

A Study On The Writing Format And Abstract Structure Of Dissertation Written By Ph.D Students Of State Universities In Indonesia.

Sukirmiyadi Sukirmiyadi

Universitas Pembangunan Nasional ‘Veteran’ Jatim, Surabaya-Indonesia

Email: ahmadsukirmiyadi@gmail.com

Abstract

Abstract is the summerized form of writing usually taken from the research result and it is usually put at the beginning of the paper. As one of the most important parts in one article or paper dealing with the research result, an abstract should be written as well as possible to make it easy to be be understandable. Besides, an abstract should also cover all parts and activities that have been conducted by the researcher. Koopman (1997: 1) and Owen D Williamson (2007: 3) said that one of the criteria of good abstract is that it should have the complete abstract structure: introduction, objective or aim, methodology, findings/results & discussion, and Conclusion written within 5 (five) paragraphs. In fact, not all abstracts written by Ph.D students have those 5 (five) aspects and format.

Based on the problem stated above, this research is aimed at finding and describing the writing format and variations of abstract structure written by Ph.D students of State Universities in Surabaya.

Meanwhile, the methodology employed in this research was descriptive qualitative. The data were taken from 15 dissertation abstracts written by Ph.D Students (8 abstracts from the Faculty of Civil Engineering and Planning/FTSP-ITS and the 7 others were from Medical Science of Airlangga University Surabaya). The data collected were the writing format dealing with the number of paragraphs of each abstract and its abstract structure.

Moreover, having been analyzed and discussed, among those 15 (fifteen) abstract texts, it was found that the writing format and its variations of abstract structure of dissertation was: [a] in accordance with the number of paragraphs: 6 (six) texts (40%) written in 3 paragraphs, 4 (four) texts (26,66%) written in 5 paragraphs, 3 (three) texts (20%) written in 4 paragraphs, 2 (two) texts (13,33%) written in 1 paragraph; [b] Meanwhile in accordance with the number of abstract structures: most of the abstracts: 9 (nine) texts (60%) were not completed with

‘conclusion’, 5 (five) texts (33,33%) with no ‘objective’, only 4 (four) texts (26,66%) were completed with the 5 (five) abstract structure, 4 (four) texts (26,66%) were not supported with the 2 (two) abstract structure: ‘objective and conclusion’ and 1 (one) text (6,66%) did not have an ‘introduction’.

Finally, it could be concluded that there were some variations dealing with the writing format of dissertation abstracts both in accordance with the number of paragraphs and and its abstract structure.

Key Words: Writing Format, Abstract, Abstract Structure, Dissertation.

1. Introduction

Based on Webster’s Desk Dictionary of the English Language, the word ‘abstract’ is said as a summary of a statement, etc’ (Webster, 1983: 4). However, for the broader meaning of abstract, there are 2 [two] ideas that could be noted. The first was Judith Kilborn (1998: 1). His statement was written in an article of Literacy Education Online (LEO: 1) which said that an abstract was a condensed version of a longer piece of writing that highlights the major points covered, concisely describes the content and scope of the writing, and reviews the writing’s contents in abbreviated form’. The second one, abstract means a short informative or descriptive summary of a longer report which has been simplified into condensed version of an original work, such as a book, journal article, technical report, patent, or sometimes a speech or an interview, Susan Gilbert (1985: 1)

In line with several definitions above, it could be assumed that abstract means a very brief writing/report telling about an activity that has just been conducted and completed by someone in advance having a certain objective or goal. Some written forms that can be abstracted are a book, article for a journal, technical report etc, including research report itself. Furthermore, viewed from its function, abstract can be classified into 2 (two) kinds, descriptive and informative abstract. Descriptive abstract refers to the one that reports/tells a short information about a report, an article/paper, or some other alike covering its objective/aim, methodology, the field or content of report, article or paper. As the result of one research, an abstract is usually written at the beginning of an article or paper before Chapter I. Introduction part. Therefore, if an abstract is correlated with a final research report, it should have 5 [five] research reports covering introduction, aim or objective, methodology, finding and discussion and conclusion. Due to its function as a result of research, abstract has to consist of [a] the title of research, [b] researcher’s name. [c] a short description containing

of the background of a study, research problems, the aim of a study, review of related literature, methodology and its analysis, finding and results, main benefit and recommendation.

