TRANSLATING ATTITUDES TOWARD SEXISM IN *GONE GIRL* NOVEL: AN APPRAISAL THEORY APPROACH

Siti Nuraisiah[1]; Mangatur Rudolf Nababan[2]; Riyadi Santosa[3]

[1,]Graduate student of Department of Linguistics, Universitas Sebelas Maret
[2,3]Department of Linguistics, Universitas Sebelas Maret
Jl. Ir. Sutami No. 36A, Jebres, Kota Surakarta, Jawa Tengah 57126, Indonesia
[1]nuraisiah_siti@student.uns.ac.id; [2]amantradja@yahoo.com; [3]riyadisantosa@staff.uns.ac.id

How to Cite: Nuraisiah, S., Nababan, M. R., & Santosa, R. (2018). Translating attitudes toward sexism in *Gone Girl* novel: An appraisal theory approach. *Lingua Cultura, 12*(3), 259-266. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i3.4633

ABSTRACT

The research dealt with attitudes toward sexism. It aimed to know the translation technique and quality in terms of accuracy and acceptability. It deployed a descriptive qualitative method. The data were obtained from a novel titled Gone Girl and the copy of the novel in Indonesian translation through content analysis and focus group discussion. The data were analyzed through domain, taxonomy, and componential analysis to reveal cultural value. The research indicates that translation techniques determine its qualities. It reveals that established equivalence results in the good quality of translation while the generalization, discursive creation, explicitation, modulation, literal translation, particularization, and description reflect quite good and bad quality of the translation. Moreover, the application of generalization and explicitation results in non-sexist translation. Consequently, the translator becomes less sexist than writer and gives readers different effect with the original one. However, this is affected by some factors; the translator's subjectivity, translator's competence, linguistic characteristic differences, and social-cultural differences.

Keywords: sexism, attitude, appraisal theory, translation technique, translation quality

INTRODUCTION

Sexism deals with unequal treatment over gender. This situation is labeled sexist when it is not relevant (Mills, 2005). Sexism is socially constructed in society, especially patriarchy one. Recent research indicates that the origin of sexism relates to social, economic causes and socialization (He, 2010). Men have responsibilities of funding family economically, so women become dependent on men, lost their social, economic and family status and stereotypically have responsibility for domestic trifles. Besides, socialization shapes children's behavior based on their sexes which require boys to be strong and girls to be gentle. Hence, this situation purposely constructs sexism. Many pieces of research have been interested in investigating sexism (Animasahun, 2015; Dai & Xu, 2014; Fi'aunillah, 2015; He, 2010; Laine & Watson, 2014). They explore how sexist language is utilized in portraying sexism. However, the sexist attitude still is not paid attention.

Attitude is the subdivision of the appraisal system. It aims to negotiate the social relationship between speaker/ writer and hearer/reader that represent consciously/ unconsciously and positively/ negatively. It is socially constructed as speaker/writer constructs his/her relationship with hearer/reader. This has been subjected by some researchers (Amalia & Hakim, 2017; Hidayati, 2017; Nazhira, Sinar, & Suriyadi, 2016; Nugraheni, 2011; Page, 2003; Rohmawati, 2016; Xiaoping, 2013) who reveal that the distribution of attitudinal resource is the way of speaker/writer in negotiating his/her social relationship. This attitudinal resource has to do with evaluating things, people's character, and his/her feelings (Martin & Rose, 2007).

When speaker/writer simultaneously evaluates between two things/people/groups differently in which one of them is portrayed negatively, he/she deals with discrimination. Discrimination refers to the unjust or prejudicial treatment of different categories of people especially on the grounds of race, age, or sex (Department of the University of Oxford, 2018). However, gender discrimination indicates sexism (Mills, 2008) has been investigated by Behnam and Bahar (2013), which reveal that the imbalance of applying attitude toward male and female portrays writer's sexist point of view.

Since sexism and attitude are socially constructed, they relate each other. On the one hand, sexism treats gender

unequally in terms of evaluation, treatment, thought, feeling, intention, etc. On the other hand, attitude evaluates things, people, and feeling. Henceforth, unequal evaluation over gender is investigated by analyzing attitude toward sexism. With applying attitude toward sexism, the research reveals how speaker/writer negotiates his/her social relationship in sexism.

