KOLOKASI DI BIDANG PENERJEMAHAN

Purwani Indri Astuti [3]

Abstrak

Di bidang penerjemahan, kolokasi merupakan hal penting yang perlu diperhatikan oleh penerjemah karena ketepatan dalam menerjemahkan kolokasi akan mempengaruhi kualitas terjemahan yang dihasilkan. Kualitas terjemahan itu sendiri dipengaruhi oleh 3 aspek, yaitu: ketepatan, keberterimaan dan keterbacaan. Keberhasilan penerjemah dalam menerjemahkan kolokasi tersebut sangat mempengaruhi tingkat keterbacaan yang dihasilkan. Salah satu jenis kolokasi yang banyak mendapat perhatian uintuk ketelitian dalam terjemahan adalah jenis kolokasi verb + object. Terdapat dua faktor penyebab suatu kata memiliki jangkauan kolokasi terbatas, yaitu tingkat ketidaklaziman dan pengertian suatu kata. Karena kekhususan kolokasi ini, maka masalah dan kesulitan dalam penerjemahan kolokasi disebabkan karena beberapa hal: 1) pengaruh pola teks sumber yang 'kuat', 2) salah menginterpretasikan makna kolokasi B.Su, 3) pertentangan antara keakuratan dan kealamiahan, 4) kolokasi khusus berdasarkan budaya, 5) kolokasi tidak lazim pada bahasa sumber.

Keywords: kolokasi, kualitas terjemahan

Pendahuluan

Kegiatan penerjemahan memiliki peran dan fungsi yang strategis untuk menjembatani proses komunikasi antar bahasa yang berbeda. Kompetensi penerjemah dalam mentransfer pesan dari Bahasa Sumber (B.Su) ke dalam Bahasa Sasaran (B.Sa) mutlak diperlukan. Penerjemah tidak hanya cukup mampu melaksanakan komunikasi dengan dua bahasa yang berbeda, akan tetapi penerjemah juga harus memiliki kompetensi penerjemahan baik berupa *linguistic competence* ataupun *extra linguistic competence*. Hal inilah yang membedakan seorang penerjemah dengan seorang dwibahasawan. Seorang dwibahasawan belum tentu mampu menjadi penerjemah, akan tetapi seorang penerjemah pastilah seorang dwibahasawan. Dengan berbekal kemampuan linguistik dan ekstra linguistik, penerjemah diharapkan dapat menghasilkan terjemahan yang berkualitas, yang memenuhi unsur ketepatan, keberterimaan dan keterbacaan. Hasil terjemahan seorang penerjemah diharapkan tidak hanya tepat dalam makna, akan tetapi juga berterima dan mudah dipahami bagi pembaca sasaran.

Untuk memenuhi ketiga aspek tersebut di atas, bukanlah hal yang sederhana bagi penerjemah. Seringkali dijumpai sebuah terjemahan yang

---

[3] Purwani Indri Astuti *adalah* Dosen di Universitas Veteran Bangun Nusantara Sukoharjo

kalau dibaca malah membuat bingung pembacanya, atau setidaknya pembaca merasa aneh dengan terjemahan tersebut. Sebagai contoh misalnya: Saya membelanjakan liburan saya yang lalu dengan keluarga saya, yang merupakan hasil terjemahan dari kalimat sumbernya *I spent my last holiday with my family*. Keanehan makna dalam terjemahan tersebut bisa terjadi karena kompetensi penerjemah masih pada tataran aturan atau kaidah, dan belum pada tataran interaksi. Dalam hal ini, makna 'membelanjakan liburan' masih dapat dipahami oleh penutur bahasa sasaran karena makna membelanjakan bisa berarti menghabiskan uang. Akan tetapi bentuk semacam itu menjadi aneh/tidak lazim. Keadaan semacam ini sering ditemukan dalam bidang penerjemahan, yang kemudian disebut dengan kolokasi atau sanding kata. Kolokasi ini menjadi masalah yang penting dicermati oleh penerjemah karena dimensi bahasa terhadap peristiwa, fenomena dan lingkungan yang berbeda-beda akan menghasilkan efek yang berbeda pula melalui kolokasi leksikalnya.

Pengertian Kolokasi

Kolokasi atau sanding kata dalam bahasa Inggris disebut dengan *collocation*. Secara sederhana, kolokasi dapat dipahami sebagai *asosiasi tetap kata dengan kata lain dalam lingkungan yang sama* (Hoetomo, 2005: 279). Dalam bahasa Inggris, Leech menyatakan, "...*consist of the associations a word acquires on account of the meanings of words which tend to occur in its environment* (1974: 20). Selanjutnya, Hatim dan Munday (2004: 249) menyebutkan, "*Collocation refers to the way that words are typically used together"*. Sementara Baker (1992:47) menyatakan "....*to think of collocation in terms of the tendency of certain words to co-occur regularly in a given language"*. Dari beberapa pendapat tersebut di atas, dapat disampaikan bahwa kolokasi merupakan suatu fenomena kebahasaan yang menunjukkan suatu kata selalu bersanding dengan kata tertentu yang muncul pada konteks tertentu dan tidak dapat disandingkan dengan kata lainnya untuk menyatakan makna yang berbeda dari makna denotatifnya, dilihat dari sudut pandang penutur.

Pada contoh di atas (*I spent my last holiday with my family*) arti kata *spent* dalam bahasa Indonesia adalah' membelanjakan'. Kata ini tidak bisa bersanding dengan kata liburan karena kata membelanjakan identik dengan mengeluarkan uang untuk dibelikan barang-barang. Ketika kata *spent (v-past dari spend)* dikolokasikan dengan kata *holiday*, makna kata tersebut berubah menjadi 'menghabiskan' karena kata tersebut lebih berterima di dalam bahasa sasarannya. Pada kasus semacam ini, terjadi perbedaan dalam menyandingkan kata *spend*/membelanjakan. Apabila penerjemah setia pada kolokasi B.Su maka terjemahan yang dihasilkan akan menjadi tidak berterima bahkan sangat mungkin mengakibatkan terjadinya distorsi pesan dalam B.Sa. Contoh kasus kolokasi yang lain misalnya dalam bahasa Indonesia didapatkan kata 'membasuh' yang berkolokasi dengan kata 'wajah/muka', kaki/tangan, badan, yang dalam hal ini merupakan bagian tubuh manusia. Kata ‘membasuh tersebut tidak dapat disandingkan dengan kata yang lain, misalnya kata ‘mobil’. Untuk kata ‘mobil’ bisa disandingkan dengan kata ‘mencuci’.

Selain kasus tersebut di atas, terdapat kolokasi yang tidak hanya menunjukkan makna sandingan saja, namun bisa berhubungan dengan masalah budaya dalam B.Su ataupun B.Sa. Sebagai contoh:

B.Su : *The young man hasn’t got a good job since he got fired from his office. Now, he only has fish and chips for his lunch.*

B.Sa : Laki-laki muda itu belum mendapatkan pekerjaan yang bagus sejak dia di PHK dari kantornya. Sekarang dia hanya makan *ikan dan keripik* untuk makan siangnya.

Pada contoh di atas dapat dilihat bahwa kata *fish and chips* dalam B.Sa dapat dipadankan dengan ikan dan keripik. Dalam hal ini, kata ikan dan keripik disandingkan dan berada dalam konteks makanan. Akan tetapi dalam kasus ini terjadi perbedaan budaya antara B.Su dan B.Sa. Pada budaya B.Su, penulis berusaha menunjukkan bahwa *fish and chips* merupakan makanan alternatif yang bisa dipilih ketika seseorang tidak memiliki uang yang banyak untuk membeli makanan. Dengan kata lain, ketika seseorang tidak bisa membeli makanan yang berharga mahal dan enak, *fish and chip* merupakan makanan yang bisa dipilih. Sementara dalam budaya B.Sa, makanan ikan dan keripik tidak bisa dikategorikan sebagai makanan yang murah karena tidak semua orang mampu membeli ikan dan keripik. Untuk jenis ikan yang bisa dianggap murah, orang akan mengatakan dengan ikan asin dan bukan hanya ikan saja. Untuk itu dalam contoh kasus ini, terjemahan yang lebih bisa berterima akan menjadi seperti ini:

B.Sa : Laki-laki muda itu belum mendapatkan pekerjaan yang bagus sejak dia di PHK dari kantornya. Sekarang dia hanya makan tahu-tempe untuk makan siangnya.

