

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge/CRC Press in *A Qualitative Approach to Translation Studies. Spotlighting Translation Problems* in 2024, available online: <https://www.routledge.com/9781032182483> or <http://www.crcpress.com/9781032182483>.

Jiménez Carra, Nieves y Mendoza García, Inma (2024): “Translation Problems Arising from Culturally Marked Translation Units in Children's Literature”, en Elisa CALVO y Elena DE LA COVA (eds.): *A Qualitative Approach to Translation Studies. Spotlighting Translation Problems*, Nueva York y Londres, Routledge, 134-150. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003253594-10>

Translation Problems Arising from Culturally Marked Translation Units in Children's Literature

Nieves Jiménez Carra

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2873-6955>

Inma Mendoza García

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4382-5822>

Introduction

Description and rationale of the research corpus

The research corpus compiled for this study falls within the scope of children's literature. It consists of the first book in the US *Judy Moody* series, written by Megan McDonald, which was first published by Candlewick Press in the USA in 2000—a 2010 paper edition was used for this study—titled *Judy Moody was in a mood*, and was aimed at children aged between 6 and 9 years old.

The reason for choosing this specific corpus is that the book contains numerous elements that will be referred to in this paper, in line with the proposal by Mayoral Asensio and Muñoz Martín (1997), as *culturally marked translation units* (CMTUs). These have been widely deemed one of the main translation challenges in Translation Studies, specifically in the context of children's literature, and have received many different names in our discipline, as Calvo and De la Cova explain in Part I of this volume. Therefore, the book is an ideal research corpus for the purposes of this study.

Skopos

This research is based on previous work conducted by Mendoza García (2014), in which the author analysed the translation of the *Judy Moody* literary series from the standpoint of descriptive translation studies (DTS) (Toury, 1995). From this perspective, Mendoza García conducted a comparative analysis of the source and target texts, determining how all the culturemes and proper names detected in her corpus were organised according to certain previously established classifications.

The objective of the study presented here is to apply a method inspired by grounded theory (GT) to part of that same corpus—specifically, to the first book in the series—from an inductive-

deductive approach due to the characteristics of this methodology. In this process, only the source text has been observed, and only those CMTUs considered translation problems have been identified and categorised, as opposed to using a prior classification of said elements as the basis, and organising the examples accordingly.

To make this process as objective as possible, early on in the analysis and following the parameters of GT, the two authors independently selected the CMTUs they considered likely to present a translation problem in the study corpus before sharing their results.

In summary, the ultimate aim of this research is to determine the extent to which the two aforementioned methodological perspectives (DTS and GT) offer similar or different data during the processing and classification of translation problems in the field of study. That is, does applying GT offer the same conclusions or similar classifications compared to the results already determined by DTS in this field?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical concepts underpinning the methodology applied in this specific research study, which are described in the following section, are as follows: the *translation assignment*, the concept of CMTU, the concept of *acceptability* and the concept of *translation problem*.

First, it should be mentioned that the textual analysis was performed using the real translation assignment for the publication of the European Spanish version of this corpus: the publisher of the translation is Alfaguara Infantil, the translation was published in Spain in 2004 and the target readers are children over the age of 8. This will, therefore, be the functional framework for determining which CMTUs in the source text are considered a translation problem and will be subject to categorisation.

Having defined the translation assignment, it is essential to specify what is understood by CMTU in this work so as to subsequently determine which specific CMTUs in the study corpus are likely to be a translation problem.

In this regard, this research draws from the following definition of what Franco Aixelá (1996: 58) terms *culture-specific items*:

[...] those textually actualized items whose function and connotations in a source text involve a translation problem in their transference to a target text, whenever this problem is a product of the nonexistence of the referred item or of the different intertextual status in the cultural system of the readers of the target text.

Based on this description, a CMTU is not simply a textual element with a determined cultural load, but rather a culturally loaded element that, depending on its function in a specific extratextual and intratextual context, poses a translation problem—for example, because it presents an issue of acceptability for the reader—. This is where the translation assignment gains importance, as a CMTU may or may not be accepted by the reader, depending on his or her knowledge of the specific culture to which it belongs.

