



## THE COMPUTERIZED ACCOUNTING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STUDENTS' TRANSLATIONS VIEWED FROM SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL

Anggreningrum ✉

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

### Info Artikel

*Sejarah Artikel:*  
Diterima Agustus 2012  
Disetujui September 2012  
Dipublikasikan November 2012

*Keywords:*  
Translation  
Interpersonal  
Textual and experiential meaning  
Translation equivalence

### Abstrak

Studi ini bertujuan untuk a) menggambarkan realisasi dari interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning, dan tekstual meaning pada translasi siswa jurusan CA dan IT STMIK WP, b) menjelaskan perbedaan dan persamaan antara translasi siswa CA dan IT dalam merealisasikan ketiga meaning tadi, c) menjelaskan apakah arti sudah tepat terhadap bahasa target. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian qualitative, dengan siswa CA dan IT sebagai subjek. Data diambil dari hasil translasi siswa CA dan IT. Peneliti mengimplementasikan teori SFL dan translasi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan persamaan terjadi pada hasil translasi kedua jurusan tersebut dalam ideational theme. Perbedaan terjadi pada transitivity and interpersonal meaning pada proses kuantitas. Translation equivalence di capai melalui translation shift.

### Abstract

*The study on translation viewed from SFL aims at a) describing the realization of interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning, and textual meaning in the students' translations of CA department and IT students' translations, STMIK WP, b) explaining the differences and the similarities between students' translations of CA department and IT department at STMIK WP in realizing those three meanings c) explaining whether the meaning of the source language is equivalence to the target language. It is a qualitative research; CA students and IT students as the subjects of this research. The data of this study are taken from students' translations on CA and IT department of STMIK WP in form of Indonesian-English translation. There are ten translations; five samples of each are selected to obtain the variation process of SFL realization. In analyzing the data, I implemented SFL theory and the translation theory. The results showed that the similarities between both departments are occurred in experiential meaning and textual meaning. Many students used ideational theme. The differences between those departments are occurred in transitivity and interpersonal meaning on the quantity of the process. In terms of translation equivalence in this text, it is achieved through translation shift.*

© 2012 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Alamat korespondensi:  
Kampus Unnes Bendan Ngisor, Semarang 50233  
E-mail: [pps@unnes.ac.id](mailto:pps@unnes.ac.id)

ISSN 2087-0108

## INTRODUCTION

English is the language of globalization, international communication, commerce and trade now. English is no longer viewed as the property of the English-speaking world but it is an international commodity sometimes referred to as English as an International Language (Richards, 2000). Therefore, this language becomes primary lesson in educational field.

English learning has benefit not only for English subject itself but also for non-English subject, English for Specific Purpose (ESP). In ESP, the learning of English is defined to meet specific needs of the learners and centered on the language appropriate to the activity in terms of grammar, lexis, register, study skills, discourse and genre (Dudley-Evans, 1998).

*Institute of Computer Management and Informatics Widya Pratama Pekalongan* (STMIK WP Pekalongan) conducts three semesters for learning English. The global aim of this learning is that the students are able to use English for transferring and adopting knowledge which they learn in the computer field. Therefore, it would be more efficient to teach them the specific kinds of language and communicative skill needed for particular field (Richards, 2000). Acquiring English language, they are able to communicate in social field and work field.

In work place, nowadays, there are so many investors in our country. One of them is foreign investors which support our economic growth (Riyanto, 2011:1). Confronting this situation, the students need to apply their ability in English, both written and oral skills. For instance, when the applicants have English interview test, it means that they conduct their ability in speaking. However, before having interview test, they have to pass the early step first of entering the work field; they send the application letters to the companies. Regarding the important of English skills in this field, in the second semester, the students of STMIK Widya Pratama Pekalongan study the subject concerning writing application letter and having English interview test. The goal of this study is to prepare them in facing the work field. Explaining the material about how to write the application letter, the teachers use translation technique.