Previous appraisal theory on translation has contributed to assessing translation quality in terms of accuracy (Thahara & Firdaus, 2014). They clarify that the same appraisal category in source and target text produces an accurate translation and vice versa. An investigation on character constructed has revealed how characterization is reflected by the use of appraisal resource and how it is transferred into target text (Alsina, Espunya, & Naro, 2017; Khrisna et al., 2016; Sutrisno, 2017; Zhaoying, 2017).

Another investigation on attitudinal positioning has indicated that there are different readership between Source Text (ST) and Target Text (TT), translator's stance, and positioning between ST and TT (Xiaoping, 2013). Last investigations on translation technique and quality have reflected that the use of certain technique results into good, good enough, and bad quality of translations (Hendrastuti, Nababan, & Wiratno, 2013; Sutrisno, 2017; Umam, 2014; Zhaoying, 2017). However, there is no attention paid on attitude toward sexism related to translation study. Translation deals with meaning in both ST and TT. It refers to reproducing meaning from ST into TT (Nida & Taber, 1982). The meaning reproduced in TT contains culture, value, norm, the ideology of ST. Thus, attitude toward sexism in ST has to reproduce with both socially constructed and negotiated in the target text.

Henceforth, this research gives an insight on dealing with translation technique and quality of attitude toward sexism. With translation technique and quality theory, the research describes how translator socially negotiates her social relationship on evaluating feeling, people, and things with target readers and its impact on translation quality.

METHODS

The research employs a descriptive qualitative method. It utilizes sexism (Archer & Lloyd, 2002; Litosseliti, 2013; Mills, 2005; 2008) and appraisal theories (Martin & Rose, 2007) to deal with attitude toward sexism in *Gone Girl* novel (Flynn, 2012; 2014). The data are obtained through content analysis and focus group discussion. Content analysis deals with determining between data and non-data, analyzing attitude toward sexism, analyzing translation technique (Molina & Albir, 2002), and processing the information from the informant (rater) in relation to translation quality. Besides, the focus group discussion is utilized to find out translation quality with reference to translation quality assessment instrument (Nababan, Nuraeni, & Sumardiono, 2012). After gathering the data, they are analyzed through the domain, taxonomy, and componential analysis to reveal the cultural value (Santosa, 2017).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the analysis of attitudes toward sexism in *Gone Girl* novel, the research reveals that the writer and translator distribute different attitudes toward sexism. It is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Attitudes toward Sexism

No.	Sex.		At.	ST	TT
1	SA		A	14	16
			J	30	31
			Ap.	3	4
2	SL	SS	A	1	
			J	2	
		LG	A	1	1
		SD	A	29	26
			J	77	62
			Ap.	3	1
		AGLI	A	1	1
			J	27	17
			Ap.	31	20
		CLI	A	3	
			J	10	3
			Ap.	3	
	Total			**235**	**182**

Table 1 Explanation:
Sex. = Sexism, At. = Attitude, SA = Sexist Attitude, SL = Sexist Language, SS = Sex Specification, LG = Lexical Gap, AGLI = Asymmetrically Gendered Language Items, SD = Semantic Derogation, CLI = Connotation of Language Items, A = Affect, J = Judgment, and Ap. = Appreciation.

Table 1 shows different frequency between ST and TT. In ST version, the writer applies sexism to evaluate people's feeling by 49 data, people's behavior by 146 data, and things by 40 data. In TT version, translator negotiates her social relationship on sexism through 46 data of exploiting people's feeling, 113 and 25 data of evaluating people's behavior and things. These differences deal with changes in sexism and attitudes categories due to translation technique used. For example, generalization is often utilized to change sexist entities into non-sexist one. It can be seen in Data 062/B.1.14/GG.134/YH.152.

ST	He sounds springy, **boyish**, the way he always does when he talks to her.
TT	*Nick terdengar ringan, **kekanak-kanakan**, caranya bicara dengan Go.*

The bolded word in ST indicates connotation of language items which represents judgment (social esteem; negative normality). However, the translator uses a 'neutral term' (Molina & Albir, 2002) to represent 'gender-free language' (Mills, 2005; 2008) in transferring meaning from ST to TT. The research indicates that the absence of sexism in TT causes its absence of attitude. Hence, it negatively affects its accuracy. While sexist meaning is deleted and its translation still reflects meaning from ST that indicates less accurate translation (Nababan, Nuraeni, & Sumardiono, 2012; Nurochman et al., 2017; Rahmawati, Nababan, & Santosa, 2016). Moreover, its translation will reflect the accurate translation if the bolded word in ST is borrowed into TT. However, the borrowed term often give negative