Pada terjemahan tersebut di atas, makna kalimat secara keseluruhan menjadi koheren dan berterima karena kolokasi kata *tahu-tempe* dapat mewakili kondisi yang ingin disampaikan dari teks B.Su ke dalam B.Sa, yaitu kondisi seseorang yang tidak mampu membeli makanan yang mahal dan enak karena keadaan keuangannya yang tidak mendukung semenjak di PHK. Dalam kasus ini kata tahu-tempe juga dikolokasikan dengan budaya B.Sa karena tahu tempe merupakan makanan lokal tradisional yang dapat dengan mudah dijumpai masyarakat B.Sa dan harganya yang relatif murah. Oleh karena itu, masalah kolokasi tidak hanya pada struktur kata yang bersanding, tetapi juga bisa kata-kata yang disandingkan dengan budaya baik B.Su nya ataupun B.Sa nya.

Jenis-jenis Kolokasi

Secara garis besar, Newmark dalam buku A Text of Translation menyebutkan ada 3 jenis kolokasi yang mempengaruhi penerjemahan. Ketiga jenis kolokasi itu adalah:

1. Adjective plus Noun, misalnya *heavy labour, runaway, economic situation*
2. Noun plus Noun, misalnya *nerve cell, government securities, eyeball*
3. Verb plus object, misalnya *pay a visit, score a victory, read a paper*

(1988: 212)

Dari ketiga jenis kolokasi di atas, yang paling membutuhkaan keakuratan penerjemah dalam penerjemahan Inggris – Indonesia adalah jenis kolokasi yang ketiga. Dalam bahasa Inggris (sebagai teks B.Su), ketika suatu kata kerja diikuti dengan obyek yang menjadi kolokasinya maka dalam bahasa Indonesia (sebagai teks B.Sa) penerjemah dituntut lebih akurat dalam menerjemahkannya karena kolokasi kata tersebut bisa memiliki makna yang sangat variatif dan spesifik. Sebagai contoh, kata *cook* berikut ini:

1. *I cook some cookies for this ceremony*. (memasak)
2. *Mother cooks rice every morning.* (menanak)

Pada contoh di atas dapat dilihat bahwa kata *cook* berarti memasak, lazimnya diikuti dengan kata/benda lain yang mengarah pada jenis masakan atau kue. Namun demikian, ketika kata *cook* tersebut disandingkan dengan kata *rice*, maka kata *cook* tersebut memiliki arti yang berbeda dengan kata sebelumnya. Dalam hal ini *cook rice* lebih lazim diartikan dengan menanak nasi dan bukan memasak nasi.
Contoh lain yang bisa dilihat pada kasus ini adalah:

1. The water runs to a lower area.
2. The little boy's nose runs heavily
3. *We thank to God for the programme can run well.*
4. The washing machine runs smoothly

Contoh-contoh di atas, kata *run* (*verb*) berkolokasi dengan *object* yang memiliki arti berbeda-beda meskipun contoh-contoh tersebut semuanya merujuk pada suatu proses.

Sebaliknya, ketika bahasa Indonesia menjadi B.Su dan bahasa Inggris menjadi B.Sa juga ditemukan permasalahan yang sama terkait dengan kolokasi. Perhatikan contoh berikut ini:

1. Adikku minum susu setiap pagi (*My little sister drinks milk every morning*)
2. Pasien itu harus minum obat secara rutin *(The patient must take some medicines routinely*)

Pada contoh ini, minum susu dan minum obat memiliki kolokasi yang berbeda dalam B.Sa (bahasa Inggris). Minum susu memiliki kolokasi *drink milk*, sementara minum obat memiliki bentuk kolokasi *take a medicine* dan tidak lazim disebut dengan *drink a medicine.*

Dari berbegai kasus kolokasi yang telah dipaparkan di atas, dapat disampaikan bahwa setiap bahasa memiliki kelaziman kolokasi yang berbeda-beda. Kelaziman ini disebut dengan jangkauan kolokasi. Penyebab dari jangkauan kolokasi ini ada beberapa faktor. Yang pertama, faktor ketidaklaziman. Jangkauan kolokasi yang terjadi karena faktor ketidaklaziman ini biasanya lebih luas karena kata yang disandingkan sangat umum. Dengan kata lain, semakin umum kata tersebut maka semakin luas jangkauan kolokasinya. Sebagai contoh misalnya kata *burry* memiliki jangkauan kolokasi yang lebih luas dibandingkan kata *inter*. Perhatikan contoh berikut ini: *Only people can be interred, but you can burry people, treasures, your head, face, feelings,and memories* (Baker, 1992: 50). Dari contoh tersebut jelas dapat disampaikan bahwa kata 'inter' memiliki jangkauan kolokasi yang sangat terbatas. Sementara itu, kata 'burry' memiliki jangkauan kolokasi yang lebih luas karena dapat disandingkan dengan beberapa kata, misalnya: 'people, treasures, feeling,...., even memories'.

Faktor kedua terjadinya jangkauan kolokasi adalah disebabkan karena adanya *sense* (pengertian) suatu kata.Hal ini dapat terjadi apabila suatu kata memiliki berbagai macam pengertian sehingga berakibat kata tersebut memiliki berbagai kolokasi untuk setiap pengertian yang dimiliki. Sebagai contoh adalah kata *run* (contoh di atas) yang memiliki beberapa arti sehingga kata tersebut dapat disandingkan atau dikolokasikan dengan berbagai kata lain sesuai dengan arti yang dimaksudkan.

Dari kedua kasus di atas, dapat disampaikan bahwa jika suatu kata diterjemahkan dengan kolokasi yang sama pada kata yang berkolokasi berbeda dalam B.Sa, maka hasil terjemahan tersebut menjadi tidak berterima. Keadaan semacam ini dapat menimbulkan perselisihan kolokasi yang akan dibahas pada sub bab selanjutnya.

Perselisihan Kolokasi (Interferensi)

Yang dimaksudkan dengan perselisihan kolokasi di sini adalah penggunaan kolokasi B.Su di dalam B.Sa. Kasus ini biasa disebut dengan istilah interferensi dan sering dilakukan oleh pembelajar bahasa asing. Interferensi ini bisa terjadi pada tataran leksikal maupun gramatikal. Sebagai contoh interferensi yang terjadi pada tataran leksikal misalnya kata 'ekonomi' dalam bahasa Indonesia (sebagai B.Su) bisa berkolokasi dengan berbagai kata benda lainnya, semisal ahli ekonomi, ekonomi rakyat, fakultas ekonomi, masyarakat ekonomi, dll. Namun tidak demikian hal nya dengan bahasa Inggris (sebagai B.Sa) yang memiliki konsep yang berbeda antara ekonomi dalam konteks pendidikan dan ekonomi dalam konteks kegiatan ekonomi. Dalam satu kasus, semisal frasa fakultas ekonomi (B.Su) tidak bisa serta merta dialihkan ke dalam bahasa Inggris (sebagai B.Sa) menjadi *faculty of economy*. Ada perbedaan konsep yang terjadi di sini. Dalam contoh di atas, fakultas ekonomi akan diterjemahkan menjadi *faculty of economics*. Oleh karena itu, antara B.Su dan B.Sa memiliki bentuk kolokasi yang berbeda. Contoh lain yang bisa dilihat semisal frasa *Indonesian University* yang merupakan terjemahan dari 'Universitas Indonesia' tidak lazim diterapkan dalam B.Sa (bhasa Inggris) karena memiliki bentuk yang lebih lazim dengan menggunaka preposisi *of* daripada bentuk tersebut sebelumnya (Soenarno, 2006: 6).

