A Study of Translation on Grammatical Cohesion Marker in *"Bidding Document"* from English into Indonesian

Ninsiana, W [1], Samiati, S.T [2], Nababan, M.R [3]

[1] The State Islamic Institute-IAIN of Jurai Siwo, Metro, Lampung,
[2-3]Postgraduate Program of Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta,
INDONESIA.

[1]widya7406@gmail.com [2]msrisamiati@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the translation of grammatical cohesion markers in Bidding Document from English into Indonesian 'Tender Documents'. The purposes of this study; (1) to formulate the type of grammatical cohesion; (2) to find out and explain the reasons that form a background marker of the grammatical cohesion; (3) to reveal and describe specifically the equivalence of meaning and the acceptability of grammatical cohesion markers. This study is a descriptive qualitative research of case study design and oriented on products. The aspects discussed the objective and genetic aspects. The data sources used (1) documents (2) informants (the rater and respondent). The technique of data collection employed scrutinizing and recording technique, questionnaires, and in-depth interviews. The data validations employed triangulation techniques and method, while the data analysis employed the ethnographic analysis of Spradley. The findings showed the type of grammatical cohesion markers in Tender Document, first; the reference cohesion marker, substitution, deletion and conjunctions. The type of conjunctions cohesion marker used dominantly. Secondly, there are 5 kinds of translation techniques; prevalent equivalence, amplification, modulation, transposition, and reduction. Third, the overall quality of cohesion marker in Bidding Document reached 2.84 for the level of accuracy and 2.79 for the level of acceptability.

Keywords: Translation, Grammatical Cohesion Markers, Equivalence and Acceptability

INTRODUCTION

Discourse is a linguistic element that is relatively the most complex and complete one. The linguistic proponent unit includes a phoneme, morpheme, word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, and up to composition. Discourse forming element interconnects when it forms a texture. Texture is functioned to distinguish whether it is discourse or not. The concept of texture shows something that is a bond between sentences so that it becomes a discourse or text. Texture deals with meaning or semantic relationships inter sentences embodied in lexico-grammar pattern.

Discourse is composed by form and meaning relationship. The relationship is created in the form of cohesion and coherence. Cohesion is a compatible relationship of language in discourse, while coherence is a meaning unity in a discourse that becomes communicative and that contains an idea. Thus, coherent discourse is a discourse seen from the relationship of forms or intrinsic structure in cohesive and the relationships of meaning or inner structure in coherence.

Cohesion and coherence in a discourse are functioned to fill the discourse in level of comprehensible and legibility. Cohesion and unity are important factor for determining the

level of legibility and comprehensible discourse. Halliday and Hasan (1976) divide cohesion into two types; grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Grammatical aspect is a form or structure of intrinsic discourse. The aspect of grammatical discourse includes reference, substitution, deletion, and compounding (Sumarlam et al; 2003).

In this case, translating the legal text of *Bidding Document* translation from English into Indonesian is not easy. The translation of legal text might be more difficult than other text. Machali (2005) says that "in translating legal text, a translator of this field usually faces linguistic and non-linguistic problem. The linguistic problems include: (a) a very long sentence, (b) some terms and 'fixed phrase', (c) expression, and (d) the gaps term, while the non-linguistic problem is varied including none of ethics code Kahaner (2004) reveals that:

> *legal translation is often more difficult than type of technical translation because the system-bound nature of terminology. Unlike scientific or other technical terminology, each country has its own legal terminology (based on the particular legal system of the country), which will often be quite different even from the legal terminology of another country with the same country.*

Based on the opinions stated above, it is summarized that translating legal text is more difficult than other text. It is caused by the texts often composed in very long sentences, with the exploitation of punctuation diverse and the complexity use of legal technical terms in constructing a sentence.

