

Exploring the Techniques Used by Machine and Human Translation in Translating *The Gift of the Magi* into Indonesian

Erma Sujiyani¹, Sulamit Syeba^{2*}, Maida Norahmi³, Riniyati⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Palangka Raya

Article history:

Received
7 May 2025

Revised
23 June 2025

Accepted
30 June 2025

Available online
4 July 2025

This paper is licensed
under Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0
International License



Abstract: The debate over whether Machine Translation (MT) or Human Translation (HT) has been ongoing for many years regarding which is better in producing translation. In the attempt to observe which is better between MT and HT, this research focuses on exploring the techniques used by U-Dictionary as an MT and Maggie Tiojakin as an HT in translating *The Gift of the Magi* into Indonesian. This research examined words, phrases, clauses, and sentences related to the translation techniques in the original version of *The Gift of the Magi* and the two translation versions made by human and machine translation. The collected data are analyzed qualitatively by using Molina and Albir's (2002) theory. The results describe that Maggie Tiojakin used 12 techniques, consisting of adaptation, amplification, compensation, description, discursive creation, established equivalent, generalization, literal translation, modulation, particularization, reduction, and transposition. Meanwhile, U-Dictionary used 8 techniques, including amplification, borrowing, calque, established equivalent, literal translation, modulation, reduction, and transposition. The dominant translation technique used by Maggie Tiojakin is discursive creation (24.54%), whereas in U-Dictionary, it is literal translation (47.27%). From the different translation techniques used, it can be proven that HT uses more varied techniques and has better translation results than MT, in which the translation of the literary works, especially a short story done by HT, is more accurate, readable, and acceptable.

Keywords: translation techniques, human translation, machine translation, U-Dictionary

INTRODUCTION

Translation is one of many ways used by people to understand different languages. Since language is important as one of the communication tools, people need translation in communicating and connecting to an equivalent idea stated in another language. Translation aims at overcoming barriers in communication between languages (Nugraha et al., 2024), thus bridging understanding (Asi et al., 2024b). The translation process inherently involves a minimum of two languages: the source language (SL), from which the original text is taken,

*Corresponding author: sulamitsyeba@yahoo.com

To cite this article: Sujiyani, E., Syeba, S., Norahmi, M., & Riniyati. (2025). Exploring the Techniques Used by Machine and Human Translation in Translating *The Gift of the Magi* into Indonesian. *Ebony --- Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 5(2) 2025, 264–276.

and the target language (TL), into which the text is rendered. According to Putrawan (2017), translation is the act of conveying the meaning of a text from the source language to the target language. In doing the translation, the focus is not only to transfer the message of the SL but also to pay attention to the style used in both languages.

Discussing translation, Human Translation (HT) has been used since the time translation was first introduced. HT takes place when the translation of oral or written language relies on human intelligence to transfer the message from SL to TL. Human Translation is the oldest form of translation. In this form, humans as translators take an important role in producing an equivalent message of SL into TL. The roles of humans, concluded by Putrawan (2017), are as a mediating agent, an author, a multi-tasking person, and also a traveller.

Nowadays, technology is advancing rapidly. Technological developments occur in many fields, including the field of translation. By using the help of software and advancements in Artificial Intelligence (AI), the latest technology, namely Machine Translation (MT), is now available as a practically instantaneous translation tool that can perform a direct process of converting one language to another. It is an alternative way to get a very fast translation result from the source language to the target language. MT is a machine that can translate from SL into TL with quick automated results, by performing a short processing time and costs less than a human translator. There are some well-known machine translation tools like Google Translate, Bing Translator, Babel Fish, Skype Translator, U-Dictionary, and many others that can be used offline and online, and some of them are free of charge. Among the aforementioned, the most familiar applications used by Indonesian students are Google Translate and U-Dictionary (Budianto et al., 2024).

