

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses some theories related to the field of this study. The theories deal with the definition of, collocation, classification of translation, types of translation and research abstract.

2.1 Collocation

Numerous of overlapping definitions and explanations of the notion of collocation has been proposed by some scholars. Some of them share the same sense that collocation is habitual co-occurrence of words or group of words. Nettinger and DeCario (1992) defined collocation as a string of specific lexical items that co-occur with a mutual expectancy greater than change. It is emphasized by Nation (2001) and McCarty and O'Dell (2008) who suggested collocation as a pair of words that often used together. According to Hill (1999), collocation field defines difference between words of similar meaning.

The different idea is proposed by Palmer (1976) who suggested that the co-occurrence of a collocation are determined both by the meaning of individual words and by the convention about 'the company they keep'. Carter (1998) defines collocation as a group of words which occur repeatedly in a language. Similarity, Lewis (2002) suggested that collocation is a predictable combination

of words which some of them may be immensely predictable such as *mineral water*, *foot the bill*, and *spring the mind*. He stated that because the lexicon is not arbitrary, we do not speak or write as if language were one huge substitution table with vocabulary items merely filling slots in grammatical structures. Furthermore, According to Notion (2001) Collocation differ greatly in size (the number of words involve in the sequence), in type (function words collocating with the content word (look with *at*), content words collocating with content word (*united* with *state*), in closeness of collocation (express their own honest opinion) and in the possible range of collocation.

According to Boonysaquan (2005) there are four characteristics of collocation. First, collocation is frequent co-occurrence of items between which no word can be inserted. For instance, word *bread and butter* are collocation. It is unusual to say *bread, cheese and butter*. Second, the collocation is composed by components which cannot be substitute by a synonym of word similar meaning. For instance, word *trip* and *journey* have similar meaning, but it is unacceptable to put *journey* with *business*, otherwise, it is common to heard *business trip*. Third, collocation is binominals which cannot be replaced. The sequence of collocation is more or less fixed. For instance, *bed* and *breakfast*, not *breakfast* and *bread*, *slowly but surely*, *more or less*, *fish and chip*. Fourth, some collocations are predictable. For instance, if a person hears collocation *more or...* s/he automatically expects the word *less* will follow.

The importance of collocation has long been noticed by many scholars. The key constituent of the lexicon of natural language is represented by collocation (Sughair, 2011). According to Hill (as stated in Lewis, 2000) collocation is very important because the way the words combined is fundamental to all language use. It makes think the complex ideas quickly and communicate more effectively. Collocations is also essential in learning a language because words are learned and used in context, and without knowing the proper co-text, with which a word can be used, little claim can be made to have mastered that word (Sadhegi, 2009).

The importance of collocation in terms of learning a language is proposed by McCharty and O'Dell (2008). According to them, there are three significance of leaning collocation. First, collocation gives the most natural way of say something, for instance the *smoking is strictly forbidden* is more natural than *smoking is strongly forbidden*. Second, collocation gives the more expressive and colorful way of say something, for instance, *a big meal* is more expressive than *a substantial meal*. Third, collocation improves the style of writing more variety.

The importance of collocation in terms of academic writing is proposed by Notion (2001) who suggested the significant of collocation as a part of academic vocabulary. First academic collocation is common to a wide range of academic text and not so common in non-academic test. Second, academic collocation accounts for a substansial number of words in academic texts. Third academic collocation is generally not as well known as technical vocabulary. Fourth,

academic collocation is the kind of specialised vocabulary that an English teacher can usefully help learners with.

In conclusion, based on the explanation above, this study defined collocation as a natural combination of a word in a language which is categorized based on its frequency of occurrence and its strength and some of them are predictable.