Translation is included in major branches of applied linguistics. It can be defined as transferring the meaning of the source language into the target language (Larson, 1984). Translation has played a central role in human interaction for thousand of years (Crystal, 2003). Moreover, it

has become one of techniques in teaching language process using grammar translation approach. The application of this approach in teaching English refers to the theory that any single method could achieve optimum success in all circumstances (Stevens, 1997). Grammar-translation approach is an extension of the approach used to teach classical languages to the teaching of modern languages (Murcia, 2001). The teacher gives a typical exercise to translate sentences from the target language into the mother tongue (or vice versa). Nevertheless, many students have difficulty in understanding the message or translating the text. I wonder about the analysis of the students' translations, especially in form of Indonesian-English translation. Consequently, it is interesting to do research in this field.

Usually, teachers use their opinion or intuition in checking the students' translation result. By applying it, they sometimes face difficulty in explaining why the certain word is better used than others in translating the text. Based on this problem, *Systemic Functional Linguistics* (SFL) can assist the teachers in explaining how the translations are.

SFL as we know it today is the result of a continual evolution of theory and description in which the theory had its roots in Firth's teachings in linguistics, taken up and developed by Halliday (Webster, 2005). Translation concerns for meaning and meaning closely related to SFL as it provides a fundamental basis for a comprehensive understanding of meaning. SFL has been applied to translation studies by translation scholar such as House (1986, 1997); Baker (1992); Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997); and Trosborg (2002). Mira Kim analyzed the use of Systemic Functional Text Analysis for Translator Education (Kim, 2007). The study found that it was possible to classify error in the target texts based on meaning using SFL. Besides, Dorry (2009) studies a use of thematic structure theory in the translation.

Taking into account what has been mentioned, I analyzed comparative study between the *Computerized Accounting* (CA) and *Information Technology* (IT) students of STMIK Widya Pratama Pekalongan translations viewed from systemic functional linguistics. I decided to compare both students since they have different background of English competence. Based on their grade, both classes have different result in English language learning. The meaning of it is that they have variation skill in English. Concerning their ability in translating the application letter, I want to reveal how their translations results are. Therefore, I did

research on the CA and IT Students' Translations Viewed from Systemic Functional Linguistics (a case at STMIK Widya Pratama Pekalongan). It is hoped that the result of this study will provide the solution to teachers in proofreading students' translation result. By knowing the students' ability, the teachers can help them in translating practice.

Based on the above statement, there are five questions in this research; the first is how are the interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning and textual meaning realized in the CA students of STMIK WP translations? Next, how are the interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning and textual meaning in the IT students of STMIK WP translations? The third is what are the differences and similarities between the CA and IT students of STMIK WP translations in realizing interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning and textual meaning? The fourth is the meaning in the source language equivalence to the target language? And the last is how do the findings contribute to the English teaching?

Based on the above problems, this study has goals in describing the realization of interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning, and textual meaning in the students' translations of Computerized Accounting Department, STMIK WP Pekalongan, describing the realization of interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning, and textual meaning in students' translations of Information Technology Department, STMIK WP Pekalongan, explaining the differences and the similarities between students' translations of CA department and IT department at STMIK WP Pekalongan in realizing interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning and textual meaning, explaining whether the meaning in the source language is equivalence or not to the target language and explaining how the findings contribute to the English teaching.

Translation may be defined as the process of text changing from the source language into the target language without modifying the level of text content in the source language (Moentaha, 2006: 11). This statement is in accordance with Newmark's idea as restated by Machali (2000: 5) who explains that translation is rendering the meaning of a text into another language that is equal to the author's purpose of the text. Moreover, Nida and Taber also define that translation is reproducing the message in the source language message into the receptor language which is equivalent to meaning and style (Widyamartaya, 1989: 11). Catford (1978: 20) also defines that translation as *the replacement of textual material in*

*one language (source language) by equivalent textual material in another language (target language).*

On the whole, translation is conveying process of the text in the source language into the target language without changing the author's meaning in the original text.