Every language has its own cohesion markers and the unique use of it (Shciller, 2006). The language aspect that connects intersectional text and makes the text into a cohesive is called cohesion marker. Translating grammatical cohesion markers in the *Bidding Document* is not easy, because the Bidding Document is a legal text that includes the category of sensitive text, so it needs a language system mastery and BSU and BSA legal system. In this regard, the problem examined in this study is the grammatical cohesion forms contained in *Bidding Document*. One of the grammatical cohesion markers in *Bidding Documents* is as an example below:

Example 1:

BSU

> At a national level there has been a discrepancy in various aspects and in many regions. To avoid this, the priorities of the national development planning should be identified at the grassroots level.

BSA

> *Pada level nasional, ada kesenjangan dalam berbagai aspek di berbagai wilayah (1). Untuk mengatasi semua **itu**, prioritas rencana pembangunan nasional harus diidentifikasi mulai dari level akar rumputnya.*

The first example above is a fragment of a sentence that uses grammatical cohesion marker in *Bidding Document*. The quotation of BSU and BSA text above comprises of two words, those are (1) At a national level ...... (2) To avoid this .... the reference of 'this' cohesion in sentence (2) TSU above in anaphoric way refers to 'discrepancies in various aspects and in many regions' contained in the sentence (1) TSU. The cohesion marker of 'this' and its reference marker is included in non-distance cohesion because it exists on adjacent sentence. The translation of *this* into 'itu' happens because there has been changed in the distance between the speakers and something designated. If the cohesion marker of 'this' should mean that the distance between the speaker and designated are close, then in this translation, the marker cohesion 'that' means that the distance between the speaker and the designated are far.

Translating this into 'itu' is due to the cohesion marker 'this' is expressed by the speakers and anything designated by *this*, it is the gaps in various aspects and in various regions perceived not so close to the speaker. However, the translations of the cohesion markers do not affect the change of reference and the direction of the reference. Cohesion markers *this* into 'ini' in the text above relates cohesively.

Based on the relevant studies dealt with the translation research in cohesion marker whether Indonesian or English is still very rare, such as the research done by Supana, (2011), Tri Widiarti Ali (2010); Rustono and Sri Wahyu, (2011); Sri Budi Astuti & Badauddin Azmy & Indayani, 2013; M.Khoiri (2013), Maja Stanoojevic Gocic (2012), Li Xiuying (2009), Saedi (1997). Some of the research related to the study of grammatical cohesion markers in Indonesian is still limited on the types of grammatical cohesion markers and conjunctions only.

The research problems of this study is formulated as follows:

(1) How is the natures and types of grammatical cohesion in the *Bidding Document* translation into Indonesian 'Tender Documents'; (2) What are the reasons that translators form the background using translation techniques on grammatical cohesion markers in *Bidding Document* into Indonesian 'Tender Documents; (3) How is the translation techniques applied in translating the grammatical cohesion markers in the Bidding Document becoming Tender Documents; (4) How is the meaning equivalence and acceptable translations on grammatical cohesion markers in the Bidding Document becoming Tender Documents; (5) How is the relationship among the type of grammatical cohesion marker, translation technique, variant technique, displacement and quality of Bidding Document?.

This research is expected to have the following benefits:

(1) Provide a complete illustration of the forms and types of grammatical cohesion markers which orient in the legal text genre 'Bidding Document' concerned with the translation from English into Indonesian; (2) Formulate the complete reasons of the translator forms a background using grammatical cohesion markers in the Bidding Document into Indonesian 'Tender Documents; (3) Reveal translation techniques applied in translating the grammatical cohesion markers in the Bidding Document becoming Tender Documents; (4) express the quality of Bidding Document on accuracy and acceptability aspects of grammatical cohesion markers in the Bidding Documents into 'Dokumen Tender; (5) shows the relationship between the type of marker cohesion, translation technique, variant technique, the shift and quality of the Bidding Document and in constructing the structure of the text.

METHOD

This research is a qualitative research in a form of case study with a fixed single case. Research in the Bidding Document is only examined on two aspects; those are genetic and objective aspects. Genetic aspects focus on the kinds of grammatical cohesion marker, equivalent and acceptable meaning, and the relationship between the type of cohesion marker, translation technique, variant technique, displacement and quality of Bidding Document. A genetic aspect on research focus is on the underlying reason for the translator to use the technique in translating the Bidding Document into Tender Documents.