However, the controversy over which one works better in translation between Human Translation (HT) and Machine Translation (MT) has been debated for years. It also attracts particular attention from many researchers in conducting ample studies on the comparison between HT and MT (Arvianti, 2018; Freitas & Liu, 2017; Halimah, 2018; Hasibuan, 2020; Lihua, 2022; Muftah, 2022; Farahani, 2020; Zong, 2018). It cannot be denied that both ways of translation provide advantages and disadvantages. Although some research results have proven that MT can replace HT in some aspects, human power, specifically the experts in translation, is still needed to produce more accurate, acceptable, and readable translation results. It means that the translation must convey the same meaning and message as the original, while presenting them in the most natural way and easy-to-understand wording (Nugraha, 2023). Therefore, in the attempt to observe which works better between MT and HT, this article focuses on exploring the techniques used by both translators in translating a famous English short story into Indonesian.

In comparing MT and HT, why do translation techniques become the focus of observation? It is because translation activities cannot be separated from translation techniques, and the proper use of translation techniques has a significant impact on resulting in precise, qualified, and acceptable translation. Translation techniques are employed to explain how the translated output corresponds to and functions in relation to specific units within the source text (Molina & Albir, 2002). Therefore, this article tries to describe the types and the dominant type of translation techniques used in MT and HT, and how those

techniques are used may affect the translation quality in terms of its accuracy and acceptability. The translation techniques discussed in this article refers to the 18 classifications of techniques in translation proposed by Molina & Albir (2002) which consist of adaptation, amplification, borrowing, calque, compensation, description, discursive creation, established equivalent, generalization, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, literal translation, modulation, particularization, reduction, substitution, transposition, and variation.

To see how MT and HT use the techniques in translation, a text is needed. A short story by O. Henry or William Sydney Porter, one of the great and famous short story writers in America, entitled *The Gift of the Magi* was selected to be translated into Indonesian. This short story was first published on December 10, 1905, in *The New York Sunday World* under the title of "Gifts of the Magi". The story centers on a young married couple and their efforts to secretly buy Christmas gifts for one another despite having very limited financial means. As a touching narrative with a moral about the true spirit of giving, it has remained popular and is often adapted for Christmas-themed performances. Its well-known plot and twist ending are widely recognized as a classic example of comic irony.

One of the translators who has translated *The Gift of the Magi* into Indonesian and who is represented as the HT referred to in this article is Maggie Tiojakin. She is an Indonesian writer, journalist, and translator. She lives in Jakarta. Maggie Tiojakin often translates literary works into Indonesian. Many of her translation works, especially the short stories, are from American writers such as O. Henry, Edgar Allan Poe, Ernest Miller Hemingway, and many others. She easily translates many American short stories because she has lived and studied in America. She less or more has learned and understood American culture. It is seen in every America's short stories she translated. It can be said that she is an expert in translation. She published her translation version of many stories in a book entitled FIKSI LOTUS by one of the famous book publishers, Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Considering some great benefits offered by U-Dictionary, this MT was chosen to translate *The Gift of the Magi* (Henry, 2022). As a machine translation tool, it primarily belongs to the category of hybrid machine translation systems, having a combination of rule-based for its dictionary function and some grammatical rules, and Statistical Machine Translation for its offline dictionary features. U-Dictionary is primarily based on a Neural Machine Translation model for its ability to translate sentences and even longer texts. Therefore, it is expected to perform a near-human ability in translating texts (Asi et al., 2024a).

U-Dictionary was developed by Youdao, a company based in Hong Kong, and launched on March 24, 2016. It can be used by downloading it on smartphones through the Google Play Store for Android and the App Store for *iOS*. The latest version of this application is 4.6.7. In the Play Store, this application has been downloaded by more than 100 million users. It has 44 stars from a total of 665.338 reviewers. This application can also be used on a PC or computer through their official website www.u-dictionary.com. Furthermore, it has 58 languages, including English and Indonesian, and it can be used online or offline.

In spite of the fact that human translation certainly cannot be compared to machine translation, both involve real brain power and according to Halimah (2018), both have a similar process of translation, beginning with reading, understanding source language text, finding equivalents, and then writing them into the target language text. However, in doing the translation, the human is influenced by some backgrounds such as education, religion, social, and cultural life; whereas the machine translation is influenced by the program. In the process of translation, the machine works automatically. Indirectly, the results of translation by machine can also be said as the result of human translation because the machine and the programs are made and designed by humans. Therefore, it is interesting to investigate the techniques used in MT and HT to find evidence whether it is true or not that MT can replace HT in the field of translation.