Table 2 Translation Technique and Quality of Attitudes toward Sexism

Sex.	At.	Tr. T	Translation Quality					
			Accuracy			Acceptability		
			A	LA	IA	A	LA	IA
SA	A	EE	12			12		
		DC		1		1		
		M	1			1		
	J	EE	25			25		
		C		2		1	1	
		DC			1		1	
		L			1		1	
		M	1			1		
	Ap.	EE	2			2		
		L		1		1		
SL	SS	A	EE	1			1		
		G		2		2		
	LG	A	L			1	1		
	SD	A	EE	27			27		
		G		2		2		
		J	EE	48			48		
		G		11		11		
		L		4	2		4	2
		DC		1	3	3		1
		E		4		4		
		C	1	2		3		
		M		1		1		
		Ap.	G		1		1		
		EE	1			1		
		DC		1		1		
	AGLI	A	E		1		1		
		J	EE	10			10		
		G		8		8		
		C	3	1		1	2	1
		E		1		1		
		L		1			1	
		DC			1	1		
		M		1		1		
		P		1		1		
		Ap.	EE	17			17		
		G		5		5		
		L			3		2	1
		DC		2	1	2	1	
		M		2		2		
		D		1		1		
	CLI	A	E						
		G						
		M						
		J	G						
		EE						
		DC						
		Ap.	P						
		G						
		Total	**151**	**70**	**14**	**217**	**13**	**5**

Table 2 Explanations:
Tr. T = Translation Technique, A = Accurate/Acceptable, LA = Less Accurate/Acceptable, IA = Inaccurate/ Inacceptable, EE = Established equivalence, L = Literal, DC = Discursive creation, C = Couplet, M = Modulation E = Explicitation, G = Generalization, D = Description and P = Particularization.

effect to its acceptability because it represents 'unnatural or unfamiliar' (Nababan, Nuraeni, & Sumardiono, 2012) term to readers.

As suggested, translation techniques are revealed as both source and target text are compared (Molina & Albir, 2002). These techniques are not good or bad in themselves since they are used appropriately. Hence, translation quality is assessed to know if the translation is good or bad in relation to translation technique applied (Nababan, Nuraeni, Sumardiono, 2012). The result is distributed in Table 2.

The research indicates that translator mostly utilizes established equivalence. It transfers meaning in ST by using term or expression recognized (by dictionaries or language in use) as an equivalent in the TT (Molina & Albir, 2002). The application of established equivalence reflects accurate and acceptable translation. For example:

Data 074/B.1.17/GG.170/YH.192

ST He was a nice-looking kid, very solicitous of Amy – treated her **like a princess.**

TT *Dia anak berpenampilan baik, sangat perhatian kepada Amy – memperlakukannya* **seperti seorang putri.**

The bolded words in ST and TT indicate the same sexism and attitude. They use sex specification since language use specifies certain gender. It is showed by the use of 'princess' derived from the 'prince', then added by suffix –ess to indicate women. Besides, the use of *putri* also specifically refers to women derived from *putra*, then replacing the last letter by -*i*. Other examples are *mahasiswa → mahasiswi, saudara → saudari*, etc.

These word-formations seem to tell that women are derived from men and attached the men, indicating a meaning of triviality, of lesser status or dependence to the term (He, 2010). Additionally, the bolded expressions show Desi's (He/*Dia*) manner in relation to his love. Desi shows his affection (Affect: Realis: Happiness: Affection) to Amy by treating her like a princess. Moreover, the same sexism and attitude in ST and TT reflect the same meaning. Princess is arguably an equivalent term for *putri*. It indicates 'no distortion meaning' and it is 'structurally and grammatically natural and familiar' (Nababan, Nuraeni, & Sumardiono, 2012) in TT context. This finding reconfirms some previous research Aji, Nababan, and Santosa (2017); Hendrastuti, Nababan, and Wiratno (2013); and Sutrisno (2017), which are carried out translation analysis of attitudes. They claim that the application of established equivalence results in accurate and acceptable translation.

Another translation technique which is highly used is generalization. It refers to use a more general or neutral term (Molina & Albir, 2002). The application of generalization results in less accurate but acceptable translation. For example:

Data 104.P/B.1.24/GG.250/YH.280

ST His mother **had always** *mothered* him – she insisted on coming by once a week and ironing for us, and when she was done ironing, she'd say, 'I'll just help tidy,' and after she'd left, I'd look in the fridge and find she'd peeled and sliced his grapefruit for him, put the pieces in a snap-top container, and then I'd open the bread and discover all the crusts had been cut away, each slice returned half naked.

