TRANSLATION QUALITY: A STUDY OF HARRY POTTER:

THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE

A MASTER'S PROJECT

BY

KHANITTHA THAICHAROEN

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master of Arts Degree in English

at Srinakharinwirot University

October 2007

TRANSLATION QUALITY: A STUDY OF *HARRY POTTER:*

THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE

AN ABSTRACT

BY

KHANITTHA THAICHAROEN

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master of Arts Degree in English

at Srinakharinwirot University

October 2007

Khanittha Thaicharoen. (2007). *Translation Quality: A Study of Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone*. Master's project, M.A.(English). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University. Project Advisor: Mrs. Tuanta Laosooksri, Assistant Professor Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup, Associate Professor Dr. Tipa Thep-Ackrapong.

This study aimed to analyze the translation quality of the well-known children's book *Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone* translated by Sumalee (2000). The seven standards of textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) were used as the framework of the study. The Thai translated version was analyzed sentence by sentence against the original text. Then the discrepancies in textual standards were analyzed. Ninety-three discrepancies were found in five chapters (1, 5, 9, 13, and 17). The findings revealed that the most frequent problem was the violation of the intentionality of the original text (92%). The second most frequently found violation was the informativity (8%). Since most of the violations did not have a great impact on the whole meaning of the book, the translation quality was considered high.

การวิเคราะห์คุณภาพงานแปลวรรณกรรมเด็กเรื่อง *แฮร์รี่ พอตเตอร์ กับ ศิลาอาถรรพ์*

บทคัดย่อ
ของ
ขนิษฐา ไทยเจริญ

ขนิษฐา ไทยเจริญ. (2550). *การวิเคราะห์คุณภาพงานแปลวรรณกรรมเด็กเรื่อง แฮร์รี่ พอตเตอร์กับ ศิลาอาถรรพ์.*

สารนิพนธ์ ศศ.ม. (ภาษาอังกฤษ). กรุงเทพฯ: บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ.

อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาสารนิพนธ์: อาจารย์ เตือนตา เลาสุขศรี.

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อวิเคราะห์คุณภาพงานแปลวรรณกรรมเด็กเรื่อง *แฮร์รี่ พอตเตอร์ กับ ศิลาอาถรรพ์ (Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone)* จากต้นฉบับภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาไทยโดย สุมาลี (2000) โดยนำ seven standards of textuality ของ de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) มาใช้ในการ วิเคราะห์ ในกระบวนการวิเคราะห์ได้นำข้อมูลของทั้งต้นฉบับภาษาอังกฤษและฉบับแปลภาษาไทยมาเปรียบเทียบ เพื่อหาความคลาดเคลื่อนและนำความคลาดเคลื่อนที่ได้มาวิเคราะห์ด้วยทฤษฎีของ de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) ผลจากการศึกษาพบความคลาดเคลื่อน 93 แห่ง จากกลุ่มตัวอย่างจำนวน 5 บท ได้แก่ บทที่ 1, 5, 9, 13 และ 17 ปัญหาที่พบมากที่สุดในการแปลฉบับภาษาไทยนี้คือละเมิด intentionality ของต้นฉบับ (92%) และ informativity เป็นปัญหาที่พบเป็นอันดับที่สอง (8%) จากผลการวิเคราะห์พบความคลาดเคลื่อนจำนวน น้อยและไม่มีผลกระทบต่อการแปลรุนแรงจึงกล่าวได้ว่างานแปลวรรณกรรมเด็กเรื่อง แฮร์รี่ พอตเตอร์ กับ ศิลา อาถรรพ์ *(Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone)* มีคุณภาพดี

TRANSLATION QUALITY: A STUDY OF HARRY POTTER:

THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE

A MASTER'S PROJECT

BY

KHANITTHA THAICHAROEN

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master of Arts Degree in English

at Srinakharinwirot University

October 2007

The Master's Project Advisor, Chair of the Master of Arts Degree in English, and Oral Defense Committee have approved this Master's Project as partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Arts Degree in English of Srinakharinwirot University.

Master's Project Advisor

……………………….…………………………………
(Mrs.Tuanta Laosooksri)

Chair of the Master of Arts Degree in English

……………………………………………………………
(Dr. Prapaipan Aimchoo)

Oral Defense Committee

……………………………………………………………… Chair
(Mrs. Tuanta Laosooksri)

……………………………………………………………… Committee
(Assistant Professor Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup)

…………………………………………………….….. Committee
(Associate Professor Dr. Tipa Thep-Ackrapong)

This Master's Project has been approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in English of Srinakharinwirot University.

……………………………………….Dean of the Faculty of Humanities
(Associate Professor Chaleosri Pibulchol)

19 October 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My heartfelt gratitude is expressed to Mrs. Tuanta Laosooksri, my project advisor, for her kindness and care. Her encouragement made my master's project possible.

I would like to thank my readers: Assistant Professor Dr. Nitaya Suksaeresup and Associate Professor Dr.Tipa Thep-Ackrapong for their valuable suggestions, and great patience in reading and editing my work. Their dedication is highly appreciated.

My thanks are given to Mrs.Kornkamon Sriduandao, Miss Pimonmas Piboonsombut, and to all my beloved friends for their love and help.

Finally, my special thanks go to my beloved grandmother, father, mother and my sisters for their unconditional love, care and support in all aspects of my life.

Khanittha Thaicharoen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Translation is regarded as a significant key interlinking literary works of man from all cultures in the world. Today, many foreign literary works especially children's books are imported into Thailand. They are popular. Some favorite books are translated into many languages, and one of the most favorite children's books is *Harry Potter* written by J.K. Rowling.

Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone is the first episode, which was first published in Great Britain in 1997 and rapidly spread to other countries including Thailand. This famous book was translated from English into Thai by Sumalee in 2000, and it was warmly welcomed by the Thai audience who mostly were teenage readers.

In fact, translating a foreign text and making it acceptable by the target language audience is not easy because each book has its own characteristics in language use, word choice, cultural concepts etc. Therefore, when the book is translated into another language, certain factors should be considered.

Because this episode is translated for a commercial purpose, the translator had to translate it as fast as possible in order to respond to the target audience's demand. Consequently, many people have doubted about the quality of the work.

For the above reason *แฮร์รี่พอตเตอร์ กับศิลาอาถรรพ์* the Thai version of *Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone* will be analyzed in terms of text quality based on the theory of textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981).

Objective of the study:

The purpose of this research was to study the translation quality of the Thai version of *Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone*: แฮร์รี่ พอตเตอร์ กับ ศิลาอาถรรพ์ by Sumalee (2000) within de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) theoretical framework.

Significance of the study:

1. The results of the study will be used as guidelines to evaluate the quality of other translated works.

2. The research results will be used as a reference for analyzing other translated works.

3. The research results will be used as guidelines for conducting further research in translation and in other related fields.

