

## THE TECHNIQUES OF ADJUSTMENT IN BARBARA O'NEILL'S SEMINAR ENTITLED *REWIRING THE BRAIN* AND ITS BAHASA INDONESIA INTERPRETING BY REUBEN SUPIT

By: Amin Rais, Yogyakarta State University  
aminrais@gmail.com

### Abstract

This research aims at describing the adjustment techniques used by the interpreter and then describing the degrees of the meaning accuracy and the expression acceptability of the interpreting. This research uses mixed methods as the research approach, in which the qualitative method is the primary method and the quantitative method is the secondary one. This research found that the interpreter used seven adjustment techniques, including: *additions*, *subtractions*, *alterations*, *additions + subtractions*, *additions + alterations*, *subtractions + alterations*, and *additions + subtractions + alterations*. In terms of the meaning accuracy, the interpreting using techniques of adjustment in the seminar is generally considered less accurate, in which 87 data (or 48.33%) are considered accurate, 92 data (or 51.11%) are considered less accurate, and 1 datum (or 0.56%) is considered inaccurate. Then, in terms of the expression acceptability, the interpreting using techniques of adjustment in the seminar is generally considered acceptable, in which 96 data (or 53.33%) are considered acceptable, 81 data (or 45%) are considered less acceptable, and 3 data (or 1.67%) are considered unacceptable.

Keywords: techniques of adjustment, interpreting, accuracy, acceptability

### INTRODUCTION

Since ancient times, translations have been used by humans to communicate with each other that have different language. The language can be in written or oral form; the languages can also be based on signs (Brislin, 1976: 1). Before written language was invented, ancient people had already used spoken language to communicate with each other, and likewise the spoken/oral translation. In a wide sense, spoken/oral translation is also known as interpreting.

While interpreting, interpreters are almost impossible to correct what they have said since the target expressions are presented only once and cannot be replayed or reviewed (Kade in Pöchhacker, 2004: 10). It can be said that interpreting is more difficult than translating.

Interpreting activities could be found in some multicultural activities which at least involve two different languages such as in seminars involving English-*Bahasa Indonesia* or vice versa. Barbara O'Neill's *Seminar Kesehatan* is one of them. It is a bilingual seminar (English-*Bahasa Indonesia*).

In the seminar, the interpreter frequently makes some modification which can be seen by comparing the source text (English) with the target text (*Bahasa Indonesia*). From this comparison, it shows that he frequently uses techniques of adjustment, including: *additions*, *subtractions*, *alterations*, or some combinations of them.

Although techniques of adjustment were actually designed to help translators produce correct equivalents and complete naturalness, the

techniques of adjustment used by the interpreter in this seminar seem problematic. Therefore, it is significant to conduct this research.

The objectives of this study are: to describe the techniques of adjustment employed by the interpreter; to describe the degrees of the interpreting meaning accuracy; and to describe the degrees of the interpreting expression acceptability.

In respect of the first objective, Nida (1964: 226-238) proposes several techniques which are called techniques of adjustment, consisting of: *additions*, *subtractions*, *alterations*, and *footnotes*. Considering that this research deals with interpreting, this research does not include *footnotes* in the analysis since it is only used in translating (written translation).

In regard of the second objective, the researcher adapts the accuracy scoring system from Nababan, Nuraeni, and Sumardiono (2012: 50). The scoring system classifies the accuracy into three levels, including: accurate, less accurate, and inaccurate. In this research the term 'accuracy' is specified into 'meaning accuracy' in order to emphasize that the accuracy assessment is in terms of meaning.

Similarly, in regard of the third objective, the researcher adapts the acceptability scoring system from Nababan, Nuraeni, and Sumardiono (2012: 51). The scoring system classifies the acceptability into three levels, including: acceptable, less acceptable, and unacceptable. In this research the term 'acceptable' is specified into 'expression acceptability' in order to

emphasize that the acceptability assessment is in terms of expression.

This research offers some benefits, both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, this research shows that Nida's techniques of adjustment cannot only be used separately (such as *additions*, *subtractions*, or *alterations*) but also in combinations (such as *additions + subtractions*, *additions + alterations*, *subtractions + alterations*, or *additions + subtractions + alterations*). Besides, this research finds that the interpreter tends to achieve the expression acceptability rather than the meaning accuracy. Then, practically, this research shows that, in interpreting, there are many skills required such as translating skills, paraphrasing, listening, and public speaking skills.

## RESEARCH METODE

### Study Type

This research uses mixed methods as the research approach, in which the qualitative method is the primary method and the quantitative method is the secondary one. Here, the researcher uses qualitative method to describe the adjustment techniques used by the interpreter and to describe the accuracy and acceptability of the interpreting used techniques of adjustment. Then, the he uses quantitative method to provide some statistics in order to strengthen the qualitative data.