The data research is a written data in the form of 1) the type of cohesion grammatical markers contained in the Bidding Document and its translation into Indonesian "Tender Documents"; 2) translation techniques used on grammatical cohesion markers; 3) Information dealing with readers' idea on the translation techniques used on grammatical cohesion markers contained

in Bidding Document translation especially in the form of the equivalence and acceptability of meaning in the translation text.

The data sources used in this study are as follows:

(1) Documents. Documents used in this study entitled "Bidding Document" and translation Indonesian version "Dokumen Tender "; (2) the informant. The informants of this study were 6 raters who delve the aspects of accuracy and acceptance assessment in "Bidding Document" and its translation Indonesian version "*Dokumen Tender*".

The research sample used is purposive sampling. Data collection techniques in this study are scrutinizing and recording technique, questionnaires, and in-depth interviews. The validity of this is a guarantee for stability conclusions and interpretations as a result of the research (Burns, 1999; Sutopo, 2006). The data obtained is examined by using triangulation for its validity. There are four kinds of triangulation such as examination techniques that function the use of sources, methods, investigators and theories (in Moelong Denzin, 2012). The Validation data used in this study is the technique of triangulation and triangulation methods.

The data analysis technique used in this study is to examine documents and archives (content analysis). This technique is done through reading and recording technique. Recording document techniques (content analysis) is a way to find a variety of things in accordance with the needs and objectives of the research (in Sutopo Yin, 2006). While the data analysis stage used ethnographic analysis stage proposed by Spradley (in Sugiyono, 2008), comprising: (1) domain analysis, (2) taxonomic analysis, (3) componential analysis, and (4) analysis of the cultural theme.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Type Marker of Grammatical Cohesion

Grammatical markers in Bidding Document include: references which consist of the personal pronoun, it is a cohesion marker of persona reference O3 single man such as 'he, his, him'; the cohesion marker of persona reference O3 plural, i.e. 'they, their, them'; cohesion marker of persona reference O1 plural, such as 'we, us, our'; cohesion marker of persona reference 'it and, itself ', while the cohesion marker of demonstrative reference consisting of cohesion demonstrative 'the, this, those, these, and then'. Meanwhile, a cohesion marker of substitution in Bidding Document consists of two categories; those are cohesion substitution of nouns and verbs.

Noun substitution includes cohesion noun 'one and ones'; cohesion substitution of verbs have only one marker of cohesion, which is 'done'. Lastly, the conjunction marker cohesion in Bidding Document is divided into four categories, comprising additive conjunction, adversative conjunctions, causal conjunction and temporal conjunctions. Cohesion marker of additive conjunction consists of 'and, or, thus, as well as, and furthermore'. The conjunction marker of adversative consists of 'but, as follows, however, the following, such as, in any case, in other cases'. Cohesion markers for causal conjunctions are, i.e., 'therefore, so that, the consequence, for this purpose, in order to, in which case, for the case, if, otherwise'. The example of grammatical cohesion markers is as follows:

TSU	If a Bid is not substantially responsive to the Bidding Document (1). It shall be rejected by the Purchaser and may not subsequently be made responsive by the Bidder by correction of the material deviation, reservation, or omission (2)

TSA	Jika suatu Tender sangat responsif terhadap dokumen-dokumen Tender (1). **_Tender_** tersebut harus ditolak oleh pembeli dan tidak boleh dibuat menjadi responsif oleh Peserta Tender dengan mengoreksi materi yang menyimpang, yang menjadi keberatan atau yang dihapus (2).