Scope of the study:

In this research, chapters 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17 of *Harry Potter: the Philosopher's Stone* were analyzed. Errors on translation were not included in the study.

In short, the Thai translated version of *Harry Potter: the Philosopher's Stone* was analyzed within de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) theoretical framework to evaluate its quality. The findings would reveal whether or not this Thai version was acceptable.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

First, the translation quality approaches are discussed. Then, the related research is reviewed.

Translation quality approaches

Many scholars have proposed various approaches to evaluate the quality of translation. Some of the well-known approaches are House's (1997) model of translation quality assessment and Reiss's (2000) criteria for literary translation quality assessment. De Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) text linguistics can be applied to translation as well.

House (1997) proposes a model for evaluating translation quality by analyzing the source text and translated text by the dimensions of field, tenor, mode and genre to find any mismatches based on pragmatic theory of language use in Halliday's (1970) functional and systemic theory. The results of the analysis are used to judge the quality of the translation. The procedure has the following steps:

1. Analysis of the original text

At this step, the original text is analyzed by the dimensions of field, tenor, mode and genre. Each dimension is explained as follows:

Field:

Field refers to the idea or detail contained in the book. This dimension is analyzed by linguistic means such as syntactic, lexical and textual means to consider the whole meaning of the book.

Tenor:

Tenor refers to the nature of the participants' relationship between the addresser and addressee in terms of social power and social distance including the author's origin and stance, social role relationship and social attitude. "Social attitude refers to formal, consultative or informal style" (Munday, 2001: 93).

Mode:

This dimension refers to both channels: spoken and written, and the degree of participation between the addresser and addressee in their simplicity and complexity.

Genre:

Genre is one of the important elements that should be considered together with the dimensions above to share the common purpose of the author.

The following shows an example of analyzing the original text: a children's book *Cinderella* based on House's (1997) theory.

Field:

It is a simple little picture book story about a little poor girl *Cinderella,* who lived with her cruel stepmother and two stepsisters. She was always treated badly, but she never complained. At the end of the story, *Cinderella* was married to a prince because she could put her foot in the glass shoe that she left at that party at midnight. After that, she lived with the prince happily. This story is designed to be read to young children to entertain them.

Tenor:

The author clearly views a bad attitude about living with a stepmother. Besides, the author also teaches the children about a moral lesson (good and bad) through the characters such as *Cinderella*, representing a good person, and the stepmother and stepsisters, representing bad people.

Mode:

Simplicity: This text is written to be read aloud for the children to hear.

Genre:

Cinderella is a children's picture book which is written to be read aloud to children as a bedtime story. The goals of this book are to entertain and teach children to be good people.

2. Statement of function

The function of the text consists of ideational and interpersonal components. The addresser intends to tell and teach the addressee about the real world that always has two sides (good/bad, beautiful/ugly or black/white). The text presented to the addressee is attractive, interesting and easily understandable in order to suit the knowledge and level of the addressee (House, 1997: 61).

3. Comparison of the original text and translated text

The original and translated texts are compared by the same dimensions such as field, tenor, mode and genre to find any mismatches that are pragmatic errors.

4. Statement of quality

In the last step, the statement of quality is analyzed by the same dimensions such as field, tenor, mode and genre to judge the quality of translation.

On the other hand, the translated text can be categorized into one of these two types: overt translation and covert translation.

An overt translation is a translated text that does not maintain the exact meaning of the original text. House (1998) explains:

> An overt translation is required whenever the source
> text is heavily dependent on the source culture and has
> independent status within it; a covert translation is required
> when neither condition holds, i.e. when the source text
> is not source culture specific (House, 1998: 119).

Although House's (1997) model is well known among critics, translators and scholars, it is not widely used as Hatim and Mason (1990) criticize that the model is too complicated to use and the criteria do not cover all translated text types (Suvannanonda, 2003: 2).

Another interesting approach is the criteria for literary translation quality assessment proposed by Reiss (2000). These criteria are proposed to evaluate the quality of literary translation, which covers all translated text types. The concept of this approach is explained as follows:

1. Evaluation of the translation without a comparison of the source text

This method aims to analyze the lexical and grammatical usage including styles and semantics in the translated text. This criterion focuses on only the analysis of language in the translated text in two aspects: fluency and internal inconsistencies. Accordingly, the target text is not necessary to be compared with the original text.

2. Evaluation of the translation by comparing it with the source text

In evaluating the translated text in any aspects except the language aspect, the target text must be compared with the source text to evaluate whether the text is completely loyal to the intent of the author or not. The intent of the author is the most important principle that the translator must consider, achieve, and express in the target text. Reiss (2000) divides the criteria for translation quality assessment into many categories as follows:

2.1. Literary category

The word *literary* means all types of writing; therefore, the criteria in this category can identify all translated text types. In evaluating any translated text, the target text must be observed. The type of text is used for selecting correct criteria in judging the text quality. Reiss (2000) categorizes translated texts according to their function as follows:

2.1.1 Content-focused text type

The content of the text is focused. The content-focused texts are judged in terms of their semantic, grammatical and stylistic characteristics. The text types which are analyzed with this criterion are reports, educational texts, academic documents, essays, journals, theses etc.

2.1.2 Form-focused text type

The second type focuses on form or style of the text. The form-focused texts are literary prose, imaginative prose, and poetry in all forms. These text types are judged in terms of their esthetics, stylistics, semantic and grammatical characteristics (Reiss, 2000: 35).

2.1.3 Appeal-text type

The purpose of this text type is to present information to persuade the target receiver. In translating any appeal-texts, the translator must retain the same effect on the receiver as the original has in the source language. Examples of this text type are advertising, preaching, propaganda, and satire (39).

2.1.4 Audio-medial text type

The audio-medial text is written to be spoken or sung. Therefore, it is not read but heard by the receiver. The text is a medium aimed to communicate with the hearer of both the source and target languages. Examples of this text type are little children's books and lullabies.

2.2 Linguistic category

This category focuses on linguistic elements such as semantic, lexical, stylistic, and grammatical elements. Each element is analyzed in different detail. The semantic element is considered by equivalence. The lexical element is considered by adequacy of function. The grammatical element is considered by correctness, and the stylistic element is considered by correspondence.

Reiss (2000) explains that to evaluate a translated text with these criteria, the target text is considered with linguistic features and equivalents to examine the linguistic irregularities that have been represented in the target language.

2.3 Pragmatic category

This category is used to consider extra-linguistic determinants such as immediate situation (exclamation, allision, shortened colloquial expressions or swear words), subject matter, time factor, place factor, audience factor (reader or hearer), speaker factor and affective implications (emotional determinants). Reiss (2000) explains that this criterion is difficult to make an objective judgment because of the different interpretations of the translators and evaluators according to their different knowledge and experiences.

Reiss (2000) also suggests other two categories such as functional category and personal category to consider an adaptive translated text. These two categories are classified in limitation of translation quality assessment.