Thus, the process of identifying the CMTUs that pose a translation problem in the field of children's literature will not only depend on the translation assignment, but it will also be closely linked to the functional concept of *acceptability* that, in line with Mendoza García (2015: 11–17), refers to the following five parameters:

- Translation coherence, which must be maintained on both an extratextual and intratextual level. Thus, on the one hand, there must be coherence between the semantic content of the text and the spatial, temporal and sociocultural context in which the plot develops; on

the other, there must also be coherence between the translation techniques used to translate the same kinds of textual elements.

- Plausibility, which is directly related to coherence on the extratextual level. For the content of the translation to be plausible, there must be coherence between the semantic context of the text and the spatial, temporal and sociocultural context in which the story takes place.
- Understanding, as there can be no acceptability if the recipient is unable to process the content of the translation.
- Naturalness, which is a parameter directly related to plausibility. The applied translation technique must not only be coherent in the temporal, situational and sociocultural context in which the plot develops, but it must also be naturally inserted in the text. In this regard, it is imperative to consider that a single CMTU can be translated differently depending on whether it is introduced by the narrator or a character. This will determine whether or not the target text is “natural” for the reader. As indicated by Mendoza García (2015: 13), it may not be very plausible or natural for a character to provide highly descriptive information. Dialogue requires spontaneity.
- Emotion, since, just as there can be no acceptability without understanding, there is no literature without emotion. It is worth highlighting that, in the study corpus, humour is crucial for causing this emotion.

These five parameters will therefore be key for the categorisation, since a translation solution is not satisfactory if it is not *acceptable*. Acceptability, however, is not static. On the contrary, Mendoza García (2015: 9) defines it as a dynamic concept, dependent on both intratextual and extratextual variables. Among the intratextual variables, the relevance of the CMTUs in the text, their recurrence, where the plot takes place, who is speaking—either the narrator or a character—and the relationship between text and illustrations must be considered. The extratextual variables, on the other hand, comprise the target readers’ age, the publisher’s preferences regarding both the translation method—domestication or foreignisation (Venuti, 1995)—and the translation techniques, and the translation’s date of publication (in this case, as mentioned previously, 2004).

As seen thus far, to correctly identify those CMTUs that create a translation problem and subsequently classify said problems, two aspects must be taken into account: on the one hand, the specific translation assignment; and, on the other, the acceptability of the product based on said assignment, which entails compliance with, firstly, the five aforementioned parameters and, secondly, the set of intratextual and extratextual variables that have a bearing on the communicative situation in which the translational action is carried out.

Subsequently, the concept of translation problem for the purposes of this research is defined based on the notion of *translation problem* inspired by Nord’s proposal (1991: 173), complemented by De la Cova (2017) and previously defined in Part I of this volume.

Here, a translation problem is any CMTU that allows the use of either more than one translation technique—in which case the translator is obliged to choose the technique that offers a greater degree of acceptability in terms of the functional context of the target text—or a single translation technique, but which entails the loss of one of the five parameters necessary to comply with said acceptability: translation coherence, plausibility, understanding, naturalness and emotion.

Lastly, to determine the kind of translation technique admissible by a determined CMTU, this research draws from the classification of what Franco Aixelá (2000) terms *translation strategies* and from Hurtado Albir’s (2001) definitions of *translation method* and *translation technique*. For Hurtado Albir (2001: 256–257), translation technique—what Franco Aixelá refers to as *translation strategy*—entails a determined translation decision made by the translator that is reflected in the target text for a specific source-text element, while translation method refers to

the entire set of decisions made by the translator during the process of creating a complete target text and reflected in the final translation product (Hurtado Albir, 2001: 241).

