Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

A Comparative Analysis of Interjections in the Prologue of *It Ends with Us* by Colleen Hoover and Its Indonesian Translation, *Akhir Antara Kita*: Implications for Language and Translation Education

*Tanty Aidullia Nasution, M. Mulyadi**

University of Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
*Correspondence: E-mail: mulyadi@usu.ac.id

A B S T R A C T

This study examines the translation of interjections through a comparative analysis of the novel *It Ends with Us* and its Indonesian translation, *Akhir Antara Kita*, with emphasis on implications for language and translation education. A qualitative descriptive method with a comparative approach was employed to classify interjections into expressive, cognitive, and phatic categories and to identify translation strategies and equivalence levels. The findings show that expressive interjections were the most frequently used, often translated through literal rendering, adaptation, or substitution to maintain emotional tone and cultural appropriateness. Cognitive and phatic interjections were generally preserved or slightly modified to suit the natural flow of the target language. While some interjections were directly transferred due to shared linguistic forms, others required modulation or replacement to achieve semantic or pragmatic equivalence. The results highlight the importance of contextually sensitive strategies in translation pedagogy for preserving emotional nuance and narrative authenticity in literary works.

A R T I C L E   I N F O

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the linguistic components that is crucial for expressing feelings, expressions, and the level of communication in a text is the interjection (Ameka, 1992; Jamaliddinovich, 2023; Sauter, 2014; Wierzbicka, 1992). Interjections are frequently employed in literary works, particularly novels, to heighten the emotional tone of both narrative and conversation (Jamaliddinovich, 2023). It Ends with Us by Colleen Hoover, which has been translated into Indonesian as Akhir Antara Kita, is one of the books that makes extensive use of interjections (Miclea, 2023; Zuhroni & Syamsurrijal, 2023). The potential for translation discrepancies that could impact the original meaning and subtleties of the source material is analyzed in this book (Wahid & Basari, 2020).

According to semantics, interjections are lexical units with expressive meaning that can stand alone in utterances without the need for a particular syntactic form (Khaichevska *et al*., 2024; Riemer, 2014; Wierzbicka, 1992). Interjections have very contextual meanings and frequently express the speaker's impulsive feelings. Some researchers (Ameka, 1992) distinguished three primary categories of interjections: conative (used to draw attention or guide the interlocutor's actions), expressive (used to convey the speaker's feelings, such as surprise, happiness, or anger), and cognitive (used to mark the thinking process or decision-making). The way these interjections are translated from one language to another can be impacted by linguistic and cultural variations.

Interjections can also be categorized according to how they are used in communication. Numerous interjections that are often used in different languages include (Shalika & Mulyadi, 2019; Wierzbicka, 1992):

(i)   Primary interjection: A word or phrase that functions solely as an interjection and has no other meaning, such as "oh," "ah," "wow."
(ii) Secondary interjection: A word that originates from another part of speech but can be used as an interjection, such as "seriously?", "crazy!", "Oh my".
(iii) Emotive interjections: Expressing emotions such as surprise, sadness, anger, or happiness about something, for example, "ouch," "wow," "hooray."
(iv) Voltive interjection: expresses a desire that encourages specific reactions from the other party, such as "hey!", "Hello!".
(v)   Cognitive interjections: Use for the process of thinking and knowing something, such as "wah", "wow", "oh".

There are various forms of incorporation at the semantic level. This study will also concentrate on translation in accordance with the previously described backdrop. There are seven different kinds of interjection translations due to the translation methodologies used for interjections. The first method is literal translation, in which interjections are translated word for word. Interjections from the source language will be translated into the target language using this method without undergoing any grammatical or semantic modifications. The second method is translation, which is translation uses an interjection with a dissimilar meaning but a different form. The interjection is then translated from the source language to the target language using a word with the same meaning but a different form. Third, translating using a non-interjective structure that conveys a similar meaning, although not in the form of interjections, this type will direct the translator when translating interjections from the source language to the target language. The reason for this translation is that the translator was unable to locate a translation in the target language for the interjection. Fourth, translation by an exclamation with a different meaning, in which the translator, because of a different point of view, will employ a new interjection with no word similarity in

the target language. Fifth, omission, the target language's use of the interjection remains unchanged since it does not affect the sentence's meaning. Last but not least is the kind of translation that is the addition of elements, in which the translator incorporates several factors to make the text more equal or natural in order to let the reader fully grasp the idea.