2.4 Functional category

This criterion is used to judge adaptive work with special functions. Moreover, special readers as editions for children and youth, popularization of specialized literature and moral religions are also considered in this category.

2.5 Personal category

The translated texts can be analyzed by the two aspects such as hermeneutical process as subjectively conditioned and translator's personality. These factors are classified in personal category. They influence translation directly. Therefore, translators translate the same text differently, with their own understanding and abilities. Reiss (2000) explains that this criterion should always be used to analyze the text together with other categories to impede the evaluator from making resolute evaluations (113).

In summary, in Reiss' criteria, evaluation of a translation can be done by either comparing or not comparing it with the source text according to the translation purpose. In evaluating fluency and internal inconsistencies, the target text is not necessary to be compared with the source text because this criterion focuses on analyzing language elements such as lexical and grammatical usage, stylistic and semantics. On the other hand, to evaluate the texts in other aspects such as in literary, linguistic, pragmatic categories, the target text is needed to be compared with the source text to consider the accuracy of the author's intention, and the equivalence of translation. This approach is useful for evaluating the quality of almost all translated text types. However, these criteria also have some limitations. They cannot be used to judge the quality of the translated text that has cultural differences from the original cultural context because it is difficult to achieve the intention of the author.

In addition, the textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) is another approach which is widely used to analyze the quality of text. De Beaugrande and Dressler posit that seven standards are elements of textuality. Therefore, in analyzing any text, these elements must be considered. The seven standards of textuality are cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality. They are explained as follows:

1. Cohesion

Cohesion refers to the ways in which the components are associated in a surface structure. Cohesion is divided into six types as follows:

1) Recurrence

Recurrence is a direct repetition of elements, since the original occurrence merely happens again (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981:54). Recurrence can be classified as follows:

1.1 Recurrence is a repetition of forms or patterns. For example:

> Harry: "You let the *troll* in?"
> Quirrell: "Certainly. I have special gift with *trolls* you must
> have seen what I did to the one in the chamber back there?
> Unfortunately, while everyone else was running around
> looking for it, Snape who already suspected me, went straight
> to the third floor to head me off and not only did my *troll* fail
> to beat you to death, that three headed dog didn't even manage
> to bite Snape's leg off properly."

> (Rowling, 1997: 210)

The above text shows the repetition or recurrence of the word *troll* without changing the form, which is recurrence.

1.2 Partial recurrence is the use of the same basic word but changing it to a different word class such as to shift the word from adjective to adverb by adding –ly.

For example:

Christina has a *beautiful* voice, so she can sing any songs *beautifully*.

1.3 Parallelism is the reusing of a surface format to present new components.

For example:

> The steel pipe crosses windswept plains and endless miles
> of delicate tundra that tops the frozen ground. It *weaves* through
> crooked canyons, *climbs* sheer mountains, *plunges* over rocky
> crags, *makes* its way through thick forests, and *passes* over or
> under hundreds of rivers and streams.

> (*TOEFL Handbook*, 2002: 271)

The italic verbs above are in the same form, in the present simple tense in agreement with the subject *it*.

1.4 Paraphrase is the recurrence of a subject matter with a change of expression.

For example:

Original: The Hudson River has a couple of interesting physical features
            that make it very attractive for settlement by the Europeans.

> (*TOEFL Handbook*, 2002: 298)

Paraphrase: The Hudson River has two interesting physical features that attract

the Europeans to settle.

1.5 Pro- form is the repetition of a noun of the same content by a pronoun instead of repeating the same thing. For example:

> *Albus Dumbledore* had got to his feet. *He* was beaming
> at the students, his arms opened wide, as if nothing could
> have pleased him more than to see them all there.

> (Rowling, 1997: 91)

The above example shows another way to repeat the same thing by using a pronoun. The name of *Albus Dumbledore* in the first sentence is repeated by using the pronoun *he* in the second one.

1.6 Ellipsis is omission of a structure and its content.

 For example:

> *The milk* couldn't be used. *All* was sour.

> (Halliday, 1976: 155)

The word *all* in the second sentence refers to *all milk* in the first sentence, but the word *milk* is omitted.

2) Junction

Junction is another cohesive device that shows the relationship of components in a sentence. This cohesive device is categorized into four as follows:

2.1 Conjunctions

Conjunctions are the lexical items that can be used to link things, which are of the same status, such as *and*, *also*, *besides*, *furthermore* etc. For example:

> Puchong, Buntan *and* Sim made their way into the tunnel
> in front of them.

> (Adirex, 1995: 253)

2.2 Disjunctions

Disjunctions are the lexical items that are used to link things, which are of alternative status, such as *or*, *either/or* etc. For example:

> Benjamin is going to buy *either* a digital camera *or* an MP3
> player with this money.

2.3 Contrajunctions

Contrajunctions are lexical items that are used to link discrepant elements, such as *but, yet, however, nevertheless* etc. For example:

> Today there are no silver coins made for general circulation. *However,* a certain number of special part silver coins are still minted for sale to collectors. These sell at much higher prices than the face – value of the coins.

> (*TOEFL Handbook*, 2002: 220)

2.4 Subordinations

Subordinations are lexical items that are used to link contents which are dependent on one another, such as *because, since, as, thus, while, hence, therefore* etc.

For example:

> *Because* meteorites were formed during the early life of our solar system, they offer valuable information about the history of the earth.

> (*TOEFL Handbook*, 2002: 221)

2. Coherence

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) explain that coherence refers to a set of conceptual relations under the surface text, which is similar to cohesion in the way stretches of language link each other. Cohesion refers to the surface of the text, while coherence refers to semantics or meaning of the text. Sriduandao (2003) explains that coherence is like the spirit of a text, and a text can be coherent without cohesive devices.

For example:

Teacher: Could you tell me a little bit about your neighbor?

Student: The Roberts have three children. Julie is the oldest daughter.

Joey is a Wednesday child. Jinny is the youngest member of the family.

Teacher: Anything else?

Student: Their servant is very interfering.

The above example shows a conversation between a teacher and a student. This conversation is short of cohesive devices to link the text together, but the receiver can interpret the text easily because the idea of each sentence supports one another well, which is the concept of coherence.

3. Intentionality

According to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), intentionality seems to be a goal on the author's mind. The author hopes the target audience will be satisfied with the text. Like that of Hatim and Mason's (1997) framework, intentionality refers to what a text producer plans to do and what he/ she hopes the target text receiver will accept. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) divide the intentionality into two categories: the text producer's attitudes and a set of goals which are strongly confirmed by the text producer.

Each text is written to express the text producer's intention to the target text receiver. Therefore, in translating any foreign texts, a translator must achieve the author's intention and relay it to the translated text accordingly.

4. Acceptability

This standard concerns the text receiver's attitude to evaluate whether the text is acceptable or unacceptable based on the other six attributes of textuality. Each text element must relate to each other and go together well.