The cohesion marker 'it' in sentence (2) TSU above in anaphoric refers to 'bid' in the sentence (1) TSU. The cohesion marker 'it' and its reference includes in non-distance cohesion because it exists in contiguous sentences. Cohesion marker 'it' is translated into 'tender' in the sentence (2) TSA. Translating cohesion 'it' has changed the type of cohesion marker, i.e. from grammatical cohesion has changed into lexical. The changes of cohesion marker type is the explicit reference of cohesion marker it. The change in cohesion markers is due to the differences in the persona reference in TSA and TSU.

Variants

The Variant Technique of the Cohesion Marker of Grammatical Reference in Bidding Document

The application technique done by the translators on their translation affects the use of techniques that is known as a single variant technique, couplets (two techniques), triplet (three techniques) and quartet (four techniques). In the Bidding Document translation, identifiable data are translated by applying the technique of 'single' and 'couplet' translation.

The shifting of cohesion marker of the grammatical reference in Bidding Document

A shifting meaning in any translation of the cohesion marker is a natural thing. In this regard, Beekman and Callow (1974) states that every phrase has their own characteristics that is different from other languages. Consequently, for the need of equivalence the translation is often done in formal and semantic shifts (Machali 2000).

There are 195 data of reference cohesion markers. 107 data are translated into the TSA and do not occur any shifting (fixed). On these data, 102 data (95.32%) are translated with accurate score, 4 data (3.73%) rated less accurate, and 1 data (0.93%) were considered inaccurate. As for the score of acceptability, the cohesion markers with constant translation reach up to 92 of data (85.98%), the less acceptability consists of 11 data (10.28%), and the unacceptability reaches 4 data (3.73%). In addition, some translation shift in TSA and have a total frequency of 41 data. The accurate score percentage for 41 shifting data reaches 27 data (65.85%), the less accurate score reaches 8 data (19.51%), and the inaccurate score are 6 data (14.63%). Meanwhile, the score of acceptability in shifting data reaches 21 (51.21%), the less acceptability reaches 13 data (31.70%), and the unacceptable score reaches 7 data (17.07%). Furthermore, the data of deletions contains 47 data. As for the percentage, the accurate score for deletion data reaches up to 36 data (77%), the less accurate score totals 9 data (19.14%), and the inaccurate data reaches 2 data (4.25%). Furthermore, for the data of acceptance qualification, the data with deletion totals 36 (76.59%), less acceptable data are 8 (17.02%), and the unacceptable reaches 3 data (6%).

From the reviews of the accumulated data on cohesion markers of good reference whether for constant, shifted, or deletion data, it can be concluded that the 'high' quality of the accuracy among the grammatical cohesion marker is achieved by data that is not shifting or being deleted (fixed). The next data with 'medium' quality of accuracy are deletion data, and the shifting data with 'low' quality of accuracy. The level of acceptance among the three kinds of data, fixed data and deletion data achieve the 'average' quality of acceptability, while for the shifting data reach the level of 'low' acceptability.

DISCUSSION

Cohesion marker of the reference in the Bidding Document

The dominant grammatical cohesion markers emerged are demonstrative reference of 'this' with the total use 40 data. In this case, the cohesion marker of demonstrative 'this' reference results the 'high' quality of translations accuracy and the 'medium' quality of acceptability.

Through 195 data contained in cohesion marker of reference, it is known that the most widely translation technique used is the translation techniques of prevalent equivalence. The total uses of these techniques in the translation of reference cohesion marker achieve 107 data. Then, the data results quality translations with "high" accuracy and the 'medium' quality of acceptance.

Meanwhile, there has been a variant technique in the translation of cohesion marker reference. In this case, the variant technique that mostly appears is the variant of single and couplets techniques. Single variant technique in the translation of cohesion markers totals 193 data use, while the two other data are translated by using a variant technique couplet. The two variants of the couplets contained in this reference of cohesion marker is combination of the techniques of common equivalence and reduction techniques, and the combination of the reduction techniques and amplification translation.