In order to find the good translation, we have to assess the translation based on the basic criteria; they are as follows (Nida and Taber, 1974: 12); put on the source language and the target language in the context of each communication, consider the text type (on the basis of function and characteristic) as the delivering message from the sender to the receiver in different setting, note the reaction of the readers of the target language that they understand the message or not and pay close attention to the translator' intent. The above criteria were used to assess students' translation results in order to collect the data of this study.

Beaugrande (1978) defines equivalence relation in terms of the translation being a valid a representative of the original in the communicative act in question. As Xiang Yinhua (2011) states that equivalence in translation should not be approached as a search for sameness, but only as a kind of similarity or approximation, and this naturally indicates that it is possible to establish equivalence between the source text and the target text on different linguistic levels and on different degrees.

Therefore, equivalence in translation can only be understood as a kind of similarity or approximation. This means that equivalence between the source text and the target text can be established on different levels and in different aspects.

In this research, translation theory will be related to systemic functional linguistics theory. Systemic Functional Linguistics is a theory of language which sets out to explain how humans make meaning (Coffin, 2010: 2). It refers to the relationship between language and the brain, on the one hand, language and society. Moreover, functional grammars view language as a resource for making meaning (Gerot and Wignell, 1994:6). They describe language in actual use and so focus on text and their contexts. It is concerned not only with the structures but also with how those structures construct meaning.

Based on the above definition, Systemic Functional Linguistics is the study of how the grammar is used in language and how the grammar constructs the meaning, by considering the language as the resource.

Three types of meaning are distinguished in SFL and each of these relate to the three overall

functions. They cover the ideational metafunction (meanings to do with propositional content), the interpersonal metafunction (meanings to do with the exchange of perspectives and the expression of attitude) and the textual metafunction (meanings concerned with how the text is structured as a message) (Coffin, 2010: 3). Moreover, those three meanings related to translation.

A variety of languages based on its usage or according to what people do with their language is generally called as register. It is a semantic concept that goes with the variation in the text situation (Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 38). The register variables cover field, tenor, and mode. Firstly, the realization of field is the pattern of process (verbs), participants (nouns), circumstances (prepositional phrases of time, manner, place, etc.)". These type of grammatical patterns express the transitivity patterns in language concerning "who is doing what to whom, when, where, why, and how". Then, tenor which is in the interpersonal meaning is realized through MOOD. It refers to variables such as the type of clause structure (declarative, interrogative), the degree of certainty or obligation expressed (modality) the use of tags, vocatives, attitudinal words which are either positively or negatively loaded, expressions of intensification, and politeness markers of various kinds. And the last is mode which is realized through theme, the patterns of foregrounding and continuity in the organization of the clause (Eggs, 1994: 77). By analyzing field, tenor and mode, the realization of three meanings can be observable.

There are three semantic categories about how phenomena of the real world are represented as linguistic structures (Gerot and Wignell, 1994:52). They are namely process, circumstances and participants.

Processes are central to transitivity and realized by verbs. Participants and circumstances are incumbent upon the doings, happenings, feelings and beings. The following are six different process types:

Material processes are processes related to experiences in the external, material world. It is actions and happenings. It is outside world and observable. E.g. She *gave* him a present and she *made* a cake.

Mental processes are ones of sensing: feeling, thinking, perceiving. It is perception, cognition, and affective processes. It is inner world and not directly observable. For instance, I *knew* the answers and I *believe* he is wrong.

Behavioral processes are processes of physiological and psychological behavior, like breathing, dreaming, snoring, smiling, looking, wat-

ching, and listening. E.g. they *cried* and he *slept* soundly.

Verbal processes are processes of saying, or more accurately, of symbolically signaling. It is mental process that becomes observable. He *said* 'hello' and he *told* a story are case in point.

