



Graduate Research School
**Research Proposal Coversheet for
Candidates in
Research Higher Degrees**

RP

EXAMPLE OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

RESEARCH AREA: HUMANITIES

DEGREE: PhD

Please note that all identifying information has been removed from this research proposal and replaced with XXX.

A. PROPOSED STUDY

1. Provide a title.

THE TRANSLATION OF METAPHORS, WITH REFERENCE TO MODERN ITALIAN PROTESTANT BIBLES

2. **For PhD:** Rule 1.3.3.3 specifies that a PhD study must make a "substantial and original contribution to scholarship, for example through the discovery of knowledge, the formulation of theories or the innovative re-interpretation of known data and established ideas". In what way is the proposed study expected to fulfil this requirement?

The Bible: it is the most translated book of all history, and there are no signs of Bible translating slowing down, as translators aim to reach the speakers of some 4000 languages with no portions of Scripture in their mother-tongue (Bertalot, 2004). Naturally then, when translation theory was introduced and developed in the field of Bible translating, its effects were astounding. Bible translation theory is usually attributed to the work of Eugene Nida, who presented his Dynamic Equivalence Model in the 1960s. According to Dynamic Equivalence theory, a good translation should aim to reproduce the same response in the target audience of the translated text as it produced in the original receptors. Thus, the form of the original should not be preserved where it would prevent a similar response to that of the original readers. When it comes to figurative language then, often a translator must find an appropriate equivalent in the receptor language which may not at all resemble the original form of the source text.

Nida did make a significant contribution to translation theory, however his Dynamic Equivalence model has more recently been questioned both by those who see the need to further develop this translation theory and by those who continue to back an essentially literal translation. My research will draw upon Nida's Dynamic Equivalence model and subsequent translation theories in order to determine to what extent they can explain the way in which metaphors have been translated in modern Italian Protestant Bibles. It must be noted that some Bibles which I will analyse were translated prior to the significant theoretical developments in the latter half of the 20th Century. For those Bibles which were published more recently, it is not known to what extent, if any, they have been impacted by modern translation theory.

Specifically, I will draw upon Relevance Theory, Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Conceptual Blending Theory in order to analyse the Bible translations. These recent theories have given much greater insight into the nature of metaphors and have therefore altered the approaches to metaphors in translation. If the translators of the Italian Protestant Bibles have not explicitly adopted these modern translation metaphor theories, what approaches did they take, and what light can modern translation theories shed on these approaches? Adopting these translation theories will therefore reveal in sound theoretical terms how metaphors have been translated in these Bibles, the effects of these approaches, and the consistency of their application.

Given that no thorough linguistic analysis has been carried out on this corpus of Italian Protestant Bibles, my analysis of the approaches to the translation of metaphors will clearly provide greater understanding of Bible translation methods used in these Bibles. This will provide a reassessment of recent translation theories based on an original corpus of texts. The potential applications of such a linguistic analysis are numerous. Translators seeking to better understand and apply modern metaphor theory and its effects on certain choices may benefit. Bible scholars, ministers, and seminary students may also find this research valuable, as they will increase their awareness of the differences and effects between Bible versions.

References in Section A

BERTALOT, V. (2004) *La Sfida delle Traduzioni: ieri, oggi e domani. La Bibbia e l'Italia*. Torino, Claudiana.

3. **For Masters:** Rule 1.3.2.3 specifies that a Masters study must be a "substantial work generally based on independent research which shows a sound knowledge of the subject of the research, evidence of the exercise of some independence of thought and the ability of expression in clear and concise language". In what way is the proposed study expected to fulfil this requirement?

N/A

4. If the proposed study includes a creative component, describe the creative component and show in what way the thesis and creative components may be linked.

N/A

B. RESEARCH DIRECTION

1. The specific aims of the project - the problem(s) it hopes to solve; or particular question(s) it will answer; issues it will explore; and the new knowledge it will create.