Meanwhile, viewed from its essence, abstract consists of two important parts: abstract structure and abstract characteristics.

(a) Abstract Structure: In general, based on its text structure as a research result, abstract has to consist of 3 (three) main parts: [1] Opening, containing of the explanation about the title and the reasons to conduct the research; [2] Body, is the main content of the whole activity covering important parts dealing with some steps to conduct the research such as: research identity, the aim of a study, statement of the problems, methodology including its supporting theories and related previous researches and [3])] *Closing*, is the final research result and conclusion (Judith Kilborn, 1998).

Meanwhile, Koopman (1997: 1) said that abstract structure must cover 5 (five) aspects: [1] *Motivation*, is the reasons/importance to choose the research topics; [2] *Objective or Goal*, is usually stated in Statement of the problems that become the focus to be discussed in the research; [3] *Approach*, is the methodology used to analyze the data available to obtain the expected findings.; [4] *Results*, is the answers or result finding from the statement of the problems; and [5] *Conclusion*, is a brief summary of the research and implication towards the finding result or the answers from the statement of the problems.

Furthermore, the similar idea was also stated by Owen D Williamson (2007 : 3). He said that besides those 5 (five) abstract structures stated above, a good abstract should be completed with '*coherence of text*. Then, abstract should consist of [1] introduction, [2] aims, [3] methods, [4] findings/results, [5] conclusions, and [6] coherence'. Then, the coherence of text writing was also supported by Reiss and Vermer in Jeremy Munday (2000 : 79).

One text is considered to be coherence when the sentences arranged and paragraphs are interrelated and cannot be separated one and another. Therefore, a good abstract should show the wholeness of meaning of text. In line with how important the coherence of text is, Judith Kilborn (1998 : 2) said that there were some criteria in efforts to get a good abstract, based on its [1] substance aspect and [2] linguistic aspect. From its substance aspect, one research can be conducted either qualitative or quantitative or both at once (mixed). Meanwhile, in accordance with its linguistic aspect especially in abstract writing, a researcher can analyze the text from its lexical equivalence and grammatical structure and its coherence of text. Most of sentences uses are simple present tense for opening or introduction, while the four others

[aim, methodology, discussion/finding and conclusion] have to use simple past tense and are dominated with passive voice.

(b) Writing format: Moreover, writing format in this research refers to the number of paragraphs used by Ph.D students to write their texts of abstracts. Normally, based on the explanation above, abstract text should have 5 (five) paragraphs which represents their abstract structure: [1] introduction, [2] aims, [3] methods, [4] findings/results, [5] conclusions, Owen D Williamson (2007 : 3). On the other hand, it was found that many of the abstract texts written by Ph.D students had only 4-3-2 and even 1 (one) paragraph.

2. The Aim of a Study.

This research is aimed at finding and describing the writing format and variations of abstract structure written by Ph.D students of State Universities in Indonesia, especially in Surabaya.

3. Methodology

The methodology employed in this research was descriptive qualitative. The data were taken from 15 (fifteen) texts of dissertation abstracts written by Ph.D Students of State Universities in Surabaya. The 8 (eight) texts of dissertation abstracts were taken from the Faculty of Civil Engineering and Planning/FTSP-ITS and the 7 (seven) others were taken from Medical Science of Airlangga University Surabaya. The data collected were the writing format dealing with the number of paragraphs of each abstract text and its abstract structure.

4. Findings, Discussion / Results

As it was explained in advance, that the main data were taken from the 15 [fifteen] texts of dissertation abstract written by Ph.D students of State Universities in Surabaya. To make it clear, the collected data dealing with the number of paragraphs [writing format] and abstract structure of each abstract text could be seen in the table below:

*Tabulation of Abstract Structure & the Writing Format [Number of Paragraphs] of Each Text of Dissertation Abstract.

