

Perpustakaan UKI

Analysis of the Similarities of Meaning and Usage between Translation Techniques (Molina & Albir) and Translation Proce...

 Turnitin Dosen 14
 Turnitin Dosen - Jun
 Universitas Kristen Indonesia

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid:::1:3598722601

Submission Date

Jun 21, 2026, 9:13 PM GMT+7

Download Date

Jun 21, 2026, 9:21 PM GMT+7

File Name

Techniques_Molina_Albir_and_Translation_Procedures_Newmark.docx

File Size

100.0 KB

17 Pages

5,683 Words

38,486 Characters

12% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

Filtered from the Report

- Bibliography

Match Groups

-  **42 Not Cited or Quoted 8%**
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
-  **16 Missing Quotations 3%**
Matches that are still very similar to source material
-  **9 Missing Citation 1%**
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
-  **0 Cited and Quoted 0%**
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 11%  Internet sources
- 7%  Publications
- 3%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

Integrity Flags

0 Integrity Flags for Review

No suspicious text manipulations found.

Our system's algorithms look deeply at a document for any inconsistencies that would set it apart from a normal submission. If we notice something strange, we flag it for you to review.

A Flag is not necessarily an indicator of a problem. However, we'd recommend you focus your attention there for further review.

Match Groups

- 42 Not Cited or Quoted 8%**
Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- 16 Missing Quotations 3%**
Matches that are still very similar to source material
- 9 Missing Citation 1%**
Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- 0 Cited and Quoted 0%**
Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 11% Internet sources
- 7% Publications
- 3% Submitted works (Student Papers)

Top Sources

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1	Internet	smarteducenter.org	1%
2	Internet	repository.uinsu.ac.id	<1%
3	Internet	repositorio.uia.ac.cr:8080	<1%
4	Publication	Fabio Alves, Fabrizio Gallai. "Applications of Relevance Theory to Translation and ...	<1%
5	Student papers	University of Mosul	<1%
6	Internet	ijelass.darulilmibinainsan.or.id	<1%
7	Internet	www.researchgate.net	<1%
8	Internet	www.academypublication.com	<1%
9	Internet	nigerianjournalsonline.org	<1%
10	Internet	dspace.univ-ouargla.dz	<1%

11	Internet	media.neliti.com	<1%
12	Internet	ojs3.unpatti.ac.id	<1%
13	Internet	eprints.iain-surakarta.ac.id	<1%
14	Internet	globalacademicstar.com	<1%
15	Internet	journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id	<1%
16	Publication	Hammas, Wedyan Ahmed. "Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Translation: A Cogn...	<1%
17	Student papers	University of Surrey	<1%
18	Internet	edulearn.intelektual.org	<1%
19	Internet	tutvital.tut.ac.za	<1%
20	Student papers	Selçuk Üniversitesi	<1%
21	Internet	journal.aspirasi.or.id	<1%
22	Publication	Allaham, Sara Ahmad. "Translation and Commentary of Early Christian Thought T...	<1%
23	Internet	ejournal-fkip.unisi.ac.id	<1%
24	Student papers	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	<1%

25	Internet	repositorio.umsa.bo	<1%
26	Internet	riunet.upv.es	<1%
27	Internet	www.ojs.rjsser.org.pk	<1%
28	Publication	Lamhot Naibaho. "The integration of mind mapping strategy on students' essay ...	<1%
29	Publication	Makamu, Thembheka Abraham. "Translation and Interpretation of Cultural Conc...	<1%
30	Internet	centaur.reading.ac.uk	<1%
31	Internet	jmi.stekom.ac.id	<1%
32	Publication	Li, Qiang. "Effective Chinese-to-English Geotourism Translation : An Interdisciplin...	<1%
33	Publication	Zaky, Rofyda Ramadan. "Accessible Qatari Folktale: Multimodal E-Book for Young ...	<1%
34	Internet	regionallens.com	<1%
35	Internet	repository.syekhnrjati.ac.id	<1%
36	Publication	Fabio Alves, Arnt Lykke Jakobsen. "The Routledge Handbook of Translation and C...	<1%
37	Publication	Leah Gerber, Lintao Qi. "A Century of Chinese Literature in Translation (1919–201...	<1%
38	Internet	macrothink.org	<1%

