

## AN ANALYSIS OF ACCURACY LEVEL OF GOOGLE TRANSLATE IN ENGLISH- BAHASA INDONESIA AND BAHASA INDONESIA-ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

By: Melita Nadhianti. melita.nadhianti@gmail.com

First supervisor : Drs. Suhaini M. Saleh, M.A.

Second supervisor : Eko Rujito Dwi A, S.S., M. Hum.

Yogyakarta State University

### Abstract

This research study aims at finding out the accuracy level of Google Translate in English – *Bahasa Indonesia* and *Bahasa Indonesia* – English translations.

This research was a descriptive qualitative research investigating the accuracy level of Google Translate in English- *Bahasa Indonesia* and also *Bahasa Indonesia* – English translations. The main source of the data was the output translation texts of Google Translate. The sample texts of this research were discussion texts, exposition texts, and narrative texts. There were three texts for each text type. The main concern was on the sentences. The researcher took three translators as the population of target readers because it was assumed that the possible users of Google Translate were translators. In this research, the researcher used some instruments to conduct the research beside the researcher itself. For the calculation of accuracy of Google Translate, data cards and data sheet were applied as the instruments. Since there were only two categorizations in accuracy research, the researcher divided the number into two. A text was said to be accurate if the accurate meanings were more than 50%, but it was said to be inaccurate if the accurate meanings were less than 50%.

The result shows that Google Translate, in both English - *Bahasa Indonesia* and *Bahasa Indonesia* - English translations are considered as inaccurate translation. This statement is based on the finding of accurate occurrence percentage in Google Translate translations which were only 49.1 % and 37.1 %. The numbers are below 50 %, which indicates that the four inaccuracy indicators (omission, addition, different meaning and zero meaning) can be found in most sentences translated by Google Translate. From the finding of this research, it shows that Google Translate still needs some improvements in making the output precise in meaning and it is more appropriate for Google Translate stands only as an aid in translating.

**Keywords:** accuracy level, Google translate, translation

---

### BACKGROUND

Living in this wide world, people cannot avoid interacting with other people from other countries that have different languages. That is why people will have difficulties in communicate with other people who come from different places. For example, *Bahasa Indonesia* that is used in the daily life of Indonesian certainly differs from English. So, Indonesian people will have

difficulties to communicate with English people. Their intention may not be understood by people whom they talk to. Translation is the best solver to answer this problem.

Along with world development, many people need to widen their knowledge about the world. Achieving the knowledge from many countries can be easier if the sources for learning are

available, such as books. However, it will not be easy if the books are written in a foreign language since the knowledge cannot be perceived perfectly. It will take a long time to understand the books by learning the language first. Getting the translated edition of the books will be the easiest way in learning the knowledge someone wants to. It is one of important reason why the need for translating is increasing from day to day, since knowledge is developing.

Catford (1974:20) states that translation is the substitute of textual material in one language by equivalent textual material in another language. It means that in translating, a translator needs to find comparable translation textual material from source language into target language. That is why to reproduce the message in the target language from the source language, a translator needs to understand the meaning of the message before re-writing the message in the target language.

As the technology develops, like computer technology, people can do their job easily and quickly since people are forced to. The inventions of machine translators are also make people do their translating activities easier and quicker. Machine translators can help people to be able to finalize translating faster although people cannot depend fully on the result of translation by a machine translator. A machine translator can help to quicken translator performance in translating so that a translator can fulfill the work demand in time facet without putting aside quality of translation.

The very beginning idea of using computers to translate natural languages was first proposed in the 1940s but the first investigation began in the 1950s. In the early 1950s research on Machine Translation was necessarily modest in its aims (Hutchins, 1997). It was constrained by the limitation of hardware; especially by inadequate computer memories and slow access to storage, and the unavailability of high-level programming languages. Many earlier researchers have assumed that Machine Translation would produce poor quality results that need human involvement in editing.

Since 1940s until now, many machine translators have been invented, for example, Systran, Logos, and Trancend which offer full automatic translations. It means that the translator can choose to use the either for the whole text or for selected sentences, and can accept or reject the results as appropriate. A translator needs to edit the results from a machine translator to create a good translation.