Sementara itu, interferensi yang terjadi pada tataran gramatika dapat dilihat pada contoh berikut ini: (B.Su) Anak-anak *sudah* pulang ke rumah.

(B.Sa) *The children are gone home.*

Pada contoh di atas terdapat ketidak laziman gramatika yang digunakan *(menggunakan to be+ V3)*, meskipun dari segi makna kalimat tersebut dapat dipahami. Secara gramatika yang baik, kalimat di atas akan lebih lazim menjadi *the children have gone home.*

Concordance

Concordance dalam hal ini diartikan dengan 'keharmonisan'. Dari permasalahan tentang perselisihan kolokasi yang telah dibahas di atas, dapat disampaikan bahwa kolokasi yang konsisten secara sempurna tidak mungkin dilakukan diantara dua bahasa yang berbeda. Yang mungkin terjadi adalah konsistensi kata yang muncul secara berulang-ulang dalam suatu kalimat yang menghasilkan keharmonisan gramatika dari kalimat tersebut. Larson(1984: 147) membagi 2 jenis keharmonisan ini, yaitu *real concordance* dan *pseudo concordance.* Keharmonisan jenis pertama (*real concordance*) adalah kata yang memiliki kolokasi yang konsisten dan memiliki acuan makna yang sama. Dalam hal ini, kata tersebut digunakan berulang-ulang namun masih memiliki makna yang sama. Perhatikan contoh berikut ini:

> *The boy* ***run*** *to the store,* ***run up*** *to the storekeeper, and asked for a can of milk. Then he* ***run out*** *to the street and holding the milk tightly,* ***run*** *home as fast as he could* ***run****.*

Pada contoh tersebut, kata *run* memiliki kolokasi yang konsisten dan mengacu pada makna yang sama terhadap kata *run* lainnya. Tidak ada kendala bagi penerjemah dalam usahanya menjaga konsistensi kolokasi dalam B.Su. Namun hal ini akan menjadi berbeda apabila teks mengandung inkonsistensi makna sesuai dengan kolokasinya, sebagaimana dalam contoh berikut ini:

> *The motor of his car stop* ***running****. The man did not know what to do. He was near a brook which was* ***runnning*** *under the road through a culvert. He thought about using some of the water to cool the engine. But he decided he would* ***run*** *back to town and see if he might* ***run*** *into someone who could help him (Larson, 1984: 148)*

Contoh di atas menunjukkan bentuk keharmonisan jenis yang kedua (*pseudeo concordance*) karena adanya inkonsistensi makna yang berubah sesuai dengan kolokasinya, walaupun kata yang digunakan tetap sama, tapi memiliki referen yang berbeda sesuai dengan kolokasi dan konteks yang melingkupi kata tersebut.

Kesulitan dan Masalah Kolokasi di Bidang Penerjemahan

Kesulitan dan masalah kolokasi dalam penerjemahan bisa terjadi akibat beberapa perbedaan pola kolokasi dalam B.Su dan B.Sa. Baker (1992: 54) mengklasifikasikan kesulitan dan masalah tersebut menjadi 5 hal, yaitu:

1. Pengaruh Pola Teks Sumber yang ‘Kuat’
   Seorang penerjemah tidak akan menemukan permasalahan yang berarti terkait dengan perbedaan pola-pola leksikal antara B.Su dan B.Sa tersebut jika pada B.Sa, kolokasi yang digunakan untuk mengungkapkan makna yang sama dengan makna kolokasi pada B.Su dapat ditemukan. Sebagai contoh, di Arab frasa *break the law* merupakan kolokasi yang tidak berterima. Kolokasi yang lazim di Arab dari frasa tersebut adalah *contradict the law’*. Contoh lain misalnya di Denmark, kolokasi kata *keep the dog/cat* tidak lazim digunakan. Kolokasi yang digunakan adala *hold a dog/cat.* Selain itu, adakalanya penerjemah menemukan kesulitan pada teks-teks yang merupakan terjemahkan literal dari bahasa Inggris. Mengutip contoh Baker (1992: 56) kata *shoes repair* diterjemahkan dengan kata *reparer* dalam bahasa Perancis. Padahal kata tersebut dalam bahasa Perancis hanya lazim berkolokasi dengan *automobile* dan bukan dengan ‘sepatu’. Oleh karena itu, pemilihan kata *reparer* menjadi kolokasi yang tidak lazim.
2. Salah Interpretasi pada Makna Kolokasi Bahasa Sumber
   Salah interpretasi pada makna kolokasi bahasa sumber dapat menjadi salah satu faktor masalah dan kesulitan dalam menerjemahkan makna kolokasi tersebut. Kesalahan dalam menginterpretasikan makna kolokasi B.Su ini bisa terjadi karena adanya pengaruh atau gangguan dari B.Sa nya. Contoh yang bisa dipahami dari kasus ini adalah sebagai berikut:
   B.Su : Anita sudah makan malam
   B.Sa 1 : *Anita has eaten her dinner**
   B.Sa 2 : *Anita has had her dinner*
   Dalam contoh tersebut, pembelajar bahasa Inggris atau penerjemah pemula akan beranggapan bahwa terjemahan B.Sa 1 merupakan hasil terjemahan yang sepadan dari B.Su (bahasa Indonesia), khususnya pada kolokasi *eaten dinner*. Padahal perlu diketahui bahwa dalam B.Sa (bahasa Inggris), kata *eat* tidak bisa berkolokasi dengan waktu makan, yaitu *breakfast, lunch, supper and dinner*. Kata tersebut lebih mengacu pada jadwal untuk makan. Jadi contoh perbedaan B.Sa1 dan B.Sa 2 terjadi karena pengaruh B.Su dominan.
3. Pertentangan antara Keakuratan dan Kealamiahan
   Merupakan tantangan tersendiri bagi para penerjemah (khususnya pemula) untuk bisa menerjemahkan kolokasi-kolokasi B.Su yang lazim ke dalam kolokasi-kolokasi B.Sa yang akurat sekaligus berterima. Pada kasus semacam ini, seorang penerjemah harus mengalihkan makna kolokasi B.Su ke dalam B.Sa yang bersifat

khusus, sekaligus penerjemah juga harus mempertahankan makna yang terkait dengan kolokasi B.Su tersebut.

Masalah keakuratan dan kealamiahan berkaitan erat dengan keberterimaan. Suatu terjemahan yang akurat dan alamiah, tingkat keberterimaannya pasti tinggi. Namun demikian hal ini tidak mudah dilakukan oleh penerjemah, apalagi untuk menerjemahkan suatu kolokasi. Sering ditemui kolokasi terdekat yang berterima pada B.Sa akan mengalami perubahan makna. Perubahan makna ini bisa bersifat minimal (tidak signifikan) atau bahkan bersifat signifikan. Masih dalam buku Mona Baker (1992: 56) dicontohkan kolokasi yang dapat menggantikan *hard drink.* Dalam bahasa Inggris, *hard drink* hanya mencakup jenis *whisky, gin,* dan *brandi,* tidak termasuk jenis *beer, lager, sherry.* Namun tidak demikian dalam bahasa Arab. *Hard drink* dalam bahasa Arab mencakup seluruh jenis minuman berakohol (*alcoholic drink)*, mulai dari *whisky, gin, brandi,* dan termasuk *beer, lager*, *sherry.* Pada kasus semacam ini, perubahan makna karena perbedaan kealamiahan dan keberterimaan teks sangat mungkin terjadi. Oleh karena itu, tugas seorang penerjemah untuk selalu mengusahakan keakuratan teks dan juga keberterimaan teks dengan menggunakan pola-pola kolokasi B.Sa yang umum.