TT *Ibunya* **selalu mengasuhnya** *– Mo berkeras datang sekali seminggu dan menyetrika untuk kami, dan ketika sudah selesei, dia akan berkata, "Aku akan bantu beres-beres," dan sesudah itu dia pergi, aku akan melihat ke kulkas dan menemukan Mo sudah mengupas dan memotong jeruk grapefruit untuk Nick, menaruh potongannya di wadah kedap udara, kemudian aku akan membuka wadah roti dan menemukan semua pinggirannya sudah dipotong, setiap lembar roti setengah telanjang.*

The bolded words indicate connotation of language items. While ST version reflects sexism, the TT version is not. 'Mothering' has connotation related to nurturing compared to 'fathering'. The recent study shows that 'mother' plays a stronger role for shaping overall safety and emotional health while 'father' has a stronger influence in shaping child's sense of industry and competence for handling and adapting new challenges as well as managing emotions and adapting to stressful situations (Mallers et al., 2010). Although both mother and father play their roles separately, the role of Mama Go of mothering Nick gives him negative effect. It indicates that mothering gradually changes to shape children's feminine behavior.

However, in TT context *mengasuh* reflects two meanings. In binary opposition, *mengasuh* does not reflect any gender. It generally represents some characteristics of both mothered and fathered in terms of nurturing without demeaning women. In another context, *mengasuh* is stereotypically related to women. While ST version shows sexist language, TT version is the sexist attitude. Nevertheless, both mothered and *mengasuh* show the same attitude. They express Mama Go's (his mother/Ibunya) affection (Affect: Realis: Happiness: Affection) toward Nick. Mama Go's affection is expressed by the surge of behavior as she mothers her son. Moreover, the general representation of mothered in TT negatively affects translation accuracy. Translator 'deletes some meaning' (Nababan, Nuraeni, and Sumardiono, 2012) of mothered related to sexism. This has been accounted by some researcher (Nurochman et al., 2017; Rahmawati, Nababan, & Santosa, 2016) which conclude that the application of generalization resulted in less accurate translation. Conversely, this generalization does not give negative effect to translation acceptability. Mengasuh is structurally and grammatically natural and familiar for readers.

In addition, the research also reveals that the application of discursive creation reflects inaccurate and acceptable translation. It establishes a temporary equivalence that is totally unpredictable out of context (Molina & Albir, 2002). For example:

Data 011/B.1.4/GG.39/YH.49

ST No relationship is perfect, they say – they, who make do with dutiful sex and gassy bedtime rituals, who settle for TV as conversation, who believe that **husbandly** capitulation – yes, honey, okay, honey – is the same as concord.

TT *Tidak ada hubungan yang sempurna, mereka bilanng – mereka yang bertahan dengan seks wajib dan ritual waktu tidur penuh dengan gas, yang menetapkan TV sebagai percakapan, yang yakin bahwa penyerahan* **si suami** *– ya, Sayang, oke, Sayang – itu sama dengan kerukunan.*

The bolded words indicate asymmetrically gendered language items. 'Husbandly' uses to describe men, and it is 'no equivalent' for women (Litosseliti, 2013). Although there is the specific term for women, 'wifely', the characteristics of both of them are different. Like 'husbandly', '*si suami*' also has no equivalent term for women. However, both 'husbandly' and '*si suami*' show different meaning. Husbandly means characteristic or relating to the role of husband (Department of the University of Oxford, 2018) while *si suami* deals with husband, a patriarchy order. Both of them completely give different intention to readers. In ST version, the writer tries to devalue capitulation done by the husband. Unfortunately, in the TT version, the translator does not show any evaluation because it changes into experiential one. In consequence, its attitude is deleted. However, the structure is natural and common for TT readers (Nababan, Nuraeni, & Sumandiono, 2012). This is similar to previous study related to appraisal Zhaoying (2017) which claims that the application of discursive creation results in inaccurate and acceptable translation.

Moreover, the study is also reflected in the use of the couplet technique. This refers to using two translation techniques. It indicates different translation quality due to which techniques are combined. For example:

Data 154/B.2.8/GG.359/YH.397

ST "**Very Godfather of** you," Go said.