In translating any text, a translator must transfer the message, the attitude and the intention of the author of the original text to the target text so that there will be a clear understanding between the text producer and the receiver. Therefore, the translated text should maintain the same message of the original text. If the translated text is misrepresented or is short of any of the standards of de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) textuality, that translated text is considered unacceptable.

5. Informativity

Informativity refers to the author's intention to provide information through the text. This standard concerns the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected/unexpected or known/unknown (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: 9). Infomativity is classified into three levels as follows:

5.1 First – order informativity

This level focuses on only important content words to make the text informativity. Therefore, the function words such as articles, prepositions, conjunctions etc. are generally omitted. This type of informativity can be found in such text types as telegrams, road signs, warning signs, and advertisements.

For example:

> NEW!
>
> TOYOTA ALTIS
> Free: spoiler, alarm, plus many extras
> Tel: 0-2658-1080-1

The above advertisement can be a good example for this level of informativity. The target receiver can understand the message of the advertisement clearly without function words.

5.2 Second – order informativity

The second – order informativity is another type of information which occurs as an unexpected alternative but a possible one. The attention is reserved for higher-order occurrences (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: 143).

For example: Koala and Panda are _____.

From the sentence above, some alternatives which are related to Koala and Panda such as *animals, bears or mammals* occur in mentality. Therefore, this sentence can be completed with any of those.

5.3 Third – order informativity

The information in the third – order informativity occurs when the text producer accounts for unexpected or unknown alternatives to the target receiver by using general words, loan words with modification to make clearer explanations. Besides, this third - level informativity can be used to upgrade the degree of information.

For example: Lemon grass is a grass.

The above example cannot give any new idea to the receiver because the explanation has low informativity. This text can be upgraded by giving more sensible information as follows:

> Lemon grass is a type of grass with lemon flavour
> that grows in hot countries and is used especially in
> Asian cooking.

<div align="right">(Oxford Dictionary, 2000: 767)</div>

In short, informativity influences the comprehension of the text receivers because it relates the information in the text. Moreover, the extent of the information depends on the author's intention as well as the knowledge and the experience of the target text receiver.

6. Situationality

The situationality is the sixth standard of textuality, which makes a text relevant to the situation of occurrence (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981: 9). Generally, people in different situations can get different meanings of the same text because of their different experiences. Situationality can help the target audience understand the message of the text easily. Therefore, the producer must create a text according to the circumstance or condition in a particular place and at a particular time. For example, a man raises a T-shirt and says "XL," and then a woman gives him an XL one. This example shows that the woman in this situation understands the short utterance "XL" of the man by giving him the XL T-shirt, understanding that he wants to ask for a shirt of this size. They understand the same thing because they are in the same situation.

7. Intertextuality

According to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), intertextuality refers to the connection between the target text and the background knowledge of the audience of a text that is inserted into it. This knowledge can be applied by the process called "mediation." This standard links the previous knowledge in the target audience's memory with the inserted one. If the audience has some background, which is familiar to the inserted text, he/she can get the idea about that text.

In short, the seven standards of textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) are appropriate for analyzing any text types including a translated text by emphasizing cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality. These seven standards overlap with each other. If the text does not meet any of the said standards, the text may be considered unacceptable.

Related studies on translation quality assessment

There are many researchers who studied translation quality applying various theoretical frameworks such as Reiss's (2000) criteria for literary translation quality assessment, which are used to evaluate the quality of *The Pilgrim Kamanita* by Suvannanonda (2003). The seven standards of textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) are used to evaluate quality of translated texts such the studies of translation quality by Chuangsuvanich (2002), Sriduandao (2003) and Kanthatrakul (2003).

Suvannanonda (2003) applied Reiss's criteria for literary translation quality assessment to prove that these criteria can cover the case of English-Thai translation and the case where the cultural context of the story is slightly different from the cultural context of the source language culture. Therefore, these criteria were tested through their application to evaluate the quality of Sathirakoses and Nagapradipa's *The Pilgrim Kamanita*. The findings of this study revealed that the criteria could be applied to English-Thai translation, and the translation of *Kamanita* was qualified according to those criteria.

Chuangsuvanich (2002) applied de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) theoretical framework to analyze translation quality by comparing the two Thai versions of *Jonathan Livingston Seagull.* The first version was translated by M.R. Kuktit Pramoj, and the second version by Chanwit Kasetsiri. The findings revealed that the intentionality of the source text was the most important problem of the two translated versions. Other problems such as situationality, informativity, intertextuality, cohesion and coherence were also found. The number of the textuality violations between M.R. Kukrit Pramoj's version and Chanwit Kasetsiri's version was 16/36 items. Therefore, the version by M.R. Kukrit Pramoj was considered more acceptable than the version by Chanwit Kasetsiri.

Similarly, Sriduandao (2003) analyzed two Thai translated versions of the *Lonely Lady*, which were translated by Pramoon Unahatoop and Nida. Only three chapters of each translated version were selected for analysis. The translations were compared to the original text sentence by sentence to find any discrepancies in the translation from English to Thai. After that, each discrepancy was analyzed within de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) theoretical framework. The findings showed 11 discrepancies in Unahatoop's version and 18 discrepancies in Nida's version. Therefore, Unahatoop's version was considered more acceptable than Nida's.

Kanthatrakul (2003) also analyzed translation quality. Two speeches translated from Thai into English addressed by the two prime ministers Dr. Thaksin Shinawatra and General Prem Tinsulanonda were studied. Both the original and translated versions were analyzed paragraph by paragraph. Then translation strategies by Baker (1991) were identified in translating from Thai into English. After that, the standards of textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler were used to analyze the data. It was found that 10 strategies were employed. Regarding the translation quality, the results showed that the standards affecting the English translation were informativity(47%), situationality (32.5%), cohesion (15%), intertextuality (2.5%) and coherence (2.5%). Kanthatrakul summarized that they were meant to keep the intentionality of the original texts and to make the translated versions acceptable in the target language.

In summary, this chapter reviewed the related studies on translation quality assessment in many approaches such as Reiss's (2000) criteria and de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) theoretical framework. At the end of this chapter, the previous studies on these approaches such as Suvannanonda (2003) who applied Reiss's criteria to evaluate the quality of *The Pilgrim Kamanita*, and Chuangsuvanich (2002), Sriduandao (2003) and Kanthatrakul (2003) who applied the textual standards proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) to evaluated the translated texts on their studied were provided.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the procedures used in the study. The data collection and the data analysis are presented.

Data collection

The data were collected from the Thai version of chapters 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17 of *Harry Potter: the Philosopher's stone*, translated by Sumalee (2000). These five chapters were selected by simple random from 17 chapters.

Data analysis

The procedures of this study were as follows:

First, the translated texts (TT) were divided into sentences according to the source texts (ST).