METHOD

The source text used in this research is the excerpt of a short story by O. Henry entitled *The Gift of the Magi* which can be accessed online at <https://etc.usf.edu/lit2go>. This short story was translated into Indonesian by Maggie Tiojakin as the HT under the title of *Pemberian Sang Majus*, and she published it through a free site made by herself called FIKSI LOTUS. U-Dictionary as the MT translated it into *Hadiah Sang Majus*. The machine translation version by machine was done by converting the source text of the story into the application of U-Dictionary. This study analyzed words, phrases, clauses, and sentences in relation to the translation techniques found in the original version of *The Gift of the Magi* and its two translated versions which were produced by human translation and machine translation.

In collecting the data, it follows the procedures of selecting the data source, reading the SL and the two versions of TL, identifying the translation techniques used by MT and HT, and coding the data. The collected data were then classified and analyzed qualitatively by referring to Molina and Albir's (2002) theories of translation techniques to find the types of techniques and the dominant ones used by MT and HT. The results of the analysis were discussed, and the last step was drawing a conclusion.

RESULTS

Molina and Albir (2002) define translation technique as a way done by a translator to convert an SL text to the TL by focusing more on analyzing the components of the language and classifying all of the components so that an appropriate equivalent is found. There are two main types of translation techniques proposed by them. They are direct techniques and indirect (oblique) techniques. The direct methods of translation comprise approaches such as borrowing, calque, and literal translation. On the other hand, the indirect or oblique methods involve a wider variety of strategies, including transposition, modulation, compensation, adaptation, description, discursive creation, established equivalent, generalization, particularization, reduction, amplification, linguistic compression, and substitution.

Referring to the research results by analyzing the SL text and comparing it with the two translation versions, it was found 110 data points related to the translation techniques

used by MT and HT were found. In translating O. Henry's short story entitled *The Gift of the Magi*, Maggie Tiojakin (HT) used 12 techniques. They were adaptation used twice, amplification used 18 times, compensation used 4 times, description used 3 times, discursive creation used 27 times, established equivalent used twice, generalization used twice, literal translation used 5 times, modulation used 26 times, particularization used 11 times, reduction used 8 times, and transposition used twice. Maggie Tiojakin did not use 6 techniques, i.e., borrowing, calque, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, substitution, and variation. Meanwhile, U-Dictionary (MT) used 8 techniques. They were amplification used twice, borrowing used 5 times, calque used 29 times, established equivalent used 6 times, literal translation used 52 times, modulation used twice, reduction used 10 times, and transposition used 4 times. The other 10 techniques were not used by U-Dictionary, i.e., adaptation, compensation, description, discursive creation, generalization, particularization, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, substitution, and variation. The frequency and percentage of the techniques used are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage of Translation Techniques Used in HT and MT

No	Translation Techniques	Frequency		Percentage	
		Maggie Tiojakin	U-Dictionary	Maggie Tiojakin	U-Dictionary
1	Adaptation	2	0	1.82%	0%
2	Amplification	18	2	16.36%	1.82%
3	Borrowing	0	5	0%	4.55%
4	Calque	0	29	0%	26.36%
5	Compensation	4	0	3.64%	0%
6	Description	3	0	2.72%	0%
7	Discursive Creation	27	0	24.54%	0%
8	Established Equivalent	2	6	1.82%	5.45%
9	Generalization	2	0	1.82%	0%
10	Linguistic Amplification	0	0	0%	0%
11	Linguistic Compression	0	0	0%	0%
12	Literal Translation	5	52	4.55%	47.27%
13	Modulation	26	2	23.64%	1.82%
14	Particularization	11	0	10%	0%
15	Reduction	8	10	7.27%	9.10%
16	Substitution	0	0	0%	0%
17	Transposition	2	4	1.82%	3.63%
18	Variation	0	0	0%	0%
Total		110	110	100%	100%

Table 1 shows that the dominant technique of translation used by Maggie Tiojakin was discursive creation (24.54%), while the dominant translation technique used by U-Dictionary was literal translation (47.27%).