From the beginning of machine translator practice, human intervention cannot be avoided in translation using Machine Translation. The Machine Translation cannot fully take over the translation task given. There must be a human intervention to create an ideal translation. The intervention can be avoided if Machine Translation System has unambiguously identified which words in the text are names. Since it is just a machine, many discrepancies can be found in

the translation task using Machine Translator, if there is no human intervention.

To know whether the translation can be considered good or not, an evaluation should be made. There are many kinds of evaluation types for Machine Translations. Related to the Machine Translation evaluation, this study aims to give an example of conducting an evaluation of Machine Translation. This study is also aims to give more information to translation students about Machine Translation so it can be used as consideration before using the system as a translation aid. Machine Translations which is used in this research is Google Translate.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research is classified into descriptive qualitative one. The use of number and statistics in this research are just to support the analysis. This research aim is determining the accuracy level of Google Translate.

This research is mainly investigating the accuracy level of Google Translate in English- *Bahasa Indonesia* and also *Bahasa Indonesia* – English translations. It means that the source language is English and the target language is *Bahasa Indonesia* and vice versa. Here, in the first research, Google Translate translated the source texts (English), as the input texts, into the target language (*Bahasa Indonesia*), as the output texts. In the second research, Google Translate translated the source texts (*Bahasa Indonesia*), as the input texts, into the target language (English), as the output text. At this research, Google

Translate took the whole process of translation while the researcher studied the accuracy of the output texts.

Here, the researcher used numbers as the data to describe the accuracy level of Google Translate. In first research, the main source of the data is the output texts of English - *Bahasa Indonesia* translation of Google Translate. The texts are taken from some articles. These texts are used as the samples of the first research. The texts to be taken are discussion texts, exposition texts, and narrative texts. There are three texts for each text type. In other words, there will be nine texts in all. The main concern is on the sentences.

Moreover, in the second research, the main source of the data is the output texts of *Bahasa Indonesia* – English translation of Google Translate. The texts are taken from some articles. These texts are used as the samples of the first research. The texts to be taken are discussion texts, exposition texts, and narrative texts. There are three texts for each text type. In other words, there will be nine texts in all. The main concern is on the sentences.

The researcher took three translators as the population of target readers because it is assumed that the possible users of Google Translate are translators. Google Translate is invented to help translator as the translation tool. Though, the translation of Google Translate needed a process of editing furthermore. This editing process could be done by a translator who knows the principles of translation or at least by those who know both

*Bahasa Indonesia* and English. So, it is reasonable that the researcher took the translators as the population because they knew the principles of translation, and also knowing both languages involved in the translation.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Findings

#### 1. The Occurrence of Accurate and Inaccurate Sentences in English - *Bahasa Indonesia* Texts

After calculating the result of the data sheets, the researcher find:

1. The accuracy level of Narrative Texts =  $(101:222) \times 100\% = 45.5 \%$
2. The accuracy level of Discussion Texts =  $(61:135) \times 100\% = 45.2 \%$
3. The accuracy level of Exposition Texts =  $(76:134) \times 100\% = 56.7 \%$
4. The average accuracy level =  $(45.5 \% + 45.2 \% + 56.7 \%) : 3 = 147.4\% : 3 = 49.1 \%$

#### 2. The Occurrence of Accurate and Inaccurate Sentences in English - *Bahasa Indonesia* Texts

After calculating the result of the data sheets, the researcher find:

1. The accuracy level of Narrative Texts =  $(42:144) \times 100\% = 29.2 \%$
2. The accuracy level of Discussion Texts =  $(49:129) \times 100\% = 38 \%$

3. The accuracy level of Exposition Texts =  $(45:102) \times 100\% = 44.1 \%$

4. The average accuracy level =  $(29.2 \% + 38 \% + 44.1 \%) : 3 = 111.3\% : 3 = 37.1 \%$

## B. Discussions

### 1. Accurate Sentences in the Texts

Even though the result of this research is not accurate, some accurate sentences can be found in the translations.

#### a. Accurate Sentences in Narrative Texts

Here is the example of accurate sentences occurrence in Narrative texts:

Source text: Finally, she was driven to the palace.

