

Macrostructure analysis of Indonesian-translation and source texts of the World Health Organization's Covid-19 pandemic guidance

Risnawaty^{1*}, Milisi Sembiring², Ihsan Fadilah³, Henni Subagiarti⁴, and Annim Hasibuan⁵

¹Master's Program in Indonesian Language Education, Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al-Washliyah, Jalan Garu II No. 93, Kota Medan, Indonesia

²Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Methodist Indonesia Jalan Hang Tuah No. 8 Medan, Indonesia

³Tampan Mental Health Hospital, Jl. HR. Soebrantas No.KM 12.5, Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia

⁴Department of English Education, Universitas Asahan, Jalan Jend. Ahmad Yani, Kisaran, Indonesia

⁵Department of English Education, Universitas Islam Labuhan Batu, Jl. H. M. Yunus No. 09 Kel. Padang Bulan, Rantauprapat

ABSTRACT

Since the beginning of the Covid-19 Pandemic, the world has heavily relied on the internet to acquire information. The Pandemic is growing as a complex information discourse with so many texts from many sources. Various texts about Covid-19 certainly have various meanings for their readers. It is interesting to see an information resource that presents information in many languages in parallel. This study aims to reveal the global meaning of the parallel Indonesian and English texts of Covid-19 released by the World Health Organization. More specifically, this study examines whether parallelism in the two versions of the same text will present differences in the global meaning of each text; and whether there are social and political aspects that potentially affect the differences. The data for this study consists of two pairs of question-and-answer texts about Covid-19 published by WHO in English and Indonesian. This study used van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis framework at the macrostructure level. This study collected all texts and macro rules (deletion, generalization, and construction) have been applied to reduce information at the texts' micro level to macropropositions at the macro level or the global topics/themes of discourse. There are some differences in the Indonesian text when compared to the original English text. Some of these differences may appear in the Indonesian translated version as a response to Indonesia's social and political conditions during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis; discourse; text; translation; translation; World Health Organization

First Received:

7 February 2022

Revised:

27 April 2022

Accepted:

20 September 2022

Final Proof Received:

27 September 2022

Published:

30 September 2022

How to cite (in APA style):

Risnawaty, R., Sembiring, M., Fadilah, I., Subagiarti, H., & Hasibuan, A. (2022).

Macrostructure analysis of Indonesian-translation and source texts of the World Health Organization's Covid-19 pandemic guidance. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 533-544. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i2.43858>

INTRODUCTION

The delivery of the message is the most vital aspect in a translation since it is a process of transferring the messages from a language into another language. Nowadays, several studies in the field of

translation have shown that the problem of message delivery does not only include messages in conventional language units, such as sentences or words (Dušková, 2018). It also reaches study on the global meaning of translation, focusing on the

* Corresponding Author

Email: risnawaty.um naw@gmail.com

macrostructure analysis of both target and source texts (see Purnomo, 2019; Wong, 2020).

Macrostructure analysis is often used to show the structure of comprehensive meaning of text. In van Dijk's (2019) terminology, this comprehensive meaning is called *global meaning*. The idea of a global meaning is mostly introduced in ideas about discourse, especially in the critical discourse studies. In the most general sense, the object of research in Critical Discourse Analysis is the public sphere: the social space and social practice in which people as citizens or social actors engage in interactions about social and political issues (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2022; Wodak, 2020). This idea has actually shown that critical discourse studies and translation share space because translation is a textual realization of information on roles and interactions, which can also include social and political aspects. Translation plays important role in moving information, knowledge, and culture in all sorts of disciplines, such as medical, economical, technological sciences, etc. from a source language (SL) into a target language (TL) for the purpose of communication.

Communication can be complete if a message reaches the addressee successfully. The message is mixed in a text, either spoken or written. Text is a semantic unit and not a mere unit of form (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 1). The text that serves to convey the message is delivered in linguistic and paralinguistic spaces. At the linguistic level, a text is realized with or manifested in sentences (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 2), while in the paralinguistic realm the text is manifested in images, symbols, signs, buildings, and music (Fairclough, 2019, p. 4).

In its function as a language unit, text does not only contain messages but it also has the power to make the addressee carrying out the message (Sabrina et al., 2021, p. 53). Certain texts not only contain informative and directive messages but also contain certain educational and ideological messages (Levitskaya & Fedorov, 2021, p. 326). To make the speaker, listener, and reader understand and carry out the content of the text, the speaker or writer can choose media that is appropriate to the age of the reader. For example, texts about the Covid-19 Pandemic, of course, are mostly intended to provide education about the pandemic. The messages must be clear and provide information that can be a guide for readers in dealing with the pandemic. Previous studies have tried to reveal the power relation in Covid-19 Pandemic texts, such as Abbas (2022), Cozza et al. (2021), and Grzelka, M. (2020). This study tried to fill another gaps, focusing on the worldwide health authority.

Since the beginning of the pandemic, the World Health Organization (WHO) has taken on various roles in handling Covid-19. One of its roles is to provide education to the world community. The WHO has made various textual products for the

purpose of educating the world community. these texts were produced by the WHO in many languages, including English and Indonesian. This study aims to critically analyze the delivery of information related to the Covid-19 Pandemic in the WHO texts in both English and Indonesian: (1) Are there any significant differences in macrostructures of the original text and its translated text; and (2) Is there a possibility of translator interference in the shift of global meaning of the texts?

