
INACCURACY OF AN EXAMINATION OF GRAMMATICAL ERROR

Shabri Abd. Majid
Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia
mshabri@unsyiah.ac.id

Abstract

When it comes to the construction of a communication process, grammar plays a significant part. It is utilized to make a clear declaration about the time at which a verb happens. The purpose of this study is to identify grammatical faults in the translation of abstracts from the Indonesian language to English that were produced by Google Translate. These errors pertain to tense, active, and passive voice abstracts. In this particular research project, the research method that was utilized was the descriptive qualitative method. The twenty abstracts that were retrieved from the repository at the University served as the population for this investigation. Documentation and checklists were the instruments that were utilized in the process of doing the data collection. When analyzing the data, Keshavarz's (1999) hypothesis was utilized. Following an examination of the data, it was discovered that the most common error that Google Translate generated was related to the use of tense. In the meanwhile, errors involving active and passive voices were only sometimes discovered. It is possible to conclude that Google Translate, operating as a tool, is unable to determine the tense of the sentences that are being translated. This is a possibility since tenses are strongly connected to the context in which the moment a verb occurs in a sentence, which is something that can only be broken down and comprehended by humans.

Keywords: Google Translate, Grammatical Errors, Translation

INTRODUCTION

Venuti (2013) asserts that translation plays a crucial role in communication in almost every nation on Earth. Even in the modern era of globalization, this is undeniable. Translation is one tool that can be used to learn languages from around the globe, according to Swarniti (2019). Because of its importance, translators have a heavy burden to bear (Baer, 2015). Since it is the most fundamental part of the "Google family," Google Translate is likely the easiest and most accessible tool for people to use when they require a translation (Medvedev, 2106). A statistically grounded translation tool, Google Translate is what Groves and Mundt (2015) claim. This means that instead of trying to translate a sentence word-for-word, the algorithm analyzes the likelihood of several interpretations of the phrase being true.

Google Translate has been quite popular among both the general public and academics, according to Sitorus (2020), since it simplifies the process of translating. One example is how popular it is for translating texts from English to Indonesian. Medvedev (2016) lists several advantages of Google Translate, including its availability in many languages, its lack of cost, and the speed and accuracy of its results. Google Translate's many attractive features, as pointed out by Groves and Mundt (2015), include its availability on mobile devices, translation in multiple languages, and the fact that it is a free web-based service. This clarifies the current era's huge need for Google Translates.

However, while Google Translate does offer many advantages, it does so with a few drawbacks as well. No one can dispute the widespread impression that the translation is of mediocre quality. The different phrase structures and noun suffixes in the source and target languages are only two of many factors that must be considered while translating (Juliarta, 2021; Ade, Maisarah, & Erniyati, 2022).

This may also contribute to the explanation for the situation. Because it is a computer, Google Translate cannot replace a human translator when it comes to translating tasks. If a person might not be able to understand the original author's intent (Kroeger, 2022), then an algorithm like Google Translate must be downright mysterious. Furthermore, when considering the qualities of clarity, accuracy, naturalness, and acceptability, Google Translate fails miserably every time (Barnwell, 2020). However, according to Medvedev (2016), Google Translate can't handle long sentences very well. Chandra and Yuyun (2018) cite Santoso (2010) as saying that it can't understand metaphorical or idiomatic language. In their 2018 publication, Chandra and Yuyun detailed this data.

Even though Google Translate does provide some extremely wrong results (as pointed out by Patil and Davies, 2014). So, to gauge how well Google Translate (also called Machine Translation or MT) performs, an error analysis should be run. For Richard (2019), understanding the issue and finding ways to fix it requires error analysis. The research conducted by Keshavarz (1999) suggests that during a translation process, seven different types of errors can be recognized and assessed. Some instances of these mistakes include lexicosemantic errors, tense errors, improper usage of prepositions, incorrect word order, distribution errors, and issues with active and passive voice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The potential for translation errors has been explored with a variety of text forms, including narrative, descriptive, and recount text abstracts. In contrast, an abstract summarizes a scientific study with a few key points that readers need to know to enjoy the work. According to Sujarwati and Hamidah (2022), academic paper abstracts are quite effective at drawing readers in. Just by reading the

Inaccuracy of an Examination of Grammatical Error...

abstract, readers can get a feel for the articles and decide if they want to keep reading. Additionally, Gambescia (2013) noted that abstracts are increasingly playing a significant role in academic writing, particularly in thesis papers. At the same time, while writing their thesis abstracts, students at the University are obligated to provide versions in both English and Indonesian. Conversely, students look for alternatives, like using Google Translate, because not all of them have the technical knowledge to translate their abstract into English.