39	Internet	newjournal.org	<1%
40	Internet	prapanca.or.id	<1%
41	Internet	prism.ucalgary.ca	<1%
42	Internet	repository.ar-raniry.ac.id	<1%

Analysis of the Similarities of Meaning and Usage between Translation Techniques (Molina & Albir) and Translation Procedures (Newmark)

Gunawan Tambunsaribu¹

Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received mm dd, yyyy

Revised mm dd, yyyy

Accepted mm dd, yyyy

Keywords:

translation procedures,
translation techniques,
equivalence, translation
studies.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the similarities between the translation procedures proposed by Peter Newmark and the translation techniques developed by Molina and Albir. Specifically, the research investigates the extent to which both frameworks share equivalent categories and theoretical orientations in explaining how translators transfer meaning from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). This research employs a qualitative descriptive method using a comparative theoretical approach. Data were collected from the classifications of translation procedures proposed by Newmark and translation techniques proposed by Molina and Albir. The analysis focused on identifying corresponding categories, examining their conceptual similarities, and comparing their functions in translation practice. The findings reveal substantial similarities between the two frameworks. Strong equivalences were identified in several categories, including *transference-borrowing*, *naturalization-naturalized borrowing*, *cultural equivalent-adaptation*, *descriptive equivalent-description*, *modulation-modulation*, *compensation-compensation*, *transposition-transposition*, *recognized translation-established equivalent*, and *through-translation/literal translation-literal translation/calque*. In addition, both frameworks share a common orientation toward *preserving meaning*, *managing cultural differences*, *achieving equivalence*, *restructuring grammatical forms*, and *ensuring target-language acceptability*. The analysis demonstrates that both models address similar linguistic and cultural challenges despite using different terminologies and classification systems. The study concludes that Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques are largely complementary rather than contradictory frameworks. While Newmark adopts a *procedure-oriented* and *problem-solving perspective*, Molina and Albir offer a *more operational* and *text-oriented classification of translation choices*. Consequently, many of Molina and Albir's techniques can be viewed as refinements and systematizations of translation operations already recognized in Newmark's model. Together, both frameworks contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of translation processes and equivalence in translation studies.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.



Corresponding Author:

Gunawan Tambunsaribu
Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: gunawan.tambunsaribu@uki.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Translation is a complex process of transferring meaning from a source language (SL) into a target language (TL) while preserving the intended message, communicative function, and cultural significance. As globalization continues to increase cross-cultural communication, translation plays a crucial role in facilitating the exchange of knowledge, literature, technology, and information among different linguistic communities. Therefore, translators are required not only to possess linguistic competence but also to apply appropriate strategies that enable them to produce accurate, natural, and acceptable translations (Nida & Taber, 1969).

Within Translation Studies, scholars have developed various concepts to explain the methods and strategies employed by translators during the translation process. Among the most influential concepts are translation procedures proposed by Newmark (1988) and translation techniques introduced by Molina and Albir. Both concepts aim to describe how translators solve translation problems and transfer meanings from the source text to the target text. Although these concepts originate from different theoretical frameworks and historical periods, many scholars have observed that they share similar functions and practical applications in translation analysis (Molina & Albir, 2002; Ordudari, 2007).

Newmark (1988) defines translation procedures as the methods used for translating smaller units of language, such as words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. He proposes several procedures, including transference, naturalization, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, descriptive equivalent, synonymy, through-translation, shifts or transpositions, modulation, recognized translation, compensation, paraphrase, and couplets. These procedures are designed to help translators overcome linguistic and cultural differences between the source and target languages while maintaining equivalence of meaning.

Similarly, Molina and Albir introduce the concept of translation techniques as procedures used to analyze and classify how translation equivalence is achieved in translated texts. They identify eighteen translation techniques, including borrowing, calque, literal translation, modulation, transposition, adaptation, amplification, reduction, linguistic compression, linguistic amplification, compensation, description, particularization, generalization, substitution, variation, established equivalent, and discursive creation. According to Molina and Albir (2002), translation techniques are observable in the final translated product and can be identified through textual comparison between the source text and the target text.