METHOD

This study is a study of translation using van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis tool to achieve the objectives stated in the previous section. The use of the Critical Discourse Analysis tool to critically assess the quality and results of translations has been massively used, such as by Ahmed and Hamad (2022), Pan and Liao (2021), and Zeng (2022). There have even been several scholars, such as Zanettin (2021), who provide guidance on exposure to Critical Discourse Analysis in translation. Because the purpose of this study is to reveal (1) any significant differences in macrostructures of the original text and its translated text; and (2) any possibility of translator interference in the shift of global meaning of the texts, van Dijk's (1983, 2009, 2014, 2019) macrostructure analysis framework is selected.

The relationship between van Dijk's framework and the objectives of this study can be expressed through van Dijk's description (1988, pp. 17-94) that a study on discourse is not enough to be based solely on a text analysis. The text is only the result of a production practice that also needs to be observed. In this case, it must also be seen how a text is produced, so that a knowledge of why the text has a certain form. In this case, this study will try to see how the WHO texts, both source texts and Indonesian translations, can be assessed for suitability and interpreted critically.

Based on the ideas above, this study places all texts related to the COVID-19 Pandemic from the WHO as the population of this study. This study uses purposive sampling (Alwasilah, 2011, p. 72; and see the application similar to this study in Donina & Hasanefendic, 2019, p. 32). Purposive sampling in this study is based on the main characteristics of the population that have similarities. In other words, this study only uses samples that meet certain criteria. As previously explained, the population of this study is the entire text of the WHO Covid-19 Pandemic, published after March 2020.

To obtain population representation, the text used as data consists of two pairs of texts in the original language (English) and the Indonesian translation. The texts contain narratives from the WHO's explanation of the Covid-19 Pandemic,

which was published between March and October 2020. The time range was chosen purposively because of the expectation of the authenticity of the data. Then this study specifically and purposively selects four question-and-answer texts about the Covid-19 pandemic that are most accessed on the WHO website, which is located at www.who.int. With selected sample texts, generalizations, both

institutionally and language products, are expected to meet the requirements for representation (cf. Alwasilah, 2011, p. 73).

For the purposes of this study, the four texts, which are two pairs of the original text and its translation, are coded Text 1 and 2 with code A for the original text and B for the translation. For more details, here are the four texts.

Table 1
Original and Translation Texts Used in This Study

Text Code	Text Title	Words	Sentences	Paragraphs
1A	What is 'herd immunity'?	333	13	5
1B	<i>Apa itu 'kekebalan kelompok'?</i>	234	12	6
2A	What is WHO's position on 'herd immunity' as a way of fighting COVID-19?	281	13	6
2B	<i>Bagaimana sikap WHO terhadap 'kekebalan kelompok' sebagai suatu cara melawan COVID-19?</i>	272	13	6

To explain Table 1 above, Text 1B is an Indonesian translation of Text 1A, which is the original English version. Similarly, Text 2B is an Indonesian translation of Text 2A which is the original English version.

Previously, it has been explained that this research uses a Critical Discourse Analysis framework (van Dijk 1998, 2008, pp. 86-90, and 2009, pp. 62-86). Van Dijk (1998, 2009) describes texts at three levels: macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure. This study only used the framework on the macrostructure, in line with the objectives of this study. In general, van Dijk (2019) explains that the macro structure is the general meaning of the text that can be understood by reading certain topics or themes in the text.

By referring to the method and analytical framework used, the steps in this research are (1) reading all the texts; (2) mapping for descriptions and general descriptions of texts; (3) perform macrostructure analysis based on van Dijk's framework (1982, 1998, and 2009); (4) mark any significant differences in macrostructures of the

original text and its translated text; and (5) examines any possibilities of translator interference in the shift of global meaning of the texts.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Texts' Microstructures and Macrostructures Level 1

To start the findings and discussion, it should be emphasized that this study explored the QnA texts from the WHO's website as a written discourse that represents the WHO's perspective on the Covid-19 Pandemic. In this case, this study looked at the general institutional perspective of the WHO may receive interference from the translator's perspective on the phenomenon of the Covid-19 Pandemic. Of the four texts used, the table below summarizes the total *macrostructure* of the texts. The table shows that 12 second-level macrostructures of the four texts have been found. In other words, the macro structure in the four texts used is at the highest level and represents the entire text and cannot be reduced further by macro rules (see Oganeseva, 2021, p. 41).

Table 2
Macrostructure of the Texts

Text Code	Microproposition	Macroproposition Level 1 (M-1)	Macroproposition Level 2 (m-2)
1A	13	6	3
1B	12	6	3
2A	13	6	3
2B	13	6	3

An interesting finding from Table 2 is the fact that the text 1B has reduced the number of micropropositions from the original text 1A. In other words, there is one sentence in the original text that has no equivalent in the translated text. This section is important to note because it is possible that the structure of the macro proposition is affected by this change in composition.

Differences in the composition of micropropositions will affect the building of global meaning in the text (see van Dijk 2019, p. 4). In turn, the general meaning of the text can also change significantly. The following is the microproposition of the original text 1A which has no equivalent in the translated text of 1B.

Example 1

WHO supports achieving 'herd immunity' through vaccination, not by allowing a disease to spread through any segment of the population, as this would result in unnecessary cases and deaths.

(Sentence 2, Paragraph 1, Text 1A)

For comparison, the following is the first microproposition in the original text 1A and the

'Kekebalan Immunity	kelompok' (herd immunity), group/herd		yang that	Juga also	dikenal known	sebagai as		
'kekebalan immunity	populasi', population	adalah is	Konsep Concept	yang that	digunakan used	untuk for	imunisasi, immunization	
di in	mana which	suatu a	populasi population	dapat can	terlindung be protected	dari from	virus virus	tertentu Certain
jika if	suatu a	ambang limit	cakupan coverage	imunisasi immunization	tertentu certain	tercapai. achieved		

(Sentence 1, Paragraph 1, Text 1B)

From the flow of information in sentences 1 and 2 of the original text 1A, the text tries to build cohesiveness between information related to herd immunity and the WHO supports. However, translated text 1B chose to remove information regarding the WHO supports. From these findings, it can be assumed that there are early indications of differences in the global meaning of the two texts which should be equivalent.

