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Abstract
Translation analysis often fixated on differences rather on similarities between source text (ST) and target text (TT). Performing a full analysis on translation, however, is not complete without looking at both ‘samenesses’ (equivalences) and differences (shifts) from ST, TT, and possibly other non-translated (NTs). Observing samenesses mean allowing for both samenesses and differences together; considering them as a ‘positive focus on differences.’ Hence, this article reports a basic observation on similarity analysis derived from an English source text and three-version Indonesian translations performed by learners as points of reference for translation profile. Chesterman’s (2007) re-formulation of Croft’s scales of increasing generalization to analyze translation similarity, will be the core structure of translation analysis. This scalar concept of degrees of generalization brings the similarities from learners’ translations into further detailed exploration. The idea here is to see if there is a general tendency shown between the sameness and differences of three learners’ translations which could be further researched in a larger extent of other (applied) linguistic areas such as general language processing and interlanguage effects.
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Introduction
Translation Studies has tried many possible ways to search for various elements occurred between a source text (so-called ST) and its target text (TT), which became a tradition for the scholars or students of translation studies to search for different elements so as to focus on equalities between the ST and TT. In the effort of finding equal concept being transferred at the textual relation, translation scholars and students have found no or very little absolute equality as they have found inequality in the actual textual relation. In the effort of seeking for better ways to see naturalness of the translation, Chesterman (2007) provides the concepts of ‘sameness’ and ‘differences’ as a solution on looking translation result and process. The combination of these two views can be extended. The underlying inquiry here is if the translation profile (TP) can provide descriptions of sameness and difference into another degree of understanding translation and translating. TP is, thus, described in terms of textual relations. The textual relations here refer to the total of translation similarities, including implied differences, with other relevant texts. These relevant texts are including ST and other relevant text in the TT – also called parallel texts or non-translated texts or NTs (Chesterman, 2007). NTs function as comparable texts of the same type of similar subject matter in the target language. Having NTs in the analysis will direct the experiment into a relatively ‘new’ findings of translation naturalness by seeing the actual textual relation between the translation and other parallel texts. The actual textual relation between these two texts portrays naturalness of the translations, whereas the shifts occurred between these parallel texts and the translation in such relation is called translation drifts (Chesterman, 2007, p.58). In other words,
building TP would be worth doing as it provides a list of linguistic features – specific and common – to seek the ‘samenesses’ and ‘differences’ concerning the source language and to place judgment on the state of being a natural translation. Analyzing TP will involve a certain degree of analysis of generalization using re-formulated Croft’s scale (Chesterman, 2007; Halverson, 2003; Halverson, 2007). This scalar concept of degrees of generalization brings the similarities from learners’ translations into further detailed exploration. The idea here is to see if there is a general tendency shown between the sameness and differences of three learners’ translations which could be further researched in a more substantial extent of other (applied) linguistic areas such as general language processing and interlanguage effects.

**Methodology**

There are three participants representing student translations with minimal experience as well as an understanding of professional translation experience. Their working languages are Indonesian and English. Prior the data collection, the participants were explained about the project and informed in a task description that they were going to participate in a small-scale experiment of English-Indonesian translation consisting of one short text with no time restriction. They received two-credits subject on translation in their third year of university; the course comprised introduction of translation theories and translation practices. The term ‘target language’ (TL) is used when the discussion talks about the participant’ translation respectively, whereas the term TT when it refers to all translation products, as shown in

**Figure 1.**

ST provided was a 172-words English text taken from Wikipedia about a biography of Duchess of Cambridge, Kate Middleton. Due to limited time allotted to finish translation task, only the first two paragraphs were chosen to be the ST. The text consists of three paragraphs comprises seven sentences of both simple and complex English sentences. Paragraph 1 consists of two sentences; paragraph 2 consists of three sentences, and paragraph 3 has only one complex sentence. Therefore, the breakdown for TP in this experiment is one-paragraph ST, three TTs, and two online parallel texts (NTs) in the target language. Online NTs are the best comparable texts available as ST is also taken from online. Therefore, the language tone and style used is similar as opposed to other texts produced for printed media.

TP will be composed of the source text, three Indonesian translations from those three participants, and two parallel texts in the Indonesian language about the simple, short, on-line text biography on the same authority figure. Re-formulated Croft’s scale will be annulated on the TP by having four levels of generalization in the following features:

1. Basic observation: description of basic facts, i.e., shifts occurred in the text
2. Internal generalization: description of conditions of the shifts occurrences
3. Higher-internal generalization: description of tendency in which the features may manifest
4. External generalization: description of constraints regarding external factors impinged the choice of features to appear in the translation

These levels will evaluate degrees ranging from the basic description into the specific description, which eventually resulting in a more comprehensive analysis of a translation profile. Translation profile, in this matter, describes the linguistic form of a translation “comprising all its relevant textual features” (Chesterman, 2007, p.54). This framework analysis can be seen in the following diagrams.
Findings and Discussion

Findings from the translation profile are divided into four parts according to the four levels of generalization analysis mentioned in the framework analysis: basic observation, internal generalization, higher-internal generalization, and external generalization. Along with these levels, discussion of each level is integrated into the results.

Basic observation

Observation results of the profile provide three categories, i.e., equivalence or ‘sameness,’ shift or ‘difference,’ and drift. The samenesses and differences information emerge from comparing of the ST and TTs, whereas drifts occur from relating the TTs to NTs.

From equivalence perspective, the TTs of the first two lines make use stylistic equivalence to maintain the titles ‘Duchess of Cambridge’ and ‘Duke of Cambridge’. In addition to being true to the titles, the translations follow the form and convey the same message of the original.

