GRAMMATICAL METAPHOR AS FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' TRANSLATION OF DICSUSSION TEXT (A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT'S STUDENTS IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY INDONESIA UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION)

Restu Surya Dinagara

Department of English Education, Indonesia University of Education

Abstract: This study focuses on investigating the procedures and methods of translating grammatical metaphors, introduced by Halliday (1985) and developed by Taverniers and Ravelli (2003), in students' translation. This study was conducted in Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, taking six fifth semester students as the participants. In order to answer the research questions, this study employs a descriptive qualitative case study. The data were obtained from the collection of students' translation of a discussion text from particular news website. The findings indicated that the translators need improvement in translating grammatical metaphors in terms of understanding the classification of metaphors, the congruent forms of metaphors, and relevant procedures of translating. Based on the text analysis, the students experienced some difficulties in translating grammatical metaphors in terms of adapting proper methods which led to mistranslating. Nevertheless, the translation produced by some students show relevant and equivalent translation. Thus, the translators need be taught explicitly about the grammatical metaphors and methods and procedures to translate the grammatical metaphors in order to produce relevant, equivalent, accurate, and faithful translation.

Keywords: *Systemic Functional Linguistics, Grammatical Metaphors, Discussion Text, Translating, Translation.*

Introduction

In translating field, it is necessary to pick a proper method and procedures to obtain a relevant, equivalent, faithful, and accurate translation (Douglas, 2003, p. 11) (Newmark, 1988, p. 73) (Fawcett, 2003 p. 7). This is due to its fact that translators' role are to deliver knowledge, culture, ideas, and even thought from various languages into the target language. Therefore, translation studies requires multilingual and also interdisciplinary, encompassing languages, linguistics, communication studies, philosophu,

and range of types of cultural studies (Munday, 2001).

Aside from translation studies, the presence of Systemic Functional Linguistics enrich the ideas of linguistic field. Halliday (1994) introduced a new terminology: grammatical metaphors which refer to verbal transference of various kinds (Halliday, 1994a, p.340). Grammatical metaphors was put forwad by Halliday and defined as the expression of a meaning through a lexico-grammatical form which originally evolved to express different kind of meaning (Emilia, 2014, Thompson, 1996).

The relation between translation studies and grammatical metaphors is that these two studies are found in particular text which contains more nominalizations; it is discussion text. Ravelli (2003, p.46) investigated the use of translation metaphor in teaching and it led to at least two problems: firstly, students are trying to move from spoken language into written language, especially those who are from non-English speaking background, secondly students tend to grasp at nominal straws to find

appropriate nominalizations. Therefore, the study intends to fill the gap with the Grammatical Metaphors as framework analysis of students' translation on discussion text.

This study is carried out to analize the grammatical metaphors in discussion text translated into target language by fifth semester students in Indonesia University of Education in terms of the methods and procedures employed.

Literature Review

- **Systemic Functional Linguistics**

Systemic Functional Linguistics (henceforth abbreviated to SFL)is one of the main functional theories of language developed in the twentieth century and it continuous to evolve in the century (Martin, 2011, p.14 cited in Emilia, 2014, p.62). SFL is a functionally based theory which examines the functions that language has evolved to serve in society and study how meanings are made in different contexts (Young & Harrison, 2004, p12).

In usual communication, situations and events can be conceptualized and expressed

linguistically in two major ways: they are closer to speaker's experience and are the basic transitivity patterns (Downing and Locke, 2002, p 160). According to Downing (2002, p 161), entities such as people and things are necessarily expressed by nouns, actions by verbs, and quality by adjectives. In fact, the linguistic representation tends to be more complex as we are mature which leads that any situations can be expressed in more than one way. Mature writers effectively exploit the source of grammatical metaphor; children and other immature writers do not (Halliday, 1994:32, cited in Cullip, 2000).