2.2 Types of Collocation

The various perspectives in classifying and defining types of collocation had been proposed by scholars. According to Hill (1999) collocation is divided into four types based on its strength; (1) unique collocation (2) strong collocation (3) weak collocation and (4) medium-strength collocation. Lewis (2000) distinguished collocation between *strong* collocation which some of them are an idiom e.g. *shrug your mind* and *common* collocation which arrange numerous words combination e.g. *fast foot, a big flat, a nice car* and *have lunch*. In other side, McIntosh (1961) and Palmer (1976) classified collocations based on the basis of their restrictions on words. Furthermore, Palmer (1981) suggested three classifications of collocation on the basis restriction as follow:

1. Some restrictions are based fully on the meaning of the item such as *green cow*.
2. Some restrictions are based on range-a word may be used with a whole set of words that have some semantic features in common. This explains

the unlikeness of the *pretty boy* (pretty being used with words denoting females).

3. Some are collocation in the strictest sense, involving neither meaning nor range, as *addled* with *eggs* and *brains* (p. 79).

Although the types of collocation had been proposed by scholars in many different ways, the most common classification of collocation is the one into Grammatical and Lexical Collocation. It is emphasized by Benson, Benson, and Ilson (1986), Bahn (1993), Carter (1998) and Lewis (2000) who defined collocation into Grammatical collocation and Lexical Collocation. The detailed of each type is explained below.

2.2.1 Grammatical Collocation

According to Benson, *et.al* (1986), grammatical collocation generally is a dominant open class word consists of content words such as a noun, a verb and adjective plus preposition or *infinitive*. Grammatical collocations usually consist of a noun, an adjective or a verb plus, a preposition or a grammatical structure such as ‘to-infinitive’ or ‘that-clause’, for instance *by accident, to be afraid that* (Bahardoust *et al.* 2012). According to Lewis (2000) grammatical collocation at least combines two words together with other words, for example *aware of problem* and *interested in football*. Grammatical collocation is sometimes also idiomatic.

According to Benson et al (1986) and Lewiss (2000) there are eight subtypes of grammatical collocation, such as; (1) Noun + Preposition

combination, for examples, *blockade against*, *claim on*, *pride in*, and *protest against*. (2) Noun followed by *to* + Infinitives combination, for examples, *it was a pleasure (a problem, a struggle) to do it*, *they had the foresight (instructions, an obligation, permission) to do it* and *they felt a compulsion (an impulse, a need) to do it*. (3) Noun + That-Clause combination, for examples, *we reached an agreement that she would represent us in court*; *He took an oath that he would do his duty*. (4) Preposition + noun combinations, for examples, *by accident*, *in advance*, *to somebody's advantage*, *on somebody's advice* and *under somebody's aegis*. (5) Adjective + Preposition combination, for examples, *angry with* (*marah kepada*), *rely on* (*bersandar kepada*) and *proud of* (*bangga kepada*). (6) Adjectives and a following *to* + infinitive combination, for examples, *it was necessary to work*, *it was necessary for him to work*, and *it was stupid of them to go*. (7) Adjective + That-Clause combination, for examples, *she was afraid that she would fail* and *It was imperative that I be here*. And the last (7) Verb + Preposition combination, for example, *began to speak*

Based on the explanation above, this study defined grammatical collocation as combination of open class words consist of adjective or a verb plus a preposition or infinitives.

2.2.2 Lexical Collocation

Lexical Collocation consists of dominant open class word (like a verb, a noun, or an adjective) and a preposition or grammatical structure (Benson *et al*, 1986). Farokh (2012) proposed that Lexical Collocation could be made up of nouns, adjectives, verbs, or adverbs, like *warmest regards*, *strictly accurate*, and etc. According to Shamma (2013) Lexical Collocations are combinations of nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs, such as *official permission*, *arbitrary government*, *seriously injured*. They range between somewhat fixed and nearly loose combinations. However, it seems that words with ‘medium strength’ are the most common.