Below from some explanation about interjection and the types of translation interjection, there are some examples:

Example 1:

SL: "Hey! Dokkie!"

TL: *"Hei! Pupi!"*

It is evident from the aforementioned example data that the interjection is translated using a literal translation style. This is demonstrated by the translation procedure, which faithfully renders the interjection word for word without altering its grammar. This is appropriate even though the letter patterns for "Hey" in the SL and "Hei" in the TL differ in terms of writing form. "Hei" is an English interjection that is similar to "Hey" but lacks an article, according to KBBI. This interjection is used to draw attention when it has a meaning that is defined by the Oxford Dictionary. Additionally, the interjection "Hey" can also imply surprise, curiosity, or displeasure. When that semantic equivalency is present, this translation can be widely accepted.

Example 2:

SL: "Well! The easter bunny is going to be disappointed in you boys!"

TL: *"Nah! Kelinci Paskah akan sangat kecewa terhadap kalian, anak-anak!"*

The translation of the interjection "Well" in SL to "Nah" in TL is an example of interjection seen in the aforementioned example is interjection with a dissimilar form but the same meaning. The interjection "Nah" belongs to the major interjection group, while the interjection "Well" is secondary. The interjection "Well" basically conveys feelings of surprise, rage, and relief. The interjection "Nah" in the TL phrase signifies that it has the same meaning as the SL interjection. As a result, despite their differing forms, these two interjections signify the same thing. As a result, this interjection falls under the primary and secondary interjection categories or can also be called a phatic interjection.

Because interjections are not merely linguistic but also have a pragmatic component relating to culture and social environment, translating them can be particularly difficult for translators. Thus, the purpose of this study is to compare how interjections are used in the original text and its translation, as well as to examine how much of the original text's interjections are changed or kept in the translation.

2. METHODS

This study combines a comparative method with a qualitative descriptive approach (De Block & Vis, 2019; Greckhamer *et al*., 2018). Information was gathered from Colleen Hoover's book "It Ends with Us," that published in 2016, and *"Akhir antara Kita,"* that published in Indonesia in 2019, the Indonesian translation. Techniques for collecting notes on every type of interjection that occurred in both texts were used to obtain data.

The analysis was carried out by categorizing interjections according to Ameka (1992) taxonomy, which includes primary interjections (words that serve entirely as interjections) and secondary interjections (words that begin in other word classes but are employed as interjections). The data is then compared between the source and translated texts to find patterns of interjection translation, which can be direct, changed, or omitted. Data gathering method in the form of document analysis using comparative and thematic analysis approaches that will be applied to the novel under investigation. This method of gathering

data is consistent with the qualitative approach. The gathered data will thereafter be examined using the methods, which include data presentation, data condensation, conclusion drawing, and verification. This study uses triangulation strategies to improve data quality by evaluating the analysis results with language and translation professionals and comparing them to interjection translation theories. Therefore, it is anticipated that the study's findings would shed light on how to translate interjections in fiction books and how they affect the target language reader's experience.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section elaborates in more depth on the findings of interjection usage in "It Ends with Us" and its Indonesian translation "*Akhir antara Kita*", focusing on the types of interjection, translation strategies, functional equivalence, and cultural adaptation based on the frameworks (Ameka, 1992; Molina & Albir, 2004). From Chapter One, interjections were classified into three main types: expressive, cognitive, and phatic. Expressive interjections dominated the dataset, aligning with the novel's emotionally driven narrative. Cognitive interjections were also frequent, especially in internal monologue or reflective speech. Phatic interjections occurred primarily in spontaneous spoken interactions.

3.1. Type of Interjection and Translation Techniques in Novel 'It Ends with Us' and 'Akhir antara Kita'

From the data collection that has been conducted, several data points have been found. Here is the data in **Table 1** containing interjections from the novel 'It Ends with Us' and its translation '*Akhir antara Kita*', along with the classification of interjection types and their translation methods.

