

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter will discuss the conclusions that are taken from the result of the research and suggestion that are expected to give benefits and inputs for the readers who are interested in translation, particularly in machine translation.

A. Conclusions

In the first chapter, it was stated that there are two aims in this present research. They are to find out the translation procedures used by Google Translate (GT) in translating unit of language from English to Indonesian and to find out the quality of English – Indonesian translation products of GT. The researcher used a qualitative descriptive method in conducting the research. To determine the translation procedures the researcher used the theory of Peter Newmark (1988), Vinay & Darbelnet (1995 in Fawcet, 1997) and Larson (1984). For defining the translation quality, the researcher used some translation quality theories by Larson (1984), Tytler (1907), Nida and Taber (1982), Tytler (1791 in Basnett, 2002), Massoud (1988 in Abdellah, 2002), and El Shafey (1985 in Abdellah, 2002).

Based on findings and discussion presented in the previous chapters, the researcher found several translation procedures which are employed by GT in translating unit of language. There are seven procedures that are used by GT in translating unit of language. The seven translation procedures are *literal*, *transference*, *naturalization*, *transposition*, *couplets and triplet*, *synonymy* and *paraphrase*. The translation mostly used by GT in translating unit of language was arranged from the highest to the lowest percentages indicating: *literal* (99 items or 49,5%), *couplets and triplets* (69 items or 34,5%), *transposition* (16 items or 8%), *transference/borrowing* (7 items or 3,5%), *paraphrase* (5 items or

2,5%), *synonymy* (3 items or 1,5%), and *naturalization* (one item or 0,5%). It can be seen above that the most frequently used by GT in translating unit of language is the *literal* translation procedure, and the least one is *naturalization* translation procedure.

The researcher analyzed 50 words, 50 phrases, 50 clauses and 50 sentences to be translated by GT. In translating the words, the most frequently used by GT is *literal* (43 items out of 50 items or 86%), followed by *transference* and *synonymy* (3 items or 6%), and *naturalizaion* (one item or 2%). In translating the selected phrases, the most frequently used by GT is *literal* (29 items out of 50 items or 58%), followed by *transposition* (15 items or 30%), followed by *transference* (4 items or 8%), and *paraphrase* (2 items or 4%). In translating the clauses, the most frequently used by GT is *couplets* (24 items or 48%), followed by *literal* (13 items or 26%), *triplets* (10 items or 20%), *paraphrase* (2 items or 4%), and *transposition* (1 item or 2%). In translating the selected sentences, the most frequently used by GT is *couplets* (23 items or 46%), followed by *literal* (15 items or 30%), *triplets* (12 items or 24%) and *paraphrase* (one item or 2%). Therefore, it can be concluded that *literal* translation procedure is a translation procedure that are mostly used by GT in translating words and phrases. GT mostly used *lteral translation* procedure in translating words and phrases because when GT translated the words and the phrases, GT did not pay attention to the context of the texts. To translate the clauses and sentences, GT mostly used *couplets* translation procedure to transfer the meaning in the TL. GT mostly used two combination of translation procedures to translated the clauses and sentences, because GT must aware to the context of the text to make an acceptable meaning to the TL in the translating the clauses and sentences.

Based on the data analysis, the result shows that the translation quality of GT products is good or acceptable in translating the selected words because it fulfills the criteria of a good translation by some experts, they are Larson (1984), Tytler (1907), Nida and Taber (1982), Tytler (1791 in Basnett, 2002), Massoud

(1988 in Abdellah, 2002), and El Shafey (1985 in Abdellah, 2002). But, the quality of GT is quite unacceptable or inappropriate in translating phrases, clauses and sentences because the meaning was not delivered properly and therefore before using GT to translate phrases, clauses, and sentences, the users have to recheck the results of translation.. From the samples, there were 165 items or 82,5% which were acceptable translation and the rest were unacceptable (35 items or 17,5%). In the words level, there were more acceptable items (50 items out of 50 items). In the phrases level, there were 42 acceptable items and 8 unacceptable items. In the clauses level, there were 41 acceptable items and 9 unacceptable items. In the sentences level, there were more unacceptable items (18 items out of 50 items) and 32 acceptable items.

B. Suggestions

After doing the research, the researcher gives some suggestions for the readers, the users of GT or everyone who is interested in translation study. The researcher proposes some suggestions as follows:

1. The users of GT should do editing in GT translation products because the products of GT are unnatural in the Target Language (TL) especially in translating phrases, clauses and sentences because Google Translate's products are lack of choosing the appropriate diction of the TL.
2. For the users, it is better to use GT especially in translating words of the SL but it must be adapted to the context of the TL to avoid misinterpretation of the SL.
3. For those who are interested in the same topic, the future researcher can elaborate more comprehensive analysis by analyzing more specific words, phrases, clauses or sentences classes.