Relational processes. They are process of 'being and having'. They can be classified according to whether they are being used to identify something or to assign a quality to something. For example, he *is* a famous artist and he *has* a truck.

Existential processes are processes of existence. It is expressed by verbs of existing: 'be', 'exist', 'arise' and the existent can be phenomenon of any kind. For instance, there *is* a bird on a tree and ghost *exists*.

A participant can be a person, a place, or an object and in the grammar of clause the participant is realized by a nominal group (Butt, et al, 1996:52). As stated above that participants are incumbent upon the doings, happenings, feelings and beings: First, Participants in material process, they are actor, goal, range, beneficiary, a recipient and a client. Second, Participants in Behavioural Processes. The first one is behavior; person or animal having the behaviour, usually endowed with consciousness. Most behavioural processes only have a single participant, and that's the behavior. Next is behaviour which is found in very few cases. Behaviour usually repeats the behavioural process with some added attribute. Meanwhile, another participant which is not a restatement of the process is called a phenomenon.

Participants' roles in mental process are sener and phenomenon. Sener is for those who are conscious can feel, think or see. On the one hand, phenomenon is that which is sensed; felt, thought or seen.

Participants in verbal processes, viz. sayer, receiver and verbiage. Sayer is the person or thing that says something. While receiver is the addressee; the person to whom something is said. Then, verbiage is the content of what is said and always expressed by a noun group phrase.

Participant in existential process is existent. It is the participant that process introduces as existing, as having existence.

Participants in relational processes are token and value. Token is the concrete entity that symbolizes a value. *Susan is the kindest salesperson in the shop* is a case in point. Whereas value is a more abstract entity that can be perceived only if represented by a more concrete entity. For instance, *Susan is the kindest salesperson* in the shop.

Circumstances answer such questions as when, where, why, how, how many and as

what. They realize meaning about time, place, manner, cause, accompaniment, matter and role.

By analyzing type of process, participant and circumstance, it is easily to analyze the transitivity.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The data of this research are ten students' translations of application letter which consists of five translations from the CA students and five translations from the IT students. All data were segmented into clauses and there were 19 clauses in CA students' translations and 19 clauses in IT students' translations. There are six process types, namely material, mental, behavioral, relational, verbal and existential. The dominant process which can be shown in the table is material. This process was chosen by the students since the translation of the text reflects the process of material doing. It expresses the notion that some entity physically does something. There is difference in material process usage. Students applied 55 material processes in Indonesian and 54 processes when they translated into English. This is because one student translated material process in Indonesia into behavioral process in English. The next dominating process is mental that related to sensing: feeling, thinking and perceiving. The use of this process in Indonesia is higher than in English. Indonesian has 40 mental processes while only 22 mental processes in English. The word "bisa" in Indonesian reflects mental process. However, when students translated into English the word 'bisa' does not include as process since it is finite. Relational process can be classified according to whether they are being used to identify something or to assign a quality to something. The students used this process in their translation as the third choice. Next, the fourth process is verbal, the process of saying or symbolically signaling. In this part, the students have the same quality and its realization in each text; it is different from relational process. Then, only two behavioral processes are chosen by students. However, no students used existential process in their translation. It was revealed that all clauses either in Ind or English apply declarative mood. It means that interrogative, imperative and exclamative was not chosen by the students. The reason is that they translate written text in form of application letter. As we know that in this letter, we give information to the reader. Therefore, the declarative mood is the most type used in this translation. Students have a range