Table 1. Type of Interjection in Novel 'It Ends with Us'.

No	Interjection (EN)	Interjection (ID)	Type of Interjection	Translation Techniques	Equivalence Level	Note
1	Oh, God	*Ya Tuhan*	Expresive	Literal	Textual Equivalent	Maintained semantically and functionally
2	Jesus	*Astaga*	Expresive	Adaptation	Pragmatic Equivalent	Avoiding explicit religious elements in the context of Indonesian culture
3	Uh	*Uh*	Phatic	Borrowing	Formal Correspondence	Not translated, kept in its original form.
4	Oh	*Oh*	Expresive	Literal	Textual Equivalent	The same in both languages.
5	Huh	*Hah*	Cognitive	Adaptation	Textual Equivalent	Adjusted to the natural form of the target language

Table 1 (continue). Type of Interjection in Novel 'It Ends with Us'.

No	Interjection (EN)	Interjection (ID)	Type of Interjection	Translation Techniques	Equivalence Level	Note
6	Wow	*Wow*	Expresive	Borrowing	Formal Correspondence	It hasn't changed because it's already common in Indonesian.
7	Damn it!	*Sialan*!	Expresive	Substitution	Semantic Equivalent	The tone of the insults is maintained, but with adjusted intensity.
8	Well	*Yah*	Cognitive/ Fatis	Equivalence	Textual Equivalent	Adjusted to sound natural in the target language.
9	Yeah, well	*Yah, mau bagaimana lagi*	Cognitive	Modulation + amplification	Pragmatic Equivalence	Adapting expressions to feel natural and emotional

Interjections like Oh, Uh, and Wow are still used in the Indonesian version without any modifications, according to the data that has been discovered. This demonstrates a shared linguistic function and cultural awareness. It has been discovered that some interjections undergo adaptation or substitution in addition to their unaltered usage. One example of an interjection that underwent modification is "Jesus," which became "*Astaga*." In order to avoid violating regional religious customs, this adaptation takes cultural pragmatics into account. Additionally, a unique technique—the interjection "Damn it"—is used to convert the subtlety to "*Sialan*". Because the word "*sialan*" is more legally acceptable to Indonesian readers than explicit English curses, this shift in interjection is known as replacement. Then, as a kind of equivalency that highlights the organic flow of conversation in the target language, the interjection "Well" is translated as "*Yah*".

3.2. Classification Function of Interjection

In addition to the methods employed, the following list of interjection types is supported by examples that illustrate their primary purposes. **Table 2** showsn the findings collected from both novels.

Table 2. Classification Function of Interjection.

Type of Interjection	Example	Function
Expresive	*Oh, God / Damn / Jesus*	Showing spontaneous emotions such as surprise, anger, or admiration
Cognitive	*Huh / Hah / Well / Yeah*	Explaining the process of thinking or the response to the statement
Phatic	*Uh / Hmm*	Signifying the persistence of communication or uncertainty

3.3. Discussion

From data that has already been found, here "Chapter One" of the novel "It Ends with Us" and its translation "Bab Satu" in "*Akhir antara Kita*" contain examples of each form of interjection (expressive, cognitive, and phatic) (Ameka, 1992; Andayani, 2024; Shalika & Mulyadi, 2019; Widiatmoko & Waslam, 2017).

3.4. Expressive interjection

Expressive interjections reflect emotional reactions such as surprise, anger, sadness, or joy. In the data, examples include:

(i)   Oh, God! → *Ya Tuhan!:* A literal translation, functionally equivalent. Maintains the emotional weight and cultural acceptability in Indonesian.

(ii) Damn it! → *Sialan*!: A substitution technique. The English interjection contains a stronger vulgar tone, while sialan conveys frustration in a more socially acceptable form.

(iii) Jesus! → *Astaga*!: Adaptation was used to avoid the religious specificity of "Jesus," opting for a more culturally neutral Indonesian exclamation.

These translations demonstrate that expressive interjections often undergo adaptation or substitution to achieve functional equivalence, particularly to avoid offensive or culturally loaded expressions.

