JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue

JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)

An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

TRANSLATION IN A DIGITIZED WORLD: HAVE HUMANS BEEN REPLACED BY MACHINES?

[1]Meenal T S, [2]Dr P Govindarajan

[1] Research Scholar, [2] Assistant Professor (Sr.),

School of Social Sciences and Languages, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vandalur - Kelambakkam Road, Chennai - 600127, Tamil Nadu, India.

ABSTRACT:

Great advancements in machine translation have been made after more than 70 years of progress. A crucial component of any machine translation service has always been ensuring that the translation corresponds to the meaning of the reference. Thus, the main objective of this study is to evaluate and contrast the effectiveness of machine and human translation from English to French. As machine translation technology advances, comparisons to human ability are sometimes made in extremely generic and overstated terms. Examining whether the machine translation service is sufficient and more dependable than the human translation. Overall, this study is important because it makes a genuine effort to understand how successfully machine translation and human translation translate texts, and it will be useful to translators, students, educators, and researchers in the field of translation. Machine translation won't ever be fully automated; instead, it will help people rather than put them at risk. As machine translation advances, humans may no longer be performing correct translations but instead modifying texts that have already been translated by machines.

KEYWORDS: Machine translation, human translation, context, technology, post-edit.

INTRODUCTION:

The examination of machine translation focuses on the utilization of computers for language translation. Warren Weaver was the very first to propose the idea of machine translation in 1947, a mere year after the creation of the first computer, the electronic numerical integrator and computer. With the incredibly rapid growth in international communication, the usage of automated machine translation has expanded recently. Major businesses are using machine translation more and more frequently, especially in the area of software localization. Sales of machine translation software for personal computers have also significantly increased, and machine translation is now being provided by a greater variety of online platforms, making it readily available to any person with an internet connection (Puchała-Ladzinska, 2016). Thus, the aims for machine translation have also been raised to what is commonly referred to as excellent translation (Green, 2015; Vashee, 2017). But Grammar, intricate syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic structures are all areas where machine translation falls short. The drawback of these software systems is that they are restricted by their dependence on their own databases and lack of linguistic expertise. Therefore, if new terms or formulations are not incorporated into the systems' data, it will be difficult to precisely translate them. Human translation, on the other hand, frequently aims higher, producing documents that adhere to the linguistic conventions of the target culture and are customized to the readers' presumptive background knowledge (Lars Ahrenberg, 2017). Nonetheless, the quality of machine translation is still a concern. Machine translation must be compared to human translation and the original language at a more profound and detailed textual level, including the levels of words, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse, in order to assess how well it has translated the target language. This multilevel

comparison will allow us to see how well machine translation compares to human translation and the original language (Haiying Li, Arthur C. Graesser and Zhiqiang Cai, 2014). Some recent publications assert that machine translation is becoming more "human-like" or "gets similar to that of regular human translators" (Wu et al., 2016). Because machine translation systems assist in bridging the gap between human and machine translation because they are fundamentally built from human translations. Modern systems frequently draw statistical structures from millions of human-translated sentences, while individualized and openly available online platforms may also include additional data obtained from an extensive number of translators over a long period of time (Munkova et al., 2021). Some researchers contend that machine translation will never match the caliber of a skilled human translator. However, machine translation systems have only lately begun to be accepted by academics and professional translators (Bowker, 2019; Vieira and Alonso, 2020; Way, 2018). Considering this, numerous translators continue to adapt to the modifications which translation innovations have made to the area of translation and the translation procedure. One kind of response to a translation issue is a translation procedure. Contrary to popular belief, translation techniques may be utilized to describe, characterize, and compare translations as well as translators and translation standards. They will be applied in this context for an analytical comparison of human and machine translation. I feel like this category of information is underutilized in machine translation, (Fomicheva et al., 2015). In the field of language study, translation is such a delicate and complex undertaking that it poses some substantial issues. It can be challenging to translate from a certain script to another when it comes to vocabulary, syntax, sound, style, and application (Akan et al., 2019).

METHODOLOGY:

This study's design is equivalent since it compares human translation and machine translation on the basis of appropriateness and acceptance. Le Petit Prince's original French text was used, along with Katherine Woods' English translation and machine translation. First, the original French document was written by Antoine de Saint-Exupery in 1943. Later in the same year, Katherine Woods produced the first English translation. As an illustration, this study used a brief paragraph to highlight the contrasts between human translation and machine translation.

Original text	Human translation	Machine translation
Bien sûr, dit le renard. Tu n'es encore pour moi qu'un petit garçon tout semblable à cent mille petits garçons. Et je n'ai pas besoin de toi. Et tu n'as pas besoin de moi non plus. Je ne suis pour toi qu'un renard semblable à cent mille renards. Mais, si tu m'apprivoises, nous aurons besoin l'un de l'autre. Tu seras pour moi unique au monde. Je serai pour toi unique au monde.	"Just that," said the fox. "To me, you are still nothing more than a little boy who is just like a hundred thousand other little boys. And I have no need of you. And you, on your part, have no need of me. To you, I am nothing more than a fox like a hundred thousand other foxes. But if you tame me, then we shall need each other. To me, you will be unique in all the world. To you, I shall be unique in all the world	Of course, said the fox. You are still for me only a little boy quite similar to a hundred thousand little boys. And I don't need you. And you do not need me either. I am for you only a fox similar to a hundred thousand foxes. But, if you tame me, we will need each other. You will be unique in the world for me. I will be for you unique in the world.

