TRANSLATION ANALYSIS ON IDEOLOGICAL LEXICONS CHOICE IN *HOW TO WIN FRIENDS AND INFLUENCE PEOPLE* BOOK AND ITS INDONESIAN TRANSLATION

Nuning Yudhi Prasetyani[1]; M.R Nababan[2]; Djatmika[2]; Joko Nurkamto[2]
[1]Doctoral Student of Universitas Sebelas Maret;
Lecturer of Universitas Pesantren Tinggi Darul Ulum Jombang
[2]Professor in Linguistics at Universitas Sebelas Maret
ningdibyo@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This is a translation research focusing on ideological lexicons used by the author and how the translator renders them into Indonesian language by applying some techniques of translation. By using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Van Dijk's model, the researcher will analyze both the author's ideological lexical choice and the translated version. Van Dijk' CDA model is suitable to apply in this study since this *How to Win Friends and Influence People* book consists of so many persuasive and motivational ideological lexicons. This is in line with Van Dijk's socio-cognitive concept where society, cognition and discourse become a triangulation framework. Dijk believed that discourse structures are mediated by social cognition which involves beliefs, opinions or mental models.

This study applied descriptive qualitative method by using two sources of data, the English and Indonesian translated version. The data were analyzed based on the translation techniques applied by the translator through CDA's approach to reveal their accuracy of translation.

Key words: translation research, quality of translation, ideological lexicons choice, Van Dijk's CDA model

I. Introduction

It cannot be denied that translation is a way of crossing different cultures, languages and civilizations. Translation plays a significant role in transferring different ideas and ideologies among different countries. This research is inspired by a consideration that translating a text is not that easy, since it is related on how an author reveals his ideas and opinions that reflect his/her ideology. This can be occurred because the author is influenced by some underlying reasons about how, who and why the text is translated into a certain language.

The book of *How to Win Friends and Influence People* which is translated into *Bagaimana Mencari Kawan dan Mempengaruhi Orang Lain* was a famous book written by a well-known motivator, Dale Carnegie. This book introduced the reader on how to motivate, win, influence people through some steps without hurting people's feelings. This book also taught us on how to be a good friend and leader.

This study seeks to find convincing answer to the following research questions:
1. To what extent did the translator render the author's ideology in target text (Indonesian language)?
2. How are the accuracy of the translated versions?

II. Theoretical Framework

Hatim & Mason (2007) assumed that translation as a social activity and cannot be considered as neutral decision. While, Hatim & Munday (2004: 6) believed that translation is: (1) The process of transferring a written text from SL to TL, conducted by a translator, or translators, in a specific socio-cultural context. (2). The written product, or

TT, which results from that process and which functions in the socio-cultural context of the TL. (3). The cognitive, linguistic, visual, cultural and ideological phenomena which are an integral part of 1 and 2. Throughout the process of translation, a translator is consistently surrounded by various ideologies affecting his/her choice: the source author's ideology, the publisher's ideology, the target's ideological preference and expectation and his/her own worldview (Al-Shehari, 2007: 3).

To explain about ideology, Fairclough (1995: 82) argued that '*ideologies arise in class societies characterized by relations of domination, and so far as human beings are capable of transcending such societies they are capable of transcending ideology*'. Simpson in Hatim & Mason (1997: 120) assumed that '*ideology as tacit assumptions, beliefs, and value systems which are shared collectively by social group*'. Thus, ideologies are constructed by a biased selection of basic social values and organized by group self-schemata in which categories, such as identity, task, goal, norms, position and resources play an important role (2011: 32). So, ideologies have social functions which influence social interaction, group of community, organized or institutionalized activities of social members to reach common or certain goals.

Furthermore, Teun. A. van Dijk (1995, 2011) said that ideologies are basic frameworks for organizing the social cognition shared by members of social groups, constituted by relevant selections of socio cultural values, and organized by an ideological schema that represents the self-definition of a group. Besides their social function of sustaining the interests of groups, ideologies have the cognitive function of organizing the societal position (attitudes, knowledge) and interest of the group, and thus indirectly monitor the group-related social practices, and hence also the text and talk of members.

In processing discourse, we need to know about the typology of knowledge. Dijk (2003, 2006) believed that there are basically two kinds of knowledge which need to attend to in discourse processing, namely: (1) personal or group knowledge about specific events: mental models (evaluation of events or situation (opinion) as well as emotions associated with such events) (2) socially or culturally shared, general knowledge: social representation.