The Bibles which I will be analysing are essentially revisions of a 17th Century translation by Giovanni Diodati (1576 - 1649). Diodati was raised in Geneva by his parents who originated from Lucca in Tuscany (Foster, 1963; Luzzi, 1942) and at the early age of 21, he became a teacher of Hebrew at the Geneva Academy, before obtaining what was to be his life-long position as Professor of Theology in Geneva. Diodati's first translation was published in 1607, and some 34 years later, in 1641, his emended and annotated edition of the Bible was published. Diodati's translation became the primary Bible used among reformed Italians, and with no further translations nor major revisions until the 20th century, Diodati's Bible, or the *Diodatina*, remained *the* Bible used by Italian-speaking Protestants (Tourn, 2004). The revisions which make up the corpus are:

- The *Riveduta*: The *Riveduta* was the first of several major revisions of Diodati's translation carried out in the 20th Century. This revision was initiated by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1906, and carried out by a board of editors, though this work is usually associated with the head editor: Giovanni Luzzi, a Waldensian pastor and theologian (Dür, 1996). It was first published in 1924 in England (Dür, 1996).
- *Bibbia*: Giovanni Luzzi's own translation, printed in twelve volumes and completed in 1931. It was to be a modern, clear translation that could be accepted by both Catholics and Protestants (Dür, 1996).
- The *Nuova Diodati*: printed by the publishing house, La Buona Novella, 1991. Another revision of the Diodati.
- The *Nuova Riveduta*: printed by the publishing house, The Geneva Bible Society, 1994.
- The *Parola del Signore*: this bible is an ecumenical translation based explicitly on the dynamic equivalence model.

These Bibles will be analysed in the light of several theories of metaphor. These theories will allow the close definition of the research questions, which are fundamentally two:

- What approaches did the translators of the Bibles take and what effects do these approaches have on the translation?

- Are they consistent in their application? If not, can any explanation be given to account for these consistencies?

As already discussed, it was Eugene Nida's distinction between Dynamic Equivalence and Formal Equivalence which revolutionised Bible translation theory. Formal Equivalence models are essentially literal translations and are described as "the old focus" in translation by Nida and Taber (1969). The revolutionary concept that Nida presented was the dynamic equivalence theory, which was focused on reproducing the same response in the target audience of the translated text as it produced in the original receptors. Thus, according to this theory, the form of the original should not be preserved where it would prevent a similar response to that of the original readers. This approach clearly affects the translation of figurative language, where the form is often not retained in order to produce that same response.

The issue of how to translate metaphors didn't receive significant treatment until several decades later though, as Nida did not deal with them at length. Nida does not lay out theoretically-based methods that can be used to translate metaphors, nor does he explain the effects that different ways of translating metaphors may have on the translations. Another area which Nida does not explore is the 'grey' area of "dead" metaphors and their link with idioms (De Waard, 1974). Nida (1964) simply states that, after time, metaphorical words lose their active, figurative meaning, and take on an extra dictionary meaning. Despite this limited explanation, this area proves to be one of the most challenging from a translator's point of view, and I intend to look closely at how the translators of the Italian Bibles have tackled these types of expressions.

Nida's Dynamic Equivalence theory has since influenced other translation theories, many of which have been developed at the Summer Institute of Linguistics (Gutt, 2000; Price, 2008). These theories generally come under the banner of 'meaning-based' translation theories, which place emphasis on the sense of the translation, rather than the form. Proponents of meaning-based theories adopt similar views as Nida regarding metaphors and so, there is no need to make further mention of them here. Another significant approach to translation theory was developed by Earnst-August Gutt, who proposes that any given message can only be understood if the appropriate contextual inferences are made. Regarding metaphors, he argues that paraphrases of metaphors in translation, which is a common solution in Dynamic Equivalence translations, are not ideal as they inevitably ignore certain inferences in the original text. Gutt's translation theory is an ideal model which can be used to determine the inferences which have been retained or ignored in a translation. I will therefore draw upon this theory to analyse the nature of translation choices and their effects within these Italian Protestant Bibles.

Although I will draw upon Dynamic Equivalence and meaning-based theories, my research will concentrate on one major development, known as Conceptual Metaphor Theory (and a later development: Conceptual Blending Theory), which was developed in the 1980s principally by Lakoff and Johnson in their book *Metaphors We Live By*. This theory does not regard metaphor as an isolated linguistic structure, but as a ubiquitous expression which results from the way the human mind categorizes experience. Lakoff and Johnson argue that thought is essentially metaphorical, for our minds are constantly mapping new experience in terms of what we know. This mapping of one domain in terms of another in our minds is the basis of 'conceptual metaphors', and these conceptual metaphors then regulate our choice of words.