of choices available to express modality. In this case, they tend to use low modality in translating the text. Most of them use *can* in their English translation to show their ability. For the second choice, they often translate *I think* which reflects that they use medium modality. Nonetheless, the students never express their modality using high modality. It can be concluded that the dominant type of theme chosen by students is ideational theme or topical theme. Most of them used *I* as pronoun in their application letter. Moreover, they also use textual theme for the second choice. The data showed that they use *and*, *but*, *that* as conjunctions and *besides*, *in addition*, and *then* as text connectives. On the contrary, interpersonal theme is not found in the application letter. It is as the same as the first findings on different students that the dominant process is material. This process of material doing was chosen by most of students, 55 material processes in Ind and 48 material processes in English. The second process is mental that related to sensing: feeling, thinking and perceiving. It is the same as comparison in computerized accounting students that mental process in Ind is most used than in English. Next, the third process is relational process in which it can be classified in order to identify something or to assign a quality to something. Then, the fourth process is verbal, the process of saying or symbolically signaling. Then, only two behavioral processes are chosen by students. Based on the table, it showed that there is no student who uses existential process in their application letter. As the findings of computerized accounting students, the students of information technology also only used declarative mood in their translation. This is because the overriding social purpose of application letter is to give information through describing, explaining and so on. It can be concluded from the above table that most students apply low modality in translating the text. Most of them use *can* in their English translation to show their ability. For the second choice, they often translate *I think* which reflects that they use medium modality. Nevertheless, the students do not express their modality using high modality. This findings is as the same as computerized accounting students. The dominant type of theme used by students is ideational theme or topical theme. They used personal pronoun "I" in their letters. Besides, they also used textual theme. Textual theme refers to conjunctions such as *and* and *that*. While *besides*, and *also* are the examples of connectives. On the other hand, interpersonal theme is not found in the application letter.

The example of the discussion is the tran-

sitivity analysis of text 1 from Computerized Accounting students' translation result. *Ingin melamar* in Indonesian was translated into *writing to apply* in English. *Ingin* is mental process and *melamar* is material process. The change of process from *mental* and *material* process into *mental* and *mental process* in English occurred here. The word *ingin* expresses future, something that has not done yet in the past. Thus, the student used present continuous as future marker. Then, *berumur* in the third clause means *mempunyai umur* which is classified as relational process. There are two groups of relational process; identifying process and attributive process. Moreover, relational process can be further sub-classified into intensive, possessive or circumstantial. In this text, the students translate *saya berumur 27 tahun* into *I am 27 years old*. Both *berumur* and *am* are attributive process. The difference is that the first is attributive possessive and the latter is attributive intensive. This finding is the opposite of the next clause. *Saya memiliki gelar* is translated into *I had a degree*. The word *memiliki* becomes *had* in English. Both of them are relational process and they have the same sub classification; they are attributive possessive. Next, the process transition from Indonesian into English also can be found in the translation of *bisa mengoperasikan*. These two verbs show mental and material process. Yet, that verbs become material process in English since *can* is a finite. *In problem solving* is the translation of *mengatasi masalah* in this text. The student changed process type in English version that is material process is changed into circumstantial matter. *Bisa berbicara* and *bisa berbahasa* were also realized into the change of process type. The first is mental-verbal process becomes verbal process in English. And the latter, mental-material process is translated into material process. Based on this first text, the student translated *merasa* in the 15<sup>th</sup> clause into *think* in English version. *Merasa* and *think* are grouped as mental process. However, it has difference in sub classification. *Merasa* is mental-affect process while *think* is mental-cognition process. The second is mood type discussion of text 1. In this case, the student translated the application letter from Indonesian into English. After analyzing the letter in Indonesian version and its translation in English, the type of mood used is declarative. It is about self identification, experience and skill. The student did not change at all concerning the type of mood. It is similar to the discussion of transitivity, *bisa mengoperasikan*, *bisa berbahasa*, and *bisa bekerja* is also analyzed in term of modality. The use of *can* showed that the student used low modality in expressing her/his

capability. On the contrary, *will*, *I think* and *I hope* which are translated in this text reflected medium modality.

