

# EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF TRANSLATIONS PRODUCED BY MACHINES AS OPPOSED TO HUMAN

Ahmez A. Jabbar<sup>1</sup>, Evert H. Hilman<sup>2</sup>

English Literature Study Program, Universitas Nasional Indonesia

<sup>1</sup> ahmezaj@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup> evhilman@yahoo.com

## Abstract

This study aims to determine the degree to which machine translations, specifically Google Translate, DeepL, and Microsoft Bing Translator, in terms of accuracy, acceptability, and readability, focusing on the translation of parts of lexical elements, namely collocations, idioms, and fixed expressions in the novel "Animal Farm" by George Orwell. In order to analyze the data, a descriptive-qualitative method with purposive sampling technique was utilized. The main theories used are Translation Methods and Procedures by Newmark and Translation Shifts by Catford as the supporting theory. To achieve greater accuracy in the results, the linguistic structure is also thoroughly examined in this research to ascertain the equivalency of the source and target languages. Out of a number of phrases that were examined and sifted on the basis of lexical element categories, (37) collocations, (49) idioms, and (24) fixed expressions were identified along with their corresponding translation quality parameters and scores. The data analysis revealed that the most accurate translation method was human translation (TL), with a weighted average score of 2.74. Google Translate (GT), Microsoft Bing Translator (MT) (with a score of 2.66), and DeepL (DL) (with a score of 2.33).

**Keywords:** Machine Translation; Translation Methods and Procedures; Three Lexical Elements; Translation Quality

## INTRODUCTION

Translation is essential for communication, enabling us to leap over barriers that exist between diverse languages and cultures. Translation involves converting content from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). This practice has been common for thousands of years and is specifically known as 'interlingual translation.' (Munday, 2001, p.5). As described by Nababan et al. (2012, p.43), translation serves as a vital tool for communication, aiming to fulfill specific communicative goals. These goals are a result of collaborative efforts between the original author of the text, the translator, and the recipient of the translated text. The determination of these goals is heavily influenced by the social and cultural contexts, as well as the beliefs and perspectives of those involved in the source and target texts. A writing is considered a translation when it establishes a parallel relationship with another text, indicating both a resemblance in content and linguistic structure.

Machine translation (MT) refers to automated translation. It involves utilizing computer software to convert a text from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). It's important to note that MT is distinct from computer-aided translation, machine-aided human translation (MAHT), or interactive translation (Okpor, 2014, p.159). The use of technology in translation has had a considerable impact on the translation's accuracy and efficacy. Technology has given translators access to a wide range of tools, from dictionaries to databases, that can assist them in precisely and successfully translating documents, literature, films, and other forms of media. Technology has also enabled translators to gain access to materials in a range of languages, which can aid in the proper translation of texts from one language to another.

Technology has also given translators access to tools such as machine translation, that can be used to translate documents rapidly and accurately.

The use of machine translation can have both positive and negative effects. On the positive side, machine translation can help to bridge language barriers, allowing people to communicate with each other, and appreciate literature more easily. It can also help to reduce the cost and time associated with manual translation. On the negative side, machine translation can produce inaccurate translations and can lead to misunderstandings due to the lack of human understanding of the language. The researcher uses Machine Translations, specifically Google Translate, DeepL, and Microsoft Translator, to translate collocations, idioms, and fixed expressions.

Google Translate's concept seems to have started in 2004 when its co-founder Sergey Brin got irritated upon receiving emails in different languages because the lines were literally translated and lacked meaning. Google Translate was developed by Google in April 2006. Originally Google Translate was released as a statistical machine translation service.

“The idea for Google Translate was first planted in 2004, when co-founder Sergey Brin became frustrated with a translation program the company was licensing after it translated a Korean email into “The sliced raw fish shoes it wishes. Google green onion thing!””

Shu, C (2016, February 18). Google Translate Now Has More Than 100 Languages And Covers 99 Percent Of The Online Population. *TechCrunch*.