4. Kolokasi Khusus berdasarkan Budaya

Pada awal uraian tulisan ini telah disinggung bahwa kolokasi bisa merefleksikan budaya darimana kolokasi tersebut muncul. Apabila suatu teks B.Su memiliki konteks budaya yang berbeda dengan teks B.Sa, maka dimungkinkan kolokasi teks B.Su tersebut mengasosiasikan gagasan yang tidak lazim. Sebagai konsekwensinya, kolokasi tersebut memiliki konsep yang sulit dipahami dalam teks B.Sa.

Pada contoh sebelumnya yang menyebutkan jenis makanan *fish and chips* memiliki arti sebagai simbol untuk menunjukkan kemampuan ekonomi seseorang yang kurang mampu dalam hal finansial. Dalam bahasa Indonesia, kolokasi ini identik dengan makanan ‘tahu-tempe’ yang menunjukkan makanan tradisional yang harganya relatif murah dan biasa dikonsumsi bagi masyarakat kurang mampu sebagai makanan/lauk wajib.

Contoh sejenis misalnya kata sapaan atau *greeting*. Dalam bahasa Indonesia (B.Su), sapaan ‘selamat malam’ lazim diucapkan ketika bertemu dengan seseorang di malam hari dan tidak lazim digunakan untuk perpisahan. Sementara di dalam bahasa Inggris (B.Sa), sapaan ketika bertemu dengan seseorang di waktu malam diucapkan dengan *good evening* dan bukan dengan sapaan *good night.* Di sini terjadi pembedaan antara sapaan waktu bertemu di malam hari dan berpisah di malam hari. Apabila kolokasi B.Su diartikan sebagaimana adanya dalam B.Sa, maka dimungkinkan akan terjadi perbedaan konsep yang mengarah pada penyimpangan pesan dikarenakan perbedaan budaya B.Su dan B.Sa.

Contoh lain perbedaan konsep budaya dalam kolokasi adalah ucapan *ladies and gentlemen* dalam bahasa Inggris (B.Su) yang diterjemahkan menjadi kolokasi ‘bapak-bapak dan ibu-ibu’ dalam bahasa Indonesia (B.Sa). Perbedaan penyebutan kolokasi B.Su dan B.Sa ini menunjukkan konsep budaya yang berbeda antara budaya barat dan timur. Dalam budaya barat, *ladies* disebutkan terlebih dulu ketimbang *gentlemen* karena lingkup budaya barat menganut paham (*ladies’ first)*, wanita yang didahulukan karena dianggap sebagai makhluk lembut dan perlu didahulukan. Sementara dalam lingkup budaya Asia, wanita dianggap inferior terhadap pria (wanita berada di belakang pria), bahkan sebagian besar masyarakat menganut paham patrialism (garis keturunan bapak).

5. Kolokasi Tidak Lazim pada Bahasa Sumber

Pada kasus ini, penggunaan kombinasi kata-kata yang tidak lazim dalam B.Su dimaksudkan untuk menciptakan *image* baru. Terjemahan kolokasi yang tidak lazim atau khas semacam ini idealnya juga harus bersifat khas dalam B.Sa nya sehingga pembaca dapat menangkap makna yang dimaksud dengan baik. Jelas disadari bahwa dalam menerjemahkan kolokasi seperti ini, banyak hambatan-hambatan yang ditemui penerjemah untuk mencari padanan maknanya dan tujuan penerjemahan. Perhatikan contoh berikut:

B.Su : *Dining out. We always go ‘dutch’.*

B.Sa : Setiap kali makan di luar, kita selalu ‘bayar sendiri-sendiri’

Pada contoh tersebut di atas, kolokasi pada B.Su termasuk kolokasi khusus yang memiliki arti untuk menunjukkan orang yang pergi ke luar bersama dengan orang lain (teman) untuk makan bersama, tetapi membayar makanan yang mereka makan secara sendiri-sendiri. Kolokasi *go dutch* merupakan kolokasi khusus dan tidak lazim serta membawa unsur budaya yang sangat kental. Kesulitan menerjemahkan kasus kolokasi semacam ini terletak pada pencarian padanan B.Sa yang tidak dapat ditemukan persis sama dengan B.Su nya.

Penutup

Dari uraian di atas, dapat disampaikan bahwa masalah kolokasi merupakan cara pandang penutur bahasa mengenai proses dan fenomena lingkungannya yang direalisasikan melalui kata yang saling menyanding. Pola kolokasi ada 3, namun pola yang lebih membutuhkan keakuratan dalam menerjemahkan kolokasi dari B.Su ke B.Sa adalah pola *verb plus object.* Kolokasi bisa menjadi permasalahan yang serius apabila di dalam menerjemahkan kolokasi tersebut tidak terdapat padanannya dalam B.Sa, baik padanan leksikal maupun padanan budaya. Ketepatan dalam menerjemahkan kolokasi akan mempengaruhi kualitas terjemahan yang dihasilkan karena kualitas terjemahan ditentukan oleh ketepatan, keberterimaan dan kealamiahan. Secara lebih rinci, kesulitan dan permasalahan kolokasi dapat disebabkan karena 1) Pengaruh Pola Teks Sumber yang ‘Kuat’, 2) Salah Interpretasi pada Makna Kolokasi Bahasa Sumber, 3) Pertentangan antara Keakuratan dan Kealamiahan, 4) Kolokasi Khusus berdasarkan Budaya, 5) Kolokasi Tidak Lazim pada Bahasa Sumber

Daftar Pustaka

Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words. A Course on Translation.* Great Britain: Clays Ltd St. Ives plc.

Bell, Roger T. 1991. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice.* New York: Longman Inc.

Harvey, A and Higgins I. 1992. *Thinking Translation: French to English*. London New York: Routledge.

-------------------------------. 1995. *Thinking Translation: Spanish to English.* London New York: Routledge.

Hatim B and Munday J. 2004. *Translation: An Advance Resource Book*. London New York: Routledge.

Larson, M.L. 1984. *Meaning Based Translation: A Guide to Cross Language Equivalent.* Boston: University Press.

Leech, G. 1974. *Semantics.* Hazel Watson & Viney Ltd. Penguin.

Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation.* London: Prentice Hall

Roseet, M.T. 1994. *Compositional Translation.* Dordrect.

such feedback, none of the respondents opted to stop participating in the class. Instead, three other options of trying to avoid making the same mistakes, not bothering, and being ready to take another risks were chosen of 47%, 31%, and 21% respectively.

So, it might be assumed that the student-student interaction is not a hindrance for learning to take place, and hence, it does not lower motivation because students' self confidence seems to not be negatively affected. Here, interaction is a good motive for students.

The third section was trying to observe how students-lecturer interaction contributed to their classroom motivation. This section was started with a direct item asking what affects the students' motivation providing them with three options ranging from the group work as class setting, the content or the unit of the lesson, and the in-duty lecturer. Providing the fact the students' choice was not limited, more than one tick was allowed. Surprisingly, the majority of the learners that are 12 in number (63%) relate their excitement or motivation to the lecturer who is teaching during the session. Seven students (39%) stated that content was closely related to their motivation. the rest confirmed that group work was their motivation trigger. Concerning the teachers' personality and attitudes in the classroom, the writer had asked the students about the way they liked the lecturers to be. Here, 18 students (95%) boldly opted to express their preference to work with lecturers who are understanding and friendly toward them and the peers. Only one student opted for the “”Others” choice without providing any reasons. None of the respondents chose the other two options in which preferred lecturers are the ones who either simply guide and explain the content or the unit or are disciplinarians. To conclude this section and the questionnaire in its general term, two items are added asking the subjects to compare the degree of their motivation in its general terms. They were asked whether the degree of their motivation before and after attending university classes remained the same. Out of 19 respondents, all confirmed positive change upon joining the classes. The reasons expressed vary from increased enjoyment in learning English as the foreign language, increased interest in upgrading more knowledge, to increased interest in telling English stories.

Conclusion

Motivation, as an affective factor, plays a central role in the sense that it is a crucial force which determines the learners' or students' initiation for taking learning action and be persistent in doing so. The conducted brief study displayed a factual existence that to some Indonesians, particularly to the students under the study, English is not an easy matter. Confirming the number that 90 % of the respondents possessed majorly extrinsic motivation to learn this challenging English, in tertiary level, the in-duty lecturers need to bear in mind some of the followings.