The distinction between translation procedures and translation techniques has generated considerable discussion among translation scholars. Some researchers argue that the two concepts refer to similar translation phenomena but employ different terminologies and classifications. For example, Newmark's procedure of transference closely resembles Molina and Albir's technique of borrowing, while Newmark's transposition and modulation correspond directly to techniques

with the same names in Molina and Albir's taxonomy. Likewise, Newmark's descriptive equivalent is conceptually similar to Molina and Albir's description, and Newmark's functional equivalent shares characteristics with the technique of adaptation in certain translation contexts (Molina & Albir, 2002; Newmark, 1988).

Theoretical discussions concerning translation procedures and techniques have become increasingly important because both frameworks are widely used in translation research. Numerous studies employ Molina and Albir's techniques to analyze literary, audiovisual, legal, and technical translations due to their detailed classification system and applicability to product-oriented analysis (Molina & Albir, 2002; Gambier & Van Doorslaer, 2010). Meanwhile, Newmark's procedures continue to be utilized in translation pedagogy and textual analysis because they provide practical guidance for solving linguistic and cultural translation problems (Newmark, 1988). Despite their extensive use, relatively few studies have systematically compared the similarities between the two frameworks, particularly regarding their semantic functions and practical usage in translation analysis.

Furthermore, Molina and Albir (2002) emphasize that translation techniques should not be confused with methods or strategies because techniques operate at the micro-textual level and become visible in the translated product. This perspective aligns with Newmark's view that procedures are applied to specific linguistic units rather than to entire texts. Such similarities suggest that translation techniques and translation procedures may represent comparable analytical tools despite differences in terminology and categorization. Consequently, investigating the relationship between these frameworks can contribute to a deeper understanding of translation theory and practice.

Several scholars have highlighted the importance of examining equivalence and translator decision-making through comparative analytical frameworks. Ordudari (2007) argues that translation strategies and procedures are essential for achieving communicative effectiveness across languages and cultures. Similarly, Venuti (2017) emphasizes that translators constantly make choices that shape the representation of meaning in translated texts. Understanding how different theoretical frameworks describe these choices can enhance both translation research and translator training.

Based on the foregoing discussion, this study seeks to analyze the similarities of meaning and usage between the translation techniques proposed by Molina and Albir (2002) and the translation procedures proposed by Newmark (1988). Specifically, the study aims to identify conceptual correspondences between the two classifications, examine how they function in translation practice, and evaluate the extent to which they overlap in terms of meaning transfer and problem-solving mechanisms. By comparing these influential frameworks, the study is expected to contribute to the development of translation theory and provide useful insights for translation researchers, educators, and practitioners.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative-comparative research design. Qualitative research is

appropriate because it aims to understand and interpret phenomena based on meanings, concepts, and theoretical perspectives rather than numerical data (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Specifically, the study employs a comparative document analysis to examine the similarities in meaning and usage between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques. Qualitative descriptive research enables researchers to systematically describe and interpret characteristics of a phenomenon based on textual data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In the context of Translation Studies, qualitative methods are frequently employed to analyze translation phenomena, theoretical constructs, and translator decision-making processes because they allow for in-depth examination of linguistic and conceptual relationships (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013).

Data Sources

The data of this study consist of theoretical concepts, definitions, classifications, and descriptions of translation procedures proposed by Newmark and translation techniques proposed by Molina and Albir. The primary sources of data are:

1. Newmark's A Textbook of Translation (1988), which presents various translation procedures and their applications in translation practice.
2. Molina and Albir's article Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach (2002), which introduces and explains the taxonomy of translation techniques.

In addition, secondary sources such as books, journal articles, and scholarly publications that discuss translation procedures, techniques, and strategies are used to support the analysis and interpretation of the findings (Munday, 2016; Baker, 2018).