Number of Data	Introduction	Aim	Methodology	Results / Finding	Conclusion	Number of Paragraphs

K-1	V	V	V	V	V	5
K-2	V	V	V	V	-	4
K-3	V	V	V	V	V	1
K-4	V	V	V	V	-	1
K-5	V	V	V	V	V	5
K-6	V	V	V	V	V	5
K-7	-	V	V	V	V	5
T-1	V	-	V	V	-	3
T-2	V	V	V	V	-	3
T-3	V	-	V	V	-	4
T-4	V	V	V	V	-	4
T-5	V	-	V	V	-	3
T-6	V	V	V	V	-	3
T-7	V	-	V	V	V	3
T-8	V	-	V	V	-	3
Deviation n	6,66%	33,33 %	0%	0%	60%	73,33% [100%]

(a) Writing Format [Number of Paragraph]of Abstract Text

Based on the table above it could be seen that the writing format of abstract texts written by Ph.D students of State Universities in Surabaya were quite diverse/varied. Among those 15 (fifteen) abstract texts, 11 (eleven) texts out of the 15 (fifteen) were dominated by the abstract texts having no appropriate writing format. This meant that most of the abstract texts (73,33%) were deviated. This deviation was found in data number [K-2, K-3, K-4, T-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8] because in fact those abstracts had less than 5 (five) paragraphs. Meanwhile, those that had complete writing format were only 26,66%. This meant that the abstract texts were written completely and they had 5 (five) paragraphs covering 5 (five) abstract structures: introduction, aim, methodology, finding/result and conclusion. This complete writing format of abstract texts was found in data number [K-1, K-5, K-6, K-7]. Here were the detail findings: [1] there were 4 (four) abstract texts having 5 (five) paragraph (complete): 26,66%, data no. K1-K3-K5-K6. These data covered 5 (five) abstract structures: introduction, aim, methodology, finding/result and conclusion. [2] there were 3 (three) abstract texts having 4 (four) paragraphs: 20%, data no. K2-T3-T4; [3] there were 6 (six) abstract texts having 3

(three) paragraphs: 40%, data no. T1-T2-T5-T6-T7-T8; [4] there was 2 (two) abstract text having 1 (one) paragraph: 13,33%, data no. K3-K4.

(b) Abstract Structure.

As it was explained previously that writing an abstract of a research report should cover 5 (five) abstract structures: [1] introduction, [2] aim/objective, [3] methodology, [4] findings/results and discussion, [5] conclusion, Koopman (1997:1) and Williamson (2007:3). In line with this statement or requirement and based on the collected data presented in the table above, it could be seen that the abstract structure of abstract texts written by Ph.D students of State Universities in Surabaya were quite diverse/varied. Among those 15 (fifteen) abstract texts, 11 (eleven) texts out of the 15 (fifteen): 73,33% were dominated by the abstract texts which did not have complete abstract structure. They might not have 'introduction, aim/objective and or conclusion. These data were data no. K2-4-7, T1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8. Meanwhile, only 4 (four) abstracts texts: 26,66% that had complete abstract structures. This meant that these four abstracts had 5 (five) abstract structure completely: 1) introduction, 2) aim/objective, 3) methodology, 4) findings/results, 5) conclusion. Here were the detail findings: [1] there were 4 (four) abstract texts: 26,66% which had complete abstract structure. They were data no. K1-K3-K5-K6. These data covered 5 (five) abstract structures: introduction, aim/objective, methodology, findings/results and discussion and conclusion; [2] there was 1 (one) datum: 6,66% which did not have 'introduction'. It was data no. K7; [3] There were 5 (five) abstract texts: 33,33% which did not have 'aim/objective'. They were data no. T1-3-5-7-8; [4] There were 9 (nine) abstract texts: 60% (the most) which did not have 'conclusion'. These data were data no. K2-4, T1-2-3-4-5-6-8; [5] Finally, there were 4 (four) abstract texts: 26,66%, which had no both 'aim/objective and conclusion'. They were data no. T1-3-5-8.

*Below was an example, one of the data, text of dissertation abstract written by one of Ph.d students of ITS Surabaya.

TsuT-5: Mahendra W

TsaT-5

<p>TERBENTUKNYA RUANG BERSAMA OLEH LANSIA BERDASARKAN INTERAKSI SOSIAL DAN POLA PENGUNAANNYA</p>	<p>THE DEVELOPMENT OF ELDERLY COMMON SPACE BASE ON SOCIAL INTERACTION AND ITS USAGE PATTERN</p>
--	---

