

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES OF REFUSAL STRATEGIES IN INDONESIAN NOVEL *KEKEJIAN YANG INDAH* TRANSLATED FROM ENGLISH NOVEL *THE BEAUTIFUL MALICE*

Wyut Yee Soe¹⁾, M. R. Nababan²⁾, Djatmika³⁾

Graduate School, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta
Indonesia

¹wyutyeesoe333@gmail.com, ²amantaradja@yahoo.com, ³djatkika@uns.ac.id

Abstract

This study is about the analysis of English refusal strategies and their translation in Indonesian as found in the novel entitled *Kekejian Yang Indah*. The aims of the study are to find out the types of refusal strategies in the original novel and to identify the translation techniques applied by the translator to translate the refusal strategies into Indonesian. The linguistic data were analyzed by using the theory of refusal strategies proposed by Beebe et al (1990). Meanwhile, the translation techniques were identified based on Molina and Albir (2002). The result shows that there are 91 data of refusal strategies. There are 67 direct refusal strategies and 24 indirect refusal strategies. The direct refusal strategies are translated by using established equivalent (135 data), modulation (22 data), explicitation (19 data), variation (19 data), implicitation (14 data), pure borrowing (6 data), reduction (5 data), addition (5 data), deletion (4 data), transposition (2 data), adaptation (1 data), paraphrase (1 data) and discursive creation (1 data). Meanwhile, the indirect refusal strategies are translated by applying established equivalent (49 data), variation (16 data), explicitation (10 data), modulation (8 data), addition (4 data), pure borrowing (3 data), reduction (2 data) and paraphrase (1 data). By using established equivalent frequently, it is assumed that translation of refusal strategies in *Kekejian yang Indah* reflects familiar and usual translation.

Keywords: translation techniques, refusal strategies, direct refusal, indirect refusal

Introduction

Translation is the result of the process of translating words or text from one language into another language. The process of translating is an inner process in an effort to divert messages from source language (SL) to the target language (TL). So, translation is art, skill and science (Nababan, 2008, p. 12). Besides, translation is a written medium and useful connection to communicate with other people in different language, culture and background (Fitria, 2015). By the existence of translation, it can help people to share any perspective of this world. People are able to share information, knowledge, ideas, and lots of things to each other. There are many

differences both source language (SL) and target language (TL) like the structure, culture and style. Therefore, translation is very useful for people who do not have good ability in understanding SL, so they need help to translate it into the TL.

The structure of utterance in TL which reflects difference is refusal strategy. Refusal is a negative response to an offer, request, invitation and suggestion (Searle, 1969). It becomes important because sometimes the speaker cannot always agree or must give positive response to the hearer. There are two main types of refusal strategies as proposed by Beebe et al. (1990) including direct and indirect refusal. Furthermore, the

formulas have been classified as direct and indirect refusal strategies. They also include adjuncts to refusals under the indirect refusal. However, the way people use refusal strategy tends to be different. For example, Western culture tends to be direct while Eastern one seems to be indirect. These differences may render difficulties to translator in transferring meaning.

Furthermore, the way translator transfers meaning is known as translation technique. It aims to know how the translator in translate SL into TL to understand the reader of view from translation products. For example:

Data BM.01

Context of Situation

Alice invites Katherine to come to her birthday party.

Alice : “Do you want to come?”
 “You will not”.

Katherine : “Probably not.”

ST : “Probably not”.

TT : “*Yeah. Kemungkinan memang tidak.*”

The example shows that Katherine directly refused Alice’s invitation. In ST, writer use negative willingness/ability of direct refusal. In TT, translator adds *Yeah* which is categorized as no of direct refusal. In consequence, the technique used by translator by adding some expression reflects different refusal strategy in TT.

Therefore, this study will analyze refusal strategy used by the writer. With theory of translation technique, this study also reveals how translator reproduces refusal strategies produced by writer.

Methodology

This research used descriptive qualitative method. Qualitative descriptive research design typically implemented an eclectic but reasonable combination of sampling and data collection, analysis, and representation techniques. It used to describe linguistic phenomena, particularly the refusal strategies

collected from the novel *Beautiful Malice* and its translation techniques by comparing both English and Indonesian versions “*Kekejian yang Indah*”. The data were obtained through content analysis. The data were refusal strategies in *Beautiful Malice* novel and translation techniques from comparing English and Indonesian versions. To formulate how translator transfers meaning from ST to TT, the study utilized translation techniques theory proposed by Molina and Albir (2012).

