

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Background of the Study

Causative verbs express an action that is caused to happen (Naibaho, 2021). It means that to create the action, there is someone or something, as an initiator, that causes an action to something or someone that is affected by the initiator. According to Dixon and Aikhenvald (Azizah, 2020), the initiator, the so-called causer, refers to someone or something (which can be an event or state) that initiates or controls the activity. On the other hand, the affected one, the so-called cause, is the entity or event that is changed or influenced by the causer and carries out the effect of the caused event. Baron said this kind of causation relation is as seen fundamental as a basic human concept and the underlying structure of human language (Assoc. Prof. Tilbe Goksun, 2020).

In relation to basic human concepts and the underlying structure of human language, language, and causative have relationships where languages tend to have a construction specifically designed to express causative relationships in which the causing event is not elaborated beyond the notion of cause (Maket, 2023). Languages and causative, several studies have investigated causative, especially comparative studies to English causatives, in different languages such as Indonesian, Arawakan, Dutch, French, and Persian (Gilquin, 2015; Levshina, Geeraerts, & Speelman, 2013). The studies show that the construction of causatives between English and other languages tends to have different constructions.

Since a machine translator merely translates the text based on the database received, this can be a fascinating study to investigate. In this case, the machine translator used is *Google Translate and U-Dictionary* which was considered the most frequently used machine translator. Hampshire and Salvia (2010) reported that Google Translate has become the top-tier machine translator because of the quality of its translation (De Vries, E., Schoonvelde, M., & Schumacher, G. (2018).

The work of Google Translate in translating causative construction into Indonesian then raised curiosity since its ability in the translation is based on the database received compared to humans who can do more in the translation. Furthermore, Arka (1993) stated that the translation of Indonesian causative cannot be undertaken simply for most Indonesian causative translations result in morphological causative to make the translation acceptable and to avoid oddity (in Ponsonnet, M. 2013). Therefore, it was absorbing to know how a machine translator, in this case, Google Translate, performs the translation compared to human's employ. The causative constructions translated in this paper were the construction containing *have, get, let, and make*.

According to Gilquin (2003), causative *have, get, let, and make* have closeness in purpose and meaning (in Mueller, C. M., & Tsushima, Y. 2019). Thus, the writer intended to investigate whether Google Translate and U-Dictionary were able to translate English causative construction into Indonesian causative construction. Concerning the first aim, the writer also intended to know how English causative *have, get, let, and make* were translated into Indonesian and undertaken by Google Translate and U-Dictionary. Besides, the study is also aimed to know what possible translation strategies are done by Google Translate compared to U-Dictionary translation in translating causative constructions containing *have, get, let, and make* from English into Indonesian.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Since not many Indonesian scholars have conducted studies on the comparison of machine translation in causative verbs, this study attempts to analyze this specific genre by addressing the following research questions:

1. How far do Google Translate and U-Dictionary able to translate English causative constructions *have, get, let, and make* and their past forms into Indonesian causative constructions?

2. What are strategies that is used by Google Translate and U-Dictionary when translating English causative construction into Indonesian causative constructions?

### **1.3. Purpose of the Study**

The purpose is to find how far Google Translate and U-Dictionary were able to translate the causative constructions successfully from English causative construction into Indonesian causative construction. The next one is to find out strategies that were applied by Google Translate and U-Dictionary in the translation of causative constructions.

### **1.4. Significance of the Study**

The result is expected to be beneficial for both applications in translating the causative verbs (have, get, let, and make). Next one, the result of the strategies is expected to be beneficial for the translation study related to machine translation.

### **1.5. Methodology of the Study**

The approach of this study is a qualitative approach. Since the data of the research are text-based, according to Creswell (2012), the approach in connection with the data is collected in a form of a text database typically uses a qualitative approach. Furthermore, Creswell (2012) added that in the qualitative study, rather than using statistics, the data analyzed are words to describe a central phenomenon in a study (Chih-Pei, H. U., & Chang, Y. Y, 2017). Furthermore, the result of the study is a form of causative constructions analysis that needs description and interpretation. Thus, the qualitative approach can be best used in this research as the data mostly deals with text and description.

This study has two purposes in relation to the translation of machine application translation and their strategies. To accomplish both purposes, there are two frameworks used. The first framework is to analyze the translation of machine translation application, and the second framework is to analyze the strategies used.

The first objective is to know whether Google Translate and U-Dictionary are able to translate English causative have, get, let, and make causatively into Indonesian. To know both Google Translate and U-Dictionary machine translation translated causatively into Indonesian, the analysis of causative form itself was grounded according to the exposition of Sneddon et al (2010) and Arka (1993). They explain that the causative form could simply be in the form of a transitive verb which denotes that the subject causes another person to do the action on the object (in Rajeg, 2020).