### Data and Data Sources

The data in this research are in the units of sentences or clauses showing that the interpreter

using techniques of adjustment. The data were collected from two sources. The first source is from the spoken utterances by Barbara O'Neill in a seminar topic entitled *Rewiring the Brain* and the second source is from the spoken utterances by the interpreter whose name is Reuben Supit. The first source is in English which plays role as the source text, while the second source is in Bahasa Indonesia which plays role as the target text.

### Research Instruments

Since the primary method in this research is the qualitative method, the research instruments are designed based more on the qualitative method. Here, the researcher is the main instrument whose role is to describe and explain the data. As the main instrument, the researcher made some other instruments, including: data sheet, data questionnaire, and the guidelines used by the respondents to fill the data questionnaire.

### Data Collection Technique

In this research, the researcher collected the data in several steps. Firstly, the researcher watched a video documentation of Barbara O'Neill's seminar entitled *Rewiring the Brain*, which can be accessed from YouTube. Then, he transcribed all the conversation during the session including both the source text (ST) and the target text (TT). And then, the researcher compared and identified every sentence or segment which uses adjustment techniques, including *additions*, *subtractions*, and *alterations*.

### Data Analysis Technique

Here, the researcher compared and identified every single segment in the ST to every

single segment in the TT. Next, they would be classified into several classifications including *additions*, *subtractions*, *alterations*, and combinations of them. After that, all the data are assessed in terms of the meaning accuracy and expression acceptability.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Description of the Techniques

This research found there are seven techniques of adjustment employed by the interpreter. The techniques were found in 180 data, as shown in the following table.

Table 1. The Adjustment Techniques Employed by the Interpreter

No.	Adjustment Techniques	Frequency
1	Additions	89
2	Subtractions	17
3	Alterations	34
4	Additions + Subtractions	20
5	Additions + Alterations	14
6	Subtractions + Alterations	2
7	Additions + Subtractions + Alterations	4
Total		180

In Table 1, it is shown that the adjustment techniques are not only used separately but are also used in combinations. The separated techniques consist of: *additions*, *subtractions*, and *alterations*. Then, the combined techniques consist of: *additions + subtractions*, *additions + alterations*, *subtractions + alterations*, and *additions + subtractions + alterations*. These seven techniques and the examples are discussed as follows.

### 1. Additions

It is the technique most frequently used by the interpreter in the seminar, taking up 89 data (or 49.44%). The example is presented as follows.

SE: Love is a **choice**.

TE: *Cinta itu adalah karena memang memilihnya.*

In the example above, the phrase ‘a **choice**’ is interpreted as ‘*karena memang memilihnya*’ (literary, ‘indeed because of **choosing** it’). Here, it can be seen that there are some lexical additions in the target expression caused by alteration of word classes; the word ‘choice’ which is a noun is changed to the word ‘*memilih*’ (literary, ‘choose’) which is a verb. Although the expression “Love is a choice” can indeed be interpreted literary to the target expression, in which it would become “*Cinta adalah sebuah pilihan*” (literary, “Love is a **choice**”), the interpreter may want to emphasize that love is not mere a choice, which seems insignificant, but because somebody does choose it so the audience can get the idea that love is a significant feeling.

### 2. Subtractions

It is the technique most infrequently used separately by the interpreter in the seminar, taking up 17 data (or 9.44%). The example is presented as follows.

SE: He started to push me, he started to poke me, and hurtful little bit.

TE: *Dia mulai dorong-dorong saya, dan mulai sakit.*

In the example above, the speaker uses two similar clauses, “He started to push me” and “he started to poke me,” in which the interpreter regards this phenomenon as a repetition. Both

clauses have similar meaning in which the subject ‘he’ (who is a baby) uses his hand to push and to poke the subject ‘me’ (who is the speaker), and then the effect of both activities is that the subject ‘me’ feels hurtful little bit. Besides, the interpreter may consider that the verb ‘push’ is a general form of the verb ‘poke’. Consequently, the expression “He started to push me, he started to poke me...” is interpreted in the target expression as “*Dia mulai dorong-dorong saya...*” (literary, “He started to push me...”). Here, the clause “he started to poke me” is omitted by the interpreter.

### 3. Alterations

It is the second technique most frequently used (after *additions*) by the interpreter in the seminar, taking up 34 data (or 18.9%). The example is presented as follows.

SE: What’s my next question?

TE: *Jadi, pertanyaan saya yang berikut adalah.*

[So, my next question is.]