<https://techcrunch.com/2016/02/17/google-translate-hits-100-languages/> (Retrieved on January 01, 2024)

DeepL is an online translation service known for its high-quality machine translations. Using artificial intelligence and neural network technology, DeepL provides translations for text and documents across multiple languages. Microsoft Translator provides real-time translation across platforms and devices using neural machine translation. Integrated into Microsoft products, apps, and services, it enables users to translate text, speech, and images seamlessly across multiple languages.

The researcher compares the results with Human Translation (HT), as exemplified by Prof. Bakdi Soemanto, and assesses the quality of the translation. The source of data for this research is George Orwell's novel "Animal Farm." Okpor (2014, p.160) described that challenges in translating collocations, idioms, and fixed expressions using MT can arise from issues such as linguistic limitations, lack of contextual understanding, difficulty in adapting to new domains, as well as the intricate nature of idioms, collocations, and fixed expressions in different languages. These challenges collectively contribute to the ongoing complexities of achieving accurate and contextually appropriate translations in machine translation systems. It's important to note that the aforementioned issues may vary depending on the specific MT system.

To evaluate the effectiveness of machine translation systems and human translators, translated text must be evaluated. While automated metrics like BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and METEOR (Banerjee & Lavie, 2005) offer ways to gauge the quality of translations, human assessment is still necessary to identify subtle differences in fluency, sufficiency, and cultural sensitivity.

According to Baker (2018, pp. 54-56), collocation patterns are largely arbitrary and not tied to specific meanings. These patterns allow for flexibility in language, enabling various forms. On the other hand, idiomatic and fixed expressions are rigid language structures that offer minimal to no room for alteration. Idioms, particularly, carry meanings that cannot be inferred from their individual components. Except when intentionally creating humor or wordplay, speakers or writers cannot typically manipulate idioms by changing word order, deleting, adding, or replacing words, or altering their grammatical structure. Further, Baker explains that fixed expressions and proverbs, similar to idioms, maintain little to no flexibility in their form.

Although unlike idioms, fixed expressions and proverbs often have relatively transparent meanings. However, despite their transparency, the meaning of a fixed expression or proverb extends beyond the sum of its individual word meanings; understanding requires treating the entire expression as a single unit to derive its intended meaning (2018, pp. 69-70).

The focus of this research is to analyze the use of machine translation, namely Google Translate, DeepL, and Microsoft Bing Translator, in translating collocations, idioms, and fixed expressions. The researcher also analyzes the effects of using MT on the translation’s quality using parameters such as accuracy, readability, and acceptability. The researcher assesses the MT’s and HT’s translation quality by adapting the Translation Quality Assessment Instrument by Nababan et al. (2012, pp. 50-53). This tool for evaluating translation quality comprises three instruments to assess accuracy, acceptability, and readability levels. Each of these instruments for translation quality is structured in three segments. The initial segment describes the categories of translation. The second segment consists of a numerical rating on a scale of 1 to 3. This arrangement signifies that as the translation quality increases, the corresponding score or number also increases, and therefore decreases for lower quality. The third segment represents the qualitative parameters associated with each translation category. The findings of this study will help to determine whether MT can presently deliver translation quality equal to or surpassing that of HT.

**METHOD**

Purposive sampling method is employed to collect data, which are subsequently analyzed using a descriptive-qualitative approach. The researcher aims to analyze the effects of using MT as well as the current adequacy of MT translation. The researcher uses two collocations, two idioms, and two fixed expressions found in the novel “Animal Farm” by George Orwell in English as the source of data. The researcher then translates the excerpts in SL (English) to the TL (Bahasa Indonesia) using 3 MT tools (Google Translate, DeepL, and Microsoft Bing Translator) and analyze the result of the translations using Nababan’s translation quality assessment methods to determine the level of accuracy, readability, and acceptability. The translation quality assessment instrument are further elaborated using the following tables:

Table 1: Accuracy Level Assessment Instrument

Translation Category	Score	Qualitative Parameter
Accurate	3	The meaning of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or texts in the SL is accurately conveyed into the target language with absolutely no distortion of meaning.
Less Accurate	2	Most of the meanings of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or texts in the SL have been accurately conveyed into the target language. However, there are still distortions in meaning or translations with dual meanings (ambiguities), or some meanings are omitted, which disrupt the integrity of the message.
Not Accurate	1	The meanings of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or texts in the SL are inaccurately conveyed into the target language or deleted.