Data Collection Technique

The study employs documentation as the primary data collection technique. Documentation is a method of collecting data from written sources, documents, archives, books, and scholarly publications relevant to the research topic (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The data collection process consists of several steps:

1. Collecting primary and secondary literature related to Translation Procedures and Translation Techniques.
2. Identifying the definitions, classifications, characteristics, and functions of each procedure and technique.
3. Compiling the identified concepts into a comparative analytical framework.
4. Organizing the data according to categories of meaning, function, and practical application.

This documentation process enables the researcher to obtain comprehensive information regarding both theoretical models and their respective classifications.

Research Instrument

In qualitative research, the researcher serves as the primary instrument for collecting, interpreting, and analyzing data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The researcher systematically reviews the literature, identifies conceptual similarities, and interprets the relationships between translation

procedures and translation techniques. To facilitate data organization, a comparison matrix is used as a supporting instrument. The matrix contains:

- a) The name of each translation procedure proposed by Newmark (1988);
- b) The corresponding translation technique proposed by Molina and Albir (2002);
- c) Definitions of each category;
- d) Similarities in meaning;
- e) Similarities in usage and function;
- f) Differences, if any.

Data Analysis Technique

The data are analyzed using qualitative content analysis. Content analysis is a systematic method for identifying, categorizing, and interpreting patterns and meanings within textual data (Schreier, 2012). The analysis follows the interactive model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), which includes:

- a) **Data Condensation:** The researcher selects and simplifies relevant information from the collected literature. Definitions, characteristics, and examples related to Translation Procedures and Translation Techniques are extracted and categorized according to their conceptual functions.
- b) **Data Display:** The categorized data are presented in comparative tables and analytical matrices. This step facilitates the identification of similarities and correspondences between Newmark's procedures and Molina and Albir's techniques.
- c) **Conclusion and Verification:** The researcher interprets the findings by examining the conceptual relationships between the two frameworks. Conclusions are drawn regarding the extent to which translation procedures and translation techniques share similar meanings, functions, and applications in translation practice. The conclusions are continuously verified through repeated examination of the data and supporting literature (Miles et al., 2014).

To ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, the study employs theoretical triangulation. The concepts proposed by Newmark and Molina & Albir are examined alongside supporting theories from other translation scholars such as Baker (2018), Chesterman (1997), Munday (2016), and Vinay and Darbelnet (1995). This triangulation helps strengthen the validity of interpretations and minimizes researcher bias.

Research Procedures

The research was conducted through a series of systematic stages. First, the research problem and objectives were identified to establish the focus and direction of the study. This was followed by a comprehensive review of literature related to translation procedures and translation techniques in order to develop the theoretical foundation of the research. Relevant theoretical data were then collected from both primary and secondary sources and subsequently classified and organized into comparative categories. The data were analyzed to identify similarities and relationships between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques. The findings were then interpreted in light of established translation theories to provide a deeper understanding

of the observed patterns. Finally, conclusions were drawn, and recommendations were proposed to support future research in the field of Translation Studies.

FINDINGS

A. Similarities Based on the Direct Conceptual and Functional Equivalences

The following table presents the similarities between Newmark's (1988) translation procedures and Molina and Albir's (2002) translation techniques based on their direct conceptual and functional equivalences. The comparison demonstrates that many categories in both frameworks perform essentially the same translational functions despite being labeled differently. These similarities are particularly evident in areas such as borrowing, cultural adaptation, descriptive explanation, grammatical restructuring, perspective shifts, compensation, and equivalence management. The findings suggest that both frameworks share common principles of meaning preservation, cultural mediation, and communicative effectiveness, indicating that Molina and Albir's techniques often refine and systematize translation operations that were already recognized in Newmark's earlier model.