Example 1:
SL: Oh, God
TL: *Ya Tuhan*

This interjection was used by Lily to hold back her emotions after her father's annoying speech at the funeral. This interjection conveys a mix of frustration and disgust. In the translation, "Oh God" maintains a common religious expression in Indonesian culture without causing a shift in meaning.

Example 2:
SL: Damn It!
TL: *Sialan!*

In this example of interjection in the novel, it is found when Lily remembers her father's actions towards her mother. Lily's words when she remembers her father's mistreatment of her mother. "Damn it!" shows anger and despair, which is translated as "Sialan!" with an equally expressive strength but more acceptable within Indonesian language norms.

3.5. Cognitive Interjection

This interjection seeks to demonstrate thought processes, responses to fresh data, or cognitive reactions to the circumstances at hand (Ameka, 1992; Shalika & Mulyadi, 2019). Cognitive interjections indicate hesitation, evaluation, or processing of information. Examples include:

(i) Well... → *Yah*...: This interjection was used when Lily reflects on her thoughts. The Indonesian version adapts the conversational tone naturally.

(ii) Huh? → *Hah?:* Serves as a cue for clarification or mild surprise. Adapted directly using natural Indonesian expressions.

These translations are generally straightforward due to similar pragmatic functions across languages, enabling equivalence through literal or adaptive choices.

Example 3:
SL: So you're in Boston purgatory, huh?
TL: *Jadi kau sudah msauk kea pi pencucian Boston, hah?*

Used when Lily responds to a confusing statement or situation. "Huh?" is a signal for a request for clarification translated as "Hah?" – a natural form in Indonesian dialogue.

Example 4:
SL: Well, crap. This was a bad idea.
TL: *Yah, sial. Rupanya ini ide buruk.*

Lily uses this kind of interjection in her inner narrative as she attempts to arrange her ideas. This interjection starts a discussion or introspection. The translation "Yah..." adapts to the language's rhythm while retaining a contemplative tone.

Example 5:
SL: Yeah, well. naked truth hurts
TL: *Yah, mau bagaimana lagi. kejujuran telanjang memang menyakitkan*

This interjection is used to initiate a reflective statement or to show acceptance of reality, even though it is unpleasant. Its main function is to show the thought process and a form of recognition. while the translation technique used in this interjection is the Modulation + Amplification technique. Modulation: occurs because the structure and expression change from the concise form "Yeah, well" to *"Yah, mau bagaimana lagi"* which is more idiomatic in Indonesian. Amplification: occurs because the translator adds the context *"mau bagaimana lagi"* which is not in the source text, but functions to clarify the meaning and tone of resignation from the speaker. This interjection has a level of pragmatic equivalence. This can be seen from the expression *"Yah, mau bagaimana lagi"* which is not literally identical to "Yeah, well", but pragmatically conveys the same nuance - a form of resignation, acceptance, or reflection on painful reality.

3.6. Phatic Interjection

Phatic interjections serve to mark the presence of communication or maintain the continuity of discourse. Often emotionally neutral (Wierzbicka, 1992). Phatic interjections function to maintain communication flow, often without semantic content:
(i) Uh… → Uh…: Borrowed directly; phonetically and semantically acceptable in both languages.
(ii) Oh… → Oh…: Although often expressive, in some contexts it serves a phatic role to indicate discourse progression or speaker realization.
The fact that these interjections are often preserved indicates their cross-linguistic universality and minimal need for cultural adjustment.

Example 6:
SL: Uh…
TL: Uh…

It appears when Lily is unsure or looking for the right words to say. This interjection is retained in its entirety because it is part of the universally recognized speech in Indonesian.

Example 7:
SL: Oh, no, Lily. Whaat did you do?
TL: *Oh, tidak, Lily. Apa yang kaulakukan?*

Used when Lily suddenly realizes something. Although it is expressive, in this context, "Oh" functions as a phatic to indicate a shift in understanding. The translation retains its original form because it fits naturally.