DISCUSSION

In order to describe the types of techniques and the dominant technique used by MT and HT to translate *The Gift of the Magi* into Indonesian, it is necessary to provide examples of translation from the two translated versions along with the source text in English. The excerpts in Table 2 show the examples of the use of different techniques by MT and HT to translate different units of translation, such as words, phrases, clauses, and sentences.

Table 2: The Source Text and the Two Translation Versions by HT and MT

No	Source Text	Target Text by HT	Target Text by MT
1	And the next day would be Christmas.	<i>Lebih sial lagi</i> , besok adalah Hari Natal.	<i>Dan</i> , hari berikutnya adalah natal.
2	They are the magi .	<i>Orang-orang ini disebut sebagai Sang Majus.</i>	<i>Mereka adalah Magi.</i>
3	“You needn’t look for it,” said Della	“ <i>Kau tidak perlu mencarinya</i> ,” kata Della.	“ <i>Kamu tidak perlu lagi mencarinya</i> ,” kata Della.
4	One dollar and eighty-seven cents.	<i>Satu dolar dan delapan puluh tujuh sen.</i>	<i>Satu dolar delapan puluh tujuh sen.</i>
5	“Cut it off and sold it,” said Della.	“ <i>Aku potong dan jual</i> ,” kata Della.	<i>Dipotong dan dijual</i> ,” kata Della.
6	...until one’s cheeks burned...	...hingga <i>pipinya memerah</i>sampai <i>pipi seseorang terbakar</i> ...
7	One flight up Della ran, and collected herself, panting.	<i>Della berlari menaiki tangga toko, napasnya memburu.</i>	<i>Satu penerbangan ke atas</i> Della berlari, terengah-engah.
8	Madame , large, too white, chilly, hardly looked the “Sofronie.”	<i>Seorang wanita bertubuh besar dengan kulit putih pucat menatap Della dengan ekspresi dingin, sama sekali tidak mencerminkan seorang Nyonya.</i>	<i>Madame</i> , besar, terlalu putih, dingin, hampir tidak tampak “Sofronie.”
9	Jim stopped inside the door, as immovable as a setter at the scent of quail.	<i>Jim menghentikan langkahnya di balik pintu, berdiri membeku.</i>	<i>Jim berhenti di dalam pintu, tak tergoyahkan seperti setter pada aroma burung puyuh.</i>
10	Grand as the watch was, he sometimes looked at it on the sly on account of the old leather strap that he used in place of a chain.	<i>Walau jam itu terlihat mewah, Jim sering menggunakannya secara diam-diam agar tidak dilihat orang, malu karena talinya yang sudah lawas dan lama tidak diganti.</i>	<i>Agung sebagai menonton itu, ia kadang-kadang melihatnya di licik pada rekening tali kulit tua yang ia gunakan untuk menggantikan rantai.</i>

From the examples presented in Table 2, it can be seen that different translation techniques were applied by HT and MT. In Example 1, Maggie Tiojakin used discursive creation in translating the word “And” into “*Lebih sial lagi*”. In this case, she created a non-lexical equivalent for the word “And” to relate it to the context of the target text so that the target language readers can easily understand the message delivered. Meanwhile, U-Dictionary used a literal technique in translating it. Yet both translation versions are readable and acceptable as they produce similar meaning through the order of words that is easy to read and still follows the linguistic rules of the target language. The same case is also found in Example 2 in which discursive creation was used by HT in translating “The Magi” into “*Sang Majus*” in which the article “the” was translated by using temporary equivalence which is totally unpredictable out of context “*sang*”, and “Magi” was translated by using naturalized borrowing technique into “*Majus*”; meanwhile pure borrowing was used by MT in translating it. In Indonesian, *Majus* means “*orang bijak*”. Based on Christian tradition, they refer to the noble pilgrims from the East who followed a miraculous guiding star to pay homage to the child who had been born king of the Jews. Maggie Tiojakin relates the term “The Magi” to the three wise men (kings) who visited baby Jesus at Bethlehem, bearing gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Furthermore, she modulated the implicit information of the source text by shifting it into explicit information in the target text by using the words “*Orang-orang ini disebut sebagai*” to clarify the referred meaning of the phrase “The Magi”.