The form of Indonesian causative verbs mostly begins with the prefix *me* and end with the affix *-kan* such as; *men-cuci-kan*(to wash),*mem-bawa-kan* (to bring), *me-yakin-kan* (to convince), etc. Some occur with the prefix *me-* and end with *-I* such as *mem-berkat-i*(to bless) and *me-n(t)emu-i*(to meet). Besides, Indonesian causatives also occur regularly with passive verbs which are preceded by the prefix *-di* or *-ter* such as *di-risau-kan* (be worried about) and *ter-tangkap* (be caught).

The second objective is to know how Google Translate translation and U-Dictionary translation translate causative form by analyzing the strategies used. The analysis is grounded according to Newmark's (1988) procedures of translation. There are 14 out of 18 procedures that were used in this study namely, transference, naturalization, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, synonymy, through-translation, shifts or transposition, modulation, recognized translation, compensation, paraphrase, couplets, and notes, additions, glosses (in Swarniti, 2019).

## 1.6. The Scope and Limitation

The data of this study were taken from one English novel namely Life of Pi by Yann Martel. There were 100 sentences that consisted of causative verbs have, get, let, and make with present and past forms and active and passive voices. The detail of the novel is as follows:

Table 1-1 The Scope and Limitation of The Study

Source Text			
Title	Author	Publication	Page
Life of Pi	Yann Martel	Knopf Canada	354

The data were from the source texts, there are 100 sentences that consist of causative verbs have, get, let, and make which included their past forms from Life of Pi and translated to Indonesia using Google Translate and U-Dictionary machine translation.

### 1.7. The Status of the Study

The studies of causative constructions have received much attention. The investigations have been undertaken semantically and syntactically across languages. As Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000) reported in investigating English periphrastic causatives in Macushi and Canela-Kraho, they found that cause in Macushi is marked for its function in the subordinate clause; and in English, it is marked for its function in the main clause (the clause with the causative verb); and in Canela-Kraho, it is marked for both (in Yu, L. 2019). Furthermore, a study conducted by Moreno (1993) reported that some languages such as Korean, Tamil, Telugu, Indonesian, Jacalteco, Modern Greek, and Thai frequently form the periphrastic causative with *make*.

Similar to Moreno, the investigation of Gilquin (2008) found that French only has *faire* as the counterpart of *make* (in Gilquin, G. (2015)). The studies above reported causatives in semantic and syntactic analysis. However, those analytical studies are inseparable from the role of translation. By analyzing the forms of periphrastic causatives, the analysis, indeed, needed to translate the target languages before being translated into English were subsequently compared.

In relation to *Google Translate* investigations of its accuracy, there are several studies undertaken. Ghasemi and Hasemian (2016) undertake a comparative study of Google Translate translations to find errors in English to Persian and the

other way around. Another study of the *Google Translate* application was conducted to assess its quality in translating six different text types which comprise Afrikaans to English and the other way around (Lotz, S., & Van Rensburg, A. 2014). Furthermore, the study on *Google Translate* was conducted to know the ability of Google Translate in translating error-free text.

The studies of causative verbs *have*, *get*, *let*, and *make* regarding translation across languages indirectly have been generally conducted in the previous literature. Specifically, Gilquin (2003) conducts *verbs have, get, let, and make* directly in relation to the corpus (Gilquin, G. 2016). Nevertheless, the comparative study of causative verbs *have, get, let, and make* with machine translators, with *Google Translate* has not been found. This study might be the first in investigating a translation of causative verbs *have, get, let, and make* with Google Translate and U-Dictionary in English to Indonesian.

## **1.8. Organization of The Study**

### **1. Chapter I – Introduction**

In this chapter, the writer will include background, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the research methodology, the scope and limitations of the study, the study of the study, and the organization of the study.

### **2. Chapter II –Review of Related Literature**

This chapter discusses the notion of causative, translation, and Google Translate. Firstly, the notion of causative deals with causative in general, English analytic causative, and Indonesian analytic causative. Secondly, the part of translation deals with translation methods, strategies, and procedures. Thirdly, a subchapter of Google Translate deals with its issues. Lastly, the previous study deals with the previous investigations in relation to periphrastic causatives, especially causative verbs *have, get, let, and make*.

### **3. Chapter III – Findings and Discussion**

This chapter comprises two main parts namely findings and discussions. These two parts are divided into several parts in relation to the purposes of this study which



are provided in the form of answers to two research questions. The finding consists of collecting obtained data from the data analysis process. Meanwhile, the discussion part is the interpretation of data analysis.

#### 4. Chapter IV – Conclusion

This chapter presents the conclusion and suggestions from the findings that are discussed in the previous chapter. The conclusion part is the summary of the data analysis of causative constructions. Meanwhile, the suggestion part comprises recommendations of this study in relation to the application of causative constructions, especially *have*, *get*, *let*, and *make* in several aspects.

