

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The results of this study show that human translation uses more Dynamic Equivalence and Idiomatic Translation often makes word omissions and additions. Google Translate uses more Formal Equivalence and Literal Translation and Google Translate focuses more on translating word-for-word in translating English short stories into Indonesian. This result is supported by the theory and evidence in the discussion. Human translation fulfills the characteristics of a good translation better than the translation produced by Google Translate.

Based on the data obtained, the researcher concludes that human translation can capture nuances, context, and emotions than Google Translate in translating English short stories into Indonesian in three categories: Acceptability, readability, and accuracy. Therefore, in this study, the human translation is better able to capture the nuances and emotions in translating short stories into Indonesian than the translation generated by Google Translate, although the human-generated translation often makes omissions.

5.2 Suggestions

Based on the results of the study, the researcher would like to make the following suggestions:

1. Although Google Translate can translate texts, users are advised to revise and edit the translation results to make it more appropriate to the desired context and meaning.

2. The developers of Google Translate can use this research as a reference to maximise the results and operation of Google Translation. Google created a web for users to provide suggestions and linguists can provide evidence of translation errors made by Google Translate so that they can optimise their product to be the best in the field of translation.
3. Further research can be done to explore other aspects of translation, such as translation of more complex literary texts or other genres, as well as comparisons between different automatic translation tools on the market.