About 58% of the respondents stated their preference to work in groups as it somehow supported them in the learning process and became a source of security. It is assumed that group work, in the respective case, has provided positive peer interaction. The positive atmosphere is reflected in the respondents' open acceptance to peer feedback that, even, was formed in laughter. Despite the common assumption that laughter might also be associated to jeer, the students under study had a different acceptance toward it. Laughter that might happen did not seem to discourage the students from participating in further learning activities which also mean that they are willing to experience more risks. Without positive interaction among the class members, another circumstance might have taken place.

In such circumstance, the in-duty lecturers need to be a part of class learning support system. Considering the fact that these students, who found English not easy, majorly possessed external motivation, the lecturers need to interfere in generating secure learning atmosphere where the learners are willing to risk mistakes in order to learn. Sixty three percent of the students under study stated their preference of having understanding and friendly lecturers. It outnumbered other two options categorized as a knowledged and a disciplinarian one.

Being an outstanding role model in class, lecturers are fortunate enough to authorize the class they are teaching and leading its members toward its successful learning goal. To achieve it, the class members have the necessity to feel secure during the learning process as risks of making mistakes is normal and natural. The security to learn is possible to obtain as the lecturers are willing to understand their students' apprehension and attend to help generating it.

References

Arnold, J. and H.D. Brown (1999): A Map of the Terrain in J. Arnold. (ed). *Affect in Language Learning.* p 1-24. C.U.P

Chambers, G.(1999). *Motivating language Learners*. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

Chomsky, N. (1989) In J. Arnold and H. D. Brown (1999). "A Map of the Terrain" C. U. P.

Clement, R., Gardner, R.C., & Smythe, P.C.(1977). *Motivational Variables in Second Language Acquisition: A Study of Francophones Learning English.* Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 9, p.123-133.

Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K.A. (1994). *Motivation, Self-Confidence and Group Cohesion in the Foreign Language Classroom.* Language Learning, 4, 417-448.

Ellis R. (1999). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. O. U. P.

Franken, Robert E. (1994). *Human Motivation(3rd edition).* Belmont, CA:Brooks/Cole . Publishing Co.

Johnson, D.W & Johnson, R.T.(2009) . An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning. *Educational Researcher*, *38*(5), 365-379.

Kral, T. (ed.) (1999). *Teacher Development : Making the Right Moves.* Selected articles from the English Teaching Forum 1989-1993. U. S Information Agency. Washington, D.C.

Sternberg, J. A. (1995). *In Search of the Human Mind*. Harcourt- Brace International.

Thomas, A. M. (1991). *Classroom Interaction*. Hong Cong. ELBS

ADVERSATIVE CONJUNCTIONS IN INDONESIAN EFL TEACHERS' ACADEMIC WRITING

Agustinus Ngadiman[9]
Connie Tanone[10]

Abstract.

This study focuses on the English adversative conjunctions empl0yed by Indonesian scholars in their academic essays. The data sources for this study were twenty introduction part of the academic writing written by Indonesian EFL teachers published I TEFLIN journals in 2002 – 2011. The instrument of this study was the writer herself. The data were analyzed based on the categorization of adversative conjunction by Murcia and Freeman (1999). The study reveals that there were variety of adversative conjuncts used in the academic essays,: (1) proper, (2) contrastive, (3) correction, (4) dismissal but not all the adversative conjuncts were appropriately used which might not be realized by many writers. 85% of the writers misused the adversative conjuncts in their papers. The might be two possible causes of errors: (1) false-concept of hypothesis and (2) the interference of the L1.

Keywords: academic writing, adversative conjunctions, error

Introduction

Academic discourse are sometimes referred to as research or documented papers especially written with a purpose of either acquitting oneself with important sources of facts in a particular field or simply shedding light on an event, a person, or a current issue through published sources and sometimes unpublished ones. In this respect, researchers look at new evidence and ask new questions; they review these earlier findings and how their own research provides new understanding of the subject (Levin 1987:538).

In college or university, academic essays are written by lecturers for publication in scientific journals. A university student may write a term paper, a thesis or dissertation to be submitted for assessment by the advisor(s) as one of the requirements for joining the next term or obtaining a degree. In writing academic essays (scientific journals, term papers, theses or dissertations) one has to adopt particular formats that have been outlined by the board of editors (scientific journals) and the faculty board (theses or dissertation).

[9] Agustinus Ngadiman adalah Dosen Bahasa Inggris di FKIP Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.
[10] Connie Tanone adalah Kepala Sekolah di SMPKr. Anak Bangsa Surabaya.

Most academic writing includes (1) title, (2) abstract, (3) introduction, (4) review of literature, (5) method, (6) analysis, and (7) conclusion. More specifically, a minimum requirement for an activity to be considered research is that it contains three components, such as a question, data, and analysis and interpretation (Nunan 1992:211). Thus, regardless of the writing format, an academic writing has at least to meet those three components

The requirement that makes an academic writing meaningful is its coherence. a text is coherence when the ideas of the text are related one to another. One of the devices that make threads of sentences in an academic writing coherence is called conjunction. Conjunctions can be categorized into five types (1) additive, (2) adversative, (3) causal, (4) temporal, and (5) continuatives, as presented in the following table.

Table 1. Types of Conjunctions

Types of Conjunctions	
Types	**Forms**
Additive	*and, also, and… too, and… as well, nor, neither, not…, either, or, or else, nor, further, furthermore, in addition, besides,* *additionally, moreover, and another thing, add to this,* *alternatively, in other words, incidentally, by the way, that is to say, that is, I mean, in other words, for example, thus, for* *instance, likewise, similarly, in the same way, on the other hand,* *by/in contrast, conversely.*
Adversative	*yet, though, only, but, nevertheless, however, despite this, all the same, in any case/event, in either case/event, any/either way, whichever, anyhow, at any rate, in any case, that may be, and, on the other hand, at the same time, as against that, in fact, as a matter of fact, actually, to tell the truth, in point of fact, instead, rather, on the contrary, at least, rather, I mean.*
Causal	*So, then, thus, therefore, hence, consequently, because of this,* *then, in that case, in such an event, under those circumstances,* *under the circumstances, otherwise, under other circumstances,* *it follows, for this reason, arising out of this, to this end, for,* *because, in this respect, for, because, in this respect, in regard to this, in other respects, apart from this.*

Temporal	*Then, next, afterwards, just then, at that moment, previously,* *before then, first…, second…, at first…, in the end, finally, at* *last, eventually, at once, there upon, soon, presently, this time,* *next time, next day, 2 minutes later, meanwhile, all this time, by* *this time, up until then, next moment, at this point, secondly,* *first…next, in conclusion, up until now, hitherto, at this point,* *here, from now on, henceforth, to sum up, to resume.*
Continuatives	*now, of course, anyway, surely, after all.*

Halliday and Hasan's classification of conjunctions: an overview (re-adapted from Christiansen 2011).

This study aims to reveal the adversative conjuncts employed in the academic writing by Indonesian EFL teachers. Since in the introduction of an academic writing the writer usually contrast ideas of previous studies, to be specific the study focused on the adversative conjuncts in the introduction section of research articles published in research article Journals of English language teaching.

Adversative Conjuncts in English

Adversative conjunctions are the term proposed by Halliday and Hasan, and adopted by Murcia and Freeman. The basic meaning of adversative is contrary to expectation. The expectation may be derived from the content (Halliday, 1976). From the meaning, we can assume that the conjunctions are used to contrast. This concept is the root. However, some linguists have different term to define the concept. Quirk et al (1972) call contrastive conjunct that covers four classes: reformulatory, replacive, antithetic, and concessive. Other linguists from the field of discourse also name differently; Guy Cook (1989) calls contrastive conjunctions, Swales and Feak (2008) name linking words, Oshima and Hogue (2006) name opposite transitional signals, and Brown et al (1984) name contrastive coordinating words. Brown classifies adversative conjuncts into four groups: (1) proper, (2) contrastive, (3) corrective, and (4) dismissal. Each of which has different function as explained in the following table.