According to Dictionary of English Language (2011, online version) the word 'lexicalization' (the process of making a word to express a concept) comes from the verb 'to lexicalize' means: 1. to express using a word or words (e.g: a language that lexicalizes the concept of time), 2. To incorporate into a language as a new word (e.g: a language that has lexicalized expressions from its dialect), 3. To treat (a phrase, expression or other group of morphemes) as a single word (e.g: pick me up→ lexicalize the phrase). In line with Lipka (1992: 1) who give the notion of lexicalization in three new directions, namely: 1. non-morphemic and sub morphemic constituents, and so-called reductive WF (word formation) e.g. in clippings, blends, and sound symbolism, 2. derivation by semantic transfer, esp. metaphor and metonymy, 3. loan processes from other languages.

Talmy (1985: 59) assumed that *lexicalization is involved where a particular meaning component is found to be in regular association with a particular morpheme. The study of lexicalization, however, must also include the case where a set of meaning components, bearing particular relations to each other, is in association with a morpheme, making up the whole of the morpheme's meaning. In the clearest case, one morpheme's semantic makeup is equivalent to that of a set of other morphemes in a syntactic construction, where each of these has one of the original morpheme's meaning components.* Thus, through lexicalization or word choices, Dijk (1995, 2008) showed that person's opinion can be constructed and codified through lexical choice which reflects fundamental dimension of ideological meaning. Furthermore, Dijk (2006: 126-128) explained that …..*words may have strong association with ideological meaning'. Meanings are prone to ideological marking than syntactic structures, because ideologies are belief systems and beliefs characteristically tend to be formulated as meanings of discourse.* Thus, lexical choices show positive or

negative judgment from the speaker/author's ideological point of views which are manifested through written or oral discourse.

Moreover, Dijk (2005: 25) added that '*lexicalization is a major and well-known domain of ideological expression and persuasion...* To him, word choices can reflect discourse genre, personal context (mood, opinion, perspective), social context (formality, familiarity, group membership, dominance relation) and socio cultural context (language variants, sociolect, norms and values). People may apply the way to show the certain topic or discourse through emphasizing positive or negative lexical choices to determine the genre and function of the text itself (e.g: talk about abortion, psychology, military etc).

III. Methodology

Based on Van Dijk's CDA Model (2006: 125-126), here are some expressions of ideology in discourse:

• **Context:** Speaker speaks *as* a member of a social group; and/or addresses recipient *as* group member; ideologically biased context models: subj. representations of communicative event and its participants as members of categories or groups.

• **Text, discourse, conversation:**
Overall strategy: positive presentation/action of Us, negative presentation/action of Them. Emphasize *Our* good things, and *Their* bad things, and De-emphasize *Our* bad things, and *Their* good things.

A. MEANING

1. Topics (semantic macrostructures)
   - Select/Change positive/negative topics about Us/Them.

2. Local meanings and coherence
   - Positive/Negative Meanings for Us/Them are:
      • Manifestation: Explicit versus Implicit
      • Precision: Precise versus Vague
      • Granularity: Detailed/fine versus Broad, rough
      • Level: General versus Specific, detailed
      • Modality: We/They Must/Should...
      • Evidentiality: We have the truth versus They are misguided
      • Local coherence: based on biased models
      • Disclaimers (denying Our bad things): `We are not racists, but...'

3. Lexicon: Select Positive/Negative terms for Us/Them (e.g. `terrorist' versus `freedom fighter')

B. FORM

1. Syntax: (De)emphasize Positive/Negative Agency of Us/Them
   - Cleft versus non-cleft sentences (`It is X who...')
   - Active versus Passives (`USA invades Iraq' versus 'Iraq invaded by USA')
   - Full clauses/propositions versus nominalizations (The *invasion* of Iraq').

2. Sound structures: Intonation, etc., (de)emphasizing Our/Their Good/Bad things

3. Format (schema, superstructure: overall form)
   - Positive/Negative meanings for Us/Them in
      • First, dominant categories (e.g. Headlines, Titles, Summaries, Conclusions) versus last, non-dominant categories.
      • Argumentation structures, topoi (stereotypical arguments, e.g. 'For their own good')
      • Fallacies that falsely conclude Our/Their Good/Bad things, e.g. overgeneralizations, authority, etc.

4. Rhetorical structures
   Emphasizing or de-emphasizing Our/Their Good/Bad things by:
   - Forms: Repetition
   - Meanings: Comparisons, metaphors, metonymies, irony; euphemisms,

hyperboles, number games, etc.