Findings and Discussion

1. Refusal Strategies in *Beautiful Malice*

Based on the analysis of refusal strategy in *Beautiful Malice* novel, the study finds that two strategies proposed by Beebe et al. (1990) are used by the writer. It is shown in the following table.

Tabel 1. Refusal Strategy in Beautiful Malice

No.	Refusal Strategy	F	%
1	Direct	67	73,63
2	Indirect	24	26,37
Total		91	100

From the table above, the writer often uses direct refusal that indirect. The writer exploits direct refusal as much as 67 data (73.63%) while indirect one is expressed 24 times (26.37%). For example:

Data BM.06

Katherine is talking to Alice that she thinks of a few good things about travelling like swimming in the Mediterranean, seeing Eiffel Tower, the Great Wall China, etc.

Alice : “**Nah. I like it here.**”

Data BM.04

Katherine is talking to Alice, if she has money, she will spend the money for herself as travelling to somewhere.

Alice : “**I’m not interested in travelling**”.

From the examples above, Alice uses different strategy in refusing Katherine suggestion. In data 06, Alice refuses

Katherine directly by saying “No”. In data 04, Alice indirectly refuses Katherine. She gives reason to what Katherine is suggesting.

2. The relation of refusal strategies and Translation Techniques

After obtaining refusal strategies in English and Indonesian versions, they are compared to reveal translation techniques. As Molina & Albir (2002) suggested, they are 18 techniques of transferring meaning from SL to TL. In this study translator only uses 12 techniques dominated by established equivalent as follows.

Tabel 2. Relation of Refusal Strategies and Translation Techniques

Refusal Strategy	Translation Techniques	F	%
Direct	Established	135	
	Equivalent		41,41
	Modulation	22	6,75
	Variation	19	5,83
	Explicitation	19	5,83
	Implication	14	4,29
	Pure borrowing	6	1,84
	Reduction	5	1,53
	Addition	5	1,53
	Deletion	4	1,23
	Transposition	2	0,61
	Adaptation	1	0,31
Paraphrase	1	0,31	
Indirect	Established	49	
	Equivalent		15,03
	Variation	16	4,91
	Explicitation	10	3,07
	Modulation	8	2,45
	Addition	4	1,23
	Pure borrowing	3	0,92
	Redution	2	0,61
	Paraphrase	1	0,31
Total		326	100

From the table above, there are 326 translation techniques used to translate 91 data of refusal strategies, including 67 data of direct refusal and 24 data of indirect refusal. First, direct refusal strategy is translated by established equivalent (135 data) modulation (22 data), explicitation (19 data), variation (19 data), implication (14 data), pure borrowing (6 data), reduction (5 data), addition (5 data), deletion (4 data),

transposition (2 data), adaptation (1 data), paraphrase (1 data). Second, indirect refusal strategy is transferred by established equivalent (49 data), variation (16 data), explicitation (10 data), modulation (8 data), addition (4 data), pure borrowing (3 data), reduction (2 data) and paraphrase (1 data).

From those, there are 12 techniques used including established equivalent, modulation, explicitation, variation, implication, pure borrowing, reduction, addition, adaptation, and paraphrase.

First, established equivalent refers to using the familiar terms or phrases (based on dictionary or language in daily use). For example:

Data BM.14

ST : “No. I’m Katherine, just Katherine.”

TT : “*Tidak. Namaku Katherine. Panggilanku Katherine.*”

From the example above, *tidak* is a familiar words and usually used in daily life. Se, modulation refers to replacing focus, point of view or cognitive aspects that exist in source language, either lexically or structurally. For example:

Data BM.17

ST : “But I will make it.”

TT : “*Tapi biar aku yang buat.*”

From the example above, translator structurally modulates *I will make it* into *biar aku yang buat*.

Third, explicitation is sub category of amplification. It refers to introducing information from the ST that is implicit from the context or the situation.

Data BM.14

ST : “No. I’m Katherine, just Katherine.”

TT : “*Tidak. Namaku Katherine. Panggilanku Katherine.*”

From the example above, translator transfers *just* explicitly into *panggilan*.