Kenneth McElhanon (2006), who has worked on Bible translation projects with the S.I.L. in Papua New Guinea, proposes possible ways of applying conceptual metaphor theory to Bible translation. He begins by suggesting three types of conceptual metaphors which vary in terms of their attachment to culture, as put forward by Kövescses (2000): (1) core conceptual metaphors which are

universally human and therefore presumably culture-free, (2) primary conceptual metaphors which are linked to human reaction/physiology and therefore often are not arbitrary metaphors, and (3) complex conceptual metaphors, which involve a mapping of experience in terms of some cultural element. McElhanon argues that these three fundamental conceptual metaphors should each be approached differently in translation. He proposes that core conceptual metaphors be translated literally, but primary conceptual and complex conceptual metaphors should be translated with appropriate conceptual mappings in the target language. In my thesis I will look at whether the translators of the Italian Protestant Bibles have adopted such an approach. If they have not followed such a translation project, are there any consistencies in the way they have approached these three fundamental conceptual metaphors?

Building on Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Turner and Fauconnier (2002) introduced what they called Conceptual Blending Theory. Whereas Conceptual Metaphor Theory allows only one domain to be mapped onto another, this theory allows multiple inputs from which certain features are imported into a 'blending space', and are mapped onto the target source (Coulson, 2006; McElhanon, 2006). In addition, this theory allows for multi-directional mappings, so that inputs could themselves become the target-source. This can be seen in Jesus' parables, which often caused listeners to challenge their understanding of reality.

McElhanon (2006) then takes the Conceptual Blending Theory and proposes its application to translation. He introduces a *translation space* which "will have metonymic links with the content of the SL [Source Language] blended space and should allow for inferences to be projected from the translation space to the target space that are comparable to those projected from the SL blended space to the SL target space" (2006, pp.69-70). McElhanon therefore justifies cultural adaptations in order to produce the same inferences, though he does advance six 'optimality principles' which constrain translation possibilities. Presumably, the Conceptual Blending Theory could explain why some translations have opted for natural equivalents (for example the 'bowels' in Jewish culture is associated with tender emotions such as sympathy, however, in Italian (and English) the translators have sometimes rendered this term with 'heart') in order to make the correct inferences. Thus, this Conceptual Blending Theory can make a considerable contribution to understanding the effects of different translating methods and therefore understanding why translators have chosen certain words/expressions to translate the original text, however only a thorough analysis will prove whether it can account for translation methods within these Protestant Bibles.

References in Section B

- COULSON, S. (2006) Metaphor and Conceptual Blending. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Available from: ScienceDirect [10 July 2009].
- DE WAARD, J. (1974) Biblical Metaphors and Their Translation. *The Bible Translator*, 25, 107-116. Available from: UBS [20 July 2009].
- DÜR, H.-P. (1996) *Giovanni Luzzi. Traduttore della Bibbia e Teologo Ecumenico*, Torino, Claudiana.
- FOSTER, K. (1963) Continental Versions to c.1600: Italian. IN GREENSLADE, S. L. (Ed.) *The Cambridge History of The Bible*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- GUTT, E.-A. (2000) *Translation and Relevance: cognition and context*, Manchester, Boston, St. Jerome Pub.
- KÖVECSÉS, Z. (2000) *Metaphor and emotion: language, culture, and body in human feeling*, Cambridge, New York, Paris, Cambridge University Press; Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.
- LUZZI, G. (1942) *La Bibbia in Italia: l'eco della Riforma nella Repubblica Lucchese, Giovanni Diodati e la sua versione italiana della Bibbia*, Torre Pellice, Claudiana.