C. ACTION
Speech acts, communicative acts, and interaction
- Speech acts that presuppose Our/Their Good/Bad things: promises, accusations, etc.
- Interaction strategies that imply Our/Their Good/Bad things: Cooperation, agreement

By using qualitative analysis approach, a series of data consisting of English ideological lexicons choice (verb and noun forms) and the Indonesian translation were gathered and compared to analyze based on Dijk's CDA model. The writer used the translation assessment on accuracy based on Nababan et al (2012) that when a translation result is considered to be accurate; it shows that the source text is delivered well (no ambiguity, unnecessary deletion and no distorted meaning/message) into target text.

IV.   Analysis

	ST	But the person who has technical knowledge plus the ability to **express ideas**, to **assume leadership**, and **to arouse enthusiasm** among people-that person is headed for higher earning power.
Data 1	TT	Tapi orang yang memiliki pengetahuan teknik ditambah kemampuan **mengekspresikan ide-ide, untuk memegang kepemimpinan dan untuk menggugah antusiasme** di antara mereka orang seperti itulah yang diarahkan untuk memperoleh kekuasaan yang lebih tinggi.
	ST	I have seen the application of these principles literally **revolutionize** the lives of many people.
Data 2	TT	Saya sudah melihat penerapan prinsip-prinsip ini secara literal telah **membuat revolusi** kehidupan banyak orang.

In this analysis, the writer wanted to show that data 1 and 2 show how the author wanted to improve or build reader's self-esteem through his positive lexicalizations such as: ..*to express ideas, to assume leadership, .. to arouse enthusiasm...* and the translator rendered them into: *.... mengekspresikan ide-ide, untuk memegang kepemimpinan,… dan untuk menggugah antusiasme, ….* Here, the translator was successful to choose suitable lexicons in rendering them . While the 2nd data for the word '*revolutionize*' which was translated into '*membuat revolusi* ' should be translated into '*mengubah dengan cepat*' or '*merevolusi*' instead of '*membuat revolusi* '. The word (verb) '*revolutionize*' means '*to bring about radical change*' that shows '*big hope, expectation, desire to move on*' to motivate people with the strong positive emphasis rather than render it into noun (*membuat revolusi*).

	ST	**Any fool** can **criticize, condemn and complain** – and most fools do. But it takes **character** and **self-control** to be **understanding** and **forgiving**.
Data 3	TT	**Semua orang bodoh** bisa **mengkritik, mencerca** dan **mengeluh** – dan hampir semua orang bodoh melakukannya. Namun perlu **karakter** dan **kontrol-diri** untuk **mengerti** dan **memberi maaf.**
Data 4	ST	Instead of **condemning** people, let's try to **understand** them. Let's try to **figure out** why they do what they do. That's a lot more profitable and intriguing than **criticism;** and it breeds **sympathy, tolerance and**

kindness. "To know all is to forgive all."

TT   Sebagai ganti dari **mencerca** orang, mari kita coba untuk **mengerti** mereka. Mari kita **berusaha mengerti** mengapa mereka melakukan apa yang mereka lakukan. Hal itu jauh **l**ebih bermanfaat dan menarik minat daripada **kritik**; dan melahirkan **simpati, toleransi** dan **kebaikan hati**, " Untuk benar-benar mengenal semua, kita harus memaafkan semua."

Data 3 and 4 show to the reader on how to remind ourselves and (or) somebody else about self-control and self-evaluation. The translator rendered the ideological lexicons choice '*Any fool.. criticize, condemn and complain..... character … self-control… understanding..forgiving*' into '*Semua orang bodoh.. mengkritik, mencerca.. mengeluh.. karakter.. kontrol-diri .. mengerti..memberi maaf*' The translator only focused on the literal meaning of the lexicalization of the sentence above, especially when she translated the phrase '*semua orang bodoh*' and the words ' *character…understanding… and forgiving*'. They should be translated into '*semua orang tolol*' and *karakter dan kontrol diri yang bagus…seseorang yang pengertian.. dan pemaaf'.* The word '*bodoh*' and '*tolol*' have different sense. For the word '***bodoh***' refers to '***slow to learn or understand, marked by a lack of intelligence*'**, while '*fool*' refers **to '*one who is deficient in judgment, sense,* or *understanding, one who acts unwisely on a given occasion.* The author**, here, wanted to show that any person who fails to understand his/her friend/someone else (of having/building a relationship with others or in a teamwork) is considered to be the fool, instead of stupid. I also put the phrase ' *yang bagus*' and '*seseorang yang ..*' to explicate these two phrases.
Data 4, … *condemning.., ... understand... figure out..criticism; ..sympathy, tolerance and kindness.* "*...forgive..*…which are translated into '*..mencerca.. mengerti..berusaha mengerti… …kritik; ..simpati, toleransi dan kebaikan hati…. memaafkan' .* The translated version of '*mencerca*' from the word '*condemn*' for it has the meaning of ' *to express strong disapproval of, to pronounce judgment against*' while the word '*mencerca*' is close to ' *disdain, reprimand or humiliate*'. So, in this context the word '*condemn*' should be translated into '*menyalahkan*' rather than '*mencerca*'. The translator was not careful enough to choose the right lexicons to show the message from the author.