Table 2: Acceptability Level Assessment Instrument

<b>Translation Category</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Qualitative Parameter</b>
Acceptable	3	The translation feels natural; commonly used technical terms are employed and familiar to the reader; phrases, clauses, and sentences conform to Indonesian language norms.
Less Acceptable	2	Generally, the translation feels natural; however, there are minor issues with the use of technical terms or some grammatical errors.
Not Acceptable	1	The translation is unnatural or feels like a translated work; uncommon usage of technical terms, unfamiliar to the reader; phrases, clauses, and sentences used do not adhere to Indonesian language norms.

Table 3: Readability Level Assessment Instrument

<b>Translation Category</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Qualitative Parameter</b>
High Readability	3	The translated words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or texts are easily understood by the reader.
Medium Readability	2	In general, the translation is understandable to the reader; however, certain parts may require multiple readings for comprehension.
Low Readability	1	The translation is difficult for the reader to understand.

Each translation category holds a different weight. The most critical factor in translation is accuracy, given the highest weight of 3. This aligns with the core idea of translation as the precise transfer of messages from the source language to the target language. Acceptability in translation is the second most important aspect, assigned a weight of 2. This prioritization stems from the acknowledgment that acceptability is closely linked to how well the translation aligns with the norms, standards, and cultural context of the target language. Importantly, acceptability can impact accuracy in specific cases, meaning a less acceptable translation might also be less accurate. Readability is assigned the lowest weight, which is 1. This emphasis on readability reflects the understanding that translation challenges are not directly tied to whether the target reader finds the translation easily understandable. Nonetheless, given that target readers normally lack access to the source language text, they naturally expect the translation to be easily comprehensible (Nababan et al., 2012, pp. 50-52).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis. The first study focuses on the methods and/or procedures utilized in the translation of the three categories—collocations, idioms, and fixed phrases. The second study looks at how the employed approaches affected the translation quality in terms of readability, acceptability, and accuracy. The data is divided into three categories:

1. The analysis of the translation of Collocations
2. The analysis of the translation of Idioms
3. The analysis of the translation of Fixed Expressions

The data are codified as follows:

Source Language (SL)

TL (Read: Human translator)

GT (Read: Google Translate)

DL (Read: DeepL)

MT (Read: Microsoft Bing Translator)

(001/AF/GT/DL/MT/005/C)

Firstly, the number 001 identifies the sequence of the datum. Second, the code AF means the title of the novel in the English version as the source language and AF means the title of the novel. Third, the code 005 indicates the page where the datum is found. The last is the letter C (Collocation), I (Idiom), and Fixed Expressions (FE) written in the end, indicating the category of the datum.

### Collocations

(001/AF/GT/DL/MT/005/C)

SL: "... a small fat pig named Squealer, with very round cheeks, **twinkling eyes**, ..."

(001/AF/GT/DL/MT/015/C)

TL: "... *mata ... berkedip-kedip ...*"

GT: "... *mata berbinar ...*"

DL: "... *mata yang berbinar-binar ...*"

MT: "... *mata berbinar ...*"

The collocation "...**twinkling eyes**..." in the SL is translated into "... *mata... berkedip-kedip ...*" in the TL. Thus, the translation procedure applied here is **Synonymy** for the word '**twinkling**' is close in meaning in Indonesian equivalent '**bersinar-sinar**'. Newmark in his book "A Textbook of Translation" (1988, p.84) states that "... the word 'synonymy' in the sense of a near TL equivalent to an SL word in a context, ... This procedure is used for a SL word where there is no clear one-to-one equivalent, ..." According to Kamus Inggris Indonesia (KII) 'twinkle' *vi* 2 '**bersinar-sinar**' (of eyes) (Echols & Shadily, 2017, p.762), which is according to Tesaurus Bahasa Indonesia (TBI) '**bersinar-sinar**' *v* '**berbinar-binar**' (p.461) is equivalent to '**berkelap-kelip**' or '**berkelip-kelip**' (p.73) and it is synonymous with '**berkedip-kedip**' (p.236). Here, there is a reduplication of the word '**berkedip-kedip**'. Further, according to Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia (TBBBI), reduplication is associated with the meaning of (1) continuous or repeated activities or actions... *Pengulangan ... bertalian dengan makna (1) tindakan atau perbuatan yang bersinambung atau berkali-kali,...* (2017, p.117). Additionally, this word '**berkedip-kedip**' cataphorically refers to "He was a brilliant talker. ... somehow very persuasive." (p.5) clarifying that the well-known pig, Squealer, talks a lot and

