “is closer to Indonesian-like text” and “more children-story like,” said respondents two and five respectively. If the text receives a similar response, it would be successful from the viewpoint of equivalent response.

Table 6. Question 2: Which one is better? Why?

Respondent	Answers
R1	The second translation; it is more natural
R2	Text 2 because it uses the words “ <i>kuek</i> ” and also the word “Hiss”
R3	The second story, because the language is much easier to understand
R4	The second text is more natural and easier for children to understand. It also does not squint the meaning
R5	Text 2 is easier to understand because the text is more children-story like so the children can understand it
R6	The second story is easier to understand
R7	The second story is more natural
R8	The second translation, as it is easier to understand, although the translation is somewhat rough.
R9	Story one is easier to understand
R10	The second story is better, easier to understand

The ST phrases such as ‘Things-Outdoors’ and ‘Things-Which-Come-Apart,’ which characterized by capital letters for each of the initial words and the hyphen marks separating each word, have brought unusual sensations to their readers. The readers expect similar responses to the two-translations. The readers seem to acknowledge the decision-making of the second student translator to stay true to the ST by producing similar text form, yet still maintaining the meaning of these words. When the phrase ‘Things-Outdoors’ is translated with ‘*Hal-Diluar*,’ the respondents felt that it is “more natural” (respondent 7, Table 5), and the translator was “consistent with the original text” (respondent nine, Table 6). Concluding, the fidelity to source language form is sometimes overlooked by translators; they seek to convey the message of the original language in target language form. Such action does not convey

Table 7 Question 3: What do you think of the borrowings? Are they necessary?

Respondent	Answers
R1	(yes, they are) important
R2	Borrowing is important

R3	important
R4	important
R5	Very important
R6	Very important
R7	Important because it helps readers understand the story
R8	Important
R9	Important
R10	Important

Table 8 Question 4: Why (they are (not) necessary?

Respondent	Answers
R1	Help children to understand by copying animal sounds
R2	Because borrowing shows direct sounds from the texts.
R3	Because it is much simpler, easier to be read
R4	To make the text easier to be read and be understood.
R5	(borrowing) helps people understand, and the word usage will become more proper and useful for avoiding misunderstanding.
R6	Important because for those who read the story will understand the story and the use of words become more formal
R7	Better the translator be consistent in using the words 'woof woof' by replacing them with 'guk-guk' in line with replacing 'quack' with 'kuek'
R8	'Woof' is better be replaced with "guk guk."
R9	If borrowing is eliminated, it will change the original story
R10	If the borrowing is replaced with other words, then they will lessen the meaning and not fit with the context.

There are situations in which writing appears, to some degree, required: in advertising slogans or children's stories, for instance. In different instances, there are specific rules about inferred, as regards the adapted version of foreign culture components in the TLT. This usage, for example, weights, musical notation, titles of written works, or geographic names. The fundamental purpose of the translators when attempting to 'adapt' this type of expressions or words is to have the same effect on those to the TLT readers – to 'domesticating' – in a sense, the cultural terms. Borrowing the terms is getting a speech or expressions directly from another word without translation. This process is usually used when the term does not become available in the target culture in any form or when the translator attempts to make some stylistic or exotic results.

CONCLUSION

The (student) translators need to place themselves in the target culture readers in order to achieve adequate equivalent in TL texts. This kind of awareness of placing themselves in the readers' shoes enables the students to acknowledge the source text profile in order to accommodate cultural differences between the SL texts and the intended readers – in this current study, who are parents with children. The present study is very limited in questions posed to the readers' which may hinder to see what the parents or adults – as potential readers and storytellers – are expected in choosing stories or storybooks for their (future) children. Other potential questions such as asking for their expectations and past

experiences are favorable for future research as a purpose to deepen insights into what kind of translation suitable for the Indonesian context. This purpose may lead to research on a kind of possible future publication of children's stories for the coming generation. In addition to that, building corpus data of translated children's stories may help both professionals and student translators to have a variety of lexis and, thus, produce equivalent translations that are close to the 'essence' of the source language.

REFERENCES

- Anam, M. K., & Nirmala, D. (2019). Semantic changes of English loanwords in Radar Kediri daily newspaper headlines. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 9(2), 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v9i2.80-89>
- Brooks, W., & Browne, S. (2012). Towards a culturally situated reader response theory. *Children's Literature in Education*, 43(1), 74–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10583-011-9154-z>
- D'Egidio, A. (2015). How readers perceive translated literary works: An analysis of reader reception. *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 14, 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.1285/I22390359V14P69>
- Eco, U. (1981). The theory of signs and the role of the reader. *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, 14(1), 35. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1314865>
- Flack, M. (1959). Angus and the ducks. In *Best in children's books* (pp. 65–76). Nelson Doubleday Inc.
- Károly, K. (2006). *Research methods in translation studies*. seas3.elte.hu › coursematerial › KarolyKrisztina › TS-lecture8
- Klaudy, K. (1996). Quality assessment in school vs professional translation. In C. Dollerup & V. Appel (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting 3* (pp. 197–207). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.16.27kla>
- Malmkjaer, K. (2018). Children's literature in/and translation: The oeuvre as corpus. *Ilha Do Desterro*, 71(1), 135–150. <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8026.2018v71n1p135>
- Martin, L. (2018). Indonesian Islamic children's literature: The lexical choices in the religious teachings. *English Language in Focus (ELIF)*, 1(1), 23–34. <https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/ELIF/article/view/4491>
- Meidasari, V. E. (2014). Teaching communicative translation: An active reception analysis between the translation and reader's reception. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 2(2), 183–191. <https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE/article/view/105>
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and application* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Nida, E. (2003). *Toward a science of translating*. Brill. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/>
- Scott, L. M. (1994). The bridge from text to mind: Adapting reader-response theory to consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(3), 461. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209411>

- Tai, Y. F. (2011). Reader-response theory applied to translation. *Sendeban*.
https://www.researchgate.net/scientific-contributions/2136528476_Y-F_Tai
- Tamburian, N. M., Pamantung, R. P., & Senduk, A. J. (2019). Kata-kata pinjaman bahasa Inggris dalam Bahasa Indonesia pada Koran Harian "Komentar Manado." *Jurnal Elektronik Fakultas Sastra Universitas Sam Ratulangi*, 1(1).
<https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/jefs/article/view/23454>
- Venuti, L. (2012). Translation changes everything. *In translation changes everything: Theory and practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203074428>
- Winarto, A. B. (2018). Borrowing words in newspaper Seputar Indonesia Desember 2009. *Buletin Al-Turas*, 19(1), 119–134. <https://doi.org/10.15408/bat.v19i1.3704>
- Xu, Z. (2016). Translation equivalence and the reader's response. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 10(2), 98–109. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b8c1/773fec4e2cc476404a26f462e8258c504d0c.pdf>