## CONCLUSION

After describing the realization of lexicogrammatical of both students' translation result, some conclusion can be drawn that the interpersonal meaning, experiential meaning and textual meaning are realized in the CA students of STMIK WP translations involving some conclusion. In the realization of transitivity, material process, mental process and relational process are dominant used by CA students. While in theme-rheme, the result showed that the common type of theme used by students is textual theme which consists of text connectives and conjunctions. In interpersonal realization, the students of CA tend to use no modality in expressing their intention in writing application letter.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words*. London/New York: Routledge
- Butt, David, et al. 1996. *Using Functional Grammar an Explorer's Guide*. Sydney: Macquire University
- Catford, J. C. 1978. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Celce, Murcia. 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Mexico: Heinle & Heinle
- Coffin, Caroline; Lillis, Theresa and, Kieran O'Halloran. 2010. *Applied Linguistics Methods*. New York: Routledge
- Cohen, L. et al. 2007. *Research Methods in Education*. London-New York: Routledge
- Creswell, John W. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Crystal, David. 2003. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Dorry, Elham Rajab. (Ed) 2009. A Use of Thematic Structure Theory in Translation. *Personal Journal of Philosophy of Language Education*. Accessed from <http://zainurrahmans.wordpress.com> on Tuesday, 17<sup>th</sup> January 2012 at 9 p.m.
- Droga, Louise; Sally Humprey. 2003. *Grammar and Meaning*. NSW: Target Texts
- Dudley-Evans, Tony. 1998. *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Eggins, Suzanne. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publisher Ltd.
- Eggins, Suzanne and Diana Slade. 1997. *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London and Washington: Cassel.
- Gerot, Linda and Peter Wignell. 1994. *Making Sense of*

- Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodean Educational Enterprises
- Halliday, M. A. K and Hasan, R. 1985. *Language, Context, and Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Matthiessen Christian. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc
- Hatim, Basil and Mason, Ian. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman
- Hatim, Basil and Mason, Ian. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London/New York: Routledge
- Hatim, Basil. 2001. *Teaching and Researching Translation*. London: Longman
- House, Juliane. 1986. *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Tübingen: Narr
- House, Juliane. 1997. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Narr
- Larson, M.L. 1984. *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence*. Lanham: University Press of America
- Kim, Mira. 2007. *Using Systemic Functional Text Analysis for Translator Education: An Illustration with a focus on the textual meaning*. Interpreter and Translator Trainer
- Machali, R. 2000. *Pedoman Bagi Penerjemah*. Jakarta: PT. Grasindo
- Martin, J.R and David Rose. 2003. *Working with Discourse*. London: Continuum
- Moentaha, Salihen. 2006. *Bahasa dan Terjemahan*. Jakarta: Kesaint Blanc
- Nida, E.A. and Charles R. Taber. 1974. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. E. J. Brill: Leiden
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London and New York: Prentice Hall International Ltd.
- Richards, Jack C., 2000. *30 Years of TEFL/TESL: A Personal Reflection*. Paper in English Teaching Forum on SEAMEO Regional Language Centre. Singapore
- Riyanto, Slamet. 2011. *Easy Writing a Letter of Application in English*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Saleh, Mursid. 2008. *Enam Tradisi Besar Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa*. Semarang: Unnes
- Sugiyono. 2008. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D (Research and Development)*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Strevens, P. 1997. *New Orientations in the Teaching of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, Henry. 1938. *The Complete Book of English*. New York: Perma Giants
- Trosborg, Anna. 2002. *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training: Status, Needs, Methods*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Webster, J. R. Hasan, and C. Matthiessen (eds), 2005. *Continuing Discourse on Language: A Functional Perspective*. London: Equinox
- Wray, Alison, et.al. 1998. *Projects in Linguistics: a Practical Guide to Researching Language*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc
- Widyamartaya, A. 1989. *Seni Menerjemahkan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius
- Xiang Yinhua. 2011. *Equivalence in Translation: Features and Necessity*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 1 No. 10; August 2011. Accessed from [http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_1\\_No\\_11\\_Special\\_Issue\\_August\\_2011/19.pdf](http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_1_No_11_Special_Issue_August_2011/19.pdf) on Wednesday, August 15th 2012 at 3 p.m.