has the power to induce or persuade action. Foley & Hall (2003, p.328) stated “... word to refer to something later in the sentence is known as ‘cataphoric reference.’

In addition, there is a corresponding plural form for ‘eyes’ through a repetition of the word ‘mata’ (*mata-mata*) in Indonesian, but the Indonesian language system shows it in a singular form ‘mata.’ Thus, **intra-system shift** is used here. Further, it is stated that the shift occurs internally, “... Moreover, in each language, the system is one of two terms, they are singular and plural and these terms are also regarded as formally corresponding” (Catford, 1965, p.80).

Following the criteria established by Nababan et al. (2012, pp.50-51), the researcher assigns the following scores for the accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

Table 4: Scoring - Datum 001 Collocation

Tran s- lator	Translation	Score		
		Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability
TL	“... <i>mata... berkedip-kedip</i> ...”	3	3	3
GT	“... <i>mata berbinar ...</i> ”	3	3	3
DL	“... <i>mata yang berbinar-binar</i> ...”	3	3	3
MT	“... <i>mata berbinar ...</i> ”	3	3	3

(002/AF/SL/005/C)

SL: “... a small fat pig named Squealer, with very round cheeks, ... **nimble movements**, ...”

(002/AF/TL/015/C)

TL: “... *gerakannya gesit ...*”

GT: “... *gerakan lincah ...*”

DL: “... *gerakan yang gesit ...*”

MT: “... *gerakan gesit ...*”

The collocation “... **nimble movements** ...” in the SL is translated into “... *gerakan... gesit ...*” in the TL. Thus, the method used here is **Communicative translation**. Newmark in his book ‘A Textbook of Translation’ stated that communicative translation attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are

readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership (1988, p.47). For the reason that, on the one hand, the word ‘nimble’ in the SL is translated into ‘*gesit*’ in the TL. As per Kamus Inggris Indonesia (KII), ‘nimble’ *adj* ‘*gesit*’ (Echols & Shadily: 2017, p.189). On the other hand, the noun ‘movements’ is translated also into a noun ‘*gerakan*’. According to Echols & Shadily ‘movement’ *n* 3 *pergerakan* (2017, p.483). In line with KBI (Kamus Bahasa Indonesia), ‘pergerakan’ *n* 1 *hal atau keadaan bergerak*, while ‘gerakan’ *n* 1 *perbuatan atau keadaan bergerak* (2008, pp.475 & 476). The collocation ‘nimble movements’ and its translation ‘*gerakan...gesit*’ cataphorically refers to a sentence “... he had a way of skipping from side to side ...” (p.5). Foley & Hall stated that “... word to refer to something later in the sentence is known as ‘cataphoric reference’ (2003, p.328).

The plural noun ‘movements’ is translated into a singular noun ‘*gerakan*’ in the TL. In this case, **intra-system shift** occurs, following Catford’s concept which stated that “... the shift occurs internally, ... Moreover, in each language, the system is one of two terms—singular and plural—and these terms may also be regarded as formally corresponding” (1965, p.80). It’s also important to note that GT translated ‘nimble’ into ‘*lincah*’ which, according to KBI, *a* 3 *cekatan; gesit; tangkas* (2017, p.931). DL translated the phrase into “... *gerakan yang gesit ...*” According to Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia (TBBBI), the inclusion of ‘*yang*’ is to create a nominal phrase from verbs, adjectives, or other word categories with a definite quality... “*kata ‘yang’ membentuk frasa nominal dari verba, adjektiva, atau kelas kata lain yang bersifat takrif atau definit...*” (2017, p.403).