This field of study has been the subject of several previous investigations. To find out how Google Translate got the words "Putri Serindang Bulan" wrong, Alasta and Sujarwati (2021) conducted their study. According to the results of this study, the most common lexical mistake in translating "Putri Serindang Bulan" into English was using an incorrect word, while the least common lexical error was using an unfamiliar word.

Another study that looked at the numerous mistakes in Indonesian folklore translated into English was Dayama (2015). The analysis revealed that the English translation of Indonesian folklore supplied by Google Translate contained four distinct types of errors. A total of 209 instances of incorrect words, 139 instances of missing words, 34 instances of word order, and a meager four instances of unknown terms were recorded as faults during the entire procedure. Google Translate does not yet support translating Indonesian folklore into English, according to Dayama (2015). This is because it produces a high volume of inaccurate translations, especially those involving word choice—a crucial part of any translation project. Their focus seems to be mostly on stories, folklore, descriptive writings, and similar subjects, based on the results of previous studies. However, this study primarily focuses on tense, active, and passive voice translation problems from Indonesian to English.

RESEARCH METHOD

A descriptive qualitative research strategy was employed for the objective of this investigation. The fundamental feature of qualitative research, according to Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, Irvine, and Walker's (2019) book, is the methodology and analysis tools used to gather and interpret data. Also, they cited Lincoln and Guba (1985), who said that humans are important in the study because most studies on humans are qualitative. Experience and circumstances are on their side.

Examining the grammatical mistakes made by Google Translate when translating abstracts from Indonesian to English is the main goal of this research. Adding a co-rating was also asked for to make the results more credible and win over the audience. To what extent do the results of the researcher's overall investigation corroborate those of the co-rater analysis was the driving force for this study.

This research used a sample size of twenty abstracts chosen from among the many papers obtained from the University Repository. This study's population was comprised of these abstracts. A complete translation of the example abstracts into another language using Google Translate, however, served as the data source. Conversely, data was organized, categorized, identified, and analyzed with the help of checklists.

Researchers used several methods to examine the data, including the following: The abstracts were translated using Google Translate as the initial step. The results were then examined for grammatical problems. Lastly, the findings were categorized according to the kinds of translation errors that were linked to. Lastly, we calculated the frequency of different types of translation issues found in five separate abstracts generated by Google Translate. The idea of mistake analysis put forward by Keshavarz (1999) was employed to offer a foundation for

Inaccuracy of an Examination of Grammatical Error...

the inquiry. There were six different kinds of error analysis in Keshavarz's view. These consist of lexicosemantic elements, tenses, prepositions, word order, distribution, verb groups, active voice, and passive voice. This study just considers three forms of voice: tense, active, and passive.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the data found, the most frequent types of translation errors are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.

A Grammatical Error in Indonesian-English Abstracts Translation

No	Types Of Grammatical Error	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Tense	48	80%
2.	Active voice and passive voice	12	20%
	Total	60	100%

An analysis of abstracts translated from Indonesian to English using Google Translate revealed several grammatical problems, as shown in Table 1. The data shows that tense errors were the most common sort of grammatical error, occurring in 80% of the cases. On the other hand, active and passive voice faults were found in 20% of the cases, but only in 12% of the cases. Following this, you will get an exhaustive breakdown of the grammatical mistakes introduced into the Indonesian-English abstract translation.

Tense

The most common sort of grammatical error that was discovered in Indonesian-English abstracts that were translated by Google Translate was this

particular particular type of error. It was demonstrated in the table that the number of translation errors of tense occurred 48 times, which is equivalent to eighty percent, in the translation of abstracts from Indonesian to English. The following is an illustration of a grammatical blunder that pertains to the use of the tense:

Extract 1

Source language: *Metode penelitian yang di gunakan adalah metode kualitatif deskriptif analisis.*

Target language: *The research method uses a descriptive qualitative analysis method. Article 3*

From the abstracts that were sampled, one grammatical error related to tense was extracted.

The previous discussion established that the past tense is the grammatical construction most commonly employed for developing abstract ideas. In contrast, the English spoken in Indonesia does not use tenses. This is difficult since the English language relies heavily on tenses to emphasize the order in which events take place. If the research approach has been used before, then the example Google Translate text should have been altered from "uses" to "used."