- MCELHANON, K. A. (2006) From Simple Metaphors to Conceptual Blending: the mapping of analogical concepts and the praxis of translation. *Notes on Translation (SIL)*, 2, 31-81. Available from: SIL [20 June 2009].
- NIDA, E. A. (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating: with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*, Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- NIDA, E. A. & TABER, C. R. (1969) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden, J. Brill.
- PRICE, J. D. (2008) *A theory for Bible Translation: an optimal equivalence model*, Lewiston, N.Y., Edwin Mellen Press.
- TOURN, G. (2004) Bibbia e protestanti. IN BUZZETTI, C. & GHIDELLI, C. (Eds.) *La Bibbia e l'Italia*. Torino, Claudiana.

2. The methods to be used or the approach to be taken. What similar projects have been undertaken here or elsewhere; have similar methods been used before?

I am basing my work on literature written in English, as there are few works on Bible translation theory in Italian. The principal Bible translating journals (*The Bible Translator* and *The Journal of Translation*) have many works on translating the Bible into other foreign languages. These works will also be a valuable source of literature for this research.

The first task will be to define the corpus of texts for examination. I have already chosen to restrict metaphors to the New Testament for the following reasons:

- It is written in Greek, a language which I am presently studying
- The texts are all of a similar historical period
- The content of the texts is very closely related
- The literary style is relatively homogeneous compared to the Old Testament

I may then narrow down the corpus to a selection of texts, or indeed one book of the New Testament, which will allow for an in-depth analysis of metaphors, whilst removing other variables such as differences in style. Alternatively, it is also possible to select certain types of metaphors according to their semantic domain (i.e. I could look at metaphors regarding body parts, or light).

The metaphors will then be entered into a database and coded on the basis of the categories which are used in the theories of metaphor outlined above.

3. What efforts have been made to ensure that the project does not duplicate work already done?

I have performed extensive bibliographical research and I have exhausted these databases. In addition, my supervisor has been in contact with Professor XXX who is one of Italy's foremost translation scholars and is on the board of the Nida Institute in New York.

4. Students should show familiarity with the research topic by including a bibliography giving publication details for the most relevant literature in the field.

- ARDUINI, S. (1996) *Retorica e traduzione*, Urbino, Università di Urbino.
- BARNWELL, K. G. L. (1974) *Introduction to Semantics and Translation*, High Wycombe, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- BEEKMAN, J. & CALLOW, J. (1974) *Translating the Word of God*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing House.
- BERTALOT, V. (1980) *Tradurre la Bibbia: problemi di traduzione della Bibbia ebraica*, Leumann, Torino; Roma, Elle Di Ci; Alleanza Biblica Universale.

- BUZZETTI, C. (1973) *La Parola tradotta*, Brescia, Morcelliana.
- BUZZETTI, C., GHIDELLI, C. (1998) *La Traduzione della Bibbia nella Chiesa Italiana: il Nuovo Testamento*, Cinisello Balsamo (Milano), San Paolo.
- BYATT, A. (1995) *New Testament Metaphors: illustrations in word and phrase*, Edinburgh; USA, Pentland Press.
- DAGUT, M. B. (1971) *A Linguistic Analysis of some Semantic Problems of Hebrew-English Translation* Jerusalem, University of Jerusalem.
- DI, J. & NIDA, E. (2007) *On Translation: an expanded edition*, Hong Kong, City University of Hong Kong Press.
- FAUCONNIER, G. (1994) *Mental Spaces: aspects of meaning construction in natural language*, Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.
- FAUCONNIER, G. (1997) *Mappings in Thought and Language*, Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.
- FAUCONNIER, G. & SWEETSER, E. (1996) *Spaces, Worlds, and Grammar*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- FAUCONNIER, G. & TURNER, M. (2002) *The Way We Think: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*, New York, Basic Books.
- FEYAERTS, K. (2003) *The Bible Through Metaphor and Translation: a cognitive semantic perspective*, Oxford ; New York, P. Lang.
- GLASSMAN, E. H. (1981) *The Translation Debate: what makes a Bible translation good?*, Downers Grove, Ill, InterVarsity.
- GRUDEM, W. A. (2005) *Translating Truth: the case for essentially literal Bible translation*, Wheaton, Ill., Crossway Books.
- GUTT, E.-A. (2000) *Translation and Relevance: cognition and context*, Manchester, Boston, St. Jerome Publishing.
- JINDO, J. Y. (2006) *Biblical Metaphor Reconsidered: A cognitive approach to poetic metaphor in biblical prophecy*, New York, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- KÖVECSES, Z. (2000) *Metaphor and Emotion: language, culture, and body in human feeling*, Cambridge; New York Paris, Cambridge University Press; Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.
- KÖVECSES, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: a practical introduction*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- KÖVECSES, Z. (2005) *Metaphor in Culture: universality and variation*, Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.
- LAKOFF, G. (1987) *Women, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- LAKOFF, G. & JOHNSON, M. (1980) *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- LAKOFF, G. & TURNER, M. (1989) *More than cool reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- LARSON, M. L. (1998) *Meaning-Based Translation. A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*, New York, University Press of America.
- LOUW, J. P. (1991) *Meaningful translation: its implications for the reader*, Reading, UK; New York, United Bible Societies.
- MARGOT, J. C. (1979) *Traduire sans trahir: la théorie de la traduction et son application aux textes bibliques*, [Lausanne], Age d'homme.
- MARTIN, R. P. (1989) *Accuracy of Translation: The Primary Criterion in Evaluating Bible Versions; with Special Reference to the New International Version*, Edinburgh, Banner of Truth.
- MCELHANON, K. A. (2006) From simple metaphors to conceptual blending: the mapping of analogical concepts and the praxis of translation. *Notes on Translation (SIL)*, 2, 31-81. Available from: SIL [20 June 2009].