Besides the translation and variants technique, the reference cohesion markers are also shifting. In this case, the shift is an adaptation of TSU data that has been translated into TSA do not change (fixed), changed (shift), and are not translated (vanished). The constant data is a data translated using techniques of common equivalence. It is called constant data due to the remains form from TSU and after translated into it TSA do not change, which results in the equivalent translation commonly used in the TSA version. Meanwhile, the changing data (shifts) are the data translated into the TSA and the changes are perceived by the use of translation techniques of modulation, amplification, and the transposition technique. The latest data is non-translated data (vanished). The deletion data is non-translated data or deliberately omitted in TSA version. This data is filled by the data translated by the reduction translation techniques, which characterize the translation is explicit data on the BSU which implicitly translated into the BSA.

In the reference of cohesion markers, it is identified that the most dominant data is the constant one, which reaches the total use for 107 data. Then, it is followed by the deletion data with the total use reaches up to 47 data, and the last is shifting data by the amount of use is 41 data.

The quality accuracy of cohesion marker references on the constant data reaches 102 data (95.32%), while the quality of acceptability reaches the number 92 data (85.98%). The quality accuracy of shifting data reaches up to 27 data (65.85%), the quality of acceptability reaches 21 data (51.21%). The data deletion achieves the total accuracy as 36 data (77%), while acceptable quality data achieves 36 data (76.59%).

Substitution of Cohesion Marker in the Bidding Document

The data for substitutions of cohesion markers contained in Bidding Document translation are only 8. The most dominant cohesion marker appeared of the 8 data is the cohesion marker of substitution noun 'one' with a total of five data usage. Cohesion marker of substitution noun 'One' produces the accuracy and acceptability quality of "average" translation.

The most widely used translation technique is amplification translation technique. From 8 data contained on substitution cohesion markers, it is identified that there are 5 data translated

by amplification technique. The data then produce a translation with the accuracy and acceptability at the medium quality.

The variant technique that emerges in the translation of the substitution cohesion marker is single variant technique. Single variant technique refers to the application of the technique of translation only. The data translated using a single variant technique were 8 data on the substitution cohesion markers.

In addition to translation and variants technique, the substitutions of cohesion markers are also shifting. The shift in this case is an adaptation of the data on the TSU after translated into TSA that do not change (fixed), change (shift), and are not translated (vanished). It is identified that the substitution cohesion markers, the most dominant data is the shifted data; this data reaches the amount of use as many as 6 data. Next, it is followed by deletion data and constant data with the total use in each 1 data.

Substitution cohesion marker on the constant data only reaches less accurate and less acceptable, for each 1 data. For the quality of accuracy and acceptability data of shifting in each reach 5 data (83%). Meanwhile, one of the remaining data on substitution cohesion marker gets on deletion data. The deletion data is at accurate and acceptable value.

Conjunction Cohesion Markers in Bidding Document

The cohesion markers of conjunction are found in the total of 231 data. Compared to the other cohesion markers, the cohesion markers 'and' achieves the total usage up to 94 times. The data is then translated into the TSA and produce an accurate translation of 90 data (95.74%), while translations with acceptable quality reaches 82 amount data (87.23%). It means that the marker of conjunctions cohesion 'and' is as the most dominant conjunction marker used in conjunction cohesion, it has produced quality level of "high" accuracy translations, and the 'medium' quality of acceptability.

Meanwhile, the translation techniques identified is mostly used in conjunction cohesion markers is that translation techniques of prevalent equivalence. The use of this technique reaches up to 192 data; the value of data accuracy reaches the amount of 186 data (96.87%), while the value of the acceptability reaches the amount of 183 data (93.31%). From these percentages, it can be concluded that in translating the conjunctions cohesion markers, translation techniques of equivalence prevalent achieves "high" quality of accuracy and acceptability. It brings a positive impact on the quality of translation Bidding Document.

In the Bidding Document translation, conjunctions cohesion markers include cohesion markers with a various number of variants technique. Besides the single variants technique, there exist variant couplet techniques. From 231 conjunction cohesion marker data, there are 2 data translated by couplet variant technique. The merger of techniques used to translate the data 2 that is a combination between the translation technique of equivalence prevalent and reduction, as well as between the translation technique of equivalence prevalent and modulation.