According to Benson *et al* (1986) and Lewis (2000), there are seven subtypes of lexical collocation, such as; (1) the Verb denoting creation or addition + Noun combination, for examples, *compose music*, *come to agreement*, and *launch a missile*. According to Moehkardi (2002), not all verbs denoting creation or action can be collocated with any nouns. Combination of verbs such as *build*, *cook*, *cause*, *make* + noun are limitless and their meaning are predictable. (2) Verb denoting eradication or cancellation + Noun combination, for examples, *reject an appeal* and *break a code*. (3) The Adjective + Noun combination, for examples, *strong tea*, *chronic alcoholic*, and *fast food*. In some cases more than one adjective can collocate with the same noun, for example *strong/weak tea*, and *kind/kindest/best regard*. (4) The Noun + Verb combination, for examples, *booms explode*, *cat mew*, *bee*

sting. (5) The Noun + Noun combination, for examples, *honey moon*, *banquette of flower*, and *piece of advice*. This subtype indicates the larger unit which a single member belongs and a specific, concentrate, small unit of something larger. (6) The Adverb + Adjective combination, for examples, *hopelessly addicted*, *deeply absorbed*, and *sound asleep*. The meaning of most adverbs in this pattern is 'very'. And (7) the Verb + Adverb combination, for examples, *apologize humbly* and *argue heatedly*

In the BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations, Benson *et al.* (1986) also separated lexical combinations into five groups according to their degree of cohesiveness.

Table 2.1 Characteristic of lexical collocation by Benson *et al* (1986)

No	Type	Characteristic	Example
1	Compounds	Completely frozen; no variations at all are possible	1. aptitude test 2. floppy disk
2	Idioms	Relatively frozen expressions whose meanings do not reflect the meanings of their component parts.	1. to have one's back to the wall 2. hammer and tongs
	Transitional	More frozen and less variable than collocations; their meanings are close to those suggested by their component parts	1. foot the bill 2. to be in the tight spot
4	Combinations	The meaning of the whole does reflect the meaning of the parts	1. pure chance 2. to commit murder
5	Free	Their components are the freest regard to combining with other lexical items	1. To analyze/report investigate a murder 2. to recall an event/adventure

Based on the explanation above, this study defined Lexical Collocation as combinations of words consist of verb, noun, adjective and adverb which some of them are strong and free collocation.

2.3 Translation

Numerous definitions of translation have been stated by linguist experts from time to time in various ways. The essential definition of translation itself is the process of transferring the meaning from source language into target language. As proposed by Nida and Taber (2000), translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language to the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in term of meaning, and second, in term of style. Based on that statement, it emphasized that the meaning of source language and target language must be translated accurately. Newmark (1988) proposed the definition of translation as the process of rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way the author intended to the text.

According to Lubis (2013) ideal mission of translation is to make the readers of the translated text understand and accept it as a reading which is both linguistically and culturally natural as his/her own native language, it is the meaning which must be translated. It is means that the core meaning expressed is more important to be translated rather than the form of source language. His examples are, the sentence *Hujan turun lagi* would be translated into *Rain comes down again* which may be understood by English native speakers but sounds

awkward since it never exists in their linguistic repertoire, the sentence *I am waiting for your reply* is the result of literal translation of *Saya menunggu jawaban Saudara* as equally understood but that is not how native speakers of English express the message for what they usually write is *I am looking forward to your reply*.

In line with Lubis, Bell (1993 p.13) suggested that translation is the express in another language (target language) of what has been express in other language (source language), preserving semantics and stylistic equivalent. Based on that statement, the meaning translated in target language should be able to convey same expression as well as said in the source language. Bassneet (2002) proposed two aspects that should be ensured in the process of rendering of a source language text into the target language, (1) the surface meaning of two will be approximately similar (2) the structures of the SL will be preserved as closely as possible but not so closely that the structures will be seriously distorted.

Based on the definitions the this study defined the translation as an action of rendering the meaning from one language (SL) into another language (TL) while in the process, the structure of source language could be interpreted differently following the target language structure without changing and eliminating the core meaning or point message.

2.4 Translation Methods

Translation is used to refer all the processes and methods to convey the meaning of the source language into the target language (Rabeh, 2010).