Extract 2

Source Language: *Metode yang digunakan di penelitian ini adalah quasi eksperiment.*

Target Language: *The method used in this research is quasi-experimental. Article 2*

A further illustration of a grammatical error in terms of tense may be found in Extract 2. When it comes to writing abstracts, the sort of tense that is

utilized the most frequently is the past tense. On the other hand, the Indonesian language does not have a tense, although the English language does. Tense plays a significant role in highlighting the order in which an event occurs. Because the research approach had been carried out in the past, the verb "is" in the example text from Google Translate needs to have been changed to "was."

Extract 3

Source language: *Populasi dalam penelitian ini semua siswa kelas XII SMK Negeri yang berjumlah 374 siswa.*

Target language: *The population in this study **are** all students of class XII SMK Negeri, totaling 374 students. Article 4*

You can see another example of grammatical errors related to tenses in extract 3. Writing abstractions typically involves using the past tense. Conversely, unlike English, the Indonesian language does not use tenses. One of the most important ways to emphasize the sequence in which something happens is by using tense. Google Translate ought to have used the word "were" instead of the verb "are" in the given sample text.

Active and Passive Voice

Google Translate found this specific form of grammatical error more frequently than any other in Indonesian-English abstracts. The number of instances of active and passive voice translation errors occurred twelve times, or twenty percent when abstracts were translated from Indonesian to English, as shown in Table 1. Here is a grammatical blunder that demonstrates the distinction between passive voice and active voice:

Extract 4

Source language: *Kemudian hasil wawancara tersebut disesuaikan dengan teori dan observasi untuk menjadi suatu draft model yang akan divalidasi oleh ahli.*

Inaccuracy of an Examination of Grammatical Error...

Target language: *Then the results of the interviews were adjusted with the theory and the observations to become a draft model that **will be validated** by experts.*

It was one of the abstracts that included grammatical mistakes in active and passive voice, and it was also the one from which the fourth sample was extracted. Based on the previous statement, it is evident that Google Translate used active voice to translate the source text, even though the original text used passive voice in its sentence structure. To fix the previous example, replace "will validate" with "would be validated." The reason is, that the sentence in issue was the passive voice, which necessitates the third "validate" form of the verb and the auxiliary verb "be." There should also be a change from "will" to "would."

Extract 5

Source language: *Studi pustaka digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data*

Target language: *Library research is used to collect the data. Article 3*

As with the previous example, extract 5 demonstrates grammatical errors related to active and passive voice. Based on the target language sentence provided, it is clear that Google Translate used the active voice to translate the source text, even though the original text used the passive voice. It was more accurate to say "was used" than "used" in the previous example. There must be the auxiliary verb "was" before the noun "used" to make the statement correct.

Extract 6

Source language: *Angket digunakan untuk mengetahui hubungan persepsi siswa terhadap layanan konseling perorangan dengan minat belajar siswa.*

Target language: *Questionnaires were used to determine the relationship between students' perceptions of individual counseling services and students' interest in learning. Article 5*

Extract 6 of grammatical errors in terms of active and passive voice was taken from of the sample abstracts. Based on the sentence of the target language above, it can be seen that “was” in the example above should have been “were”.

Inter-Rater Reliability

The researchers wanted to be sure the results were reliable, so they asked for a co-rater. The researcher randomly picked two abstracts, and the co-rating was asked to analyze them. It was determined that abstracts 3 and 5 would make up the study's sample. What follows is an analysis of why the researcher's and the co-rater's results for the flouting maxim were so different:

Table 2.

The Result of Grammatical Error between Researcher and Co-Rater

Types of Grammatical Errors	Number of Grammatical Errors		Score
	Researcher	Co-Rater	
Tense	6	6	1
Active and passive voice	2	2	1
Average		1	

Both the researcher and the co-rater found no statistically significant differences in the examination of grammatical errors in the English abstracts translated from Indonesian using Google Translate (Table 2). The data in the table indicate that 1 is the mean outcome. Given the facts and the explanation that was given earlier, it is reasonable to conclude that the co-rater's analysis is equivalent to the researchers.

Discussion

The research showed that Google Translate's Indonesian-English abstract translation has two types of grammatical faults: tense errors and active and

passive voice issues. Google Translate reports that tense errors are the most prevalent type of translation error while translating from Indonesian to English. Google Translate's second most common manner of expression in Indonesian-English abstractions was the active and passive voice, following closely after that.

Beyond that, these results are in agreement with what Qamariah, Wahyuni, and Meliana found (2020). Students in second grade at SMK-SMTI Banda Aceh had a lot of problems with verb tenses and other grammatical errors, according to their writing.