In addition to translation techniques and variants technique, conjunction cohesion markers also are shifting. The shift in this case is an adaptation of the data on the TSU after translated into TSA that do not change (fixed), change (shift), and are not translated (vanished). The dominant data uses in conjunction cohesion markers are constant data, the number of 192 data. Then, the shifted data reaches 31 data and deletion data with the total usage are 8 data.

The quality of accuracy of conjunction cohesion markers on constant data reaches 186 data (96.87%), while the quality of the data acceptability totals 183 (95.31%). The quality

accuracy of shifting data reaches 16 data (51.61%), the quality of acceptability reaches 12 data (38.70%). The accuracy of data deletion totals 7 data (87.50%), while for the amount of data with acceptable quality of reaches 3 data (37.30%).

Based on description to the above data, it can be concluded that the use of cohesion markers that mostly affect to the quality of the Bidding Document translation is conjunction cohesion markers, and is followed by this reference and substitution cohesion. The technique of translation having the most significant impact in translating the Bidding Document translation is equivalence prevalent techniques. Furthermore, compared with a variant of the technique couplet, single variants technique is more widely used. Meanwhile, among types of constant meaning, shift and deletion, the constant data has the most quantity of use. Then, the constant data remains also the only data that reaches the value of the accuracy and acceptability of the 'high'. It gives a positive contribution in term of the quality of accuracy and acceptability translation of cohesion grammatical markers in Bidding Document translation.

The Relationship between the type of Cohesion Marker, Translation technique, Variant technique, Cohesion Shifting Type and Quality of Bidding Document Translation

The findings and discussion in this study explains that the relationship of type of cohesion marker, translation technique, variant technique, a type of shifting meaning has a strong role in the translation of legal texts 'Bidding Document', especially it takes an important role in tracing and composing some clause or a group clause.

In the Bidding Document, the most influential conjunctions marker gives a positive contribution, followed by reference and substitution cohesion. The technique of translation that has the most significant impact in translating the Bidding Document is translation techniques of equivalence prevalent, as well as the use of single variants technique which has the most widely frequency of use. The relationship of conjunction in the Bidding Document text can shape similar but may significantly differ according to the context (Baker, 2011).

Furthermore, the relationship of grammatical cohesion conjunction has significant role in constructing text. Thus, the relationship of type of grammatical conjunction cohesion, which shifts to the type of cohesion, impacts on the quality of Bidding Document translation. Among the types of constant, shift and deletion meaning, the kind of constant meaning remains the most widely use and has the 'high' value of accuracy and acceptability. It provides a positive contribution in relation to the quality of accuracy and acceptability translation on grammatical cohesion markers in Bidding Document translation.

CONCLUSIONS

Type of Grammatical Cohesion Marker in the Bidding Document

There are 3 types of cohesion markers In the Bidding Document translation; cohesion marker reference (reference), substitution, and conjunctions markers cohesion (compounding). Cohesion marker reference in Bidding Document includes cohesion marker of persona reference and demonstrative. The reference cohesion marker of single person O3 man covers 'he, his, him'; the reference cohesion marker of plural persona O3 comprises 'they, their, them'; the reference cohesion marker of plural persona O1, are 'we, us, our'; the reference cohesion marker of 'it and itself' person. The cohesion marker of demonstrative reference dominantly appeared is the cohesion marker of demonstrative reference with the total use of 40 data and 195 data for reference cohesion.

Meanwhile, there are 2 categories of substitution cohesion marker; comprising the cohesion reference of noun and verb. The nominal reference covers the cohesion of 'one and ones'

noun; verbal cohesion marker has only one cohesion marker, 'done'. The last, conjunction cohesion marker in Bidding Document are divided into four categories, comprising additive, adversative causal, and temporal conjunction. The cohesion marker of additive conjunction includes '*and, or, thus, as well as, furthermore*' conjunction. Adversative conjunction marker covers the conjunction of '*as follows, however, the following, such as, in any case, in other cases*'. Then, the cohesion markers of causal conjunction are '*therefore, so that, the consequence, for this purpose, in order to, in which case, for the case, if, otherwise*'.