From several classifications that have been explained, the comparison showed that most interjections were translated with moderate to high fidelity. Literal and borrowing techniques were commonly used when the interjection was shared or close between English and Indonesian. Where cultural or stylistic dissonance existed, adaptation or substitution was applied. Using Baker's framework, the translations achieved varying levels of equivalence:

(i) Textual equivalence;
(ii) pragmatic equivalence that takes into account socio-religious norms; and
(iii) semantic equivalence that also reflects emotional but not vulgar content.

The overall consistency in achieving equivalence suggests that the translator prioritized functional similarity over formal exactness, an effective strategy for emotionally loaded narrative prose. Besides that, cultural context was a key determinant in translating expressive interjections. English interjections with religious references (e.g., Jesus) were replaced with neutral expressions (*Astaga*) to align with Indonesian cultural norms, which are generally more reserved in religious utterances. This highlights the translator's sensitivity to target reader expectations and societal constraints.

4. CONCLUSION

Using a variety of translation procedures, it was discovered that the majority of the interjections in the source text were preserved in the target language. Translations of emotive and culturally appropriate alternatives, such as *Ya Tuhan, Sialan!,* and *Ya ampun*, are used for expressive interjections like Oh, God, Damn it!, and Oh my God. Additionally, phatic and cognitive interjections such as Huh, Well, and Uh are modified or kept in place to conform to the natural form of the Indonesian language. The most common translation strategies are borrowing, adaptation, modulation, and literal translation. In both languages, these strategies are employed to preserve a balance between form and meaning. In the meantime, interjections in translation attain a degree of textual and pragmatic equivalence, with certain instances exhibiting semantic equivalence that successfully preserves the emotional function. Given that the narrative of this book is largely focused on the main character's emotional experiences, the expressive interjection is the most prevalent kind of interjection. The study's findings support the notion that translating interjections calls for awareness of the sociocultural setting and narrative style in addition to language comprehension.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

6. AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. Authors confirmed that the paper was free of plagiarism.

7. REFERENCES

Ameka, F. (1992). Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *18*, 101–118.

Andayani, T. (2024). Analysis of interjections in Supporting Characters in the Novel "Rindu" by Tere Liye. *Journal of Linguistica*, *1*(4), 1–9.

De Block, D., and Vis, B. (2019). Addressing the challenges related to transforming qualitative into quantitative data in qualitative comparative analysis. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *13*(4), 503–535.

Greckhamer, T., Furnari, S., Fiss, P. C., and Aguilera, R. V. (2018). Studying configurations with qualitative comparative analysis: Best practices in strategy and organization research. *Strategic Organization*, *16*(4), 482–495.

Jamaliddinovich, Y. (2023). Linguopoetic characteristics of interjection words. Anglisticum. *Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies*, *12*(11), 34–41.

Khaichevska, T., Bondaruk, L., and Rohach, O. (2024). Cognitive-epistemological, pragmatic, and psycholinguistic aspects of French interjections. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, *11*(1), 96-108.

Miclea, A. (2023). Colleen Hoover's Formulas for Best-Sellers as Seen in Reminders of Him and it Ends with Us. *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, 20(1), 72–79.

Molina, L., and Albir, A. H. (2004). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta*, 47(4), 498–512.

Riemer, N. (2014). Comment: Interjections and expressivity. *Emotion Review*, *6*(1), 64–65.

Sauter, D. A. (2014). Comment: Evidence for basicness from noise-like interjections of emotions. *Emotion Review*, *6*(1), 65–66.

Shalika, M. P., and Mulyadi, M. M. (2019). Cognitive interjection in Indonesian and Japanese. *Humanika*, 26(1), 32.

Wahid, M. I., and Basari, A. (2020). Techniques of translating interjection in the novel "Looking for Alaska" in terms of functions, meanings, and categories. *E-Structural*, *3*(01), 31–44.

Widiatmoko, B., and Waslam, W. (2017). Interjeksi Dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Analisis Pragmatik. *Pujangga*, *3*(1), 87.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). The semantics of interjection. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *18*(2–3), 159–192.

Zuhroni, Z., and Syamsurrijal, S. (2023). Analysis of intrinsic element found in it ends with us by Colleen Hoover. *JISHUM: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *2*(1), 46–58.