The concept of grammatical metaphor was introduced in Halliday's *Introduction of Functional Grammar* (1985). The most productive form of grammatical metaphor is nominalization, or the transfer of meaning to the nominal group in the clause. Processes and their qualities, quantities and qualities of Things and logical relations can all be coded as Things (Cullip, 2000).

The functions of grammatical metaphor in English are to accomplish the following:
 a. To take advantage of the meaning potential to nominal group;
 b. To structure new argument through the manipulation of the system of Theme and New
 c. To technicalize processes by freezing actions, associated participants and circumstances, and logical relations (Cullip, 2000).

Relevant to the metafunctions of language, there are three main types of grammatical metaphors that can be found in a clause in a text: *metaphors of transitivity* (ideational metaphor), *metaphors of mood* (interpersonal metaphor), and logical metaphor (textual metaphor) (Halliday, 1994a, p. 343, cited in Emilia, 2014, p. 267).

- **Ideational Metaphors**

Ideational metaphor involve transference from one kind of element to another and can be classified into *experiential,* and *logical*; *experiential* concerns with elements of figure meanwhile *logical* concerns with reconstruing a conjunction between figures as if it were a *process, quality,*

circumstance or *thing* (Martin & Rose, 2003, p.104, cited in Emilia, 2014, p. 267). Ideational metaphor is also called as metaphor of transitivity. The grammatical variation between congruent and incongruent forms here applies to transitivity configurations, and can be analyzed in terms of the functional structure of these configurations (Ravelli, Vanderbergen, &Taverniers, 2003, p. 8).

• **Logical Metaphors**

Logical metaphors (textual metaphor) can be expressed in some relational (circumstantial) processes, such as: *cause* and *lead to*; cause and lead to are the metaphorical forms from "if-so" (Emilia, 2014, p. 272). Logical metaphor replaced more congruent use of two mental processes clauses bound by a logical sign (*because*) with a relational process clause containing two embedded mental process clauses (Bloor and Bloor, 2004, p. 130). Logical metaphor, according to Martin & Rose (2008, p.42) depend on nominalizing what happened as well. That makes the prepositions and verbs have something to depend on.

Causal connections can also be realized incongruently using nominal (*reasons, effects, response*); verbal (*make, lead to*), and prepositional (*for, through, from, in the absence of, etc.*) (Emilia, 2014, p. 273).

• **Interpersonal Metaphors**

Interpersonal metaphors deal with the way to enact interpersonal relations and create intersubjective positioning through linguistic interaction (Taverniers, 2006, p. 5). Interpersonal metaphor involves non-congruent ways of informal spoken language which concerns with establishing and maintaining relations with other people (Xue-feng, 2010, p. 30). Interpersonal metaphors include metaphor modality and metaphor of mood.

Metaphors of modality usually occur in some expressions in which modality usually realized either as a Finite or as an Adjunct in fact gets realized as a clause (Emilia, 2014, p. 274). Metaphors of modality are often found in the clause realizing the speakers' opinion as a separate projecting clause in a hypotactic clause complex, not as a modal element (Vandenbergen, Taverniers,

and Ravelli, 2003, p. 94-95). Examples of metaphors of modality can be seen below, adapted from Halliday (1994a, p. 354).

Metaphors of mood can occur especially in some commands, statements, and offers. The choice between these different mood types enables people to give information by means of statements, using declarative mood; to ask information by means of questions, using the interrogative mood; to put forward something to be considered, accepted, or refused be means of offers, using the interrogative mood; or to ask for something to take place by means of commands, using imperative mood (Emilia, 2014, p. 276, Xue-Feng, 2010, p. 31). In this type of interpersonal metaphor, a mood meaning is not expressed in the clause, but rather as explicit element outside the clause (Taverniers, 2002, p. 402).