Fourth, variation refers to replacing linguistic or paralinguistic elements that affect linguistic variation. For example:

Data BM.27

ST : “I **don’t** actually know.”
 TT : “*Aku **tak** tahu pesis.*”

From example above, translator uses different language variation to translate *don’t* into *tak*. While ST version is standardized variation, TT version is non-standardized one.

Fifth, implicitation is sub category of reduction. It refers to allowing the situation to indicate information that is explicit in the ST. For example:

Data BM.47

ST : **I don’t think so.** I’m very hungry.
 TT : ***Tidak.** Aku sangat lapar, Ma.*

From example above, translator implicitly transfer *I don’t think so* into *tidak*. It will be equivalent if it replaces by *aku tidak berpikir begitu*.

Sixth, pure borrowing refers to completely applying words or terms directly from the source language into target language without changing anything; for example.

Data BM.14

ST : “No. I’m **Katherine**, just **Katherine**.
 TT : “*Tidak. Namaku **Katherine**. Panggilanku **Katherine**.*”

From the example above, translator transfer *Katherine* directly. It is borrowed without any change.

Seventh, reduction refers to applying with partial removal, because the removal is considered not to cause distortion of meaning. For example:

Data BM.85

ST : “Doesn’t matter. I don’t want talk. **I want to have some fun.**”
 TT : “*Tak masalah. Aku tak minat ngobrol. Aku **senang-senang**.*”

From example above, translator remove want to in TT. However, it still represents writer’s intention.

Eighth, addition is sub category of amplification. It refers to making an addition. For example:

Data BM.33

ST : “I don’t know, Mom.”
 TT : ***Wah**, tidak janji, Ma.*”

From the example above, translator adds information in TT. *Wah* is added and it is not reflected in ST version.

Ninth, deletion is sub category of reduction. It refers to removing information in TT. For example:

Data BM.77

ST : “I don’t want to.”
 TT : -

From the example above, translator removes information in TT. Consequently, refusal strategy is not reflected in TT.

Tenth, transposition refers to changing grammatical category. For example:

Data BM.61

ST : “No. That is not **the weird** bit.”
 TT : “*Bukan. Bukan itu **yang aneh**.*”

The bold word in the example above changes its word class. It changes from noun to adjective.

Eleventh, adaptation refers to replace a ST cultural element with one from the target culture. For example:

Data BM.42

ST : “No way. **God, no.** Give me a little more credit than that.”
 TT : “*Tidak mungkin. **Amit-amit, tidak.** Seleraku belum separah itu.*”

The bold clause in the example above is adapted in TT culture *Amit-amit*. *Amit-*

amit is culturally constructed in TT culture and doesn't exist in ST one. While *God, no* can be equivalently transferred into *Oh Tuhan, tidak*, translator adapts it.

Twelfth, paraphrase is sub category of amplification. It is a lexical change that makes the TT longer than the ST but does not change the meaning. For example:

Data BM.66

ST : "No. **I'll be fine.** Thank anyway."

TT : "*Tidak usah. **Nanti juga sembuh sendiri.** Tapi terimakasih atas tawarannya.*"

The bold clause in TT is longer than ST version. However, the meaning is reflected well.

Conclusion

Refusal is one of speech act express to refuse offer, suggestion, request or invitation from others. This is usually expressed directly and indirectly. From the study conducted in *Beautiful Malice* novel, the writer tends to exploit direct refusal strategy than indirect one. Besides, by comparing those strategies in English and Indonesian versions, the study reveals twelve translation techniques used by translation for handling refusal strategy. They are established equivalent, modulation, explicitation, variation, implicitation, pure borrowing, reduction, addition, adaptation, and paraphrase. From those translation techniques used, translator frequently uses established equivalence which is considered as a familiar translation and usually used in daily life. Henceforth, translation of refusal strategies in *Kekejian yang Indah* reflects familiar and usual translation.

References

Beebe, et al. (1990). Pragmatic Transfer in ESL Refusals. In R. C. Scarcella, E. S. Anderson, and S.D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language* (pp. 55-94). New York: Newbury House.

Fitria. (2015). *Translation Technique of English to Indonesian subtitle in Doraemon*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.

Molina, L. & Albir, A.H. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta*, XLVII, 4.

Nababan, M. R. (2008). *Teori Menerjemah Bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

James, R. (2010). *Beautiful Malice*. New York: Bantam Books