<p>Penelitian ruang bersama lansia sangat berguna untuk mendukung peningkatan kualitas kehidupannya. Hal ini juga merupakan agenda penting di tingkat nasional dan global. Salah satu bahasan dalam agenda penelitian berkaitan dengan lansia ini adalah tentang hubungan lingkungan fisik dengan kebutuhan bersosialisasi lansia. Penelitian ini akan mendalami masalah tersebut dengan spesifikasi bahasan pada teori ruang bersama dan interaksi antar lansia yang terjadi di dalamnya.</p> <p>Penggunaan ruang bersama oleh lansia di panti werdha menjadi perhatian dalam penelitian yang akan dilaksanakan ini. Penggunaan ruang bersama oleh lansia tercermin melalui pola dan perulangan yang diperlihatkan lansia dalam menggunakan ruang bersamanya. Analisa dilaksanakan dari sisi kuantitatif dan analisa diagram sosiogram berkaitan dengan penggunaan ruang bersama oleh lansia.</p> <p>Metodologi penelitian yang dilaksanakan dalam penelitian ini adalah <i>Combined Strategies (Mixed-Methodology)</i> dengan taktik penelitian yang dilakukan adalah berfokus pada koleksi data dan analisa. Titik penting dalam analisa penelitian adalah berkaitan dengan kehadiran bersama, interaksi, pergerakan antar ruang, dan pola penggunaan ruang bersamanya. Temuan yang berupa</p>	<p>Research on elderly common space is useful to support higher quality of their life. This support is important agenda in national and global. One big discussion in older people research is the connection physical environment with need of socialization. These researches also deeply analyse those problem with specific discussion of common space theory and interaction between elderly in its space.</p> <p>The use of common space for elderly in their elderly house became important aspect in this research. The elderly usages of common space will show from the usage pattern of their space. Research will analyze from quantitative and sociogram connected with the usage pattern of their common space.</p> <p>Research methodology that held here is Combined Strategies (Mixed-Methodology) with research tactics are focus on data collection and analysis. Important point in this research analyse are co-presence, movement, and common space usage pattern. The result contribution and research originality are finding the process to develop elderly common space, common space characteristics, factors that creates common space and Environmental Social Value (NSL).</p> <p>Key words: Usage Pattern, Interaction, Common Space</p>
--	---

<p>kontribusi dan orisinalitas penelitian ini adalah pada penemuan proses terbentuknya ruang bersama, sifat-sifat dan faktor-faktor pembentuknya serta Nilai Sosialisasi pada Lingkungan (NSL).</p> <p>Kata kunci: Pola penggunaan, Interaksi, Ruang bersama.</p>	
--	--

*Discussion: Based on the writing format and abstract structure as it was explained previously, datum no. T-5 might not be classified as a good example in abstract writing because it did not satisfy both its writing format and abstract structure. The writing format that had to consist of 5 (five) paragraphs, this datum only had 3 (three) paragraphs and this abstract text did not have 'aim and conclusion'. Furthermore, each paragraph that had to have only one abstract structure, the two of three paragraphs, paragraph two and three, had more than one abstract structure. Paragraph two consisted of introduction and methodology while paragraph three consisted of methodology and findings.

5. Conclusion

In line with the finding result and discussion, it could be concluded that there were some variations dealing with the writing format of dissertation abstracts both in accordance with the number of paragraphs and and its abstract stucture. For the writing format, the finding result was dominated by abstract texts which had 3 (three) paragraphs [40%]. While for the abstract stucture, it was dominated by abstract texts which had no conclusion [60%]. Finally, among the 15 (fifteen) abtract texts, only 3 (three) of them [20%], data no. K1-5-6 were classified as a good abstract writing, satisfying both their writing format and abstract structure.

References

- [1] Al-Hassnawi, Ali R.A. 2003-2008. *Aspects of Scientific Translation: English into Arabic Translation as a Case Study*. Ibri College of Education, The Sultanate of Oman. Hassnawi_66@yahoo.com, from <http://www.translationdirectory.com/article10.htm>
- [2] Al-Qinai, Jamal. 2000. *Translation Quality Assessment, Strategy, Parameters and Procedures* dalam Meta: Journal, Vol 45, No. 3, p.497-519. <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/00187Bar>