Table 2. Types and functions of adversative conjuncts

No	Type	Lexical Forms	Functions
1	Proper	*but, yet, though, and only*	To oppose ideas
		however,	To relate the certainty

		nevertheless, despite this, in contrast	and uncertainty
2	Contrastive	*in fact*, *actually*, *on the other hand*, and *at the same time*	against of what the current state of communication process to lead to expect
3	Correction	*instead, rather, on the contrary*, and *at least*	against what has just been said,
		instead, *rather,* and *on the contrary*	to replace or substitute one thing with another
4	Dismissal	are *in any case, anyhow*, and *at any rate.*	against what has just been said, or on formulation is rejected in favor of another

Introduction of research articles

Introductions of research articles are important because they play a key role in showing the reference of the research about to be reported in the essay to previous work (Bunton: 2002:58). As such, they set up the reader's expectation and can make it easier to navigate the long text to follow. In line with this statement, Davis (2005: 232) state that introduction for a journal manuscript will specially do these things: (1) almost immediately call attentions to and define or clarify the specific topic for the reader, (2) provide brief precise background necessary for understanding the topic and justifying why the writer is working with it, and (3) clearly define the main focus or objective relative to the subject. In an abstract these things would be done briefly with a sentence of rationale and definition that takes care of the first two things and then a specific statement of the objectives.

Similar to Davis, state that the function of the Introduction is to: (1) establish the context of the work being reported, which is accomplished by discussing the relevant *primary research literature* (with citations) and summarizing the writers' current understanding of the problem you their investigating; (2) state the purpose the work in the form of the hypothesis, question, or problem you investigated; and, (3) briefly explain the rationale and approach and, whenever possible, the possible outcomes the study can reveal. In other words, the Introduction must answer the questions, "*What was I studying*? *Why was it an important question? What did we know about it before I did this study? How will this study advance our knowledge?*"

According to Weissberg and Buker (1990: 20) an introduction of an essay serves as an orientation for readers of the report, giving them the perspective they need to understand the detailed information coming in later section. Bathia (1995: 82) and Bunton (2002:58) therefore assert that introductions of research articles are important because they play a key role in showing the reference of the research about to be reported in the essay to previous work (Bunton: 2002:58). As such, they set up the reader's expectation and can make it easier to navigate the long text to follow.

Weissberg and Buker (1990: 20) suggest the introduction of an academic essay, especially a research-based one, be divided into five parts or stages.

Stage	
1	General statement(s) about a field of research to provide reader with a setting for the problem to be reported.
2	More specific statements about the aspects of the problem already studied by other researchers.
3	Statements that indicate the need for more investigation
4	Very specific statements giving the purpose/ objectives of the writer's study.
5	Optional statements that give a value of justification for carrying out the study.

As summarized in the table above in stage 1, the writer establishes a context, or frame of reference, to help readers understand how the research fits into a wider field of study. In stage 2, the writer reviews the findings of other researchers who have already published in the related field. This stage is often called review of related literature. Stage 3 indicates an area that is not treated in the previous studies, but that is important from the point of view of the writer's own work. Stage 4 formally announces the purpose of the study. This stage serves to stage as consciously as possible the specific objective(s) of the research report. The statement of the purpose should be directly related to the research question upon which the writer based the study. Stage 5 indicates benefits or application of the work. This stage, the statement of value, is written in a way that suggests an attitude of tentativeness or modesty on the part of the author. When writing a report of his/her own study, Weissberg and Buker (1990: 82) suggest the writer should not sound too sure of the benefits, either practical or theoretical, of his/her work. It is conventional to sound more caution.

Swale (1990: 140) refers those stages as "rhetorical moves", while Holmes (1997: 325) defines a "move" as a segment of text that is shaped and constrained by a particular communicative function. Swale calls this model of rhetorical move the 'Create Research Space', as illustrated in the following table.

“Create Research Space (CARS)’ model for research article introduction

Move 1: Establishing a Territory Step 1: Claiming centrality; Step 2: Making topic generalization(s) Step 3: Reviewing items of previous Move 2: Establishing a Niche Step 1A: counter-claiming, or Step 1B: indicating a gap, or Step 1C:Question-raising, or Step 1D: Continuing a tradition Move 3: Occupying the Niche Step 1A Outlining purpose, or Step 1B: Announcing present research, Step 2 : announcing principal findings Step 3 : Indicating research article structure

This echoes Bathia (1993: 30), who suggests that generic or “cognitive structure” shows the moves the writer makes in text in order to achieve his/her communicative purpose in the genre. The communicative purpose of a research article introduction is defined by Bhatia (1993: 82) as marking ‘a link between what has gone before in the relevant field of research and the present work that is being reported’, making it ‘relevant by placing it appropriately in the context of previous research in a particular field of study’

According to Swale and Feak (2004:224) the introduction section of Research papers follow the patterns in table 2 in response to two kinds of competition: competition for research space and competition for readers. In this introduction pattern, the work of others and/or what is known about the world is primary, and the work of the writer is secondary.

Swale’s mode above is modified by Paltridge ans Starffield (2007: 83, as illustrated in the following table.

Move 1: establishing a research territory a. by showing that the general research area is important, central, interesting, problematic, or relevant in some way (optional); b. by introducing and reviewing items of previous research in the area (obligation) Move 2: establishing a niche a. by indicating a gap in the previous research; or by extending previous knowledge in some way (obligation) Move 3: Occupying the niche a. by outlining purpose or stating the nature of the present research b. by listing research questions or hypotheses c. by announcing principal findings d. by stating the value of the present research e. by indicating the structure of the research paper

According Paltridge and Starfield (86-89) in this model Move 1 – establishing a research territory – the writer typically begins to carve out his/her research space by indicating that the general area is in some way significant. This is often done through reviewing previous research in the field. In Addition, the writer may choose to provide background information on the particular topic being investigated and may define key terms which are essential for the study.

Move 2 – establishing a niche – points to a 'gaps' or niche in previous studies which the research will 'fill'. For Swales and Feak (1994), the metaphor for the niche or research space is based on the idea of competition in ecology –academic writers seeking to publish must compete for 'light and space' as do plants and animal. This gap sometimes presented as a problem or need that has been identified as requiring further research. In Move 2 of the framework, the writer typically establishes a niche by indicating a gap in the previous research or possibly extending a current research approach into a new area.

In move 3 – occupying the niche – the writer, by outlining the purposes of his or her research, indicates to the reader how the proposed research will 'fill' the identified niche or gap.

In line with Swale and Feak's model of rhetorical move, Paltrige and Starfield (2007: 82-83) state that the introduction section of a research article typically moves from a fairly general review of the research terrain to the particular issues under investigation through they key moves which capture the communicative purposes of the introduction.: (1) to establish a research territory, (2) to identify a niche or gap in the territory and ; (3) to then signal how the topic in question occupies that niche.

In analyzing The Generic Moves in PhD thesis Introduction, Bunton (2002: 37-75) found that nearly all introductions had sequences of text identifiable as three moves of Swale's (1990) CARS model: Establishing Territory (T), Establishing a Niche (N), and Occupying the Niche (O). The only exception was one author whose introduction did not explicitly establish a niche in the previous research for his researcher to occupy. Further he identified that the moves were cyclical in nearly all introduction. Only in three did the T – N – O moves. The most frequently used cycle was not T – N O, but T – N. this typically occurred as authors were reviewing previous research and pointing out gaps or problems or raising questions as they reviewed the literature, but did not go on to announce their own research until later. On average, Bunton found, there were 2.5 T –N, cycles per introduction, 1.4 T –N – O cycles and 0.7 T – O cycles.