According to Newmark (1988), there are eight methods in translation. The first is word-for-word translation. That method attempts to translate the source language directly into the target language by their most equivalent meaning, even the products is out of context, especially for idioms, proverbs and cultural words. The second is literal translation. That method attempts to translate grammatical structure of source language into the nearest target language equivalent but the lexical word is translated become out of context. The third is faithful translation. In that method, the source language is interpreted into the closest contextual meaning of target language include the cultural words, the degree of grammatical structure and lexical 'abnormality' in the translation. The fourth is semantic translation. The difference of that method from faithful translation is only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value. The fifth is adaptation translation. That method is used mainly for the plays, comedy, poetry, theme, character and plot which needed to converted the culture of source language into target language and rewritten text. The sixth is free translation. That study reproduces the matter without the manner, or the content without the form of the original, usually, it is a paraphrase much longer than the original, a so-called 'intralingual translation. The seventh is idiomatic translation. That method reproduces the message of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where these do not exist in the original. The last is communicative translation. That method attempts to convert the exact contextual meaning of source language in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership.

2.5 Collocation Translation

Some scholars have shared the same idea that translating collocation is not an easy matter. Collocations are notoriously difficult for non-native speakers to translate, primarily because they are opaque but cannot be translated on a word by word basis (Samdja & McKeown, 1994). It is emphasized by LÜ and Zhou (2004) who stated that many collocation translations are idiosyncratic in the sense that they are unpredictable by syntactic and semantic features. For example in Indonesia the translation of word *di* can be *in*, *on*, or *at*, the translation of word *depan* can be *front* or *forward*. However, the translations of collocation *di depan* as *in front of* is preferred over *at front of* or *on front of* or *in forward*. According to Sughair (2011), in the process of translation collocation, learner must be very careful in delivering the accurate equivalent in target language. Furthermore, he assumed that it is not enough to translate collocation only based on its component, instead, the semantic and cultural characteristic are needed to be considered. According to Baker (2011), the close match between collocation patterns in two languages might not carry the same meaning, for example *to run a car* in English means *to own*, *to use* and *be able to maintain a car financially*. However, in Modern Greek to speak of car *running* simply means that *it's being driven with excessive speed*.

The pattern of collocation of one language may differ from another. For example, in Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian), the word *memasak* (to cook) may co-occur with *kue* (cake) and foods like *sayur* (vegetables), *nasi* (rice), *sop* (soup) etc. The word *angry* in English collocates with *with* while *kind* collocates with *to*,

rely with *on*. Furthermore, in Bahasa Indonesia *marah* (angry), *baik* (kind) and *bertumpu* (rely) all collocate with the same preposition *kepada* (to) as in *marah kepada, baik kepada, bertumpu pada (kepada)* (Lubis, 2013).

The first stage of translating collocation is necessary to taking account of collocation meaning rather than substituting individual words with their dictionary equivalents. The use of the established pattern of collocation also helps to distinguish a smooth translation that does not require readers to labor unproductively over irrelevant linguistic infelicities from a clumps translation which might leave readers with the impression that the translator is simply inexperienced or incompetence (Baker, 2011).

According to Shitu (2015) there are four sources of lexical and grammatical collocation translation errors. The first is interlingual transfer as a source of collocation errors among EFL and ESL learners. Many scholars have confirmed that first language collocation knowledge interferes with the learning of English collocations in line, leading to the making of errors because of the differences in the systems of the two languages. The Second one is the use of certain learning strategy types such as synonym, repetition and overgeneralization. EFL students tend to translate a word in target language with a synonym in the source language nevertheless there are no perfect synonyms in the English language. As the result, students with limited proficiency in English use this strategy because their competence of English is low. The Third is the lack of collocation competence as a main cause of collocation errors; it is shown as students often come up with the wrong choices of words in their writing as

indicated lack of collocation competence. The fourth other causes cover approximation, ignorance of rules restrictions, false concept hypothesis.

In short, collocation translation is challenging because it needs good mastery of vocabulary and collocation in the target language. Several factors as mother tongue influence, the low competence of target language and the use of certain strategy are lead to error in collocation translation. The other aspects are need to be considered in collocation translation such as avoiding word per word and literal translation and paying attention to the language structure differences.

