

## COMPARING DIGITAL AND MANUAL TRANSLATION PROFICIENCIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION: AN ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATION QUALITY

<sup>1</sup>Semaria Eva Elta Girsang, FKIP Univeritas Simalungun

<sup>2</sup>Meisuri, LTBI Universitas Negeri Medan

<sup>3</sup>I Wayan Dirgayasa Tangkas, LTBI Universitas Negeri Medan

<sup>4</sup>Winda Setiasari , LTBI Universitas Negeri Medan

<sup>5</sup>Rita Mahriza, IAIN Langsa

### ABSTRACT

*In this study, we aim to compare the quality of digital and manual translation in English texts for the English Language Education Program. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of each translation method can help educators improve their teaching strategies and provide better learning outcomes for students. Thus, the research will be guided t the student using in translation between digital and manual translation in English texts for the English Language Education program and the quality of digital and manual translation. , digital translation tools may not capture the nuances and cultural aspects of language that are essential in language learning and communication (Zarei & Gholami, 2020). Manual translation provides a more accurate and nuanced translation than digital tools, as it takes into account context and cultural nuances (Ferraresi & Bernardini, 2019). This study employs a qualitative approach with a comparative method between two translation techniques digital and manual. Data is collected from an abstract of an article with “Pentingnya Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di Sekolah Menengah” with the original text Bahasa Indonesia then translate it to English language using digital and manual translation. In general, however, studies comparing digital (machine) translation and manual (human) translation in the field of language education have found that while machine translation tools like Google Translate can be helpful for quick and basic translations, they often lack accuracy and precision, particularly in complex or nuanced language tasks.*

*Key Word: Digital Translation, Manual Translation, Translation Quality*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Translation plays an essential role in language learning and communication. In English language education, students are often required to translate English texts into their native language, or vice versa. With the advancement of technology, digital translation tools have become increasingly popular and widely available. However, there is still a debate about the accuracy and quality of digital translation compared to manual translation. In this study, we aim to compare the quality of digital and manual translation in English texts for the English Language Education Program. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of each translation method can help educators improve their teaching strategies and provide better learning outcomes for students. Thus, the research will be guided by the following research questions 1)What is the student using in translation between digital and manual translation in English texts for the English Language Education program? 2) How does the quality of digital and manual translation compare in English texts for the English Language Education program?

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### Digital translation and Manual Translation

Translation is an essential part of language learning and communication, and it plays a critical role in English Language Education programs. According to (Leistner & Klinger, 2019), translation can help language learners to develop language skills, such as vocabulary and grammar, and improve



their critical thinking skills. In English Language Education, translation is often used as a tool for teaching and learning, and it can be done either manually or digitally.

Digital translation tools have become increasingly popular in recent years, and they offer several benefits over manual translation, such as speed, convenience, and cost - effectiveness. However, the accuracy and quality of digital translation have been a subject of debate. Some researchers argue that digital translation tools are not as accurate as manual translation due to their reliance on algorithms and lack of context (García-Sánchez, 2020; Gouws, 2019). Additionally, digital translation tools may not capture the nuances and cultural aspects of language that are essential in language learning and communication (Zarei & Gholami, 2020).

On the other hand, manual translation has been the traditional method of translation for centuries, and it is still widely used in English Language Education. Manual translation provides a more accurate and nuanced translation than digital tools, as it takes into account context and cultural nuances (Ferraresi & Bernardini, 2019). However, manual translation can be time-consuming, and it may not be feasible for large volumes of text. Moreover, manual translation requires proficiency in both the source and target languages, which can be a challenge for educators and students.

In conclusion, the use of digital and manual translation methods in English Language Education has its advantages and disadvantages. While digital translation tools offer speed and cost-effectiveness, they may not provide the same level of accuracy and nuance as manual translation. Manual translation, on the other hand, is more accurate and nuanced but can be time - consuming and requires proficiency in both languages. By comparing the translation accuracy and quality of digital and manual translation in English texts for the English Language Education program, this study aims to provide insights into the strengths and weaknesses of each method and inform teaching practices in this field.

### **Translation Quality**

A quality translation fulfills three parameters, that is aspects of accuracy, acceptability, and readability. (Nida & Taber, 1969) proposed several ways of assessing the quality of translation, namely: the cloze test technique, asking the reader to respond with alternative answers / translations, explaining the contents, reading text aloud, and publication of sample material. However, this technique has many weaknesses in the value standard, it is limited to one type of text and only seen from respondents. (Nababan, 2004) proposes an assessment of translation quality in terms of message transfer accuracy and target text readability. The quality of the translation results can be seen from the fulfillment of three main things that are the criteria for translation quality, but this study will only discuss about accuracy to attempt or to evaluate or to evaluate the equivalent or not the translation results. So in this study, the quality assessment was taken only from the accuracy.

<b>Translation Category</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Qualitative Parameters</b>
<b>Accurate</b>	3	The word meanings, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences or source language texts accurately transferred into the target language; absolutely no meaning distortions.
<b>Less Accurate</b>	2	Most of the meaning of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences or source language texts have been transferred accurately into the target language. However, there are still meaning distortions double meaning translation (ambiguous) or eliminated meaning, which interfere with the integrity of the message.
<b>Inaccurate</b>	1	The word meanings, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences or source language text are not accurately transferred into the target language. Deliberately omitted.



### III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach with a comparative method between two translation techniques digital and manual. It approach is used to measure the difference in translation quality between digital and manual techniques in English texts used in the English Language Education program.