- [3] Ashari Husein, Ardiansyah. 2007. Beranda Hati: *'Pengantar Metode dan Teknik Menerjemah Buku'*; Makalah ini disampaikan dalam Sekolah Menulis SINAI yang diselenggarakan oleh Studi Informasi Alami Islam, Mesir: <http://abukhonsa.multiply.com/journal/item/39>
- [4] Baker, Mona. 1991. *'In Other Words; A Course Book on Translation'*. London, Great Britain and New York: Routledge, Linguistics / Translation Studies
2001. 2000. *'Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies'*.
i. London, Great Britain and New York: Library of Congress
ii. Cataloging-in-Publication Data; TJ International Ltd, Padstow,
iii. Cornwall.
- [5] Bassnett, Susan dan Mc Guire. 1988. *'Translation Studies'*. London: Clays Ltd. St Ives plc.
- [6] Bell, T. Roger. 1991. *'Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice'*. London: Longman.
- [7] Brown, Gillian and Yule, George. 1983. *'Discourse Analysis'*. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Catford, JC. 1969. *'A Linguistics Theory of Translation'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [9] Cooper, J. David. 2001. *'Using Different Types of Texts for Effective Reading Instruction'*. Houghton Mifflin Company. <http://www.eduplace.com>
- [10] Cutting, Joan. 2002. *'Pragmatics and Discourse'*; A Course book for Students. London and New York: Routledge; Taylor & Francis Group.
- [11] Day, Robert A. 2008. *'How to Write and Publish Scientific Papers'*. Spanish and Washington DC, USA: Organization Panamericana de la Salud; Fundacao Oswaldo Cruz; memorias@firocruz.br.
- [12] Edi Subroto. 2007. *'Pengantar Metode Penelitian Linguistik Struktural'*. Surakarta: LPP UNS Press.
- [13] Esti Junining. 2003. *'The Translation of Thesis Abstracts in the Accounting Department of Brawijaya University'*. Thesis: State University of Malang, Graduate Program in English Language Education.
- [14] Farida Amalia. 2007. *'Ideologi dalam Penerjemahan'*. Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia: <http://www.apfi-pppsi.com/cadence24/pdf/24-11.pdf>
- [15] Fauwsett, Peter. 1997. *'Translation and Language'*; Linguistic Theories Explained. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.

- [16] Gilbert, Susan. 1985. *'How to Write an Abstract'* on Science Digest Journal, published on May 1985. Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association.
- [17] Grosz, Barbara J, & Joshi, Aravind K. 2003. *'A Framework for Modelling the Local Coherence of Discourse'*. Cambridge: Division of Applied Sciences, Harvard University. grosz@das.harvard.edu. <http://acl/dc.upenn.edu/j/j95/.2003.pdf>
- [18] Hadari Nawawi & Mimi Martini. 2005. *'Penelitian Terapan'*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press. Hoed, Benny H. 2006. *'Tentang Penerjemah'*. Jakarta: Harian Nasional Kompas.
- [19] Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, Ruqaya. 1980. *'Cohesion in English'*. Great Britain: Longman Group Ltd.
- [20] 1985. *'An Introduction to Functional Grammar'*. Great Britain: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd.
- [21] Hoed, Benny H. 2006. *'Tentang Penerjemah'*. Jakarta: Harian Nasional Kompas. Hoed, Benny H. 2006. *'Tentang Penerjemah'*. Jakarta: Harian Nasional Kompas.
- [22] Ida Sundari Husen. 2005. *'Masalah Pilihan Kata dalam Penerjemahan Menciptakan Kata Baru atau Menerima Kata Pinjaman?'*. HPI d.a Pusat Penerjemahan FIB UI Gedung Rektorat Lantai Dasar, Jl. Salemba Raya No. 4 Jakarta Pusat; <http://wartahpi.org/content/view/28/54/>
- [23] Kilborn, Judith. 1998. *'Writing Abstracts'*. LEO: Literacy Education Online. St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minnesota. <http://leo.stcloudstate.edu/bizwrite/abstracts.htm>
- [24] Koopman, Philip. 1997. *'How to Write an Abstract'*. Carnegie Mellon University: <http://www.ece.cmu.edu/~koopman/essays/abstract.html>
- [25] Larson, Mildred L. 1991. *'Meaning-Based Translation'*. New York. University Press of America.
- [26] Lauwerse, M.M & Graesser, A.C. 2005. *'Coherence in Discourse'*. Chicago, Fitzroy Dearborn. <http://www.autotutor.org/publications/newspapers/Louwerse>.
- [27] Machali, Rochayah. 2000. *'Pedoman Bagi Penerjemah'*. Jakarta. P.T.Grasindo Gramedia Widiasarana.
- [28] 2009. *'Kajian Penerjemahan Terkait Budaya: dengan Kasus-kasus Domestication and Foreignization'* dalam *'Telaah-telaah Wacana, Bahasa, dan Penerjemahan'*. Yogyakarta: Sunan Kalijaga Press.