Example number three shows no difference in meaning produced by HT and MT despite the different techniques applied. The literal technique was used by HT in translating the direct speech “You needn’t look for it” into “*Kau tidak perlu mencarinya*” while MT used addition by giving additional information with the word “*lagi*” to strengthen the sense carried in the target text. The addition of the word “*lagi*” in the target text has no big impact on the meaning delivered, and if it is eliminated from the target text, the meaning remains the same. The same case also happens in Examples number four and five. Maggie Tiojakin used a literal technique in the translation of “One dollar and eighty–seven cents” into “*Satu dolar dan delapan puluh tujuh sen*”, whereas U-Dictionary used reduction by eliminating the word “and” in the target text. The phrasal verbs “Cut it off and sold it” in the source text in Example 5 were translated by HT using the addition technique. To get the meaning clarity of the text, she added the word “*Aku*” that refers to Della as the doer who cut and sold her own hair. Otherwise, the transposition technique was used by MT to translate these phrasal verbs. In the MT version, the imperative phrasal verbs in the source text were transformed into the passive phrasal verbs in the target text. However, both translation versions are still adequate and acceptable.

Despite the different techniques applied by HT and MT, the results of translation produced, as can be seen in Examples 1-5, have no significant difference in meaning. This happens when the source text uses good grammar with common words and simple sentences, so that it is easier for both HT and MT to translate them into the target text. However, Examples 6-10 show significant differences in the meaning produced by HT and MT.

In Example 6, the adaptation technique was used by Maggie Tiojakin to translate “one’s cheeks burned” into “*pipinya memerah*”. This technique is known as a cultural adaptation technique. It is done by replacing the cultural elements in SL with similar cultural

elements in TL. *Burned* in Indonesian literally means *terbakar*. However, in this context, the word *burned* does not mean that someone's cheeks are injured or damaged by heat, but it describes one's red face because of feeling embarrassed. So, instead of changing *burned* into *terbakar*, she changes it into *memerah*. This is done by the translator because the target audience will be more familiar with the context. Meanwhile, U Dictionary translates "one's cheeks burned" into "*pipi seseorang terbakar*" by using the calque technique. This translation technique translates SL phrases or words literally. It can be done by adjusting the structure of words or phrases of TL into the structure of the TL, but not on the meaning. The structural adjustment can be seen in the phrase *one's cheeks* which was translated into *pipi seseorang* by following the phrase structure pattern in Indonesian, which uses a Head-Modifier (HM) pattern. Next, the application translates the word *burned* into *terbakar*. It can be seen that the application cannot identify the contextual meaning of the word *burned* in this phrase. So, it literally translates the meaning of the word *burned* into *terbakar* in Indonesian.

Several techniques were applied by Maggie Tiojakin in translating the sentence in Example 7. To translate the phrase "One flight up", HT used the transposition technique by shifting the noun phrase into a verb phrase "*menaiki tangga*". It was done to preserve the meaning and make the target text sound natural and acceptable. In contrast, MT used a literal technique to translate it (**one** into *satu*, **flight** into *penerbangan*, and **up** into *ke atas*); hence, the translation result was so awkward, and the meaning did not make sense at all. The other technique used by HT was Modulation; it was used to translate the word "panting" into "*napasnya memburu*". Maggie translated it by changing the point of view and the semantic meaning. In Collin Online Dictionary (COD), the word "panting" is from the word "*pant*" which means a situation of someone who breathes rapidly and heavily, gasping, as running very fast. It means "*terengah-engah*" in Indonesian. Maggie changed the semantic meaning "*panting*" into "*napasnya memburu*", whereas U-Dictionary used an established equivalent to translate the word "panting" into "*terengah-engah*". It was done because it was the recognized term as found in the dictionary or language in use as an equivalent in TL, and both translation versions are still acceptable.