Some benefits of using grammatical metaphor are that author will focus on key abstract ideas rather than processes and events (Gibbons, 2009, p. 51, cited in Emilia, 2014, p. 272). Grammatical metaphor constitutes an alternative way of constructing the picture of reality (Hadidi, 2012, p. 349). Grammatical metaphor has been used in historical texts, written by politicians (Martin, 2002, p. 51). It also makes the writing more vivid and contrived (Xue-Feng, 2012, p.36).

- **Discussion Text**

Discussion text is a breakdown version of argumentative text; argumentative is divided into two types: exposition and discussion. Discussion text aims to discuss the light of some kind of frame of position which proposes both sides of argument (Emilia, 2005, p. 60).

Discussion text sometimes begins with a background stage which provides any information the reader needs in order to follow the arguments. Discussion can be found in essays, editorials, and public forums which canvas a range of views of an issue, panel discussion, or research summaries (Feez and Joyce, 1998b, cited in Emilia, 2005, p. 60-61).

Knap and Watkins (2005, p. 189-190) explains that the grammatical features of argumentative essay, here is discussion, can be seen as follows:

Restu Surya Dinagara
Grammatical Metaphor as Framework Analysis of Students' Translation of Dicsussion Text (A Case Study of English
Department's Students in Public University Indonesia University of Education)

(1) the use of mental verbs to express the opinions, (2) the use of connectives to argue logical relations and link points, (3) movement from personal to impersonal voice, (4) the use of modality to argue the position of the writer and the reader, (5) the use of nominalizations in argument to allow the writer condense information and deal with abstract issues.

- **Translation Studies**

Translation studies play an important role regarding communication among countries. Newmark (1988, p. 5) defines translation as rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way the author intended the text. Hatim & Munday (2004, p. 3) also add that translation relates to a process, which focuses on the role of the translator in taking the original or source text (ST) and turning it into a text in another language, and the product, which centers on the concrete translation product produced by the translator. In other words, it can be concluded that there are two different important points in translation studies: translation, as a product, and translating, as the

process of translating which covers many aspects and linguistics components. Catford (1965, p. 1) also adds that translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another.

During the process of translation, there are several terms to discuss due to their similar purposes. Newmark (1988b, p.81) states that there are distinction between translation methods and translation procedures. He also adds that methods deal with the whole text meanwhile procedures deal with particular smaller units of language.

The discussion of translation process comes to fruitful explanations from some experts. In terms of types of translation methods, there are several types of methods according to Cartford (1965, p. 21-26): (1) Full translation: the entire text is submitted to the translation process (2) Partial Translation: some part or parts of the SL text are left untranslated, (3) Total Translation: the replacement of SL grammar and lexis by equivalent TL, (4) Restricted translation: means replacement of SL textual material by

equivalent TL textual material, at only one level (Catford, 1965, p. 21), (5) Phonological translation means the replacement of SL phonology by equivalent TL phonology, but there are no other replacements except such grammatical or lexical changes, (6) Graphological Translation means the replacement of SL graphology by equivalent TL graphology, without other replacements except accidental changes, (7) Free Translation : in free translation, equivalences shunt up and down the rank scale, but tend to be at the higher ranks, sometimes between lager units than the sentence, (8) Literal Translation lies in particular positions as intended by the author to achieve equivalence; it may add additional words, or change the structure at any rank, (9) Word-for-Word Translation means the translation with rank-bound at word-rank and may include some morpheme-morpheme equivalences

Related to the explanation above, this study focuses on investigating the methods and procedures employed by low, middle, and high achiever students in their translation of grammatical metaphors in discussion text.

Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-qualitative method to answer the research questions. This method was selected due to intention of the researcher to analyze, describe, categorize, and interpret the data (Creswell, 2012, p. 16) in investigating the linguistic elements through grammatical metaphor concept in translation product.

This study was conducted at one of public university in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. The participants of this study were six fifth semester students representing all levels of achievement: low, midle, and high achievers. This study used purposive sampling technique in choosing the participants. The participants were intentionally selected based on specialist knowledge or criteria (Walliman, 2006, p. 79) after field observation done to make sure certain types of individuals that expose particular features in this study (Berg, 2001, p. 32).