- NICHOLS, A. H. (1996) *Translating the Bible: a critical analysis of E. A. Nida's theory of dynamic equivalence and its impact upon recent Bible translations*. Sheffield, The University of Sheffield.
- NIDA, E. & DE WAARD, J. (1986) *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation*, Nashville, Thomas Nelson.
- NIDA, E. & REYBURN, W. D. (1981) *Meaning across cultures: a study on Bible translating*, Maryknoll, N.Y., Orbis.
- NIDA, E. A. (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating: with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*, Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- NIDA, E. A. (1984) *Signs, Sense, Translation*, Roggebaai, Cape Town, Bible Society of South Africa.
- NIDA, E. A. & TABER, C. R. (1969) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden, J. Brill.
- NOSS, P. A. (Ed.) (2007) *A History of Bible Translation*, Rome, Edizioni de storia e letteratura.
- PHILLIPS, J. B. (1967) *Ring of Truth: a translator's testimony*, New York, Macmillan.
- PORTER, S. E. (2001) Some Issues in Modern Translation Theory and Study of the New Testament. *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*, 9, 350-382.
- PORTER, S. E. & HESS, R. S. (2004) *Translating the Bible: problems and prospects*, London ; New York, T & T Clark International.
- REISS, K. (2000) *Translation Criticism - The Potentials & Limitations: categories and criteria for translation quality assessment*, New York, American Bible Society.
- RYKEN, L. (2003) *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation*, Wheaton, Illinois, Crossway.
- SCORGIE, G. G., STRAUSS, M. L. & VOTH, S. M. (Eds.) (2003) *The Challenge of Bible Translation: communicating God's Word to the world*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing House.
- SOSKICE, J. M. (1985) *Metaphor and Religious Language*, Oxford London; New York, Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.
- SOSKICE, J. M. (2007) *The kindness of God: metaphor, gender, and religious language*, Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press.
- STINE, P. C. (1990) *Bible Translation and the Spread of the Church : the last 200 years*, Leiden; New York, E.J. Brill.
- TURNER, C. V. (2002) *Biblical Bible Translating*, Sovereign Grace Publishers, Lafayette.
- WENDLAND, E. R. (2004) *Translating the Literature of Scripture*, Dallas; Winona Lake, Indiana, SIL International; Distributed by Eisenbrauns.
- WILT, T. (Ed.) (2003) *Bible Translation: frames of reference*, Manchester, UK; Northampton, MA, St. Jerome Pub.

C. CANDIDATURE PLAN

1. The supervisor should assist the student to prepare a framework for the research, with a general timeframe for completion of the various phases and a detailed timeframe for the next 12 months. Each Annual Progress Report will include an update of the general plan and a detailed plan for the next 12 months.