In his model of translation strategies—which, in this study, following Hurtado Albir's proposal, are called *translation techniques*—Franco Aixelá (1996, 2000) contemplates a total of eleven different kinds of strategies, which he organises, from a cultural perspective, into two main translation methods: conservation—termed *foreignisation* in this work, following Venuti's (1995) proposal—and substitution—termed *domestication*, also using Venuti's (1995) terminology.

Research Methodology: Categorisation of Translation Problems

This section will now explain the process of applying an inductive-deductive method, heavily influenced by GT methodology, to the specific research corpus at hand. Thus, on the one hand, the notions of *translation problem* and CMTU, on which this work is based, rely on a deductive method, since both concepts have, in fact, previously been defined in Translation Studies. On the other hand, an inductive method is used, as the process of identifying and cataloguing such translation problems before finally labelling all the units of analysis (codes) is conducted on the basis of direct observation and study of the research corpus.

On the grounds of these premises, as explained below, the three fundamental stages of GT methodology—open coding, axial coding and selective coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1990: 61-142)—are used for this study.

Open coding

The first stage of the process involved the identification of all the CMTUs present in the source text. Thus, examining the research corpus revealed three distinct categories of said elements, which were labelled as follows: culturally marked common nouns, culturally marked situations and culturally marked proper names. Regarding the third and final category, it is worth explaining that, in this study, all proper names must be regarded as CMTUs due to their foreign spelling. Nevertheless, this paper will only analyse those proper names considered culturally loaded due to the cultural entity they represent (signified), and not just because of their foreign spelling (signifier).¹

Following the identification, classification and labelling of all three types of CMTUs, only those culturally marked common nouns, situations and proper names were detected that, according to our theoretical framework, presented a translation problem in the specific context at hand. In other words, the first step of the procedure consisted of cataloguing and labelling those elements that would constitute the three main initial codes of this study: culturally marked common nouns presenting a translation problem, culturally marked situations presenting a translation problem and culturally marked proper names presenting a translation problem. At this point, two key issues should be clarified.

Firstly, all culturally loaded information units will be regarded as CMTUs, regardless of whether or not they present a translation problem, as stated by Mendoza García in some of her previous studies (2014, 2018). However, while Mendoza García (2014, 2018) proposed a CMTU classification model, only those CMTUs presenting a translation problem and the types of translation problems arising from such CMTUs are contemplated in this paper.

Secondly, a functional approach was adopted to analyse the research corpus, whereas Mendoza García used a descriptive and functional approach (2014, 2018). She used former translation

technique classification models to describe those techniques applied in her research corpus, while this study was tackled from a different angle: attention was directed at exploring the research corpus in order to design a classification model of translation problems, which could subsequently be used by other researchers to identify translation problems in similar research corpora.

The specific steps taken in the open coding procedure—phase one—are listed below:

1. Identifying culturally marked common nouns
2. Identifying culturally marked common situations
3. Identifying proper names
4. Identifying culturally marked proper names
5. Identifying culturally marked common nouns presenting a translation problem
6. Identifying culturally marked situations presenting a translation problem
7. Identifying culturally marked proper names presenting a translation problem
8. Describing specific translation problems arising from each of the previously identified culturally marked common nouns
9. Describing specific translation problems arising from each of the previously identified culturally marked situations
10. Describing specific translation problems arising from each of the previously identified culturally marked proper names

Axial coding (second cycle coding)

Having isolated those CMTUs presenting translation problems from those that do not, and after categorising the former into culturally marked common nouns presenting a translation problem, culturally marked situations presenting a translation problem, and culturally marked proper names presenting a translation problem, a set of interacting relationships were established among the different specific translation problems arising from each of the three different CMTU groups classified previously.