Here, the source expression is an interrogative sentence (indicated by the word ‘what’ in the beginning of the sentence), whereas the target expression is a declarative sentence. The shift is from a question to a statement.

### 4. Additions + Subtractions

It is the techniques’ combination most frequently used by the interpreter in the seminar, taking up 20 data (or 11.11%). The example is presented as follows.

SE: Caffeine<sup>A</sup> causes a disruption of neurotransmitter<sup>B</sup>.

TE: *Dia<sup>A</sup> membuat gangguan daripada neurotransmitter atau zat penghantar listrik syaraf<sup>B</sup>.*

In this example, the interpreter firstly employs *subtractions* and secondly employs *additions*. Firstly, in terms of *subtractions*, the word ‘caffeine’ is interpreted in Bahasa Indonesia as ‘*dia*’ (literary, ‘it’). Here, it can be seen that the interpreter makes the subject ‘caffeine’ more implicit by using the pronoun ‘*dia*’ (literary, ‘it’) in Bahasa Indonesia for the subject ‘caffeine’ in the source expression.

Secondly, in terms of *additions*, the term ‘neurotransmitter’ is interpreted as ‘*neurotransmitter atau zat penghantar listrik syaraf*’ (literary, ‘neurotransmitter or the substance carrying electricity to the nerves’). It can be seen that the addition here is in terms of *amplification from implicit to explicit status* in which the audience would not understand what means by the terms ‘neurotransmitter’ unless it is explicated by adding the definition of such terms in detail.

#### 5. Additions + Alterations

It is the second techniques’ combination most frequently used by the interpreter in the seminar, taking up 14 data (or 7.78%). The example is presented as follows.

SE: It **does not**<sup>A</sup> regenerate<sup>B</sup>.

TE: *Dia tidak akan*<sup>A</sup> *menghasilkan* *dirinya*<sup>B</sup> *kembali*<sup>B</sup>.

Firstly, the alteration in terms of *categories* can be seen from the source expression “It **does not**...” which is rendered in the target expression as “*Dia tidak akan*...” (literary, “It **will not**...”). The change is from present tense to future in which the source expression uses present tense but the target expression uses future tense.

Secondly, the addition in terms of *obligatory specification* can be seen from the word ‘regenerate’ which is rendered in Bahasa Indonesia as ‘*menghasilkan dirinya kembali*’ (literary, ‘regenerate **itself**’). The word ‘*dirinya*’ (literary, ‘itself’) is added in the target expression to make it more explicit.

#### 6. Subtractions + Alterations

From the seven techniques, it is the technique most infrequently used by the interpreter in the seminar, taking up 2 data (1.11%). The example is presented as follows.

SE: **Now**<sup>A</sup>, what does **that baby want**<sup>B</sup>?

TE: *Apakah yang diinginkan oleh bayi itu*<sup>B</sup>?

Firstly, the subtraction in terms of *transitional* can be seen from the transitional word ‘now’ which exists in the source expression but does not exist in the target expression. Since the function of a transitional word is just to mark one segment or sentence to another, to omit such transitional words is considered not too problematic.

Secondly, the alteration in terms of *categories* can be seen from the source expression “what does **that baby want**” which is rendered in the target expression as “*apakah yang diinginkan oleh bayi itu*” (literary, “what is **wanted by that baby**”). The shift here is from active voice to passive in which the source expression uses an active voice but the target expression uses a passive voice.

#### 7. Additions + Subtractions + Alterations

The combinations do not only involve two techniques but also three techniques. Here, the combination involves three techniques including:

*additions, subtractions, and alterations.* This techniques' combination is found in four data (or 2.22%). The example is presented as follows.

SE: He told me<sup>B</sup>, "I took a whole year to conquer them."<sup>C</sup>

TE: Dan<sup>A</sup> dia mengatakan<sup>B</sup> bahwa satu tahun lamanya baru bisa sembuh.<sup>C</sup>

Firstly, the addition in terms of *connectives* can be seen from the Indonesian connective word 'Dan' (literary, 'And') in the beginning of the target expression which does not exist in the source expression. The function of such connective word here is just to mark one segment or sentence to another so it is allowed to simply add it if needed.

Secondly, the subtraction in terms of *specification of reference* can be seen from the source expression "he told me" which is rendered in the target expression as "dia mengatakan" (literary, "he told"). Since it is considered clear enough to whom the subject 'he' would tell about, the interpreter omit the object participant 'me' which exist in the source expression so the target expression becomes more implicit.