For example:

ST: "Severus?" Quirrell laughed and it wasn't his usual quivering treble, either, but cold and sharp. "Yes, Severus does seem the type, doesn't he? So useful to have him swooping around like an overgrown bat. Next to him, who would suspect p-p-poor st-stuttering P-Professor Quirrell?"

(Rowling, 1997: 209)

TT: "เซเวอร์รัสน่ะเรอะ" // ควีเรลล์หัวเราะ มิใช่เสียงหัวเราะสั่นๆ ตามปกติของเขาด้วย แต่เป็นเสียงหัวเราะเยือกเย็นและบาดลึก // "ใช่ เซเวอร์รัสดูเหมือนจะเป็นคนแบบนั้นใช่ไหม // เมื่ออยู่ใกล้ๆ กับเขา ใครจะสงสัย ศะ- ศาสตราจารย์ควีเรลล์ คะ-คน ตะ-ติดอ่าง ที่-ที่ นะ- น่าสงสาร" //

(Sumalee, 2000: 348)

Second, compare the translated text with the source text to find whether there are any discrepancies. Then, group discrepancies with the application of de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) theoretical framework. After that, a simple calculation of frequency of each textual standard was used. Finally, the results were discussed and presented in percentage.

In short, the data of the study randomly chosen from chapters one, five, nine, thirteen and seventeen were collected and divided into sentences. Then the textual standards were used to analyze and assess the discrepancies between the original and translated versions. Finally, the frequency of each textual standard was calculated and the results were discussed and presented in percentage.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, the results of the study are presented. The original and the Thai translated texts were compared to find any mismatches between them. The discrepancies can be classified into four groups. The fist two groups are violations of colloquialism and of the status of the pronoun reference in the original. The third group is the shift of the degree of informativity, and the last one is mistranslation. Then all these discrepancies are discussed.

I. Colloquialism

The first discrepancy found is violation in replacing the English colloquial words or informal speeches with those in Thai. The violation can be divided into four categories.

1.1 Preposition

Example 1:

ST: 'Best be off, Harry, lots *ter* do today, gotta get up *ter* London an' buy all yer stuff *fer* school.'

TT: "ออกเดินทางดีกว่าแฮร์รี่ มีอะไรต้องทำอีกเยอะวันนี้ ต้องไปถึงลอนดอนแน่ะ แล้วซื้อของใช้

สำหรับไปโรงเรียน"

("OK. I had better be going, Harry, there are many things *to* do today. I have to go *to* London and buy all your stuff *for* school.")

Example 2:

　ST: "Like I said, yeh'd be mad *ter* try an' rob it."

　TT: "เหมือนที่บอกมั้ย ต้องเป็นบ้าแน่ถ้าพยายามปล้นที่นี่"

　　("Like I said, you must be mad *to* try to rob here.")

Discussion

The original sentences above are Hagrid's speeches and the underlined words (*ter* and *fer*) clearly show his speaking style. The word *ter* in the above sentences is *to* (ถึง), and *fer* means *for* (สำหรับ). These utterances always occur in Hagrid's conversation. In the five chapters (1, 5, 9, 13 and 17), the word *ter* has been found14 times and *fer* seven times. These words reflect a nonstandard English accent.

Sumalee replaces these colloquial utterances with general Thai words. Although the translator tries to select Thai informal words that are similar to the situation in the source text to render them, the translated text cannot retain the original intention because they do not reflect the social class concealed in them.

1.2 Conjunction

Example:

ST: 'Stalagmite's got an "m" in it,' said Hagrid. '*An*' don' ask me questions just now, I think I'm gonna be sick.

TT: "หินงอกก็มีตัวองูอยู่น่ะสิ" แฮกริดตอบ "*แต่*อย่าถามอะไรตอนนี้เลย ฉันว่าฉันจะแย่แล้ว"

　　('Stalagmite's got an "m" in it,' said Hagrid. '*But*' don't ask me

　　questions just now, I think I'm going to be sick.)

Discussion

The next discrepancy is the violation in translating conjunctions in the informal

speeches into Thai. Some conjunctions such as *and* in the original text is reduced as '*an*'

as in speaking. Sumalee replaces this conjunction in Thai with various words as *กะ* (and),

กับ (with), *และ* (and), *แล้ว* (then), and *แต่* (but) depending on the situation in the story.

However, the replacements do not reflect the speaking style of the character.

These violations have been found 10 times. Most of them are translated into Thai as *แล้ว*

(then) and *แต่* (but). In Thai, these words do not reflect the informal speaking style.

1.3 Pronoun

Example 1:

ST: 'Told *yeh*, didn't I? Told *yeh* you was famous. Even Professor Quirrell

was Trembling' ter meet *yeh* – mind you, he's usually trembling.'

TT: "บอกแล้วใช่ไหมล่ะ บอกแล้วว่า*เธอ*น่ะมีชื่อเสียงโด่งดัง แม้แต่ศาสตราจารย์ควีเรลล์ยังตัวสั่นเลย

ที่ได้เจอ*เธอ* — แต่นั่นแหล่ะ เขาก็ตัวสั่นอย่างงี้เรื่อยล่ะ"

('Told *you*, didn't I? Told you you was famous. Even Professor Quirrell

was Trembling' to meet *you* – mind you, he's usually trembling.')

Discussion

Another colloquialism is the pronoun *yeh*. Hagrid utters this word instead of the

word *you* (คุณ). This word is the most frequent colloquial word found in this study. They

have been found 19 times in the five chapters. Sumalee replaces *yeh* with Thai *เธอ*. This

replacement cannot reflect Hagrid's speaking style; therefore, it cannot maintain the intentionality of the original text.

Besides the word *yeh* above, there is another pronoun found in this study. It is *yer* (your). This colloquial word has been found 13 times in the five chapters.

Example 2:

ST: 'Still got *yer* letter, Harry?' he asked as he counted stitches.

TT: "จดหมายยังอยู่กับเธอใช่มั้ย แฮร์รี่" เขาถาม พลางนับห่วงไหมพรมไปด้วย

("Is the letter still with you, Harry?" he asked as he counted stitches.)

Example 3:

ST: "Just *yer* wand left – oh yeah, an' I still haven't got yeh a birthday present.'

TT: "เหลือแต่ไม้กายสิทธิ์ – อ้อ ใช่ และฉันก็ยังไม่ได้ของขวัญวันเกิดให้เธอเลย"

("Just *your* wand left – oh yes, and I still haven't got you a birthday present.")

Discussion

Sumalee may not be able to find a suitable word to replace the word *yer* (your) in the original text. Therefore, she omits the possessive pronoun *yer* as in the examples above. Therefore, the Thai translated version cannot maintain the intentionality of the source text especially in terms of colloquialism in pronouns.

1.4 Verb

The discrepancy in translating informal verbs such as *gotta* (got to), *gonna* (going to), *wanna* (want to) and *ain't* (am not) is often found in this study.

Example 1:

ST: 'As a matter o'f fact, I *gotta* visit Gringgotts anyways.'