For more details, and in line with the objectives of this study, the findings and discussion can be continued by looking at how level 1 macrostructures are formed from existing micropropositions. As shown in the Table 2, there are three level 1 macropropositions throughout the text. The macropropositions, at least represent the number of paragraphs in each text. These macropropositions can be used as a starting point for explaining the macrostructure of each text.

A macrostructure is not only the global structure of a text but also includes some schematic structures consisting of knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies (Negryshev, 2020; Van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983, p. 183). The macro structure consists of one or more words, which express the

translated text 1B, which is the precursor to the missing microproposition above.

Example 2

'Herd immunity', also known as 'population immunity', is the indirect protection from an infectious disease that happens when a population is immune either through vaccination or immunity developed through previous infection.

(Sentence 1, Paragraph 1, Text 1A)

discourse topic of the text which is called a macroproposition. These macro propositions are derived from the text through macro rules, which summarize and reduce information to its core or organize propositions into hierarchical macrostructures based on contextual knowledge (Dosi & Douka, 2021, p. 18; van Dijk 2019, p. 30).

In the first-level macro-structure analysis, macropropositions are explored by applying linguistic features called *macro-rules*. To find out the global meaning structure of WHO texts in both languages, macro rules must be applied first based on all texts to reveal the macro structure that reflects the focus of each text. Thus, the use of macro rules can help reduce non-essential information and allow the reader to use the information adequately (van Dijk 2019, p. 14). There are three types of macro rules used in finding out the macro structure of the text, namely deletion, generalization, and construction (Van Dijk 1988, p. 10). From the exploration results of the first level macropropositions, the table below shows how each text displays its own global meaning character formation.

Table 3
Macro-Rule on Text by Type

Text Code	Macro Rule			Total Macro Rule
	Construction	Generalization	Deletion	
1A	2	1	3	6
1B	2	1	3	6
2A	1	1	4	6
2B	1	2	3	6

As can be seen in the Table 3 above, each text shows a strong deletion character in the formation of macropropositions. In this case it can be interpreted

that the WHO as an institution intends to provide complete information regarding the Covid-19 pandemic. However, some of the information may

be too specific or even too general. For example, in giving an explanation about Covid-19, the text is made to talk too much about the concept of immunization. This can be an indication that the WHO is still unable to provide a complete picture regarding specific ways of handling the Covid-19 pandemic through the texts it has released. For clarity, the next section will discuss each macrorule and the differences between the original and translated texts.

Deletion

The deletion rule concerns the reduction of unnecessary or irrelevant information related to

Covid-19 from the text. This deletion can be applied to information in the form of words, phrases, clauses (van Dijk 1980, p. 52) or even whole sentences (p. 66). Information or propositions that are removed from micro propositions are information that is irrelevant in the interpretation of discourse macro propositions for the representation of the Covid-19 Pandemic. In other words, this deletion allows the reader to construct global facts that represent global events and actions practiced by the WHO. The following is an example of deletion in the original text and the translated text number 2.

Example 3

Microproposition	Macroproposition Level 1
<i>Attempts to reach 'herd immunity' through exposing people to a virus are scientifically problematic and unethical. Letting COVID-19 spread through populations, of any age or health status will lead to unnecessary infections, suffering and death.</i> (Sentence 1-2, Paragraph 1, Text 2A)	<i>Letting COVID-19 spread will lead to suffering.</i>

The flow for the formation of Level 1 macropropositions in the translated text in the example 4. Based on the example, the WHO seems to be trying to comprehensively represent the pandemic situation when explaining the institution's stance. In this case, the WHO places Covid-19 Pandemic as the global topic that is the center of discussion in both the translated and original texts. This is possible, partly because of the possibility of different translators of Text 1 and Text 2. In Text 2,

the translation seems to be done using a more source-based techniques, compared to Text 1 which is more meaning-based (see Azad, 2022). However, it is not the focus of this study. The essence of this comparison is that there is a clear indication that there is a tendency for Indonesian-language translators to interfere with the global meaning construction of the texts used in this study.

Example 4

Micropropositions:

<i>Upaya-upaya</i> efforts	<i>Mencapai</i> Achieve	<i>'kekebalan</i> immunity	<i>kelompok'</i> group	<i>melalui</i> through	<i>tindakan</i> action	<i>memaparkan</i> infecting	<i>orang</i> people		
<i>terhadap</i> To	<i>suatu</i> a	<i>virus</i> virus	<i>merupakan</i> is	<i>tindakan</i> action	<i>yang</i> that	<i>dari</i> from	<i>sisi</i> side	<i>keilmuan</i> scientific	<i>bermasalah</i> problematic
<i>dan</i> and	<i>tidak</i> not	<i>etis.</i> ethical							
<i>Membiarkan</i> letting	<i>COVID-19</i> Covid-19	<i>menyebarkan</i> spread	<i>di</i> in	<i>tengah</i> middle	<i>penduduk,</i> population	<i>terlepas</i> despite	<i>dari</i> from	<i>usia</i> age	<i>atau</i> or
<i>status</i> status	<i>kesehatan</i> health	<i>akan</i> will	<i>mengakibatkan</i> cause	<i>infeksi,</i> infection	<i>penderitaan,</i> suffering	<i>dan</i> and	<i>kematian</i> death		
<i>yang</i> that	<i>tidak</i> not	<i>seharusnya</i> should	<i>terjadi.</i> happen						