Data 5	ST	His organization **is now inspired with a new loyalty**, **a new enthusiasm**, **a new spirit** of teamwork.
	TT	Organisasinya kini **diilhami dengan** satu **kesetiaan baru**, **antusiasme baru**, **semangat baru** dari tim kerja.
Data 6	ST	Say to yourself over and over: "My **popularity**, my **happiness** and **sense of worth** depend to no small extent upon my skill in **dealing with people**."
	TT	Sampaikan pada diri Anda berulang-ulang: "**Kepopuleran** saya, **kebahagiaan** saya, dan **rasa berharga saya** tergantung dari kemampuan saya **berhubungan dengan manusia**."

In data 5 and 6 the author show some motivational words or phrases through positive lexicalizations such as: *is now inspired with… a new loyalty, a new enthusiasm, a new spirit..* **(data 5)** and *'My popularity, my happiness…sense of worth… dealing with people* **(data 6)** which were translated into '*kini diilhami dengan… kesetiaan baru, antusiasme baru, semangat baru, … berhubungan dengan manusia* **(data 5)** and '*Kepopuleran saya,*

kebahagiaan saya, ...rasa berharga saya...berhubungan dengan manusia." (**data 6**) show that the translator was successful enough in comprehending the author's ideological lexicons choice, however, there still a phrase that the translator failed to render it into the suitable lexicons choice; when she translated the phrase of '*sense of worth*' into '*rasa berharga saya*', it should be translated into *'harga diri saya'.*

V.   Conclusion

1. Translation is assumed to be a communicative performance engaging with the production of a new target text in a new target context through CDA framework.
2. A translator must be aware and careful in rendering the author's lexicalizations because they represent his/her ideology.

REFERENCES

Al-Shehari, Khalid. 2007. *Semiotics and the Translation of News Headlines: Making an Image of The Other*. Translation Studies in The New Millennium: An International Journal of Translation an Interpretation 5, pp: 1-16

Carnegie, Dale. 1981. *How To Win Friends and Influence People*. Revised edition. Revisi. Simon and Schuster, New York.

Dictionary of English Language. 2011. Published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. Online version

Dijk, van. T.A. 1995. *Discourse Semantics and Ideology*. Discourse and Society. Vol 6(2), pp: 243-289. SAGE. London

………………..2003. *Discourse-Knowledge Interface.* In Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinary. Edited by: Gilbert Weiss and Ruth Wodak, pp: 85-109

……………2005. *Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis*. In C. Schaffner dan A. Wenden (ed). *Language and Pace*. Pp. 17-33. Aldershot, Darmouth Publishing

………………2006. *Ideology and Discourse Analysis*, Journal of Political Ideologies. Hal: 115-140. Routledge. Taylor&Francis group

…………….. 2008. *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge University Press. New York

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman group, Ltd

Fauzia, Nina, N.S. 2005. *Bagaimana Mencari Kawan dan Mempengaruhi Orang Lain*. Binarupa Aksara. Jakarta

Lipka, Leonhard. 1992. *Lexicalization and Institutionalization in English and German*. In Journal of Linguistica Pragensia, pp: 1-13

Mason, Hatim & Munday, Jeremy. 2004. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. Routledge. Taylor & Francis group. New York

Nababan, M. Rudolf. 2012. *Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan*. Journal of Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. Vol 24 No. 1. Pp: 39-57.

Talmy, Leonarkd. 1985. *Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms*. In T. Shopen, ed., Language Typology and Syntactic Description 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp: 57-149.