TT: "ที่จริง ยังไงๆ ฉันก็ต้องไปกริงกอตส์อยู่ดี"

("In fact, I *got to* go to Gringgotts anyways.")

Example 2:

ST: 'An' don' ask me questions just now, I think I'm *gonna* be sick,'

TT: "แต่อย่าถามอะไรตอนนี้เลย ฉันจะแย่แล้ว"

("But don't ask me questions now, I'm *going to* be sick.")

To translate the verbs with an *ing* ending such as *sayin'* (saying), *forgettin'* (forgetting) and *tryin'* (trying) is another problem.

Example 3:

ST: 'I'm not *sayin'* that's not a good idea, but yer not ter use magic in the

Muggle world except in very special circumstances,' said Hagrid.

TT: "ฉันไม่พูดหรอกว่ามันไม่ใช่ความคิดที่ดี แต่เธอต้องไม่ใช้เวทมนต์ในโลกของพวกมักเกิ้ล

นอกจากในสถานการณ์พิเศษเท่านั้น" แฮกริดบอก

("I'm not *saying* that's not a good idea, but you not to use magic in the

Muggle world except in very special occasions," said Hagrid.)

Discussion

All the examples above show the discrepancies in translating verbs in informal speeches. The translator has a hard time finding Thai words to replace these verbs. Though she can show informality in the translation to a certain degree, the replacements cannot completely reflect the speaking style of the characters. Consequently, these replacements somehow distort the intentionality of the author.

In short, regarding colloquialism, four groups of violations of informal speeches found in preposition, conjunction, pronoun and verb are discussed.

II. Pronoun reference

Besides the mismatches in replacing the colloquial words above, another interesting thing is the translation that does not reflect the status of the pronoun reference such as the word *it* in the following:

This word is translated into Thai as *มัน*, but *it* in some sentences is replaced with other words in the Thai version. These replacements are discrepant from the source text. They are explained as follows:

Example 1:

ST: *It* was Quirrell.

TT: *เขาคือควีเรลล์*

  (*He* was Quirrell.)

Example 2:

ST: *It* put its hand into its pocket and pulled out a blood - red stone.

TT: *เขาล้วงมือเข้าไปในกระเป๋าและดึงหินสีแดงก่ำเหมือนเลือดออกมา*

(He put his hand into his pocket and pulled a stone as red as blood out.)

Discussion

It in the first example refers to Quirrell, who is Voldermort's loyal slave. He is behind all terrible events in the story. Quirrell is a bad wizard; therefore, the author intends to use the pronoun *it* to lower his status. It implies that he is a monster or devil, not a man. Sumalee does not achieve this intentionality because she translates *it* as *เขา*

(He).

Similarly, the word *it* in the second example refers to Harry's shadow. The author uses this pronoun because a shadow is not human, nor is it alive. Sumalee may think Harry's shadow is human, so she translates it as *เขา* (He). The replacement does not maintain the intentionality of the original text.

III. Informativity

Informativity is another standard that affects translation. The addition of information distorts the source text as shown in the examples 1 - 8.

Example 1:

ST: *Petrified*, he watched as Quirrell reached up and began to unwrap his turban.

TT: *เขาตกตะลึงนิ่งขึงเหมือนเป็นหินและมองดูควีเรลล์ที่ย่างเข้ามาใกล้และเริ่มแก้ผ้าโพกหัวออก*

(*He was stupefied as if he was a stone* watching Quirrell reach up and

begin to unwrap his turban.)

Discussion

The author uses the word *petrified* to show Harry's feeling when he sees another horrible face on Quirrell's head. Harry is so shocked that he cannot move. Sumalee understands this scene well, so not only does she translate *petrified* into Thai as *นิ่งขึงเหมือนเป็นหิน* (petrified), but she also adds some more description in the Thai version *เขาตกตะลึง* (stupefied) to make the audience sense Harry's feeling. Therefore, the Thai version has more informativity.

Example 2:

ST: Not the Stone, boy, you – *the effort* involved nearly killed you.

TT: ไม่ใช่จากศิลาอาถรรพ์ เด็กน้อย ตัวเธอต่างหาก — *ความพยายามของเธอที่จะกันควีเรลล์จาก*

ศิลาอาถรรพ์เกือบจะฆ่าเธอเสียแล้ว

(Not the Stone, little boy, you – *your effort to hinder Quirrell from the Stone*

nearly killed you.)

 Discussion

The discrepancy is the phrase *the effort involved*. In this scene, Harry nearly dies from protecting the Philosopher's Stone from Quirrell. Dumbledore tries to warn Harry of his action. The author uses the phrase *the effort involved* which refers to Harry's heroic deed without describing his bravery because the author thinks the audience still remembers that event; therefore, it is not necessary to repeat it.

The translator understands the author's attention well, but she wants to make this scene clear to the Thai audience by giving more information about the previous event adding *ความพยายามของเธอที่จะกันควีเรลล์จากศิลาอาถรรพ์* (your effort to hinder Quirrell from the Stone). This makes the audience suddenly understand the message that Dumbledore wants to impart to Harry. Therefore, the Thai translated text has more informativity.

Example 3:

ST: 'You tell him, Nevill.'

TT: "นายบอกเขาดีมาก เนวิลล์"

("You tell him, *very well*, Nevill.")

Discussion

This discrepancy is the phrase *ดีมาก* (very well), which Sumalee adds into the Thai translated version. Ron utters the above to show his surprise when he hears Nevill argue with Malfoy. Normally Nevill is a coward. Therefore, adding more information can help the audience understand this scene better.

Example 4:

ST: Over and over again he dreamed about his parents disappearing in a flash of green *light while a high voice cackled with laughter.*

TT: เขาฝันซ้ำแล้วซ้ำอีกว่าพ่อแม่ในแสงวาบสีเขียว ขณะที่มีเสียงแหลมผสมเสียงหัวเราะเยาะเย้ยดังบาดหู

(Over and over again he dreamed about his parents disappearing in a flash of green light while a *sharp voice mixed with satiric laughter is offensive to the ears.*)

Discussion

The discrepancy is the phrase *a high voice cackled with laughter.* Sumalee renders the word *high voice* as เสียงแหลม (sharp voice). Besides, the phrase *เยาะเย้ยดังบาดหู* (offensive to the ears) is added to express some feelings to the audience. Therefore, the Thai translated version has more informativity.

Example 5:

ST: 'Longbottom, *if brains were gold* you'd be poorer than Weasley, and that's saying something.

TT: "ลองบัตทอม ถ้าสมองของนายเป็นทองล่ะก็ นายก็จนกว่าวิสลีย์ซะอีก นี่คงบอกอะไรได้นะ."

("Longbottom, *if your brain was gold,* you'd be poorer than Weasley, and that's saying something.")