Bunton further found that most introductions began with establishing a territory. Five of these began by announcing the purpose, focus, or scope of the present research (O moves) and two began with a problem statement or claim that there had been little research in the fields (N move). In all cases, the opening O or N was followed by a move to establish the territory (T). He also found that the majority of the introductions analyzed (42 of 45) ended with occupying the niche.

Research Method

The subjects of this study were the Indonesian EFL teachers who wrote academic writing published by academic journals. Indonesian EFL teachers are the representative of scholars who have experiences in writing academic discourse. Second, to have the portrait of the ability of using conjunctions, the subjects must have the advance level of English mastery. They are English teachers in the university level from ten different universities in Indonesia. From 20 papers published in the journals, eight of them were presented in the seminar of English language studies. Since the thesis is a case study research in which the purpose is to investigate a phenomenon in the real context, then the appropriate data source must be the real academic writing written by Indonesian EFL teachers.

The source of data in this study was the research papers of Indonesian EFL teachers published in several journals ranging from 2002 to 2011. There are six journals from there different publishers. The six journals involved four journals published by two universities in Surabaya and in Jogjakarta, and the other two journals were published. The data are classified based on the categorization proposed by the Murcia and Freeman categorization

The Findings

1. Types of Adversative Conjunctions Employed

There are 4 types of adversative conjuncts employed in the research articles und3r study: (1) proper, (2) contrastive, (3) correction, (4) dismissal. Another type of the adversative conjuncts can be categorized as miscellaneous, as they cannot be categorized into any of those four types proposed by the Murcia and Freeman categorization.

1. Proper: *however, nevertheless, despite this, in contrast*

   There are four conjunctions belong to "Proper" adversative category. The most frequent conjunction used was *however* which occurred 15 times of 39 conjunctions (the total occurrence of conjunction). Followed by *nevertheless* which occurred twice. The other two conjunctions *despite* and *in contrast* occurred once. Unfortunately, the high frequent of use of the conjunction *however* was not parallel with its suitable use, because from 15 times occurrence, 12 or 80% of them were used unsuitably. *Nevertheless* which occurred twice, was used suitably once or 50% of the use was suitable. The conjunctions *despite* and *in contrast* appeared once

2. Contrastive.: *in fact, actually, however, on the other hand, at the same time*
   The conjunction *actually* occurred three times and were 100 % suitably used. *In fact* occurred twice and were 100 % suitably used. *On the other hand* occurred twice and 100 % unsuitably used. *At the same time* did not occur at all. At the same time did not occur at all because in many cases it did not show contrast as much as its contemporal relationship. Therefore, the absence can be understood because of its other common function. From the total conjunctions in the source of data, 18, 4 % or 7 conjunctions used are from this category.
3. Correction: *instead, rather, on the contrary, at least*
   The conjunctions in this category were used minimally because of their specific functions. The conjunction *instead* only occurred once and used unsuitably. The other three conjunctions, on the other hand, did not occur at all. Therefore, the conjunction used from this category was only 2, 6% of the total conjunctions used. In fact, after analyzing the data, the writer found several contexts that should use the conjunctions in this category because of their context.
4. Dismissal: *in any case, anyhow, at any rate*
   The conjunctions that show dismissal never occurred in the source of data or 0%. Once again, again after analyzing the use of conjunctions, the writer found the contexts that should have used the conjunctions from this category.
5. Miscellaneous: *although, even though, yet, but, while, whereas*
   Besides the adversative conjunctions based on the categorization by Murcia and Freeman, the writer found some conjunctions operated that show contrast in the sources of data. The writer categorized them in one category, called „Miscellaneous‟. There are six conjunctions in this category; they are *although, even though, yet, but, while,* and *whereas.*
   (a) *Although* is used where there is an unexpected contrast between two propositions, for example: *Reid failed to score himself* ***although*** *he helped Jones score two goals.*
   The unexpected contrast is between the Reid failed himself and helped other score two goals.
   (b) Even though
   Even though is a stronger form of although that used when the contrast is particularly strong to mean “despite the fact that‟, for example:
   Even though Tom doesn’t speak Spanish, I think he still should visit Madrid.
   The strong contrast is between the facts that Tom does not speak Spanish and the intention to visit a city where the official language is the language he does not speak.

(c) Yet

The meaning of *yet* is simply "but at the same time". It refers to denial of expectation, which after the conjunction the condition turns out not to be true. the adversative conjunct "Yet" is used where denial of expectation is not especially strong and formal, for example:

*Mark is lazy, **yet** well intentioned*

The conjunction above can be changed with *but at the same time* without changing the meaning at all. From the sentence, we also know that the context is not formal.

(d) But

The adversative conjunct But is often described as logically equivalent to "and" as can be seen in the examples bellow.

It is raining, ***but*** I am happy.

It is raining ***and*** I am happy.

Both of the uses are true. The different is the meaning. The first sentence means a contrastive situation, and the second sentence means a parallel situation.

(e) Whereas and While

Whereas and *while* are used to express simple differences. Whereas is more formal than while. The formal form for while and whereas is whilst. Below are the examples:

I've got two sisters, ***while*** my best friend has got two brothers.

Read and yellows are warm colors, ***whereas*** blues and greens are cool.

Only 84 people died on railways last year, ***whilst*** more than 5,000 died on the roads.

The miscellaneous conjuncts in the data were categorized based on their functions as follows: (1) Proper: *Although*, *even though*, *yet*, and *but* and (2) Contrastive: whereas and while:

To get clear picture of the adversative conjuncts employed in the research articles under study table 3 summarizes the types of the conjuncts used.

Table 3. Type of Adversative Conjuncts Employed

No	Types	Conjunctions employed	Number of occurrences
1	Proper	However	15
		Nevertheless	2
		Despite this	1
		In contrast	1
2	**Contrasts**	In fact	-
		Actually	3
		However	-

3	**Correction**	*Instead*	-
		Rather	-
		on the contrary	-
		at leas	-
4	**Dismissal**	*in any case,*	-
		Anyhow	-
		, at any rate	-
5	Miscellaneous	*although,.*	1
		even though	1
		yet,	1
		but,	1
		, while	1
		Whereas	1

2. The Erroneous Adversative Conjunctions Employed

There were 24 erroneous conjunctions employed in 20 sources of data. The 24 erroneous conjunctions were caused by intralingual factor, specifically false concept hypothesis. False-concept hypothesis is the result of the subjects' difficulty in particular adversative conjunctions, thus errors occurred in their writing. This may be caused by the perception that conjunctions are synonym or interchangeable as long as they are in the same category. For example the conjunctions „in contrast‟, on the other hand‟, and „on the contrary‟ may be perceived the same, which are very different in function and in context. The understanding that conjunctions are specific is important in English language teaching and learning. The second possible cause is interference of Bahasa Indonesia with 21 times occurrence. The subjects were affected by their L1 can be seen quite clear in several data. In data 8,"whereas‟ is used in: "In Writing III the teacher responded to the students‟ diary entries, whereas in Writing IV their partners responded to their diaries entry." This sentence can be formed in L1 first and then translated into English. In L1 or Bahasa Indonesia, this sentence is, "*Pada Writing III guru merespon diari siswa, sedangkan pada Writing IV rekan-rekannya yang merespon."* "Whereas‟ is "*sedangkan"* (John M. Echols, 1995) in Bahasa Indonesia. L1 interference can be seen in data 14. "The „label‟ was written English with student's active learning or CBSA approach, **yet** the learning activities were very much like the ones I found in my junior high school." This sentence was probably outlined in Bahasa Indonesia as *"Labelnya tertulis English dengan cara belajar siswa aktif atau pendekatan CBSA, namun aktivitas pembelajarannya sama persis dengan yang saya temui di masa sekolah menengah pertama saya."* In Bahasa Indonesia, yet is *namun* (John M. Echols, 1995), therefore L1 interference might take place in this sentence.