Following the criteria established by Nababan et al. (2012, pp.50-51), the researcher assigns the following scores for the accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

Table 5: Scoring - Datum 002 Collocation

Trans- lator	Translation	Score		
		Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability
TL	“... <i>gerakannya gesit ...</i> ”	3	3	3
GT	“... <i>mata berbinar ...</i> ”	3	3	3
DL	“... <i>gerakan yang gesit ...</i> ”	3	3	3
MT	“... <i>gerakan gesit ...</i> ”	3	3	3

**Idioms**

(001/AF/SL/003/I)

SL: “Is it not **crystal clear**, then, comrades, that all the evils of this life of ours spring from the tyranny of human beings?”

(001/AF/TL/008/I)

TL: “... *terang benderang ...*”

GT: “... *jelas sekali ...*”

DL: “... *sangat jelas ...*”

MT: “... *sangat jelas ...*”

The idiom “... **crystal clear** ...” in the SL is translated into “... **terang benderang** ...” in the TL. ‘Crystal clear’ means “unambiguous or easily understood” (Siefring, 2004, p. 67). The idiom anaphorically refers to a phrase “...**the plain truth**” (p.2). Foley & Hall (2003, p.328) described anaphoric reference as “referring back in a text to a previously mentioned item...” According to Kamus Inggris Indonesia (KII), ‘crystal-clear’ *adj 2 jelas/terang sekali* (Echols & Shadily, 2017, p.199). Thus, the translation method applied here is **Idiomatic translation**. Newmark (1988, p. 47) stated that “idiomatic translation 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.” As a supporting theory, **translation by paraphrase** method by Baker (2018, p.81) can also be applied here, which is a method used “...when a match cannot be found in the target language or when it seems inappropriate to use idiomatic language in the target text because of differences in stylistic preferences of the source and target languages.” However, as previously mentioned, the idiom “... **crystal clear** ...” anaphorically refers to a phrase “...**the plain truth**” (p.2). According to KBI (p.172), ‘benderang’ *a terang benar (tt cahaya, warna)*. In the context of ‘crystal clear,’ there is no reference to colour or light, thus TL’s translation is incorrect.

GT translated the idiom “... **crystal clear**...” to “... **jelas sekali** ...” Both DL and MT translated the idiom into the phrase “... **sangat jelas** ...” It can be seen that GT, DL, and MT used the **Communicative translation** method which “attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership (Newmark, 1988, p.47).” In addition, translation by paraphrase method (Baker, 1992, p.75) can also be applied here as a supporting theory. Following the criteria established by Nababan et al. (2012, pp.50-51), the researcher assigns the following scores for the accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

Table 6: Scoring - Datum 001 Idioms

Tran s- lator	Translation	Score		
		Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability
TL	“... <b>terang benderang</b> ...”	1	2	2
GT	“... <b>jelas sekali</b> ...”	3	3	3
DL	“... <b>sangat jelas</b> ...”	3	3	3
MT	<b>ditto.</b>	3	3	3

(002/AF/SL/005/I)

SL: “..., the whole farm **burst out** into Beasts of England in tremendous unison.”

(002/AF/TL/012/I)

TL: “... **menyanyi**...”

GT: “...**berubah**...”

DL: “...**meledak**...”

MT: “...**meledak**...”



The idiom “...burst out...” in the TL is translated into “... *menyanyi*...” in the TL. It cataphorically refers to a word mentioned later in the sentence, i.e. ‘...Beasts of England.’ (p.5) (...my mother and the other sows used to sing an old song of which they knew only the tune and the first three words) (p.3). Foley & Hall (2003, p.328) stated that a “... word to refer to something later in the sentence is known as ‘cataphoric reference.’ According to Kamus Inggris Indonesia (KII), ‘to burst out’ 2 ‘dengan tiba tiba’ (Echols & Shadily, 2017, p.112), and as per Kamus Bahasa Indonesia (KBI), ‘nyanyi’ me- ‘sing’ (2008, p.393) The translation captures the semantic meaning of the original expression by conveying the idea of enthusiastic singing. Given this, the translation method used here is **semantic translation**, which “... must take more account of the aesthetic value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text, compromising on 'meaning' where appropriate so that no assonance, word-play or repetition jars in the finished version.” (Newmark, 1988, p.46).