Discussion

The discrepancy is found in the clause *if brains were gold,* which is translated into Thai as *ถ้าสมองของนายเป็นทองละก็.* In the original text, there is no possessive pronoun *your* (ของนาย) because the author intends to refer to brains in general. She does not specify only Longbottom's brain, but Sumalee misses the author's intention; therefore, she specifically renders this sentence as *ถ้าสมองของนาย* (Longbottom's brain) *เป็นทองล่ะก็.* She adds the pronoun *your* in the target text.

Example 6:

ST: Enter, stranger, but take heed
    Of what awaits the sin of greed,
    For those who take, but not earn,
    Must pay most dearly in their turn,
    So if you seek beneath our floors
    A treasure that was never yours,
    Thief, you have been warned, *beware*
    Of finding more than treasure there.

(Rowling, 1997: 56-57)

TT: เข้ามาซิคนแปลกหน้าแต่ระวัง
    อยากได้ตังค์คนอื่นเขาบาปหนา
    คนที่เอาแต่ไม่หานี่น่าระอา
    ในไม่ช้าต้องใช้หนี้ที่สุดแพง
    ถ้าคุณค้นหาของใต้พื้นเรา
    สมบัติเขาใช่ของคุณจงแสยง
    หัวขโมย – ขอเตือนว่าอย่าเสียแรง
    แทนเจอแหล่งขุมทรัพย์กลับเจอภัย

(Sumalee, 2000: 93)

Discussion

There are many discrepancies found in translating this poem into Thai. Translating any English poems into Thai is not easy because each poem has its own style or its specific pattern. Sumalee tries to render this poem into Thai by adding some information to link each stanza together.

This addition is not accurate to the source text, nor can it maintain the intentionality of the original text. For example, the clause *of what awaits the sin of greed* is rendered as *อยากได้ตังค์คนอื่นเขาบาปหนา* (want to get other money) to explain *of what awaits* in the original text. Similarly, the phrase *กลับเจอภัย* (to have a catastrophe) is added

into the Thai translation to explain the clause *of finding more than treasure there* in the original text. Another discrepancy is the word *beware* (ระวัง) which is translated as *อย่าเสีย แรง* (Don't waste your energy). This replacement distorts the original intention because the original text aims to warn the thief who wants to rob the treasure there. Sumalee uses the phrase *อย่าเสียแรง* instead because she wants to have a rhyme with the end of the previous sentence.

The next discrepancy is in translating idiomatic expressions and metaphors. The translator replaces the original text with a different word in the Thai version and adds some more informativity. Sumalee uses this strategy to make the text easy to understand because the original version contains English idiomatic expressions and metaphors that are difficult for Thais to understand. Therefore, rendering these original words with easy and familiar words into Thai can help the Thai audience imagine the scene more clearly. They are discussed in examples 7 and 8.

Example 7:

ST: "When I open my eyes I'll be at home in my *cupboard*."

TT: "เมื่อฉันลืมตาขึ้น ฉันก็จะอยู่ที่บ้านใน*ห้องใต้บันได*"

(When I open my eyes I'll be at home in *the room under stair way*.)

Discussion

   This discrepancy is in translating the word *cupboard* into Thai language. The author chooses this word to reflect Harry's status when he lives with the Dudleys in the Muggle's world. The word *cupboard* can imply the place where Harry lives. A small narrow and uncomfortable room appears in the audience's mind. Sumalee replaces this word with *ห้องใต้บันได* (the room under the stair way). This replacement is not exactly the same as that in the source text, but it maintains the intentionality of the original text.

   Example 8:

ST: mint *humbugs*

TT: *ขนมหวานไส้นุ่มๆ เคลือบน้ำตาลรสมิ้น*

   (The sugar-coated smooth filling sweets with mint flavor.)

Discussion

   The discrepancy is the word *humbugs*. This word means *เหลวไหล, ไร้สาระ* or *ไม่ได้เรื่อง* (nonsense). The author names the sweets as *humbugs* to imply their terrible taste. Sumalee does not achieve this intentionality. She normally renders this word by describing them into Thai as *ขนมหวานไส้นุ่มๆ เคลือบน้ำตาลรสมิ้น* (The sugar-coated smooth filling sweets with mint flavor). Therefore, the translation has more information than the original text, and it distorts the intentionality of the source text.

In short, regarding informativity, three groups of violations of shifting the degree of informativity have been discussed. They are adding more information to clarify the translation, adding information for some rhymes in the Thai poem and explaining idiomatic expressions and metaphors.

IV. Mistranslation

The last discrepancy found is mistranslation. Sumalee mistranslates some words, all of which distort the intentionality of the original author such as the word *Elixir of life* in the following discrepancy.

Example:

ST: *Elixir of life*

TT: *ยาชุบชีวิต*

(*The medicine to restore life*)

Discussion

The phrase *elixir of life*, which means *ยาอายุวัฒนะ* (a medicine to prolong life) in Thai is the last discrepancy to be discussed. Sumalee renders the phrase *elixir of life* into a different meaning from the original text as a medicine to restore life.

In the situation, Nicolas and his wife have enough pills to prolong their lives, but they die in the end of this scene. Therefore, to replace this phrase as *ยาชุบชีวิต* is not suitable, and it distorts the intention of the original text.

So far, this chapter has presented the discrepancies found in the five chapters (1, 5, 9, 13 and 17). They are classified into four groups. The fist two groups are violations of colloquialism and status of the pronoun reference in the original. The third group is the shift of the degree of informativity, and the last one is mistranslation. All of these discrepancies distort the intentionality and informativity of the original text. The results are presented in the table as follows:

Table 1 Frequency of discrepancies between the original and the translated version

Standard of Textuality	Frequency of Discrepancy	Percentage
1. Intentionality	86	92%
1.1 Colloquialism	72	77%
1.2 Status of the pronoun reference	13	14%
1.3 Mistranslation	1	1%
2. Informativity	7	8%
Total	93	100%

Regarding Table 1, the frequency of the seven standards of textuality by de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) affected by the Thai translated version is shown. This Thai version has violated the standards of the original text 93 times. Intentionality violation has been found 86 times (92%), which is the most frequently violated standard found in the five chapters. Informativity has been found seven times (8%).

In brief, the results of the study have been presented. The original and the Thai translated texts have been compared to find any mismatches. It has been found that the most frequent violations have been of intentionality (92%) and informativity (8%).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents a summary of the study together with a discussion of the findings. After that, the limitations of the study, the implications and the recommendations for further studies are provided.

Summary

This study aimed to evaluate the quality of the Thai version of *Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone* translated by Sumalee (2000) within de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) theoretical framework.

According to the analysis, 93 discrepancies were found from 138 pages in five chapters (1, 5, 9, 13 and 17). The Thai version violated the original intentionality 86 times (92%), which was the most frequently violated standard found in the five chapters. Informativity was found seven times (8%). The number of violation is considered comparatively small.