In Example 8, Maggie Tiojakin used generalization technique in translating the specific form of address used as a title for women in artistic occupation "Madame" into a broader and more general term in the target text "*seorang wanita*", while U-Dictionary used pure borrowing in translating it without making any change on the word "*Madame*" in Indonesian. Another pure borrowing was also applied by U-Dictionary on the word "Sofronie" which should be the description of the "Madame" along with the literal translation of other characteristics mentioned before it, hence it made the translation produced for the whole sentence unnatural and awkward. However, by using an amplification technique, the HT can transfer the message of this sentence to be more comprehensible to the target text readers by giving a contextual description and additional information about what is meant by the word "Madame". So, although the quantity of words in the target text is higher than what can be found in the source text, the result of translation done by HT is more acceptable and natural.

Maggie Tiojakin used amplification to translate the sentence in Example 9. The sentence “*Jim stopped inside the door*” was translated into “*Jim menghentikan langkahnya di balik pintu*”. Maggie translated it by adding new information, “*langkahnya*” which was not formulated in the source text; this was done to make the translation result more natural and acceptable. She also used an established equivalent technique in translating the simile “as immovable as a setter at the scent of quail,” which means the showing of dumbfounded action because of seeing something shocking into non-figurative expression “*berdiri membeku*”. On the contrary, U-Dictionary failed to recognize the meaning carried in this sentence, even more so to recognize the figurative expression (simile) found in this sentence. There was also one word, “setter,” that was kept untranslated. This MT translated the sentence literally, so that the result of its translation is weird and unacceptable.

Example 10 shows a complex sentence in which various techniques are needed to transfer its message comprehensively into the target text. In this case, Maggie Tiojakin as the HT successfully transferred the message of this sentence into more flowing and understandable sentence in the target text by applying several techniques of translation, while U-Dictionary or the MT mostly used literal technique to render the message of this sentence into the target text so that it produced the inaccurate and choppy sentence in the target text. Maggie mainly used amplification by adding the contextual information in the target text, such as on the pronoun “he” which was substituted by the name of the main character in the story “Jim”, and also on the addition of the adverb “*secara diam-diam agar tidak dilihat orang*”, as well as the addition of the adjective “*malu*”. This technique was done to fill up the gap regarding the information given in the SL, which is not formulated explicitly, so that it needs to be strengthened by adding some more details information in the TL. By using transposition, some grammatical adjustments were also done by HT to produce more readable expressions in the target text, such as in the structure shift of “the watch” which follows the pattern of a modifier and head into the pattern of a head and modifier in Indonesian “*jam itu*”.

Concerning the aforementioned discussion, it can be concluded that Maggie Tiojakin (HT) used more indirect (oblique) translation techniques in which these techniques were used 105 times. When the structural or conceptual components of the source language cannot be translated directly without changing meaning or disrupting the target language's grammatical and stylistic characteristics, oblique translation techniques are employed, according to Bosco (n.d.). Furthermore, according to Vinay & Dalbarnet (1958) and Venuti (1992), some stylistic effects cannot be translated into the target language (TL) without disrupting the syntactic order or even the lexis due to structural or metalinguistic incompatibilities. In this case, it is understood that more complex methods have to be used, which at first may look unusual but which nevertheless can permit translators a strict control over the reliability of their work: these procedures are called oblique translation methods.

In addition, indirect (oblique) translation techniques were used in order to make the translation more readable, acceptable, and accurate. In line with the definition of translation, which is translation is not only transferring the form of the language but also the meaning, style, and cultural values, these variation techniques make the translation easy to be understood, acceptable in the TL grammatical structure, style, and culture, and equivalent in

the meaning. To sum up, HT employed these versions of the strategy while keeping the message consistent and cognizant of the context. She translated according to the context, and it is impossible to translate from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL) without changing the style or grammatical structure. These are also used to effectively communicate the text's meaning and ensure that readers fully comprehend the message being sent from the source language to the target language.