2.6 Abstract in Student's *Skripsi*

According to John W. Creswell (2012), an Abstract is a summary of the major aspects of a study or article, conveyed in a concise way, for this purpose, often no more than 350 words and written with specific components that describe the study. American Psychological Association (2011) proposed an abstract as a brief, comprehensive summary of the contents of the article; it allows readers to survey the contents of an article quickly, and, like a title, it enables abstracting and information services to index and retrieve articles. Abstract is an important element in research article or scientific writing which aimed to fulfil the formal rules of writing in education institute.

The statement of a good abstract defined by American Psychological Association (2001) which should convey the certain qualities below:

1. Accurate, It should reflects the paper's objective and content
2. Self-contained, there is no abbreviations, it defined the unique terms, it use paraphrasing instead of quoting
3. Concise and specific, It is brief, ideally not exceeding 120 words, It contains only most important concepts, findings, and implications.
4. Nonevaluative, It report contents of manuscript without commenting on them.
5. Coherent and readable, It use active voice, It use present tense for implications, and past tense for talking about the experimental manipulation

Based on explanation above, this study suggested research abstract as a brief summary of a whole research consist of research purposes, objectives, findings, and conclusion.

2.7 Previous Studies on Collocation Translation Errors

Several studies of collocation translation errors have been conducted by students and scholars. The first, a study by Lestariana (2017) , as student of IAIN Metro Lampung investigated collocation translation occurred in ten students English Department asbtract of skripsi proposal. The study was coming up with the result showed that the Indonesian collocation was translated into English collocation on undergraduate thesis abstract consisted of the incorrect collocation

74,45% and correct collocation 25,55%. There were two types of incorrect collocation namely Lexical Collocation 89,01% and Grammatical collocation 10,99%. Moreover, problems that were faced by the student in translating collocation were caused by approximation, ignorance of the rule restriction, overgeneralization, interlingual transfer, false concept of hypothesized, the use of synonym, word coinage and the meaning of lexical item.

Hasemi, Azizinedhad and Dravishi (2011) investigated the collocation errors in Iranian EFL college learners' writing. They conduct a research of 68 sophomores University students in Hamadan City as the participant. They collected thirty-eight assignments and thirty-eight in-class practice and analyzed for collocation errors. The modified version of Benson et al. (1986) and Chen (2002) is used to identify the unacceptable and Lexical Collocation errors. As the suggestion provider for the correction, the British National Corpus was employed. They also administered questioners to explore the participant's perception of difficulty in collocation. The result of questioners revealed that the participants' perceptions of collocation types were different from the collocation error types the participants made in their writing samples. Ignorance of rule restrictions was the major source of collocation errors. EFL students make collocation errors in their writing because of the interference of their mother tongue, lack knowledge of the collocation concept, intralingual transfer, paraphrase and their shortage of their collocation knowledge.

In 2013, a study entitled 'Collocation as Source of Translation Unacceptability: Indonesian Students' Experiences by Lubis. The study is exploring the wrong English collocations made by some Indonesian English learners. It intended to find out the causes of the wrong collocations. The study collected twenty-seven wrong English Lexical Collocations and nine wrong grammatical from the students' translation and writing assignments have been examined. After comparing the patterns of English collocations and the Indonesian collocations, the researcher found that the erroneous English collocations are attributed to four causes: (1) learners' lack of knowledge of collocation (2) differences of collocations between English and Bahasa Indonesia, (3) learners' low mastery of vocabulary and (4) strong interferences of the learners' native language.

The next study is conducted by Shitu (2015) aimed to identify the errors, analyze their structural compositions so as to determine whether there are similarities between students in this regard and to find out whether there are patterns to these kinds of errors which will enable the researcher to understand their sources and causes. The data was collated using percentages in which the identified numbers of occurrences were converted accordingly in percentages. The findings from the study indicate that there are similarities as well as regular and repeated errors which provided a pattern. It is concluded that students' collocation errors are attributable to poor teaching and learning which resulted in wrong generalization of rules.