Lastly, the alteration in terms of *clause and sentence structure* can be seen from the source expression "He told me, 'I took a whole year to conquer them'" which is rendered in the target expression as "Dan dia mengatakan bahwa satu tahun lamanya baru bisa sembuh" (Literary, "And he told that one year is the period of recovering"). The change is from direct discourse to indirect in which the source expression uses a direct discourse but the target expression uses indirect discourse.

## Description of the Meaning Accuracy

This research found that the interpreting using techniques of adjustment is considered almost fifty-fifty accurate and less accurate, in which 87 data are considered accurate and 92 data are considered less accurate, while the 1 datum is considered inaccurate. The frequency of each degree can also be seen in the following table.

Table 2. Degree of the Meaning Accuracy

No.	Degree of Accuracy	Frequency
1	Accurate	87
2	Less Accurate	92
3	Inaccurate	1
Total		180

The three degrees of accuracy (shown in Table 2) are described as follows.

### 1. Accurate

From 180 data, 87 data (or 48.33%) are considered accurate. The example is presented as follows.

SE: Welcome to this evening lecture!

TE: Selamat berjumpa kembali di acara ceramah pada malam hari ini!

In this example, there are some amplifications in the word 'welcome' and the word 'lecture' but the interpreting still considered accurate. It is considered accurate with the mean score 2.67 (two point six seven) for the accuracy, in which the first and third respondents consider it accurate (scores 3) but the second respondent considers it less accurate (score 2). Here, though the word 'welcome' in the source expression is amplified in the target expression as 'selamat berjumpa kembali' (literary, 'welcome back'), it is considered accurate, by the first and third

respondents, since this lecture (entitled ‘rewiring the brain’) is the thirteenth of the sixteen topics in the seminar which means that this meeting is not the first meeting so the interpreter uses the expression ‘*selamat berjumpa kembali*’ (literary, ‘welcome **back**’) rather than ‘*selamat berjumpa*’ (literary, ‘welcome’). Then, the word ‘lecture’ in the source expression is amplified as ‘*acara ceramah*’ (literary, ‘lecture **program**’). It is considered accurate since this addition does not distort the meaning. In addition, in terms of acceptability, the interpreting is considered acceptable, in which the three respondents all consider it acceptable (scores 3).

### 2. Less Accurate

From 180 data, 92 data (or 51.11%) are considered less accurate. The example is presented as follows.

SE: Seventy **times** seven.

TE: *Tujuh puluh kali tujuh kali.*

[Seventy **times** seven **times**.]

In this example, the word “times” in the source expression is doubly interpreted in the target expression. Here, the interpreting is considered less accurate since the mean score is 2.33 (two point three three) for the accuracy, in which the first and second respondents consider it accurate (scores 3) but the third respondent considers it inaccurate (score 1). The third respondent considers it inaccurate since the word ‘seven’ will be accurately interpreted as ‘*tujuh*’ (literary, ‘seven’), not ‘*tujuh kali*’ (literary, ‘seven times’). In addition, it is also considered less acceptable with the mean score 2.33 (two point three three), in which the second respondent

considers it acceptable but the first and third respondents consider it less acceptable.

### 3. Inaccurate

From 180 data, 1 datum (or 0.56%) is considered inaccurate. The example is presented as follows.

SE: All heavy metals **poison the brain**.

TE: *Semua logam-logam berat itu adalah... ya...*

[All heavy metals **are...ya...**]

In this example, it can be seen that the expression of “...poison the brain” in the target expression is not transferred correctly in the target expression. Here, the interpreting is considered inaccurate, in which the three respondents give scores 1 (one) for the accuracy. The three respondents consider it inaccurate since the expression of “...poison the brain” explaining why heavy metals are dangerous is not transferred in the target expression. The semantic absence of such expression in the target expression can be seriously misleading if the listeners do not understand English, which is the language the source speaker are speaking in. In addition, in terms of acceptability it is considered unacceptable since it is not conveyed in a complete sentence.

### Description of the Expression Acceptability

This research found that the interpreting using techniques of adjustment is generally considered acceptable, in which 96 data are considered acceptable, 81 data are considered less acceptable, and 3 data are considered unacceptable. The frequency of each degree can also be seen in the following table.

Table 3. Degree of the Expression Acceptability

No.	Degree of Acceptability	Frequency
1	Acceptable	96
2	Less Acceptable	81
3	Unacceptable	3
Total		180

The three degrees of acceptability (shown in Table 3) are described as follows.

### 1. Acceptable

From 180 data, 96 data (or 53.33%) are considered acceptable. The example is presented as follows.

SE: But when it comes to the head, it becomes an external structure.