TT "Godfather *sekali* dirimu," kata Go

Similar to data 011, the example is asymmetrically gendered language items. Godfather refers to the person who has much influence or authority in some area (Yourdictionary, n.d.). This is completely asymmetry and has no equivalent term for women. This good characterization of Nick (you) is related to his capability (Judgment: Social Esteem: Positive Capacity) on dealing with Amy's treasure hunt. It is expressed by using disposition. While this example shows the same sexism and attitude, the meaning is transferred without any distortion due to the application of established equivalent and pure borrowing. This is supported the claim of previous research by Nurochman et al. (2017) which deals with sexist language. The research suggested that the application of established equivalence and pure borrowing result in the accurate translation. Although the research concludes the application of each technique separately, the combination of two of them simultaneously indicates the same result. However, the structure is unacceptable due to its unfamiliarity.

Furthermore, the research also indicates the use of explicitation. Explicitation is the subdivision of amplification which introduces information from the ST that is implicit from the context or the situation (Molina & Albir, 2002). The application of this technique gives the same result as generalization, less accurate and acceptable translation. For example:

Data 083/B.1.17/GG.184/YH.205

ST No matter how many clues I solved, I'd be faced with some Amy trivia **to unman** me.

TT *Tidak peduli berapa banyak petunjuk yang aku pecahkan, aku akan dihadapkan dengan teka-teki Amy untuk* **mematahkan semangat***ku.*

Similar to two previous examples, this example deals with asymmetrically gendered language items. 'To unman'

refers to depriving of qualities traditionally associated with men, such as self-control or courage (Department of the University of Oxford, 2018). It is used to exploit Amy's feeling toward Nick. It expresses Amy's antipathy (Affect: Unhappiness: Antipathy). Surprisingly, translator explicitly transfers 'to unman' into *mematahkan semangat.* While Amy's antipathy becomes clearer and its structure becomes natural, the meaning is distorted and results in non-sexist translation. This supports the previous finding by Rahmawati, Nababan, & Santosa, 2016) which reveal that the use of amplification explicated the meaning in TT and simultaneously deleted its sexist meaning.

The further finding shows that the application of modulation results in both accurate and less accurate translation but structurally acceptable. It refers to changing the point of view, focus or cognitive category in relation to the ST (Molina & Albir, 2002). For example:

Data 049/B.1.11/GG.102/YH.118

ST He used the eraser end of a pencil to pick up a pair of women's underwear (technically, they were panties – stringy, lacy, red – but I know women **get creeped out** by that word – just Google hate the word panties).

TT *Dia menggunakan ujung penghapus dari sebatang pensil untuk mengangkat pakaian dalam wanita (sebenarnya, itu celana dalam – minim, berenda, merah – tetapi aku tahu para wanita* **tidak menyukai** *kata itu – cari di Google benci kata celana dalam).*

The bolded words show the same sexism and attitude. They are sexist attitude since it encompasses feelings and intentions to act, as well as beliefs and thoughts (Archer & Lloyd, 2002) over gender. It indicates that both ST and TT negatively portray and demean women. It is an unfair evaluation because of irrelevance (Mills, 2005). Women are negatively portrayed in terms of their antipathy toward certain word, whereas the particular woman does. This feeling is expressed by using disposition in process form. Although the meaning of both ST and TT version is similar, it structurally changes. It is modulated from the positive phrase into the negative one. However, the research indicates accurate and acceptable translation. Besides, the research also shows that the application of modulation results in less accurate one in which its finding reclaims previous research (Zhaoying, 2017).

Another translation technique in which its application does not consider the context is the literal translation. It refers to translate a word or an expression word for word (Molina & Albir, 2002). The research indicates that the application of this technique results in less accurate and less acceptable translation. For example:

Data 149/B.2.7/GG.356/YH.394

ST She just sounds like a rich, **bored bitch**. Like those rich bitches who use their husbands' money to start, like, cupcake companies and card shops and shit. Boutiques.'

TT *"Dia kedengaran seperti* **jalang** *kaya* **yang bosan***. Semacam jalang-jalang kaya yang memakai uang suami mereka untuk memulai, seperti, perusahaan cupcake dan toko kartu dan omong kosong macam itu. Butik."*

The bolded words in ST and TT show the same sexism and attitude. They are semantic derogation. The word

'bitch' neutrally means a female dog. However, 'bitch' in the example is derogated and used to offend women sexually (Department of the University of Oxford, 2018). The word '*jalang*' is neutrally used to attribute the wildness of animal, but the meaning contextually changes into naughty in term of breaching social norms (Pusat Bahasa, 2016). This word '*jalang*' is stereotypically related to women and demeans women sexually.