GT translated the idiom into “...*berubah*...” According to Kamus Bahasa Indonesia (KBI), ‘*ubah*’ ber- change (2008, p.599). Given the context where "the whole farm burst out into *Beasts of England* in tremendous unison" (p.8) is a specific action indicating the sudden singing of a song by the entire farm, the translation does not accurately capture the intended meaning. It appears that the translation method GT attempted to adhere to is **semantic translation**, which “... must take more account of the aesthetic value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text, compromising on 'meaning' where appropriate so that no assonance, word-play or repetition jars in the finished version.” (Newmark, 1988, p.46), but fails to convey the meaning effectively.

DL and MT translated the idiom to “...*m eledak*...” According to Kamus Bahasa Indonesia (KBI), ‘*meledak*’ v 1 pecah dan meletup (dng kuat) (2008, p.898). DL and MT may have attempted to use a **literal translation** method, where “...the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context” (Newmark, 1988, p.46). However, given the context of the sentence, "...burst out into *Beasts of England* in tremendous unison" (p.8), a literal translation fails to capture the intended meaning of the idiom accurately.

Following the criteria established by Nababan et al. (2012, pp.50-51), the researcher assigns the following scores for the accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

Table 7: Scoring - Datum 002 Idioms

Tran s- lator	Translation	Score		
		Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability
TL	“... <i>menyanyi</i> ...”	3	3	3
GT	“... <i>berubah</i> ...”	1	1	1
DL	“... <i>meledak</i> ...”	1	1	1
MT	“... <i>meledak</i> ...”	1	1	1

**Fixed Expressions**

(001/AF/SL/006/FE)

SL: "Now, **as it turned out**, the Rebellion was achieved much earlier and more easily than anyone had expected."

(001/AF/TL/017/FE)

TL: "... *ternyata*..."

GT: "... *ternyata*..."

DL: "... *ternyata*..."

MT: "... *ternyata*..."

The expression "...as it turned out..." in the SL is translated into "... *ternyata*..." in the TL. This expression is used at times when events "... happen in a particular way or to have a particular result, especially an unexpected one." For example, to turn out - "did it turn out to be correct?" means "*apakah itu ternyata benar?*" (2017, p.761). According to The Oxford American Dictionary of Current English (1999, p.878), 'turn out' 9 (often foll. by *to* + infin. or *that* + clause) prove to be the case; result (*turned out to be true*), whereas according to Kamus Bahasa Indonesia (KBI), '*ternyata*' v *sudah nyata* (2008, p. 1082). Thus, the translation method used here is **Communicative translation** which "attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership (Newmark, 1988, p.47)." As a supporting theory, **translation by omission of entire idiom** method by Baker (2018, p. 86) is also applicable in this case. The method can be used when the expression "...has no close match in the target language, its meaning cannot be easily paraphrased, or for stylistic reasons." Furthermore, GT, DL, and MT similarly translated the expression in the SL to "...*ternyata*..." and used the same translation methods as TL.

Following the criteria established by Nababan et al. (2012, pp.50-51), the researcher assigns the following scores for the accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

Table 8: Scoring - Datum 001 Fixed Expressions

Tran s- lator	Translation	Score		
		Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability
TL	"... <i>ternyata</i> ..."	3	3	3
GT		<b>ditto.</b>		
DL				
MT				

(002/AF/SL/008/FE)

SL: "**Never mind** the milk, comrades!"

(002/AF/TL/025/FE)

TL: "*Tidak masalah*..."