At this stage, it is important to note that throughout the process, and as suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1990: 109), memos were constantly written and organised, and both the theory based on the data observed and the data observed based on the theory were verified. This reciprocal methodological approach would help identify those translation-problem-related phenomena that were systematically repeated when analysing every specific CMTU, before coding and labelling them. More specifically, all the distinct types of translation problems arising from the previously identified culturally marked common nouns, situations and proper names were grouped, classified and labelled. The list below summarises the axial coding procedure—phase two—:

1. Categorising and labelling the specific translation problems arising from the previously identified culturally marked common nouns.
Categorising and labelling the specific translation problems arising from the previously identified culturally marked situations.
2. Categorising and labelling the specific translation problems arising from the previously identified culturally marked proper names.

In summary, the second stage of the process focused on describing those CMTUs presenting translation problems, as well as on the reasons underlying such problems. This gave rise to the sub-categories shown further below.

It should be noted that at this stage of the process, since no differences were found between the data collected after analysing the culturally marked common nouns and situations presenting translation problems, the decision was made to group these two types together.

Thus, by applying the inductive method, the following results were obtained from this second phase of the study. On the one hand, in the case of common nouns, six different sub-categories were identified, according to the features defining culturally marked common nouns and culturally marked situations presenting translation problems in the research corpus, namely:

1. Source system's own reality: the extratextual reality referred to in the source text by the culturally marked common noun or the culturally marked situation is specifically characteristic of the source system.
2. Source system's own reality without an equivalent reality in the target system: there is no extralinguistic reality in the target system that is equivalent to that referred to by the culturally marked common noun or the culturally marked situation in the source text.
3. Source system's own reality without an exact equivalent reality in the target system: there is an extralinguistic reality in the target system that is similar, although not entirely equivalent, to that referred to by the culturally marked common noun or the culturally marked situation in the source text.
4. Source system's own reality presumably not known to the target readers: this involves the prior assumption that the target readers are not familiar with that specific culturally marked common noun or culturally marked situation characteristic of the source system.
5. Source system's own reality without a standardised translation in the target system: there is no standardised translation in the target system for a specific culturally marked common noun or culturally marked situation.
6. Source system's own reality with a standardised translation in the target system: there is a standardised translation in the target system for a specific culturally marked common noun or culturally marked situation.

Furthermore, fourteen different sub-categories were identified according to the features defining the culturally marked proper names presenting translation problems in this specific research corpus, namely:

1. Real entity: the culturally marked proper name in the source text refers to a reality—whether a person, a place, a brand, etc.—that exists in real life.
2. Pre-existing fictitious entity: the culturally marked proper name in the source text refers to a reality—whether a person, a place, a brand, etc.—that does not exist in real life, but that does exist in a fictional literary world, for example, in a literary work, film, etc. Here, *pre-existing* means that the culturally marked proper name has already been created in a previous work.
3. New fictitious entity: the culturally marked proper name in the source text refers to a reality—whether a person, a place, a brand, etc.—that does not exist in real life, but that does exist in a fictional literary world, for example, in a literary work, film, etc. In this instance, however, in contrast to *pre-existing*, a *new* fictitious entity is used to refer to an entity that has been specifically created for the research corpus under study.
4. Real proper name: in the source text there is a form or signifier representing the entity referred to by the culturally marked proper name—whether a person, a place, a brand, etc.
5. Semantic: the culturally marked proper name under analysis is semantically charged.
6. Non-semantic: the culturally marked proper name under analysis is not semantically charged.
7. If a real entity, the source system's own reality or not
8. With an equivalent entity in the target system: in the target system there is a reality—whether a person, a place, a brand, etc.—that is equivalent to that referred to by the culturally marked proper names in the source text.

9. Without an equivalent entity in the target system: in the target system there is no reality—whether a person, a place, a brand, etc.—that is equivalent to that referred to by the culturally marked proper names in the source text.
10. Without an exact equivalent entity in the target system: in the target system there is a similar, although not entirely equivalent reality—whether a person, a place, a brand, etc.—to that referred to by the culturally marked proper names in the source text.
11. With a standardised translation in the target system: in the target system there is a standardised translation for a specific culturally marked proper name.
12. Without a standardised translation in the target system²: in the target system there is no standardised translation for a specific culturally marked proper name.
13. Presumably known to the target readers: prior assumption that the target readers are familiar with a specific culturally marked proper name, characteristic of the source system.
14. Presumably not known to the target readers: prior assumption that the target readers are not familiar with a specific culturally marked proper name, characteristic of the source system.