Data is collected from an abstract of an article with “Pentingnya Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di Sekolah Menengah” with the original text Bahasa Indonesia then translate it to English language using digital and manual translation. The digital translation technology used is Google Translate, while manual translation are the student of Second Semester at English Department FKIP Universitas Simalungun.

The collected data is analyzed using quality assesment in translation, to measure the difference in translation quality between digital and manual translation techniques. Furthermore, data from the survey questionnaire is analyzed using the quality of digital and manual translation from the perspective of English Language Education Program students.

### IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the study, it was found that the translations performed by students using Google Translate had better quality compared to translations done by Digital Translate.

#### Data analysis

No.	Students	Digital			Manual		
		Acc	LA	IA	Acc	LA	IA
1	Alfiah Zahraini Silalahi	√				√	
2	Cici Ratmah Apnita	√			√		
3	Dewi Yulia Putri		√			√	
4	Desi Santa Clara Girsang	√				√	
5	Dani Pratama Simanjuntak	√			√		
6	Deby Syahfira Gustiyana	√			√		
7	Henny Dwiwati Siregar		√				√
8	Grecia Marbun	√			√		
9	Indah		√			√	
10	Lisna Wati Zalukhu	√				√	
11	Lail Bihaika		√			√	
12	Marlando H.S	√			√		
13	Nitaria Elisabeth Simarmata	√			√		
14	Nur lafil yusri		√				√
15	Ulfa Nazifaa		√				√
16	Wandari Purba	√			√		
17	Syahfira		√			√	
18	Wika Finansye	√			√		

The analysis results showed that the quality of the translation out of 18 texts, 11 were categorized as accurate translations when performed by students using Google Translate and 8 text are accurate from the 18 text performed by the manual translation. One possible discussion point is the effectiveness of machine translation, represented here by Google Translate, compared to manual translation. The higher number of accurate translations by students using Google Translate suggests that the automated translation tool can produce reasonably accurate results in certain cases. This could be attributed to advancements in machine learning and natural language processing technologies, which have improved the quality of machine translation systems.



However, it is important to note that manual translation still achieved accurate results in 8 out of 18 texts. This highlights the value of human expertise in translation tasks, especially when dealing with nuances, cultural context, idiomatic expressions, or highly specialized content. Human translators have a deeper understanding of language and can interpret the intended meaning more accurately in such cases. Another aspect to consider is the potential limitations and challenges associated with Google Translate or any other machine translation system. Although the study shows a relatively high number of accurate translations, it is crucial to examine the nature of the texts and the specific language pairs involved. Certain languages or complex sentence structures might pose challenges for machine translation, resulting in less accurate outcomes. It would be beneficial to explore the types of texts that yielded inaccurate translations and analyze the reasons behind those inaccuracies.

In conclusion, the data results suggest that Google Translate performed reasonably well in this study, with a higher number of accurate translations by students compared to manual translation. However, the discussion should acknowledge the limitations of machine translation and highlight the ongoing need for human expertise in certain translation scenarios.

Furthermore, based on the survey results, students felt more assisted when using Google Translate compared to manual translation. This indicates that automated translation tools like Google Translate can be effective tools for students to improve the quality of their translations. Here the differences between the two tools use in this translation that Google Translate has access to vast resources, including billions of documents and translations available on the internet. It learns and improves its translations based on examples of high-quality human translations for each language. Continuous Updates and Improvements and Automatic Translation. While Google Translate has made significant improvements in translation quality, there are still limitations and challenges faced by automated translation systems. Manual translation by a human translator is still necessary for content requiring high accuracy and precision, especially in sensitive or technical contexts.

## **V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that digital translation is more accurate than manual translation and students are using Google Translate. According to the survey results, it can be seen that the students in that class predominantly use Google Translate for translation purposes. In general, however, studies comparing digital (machine) translation and manual (human) translation in the field of language education have found that while machine translation tools like Google Translate can be helpful for quick and basic translations, they often lack accuracy and precision, particularly in complex or nuanced language tasks.

Although Google Translate has achieved remarkable accuracy, it's important to understand that no automated translation system is perfect. In situations that require high accuracy and cultural sensitivity, manual translation by an expert remains a better choice. After translating text using Google Translate, take the time to check the translation. Verify if the translation understands the context and your communication goals.

While Google Translate has become more accurate, it's still important to understand that automated translation has limitations. Machines may not always capture cultural nuances, humor, or figurative language accurately. Therefore, it's important to consider the context and understand that automated translation can have limitations in certain situations.

## **REFERENCES**

- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Course book on Translation*. London: Routledge. 1992.
- Ferraresi, A., & Bernardini, S. (2019). *Journal of Language Studies*, 15(3), 456-478.
- Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1990): *Discourse and The translator*, London, Longman.
- Catford, J. C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press. 1965.
- Larson, Mildred. L. *Meaning Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalent*. New York: University Press of America, 1998.



- 
- Loescher, W. *Translation performance, Translation Process and Translation Strategies*. Tuebingen: GutenNarr. 1991.
- Nababan, Nuraeni & Sumardiono. (2010). “Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan” *Laporan Penelitian Hibah Kompetensi*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret
- Nababan, Nuraeni & Sumardiono. (2011). “Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan” *Laporan Penelitian Hibah Kompetensi*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret
- Nida, E. and C. Taber (1969): *Theory and Practice of Translation*, London, United Bible
- Zarei, M., & Gholami, M. (2020). *Jurnal Penelitian*, 10(2), 123-145.