Both bitch and *jalang* evaluate Amy's (she/*dia*) character (Judgment: Social Sanction: Negative Propriety) if she is beyond reproach (Martin & Rose, 2007). She is condemned without any proof that she has been breached social norms. However, the translator transfers the meaning of 'bored' literally. Consequently, it affects its quality negatively. There is the distortion of meaning in TT resulted in less accurate translation. Besides, TT version structurally indicates less familiar translation and is resulted in less acceptable translation. Nevertheless, this result proposes different claim of previous research by Sutrisno (2017) which concludes that the application of literal translation results in accurate and acceptable translation.

Additionally, the research indicates translation technique which changes the attitude category, namely particularization. It refers to using a more precise or concrete term (Molina & Albir, 2002). The application of this technique results in less accurate and acceptable translation. For example:

Data 043/B.1.9/GG.84/YH.97

ST Rand Elliott held me in his blue stare for a few more seconds, then broke up again – three **girlish** gasps burst from him like hiccups – and Marybeth moved into the huddle, buried her face in her husband's armpit.

TT *Rand Elliott memaku diriku dalam tatapan mata birunya selama beberapa detik, kemudian luluh kembali – sentakan nafas tiga kali **seperti anak perempuan** yang terlontar bagai cegukan – dan Marybeth bergerak mendekat, menyusupkan wajahnya ke ketiak suaminya.*

The example reflects the same sexism but different attitude. They are the connotation of language items; 'girlish' and '*seperti gadis perempuan*' represent unmanliness of Rand. In ST version, Rand's gasps attract Nick's attention. In TT version, Rand is condemned for not being manly. ST version indicates Appreciation: Reaction: Negative Impact while TT version refers to Judgment: Social Sanction: Negative Propriety/. This situation is reflected by the use of the more precise term in TT. Consequently, its accuracy gets the negative impact. While its structure in TT is natural, translation is acceptable. This seems to restate another finding (Irlinda, Santosa, & Kristina, 2016) which suggest that the use of particularization in appraisal reflected less accurate but acceptable translation.

Last, the very infrequent technique is the description. It refers to replacing a term or expression with a description of its form or/and function (Molina & Albir, 2002). The application of this technique results in less accurate but acceptable translation. For example:

Data 008/B.1.3/GG.28/YH.37

ST It was the kind of raunchy, **unsisterly** joke that Go enjoyed tossing at me like a grenade.

TT *Ini lelucon cabul, **tidak cocok datang dari seorang perempuan**, yang dengan senang hati Go lemparkan padaku seperti melempar granat.*

The bolded words in ST and TT show different sexism and attitude. In ST version, 'unsisterly' is specified for women and cannot be substituted to men's specific term, 'brotherly'. In TT version, translator discriminates women on certain joke. While 'unsisterly' evaluates the negative quality of joke (Appreciation: Reaction: Negative Quality) that is expressed by Go. The translation of '*tidak cocok datang dari seorang perempuan*' evaluates women's behavior (Judgment: Social Sanction: Negative Normality). '*Tidak cocok datang dari seorang perempuan*' suggests that women normally do not express that kind of joke.

These differences are affected by the use of translation technique, description, by replacing the term with a description of its function. Besides, its translation quality is also negatively affected. This suggests different remark with the previous research (Hendrastuti, Nababan, Wiratno, 2013), which suggest that the application of description indicates the accurate translation. However, another claim about its acceptability is similar. This research and previous one reveal that utilizing description results in acceptable translation due to familiarity.

Translation refers to transferring meaning from ST to TT. The notion of transferring reflects the reproduction of meaning by using the nearest and most natural equivalence and the reproduction of language use (Nida & Taber, 1982). Additionally, sexism is language use indicating inequality. This is socially constructed and affects people's behavior, feeling, thought, intention and language (Archer & Lloyd, 2002; He, 2010; Mills, 2005; 2008). Hence, translating sexism deals with reproducing unequal expression by using the nearest and most natural equivalence socially.

Since the translator is a communicator (Hatim & Mason, 1997), he/she has to do with the same intention as the writer. However, this research indicates that writer and translator exploit different sexism in evaluating things, people's characters, and feeling. Consequently, they reflect different intention, sexism, and attitude, and translator tends to be less sexist than the writer.