So as to be able to construct the GT based on the data collected, classified and labelled in this second stage of the process, the variables that would condition the translator's decisions and, consequently, their degree of acceptability also needed to be identified, catalogued and labelled. Again, to do so, focus was placed on those variables that were systematically repeated.

First of all, the analysis revealed the importance of differentiating between the two main types of variables detected: intratextual variables and extratextual variables. As for the former, the following variables were crucial to the translator's decisions:

- Relevance

The degree to which the specific CMTU analysed in this corpus is related to the plot and, thus, determines which translation technique is to be applied. For instance, special care must be taken when translating “Judy”, as this culturally marked proper name refers to the main character of the entire book (and series).

- Recurrence

The frequency of occurrence of the specific CMTU under analysis determines which translation technique is to be applied. For instance, special care must be taken when translating “spelling” as this culturally marked common noun/culturally marked situation appears throughout the whole book (series), recurring in different textual contexts, which poses several translation challenges and requires compliance with the translation coherence criteria.

- Where the plot takes place

The cultural context of the plot location determines which translation technique is to be applied to the specific CMTU under analysis. For instance, when translating “Judy”, it is important to bear in mind that the application of the naturalisation technique—such as “Judith”—would not be acceptable since Judy is a white—not a Latino—character living in the USA and, therefore, it would not be plausible to translate the name with a Spanish spelling.

- Who is speaking

One specific translation technique or another may be applied depending on whether the text fragment in which the CMTU appears is produced by the narrator or by a character. For instance, when translating “George Washington (heads)”, for the translator to comply with plausibility criteria, the application of a domesticating translation technique would not be acceptable.

- Text/Illustration

When translating a specific CMTU in the text that also refers to something shown in an illustration, the translator must adapt to the illustration and not the other way round; this will limit the range of translation techniques that can be applied. For example, when translating, “You look like a star-spangled mummy and walk like a banana. That’s what,” it is essential the translator be aware that, in the illustration, Stink, Judy’s brother, is wearing a flag as a cape and a hat with stars and, consequently, the reference to the flag or the stars should be maintained in the translation.

With regards to the extratextual variables, the following were deemed essential when choosing a specific translation method or technique:

- Publisher’s preferences with regards to the translation method

When the translator considers both domesticating and foreignising translation techniques to be viable, it will be the publisher who has the final say.

- Publisher’s preferences with regards to foreignising translation techniques

When the translator considers that only a foreignising method may be used but finds it feasible to apply more than one foreignising translation technique, it will be the publisher who has the final say.

- Publisher’s preferences with regards to domesticating translation techniques

When the translator considers that only a domesticating method may be used but finds it feasible to apply more than one domesticating translation technique, it will be the publisher who has the final say.

- Readers’ age at the time the translation was first published

In this research corpus, the translator must consider that some of the CMTUs identified in the source text may be known to today’s target readers—children over the age of 8 in 2022, at the time of writing this paper—, but might not have been known to the target readers when the translation was first published—children over the age of 8 in 2004.

Selective coding

While, up to this point, those specific CMTUs in the research corpus that create translation problems have been identified and listed—culturally marked common nouns and culturally marked situations presenting translation problems, on the one hand, and culturally marked proper names, on the other—, this third and final phase of the process heads in a different direction. That is, based on the list of these specific translation problems arising from the two CMTU groups, all the CMTUs presenting the same set of translation problems were grouped and, thus, the same set of translation problem sub-categories described in the axial coding phase was compiled.

Results

Following the identification, classification and labelling of all the CMTUs presenting translation problems in the research corpus, the final step involved designing the GT, consisting of the categorisation of all the translation problems found in the specific research corpus.