To follow purposive sampling, the researcher chose six participants from one class and categorized into three levels achievement: low, middle, and high achiever based on their performance in comprehending Practice of Translating subject in previous semester based on their score. It is done to enhance the understanding of the context based on prior knowledge (Duff, 2008).

The data were obtained from the translation product done by students of English Education Department. Each student was asked to translate an Indonesian discussion texts entitled "**Using Wikipedia as PR is a Problem, but Lack of a Critical Eye is Worse"** retrieved at October 13th, 2015 from jakartaglobe.beritasatu.com.

Data Presentation and Discussions

To begin the analysis of the translated text, the action of unpacking metaphors from the original text is necessary. Halliday (1999, cited in Hadidi & Raghami, 2012) stated that each metaphorical wording must have its equivalent congruent wording. So from the original text, congruent domains will be extracted as refer to Thompson hypothesize (see Chapter II). Stalhammar (2006, p.3) also added that unpacking metaphors into underlying clauses to reveal contextual knowledge and linguistic maturity is required.

Generally, the result of the translations from low, mid, and high achievers students provide some similarities and differences. The similarities are found in translating ideational metaphors. In ideational metaphor number 1, most students used inappropriate free translation. In ideational metaphor number 2, most students translated appropriately although some translators added additional word to develop the translation. In ideational metaphor number 3, translators mostly employed free translation and created some variations in the translation. In ideational metaphors number 4 most students used free translation method to obtain the translation. In ideational metaphors number 5, most students used word-for-word quite effectively to produce the translation. In

ideational metaphor number 6, the free translation often used although some result of translation varied. In ideational metaphor number 7, some students used word-for-word and the rest used free translation to obtain the translation. In terms of interpersonal metaphor, students generally produced equivalent translation, although there were mistranslations in some words.

In terms of differences based on the translation result, low achiever students employed less various methods in the process of translation. They used word-for-word method and obtained a non-natural translation. Meanwhile, mid achiever students employed more various method and added additional words to develop the translation. Meanwhile, high achiever students were relatively more creative in producing the translation and employed various methods of translation. They also sometimes restructure the grammar in the target language but still managed to maintain the ideas and naturalness of the meaning.

Based on this study, translating grammatical metaphors is not as easy

as translating cultural or idiomatic clauses. Some students even failed to translate the metaphors that it resulted into inappropriate translations. Grammatical metaphors consist of nominalization that is the alteration of verb, adjective, or conjunction to noun so that the students need to identify the congruent forms in advance before translating the text.

Conclusion

This study found out that some students, especially middle and high achievers have comprehended the concept of grammatical metaphors and ways to translate discussion text into target language although they have not taken the Functional Grammar course. Meanwhile the low achievers were sometimes getting confused of how to translate the nominalizations, appropriately. It can be seen on how the low achievers sometimes mistranslated nominalizations and just employed word-for-word methods to obtain the translation. Meanwhile, the middle and high, although they sometimes mistranslated too, employed various ways of translating in order to

Restu Surya Dinagara
Grammatical Metaphor as Framework Analysis of Students' Translation of Dicsussion Text (A Case Study of English
Department's Students in Public University Indonesia University of Education)

produce the translation. Since the character of good translation are faithful, correct, accurate, and equivalent or even provide appropriate collocation (Douglas, 2003, p. 11) (Newmark, 1988, p. 73) (Fawcett, 2003 p. 7), the low achievers' translation did not cover those characteristics.

Despite the difficulties of translating grammatical metaphors, the knowledge of translating grammatical metaphors are necessary to be taught to the students for the grammatical metaphors sometimes led to mistranslation. This is for further improvement of students' translation because grammatical metaphors are mostly found in discussion and argumentative text written by mature writers (Halliday, 1994:32, cited in Cullip, 2000).