(1) SL = Catherine, **Duchess** of Cambridge…is the wife of Prince William, **Duke** of Cambridge… (ln.1-2)
Catherine, **Duchess** of Cambridge…adalas istri Pangeran William, **Duke** of Cambridge…[TL1][TL3]

Besides the choice of the participants to maintain the titles, they were also confidently translated another title which they knew it is true in the target language. The title ‘prince’ in the original is translated into ‘pangeran’ as shown in the example (2) as follows:

(2) SL = ...is the wife of Prince William… (ln.2-3)
...adalah istri dari Pangeran William…[TL1]

Shifts occurred in the translation, such as semantic shift, addition, and code-switching/borrowing. Addition in the translation may cause changes in semantic items as shown in the example (3). The article ‘the’ as in ‘the wife’ translated into ‘seorang’ resulted in an ambiguous meaning to the concept of one wife or more than one wives.

(3) SL = ...is the wife of Prince William… (ln.2-3)
...adalah seorang istri dari Pangeran William…[TL2]

Meanwhile, example (4) shows that the phrase ‘second in line to succeed’ literally translated by the second participant, which carries no meaning and it does not even convey one-to-one semantic relation to the original phrase. The verb phrase ‘to succeed’ turned to adjectival phrase ‘yang sukses.’ The phrase ‘to succeed’ was not translated, resulting in a major change in semantic units presented in TL3: semantic shift, which
shows that there is something missing in the translation.

(4) SL = William is second in line to succeed his grandmother, Queen Elizabeth II, as a monarch of the United Kingdom… (ln.4-5)
   William adalah garis kedua yang sukses seperti neneknya, Ratu Elizabeth II, …[TL2]
   William adalah garis kedua neneknya…sebagai monarki kerajaan …[TL3]

Borrowing procedure, however, is considered a shift in a certain way due to its functions to fill in the semantic gap within a translation. Therefore, presenting particular British titles such as ‘Duchess’ and ‘duke,’ the borrowing procedure is used in the all the translations as shown in the example (1). Meanwhile, other common titles such as ‘queen’ and ‘prince’ were translated into equivalent terms in the target language ‘ratu’ and ‘pangeran.’

When comparing all the three target texts with two NTs, there is a drift found in the short paragraph: semantic drift. Semantic drift is shown in the example (5). The drift occurs due to the translation of ‘duke’ in the sentence. The royal rank such as ‘adipati’ has never been used since the other term replaced it, namely ‘bupati.’ The previous rank only used before Indonesian’s Independence Day. The later rank is more commonly used right after 1945.

(5) SL = Catherine, Duchess of Cambridge,…is the wife of Prince William, Duke of Cambridge…
   (ln.1-2)
   Catherine, istri Adipati Cambridge,…adalah istri Pangeran William, Adipati Cambridge…
   [NT1]

Internal generalization
Borrowing strategies tend to be the learners’ choice, resulting in that their translations make use of code-switching, e.g., Duchess, Duke. Grammatical errors also have caused deviation of meaning in the translation, e.g., William adalah garis kedua yang sukses seperti neneknya, Ratu Elizabeth II, …[TL2]. These errors, inevitably, cause a semantic shift to occur in the translation. In terms of semantic drift, the translation of “Duke” into “Adipati” seemed to give an odd meaning in relation to the TTs since the later texts preserve the title in its original language.

Higher-internal generalization
Borrowing and code-switching seem to appear frequently under certain conditions, such as abstract names/nouns, noble titles. The choice employing such strategy may cause under extra processing constraints, that is maintaining someone’s rank in worldwide view.

External generalization
Knowing that the participants had the intention to preserve their focus on vocabulary items, resulting the form of translated sentences in the Indonesian language was also very similar to the source text.

About translating biographical text, some actual information related to the person affect the language choice and language style in which the translators or other writers (in case of NTs) tried to reconstruct. The context in which the text came from and to whom the translation would also be read cannot be neglected, as it may affect the world (in case of translating one prominent figure in the British monarch.

Regarding syntactic profiles, the STL. Paragraph 1 consists of two simple sentences; paragraph 2 consists of the other three simple sentences, whereas paragraph 3 has one complex sentence. Thus, it can be predicted that the participants spent longer time to translate the third paragraph with one complex sentence compare to the others with simple sentences. Although this prediction can be true in one case, there are other
conditions or circumstances that the prediction will not happen. Any conditions or circumstances such as mastery level of both source and target language, abstract nouns, little or no background knowledge of the source text can lead the participants to employ different techniques/procedures/strategies.

**Conclusions**

Borrowing and code-switching are one of the strategies to preserve the meaning of so-called-adoption terms in translating the biographical text. Goals to ‘maintain’ an imagery of prominent figure in the translation often lead the translators/writers to preserve the pattern and style of the SL resulting a gloss translation. Shifts occur when there are vocabulary items such as abstract nouns and proper names which difficult to translate regarding cultural liability. When building translation profile, the most difficult part is not finding a translation of the original text, but on finding good, compatible, and reliable types of non-translated texts in particular topic related to the translation. As there are various texts of the target language available, there should be a standard in choosing a good and reliable non-translated text for (student) translators to be certain of. This method of building translation profile and analyze the profile using Croft’s scalar is useful for classroom application aimed to research not an only translation as products, but also further students’ analysis into a process of assessing naturalness in translation and understand the underlying process(es) of translation. The challenges may occur in how the students are familiar with the primary process in translation, strategies/procedures that might take place during transferring, and other external factors.
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