In contrast to Maggie Tiojakin, U-Dictionary used more direct translation techniques such as borrowing, calque, and literal translation. These techniques were used 76 times. Direct translation techniques are used when it is feasible to translate conceptual and structural elements of the source language into the target language. The MT mostly uses these techniques because the alerting of the grammatical structure or style was not understood by the program of U-Dictionary. The use of more direct translation techniques makes the result of the translation difficult to understand, unfit in the TL grammatical structure, style, and culture, and unacceptable in the meaning. These techniques are also used when the SL did not need to alter the grammatical structure or style. The program just transposed directly from the SL into the TL. In addition, MT also used oblique translation techniques amplification, established equivalent, modulation, reduction, and transposition. These techniques were used 24 times. The MT used these variations of translation techniques because the alteration of the grammatical structure or style was known to the program. However, these oblique techniques were rarely used by U-Dictionary because the alterations in the system of the program were limited.

Even if Maggie Tiojakin also used the direct translation technique, which was literal translation, it was used 5 times. This technique was used to translate when the SL did not need to alter the grammatical structure or style. It may be possible to translate the source language message element by element into the target language because some translation tasks are based on either (i) parallel categories, in which case we can talk about structural parallelism, or (ii) parallel concepts, which are the result of metalinguistic parallelisms (Vinay & Dalbernet, 1958). Tiojakin rarely used it because most of the contents in the SL could not be just transposed directly into the TL. It was also to avoid the misunderstanding and low-quality translation. Because of the quality of the translation, it resulted as if it were Tiojakin's work rather than a translation.

In translating *The Gift of the Magi* into Indonesian, the dominant translation technique used by Maggie Tiojakin was discursive creation. Molina and Albir (2002) said discursive creation is to establish a temporary equivalence that is totally unpredictable out of context. Based on Istiqomah et al. (2019), the translator translated differently from the source text in order to make viewers understand any different culture in the source text. Maggie, as a human, has many ideas to make some creations because she is influenced by her background and experiences. That is why this technique is only used by Maggie. As a machine, U-Dictionary is only programmed to translate according to text inputted, so it cannot translate out of context.

Conversely, the primary translation technique employed by U-Dictionary was literal translation. According to Molina & Albir (2002), literal translation involves rendering words or expressions directly, word for word. Khenglawt and Lalţanpuia, (2018) explain that

machine translation systems typically operate on two levels: metaphrase and paraphrase. Metaphrase refers to literal translation, where each word is translated individually. However, this approach may fail to accurately convey the original meaning, potentially resulting in semantic differences. In contrast, paraphrasing focuses on capturing the overall sense or gist of the source text. While the syntactic structure may remain the same or change, the goal is to achieve dynamic equivalence in the translated version (Kituku et al., 2016). The system of the program in machine translation is designed in that way. That is why literal translation was used more by U-Dictionary.

CONCLUSION

The research shows the different translation techniques applied by human translators (HT) and machine translators (MT). It shows that through the experiences and some social and cultural backgrounds, human uses more oblique translation techniques. Humans can change, replace, introduce, describe, add, or suppress the translation of the source text into the target text with an understanding of the context and without changing the message of the source text. These oblique translation techniques determine the readability, acceptability, and accuracy of the translation of a human translator. Different from a human translator, a machine translator uses more direct translation techniques. Direct translation techniques include borrowing, calque, and literal translation. The use of direct translation techniques makes the translation of the machine translator less readable, acceptable, and accurate.

Machine translator mostly translates the source text literally into the target text or take straight from the source text. It can change, introduce, add, and suppress the translation of the source text into the target text, but those are very limited. Those only happen in the general context and the familiar one. It can be said that machine translators are not actually arranged and designed for translating specific purposes such as literary works. From the different translation techniques used, it can be seen that human translation has better results than machine translation. Thus, this study demonstrates that while machine translation may perform translation in certain contexts, it cannot take the role of human translation. Therefore, to produce translation results with high efficiency and better quality, a translator should work together with the machine translation by using it as a translation aid to significantly save time to complete the translation task, and then edit the target text translated previously by the machine.