Experientially, the low achiever tended to use less various methods to produce the translation and provided the similar sentence structure in the translation. When they found the difficult sentence or clause, such as grammatical metaphors, they left the word for word translation and it sometimes obscured the core meaning of the sentence. Meanwhile, the mid and high achievers students provided more flexible structure and sometimes added a word or extension to provide better translation Cartford (1965, p. 21-26). Some high achievers even translated to grammatical metaphor by providing the congruent form and adopted literal translation.

Overall, the findings indicate that students still need improvements in terms of nominalization comprehension, SFL comprehension, and translating comprehension to obtain a reliable and relevant translation.

References

Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies.* New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, S., Trivedi, H. (2002). *Post-colonial translation.* London: Routledge.

Bateman, J. A. (1990). Finding translation equivalents: An application of grammatical metaphor. 13.

Bloor, T., Bloor, M. (2004). *The functional analysis of English.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Catford, J. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation.* London: Oxford University Press.

Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical discourse.* London: Continuum.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research.* Boston: Pearson.

Downing, A. (2002). *English grammar.* New York: Routledge.

Emilia, E. (2005). *A critical genre-based approach to teaching academic writing in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia.* Melbourne.

Emilia, E. (2012). *Pendekatan genre-based dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris: petunjuk untuk guru.* Bandung: Rizqi Press.

Emilia, E. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar.* Bandung: Pustaka Jaya.

Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and language.* Manchester: Saint Jerome Publishing.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gerot, L., Wignell. P. (1995). *Making sense of functional grammar.* Sydney: Gerd Stabler.

Hadidi, Y. (2012). A comparative study of ideational grammatical metaphor in business and political texts. *Macrothink Institute International Journal of Linguistics*, 349.

Halliday, M. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar.* London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. (2001). *Towards a theory of good translation. In E. Steiner & C. Yallops (Eds) Exploring translation and multilingual text production: beyond content.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 13-18.

Halliday, M. (2004). *The language of science.* London: Continuum.

Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar.* London: Oxford University Press.

Hatim, B., Munday. J. (2004). *Translation and advanced resource book.* Oxon: Routledge.

Hewings, A. M. H. (2005). *Grammar and context.* Oxon: Routledge.

Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. pp. 232-239.

Jesus, S. M., Pagano, A. S. (2006). Probabilistic grammar in translation. *International Systemic Functional Congress*, (p. 428).

Knapp, P., Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar. Technology for teaching and assessing writing.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

Manfredi, M. (2008). *Translating text and context: translation studies and systemic functional linguistics.*

Martin, J., C.M.I.M., M., & Painter, C. (1997). *Working with functional grammar.* London: Arnold.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education. Revised and expanded from: Case study research in education.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies.* London: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation.* Hempstead: Pearson Education Limited.

Sari, E. T. (2014). The sequence of ideational grammatical metaphor wording technique in historical text: a systemic functional linguistic approach. *International journal of applied linguistics & english literature*.

Stalhammar. (2006). Grammatical metaphor/metonymy in the treaty establishing a constitution for Europe: A comparison between the English and Swedish versions. 99.

Steiner, E. C. Y. (2001). *Exploring translation and multilingual production: beyond content.* Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Taverniers, M. (2002). *Systemic functional linguistics and the notion of grammatical metaphor.* Ghent: Universiteit Gent.

Taverniers, M. (2006). Grammatical metaphor and lexocal metaphor: Different perspectives on semantic variation. *Springer*, 321-332.

Thompson, G. (1996). *Introducing functional grammar.* London: Arnold.

Vanderbergen, A. M. S. (2003). *Grammatical metaphor views from systemic functional linguistics.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins North America.

Vandervergen, A. M. S., Taverniers, M., & Ravelli, L. (2003). *Grammatical metaphor: Views from systemic functional linguistics.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Walinski, J. (2015, October 4). *Translation procedures*. Retrieved from research gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282504599_Translation_Procedures

Walliman, N. (2006). *Social research method.* London: Sage Publication.