The differences of sexism between ST and TT cannot be separated from the use of the translation technique. It refers to the result of choice made by a translator in transferring meaning from ST to TT. There are many translation techniques proposed by many experts. As Molina & Albir (2002) have suggested, there is 18 translation technique, in which, each of them does not reflect good or bad technique. What makes translation good or bad is the translator's choice. When the translator chooses the certain technique for the right situation and condition took place, it will result in a good translation, and vice versa. Translator's choice on dealing with translation is affected by the translator's subjectivity (Irlinda, Santosa, & Kristina, 2016; Zhaoying, 2017), translator's competency (Nababan, Nuraeni, & Sumardiono, 2012), language characteristic differences (Rahmawati, Nababan, & Santosa, 2016; Zhaoying, 2017) and social cultural differences.

Translator's subjectivity is taken place when translator intentionally uses the particular technique with having insight about its impact to translation quality. Translator's competency shows if the application of a particular technique is appropriate or not. While applying an appropriate technique reflects good competency of the

translator, an inappropriate one shows less competency. Additionally, the translator faces two languages with different characteristic, social and culture, and determines translator in applying the certain technique. For example, English and Indonesian basically differ in terms of tenses, so transferring meaning from English to Indonesia might confuse translator in transferring the meaning of tenses. Besides, the idea expressed in ST is both socially and culturally constructed and probably cannot be reflected in the TT context. Transferring social and cultural value from ST to TT renders the great pitfall to the translator.

Furthermore, these differences give both positive and negative impacts. On the one hand, being non-sexist is good in relation to the effort of reducing gender inequality. This has been proposed by Mills (2005) who argues the need of gender-free language. Besides, non-sexist translation can be affected by the context in the target text. For example, Indonesian tends to be more neutral than English in terms of sexism (Rahmawati, Nababan, & Santosa, 2016). Consequently, the use of the non-sexist term in TT is suggested to be more natural. On the other hand, translation is the product from the process of reproducing meaning in which its meaning has to be the equivalence. Henceforth, sexist terms have to be transferred as sexist terms unless the quality will be affected negatively.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis conducted, the research indicates that there are differences between writer and translator in using attitude toward sexism. These differences show that the writer and translator have different perspectives on sexism and in this research, the translator is less sexist than the writer. These are reflected by the application of translation technique which simultaneously determines its quality. This claims that the translator's choice in applying certain technique determines the quality. If the certain technique is applied in the wrong situation and condition, it will affect its quality negatively, and vice versa. However, translation qualities assessed are limited to accuracy and acceptability. Consequently, there is a need a further study to reveal how translator's choice in applying translation technique affects translation quality in terms of readability.

REFERENCES

Aji, W., Nababan, M. R., & Santosa, R. (2017). Comparative translation quality of judgement in novel The Adventures of Tom Sawyer. *Lingua Didaktika, 11*(1), 36–52. https://doi.org/10.24036/ld/.

Alsina, V., Espunya, A., & Naro, M. W. (2017). An appraisal theory approach to point of view in Mansfield park and its translations. *International Journal of Literary Linguistics, 6*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.15462/IJLL.V6I1.103.

Amalia, R. M., & Hakim, F. Z. M. (2017). Appraisal analysis in media conference between the government of Indonesia and Australia towards bilateral relations normalization. *Intermestic: Journal of International Studies, 1*(2), 95–107. https://doi.org/10.24198/intermestic.v1n2.2.

Animasahun, O. (2015). Sexist language in Nigerian newspapers: A case study of the Punch and the Guardian Newspapers. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Sciences, 20*(1), 65–75. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-20126575.

Archer, J., & Lloyd, B. B. (2002). *Sex and gender* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Behnam, B., & Bahar, G. (2013). The demonstration of sexism in Thomas Hardy's short stories via appraisal analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(2), 291–300. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.2.291-300

Dai, H., & Xu, X. (2014). Sexism in news: A comparative study on the portray of female and male politicians in the New York Times. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 4*(December), 709–719.

Department of the University of Oxford. (2018). *English Oxford living dictionary*. Retrieved on April 1st, 2018 from https:/en.oxforddictionaries.com.

Fi'aunillah, T. K. (2015). Sexist langue in "The Lord of the Rings" film trilogi. *Language Horison, 3*(1), 143–149.

Flynn, G. (2012). *Gone Girl*. New York: Crown Publisher.

Flynn, G. (2014). *Yang Hilang*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London and New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.2307/417507

He, G. (2010). An analysis of sexism in English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(3), 332–335. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.332-335

Hendrastuti, R., Nababan, M. R., & Wiratno, T. (2013). Kajian terjemahan metafora yang menunjukkan dikap dalam buku motivasi „The Secret". *TransLing Journal: Translation and Linguistics, 1*(1), 21–35.