Agreed Task / Milestones	Date to be completed by
Completion of AACE7000 (Academic Conduct Essentials Unit) for those who enrolled at UWA for the first time from 1 January 2008. Details can be found at http://www.ace.uwa.edu.au/	N/A
Completion of Greek1151	JUNE 2009 - COMPLETED
Present my research proposal in an oral presentation to the Faculty	JULY 2009 - COMPLETED
Hand in Research Proposal	AUGUST 2009
Completion of Greek1152	NOVEMBER 2009
Submission of a written paper (approximately 10000 words). This will include a summary of the history of Bible production in Italy and a survey of Bible translation theories.	FEBRUARY 2010
By this date I will have defined my corpus of metaphors and I will have entered them into a database.	JULY 2010
I will have completed the coding of these metaphors. For each of the metaphors, the Greek original will be coded in terms of the translation theories, and the translation into Italian will be analysed and coded in the database.	FEBRUARY 2011
The composition stage: I will have drafted three chapters: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. History of Bible production in Italy 2. Theoretical approaches to Bible translating. This chapter will also include the methodology of this research based on the discussion of translation theories. 3. The findings. 	DECEMBER 2011
Final Stage: editing, printing and binding the dissertation.	FEBRUARY 2012
In addition, I will be required to participate in disciplinary activities (including research seminars by fellow students).	

2. All new PhD students are required within a period of twelve months to complete designated tasks and meet agreed milestones in order for their ongoing candidature to be confirmed. If you are enrolled in a PhD please identify your Confirmation of Candidature tasks and indicate the date at which they will be completed.
3. In partnership with your supervisor(s), please undertake a skills audit to determine if you possess the generic skills required to bring your project to a timely completion. Please identify the special skills your project requires of you, and if you do not possess them map out a strategy for their achievement.
 1. Knowledge of the Italian language
Satisfactory level already achieved.
 2. Familiarity with translation theory
This will need to be further developed through the large body of literature available.
 3. Familiarity of ancient Greek.
I have already completed BEGINNERS' GREEK1151. I am now enrolled in BEGINNERS' GREEK 1152
4. Regulation 9.1 (d.) of the Code of Good Practice for Graduate Research Supervision states that students are expected to devote at least 30 hours per week (or equivalent if the candidature is part-time) to research higher degree studies. If your normal working hours are going to be anything less than 30 hours Monday to Friday 9am-5pm then please outline what they will be.

D. FACILITIES

1. In addition to confirming that proper supervision is available for the project, please comment on any other requirements, for example:
Supervision has been allocated for this project. A/Prof XXX is my supervisor.
2. Special Equipment - if not already available, how it will be obtained.
N/A
3. Special Literature - if not available from the Library, how will access to it be obtained?
The texts for study - *Riveduta*, *Nuova Diodati*, *Nuova Riveduta* and *Parola del Signore* - have already been purchased. Luzzi's *Bibbia* is still in circulation and can be purchased online.
Other essential literature can be obtained through interlibrary loans.

E. ESTIMATED COSTS

What funds will the School commit to maintain the project? Please include all contributions that the School will make, excluding staff salaries and building/infrastructure costs. Please provide a breakdown of the costs, including, for example, items such as photocopying, telephone, computing and other administrative costs as well as costs specific to the research project.

I will require normal infrastructural support. I have attached a document of funding made available by the School of XXX. Below is a list of estimated costs.

PHOTOCOPYING (MAX. 1000 PAGES PER ANNUM AT 10C PER COPY)

\$300

PRINTING (MAX. 300 PAGES PER ANNUM AT 10C PER COPY)

\$90

IN ADDITION I PLAN ON PRESENTING MY FINDINGS AT THE *NIDA SCHOOL FOR TRANSLATION STUDIES* IN 2011 (DATE AND LOCATION HAVE NOT YET BEEN SPECIFIED). THE COURSE AND ACCOMMODATION ARE FREE. FOR THIS TRIP, I INTEND TO USE THE G.R.S. TRAVEL GRANT (\$1750) AND ADDITIONAL FUNDING FROM THE SCHOOL OF XXX (RESEARCH GRANT UP TO \$3000) WHICH SHOULD COVER THE FLIGHT EXPENSES.