Below are all the categories and sub-categories of the translation problems identified in the corpus, as well as the number of instances per group. To make the data easier to visualise, they are presented by category.

When identifying, cataloguing and labelling the categories, the following data were considered and described: the specific CMTU creating the translation problem, the specific source context, the description of the translation problem, the possible translation techniques to be applied, comments about their impact on the degree of acceptability, the intratextual and extratextual variables conditioning the translator's decision, and comments about their impact on the degree of acceptability.

Translation problems arising from culturally marked common nouns and culturally marked situations
(from categories to examples in the research corpus)

CATEGORY 1

Sub-category 1: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 2: Source system's own reality without an equivalent reality in the target system

Sub-category 4: Source system's own reality presumably not known to the target readers

Sub-category 5: Source system's own reality without a standardised translation in the target system

No. of instances in the research corpus: 8

CATEGORY 2

Sub-category 1: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 3: Source system's own reality without an exact equivalent reality in the target system

Sub-category 4: Source system's own reality presumably not known to the target readers

Sub-category 5: Source system's own reality without a standardised translation in the target system

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

CATEGORY 3

Sub-category 1: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 2: Source system's own reality without an equivalent reality in the target system

Sub-category 4: Source system's own reality presumably not known to the target readers

Sub-category 6: Source system's own reality with a standardised translation in the target system

No. of instances in the research corpus: 3

CATEGORY 4

Sub-category 1: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 3: Source system's own reality without an exact equivalent reality in the target system

Sub-category 4: Source system's own reality presumably not known to the target readers

Sub-category 6: Source system's own reality with a standardised translation in the target system

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

Translation problems arising from culturally marked proper names
(from categories to examples in the research corpus)

CATEGORY 1

Sub-category 3: New fictitious entity

Sub-category 4: Real proper name

Sub-category 6: Non-semantic

Sub-category 11: With a standardised translation in the target system

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

CATEGORY 2

Sub-category 3: New fictitious entity

Sub-category 4: Real proper name

Sub-category 5: Semantic

Sub-category 12: Without a standardised translation in the target system

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

CATEGORY 3

Sub-category 1: Real entity

Sub-category 4: Real proper name

Sub-category 6: Non-semantic

Sub-category 7: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 10: Without an exact equivalent entity in the target system

Sub-category 11: With a standardised translation in the target system

Sub-category 14: Presumably not known to the target readers

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

CATEGORY 4

Sub-category 1: Real entity

Sub-category 4: Real proper name

Sub-category 5: Semantic

Sub-category 7: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 9: Without an equivalent entity in the target system

Sub-category 11: With a standardised translation in the target system

Sub-category 14: Presumably not known to the target readers

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

CATEGORY 5

Sub-category 1: Real entity

Sub-category 4: Real proper name

Sub-category 5: Semantic

Sub-category 7: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 9: Without an equivalent entity in the target system

Sub-category 12: Without a standardised translation in the target system

Sub-category 14: Presumably not known to the target readers

No. of instances in the research corpus: 6

CATEGORY 6

Sub-category 1: Real entity

Sub-category 4: Real proper name

Sub-category 6: Non-semantic

Sub-category 7: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 9: Without an equivalent entity in the target system

Sub-category 11: With a standardised translation in the target system

Sub-category 14: Presumably not known to the target readers

No. of instances in the research corpus: 2

CATEGORY 7

Sub-category 1: Real entity

Sub-category 4: Real proper name

Sub-category 6: Non-semantic

Sub-category 7: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 8: With an equivalent entity in the target system

Sub-category 11: With a standardised translation in the target system

Sub-category 14: Presumably not known to the target readers

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

CATEGORY 8

Sub-category 1: Real entity

Sub-category 4: Real proper name

Sub-category 6: Non-semantic

Sub-category 7: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 8: With an equivalent entity in the target system

Sub-category 12: Without a standardised translation in the target system

Sub-category 14: Presumably not known to the target readers

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

CATEGORY 9

Sub-category 2: Pre-existing fictitious entity

Sub-category 5: Semantic

Sub-category 7: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 8: With an equivalent entity in the target system