(Sentence 1-2, Paragraph 1, Text 2B)

Macroproposition Level 1:

<i>Membiarkan</i> letting	<i>COVID-19</i> Covid-19	<i>menyebarkan</i> spread	<i>akan</i> will	<i>mengakibatkan</i> cause	<i>penderitaan.</i> Suffering
------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------

Generalization

In the use of generalization rules, certain series of propositions are converted into more general propositions. Participants and predicates are elements that can be generalized. Participants can be

grouped, while the predicates are included in the same marker, which denotes the superset of the property or relation denoted (cf. van Dijk 2019, p. 47). As can be seen in the Table 3, this study found at least one generalization on the formation of

macropropositions in each text. In this case, it is certain that the original texts as well as the translated texts both use these macro-rules to develop global meanings that emphasize general

health matters, in addition to the specific aspects of the Covid-19 pandemic. The following is an example of generalization in the original text and the translated text number 1.

Example 5

Microproposition	Macroproposition Level 1
<i>To safely achieve herd immunity against COVID-19, a substantial proportion of a population would need to be vaccinated, lowering the overall amount of virus able to spread in the whole population. One of the aims with working towards herd immunity is to keep vulnerable groups who cannot get vaccinated (e.g. due to health conditions like allergic reactions to the vaccine) safe and protected from the disease.</i>	<i>To safely achieve herd immunity, a proportion of a population would need to be vaccinated to keep vulnerable groups safe.</i>
(Sentence 5-6, Paragraph 4, Text 2A)	

The flow for the formation of Level 1 macropropositions in the translated text (Example 6). In the translated text, the translator made generalizations from the beginning by changing the term *herd immunity*, as a condition, in the original text into a concept *konsep*. The changes the meaning of the formed macroproposition. In the original text, the macrostructure has the theme of *To safely achieve herd immunity*. On the other hand, in the translated text, the global meaning rests on *dalam konsep kekebalan kelompok* (in the concept of herd immunity). In this section, the big role of the translator can be seen through the shift in global meaning in the macroproposition of the translated text.

Apart from the finding, it should also be noted that the translator has inserted information that has no equivalent in the original text. Sentence 6, which reads *Alhasil, tidak semua orang perlu diimunisasi agar terlindungi* (Then, not all people have to be vaccinated to be protected), cannot be found in the original text. Despite the fact that the translator uses a method that tends to be meaning-based, this addition is quite significant in the original text because there is a tendency for the translator to let people perceive that vaccination is not necessary for everyone. Therefore, it is reasonable to suspect that the insertion of information and changes in global meaning in the translated text are proven to be strongly influenced by the translator, as the party who chooses the structure and words of the text

Example 6

Microproposition:

<i>Dalam konsep</i>	<i>kekebalan</i>	<i>kelompok,</i>	<i>sebagian</i>	<i>besar</i>	<i>penduduk</i>	<i>diimunisasi,</i>
in concept	immunity	group	part	big	population	vaccinated
<i>sehingga</i>	<i>menurunkan</i>	<i>jumlah</i>	<i>keseluruhan</i>	<i>virus</i>		
so	lowering	amount	whole	virus		
<i>yang dapat</i>	<i>menyebarkan</i>	<i>ke seluruh</i>	<i>populasi.</i>			
that can	spread	To whole	population			
<i>Alhasil,</i>	<i>tidak</i>	<i>semua</i>	<i>orang</i>	<i>perlu</i>	<i>diimunisasi</i>	<i>agar</i>
then	not	all	people	need	vaccinated	to
<i>Hal ini</i>	<i>membantu</i>	<i>memastikan</i>	<i>bahwa</i>	<i>kelompok-kelompok</i>	<i>rentan</i>	
matter this	help	ensure	that	groups	vulnerable	
<i>yang tidak</i>	<i>dapat</i>	<i>diimunisasi</i>	<i>tetap</i>	<i>aman.</i>		
that not	can	vaccinated	stay	safe		

(Sentence 5-7, Paragraph 4, Text 2A)

Macroproposition:

<i>Dalam konsep</i>	<i>kekebalan</i>	<i>kelompok,</i>	<i>sebagian</i>	<i>besar</i>	<i>penduduk</i>	<i>diimunisasi,</i>
in concept	immunity	group	part	big	population	Vaccinated
<i>memastikan</i>	<i>kelompok</i>	<i>rentan</i>	<i>tetap</i>	<i>aman.</i>		
ensure	group	vulnerable	stay	safe		

Construction

By applying construction rules to micropropositions in each text, new global information will be able to be formed in a higher level of predication (cf. van Dijk 2019, p. 48). That is, this rule requires substitution or exchange between concepts at the micro level with more global

concepts at the macro level, followed by integrating propositions containing the same facts, and forming new global information that is in the same context or topic. In general, construction rule helps to organize micro-information by combining information together as a single unit, reducing information without deleting, and formatting new information at

a more global level. The Table 3 shows the total occurrence of construction rules in the copy texts as many as six processes.

As can be seen in Table 3, the pair of Text 1 has more of a construction character in the formation of macropropositions. This study is open to the possibility that this is due to the meaning-based translation technique used by the Text 1 pair.

However, this is not the focus of this study. This study, in line with its objectives, considers that there is a change in global meaning in translated text 1B caused by translator interference. For clarity, the example below shows how macropropositions in Original Text 1A and Translated Text 1B are formed through the construction process.