Discussion

The Thai version of *Harry Potter: The Philosopher's Stone* is considered having good quality because the number of violations is rather small, and they do not have serious impacts on the whole meaning of the book. Mostly the translator cannot maintain the original intentionality because in Thai, it is difficult to express the sense of social class as shown in the novel in English. Therefore, the translation suffers some translation loss in this regard. This is not unusual because other research results also showed that most translations could not sustain the original intentionality such as the

results of the studies of Sriduandao (2003) who studied two Thai translated versions of the *Lonely Lady*, which were translated by Pramoon Unahatoop and Nida and a comparative study of two translated versions of *Little Lord Fauntleroy* of Sriwalai (2007).

The results of these two studies can support the findings of this current research. The intentionality was the main significant problem found in these studies. These three translated texts violated this standard most because the data analyzed are novels.

Although these studies analyzed translated novels, the results were not completely similar. There were others such as informativity, situationality and cohesion in Sriduandao(2003) and Sriwalai(2007)'s studies (2003), while situationality and cohesion did not have any impact on this study.

Besides, informativity was another significant problem found in this study. This related to the results of the study of Kanthatrakul (2003). The findings of the previous study revealed that informativity was the most important problem in translating speeches because this study focused on information and content of the speeches. While, this current research did not focus on only the content. However, informativity still gave good effect because it provided better understanding to the audiences.

The translation has high quality because there are small violations that do not have serious impacts on the whole meaning of the story. The translator paid attention in every detail especially to select appropriate target words to replace the original words. There were two ways used to select the target words. The first one was to consult dictionaries and another one was to consult the experts such as her husband, Thai relatives and the editor (Manager, 2003).

In brief, the translation has high quality because the translator selects suitable target words by using dictionaries and personal sources to render to original version.

Limitation of the Study

1. The data collected in this study did not totally represent the whole original text because there were only five chapters (1, 5, 9, 13 and 17) analyzed. Therefore, to make accurate evaluation, all chapters in the source text should be analyzed to find any mismatches between the source and translated texts. Besides, only the outstanding violations from a total of 93 discrepancies were selected. Therefore, they did not cover all discrepancies in the study.

2. Most previous studies compared two or more translated versions with the original text to find any discrepancies between the source and target texts. However, in this study, there was only one Thai version compared with the source text. Thus, we do not know if the translation has better quality than other versions.

3. The seven standards of textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) have not purposefully been designed for literary translated works, but they have been created to assess all text types. However, this theory is flexible; therefore, a researcher have to try and adjust the framework to other text types for his own specific purpose. Therefore, the analysis will be beneficial or not depends on the choice of the analyst. It is recommended that the analyst practice analyzing a lot of texts to maintain reliability of the analysis.

Implications

The research results of this study are beneficial as follows:

1. The results of the study can be used as a guideline to evaluate the quality of other translated works and to conduct further research in translation and other related fields.

2. The research results can be applied in teaching translation to make students translate the texts carefully and know how to evaluate and judge the quality of the texts.

Recommendations

1. Other researchers may apply the seven standards of textuality proposed by de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) to evaluate the quality of other translated genres such as poetry, news, songs and so on.

2. Researchers who are interested in assessing the quality of a translated text may apply other theoretical frameworks to analyze the translated text. The interesting ones are House's (1997) model of translation quality assessment and Reiss's (2000) criteria for literary translation quality assessment.

In short, this chapter presented a summary of the study and a discussion of the findings together with the limitation, implications and recommendations of the study to be guidelines for further research in translation and related field.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

เตือนจิตต์ จิตต์อารี. (2548).   *แปลให้เป็นแล้วเก่ง.* กรุงเทพฯ: อมรินทร์พริ้นติ้ง.

มณีรัตน์ สวัสดิวัตน์ ณ อยุธยา. (2548). *การแปล: หลักการและการวิเคราะห์.* กรุงเทพฯ:

สำนักพิมพ์แห่งจุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย.

วรรณา แสงอร่ามเรือง. (2545). *ทฤษฎีและหลักการแปล.* กรุงเทพฯ: โครงการเผยแพร่ผลงาน

ทางวิชาการ คณะอักษรศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย.

สุพรรณี ปิ่นมณี. (2546). *การแปลขั้นสูง.* กรุงเทพฯ: สำนักพิมพ์แห่งจุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย.

สุมาลี. (นามแฝง). (2543). *แฮร์รี่ พอตเตอร์ กับ ศิลาอาถรรพ์.* กรุงเทพฯ: นานมีบุ๊คส์.

Adirex, P. (1995). *Mekong.* Bangkok: Darnsutha.

Beaugrande, R. de and Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics.* London:

Longman.

Chuangsuvanich, J. (2002). *Translation quality: A comparative study of two Thai*

versions of Jonathan Livingston Seagull. A Master's Project M.A. (English).

Bangkok: Graduate School. Srinakharinwirot University. Photocopy.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator.* London and New York:

Longman.

_____ (1997). *The translator as communicator.* London: Routledge.

House, J. (1997). *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited.* Tubingen: Gunter

Narr Verlag.

Kanthatrakul, S. (2003). *Translation quality: A study of two speeches translated from*

Thai into English. A Master's Project M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School.

Srinakharinwirot University. Photocopy.

Lertrathakarn, P., Lertrathakarn, S., Neelapattamanon, P., & Kaewmesuk, S. (Eds.). (2002). *TOEFL Handbook*. Bangkok: PSP.

Manager. (June 18, 2003). *Interviewing Harry Potter's translator*. (Online). Available: http://www.manager.co.th. Retrieved August 19, 2007.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and application*. New York: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Rowling, J.K. (1997). *Harry Potter and the philosopher's stone*. London: Bloomsbury.

Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation criticism, the potentials and limitation: Categories and criteria for translation quality assessment.* New York: American Bible Society.

Sriduandao, K. (2003). *Translation quality: A comparative study of two translated versions of The Lonely Lady.* A Master's Project M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School. Srinakharinwirot University. Photocopy.

Sriwalai, N. (2007). *Translation quality: A comparative study of two translated versions of Little Lord Fauntleroy.* A Master's Project M.A. (English). Bangkok: Graduate School. Srinakharinwirot University. Photocopy.

Suvannanonda, B. (2003). *Katharina Reiss's criteria for literary translation quality assessment: A case study of the Pilgrim Kamanita*. A Master's Project in Translation and Interpretation. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University. Photocopy.

Wehmeier, S., Lea, D., Florio, J., Parkinson, D., & Ashby, M. (2000). *Oxford advance learner's dictionary 6th ed.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VITAE

VITAE

Name: Miss Khanittha Thaicharoen

Date of birth: July 6, 1981

Place of birth: Nakorn Pathom

Address: 51 Moo 7, Tambon Bangkham, Muang, Nakhon Pathom,

                         73000

Education Background

2007   Master of Arts (English) from Srinakharinwirot

                         University

2004   Bachelor of Education (English) from Rajabhat

                         Suan Sunandha University