GT: “*Jangan pedulikan...*”

DL: “*Apalagi...*”

MT: “*Lupakan...*”

The expression “**Never mind...**” in the SL is translated to “*Tidak masalah...*” in the TL. The expression cataphorically refers to the following sentences: “That will be attended to. The harvest is more important.” (p.8). Foley & Hall (2003, p.328) described anaphoric reference as “referring back in a text to a previously mentioned item...” According to The Oxford Dictionary of Current English (1993, p.565), ‘never mind’ **3** used to evade a question. According to Kamus Inggris Indonesia (KII), ‘mind’ *Inf.*: ‘never mind’ *tak apa. Tak apa-apa* (2017, pp.474 & 475). According to Kamus Bahasa Indonesia (KBI), ‘*tidak*’ *adv partikel untuk menyatakan pengingkaran, penolakan, penyangkalan* (2008, p.1701), whereas ‘*masalah*’ *n sesuatu yg harus diselesaikan atau harus dicarikan jalan keluarnya; persoalan* (2008, p.1992). Thus, the translation method used here is **literal translation** which captures the grammatical structure of the SL while providing the nearest equivalent in the target language TL. Newmark (1988, p.47) described the literal translation method as “the SL grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TL equivalents but the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context.”

GT translated the expression into “*Jangan pedulikan...*” According to Kamus Bahasa Indonesia (KBI), ‘*jangan*’ *adv kata yg menyatakan melarang, berarti tidak boleh* (2017, p.615) and ‘*peduli*’ (*akan, dng*) *v mengindahkan; memperhatikan; menghiraukan* (2017, p.1138). Additionally, as per TBBBI (2017, p.136), the suffix ‘*-kan*’ can be used when the sentence’s object becomes a tool of action... “*Objek kalimat menjadi alat tindakan,*” which, in this case, ‘*...susunya*’ or ‘...the milk’ (p.8) is the object of the sentence. The translation method used here is **semantic translation**, which “... must take more account of the aesthetic value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text...” (Newmark, 1988, p.46). GT effectively captures the meaning of “never mind...” by conveying the idea of disregarding or not paying attention to something.

DL translated the expression into “*Apalagi...*” according to Kamus Bahasa Indonesia (KBI), ‘*apalagi*’ *p lebih-lebih (lagi)* (2017, p.80). In this context, GT’s translation is not the most accurate, as ‘apalagi’ typically conveys a sense of emphasis or further amplification rather than evasion. It appears that GT attempted to use **semantic translation**, which “... must take more account of the aesthetic value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text...” (Newmark, 1988, p.46), but did not effectively convey the SL meaning.

MT translated the expression into “*Lupakan...*” According to Kamus Bahasa Indonesia (KBI), ‘*lupa*’ *4 lalai; tidak acuh* (2017, p.956), and as per TBBBI (2017, p.136), the suffix ‘*-kan*’ can be used when the sentence’s object becomes a tool of action... “*Objek kalimat menjadi alat tindakan,*” which, in this case, ‘*...susunya*’ or ‘...the milk’ (p.8) is the object of the sentence. MT effectively captures the meaning of “never mind...” by conveying the idea of disregarding or not paying attention to something. In this case, the translation method employed is semantic translation, which “...must take more account of the aesthetic value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text...” (Newmark, 1988, p.46). GT effectively conveys the intended meaning of disregarding or forgetting ‘the milk’ from the SL, while also paying attention to the aesthetic aspects of the translation.

Following the criteria established by Nababan et al. (2012, pp.50-51), the researcher assigns the following scores for the accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

Table 9: Scoring - Datum 002 Fixed Expressions

Translator	Translation	Score		
		Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability
TL	<i>“Tidak masalah...”</i>	3	3	3
GT	<i>“Jangan pedulikan...”</i>	3	3	3
DL	<i>“Apalagi...”</i>	1	1	1
MT	<i>“Lupakan...”</i>	3	3	3

## Discussion

Table 9: Final Scores of All Translators

Translator	Average Score			Total	Weighted Average
	Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability		
<b>TL</b>	$2.66 \times 3 = \mathbf{7.98}$	$2.83 \times 2 = \mathbf{5.66}$	$2.83 \times 1 = \mathbf{2.83}$	<b>16.47</b>	$16.47 : 6 = \mathbf{2.74}$
<b>GT</b>	$2.66 \times 3 = \mathbf{7.98}$	$2.66 \times 2 = \mathbf{5.32}$	$2.66 \times 1 = \mathbf{2.66}$	<b>15.96</b>	$15.96 : 6 = \mathbf{2.66}$
<b>DL</b>	$2.33 \times 3 = \mathbf{6.99}$	$2.33 \times 2 = \mathbf{4.66}$	$2.33 \times 1 = \mathbf{2.33}$	<b>13.98</b>	$13.98 : 6 = \mathbf{2.33}$
<b>MT</b>	$2.66 \times 3 = \mathbf{7.98}$	$2.66 \times 2 = \mathbf{5.32}$	$2.66 \times 1 = \mathbf{2.66}$	<b>15.96</b>	$15.96 : 6 = \mathbf{2.66}$

- a. Accuracy is given the highest weight of 3. Acceptability is assigned a weight of 2. Readability is assigned the weight of 1.