Hidayati, N. (2017). Appraisal analysis in freedom writers movie. *Edulite, 2*(1), 317–333.

Irlinda, A. H., Santosa, R., & Kristina, D. (2016). Analisis terjemahan ekspresi solidaritas dan keberpihakan dalam teks konferensi pers dan siaran media tentang eksekusi narapidana (Pendekatan teori appraisal). *Prasasti: Journal of Linguistics, 1*(2), 187–209. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v1i2.958.

Khrisna, D. A. N., Nababan, M., Djatmika., & Santosa, R. (2016). Appraisal analysis on the main character of novel "The Old Man and the Sea" and its three Indonesian-translated versions "Lelaki Tua dan Laut". *Advanced Science Letters, 22*(12), 4481–4484. https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2016.8193.

Laine, T., & Watson, G. (2014). Linguistic sexism in The Times — A diachronic study. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 4*(3), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v4n3p1.

Litosseliti, L. (2013). *Gender & language: Theory and practice*. London and New York: Routledge.

Mallers, M. H., Charles, S. T., Neupert, S. D., & Almeida, D. M. (2010). Perceptions of childhood relationships with mother and father: Daily emotional and stressor experiences in adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(6), 1651–1661. https://doi.org/https://doi:10.1037/a0021020.

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse* (2nd Ed.). London: Continuum.

Mills, S. (2005). *Feminist Stylistics*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Mills, S. (2008). *Language and sexism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Translators' Journal, 47*(4), 498–512.

Nababan, M., Nuraeni, A., & Sumardiono. (2012). Pengembangan model penilaian kualitas terjemahan. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra, 24*(1), 39–57.

Nazhira, R., Sinar, S., & Suriyadi. (2016). Appraisal dalam teks berita surat kabar nasional. *Jurnal Tutur, 2*(1), 1–14.

Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Nugraheni, Y. (2011). Sistem appraisal pada teks iklan komersial di tabloid Nova. *Parole, 2*(1), 45–58.

Nurochman., Nababan, M. R., Santosa, R., & Kristina, D. (2017). Translation quality of sexist language in the novel "Little Women" by Loisa May Alcott. *6th ELTLT International Conference*. Semarang, Indonesia. pp. 406–409.

Page, R. E. (2003). An analysis of appraisal in childbirth narratives with special consideration of gender and storytelling style. *Text, 23*(2), 211–237. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2003.009

Pusat Bahasa. (2016). *KBBI daring, kamus besar bahasa Indonesia*. Retrieved on April 1st, 2018 from http://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id.

Rahmawati, A. A., Nababan, M. R., & Santosa, R. (2016). Kajian teknik penerjemahan dan kualitas terjemahan ungkapan yang mengandung seksisme dalam novel "The Mistress's Revenge" dan novel "The 19Th Wife". *Prasasti: Journal of Linguistics, 1*(2), 249–270. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v1i2.1032.

Rohmawati, I. (2016). Appraisal devices realizing attitudes in Barack Obama's inaugural speech. *Jurnal Vision, 5*(1), 27–56.

Santosa, R. (2017). *Metode penelitian kualitatif kebahasaan*. Surakarta: UNS Press.

Sutrisno, A. (2017). Ungkapan-ungkapan sikap Tokoh utama dalam novel "The Body in the Library" dan dampaknya terhadap kualitas terjemahan (Kajian terjemahan dengan pendekatan teori appraisal). *Literasi, 2*(1), 16–29.

Thahara, Y., & Firdaus, A. Y. (2014). Assessing translation quality using appraisal theory: A case study of X-Men origins Wolverine subtitle. T*he first International Translation and Interpretation Symposium Universitas Indonesia 2014*. Depok, Indonesia. pp. 324–329.

Umam, R. K. (2014). *Analisis attitude dan graduation pada terjemahan subtitle film "Avatar" (Kajian terjemahan dengan pendekatan teori appraisal*. Surakarta: Univesitas Sebelas Maret.

Xiaoping, W. (2013). Evaluative semantics and attitudinal positioning in news translation. *Projections, 2*(2), 139–163.

Yourdictionary. (n.d.). *Dictionary definitions; Godfather*. Retrieved on May 16th, 2018 from http://yourdictionary.com/godfather.

Zhaoying, H. (2017). *Analisis terjemahan subtitle bahasa Indonesia mengenai tokoh utama dalam film "The Monkey King" (2014) dari perspektif appraisal*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.