Target text: *Akhirnya, ia dibawa ke istana.*

#### b. Accurate Sentences in Discussion Texts

Here is the example of accurate sentences occurrence in Discussion texts:

Source text: Homeschooling is an alternative way to educate our kids beside sending them to public school.

Target text: *Homeschooling adalah cara alternatif untuk mendidik anak-anak kita di samping mengirim mereka ke sekolah umum.*

#### c. Accurate Sentences in Exposition Texts

Here is the example of accurate sentences occurrence in Exposition texts:

Source text: Mostly groups of society have their own languages.

Target text: *Sebagian besar kelompok masyarakat memiliki bahasa mereka sendiri.*

## 2. Inaccurate Sentences in the Texts

In reference to the result number of the accuracy level, many inaccuracies are made by Google Translate in translating the texts. In other words, many indicators of inaccuracy in translation can be found in the target text.

### a. Omission

Omission is characterized by the absence of one or more items that must appear in translating a text which make a different meaning. Any word in a sentence or phrase is a potential candidate for omission.

#### 1. Omission in Narrative texts

Here is the example of omission of the translation in Narrative texts conducted by Google Translate.

Source text: Then Snow White told the dwarfs the whole story and Snow White and seven dwarfs lived happily ever after.

Target text: *Kemudian Putri Salju kepada kerdil seluruh cerita dan Snow White dan tujuh kurcaci hidup bahagia selamanya.*

In the target text, the word “told” is omitted, when it should be translated as “*memberitahu*”. This occurrence makes the meaning of the target text inaccurate.

#### 2. Omission in Discussion Texts

Here is the example of omission of the translation in Discussion texts conducted by Google Translate.

Source text: *Ya, game online memang salah satu permainan yang biasa dimainkan di komputer,*

*laptop, tablet, atau bahkan handphone dengan menggunakan koneksi internet.*

Target text: Yes, online gaming is one of the regular game is played on a computer, laptop, tablet, or even a mobile phone using the internet connection.

In the target text, the words “*yang biasa*” is omitted, when it should be translated as “which is usually”.

#### 3. Omission in Exposition texts

Here is the example of omission of the translation in Exposition texts conducted by Google Translate.

Source text: Those various names of English are used as the first language in those countries.

Target text: *Mereka berbagai nama dari bahasa Inggris digunakan sebagai bahasa pertama di negara-negara.*

In the target text, the word “those” is omitted, when it should be translated as “*itu/tersebut*”.

### b. Addition

Another inaccuracy which is made by Google Translate is addition. Addition means the presence one or more items in the receptor language for getting across the meaning.

#### 1. Addition in Narrative texts

The following presents the example of addition in Narrative texts translations.

Source text: They treated Cinderella very badly.

Target text: *Mereka memperlakukan Cinderella yang sangat buruk.*

The example above performs that there is word “*yang*” which is not justified in the source text. It

means that the addition word has distorted the meaning of the source text.

## 2. Addition in Discussion Texts

The following presents the example of addition in Discussion texts translations.

Source text: Mostly of the classes of distance learning are asynchronous.

Target text: *Sebagian besar dari kelas pembelajaran jarak jauh yang asynchronous.*

The word “yang” in the target text is an addition that is not exists in the source text.

## 3. Addition in Exposition Texts

The following presents the example of addition in Exposition texts translations.

Source text: It can be either as a first or second language.

Target text: *Hal ini dapat baik sebagai bahasa pertama atau kedua.*

The word “hal” in the target text is an additional that is not exists in the source text.

### c. Different Meaning

The third indicator of inaccuracy in translation is having different meaning. Sometimes mistakes are made in the analysis of the source text or in the transfer process and a different meaning result. In the wrong meaning the translator supplies something which is incorrect.

#### 1. Different Meaning in Narrative texts

The examples below illustrate the occurrence of having different meaning in Narrative text.

Source text: She lived with her step mother and two step sisters.

Target text: *Dia tinggal bersama ibunya langkah dan dua saudara perempuan langkah.*

In the target text, the word “step” is translated into *Bahasa Indonesia* as “langkah”. The meaning which is given to the word “step” does not fit the context. It should be translated as “tiri” to make it proper with the context and to preserve the exact meaning of the source text in the target language.

#### 2. Different Meaning in Discussion Texts

The examples below illustrate the occurrence of having different meaning in Discussion texts.