Example 7

Microproposition	Macroproposition Level 1
<i>The percentage of people who need to be immune in order to achieve herd immunity varies with each disease. For example, herd immunity against measles requires about 95% of a population to be vaccinated. The remaining 5% will be protected by the fact that measles will not spread among those who are vaccinated. For polio, the threshold is about 80%.</i> (Sentence 7-10, Paragraph 5, Text 2A)	<i>The percentage of immune people to achieve herd immunity varies, measles requires about 95% and polio requires 80%.</i>

The flow for the formation of Level 1 macropropositions in the translated text in Example 8. As can be seen, macropropositions Level 1 in both the original and translated texts must be formed through construction, in order to create meanings that summarize all the meanings represented in their respective micropropositions. If the two macropropositions are compared, the representation of level 1 macropropositions in the translated and the original texts above is relatively not too much different. Both give rise to relatively the same global meanings. Thus, the translator can be said to have succeeded in translating the text into Indonesian by

maintaining the global meaning to be conveyed in the original text.

However, it should also be noted that in this section, there are relatively significant findings. Unlike the examples in the generalization section, in this construction example, translators tend to use textual-based translation techniques. In this way, the macropropositions in the original text and the source text are both generated through construction techniques, without any significant changes in the global meaning of the text.

Example 8

Microproposition:

<i>Persentase</i> percentage	<i>orang</i> people	<i>yang</i> that	<i>perlu</i> need	<i>memiliki</i> have	<i>antibodi</i> antibodies	<i>untuk</i> to	<i>mencapai</i> achieve		
<i>kekebalan</i> immunity	<i>kelompok</i> group	<i>terhadap</i> on	<i>suatu</i> a	<i>penyakit</i> disease					
<i>berbeda-beda</i> varies	<i>dari</i> from	<i>satu</i> one	<i>penyakit</i> disease	<i>ke</i> to	<i>penyakit</i> disease	<i>lain.</i> Other			
<i>Sebagai</i> as	<i>contoh,</i> example	<i>untuk</i> To	<i>mencapai</i> achieve	<i>kekebalan</i> immunity	<i>kelompok</i> group				
<i>terhadap</i> to	<i>campak,</i> measles	<i>sekitar</i> about	<i>95% populasi</i> 95% population	<i>harus</i> have	<i>diimunisasi.</i> be vaccinated				
<i>5% penduduk</i> 95% population	<i>Lain</i> Other	<i>akan</i> will	<i>terlindungi</i> be protected	<i>karena</i> because	<i>campak</i> measle	<i>tidak</i> not	<i>akan</i> will	<i>menyebarkan</i> Spread	
<i>di</i> in	<i>antara</i> among	<i>orang-orang</i> People	<i>yang</i> that	<i>diimunisasi.</i> be vaccinated					
<i>Untuk</i> for	<i>polio,</i> polio	<i>ambangnyanya</i> Limit	<i>adalah</i> is	<i>sekitar</i> about	<i>80%</i> 80%				

(Sentence 8-11, Paragraph 5, Text 1B)

Macroproposition Level 1:

<i>Persentase</i> percentage	<i>orang</i> people	<i>dengan</i> with	<i>antibodi</i> antibodies	<i>untuk</i> for	<i>kekebalan</i> immunity	<i>kelompok</i> group	<i>berbeda-beda,</i> Varies
<i>campak</i> measle	<i>memerlukan</i> require	<i>sekitar</i> about	<i>95%</i> 95%	<i>dan</i> and	<i>polio</i> polio	<i>memerlukan</i> require	<i>80%.</i> 80%

Texts' Macrostructures Level 2

The analysis of the texts' macrostructures to both text pairs was carried out based on sentence segmentation, as can be seen in the Table 2. The macropropositions level 1 were derived from the propositions in the text base by applying macro rules at the first level. In the next stage of analysis, the macrostructure at the second level is derived through the macro-rule of the macropropositions that have been found from the first level analysis.

Table 4 below presents the final highlight of the number of segmentations macropropositions in the first-level analysis and the macro-structure of the second-level analysis of the texts. In line with the focus of this study, this second level macro proposition section explains and deepens the macro structure findings in the first level analysis to see in more detail how the WHO represents the Covid-19 Pandemic in their texts.

Table 4
Macropropositions Level 2 of Each Text

Text Code	M-1	m-2	Process
1A	6	3	1. construction & integration, 2. construction & integration, 3. construction & integration,
1B	6	3	1. zero 2. integration 3. construction & integration
2A	6	3	1. zero 2. construction & integration 3. construction & integration
2B	6	3	1. zero 2. construction & integration 3. construction & integration

Table 4 above is a summary of sentence segmentation at the micro level. These segmented sentences are deleted, generalized, and constructed to produce global macropropositions at the second level that are very likely to be considered as facts. In other words, there are at least three facts in each text derived from six macropropositions Level 1. Considering that macro rules are recursive (van Dijk, 2019, p.76), macro rules can be applied again at each level of abstraction to produce a shorter abstract that produces a hierarchical macro structure, consisting of several levels, each level consisting of

a sequence a macro proposition that summarizes a sequence of lower-level macropropositions (cf. Van Dijk, 2019, p. 76). This second level macro rule is useless when applied to a single macro proposition (Van Dijk, 2019, p. 49). Therefore, there are more than one macropropositions.

Realization of macro rules at the second level, especially for the section that contains the representation of the Covid-19 pandemic. The six macro propositions at the first level (M-1) are reduced to three macro propositions at the second level (m-2).