The Translator's Motive to Use Translation Technique on Grammatical Cohesion Marker in Bidding Document

There are 5 translation techniques that underlie the translator to take the decision about translation technique, those are (1) prioritizing (2) creating understandable translations (3) avoiding meaning confusion (4) confirming (5) making variation. The use of these 5 translation techniques is purposed to have understandable translation as Indonesia original text, thus it is not visible as translation text.

Translation technique in Bidding Document

There are 18 translation technique proposed by Molina and Albir (2000), yet the translation technique applied in translating grammatical cohesion marker in Bidding Document took only 5 of which, those are technique of common equivalent, amplification, modulation, transposition, and reduction.

Equivalent and acceptability meaning in Bidding Document translation

Dealing with equivalent and acceptable translation of grammatical cohesion marker in Bidding Document, it is stated that the overall quality for accuracy level is 2.84 and acceptability is 2.79. From these valuation aspects comprising accurate and acceptable level can be concluded that Bidding Document is valued as accurate and acceptable translation accepted by the target reader because the message of Bidding document conveyed with norm and culture target language.

The relation among the type of cohesion marker, translation technique, variant technique, cohesion shifting and Bidding Document quality translation

From the whole relation between the type of cohesion marker, translation technique, variant technique and shifting data give accurate and acceptable quality translation in Bidding Document is categorized as 'good'. It means that Bidding Document is valued to be accurate and acceptable translation accepted by target readers due to its message in Bidding Document revealed with norm and culture of the target language.

REFERENCES

[1]   Astuti, S., Azmy, B., & Indayani, B. (2013). *Kohesi dan Koherensi Wacana pada Skripsi Mahasiswa Angkatan 2008 Prodi PBSI UNIPA Surabaya.* Wahana Jurnal.Vol.61.Nomer 2. 1 Desember 2013

[2]   Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation.*London: Roudledge

[3]   Beekman, J., & Callow, J. (1974). *Translating the Word of God.* Michigan: Zondervan

[4]   Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teachers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press

[5]   Denzin, N.K., & Lincaln, Y.S (1998). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials.* Thousand Oaks:Sage Publications

[6]   Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman House

[7]   Gocic, M. S.(2012). Cohesive Devices in Legal Discource. *Dalam Jurnal Linguistics and Literature. Vol.10*(2).2012.pp.89-98

[8]   Khoiri, M. (2013). *Kesalahan Penanda Kohesi dalam Skripsi Mahasiswa Nonbahasa Universitas Madura Pamekasan. Jurnal NOSI. 1*(6) Agustus 2013.

[9]   Li, X. (2009). An analysis of the Cohesive Devices Adopted by Burton Watson and William H. Nienhauser, J.R. in Translating Shi Ji (Records of the Historian) Into English. *http//accurapid.com/jouurnal/28.edu/htm*

[10]   Molina, L., & Albir, A.H. (2002). *Translation Technique Revised : a Dynamic and Functionalist Approach.* Meta: *Translators Journal. Vol. XLVII*(4).

[11]   Moleong, L.J. (2012). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif.* Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya

[12]   Saedi, K. L. (1997). Lexical Cohesion and Translation Equivalence. Meta*: Translators Journal. Vo. 42*.1997

[13]   Schiller, A. (2006). *Webside Translation: Issues of Translation. www.unizev.Es/aelfe 2006/ALEFE06/4.translation/7u.pdf*

[14]   Sumarlam, (2003). *Teori dan Praktik Analisis Wacana.* Surakarta : Pustaka Cakra

[15]   Supana. (2012). *Kajian Terjemahan Penanda Kohesi pada Novel WINGS Karya Danielle Steel ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Disertasi. Surakarta: UNS

[16]   Sutopo, H.B. (2006). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar Teori dan Terapannya dalam Penelitian.* Surakarta : UNS Press