Sub-category 11: With a standardised translation in the target system

Sub-category 13: Presumably known to the target readers

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

CATEGORY 10

Sub-category 2: Pre-existing fictitious entity

Sub-category 5: Semantic

Sub-category 7: Source system's own reality

Sub-category 8: Equivalent entity in the target system

Sub-category 11: With a standardised translation in the target system

Sub-category 14: Presumably not known to the target readers

No. of instances in the research corpus: 1

The methodological procedure followed to obtain these categories and sub-categories will now be described. Due to space constraints, one example will be given of a culturally marked proper name belonging to category 1 from the preceding list:

- Proper name: Judy
- Context: *Judy Moody was in a Mood* (book title)
- Description of the analysis:
 - Description of the translation problem: First name of the main character of the book (series).
 - Possible translation techniques:
 - Repetition: Judy
 - Naturalisation: Judit
 - Loss of foreign flavour and, consequently, loss of emotion
 - Loss of plausibility (a white girl in the USA would not be called Judit)

- Autonomous creation: *Leonor está de mal humor*.
 - To maintain the rhyme in the Spanish title.
- *Intratextual variables*
 - Relevance: The proper name is considered relevant because it enhances the strong foreign flavour of the book (series).
 - Where the plot takes place: USA → plausibility
- *Extratextual variables*
 - Publisher's preferences (with regards to both the translation method and the translation techniques)

The classification obtained through the application of a GT-inspired inductive-deductive analysis method shows the complexity of translating texts belonging to the studied genre, which will undoubtedly depend on the context. Furthermore, as anticipated in the theoretical framework, a CMTU may pose a translation problem, making the assignment key in determining the degree of acceptability of the translation arising from the applied technique. This relationship between translation problem and acceptability has guided the research.

Conclusions

One of the aims of the study was to apply an inductive-deductive analysis with a strong GT basis to part of the same corpus previously analysed by Mendoza García (2014, 2018) following DTS guidelines.

As previously mentioned, in Mendoza García's research, the field of study, i.e. units of analysis, comprised all the culturemes and proper names in the European Spanish version of the entire *Judy Moody* series. In this study, however, the units under analysis are limited to those CMTUs (culturally marked common nouns, culturally marked situations, and culturally marked proper names) in the first book that create translation problems; that is, no consideration is given to other CMTUs that may also appear in the source text.

As also mentioned, Mendoza García's work (2014) fell within the scope of DTS (Toury, 1995) and, therefore, her corpus consisted of both the source and target texts, while this study only used the source text as the corpus for inductive-deductive bottom-up qualitative analysis.

As explained previously, in order to detect, catalogue and label all the units of analysis in the study corpus, the three phases of GT methodology were applied, i.e., open coding, axial coding and selective coding, to the first book in the *Judy Moody* series. The results of this analysis was the classification of a total of 46 CMTUs creating translation problems, of which 13 are culturally marked common nouns and culturally marked situations, and 33 are culturally marked proper names. As can be seen, the number of culturally marked proper names is significantly higher than the number of culturally marked common nouns and culturally marked situations together. When comparing the results of this study to those of Mendoza García's study (2014), in her analysis of the first book in the series, she identified a total of 86 CMTUs, of which 20 were culturally marked common nouns and culturally marked situations, and 66 were proper names.

It must be remembered that Mendoza García extracted all the CMTUs in the book, regardless of whether or not they created translation problems. Thus, in her work she included proper names such as "Lego", "Barbie", "New Zealand" and "Red Cross", for example, which only accept a single adequate and functionally valid translation technique and, therefore, do not create a translation problem. Furthermore, as explained above, this study only considers those culturally marked proper names that are culturally loaded due to their semantics, while Mendoza García (2014) previously considered all the proper names in the book, as she believed their foreign spelling to be a cultural feature in itself.