RESULTS:

The visual impact of the table reveals that the length of human translation exceeds that of machine translation. This is supported by the fact that, when we compare the translations as a whole, the human translation has more words and characters. This table demonstrates that the translation provided by the machine is both literal and conveys the intended meaning. While that may be true in certain instances, it may also shift the context in others. Due to their short turnaround times and wide selection, online text translation services are growing in popularity. Today's population relies largely on machine translation because most people do not speak all languages. This study employed an experimental approach to examine the effectiveness of machine vs. human translation in a French-English context. The ongoing argument between machine and human translation centers concerns if machine translation is going to replace human translation in a time when machine translation is constantly advancing. The linguistic barrier has been greatly diminished with machine translation. As a result, it

seems that concerns about human translators being substituted by machines in the future are unfounded. Still, it seems likely that the role of the translator will change over time. With the development of machine translations, human translators could no longer be the most precise translators, but instead editors who revise texts that have already been translated by computers.

CONCLUSION:

In this study, the original French and human-made English translations of Google's English translation were compared. The results can be used to enhance the suitability of machine translations by software developers working in the field. The outcomes may also be helpful for specialists in the field doing comparison studies in the area of machine translation versus human translation. There is still an immense need for machine translation as an instrument for translators, particularly when it allows for speedily producing huge quantities of text. Because of this, it's crucial to use machine translation carefully, at least until the system becomes more sophisticated and can comprehend the pragmatic context; supervision is needed to avoid such mistakes. Even though machine translation conveys the intended meaning, people will never be completely supplanted by technology. The content that machine translation produces can only be post-edited by humans.

REFERENCES:

1. Weaver W. Translation. Machine Translation Lang 1955;14:15–23.
2. Puchała-Ladzinska, K. (2016), "Machine translation: a threat or an opportunity for human translators?", Studia Anglica Resoviensia T, Vol. 3 No. 2016, pp. 89-98, doi: 10.15584/sar.2016.13.9.
3. Spence Green. 2015. Beyond post-editing: Advances in interactive translation environments. ATA Chronicle Www.atanet.org/chronicle-on-line/...
4. Kirti Vashee. 2017. A closer look at sdl's adaptive machine translation technology. Http://kvemptypages.blogspot.se/2017/01/a-closer-lookat-sdls-adaptive-machine translation.html.
5. Lars Ahrenberg. 2017. Comparing Machine Translation and Human Translation: A Case Study. The First Workshop on Human-Informed Translation and Interpreting Technology (HiT-IT) Proceedings of the Workshop. PP 21-28.
6. Haiying Li, Arthur C. Graesser and Zhiqiang Cai. 2014. Comparison of Google Translation with Human Translation. Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence.
7. Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, Jeff Klingner, Apurva Shah, Melvin Johnson, Xiaobing Liu, Lukasz Kaiser, Stephan Gouws, Yoshikiyo Kato, Taku Kudo, Hideto Kazawa, Keith Stevens, George Kurian, Nishant Patil, Wei Wang, Cliff Young, Jason Smith, Jason Riesa, Alex Rudnick, Oriol Vinyals, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. Google's neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. CoRR abs/1609.08144. Http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.08144.
8. Munkova, D., Munk, M., Welnitzova, K. and Jakabovicova, J. (2021), "Product and process analysis of machine translation into the inflectional language", SAGE Open, Vol. 11 No. 4, doi: 10.1177/ 21582440211054501.
9. Vieira, L.N. and Alonso, E. (2020), "Translating perceptions and managing expectations: an analysis of management and production perspectives on machine translation", Perspectives, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 163-184, doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2019.1646776.
10. Bowker, L. (2019), "Fit-for-purpose translation", in O'Hagan, M. (Ed.), The Routledge Handbook of Translation Technology, Routledge, London, pp. 453-468.
11. Way, A. (2018), "Quality expectations of machine translation", in Moorkens, J., Castilho, S., Gaspari, F. and Doherty, S. (Eds), Translation Quality Assessment, Springer, Cham, pp. 159-178, doi: 10. 48550/arXiv.1803.08409.
12. Marina Fomicheva, Nuria Bel, and Iria da Cunha. ´ 2015. Neutralizing the Effect of Translation Shifts on Automatic Machine Translation Evaluation, Springer International Publishing, pages 596–607. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18111-0 45
13. Akan, M.F., Karim, M.R. and Chowdhury, A., M. K. (2019), "An analysis of Arabic-English translation: problems and prospects", Advances in Language and Literary Studies, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 58-65, doi: 10.7575/aiac.alls.v.10n.1p.58.

14. Muneera Muftah. 2022. Machine vs human translation: a new reality or a threat to professional Arabic–English translators, PSU Research Review, Emerald Publishing Limited.
15. Haifeng Wang, Hua Wu, Zhongjun He, Liang Huang, Kenneth Ward Church. 2021. Progress in Machine Translation. Elsevier LTD on behalf of Chinese Academy of Engineering and Higher Education Press Limited Company.
16. http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks03/0300771h.html#ppchap21
17. https://blogs.ubc.ca/edcp508/files/2016/02/TheLittlePrince.pdf
18. https://translate.google.com/