Example 9

First Level Macrostructure (M-1)

- M1 : 'Herd immunity' is the indirect protection from an infectious disease when a population is immune.
- M2 : Herd immunity against COVID-19 should be achieved by protecting people through vaccination.
- M3 : Vaccines train systems to fight disease, known as 'antibodies'.
- M4 : To safely achieve herd immunity, a proportion of a population would need to be vaccinated to keep vulnerable groups safe
- M5 : The percentage of immune people to achieve herd immunity varies, measles requires about 95% and polio requires 80%.
- M6 : The proportion of the population that must be vaccinated against COVID-19 is not known.

Second Level Macrostructure (M-1)

- m1 : 'Herd immunity' against Covid-19 is the protection when a population is immune achieved from vaccination. **(from M1 and M2 through Construction & Integration)**
- m2 : To achieve herd immunity, a proportion of a population would need to be vaccinated to train systems to fight disease, known as 'antibodies'. **(from M3 and M4 through Construction & Integration)**
- m3 : The percentage of immune people to achieve herd immunity varies, but the proportion of the population that must be vaccinated against COVID-19 is not known. **(from M5 and M6 through Construction & Integration)**

In the Text 1 pair, m-2 is generated through two macro rules, namely integration and construction, so that each produces three macro propositions at the second level. The integration process here is one of the branches of construction

in the general description of macro rules for macrostructure analysis. In the translated text, the flow of the formation of macropropositions is more or less the same as follows.

Example 10

First Level Macrostructure (M-1)

M1	:	<i>'Kekebalan kelompok' adalah konsep imunisasi, di mana</i> immunity group is concept immune in which
		<i>suatu populasi terlindung dari virus jika cakupan tercapai.</i> a population Be protected from virus if coverage Be achieved
M2	:	<i>Kekebalan kelompok tercapai dengan melindungi orang dari virus.</i> immunity group Be achieved by protect people from virus.
M3	:	<i>Vaksin melatih sistem imun untuk menciptakan 'antibodi', memutus</i> vaccine train system immune for create antibodies Cut
		<i>rantai penularan.</i> chain infection
M4	:	<i>Dalam konsep kekebalan kelompok, sebagian besar penduduk diimunisasi,</i> in concept immunity group part big population Vaccinated
		<i>memastikan kelompok rentan tetap aman.</i> ensure group vulnerable stay safe
M5	:	<i>Persentase orang dengan antibodi untuk kekebalan kelompok berbeda</i> percentage people with antibodies for immunity group Varies
		<i>campak memerlukan sekitar 95% dan polio memerlukan 80%.</i> measle require about 95% and polio require 80%
M6	:	<i>Mencapai kekebalan kelompok dengan vaksin yang aman dan efektif</i> Achieve immunity group with vaccine that safe and Effective
		<i>membuat penyakit semakin jarang dan menyelamatkan nyawa.</i> make disease become rare and safe life

Second Level Macrostructure (m-1)

m1	:	<i>'Kekebalan kelompok' adalah konsep imunisasi yang dapat dicapai</i> immunity group is concept immune that can Be achieved
		<i>dengan melindungi orang dari virus.</i> by protect people from Virus (from M1 and M2 through Construction & Integration)
m2	:	<i>Dalam konsep kekebalan kelompok, sebagian besar penduduk diimunisasi</i> in concept immunity group part big population Be vaccinated
		<i>dengan persentase yang berbeda-beda untuk setiap penyakit</i> with percentage that varies for every Disease (from M3 and M4 through Construction & Integration)
m3	:	<i>Pencapaian kekebalan kelompok dengan vaksin</i> Achieve immunity group with vaccine
		<i>membuat penyakit semakin jarang dan menyelamatkan nyawa.</i> make disease become rare and safe life (from M5 and M6 through Construction & Integration)

At this second level, the macro structure can show the true global topic of the text. The dominant representation of herd immunity in the Text 1 pair as a global topic is empirical evidence that the storytelling of events revolves around herd immunity and its parts. Objectively and

proportionally, it can be said that this phenomenon makes sense because the text is intended to create knowledge about herd immunity in handling the Covid-19 pandemic.

Likewise, in the Text 2 pair, the derivation of macropropositions level 2 shows that

macrostructural generation techniques have been able to show global text topics. To clarify this claim, Table 5 below lists the global topic coverage of text that can be extracted from macrostructure level 2.

As can be seen in the table 5, the pairs of Text 2 have relatively the same global meaning. It can be ensured that the translator does not shift any global meaning in the 2B translation text. As has also been stated in the discussion section on micropropositions, this study considers that the translator has translated the text based on source text 2A. However, this situation is not found in Text 1B. Briefly in Table 5, there is a shift in global meaning related to herd immunity which is discussed in the text. For clarity, these materials, together with the materials in the previous sections, will be elaborated to answer the objectives of this study in the next two sections.

Table 5
Global topics of text based on macrostructure level 2

Text Code	Global Topic
1A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Herd immunity (against Covid-19) 2. (Achieving) Herd Immunity 3. (Percentage of immune people to achieve) herd immunity
1B	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (<i>Konsep</i>) <i>Kekebalan Kelompok</i> (Concept of) Herd Immunity 2. (<i>Imunisasi populasi dalam konsep</i>) <i>kekebalan kelompok</i> (Population immunization in the concept of) herd immunity 3. (<i>Pencapaian</i>) <i>Kekebalan Kelompok</i> (Achieving) herd immunity
2A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Covid-19 (must be prohibited to spread) 2. (WHO is still studying) Covid-19 immunity 3. (WHO is increasingly finding) ways to deal with Covid-19
2B	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Covid-19 (harus dicegah penyebarannya)</i> Covid-19 (must be prohibited to spread) 2. (<i>WHO masih mempelajari</i>) <i>Imunitas Covid-19</i> (WHO is still studying) Covid-19 immunity 3. (<i>WHO sedang berusaha menemukan cara untuk menangani Covid-19</i>) (WHO is trying to find) ways to deal with Covid-19