Table 4. The Erroneous Adversative Conjunctions Employed

No.	**Types of conjunction used**	**Occurrence**	**Correct**	**Error**
1	*However (Proper)*	*15*	*3*	*12*
2	*On the other hand (Contrastive)*	*2*	*0*	*2*
3	*In fact (Contrastive)*	*2*	*2*	*0*
4	*Nevertheless (Proper)*	*2*	*1*	*1*
5	*Actually (Contrastive)*	*3*	*3*	*0*
6	*Despite (Proper)*	*1*	*1*	*0*
7	*In contrast (Proper)*	*1*	*1*	*0*
8	*Instead (Correction)*	*1*	*1*	*0*
9	*Although (Proper)*	*4*	*3*	*1*
10	*Even though (Proper)*	*2*	*0*	*2*
11	*Yet (Proper)*	*2*	*0*	*2*
12	*But (Proper)*	*2*	*0*	*2*
13	*Whereas (Contrastive)*	*1*	*0*	*1*
14	*While (Contrastive)*	*1*	*0*	*1*
	Total	*39*	*15*	*24*

In short, as illustrated in the table above, the study reveals the following phenomena. First, there were 14 types of conjunctions used in 20 sources of data to show contrast, and 8 of them belong to the category of Murcia and Freeman. The other 6 conjunctions that do not belong to the categorization were securitized based on the functions and contexts and were categorized to the categorization. Second, there were 39 conjunctions used in 20 sources of data. From 39, the correct conjunction employed was 15 or 38 %, and the error made was 24 or 62%. The conjunction *however* is mostly used by the writer to show contrast. This conjunction occurs 15 times, but only 3 of them are appropriate.

Discussion

Based on the findings there are 14 types of conjunctions that show contrast employed in the academic writing under study; 8 of them belong to adversative conjunctions. Unfortunately most of conjunctions were used inappropriately. The misuse may stem to two sources: "false-concept hypotheses" and interference of the L1. Anyhow, the misuse of conjunctions is in the level of local errors, in other words, the errors doe not hinder meaning comprehension. The present study thus support previous studies conducted by previous researchers which found that misuse of conjunctions also happened the advanced English learners. The errors occurred mostly happened to adversative conjunction (Chou 2002). The finding showing that conjunctions were inappropriately employed, according to Chou (2002), is due to inadequate knowledge of the necessary linguistics devices.

The implication of this finding was that conjunctions are important and needed to be addressed in academic writing. Writers of academic writing and advanced writers therefore should be well informed with the e use of adversative conjuncts to create qualified academic discourse.

Conclusion and Suggestions

In order to accomplish the task to contribute to the society and the knowledge of a particular discipline, a teacher deals with academic writing in the form of research, articles, papers and many others. To get the academic writing published, a writer need to show the significance, this can be done in the introduction part. In introduction, the writer shows the gap that he wants to solve. In indicating the gap, he needs to make use of the adversative conjunctions correctly. This study was intended to give benefits for all scholars, especially for those who write academic papers or researches. The study was different from the previous and related studies conducted, because the data of this study were written by nonnative EFL teachers. This present study focused on adversative conjunction in the introduction part. In addition, the theories and the results of this study might give inputs for improvements of using the adversative conjunctions In this study, the 20 introductions written by Indonesian EFL teachers from 2002 to 2011 were analyzed based on the categorization of Murcia and Freeman (1999). It was found out that 85% of the subjects misused the adversative conjunctions.

Adversative conjunctions have different functions that might be not realized by many writers. This fact is based on the finding that 85% of the writers misused the adversative conjunctions in their papers. The errors happened because of two possible causes. The first one is false-concept hypotheses of the target language itself and the interference of L1 False-concept hypothesis. This assumption may be caused by the perception that conjunctions are synonym or interchangeable as long as they are in the same category. The understanding that conjunctions are specific is important in English language teaching and learning. The second possible cause is the interference of L1. The subjects might compose the sentences in L1 which then translated into L2, including the conjunctions. After finding out the possible causes of the errors, the writer evaluated the level of the errors, whether they belonged to global or local errors. The errors were in the level of local errors; in other words, the errors did not hindrance the understanding of the message.

Since this study only dealt with adversative conjunction in the introduction part of the academic writing, further studies can investigate other classes of conjunctions such as additive (and, also, else, in addition, etc), causal (because of this, for this reason, on this basis, to this end, in that case, under the circumstances, in this respect, etc), and temporal (next, finally, a meanwhile, in conclusion, to resume, etc) in other part of the academic writing like in the body or in the conclusion. It is expected that by more studies on conjunctions, the understanding can be developed. Furthermore, the study in academic writing is needed to help scholars to write linguistically correct.

References

Alice Oshima, A. H. (2006). *Writing Academic English.* New York: Pearson Longman.

Ann Cole Brown, J. N. (1984). *Grammar and Composition.* United States of America: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Bathia (1995: 82)

Borkin, A. (1979). Antithetic Conjuncts in Written English. *RELC Journal* , 44 - 56.

Bunton (2002:58)

Carrio, M. L. (n.d.). Retrieved from www. espworld. info/Articles_13/Connector.htm.

Celce-Murcia, M.-F. D. (1999). *The Grammar Book.* United States of America: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard, M. (1985) Second Edition. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis.* London Longman.

Douglas Biber, S. J. (1999). *Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M. R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Hashimoto, Irvin Y. (1982) *Strategies for Academic Writing- A Guide for College,* USA: The University of Michigan.

Laura Centonze. 2013. Conjunctions in ELF Academic Discourse: A Corpus-based Analysis**.** *The Sixth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca: New Perspectives on ELF*, held at Roma Tre University, 4-7 September 2013.

LeCompte, M. D. et al. (1992) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, California: Academic Press.

Levin (1987:538)

Murphy, R. (2004). *English Grammar in Use.* Singapore: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, R. (2005) *Writing for Academic Journals,* England: Open University Press.

Nunan, D. (1992) *Research Method in Language Learning,* USA: Cambridge University Press.

Paltridge, B. S. (2007). *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language.* New York: Routledge.

.Quirk, R. S. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* New York: Longman.

Roth, A. (1986) Fifth Edition. *The Research Paper-Process, Form, and Content,* California: Wadsworth.

Scott, D. and Usher, R. (1996) *Understanding Educational Research,* London: Routledge.

Swales, J. M. and Feak, C. B. (2004) Second Edition. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students- Essential Tasks and Skills,* USA: The University of Michigan.

Swales, J. M. (2008). *Academic Writing for Graduate Students.* United States of America: The University of Michigan Press.

Weissberg, R. and Buker, S. (1990) *Writing Up Research: Experimental Research Report Writing for students of English,* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall

- - - - - - - gunting dan kirimkan ke alamat Tata Usaha FKIP atau fax. (031) 3891267 - - - - - - -

FORMULIR BERLANGGANAN JURNAL "MAGISTER SCIENTIAE"

Mohon dicatat sebagai pelanggan Jurnal "Magister Scientiae"

Nama : ____________________

Alamat : ____________________

____

(Kode Pos ____________)

____________, ____________

Harga langganan mulai Januari 2003 :

- Rp. 30.000,00 untuk 1 tahun
- Rp. 50.000,00 untuk 2 tahun
- Rp. 70.000,00 untuk 3 tahun

(____________________)

Formulir Ini Boleh Difotokopi

BERITA PENGIRIMAN UANG LANGGANAN

Dengan ini saya kirimkan uang sebesar :

- [ ] Rp. 30.000,00 untuk langganan 1 tahun, mulai Nomor ………………. Tahun …………….
- [ ] Rp. 50.000,00 untuk langganan 2 tahun, mulai Nomor ………………. Tahun …………….
- [ ] Rp. 70.000,00 untuk langganan 3 tahun, mulai Nomor ………………. Tahun …………….

Uang tersebut telah saya kirimkan melalui :

- [ ] Bank "***Mandiri***", rekening Nomor **140 - 00-0228177-3**, a/n A.Y. Eko Budoyo & Ig. Harjanto
- [ ] Pos Wesel dengan Resi nomor ……………………………….. tanggal …………………