Xue-Feng, W. (2010). Grammatical metaphor and its difficulties in application. *US-China foreign language*, 36.

Yasseri, T. (2015, September 9). *Commentary: Using wikipedia as pr is a problem, but lack of a critical eye is worse*. Retrieved October 2015, from http://jakartaglobe.beritasatu.com/: http://jakartaglobe.beritasatu.com/opinion/commentary-using-wikipedia-pr-problem-lack-critical-eye-worse/

Young, L., Harrison, C. (2004). *Systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis.* London: Continuum.

No	Source Language		Target Language	Process	Metaphorical Alteration	Translation Result
1	Metaphorical Forms	<u>Conflict of interest in those editing articles has</u> been part of Wikipedia from the beginning.	Ketertarikan mengedit artikel-artikel telah menjadi konflik-konflik bagian Wikipedia sejak awal.	Material process	Verb to Noun	The meaning of "conflict of interest" is not relevant with the proper target language
	Congruent Forms	People are conflicting due to the article editing from the beginning of Wikipedia				Conflict of interest means *konflik kepentingan*
2	Metaphorical Forms	Their contribution to the project	kontribusi mereka dalam proyek tersebut	Material process	Verb to Noun (Alteriation from contribute to contribution)	The translation is relevant with the source language. The target language is natural and equivalent.
	Congruent Forms	As many authors have contributed to the project				
3	Metaphorical Forms	Self-serving editing	Jasa mengedit pribadi	Material process	From Clause to Nominal Group	The translation is irrelevant since the word self-serfing did not contain personal opinion.
	Congruent Forms	To edit the information by themselves				Self-serving editing means *pengeditan yang*

						menguntungka n diri sendiri
4	Metaphorical Forms	The arrival of [citation needed] tags is a good way to alert readers to the potential for statements to be unsafe, unsupported, or flat-out wrong.	Adanya [kebutuhan pengutipan] menandai adalah sebuah jalan yang baik sebagai sinyal bagi pembaca agar artikel yang dimuat tersebut menjadi aman, didukung, atau benar.	Existentia l process	Verb to Noun (Changing the ending of the verb form)	The clause "the arrival of [citation needed] tag" was mistranslated.
	Congruent Forms	Tags arrives to alert readers to the potential for statements to be unsafe, unsupported, or flat-out wrong in a good way.				"The arrival of [citation needed] tag" means *masuknya tanda [kutipan diperlukan].*
5	Metaphorical Forms	Self-editing	Pengeditan diri sendiri	Material process	From Clause to Nominal Group	Irrelevant Translation of "self-editing"
	Congruent Forms	People edit the entry by themlseves.				Self-editing means *pengeditan mandiri*
6	Metaphorical Forms	a bit of caution and <u>awareness</u> in the reader of these potential flaws is required	sedikit perhatian dan <u>pengamanan</u> kepada pembaca dari potensi pengurangan yang diperlukan	Behaviora l process	From Clause to Nominal Group	Irrelevant translation of "awareness"
	Congruent Forms	Readers required to be aware and concern of these potential flaws.				awareness means *kesadaran*

7	Metaphorical Forms	At the same time, "organized" problematic editing	pengeditan "terstruktur" yang bermasalah	Material process	From Clause to Nominal Group	Irrelevat grammatical structure from source language to target langauge.
	Congruent Forms	Problem in editing process was organized				It is supposed to be *pengeditan bermasalah yang terstruktur.*

No	Source Language		Target Language	Orientation	Value	Translation Result
1	Metaphorical Forms	I'd suggest abandoning the use of Wikipedia	Yang saya anjurkan untuk dipahami mengenai kegunaan dari Wikipedia	Subjective	Low	The interpersonal metaphor is relevant. But the word abandon is not equivalent to the source language.
	Congruent Forms	People are conflicting due to the article editing from the beginning of Wikipedia				Abandon means *meninggalkan*