(FLIGHT) **\$2500**
(DAILY SUBSISTENCE) **\$ 500**

TOTAL **\$3390**
\$1130 p.a.

F. FIELDWORK

If you are conducting fieldwork as part of your research, you must read the University's Field Work Policy which can be found at http://www.safety.uwa.edu.au/policies/field_work Are you familiar with the University's Insurance Policy which can be found at <http://www.safety.uwa.edu.au/policies/student?>

Fieldwork is not required for this project.

G. SUPERVISORS

Each student must have a supervisor who is nominated as the Coordinating supervisor. The Coordinating supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the administrative and reporting requirements of the supervisors are met. This supervisor will receive all correspondence from the Graduate Research and Scholarships Office relating to your candidature, and is responsible for communication with and between other supervisors. The Coordinating supervisor must be a member of staff of this university.

Title, First Name, Surname	A/PROF XXX		
UWA School	XXX		
Email	XXX		
Supervision type	Coordinating		%99
Title, First Name, Surname	Dr. XXX		
UWA School or address	XXX		
Email	XXX		
Supervision type	Co-supervisor	<input type="checkbox"/> External	%1

If a student is enrolled in Joint Schools, there must be a Coordinating supervisor from each School.

Where a student has more than one supervisor, the supervisors and the student must discuss the roles of each supervisor, record this in writing and lodge the record with the Graduate Research and Scholarships Office as part of the Research Proposal.

Please provide a list of your supervisors and their role, including percentages, as indicated in the Research Proposal Cover Sheet.

H. CONFIDENTIALITY & INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

If your thesis is likely to contain information of a confidential nature, you must draw this to the attention of the Board of the Graduate Research School from the outset, or as soon as it becomes apparent.

You must also draw the Board's attention to any intellectual property issues that need to be considered, including any existing intellectual property of value that is pertinent to the research and to any agreements that may affect your right to intellectual property arising out of the research.

A simple guide for Research students as to confidentiality and intellectual property issues is available at <http://www.postgraduate.uwa.edu.au/policies>

Students who are likely to be affected by matters concerning confidentiality or intellectual property should familiarise themselves with Rules 1.3.1.24-1.3.1.30 of the University General Rules for Academic Courses, General Provisions for Research Higher Degrees (by thesis) and with the University's Intellectual Property Policy. Both are available on the WWW at <http://www.postgraduate.uwa.edu.au/policies>

This thesis does not raise any issues regarding confidential or intellectual property.

I. APPROVALS

The Head of School is required to certify on the Research Proposal that all necessary approvals in relation to it have been obtained from the appropriate University of Western Australia committees (see www.postgraduate.uwa.edu.au/forms?f=145053 for relevant contact details). Approvals will be required prior to the use of animals, the participation of human subjects, genetic manipulation, potentially biohazardous procedures and situations, the use and disposal of potent teratogens and carcinogens, the use of ionising radiation, or other matters of a hazardous nature. It is the responsibility of the student, the supervisor and the Head of School to ensure that appropriate approvals have been obtained. Similarly, it is essential that all required safety and other training is complete prior to the commencement of research

J. SUBMISSION OF THE RESEARCH PROPOSAL/DETAILS OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

Having prepared the proposal:

- Students should complete a Research Proposal Coversheet and submit **TWO** copies of their proposal and coversheet through the supervisor and Head of School/Graduate Research Coordinator to the Graduate Research School.
- Prospective students applying on the basis of an incomplete PhD from another institution should complete the Application Form and submit **TWO** copies of the Details of Proposed Research and application form (plus other supporting documentation as required) through the proposed supervisor and Head of School/Graduate Research Coordinator to the Graduate Research School.
- Applicants applying to transfer (upgrade) from a Masters programme at UWA to the PhD should complete the Application to Upgrade Form and submit **TWO** copies of the Details of Proposed Research and Upgrade form through the proposed supervisor and Head of School/Graduate Research Coordinator to the Graduate Research School.

Students, supervisors and Heads of School must ensure that the coversheet is completed and signed, as it certifies that the assurances made therein have been made to the Board. NO RESEARCH PROPOSAL OR APPLICATION FOR CANDIDATURE CAN BE CONSIDERED WITHOUT THESE ASSURANCES.