- [29] Mc. Carthy, Michael. 1991. *'Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers'*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [30] Mc Guire, Susan Bassnet. 1988. *'Translation Studies'*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd. British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data.
- [31] Molina, L and Albir, AH. 2002. *'Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach'* dalam *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal* Vol. 47, No. 4 p. 498 – 512, <http://id.erudit/008033ar.pdf>
- [32] Munday, Jeremy. 2000. *'Introducing Translation Studies': Theories and Applications*. London : Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- [33] Nasution, S. 2003. *'Metode Research: Penelitian Ilmiah'*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- [34] Newmark, Peter. 1981. *'Approach to Translation'*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, Ltd.
- [35] 1988. *'A Textbook of Translation'*. Great Britain Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- [36] Nida, Eugene A. 1976. *'Language Structure and Translation'*. California: Stanford University University Press.
- [37] Taber, Charles R. 1974. *'The Theory and Practice of Translation'*. Leiden: The United Bible Societies.
- [38] Nunun Tri Widarwati. 2001. *'Kesulitan-kesulitan Penerjemahan dari Bahasa Inggris ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia oleh Para Dosen Universitas Sebelas Maret'*. Surakarta. Tesis.
- [39] Procter, Margeret. 2008. *'The Abstract'* Home / FAQs / News / Writing Centres / Advice / Books / For Faculty; California State Science Fair / Recommended Abstract Structure / CalfSF@usc.edu University of Toronto.
- [40] Pym, Anthony. 1992. *'Translation and Text Transfer', An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication'*. Frankfurt, Germany. Verlag Peter Lang GmbH.
- [41] Saedi, K. Lotfipour. 1997. *'Lexical Cohesion and Translation Equivalence'*. *Meta*, Vol. 42, No. 1 Th. 1997, p. 185-192.
- [42] Sakri, Adjat. 1984. *'Thwal Menerjemahkan'*. Bandung. Penerbit ITB Bandung.
- [43] Sidiropoulou, Maria. 2005. *'Abstract Writing: English-Speaking Countries vs. Greece'*. *Meta*, Vol. 40, No. 4 Th 2005, p. 579-593. <http://id.erudit.org/erudit/004140ar>
- [44] S. Nasution. 2003. *'Metode Research': Penelitian Ilmiah*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.

- [45] Soricut, Radu & Marcu, Daniel. 2003. *'Discourse Generation Using Utility – Trained Coherence Models'*. Information Sciences Institute University of Southern California. <http://www.isi.edu/~radu/papers/ACL06/id/4to-cameraready.pdf>
- [46] Sukandarrumidi. 2002. *'Metodologi Penelitian'*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- [47] Sukirmiyadi, 2014. Dissertation: 'A Study on the Abstract Translation of Dissertation from Indonesian into English'. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta.
- [48] Sutopo, H.B.. 2002. *'Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif': Dasar Teori dan Terapannya*
- [49] 2006. *'Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar Teori dan Terapannya dalam Penelitian'*; Surakarta: UNS Surakarta
- [50] Taryadi, Alfons. 2005. *'Terjemahan yang Ngawur'*. Jakarta,: harian Nasional kompas. Jakarta.
- [51] Venuti, Lawrence. 2004. *'The Translation Studies Reader'* USA and Canada: TJ International Ltd. , Padstow, Cornwall
- [52] Williamson, Owen D. 2008. *'How to Write a Better Abstract'*; Sydney: Spine Society of Australia. Owen.williamson@med.monash.edu.au
- [53] Wolf, Florian & Gibson, Edward. 2004. *'Discourse Coherence and Pronoun Resolution'*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Language and Cognitive Processes, Email: fwolf@mit.edu
- [54] Yus, Francisco. 2002. *'Special Issue on Pragmatics and Translation'*. Alicante, Spain: Department of English Studies, University of Alicante. <http://www.ua.es/dfing/personal/profits/yus.htm>