Source text: Homeschooling needs a lot of time in preparation and delivery.

Target text: Homeschooling *membutuhkan banyak waktu dalam persiapan dan pengiriman.*

In the target text, the word “delivery” should be translated as “*penyampaian*”. The word “*pengiriman*” does not fit the context.

#### 3. Different Meaning in Exposition text

The examples below illustrate the occurrence of having different meaning in Discussion text.

Source text: Some of them appear the top global languages.

Target text: *Beberapa dari mereka tampak bahasa global atas.*

In the target text, the word “top” should be translated as “*populer*”. The word “*atas*” does not fit the context.

### d. Zero meaning

The last indicator of inaccuracy in translation is having zero meaning. This indicator can be traced by the meaningless translation of the source text into target language. In other words, the

translation does not communicate any meanings at all, or the target text cannot be understood by the reader. This indicator is also found in the translation of Google Translate.

### 1. Zero Meaning in Narrative Texts

Here is the example of zero meaning occurrences in Narrative texts:

Source text: The step mother and sisters were conceited and bad tempered.

Target text: *Langkah ibu dan saudara yang sombong dan buruk marah.*

In the example of target text above, the text has no meaning at all. It means that the text can be categorized as zero meaning.

### 2. Zero meaning of Discussion Texts

Here is the example of zero meaning occurrences in Discussion texts:

Source Text: a united school apparel can relief a financial stress of the backs of many families.

Target text: *Sebuah bersatu pakaian sekolah dapat melegakan tekanan keuangan dari punggung banyak keluarga.*

In the example of target text above, the text has no meaning at all. It means that the text can be categorized as zero meaning.

### 3. Zero Meaning in Exposition Texts

Here is the example of zero meaning occurrences in Exposition texts:

Source text: We even hear British, American, Australian, and even Singaporean English.

Target text: *Kami bahkan mendengar Inggris, Amerika, Australia, dan bahkan Singapura bahasa Inggris.*

In the example of target text above, the text has no meaning at all. It means that the text can be categorized as zero meaning.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings on the previous chapter, it can be concluded that based on two categorizations of accuracy level, accurate and inaccurate translations, Google Translate, in both English - *Bahasa Indonesia* and *Bahasa Indonesia* - English translations are considered as inaccurate translation. This statement is based on the finding of accurate occurrence percentage in Google Translate translations which were only 49.1 % and 37.1 %. The numbers are below 50 %, which indicates that the four inaccuracy indicators (omission, addition, different meaning and zero meaning) can be found in most sentences translated by Google Translate.

In every inaccurate sentence, the inaccuracy indicators can be found in the translation texts. Most of the inaccurate sentences are complex sentences. It means that Google Translate is still facing problems in preserving the meaning of complex sentences. While in simple sentences, it can maintain the real meaning of the source language.

## References

- Arnold, E. A. 1994. *Machine Translation: An Introductory Guide*. London: Blackwells-NCC.
- Bell, R. T. 1991. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.

- Catford, J. C. 1974. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. 1994. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Hutchins, E. 1997. *Cognition in the Wild*. Canada: MIT Press.
- Khomeijani, F. 2005. *A Framework for Translation Evaluation*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Krippendorf, K. 1980. *An Introduction to Its Methodology*. California: SAGE Publication Inc.
- Larson, M. L. 1984. *A Guide to Cross language Equivalence*. Maryland: University Press of America.
- Machali, R. 1998. *Redefining textual equivalence in translation : with special reference to Indonesian-English*. Jakarta : Translation Center, Faculty of Arts, University of Indonesia.
- Manafi, A. 2005. *An Approach to the English translation of literary and Islamic texts (II)*. Tehran: Dell Publishing Co.
- Mark, A. and Kathy, A. 1997. *Text Types in English*. South Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia.
- Moleong, L. J. 2001. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nida, E. A. and Taber, C. R. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Boston: BRILL.
- Rahimi, R. 2004. *Alpha, Beta and Gamma Features in Translation: Towards the Objectivity of Testing Translation, Translation Studies*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing.
- Suryawinata, Z. 2003. *Translation: Bahasan Teori dan Penuntun Praktis*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