Differences in Global Meaning of the Original Text and the Translated Text

The global meanings of the original text and the translated text of the two WHO-produced texts can be seen in the second-level macro-structure analysis. At least, to answer the question of the difference in global meaning, there are two points that can be made. First, in the second level macro proposition analysis, the macro structure can show the global topic of the text, as can be seen in Table 5. In the

Text 1 pair, this is indicated by the dominant representation of herd immunity as a global topic in almost all second level macro propositions. In Text 2, the focus of global topics is divided into (1) the position and role of the WHO; and (2) prevention of the spread of Covid-19. Second, the narratives in the four texts start from the perspective of the WHO as an institution that plays a role in providing education. This is shown from the macro propositions at the second level which rest on the grooves made in such a way as to answer certain questions.

Table 5 has actually shown that the significant difference in the global meaning of the text is only found in the Text 1 pair. In addition to the summary in Table 5, Example 10 has shown these differences. First, Text 1A emphasizes the topic of global herd immunity as a state/condition, while Text 1B makes the topic of global herd immunity a concept. This is evident from the words that accompany the global topic in both texts. Text 1A uses the explanation *is the protection when* in *m1*, which implies that herd immunity there is a protected state or an action to protect. On the other hand, *m1* in Text 1B clearly states that herd immunity *adalah konsep immunisasi* (is an immunization concept). Likewise in *m2*, Text 1A emphasizes the method to achieve herd immunity, where the sentence begins with *to achieve herd immunity*; but Text 1B again emphasizes the concept with *Dalam konsep kekebalan kelompok* (In the concept of herd immunity).

In this case, to further emphasize, in macro-structural analysis, the representation of herd immunity in the two texts cannot be said to be equivalent or equivalent, considering that the translated text has shifted the global topic of the original text. It can also be said that in this section there are different images in the two texts. This is also reinforced by the presence of new micropropositions in the translated text that suddenly appear, without being in the source text.

Macro structure analysis, both on the first and second level macro propositions in both pairs can state (1) there is a trend of global topic shift in Text 1B as a translation of the original Text 1A; (2) the herd immunity representation building in Text 1B contains information that is different and not equivalent to Text 1A; (3) the WHO has tried to provide complete information through micro propositions that contain factual matters, but the translated text contains more information on different global topics; (4) Herd immunity is a state to be achieved in Text 1A, but it is a concept in Text 1B; and (5) Text 1A tends to put forward scientific things without any conjecture, while Text 1B puts forward several new propositions that are still hypothetical, for example stating that *tidak semua orang perlu diimunisasi agar terlindungi* (not all people must be vaccinated to be protected).

However, in the next section, it is clearly stated that *persentase orang yang perlu memiliki antibodi untuk mencapai kekebalan kelompok terhadap suatu penyakit berbeda-beda dari satu penyakit ke penyakit lain* (the percentage of people who need to have antibodies to achieve herd immunity against a disease varies from one disease to another; also compare with the source text).

Based on the explanation above, Text 1A has experienced a global topic shift in its translation, Text 1B. In this case, the translator of Text 1B has used his cognitive intuition when compiling the translated text. This is the realization of representation through the expression of mental models in the text (van Dijk, 2019, p. 114). Through mental models, everyday discourse provides us with knowledge about the world, shared social attitudes, and especially ideologies as well as fundamental norms and values. Translators have an idea of how groups and power can influence discourse and vice versa, namely through certain social representations in the texts they compose.

Possibility of Translator Interference in the Shift of Global Meaning of the Texts

Continuing the discussion on the realization of representation through the expression of mental models in the text at the end of the previous section, in this section the discussion will focus on the possibility of translator interference in shifting the global meaning of the text. In this case, this study considers that the shift in topic or global meaning is the realization of the translator's personal knowledge of the issues raised in the text, as can be seen in Examples 9 and 10. In example 10, an important part that forms the macrostructure with the concept of herd immunity, the text gives identity to herd immunity as a concept, not as a situation.

In the narrative, there is a realization from a perspective on herd immunity as rhetoric in the Covid-19 pandemic. This is what van Dijk (2019) means as the realization of personal knowledge that certain treatments will trigger the formation of texts. The result of the translation in Text 1B is an attempt by the translator, in his role as a new text writer, to give a motive to the phrase herd immunity.

This realization may have come from the translator's personal observations on the Covid-19 Pandemic phenomenon in the vicinity. The results of the observations then become the basis for compiling the translated text. Therefore, at first this was the cognition of the author's knowledge which he later adopted as information in the translated text. The realization of this kind of personal knowledge clearly tends not to be neutral (see van Dijk 2019, p. 21 and Aarden et al., 2021, p. 3). This is understandable considering that at the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia, between March and April 2020, not too far away from the preparation of the WHO texts, Indonesia

experienced a kind of cultural shock and mixed information regarding the ongoing pandemic. It is reasonable to suspect that the translator who composed Text 1B received a lot of input information, which was then realized in the text.

CONCLUSION

This study aims to critically analyze the delivery of information related to the Covid-19 Pandemic in the WHO texts in both English and Indonesian. Therefore, in line with the aims of the study, there must be an answer for (1) are there any significant differences in macrostructures of the original text and its translated text; and (2) is there a possibility of translator interference in the shift of global meaning of the texts?