The final aim of this research was to determine whether these two different methodological approaches (DTS and GT) offer similar or different outcomes in the process and resulting classification of translation problems in the genre of the study corpus (children's literature). Despite this work only focusing on CMTUs that create translation problems, unlike Mendoza García (2014) who included all the CMTUs, following the analysis of the results of this study, those CMTUs presenting translation problems in the corpus were found to be present in Mendoza García's previous research. In fact, looking at Mendoza García's complete list of CMTUs in the first book of the series, no additional CMTUs creating translation problems were found that have not already been detected by applying this methodology.

Nonetheless, the reflection is that the similarity of the results of this study proves the validation of the two approaches taken. In this sense, both DTS and GT, when applied from the same research perspective, have proved to be valid methodologies in the specific context of this study. This type of verification is indirectly similar to that which could have been reached if the focus had been placed on establishing an intercoder reliability (O'Connor and Joffe, 2020).

From the point of view of taxonomies, and as shown above, this research has produced a classification of translation problems arising from CMTUs in children's literature which is broad enough for it to be applied to other studies based on this genre. This research identified four categories (with a total of six sub-categories) for culturally marked common nouns and culturally marked situations, and ten categories (with a total of 14 different sub-categories) for culturally marked proper names.

Previous research in DTS has established descriptive CMTU classifications with similar sub-categories (albeit named differently), but has not considered only those CMTUs that create functional translation problems. Therefore, this work provides a specific classification that narrows down the categories and sub-categories to those that arise when there is a translation problem, making it especially useful for translator training. Additionally, the conducted study might have implications for research, in that it shows that the application of both a functional approach and a methodology not specifically created for, or popular in, Translation Studies can provide researchers with a different methodological tool to research not only the presence of translation problems in other literary genres or sub-disciplines, but also to apply this same methodology to the study of a different concept (for instance, the *translation error*).

References

Primary sources

McDonald, Megan ([2000] 2010). *Judy Moody was in a mood*. Somerville (Massachusetts), Candlewick Press.

References

- Corbin, Juliet & Strauss, Anselm (1990/2008). *Basics of qualitative research*. SAGE.
- Franco, Javier (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Álvarez & M. C. A. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, power, subversion* (52-78). Multilingual Matters.
- Franco, Javier (2000). *La traducción condicionada de los nombres propios (inglés-español). Análisis descriptivo*. Almar.
- Hurtado, Amparo (2001). *Traducción y traductología*. Cátedra.
- Mendoza-García, Inma (2014). *La traducción al español de Judy Moody, de Megan McDonald: revisión del tratamiento de los culturemas y los nombres propios desde la traductología*. [PhD Dissertation. University of Seville]. <https://idus.us.es/handle/11441/73275>
- Mendoza-García, Inma (2015). La aceptabilidad de la traducción cultural en la literatura para la infancia: Una propuesta conceptual y metodológica. *Tonos Digital*, 29, 1-22. <http://www.tonosdigital.com/ojs/index.php/tonos/article/view/1324>

- Mendoza-García, Inma (2018). Unidades de traducción culturalmente marcadas: propuesta de clasificación dinámica con fines traductológicos. *Hermes*, 58, 193-213.
- Mayoral, Roberto & Muñoz, Ricardo (1997). Estrategias comunicativas en traducción intercultural. In P. Fernández & J. M. Bravo (Coords.), *Aproximaciones a los estudios de traducción* (143-192). Universidad de Valladolid.
- O'Connor, Cliodhna & Joffe, Helene (2020). Intercoder reliability in qualitative research: debates and practical guidelines. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19, 1-13.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de (1916/1983). *Course in general linguistics* (trans. Harris). Duckworth.
- Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.

¹The terms *signifier* and *signified* are used with the meaning of the well-known semiotic concepts coined by Saussure ([1916]1983: 12, 14–15, 66, 67, 101).

²Also in this instance, *reality* and *entity*—whether real or fictitious—refer to the concept or the signified, while the use of a proper name or mention of *standardised translation* refers to the form or the signifier.