According to research by Qamariah, Wahyuni, and Meliana (2020), students made these mistakes because they had not mastered the formula for changing tenses. An error in the abstract translation from Indonesian to English was likely caused by Google Translate's (the machine's) inability to understand the overall context of the source text, according to the data analysis results. Mistakes have been made because Google Translate cannot translate this specific situation. A combination of the present and past tenses has been used in the abstract. Google Translate provides literal translations from the source language into the target language within the data, disregarding any consideration of the language's time constraints. The data analysis revealed grammatical errors in the target text's tense, active voice, and passive voice; therefore, it is reasonable to assume that Google Translate made these mistakes because it couldn't understand the correct grammar.

CONCLUSION

The following are some of the many inferences that can be made from the research's findings and discussion: Among the two types of grammatical errors detected in the Google Translate abstract from Indonesian to English, tense mistakes were the more common. The study found sixty grammatical errors in the translated Indonesian-English abstracts from Google Translate, mostly in the areas of tense, active voice, and passive voice. Among the most common mistakes found, those affecting the tense were 48 cases (80%), and those combining the active and passive voice, were 12 cases (20%). While functioning as a tool, Google Translate may not be able to identify the tense of the translated sentences. This is possible because human beings are the only ones capable of studying and understanding sentence context, which is closely related to tenses.

REFERENCES

- Alasta, K. & Sujarwati, I. (2021). *Lexical Errors Produced by Google Translate in Translating "Putri Serindang Bulan" to English Language*. *Journal of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education*, Vol. 2(2), 200-211. doi: 10.52690/jadila.v2i2.196
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., Irvine, C. K., & Walker, D. (2019). *Introduction to Research in Education* (10th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Baer, B. J. (2015). *Translation and the making of modern Russian literature*. New York: Bloomsbury Academy. Barnwell, K. 2020. *Bible Translation; An introductory course in translation principles*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.
- Chandra, Sylvi Octaviani, & Ignasia Yuyun. (2018). *The Use of Google Translate in EFL Essay Writing*. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, Vol. 21(2), 228-238. doi: 10.24071/llt.v2i2.1539
- Dayama, G. P. & Havid, A. (2015). *Types of Errors Found in Google Translation: A Model of Mt Evaluation*. *Undergraduate Thesis*.

- Gambescia, S. F. (2013). *A Brief on Writing a Successful Abstract. Education for Health*, Vol. 26 (2), 122. doi: 10.413/1357-6283.120706
- Groves, M., & Mundt, K. (2015). *Friend of foe? Google Translate in language for academic purpose. English for Specific Purposes*, Vol. 37, 112-121. doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2014.09.001
- Juliarta, I. M. (2021). *The noun phrase and its translation in the novel "Budha, a story of enlightenment". Journal of Applied Studies In Language*, Vol. 5 (1), 10-22. doi: 10.31940/jasl.v5i1.2297
- Keshavarz, M. H. (2011). *Contrastive analysis and error analysis*. Tehran: Rahnama Publication.
- Khodabandeh, F. (2007). *Analysis of students' errors: The case of headlines. The Asian ESP Journal*, Vol. 3 (1), 6-21. <http://asian-esp-journal.com>
- Kroeger, P. (2022). *"For She Loved Much" Reason Caluses in Translation. Journal of Translation*, Vol. 18 (1), 13-36. doi: 10.54395/JOT-TTWKV
- Medvedev, G. (2016). *Google Translate in Teaching English. The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purpose*, Vol. 4 (1), 181-193. ISSN 2334-9212
- Patil, S., & Davies, P. (2014). *Accuracy of Google Translate in medical communication. British Medical Journal*, Vol. 52. doi:10.1136/bmj.g7392
- Qamariah, H., Wahyuni, S. & Meliana. (2020). *An Analysis of Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing English Text in the Second of SMK-SMTI Banda Aceh. Journal GEEJ*, Vol. 7 (1). doi: 10.46244/geej.v7i1.1041
- Richard, J. C. (2019). *Error Analysis: Perspective on second language acquisition*. (e-Book ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Sitorus, Thiar. (2020). *Utilization of Google Translate as a Translation Media for English Language Materials*.
- Sujarwati, I., & Hamidah, M. (2022). *Grammatical Mistakes of Indonesian-English Translation on Students' Thesis Abstract. JPE: Jurnal Pendidikan Edutama*, Vol. 9 (2), 175-184. doi: 10.20734/jpe.v9i2.2122
- Swarniti, N. W. (2019). *The Translation Procedures of Bible Translation. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, Vol. 5 (2), 187-196. doi: 10.22225/jr.5.2.1277.187-196
- Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation changes everything: theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.