TE: *Tetapi kalau e... tulang ini sampai di kepala, dia menjadi satu bentukan yang external atau kelihatan dari luar.*

In this example, the phrase “an external structure” in the source expression is interpreted as “*satu bentukan yang external atau kelihatan dari luar*” (literary, “an external form **or visible from outside**”). Here, the interpreting is considered acceptable with the mean score is 2.67 (two point six seven) for the acceptability, in which the first and second respondents give scores 3 (three) and the third respondent gives score 2 (two). Though the third respondent considers it less acceptable, the first and second respondents consider it acceptable. The third respondent considers it less acceptable since the terms “external” in the target expression makes the interpreting sounds less natural. In other hand, the first and second respondents consider it acceptable since the expression “*kelihatan dari luar*” (literary, “visible from outside”) has a function explaining the terms “external”, in which

the interpreting will sound unnatural if it is not explained. In addition, while in terms of acceptability it is acceptable, in terms of accuracy it is less accurate with the mean score 2 (three) for the accuracy, in which the first respondent considers it accurate (score 3), the second respondent considers it less accurate (score 2), and the third respondent considers it inaccurate (score 1).

### 2. Less Acceptable

From 180 data, 81 data (or 45%) are considered less acceptable. The example is presented as follows.

SE: In a dog, frontal lobe takes up seven point five percent.

TE: *Pada anjing, maka frontal lobenya itu, lobus fontalisnya, tujuh koma lima persen.*

In this example, the phrase ‘frontal lobe’ in the source expression is doubly interpreted as ‘frontal lobenya itu, **lobus fontalisnya**’ (literary, ‘its frontal lobe, its frontal lobe’). Here, the interpreting is considered less acceptable in which the mean score is 2.33 (two point three three) for the acceptability, in which the second respondent considers it acceptable (score 3) but both first and third respondents consider it less acceptable (score 2). The second respondent considers it acceptable since there is no grammatical mistake in that expression but both first and third respondents consider it less acceptable since both terms ‘*frontal lobe...*’ and ‘*lobus frontalis...*’ in the target expression still sounds unnatural. In addition, though in terms of acceptable it is considered less acceptable, in terms of accuracy it is considered accurate with

the mean score 2.67 (two point six seven) for the accuracy, in which both first and third respondents consider it accurate (score 3) but the second respondent considers it less accurate (score 2).

### 3. Unacceptable

From 180 data, 3 data (or 1.67%) are considered unacceptable. The example is presented as follows.

SE: It's the choice factor<sup>B</sup>.

TE: Dan<sup>A</sup> inilah tergantung kepada pilihan<sup>B</sup>.

In this example, first, the transition 'Dan' (literary, 'And') is added in the target expression. Then, source expression "It's **the choice factor**" is interpreted as "... *inilah tergantung kepada pilihan*". Here, the problem is not on the transition 'Dan' added in the TE, but on the grammatical mistake used in the expression "...*inilah tergantung kepada pilihan*" which is better changed into "... *ini tergantung pada pilihan*" (literary, "... it depends on the choice") or which is best changed into "... *ini adalah faktor pilihan*" (literary, "...it is the choice factor").

## CONCLUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

### Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, this research can be concluded into several points. First, there are seven techniques of adjustment used by the interpreter. They are: 1) *additions*, 2) *subtractions*, 3) *alterations*, 4) *additions + subtractions*, 5) *additions + alterations*, 6) *subtractions + alterations*, and 7) *additions + subtractions + alterations*. From those seven

techniques, *additions* is the technique most frequently used by the interpreter, taking up 89 data (49.44%). Second, in terms of meaning accuracy, the interpreting using techniques of adjustment is generally considered less accurate, in which 87 data (or 48.33%) are considered accurate, 92 data (or 51.11%) are considered less accurate and 1 datum (or 0.56%) is considered inaccurate. Last, in terms of expression acceptability, the interpreting using techniques of adjustment is generally considered acceptable, in which 96 data (or 53.33%) are considered acceptable, 81 data (or 45%) are considered less acceptable, and 3 data (or 1.67%) are considered unacceptable.

### Suggestions

The researcher suggests all the students who interest working as interpreters to improve their listening skills, translating skills, and their speaking skills. As interpreters, they need to master the languages they are going to deal with as well as possible since there is no time for them to open any dictionary while interpreting. The researcher also suggests other researchers to conduct researches in Interpreting since interpreting tends to be more problematic than translating.

## REFERENCES

- Brislin, R.W. (1976). Translation: Application and Research. New York: Gardner Press.
- Nababan, Nuraeni, & Sumardiono. (2012). "Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan". *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, Vol. 24. (No. 1). pp 39-57.

Nida, E.A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Pochhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.