First, macrostructure analysis, both on the first and second level macro propositions in both pairs can state that there is a trend of global topic shift in Text 1B as a translation of the original Text 1A. The herd immunity representation building in Text 1B contains information that is different and not equivalent to Text 1A. In fact, the WHO has tried to provide complete information through micro propositions that contain factual matters, but the translated text contains more information on different global topics. On the realization, herd immunity is a state to be achieved in Text 1A, but it is a concept in Text 1B. Text 1A tends to put forward scientific things without any conjecture, while Text 1B puts forward several new propositions that are still hypothetical, for example stating that *tidak semua orang perlu diimunisasi agar terlindungi* (not all people must be vaccinated to be protected). However, in the next section, it is clearly stated that *persentase orang yang perlu memiliki antibodi untuk mencapai kekebalan kelompok terhadap suatu penyakit berbeda-beda dari satu penyakit ke penyakit lain* (the percentage of people who need to have antibodies to achieve herd immunity against a disease varies from one disease to another; also compare with the source text).

Second, to sum up all the descriptions on a macro level, Text 1B has received strong interference from the realization of the translator's knowledge and experience. In this case, the interference is too strong to finally shift the global meaning of the text in the source Text 1A, as has been shown through macrostructures analysis at Levels 1 and 2. At the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia, between March and April 2020, Indonesia experienced a kind of cultural shock and mixed information regarding the ongoing pandemic. It is reasonable to suspect that the translator who composed Text 1B received a lot of input information, which was then realized in the text.

This study is not a perfect study. This is also not to determine the good or bad quality of a translation. This study suggests that it is very likely that the different receptions of a translated text are due to different mental experiences due to the different global meanings of the text. Future studies are expected to further deepen the analysis structure to the micro level. For example, this study did not find a significant difference in global meaning for pairs of Texts 2A and 2B on a macro basis. However, an in-depth study of the microstructure may be able to elaborate on other possibilities.

REFERENCES

- Aarden, E., Marelli, L., & Blasimme, A. (2021). The translational lag narrative in policy discourse in the United States and the European Union: A comparative study. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8(1), 1-9.
- Abbas, A. H. (2022). Politicizing COVID-19 vaccines in the press: A critical discourse analysis. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 35(3), 1167-1185.
- Ahmed, A. H., & Hamad, S. R. (2022). The role of critical discourse analysis in translating some selected speeches of Obama. *Journal of Al-Frahedis Arts*, 14(48| Second Part), 566-580.
- Alwasilah, A. C. (2022). *Pokoknya studi kasus: Pendekatan kualitatif*. Kiblat Buku Utama.
- Azad, A. (2022). Quality of transmission of metaphors of hijab verses in Persian translations based on Newmark translation model. *Translation Studies of Quran and Hadith*, 8(16), 256-287.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (2022). *Discourse in late modernity*. Edinburgh university press.
- Cozza, M., Gherardi, S., Graziano, V., Johansson, J., Mondon-Navazo, M., Murgia, A., & Trogal, K. (2021). COVID-19 as a breakdown in the texture of social practices. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28, 190-208.
- Donina, D., & Hasanefendic, S. (2019). Higher Education institutional governance reforms in the Netherlands, Portugal and Italy: A policy translation perspective addressing the homogeneous/heterogeneous dilemma. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 73(1), 29-44.
- Dosi, I., & Douka, G. (2021). Effects of language proficiency and contextual factors on second language learners' written narratives: A corpus-based study. *International Journal of Research*, 10(5), 1-18.
- Dušková, L. (2018). Parallel corpora and contrastive linguistics: Where to look for pitfalls in the translation of information structure. *Bergen language and linguistics studies*, 9(1), 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.15845/bells.v9i1.1519>
- Grzelka, M. (2020). Attitudes toward vulnerable populations in the time of COVID-19: critical discourse analysis of gazeta.pl online comment sections. *Society Register*, 4(2), 121-132.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Levitskaya, A., & Fedorov, A. (2021). Theoretical model of media competence's development of teachers-to-be in the process of the analysis of manipulative media influences. *Медиаобразование*, (2), 323-332.
- Negryshev, A. A. (2020). The macrostructure of news media text: discursive approach. *Russian Linguistic Bulletin*, 1(21), 154-156.
- Oganesova, I. S. (2021). The description of linguistic components of the discourse. *Международный журнал гуманитарных и естественных наук*, (6-1), 40-43.
- Pan, L., & Liao, S. (2021). News translation of reported conflicts: A corpus-based account of positioning. *Perspectives*, 29(5), 722-739.
- Purnomo, S. L. A. (2019). Revisiting van Dijk's socio-cognition for integrative research taxonomy design on game localization-critical discourse analysis. In SF. L. A. Purnomo (Ed.), *STUDIES ON SHIFT: Game localization and subtitling* (p. 115). Fakultas Adab dan Bahasa IAIN Surakarta.
- Sabrina, A., Siregar, I., & Sosrohadi, S. (2021). Lingual dominance and symbolic power in the discourse of using the PeduliLindungi application as a digital payment tool. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(2), 52-59.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1983). Discourse analysis: Its development and application to the structure of news. *Journal of communication*, 33(2), 20-43.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and knowledge: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2019). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Routledge.
- Wong, R. (2020). *A Foucauldian discourse analysis of diabetes knowledge translation and the governance of family physicians and endocrinologists in Canada* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Toronto.
- Wodak, R. (2020). *The politics of fear: The shameless normalization of far-right discourse*. Sage.
- Zanettin, F. (2021). *News media translation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zeng, W. (2022). *Advances in discourse analysis of translation and interpreting: linking linguistic approaches with socio-cultural interpretation*. Routledge.