REFERENCES

- Arvianti, G. F. (2018). Human translation versus machine translation of Instagram's captions: Who is the best? *2nd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings*, 2, 531–536.
<http://103.97.100.145/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/3585/3412>
- Asi, N., Fauzan, A., Nugraha, R. F., Binti, J. A. Y. P., & Vanesa, N. (2024a). Culturally distinctive features in journalistic text: A case study on students' vs. AI-generated translations. *Yavana Bhasha : Journal of English Language Education*, 7(1), 54–67.
<https://doi.org/10.25078/yb.v7i1.3212>

- Asi, N., Fauzan, A., Nugraha, R. F., Binti, J. A. Y. P., & Vanesa, N. (2024b). Students' Strategies and Errors In Journalistic Text Translation. *Journal of English Educational Study (JEES)*, 7(1), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.31932/jees.v7i1.2897>
- Budianto, S., Andharu, D., & Kartini, R. (2024). Analyzing the differences: U-dictionary and google translate's English-to-Indonesian speech translation. *Research and Development in Education (RaDEn)*, 4(1), 138–148. <https://doi.org/10.22219/raden.v4i1.32316>
- Farahani, M. V. (2020). Adequacy in Machine vs. Human Translation: A Comparative Study of English and Persian Languages. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2020.98700>
- Freitas, C., & Liu, Y. (2017). *Exploring the Differences between Human and Machine Translation Translation Recommended Citation Recommended Citation*. https://cedar.wvu.edu/wvu_honors
- Halimah. (2018). BAHTERA: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra. *BAHTERA: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastr*, 17(1), 11–29. <http://journal.unj.ac.id/unj/index.php/bahtera/>
- Hasibuan, Z. (2020). A Comparative Study Between Human Translation and Machine Translation as an Interdisciplinary Research. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, 3(2), 115. <https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v3i2.8545>
- Henry, O. (2022). *The Gift of the Magi*. Renard Press Limited.
- Istiqomah, L., Erawati, M., & Suparno, S. L. (2019). Discursive Creation Technique of English to Indonesian Subtitle in Harry Potter: The Chamber of Secrets Movie. *Lingual*, 7(1), 1–4. <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/language/article/view/48085/29585>
- Khenglawt, V., & Lal̄anpuia. (2018). Perspective and Trends in the Development of Science Education and Research. *Proceedings of the Mizoram Science Congress 2018*, 141–145. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2991/msc-18.2018.22>
- Kituku, B., Muchemi, L., & Nganga, W. (2016). A review on machine translation approaches. *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*, 1(1), 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.11591/telkomnika.v1i1.pp182-190>
- Lihua, Z. (2022). Retracted: The Relationship between Machine Translation and Human Translation under the Influence of Artificial Intelligence Machine Translation. *Hindawi: Mobile Information Systems*, 2023, 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/9898413>
- Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta Journal Des Traducteurs*, 47(4). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
- Muftah, M. (2022). Machine vs human translation: a new reality or a threat to professional Arabic–English translators. *PSU Research Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PRR-02-2022-0024>
- Nugraha, R. F. (2023). Idiom Translation Quality Assessment on “Landline” Novel by Rainbow Rowell. *EBONY: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 3(2), 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.37304/ebony.v3i2.9468>

- Nugraha, R. F., Asi, N., & Fauzan, A. (2024). *WORDS ACROSS BORDER An Introductory Book to Translation*. Deepublish. <https://deepublishstore.com/produk/buku-words-across-border-an-introductory-book-to-translation/>
- Putrawan, G. E. (2017). *Basic Understanding of Translation; Theoretical and Practical Points of View*. Graha Ilmu. <https://bintangpusnas.perpusnas.go.id/konten/BK2688/basic-understanding-of-translation-theoretical-and-practical-points-of-view>
- Venuti, L. (1992). *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. Routledge.
- Vinay, J. P., & Dalbarnet, J. (1958). A methodology for translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. Routledge.
- Zong, Z. (2018). Research on the Relations between Machine Translation and Human Translation. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1087(6). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1087/6/062046>