Based on the analyzed data, human translation (TL) received the highest weighted average score of 2.74, followed by Google Translate (GT) and Microsoft Bing Translator (MT) with a score of 2.66, and DeepL (DL) with a score of 2.33. This suggests that while machine translation tools (GT and MT) can nearly match the accuracy of human translators, they fall slightly short in terms of acceptability and readability. Furthermore, it is evident that both Human Translation and Machine Translation are not exempt from errors in translation. Consistency across different machine translation tools was observed, but variations in translation choices emphasized the importance of context and interpretation in translating

collocations, idioms, and fixed expression. Overall, these findings emphasize the intricate nature of translation and the crucial role of context in ensuring accurate and meaningful communication across languages.

## CONCLUSION

This research reveals that each translator and the translation method applied has their own set of strengths and weaknesses. For example, while literal translation strives to preserve the grammatical structure of the original text, it may struggle to convey the intended meaning accurately, especially with idioms and expressions. On the contrary, semantic translation focuses on conveying the overall meaning and aesthetic value of the expression, often resulting in more nuanced and contextually appropriate translations. Communicative translation aims to find a balance between fidelity to the source text and readability for the target audience, ensuring that the translated text is comprehensible and culturally acceptable. Despite the diversity of translation methods, challenges such as inaccurate translations and variations across different translation tools highlight the subjective nature of translation as well as the importance of human judgment in achieving accurate and effective translations. In conclusion, this research emphasizes the necessity for translators to navigate linguistic, cultural, and contextual complexities with skill and sensitivity. By understanding the strengths and limitations of various translation methods and applying careful judgment in their application, translators can strive to deliver translations that faithfully represent the original text while resonating with the target audience.

Therefore, it can be concluded that Machine Translation is still considered feasible to use as a tool that works well with simple texts, but it frequently has trouble with complex content. Idiomatic phrases, cultural items, and technical jargon can be difficult for machine translation (MT) systems to translate, which can result in inaccurate translations and a loss of meaning.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher acknowledges the invaluable support of their advisor, friends, family, as well as IKIP Siliwangi and PROJECT, without whom this research would not have been possible. Their assistance played a crucial role in accomplishing the research objectives, and the researcher hopes that this article will offer precious insights and be beneficial for future research.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Worlds: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2008). *Tesaurus Bahasa Indonesia*. Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Echols, J. M., & Shadily, H. (2017). *Kamus Inggris Indonesia* (10th ed.). PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Foley, M., & Hall, D. (2003). *Advanced Learner's Grammar: A self-study reference & practice book with answers*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Routledge.
- Nababan, M., Nuraeni, A., & Sumardiono. (2012). Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan. *Kajian Linguistik Dan Sastra*, 24(1), 39–57.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice-Hall International.
- Okpor, M. D. (2014). Machine Translation Approaches: Issues and Challenges. *IJCSI International Journal of Computer Science Issues*, 11(5), 159–165.

- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd.
- Orwell, G. (2021). *Animal Farm* (B. Sumanto (Ed.); 2nd ed.). Bentang Pustaka.
- Oxford American Dictionary of Current English*. (1999). Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Oxford Dictionary of Current English*. (2010). Oxford University Press.
- Shu, C. (2016). *Google Translate Now Has More Than 100 Languages And Covers 99 Percent Of The Online Population*. Techcrunch. <https://techcrunch.com/2016/02/17/google-translate-hits-100-languages/>
- Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* (4th ed.). (2017). Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Tim Penyusun Kamus Pusat Bahasa. (2008). *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia*. Pusat Bahasa.