Newmark's Translation Procedures	Molina & Albir's Translation Techniques	Similarity Analysis
Transference	Borrowing (pure borrowing)	Both preserve the SL item in the TL without translating it. <i>Names, institutions, places, and culturally bound items</i> remain unchanged. Both emphasize maintaining foreign lexical identity.
Naturalization	Naturalized Borrowing	Both adapt foreign terms to the phonological or orthographic rules of the TL while preserving their foreign origin.
Cultural Equivalent	Adaptation	Both replace source-culture elements with target-culture equivalents to increase cultural accessibility.
Descriptive Equivalent	Description	Both explain the meaning/function of unfamiliar cultural concepts through description rather than direct lexical substitution.
Modulation	Modulation	Nearly identical concepts. Both involve changing perspective, viewpoint, or conceptual category.
Compensation	Compensation	Same concept: relocating lost meaning, stylistic effect, or information elsewhere in the text.
Transposition	Transposition	Both involve grammatical/category shifts while preserving meaning.
Recognized Translation	Established Equivalent	Both rely on officially accepted or commonly recognized translations.
Through-translation / Literal Translation	Literal Translation / Calque	Both reproduce source structure or lexical form closely, though Molina & Albir divide literality more explicitly.

Below is a more specific and comprehensive comparison between the corresponding categories in Newmark's translation procedures and Molina & Albir's translation techniques.

1. Transference ↔ Borrowing (Pure Borrowing)

Aspect	Transference (Newmark)	Borrowing (Molina & Albir)
Core idea	Transfers SL item directly into TL	Takes words directly from another language
Purpose	Preserve foreign identity	Preserve original lexical form
Main focus	Proper names, institutions, culture-bound terms	Any lexical borrowing

These two categories are almost identical because both maintain the *foreign lexical item unchanged* in the target text. They preserve cultural authenticity and prevent semantic distortion. Both are commonly used for: a) personal names, b) geographical names, c) institutions, d) foods, and d) cultural concepts.

Translation Example

Source Text (English): Yesterday I visited Kyoto and ate sushi.

Target Text (Newmark: Transference): *Kemarin saya mengunjungi **Kyoto** dan makan **sushi**.*

Target Text (Molina & Albir: Borrowing): *Kemarin saya mengunjungi **Kyoto** dan makan **sushi**.*

2. Naturalization ↔ Naturalized Borrowing

Aspect	Naturalization (Newmark)	Naturalized Borrowing (Molina & Albir)
Core idea	Adapt pronunciation and morphology	Adapt borrowed item to TL rules
Main focus	Linguistic assimilation	Orthographic adaptation
Translation operation	Foreign word adjusted to local usage	Borrowing + adaptation

Both strategies maintain foreign origin while making the word easier for target readers. Both strategies adapt foreign lexical items to the orthographic conventions of the target language while preserving their source-language roots, enhancing readability and promoting greater linguistic acceptability among target readers.

The major similarity: *foreign term retained + adjusted form*

Translation Example

Source Text: The meeting was successful.

Naturalization (Newmark): ***Miting** itu berjalan sukses.*

Naturalized Borrowing (Molina & Albir): ***Miting** itu berjalan sukses.*

Other examples:

SL: Television

TL: Televisi

SLT: Democracy

TL: Demokrasi

3. Cultural Equivalent ↔ Adaptation

Aspect	Newmark	Molina & Albir
Goal	Replace culture-specific item	Replace cultural element
Orientation	Reader understanding	Cultural accessibility

These categories are strongly related because both prioritize *cultural acceptability over literal meaning*.

Translation Example 1

Source Text: He loves playing baseball.

Cultural Equivalent (Newmark): *Dia suka bermain sepak bola.*

Adaptation (Molina & Albir): *Dia suka bermain sepak bola.*

Note: The word “**baseball**” is translated into “**sepak bola**” because Indonesian readers relate to that name easily.

Translation Example 2

Source Text: The students are preparing for A-level examinations.

Target Text: *Para siswa sedang mempersiapkan ujian nasional tingkat menengah atas.*

Note: The educational system is culturally adapted. These two approaches emphasize reader accessibility by adapting source-culture elements to the target culture, reducing cultural distance and making the translated text feel more familiar to the target audience."

4. Descriptive Equivalent ↔ Description

Aspect	Newmark	Molina & Albir
Purpose	Explain meaning using several words	Describe form/function
Method	Explicit explanation	Descriptive replacement

Both approaches are employed when no direct equivalent exists in the target language, requiring the translator to transform a lexical item into an explanatory expression to convey its meaning accurately. A key similarity between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques lies in their use of explanatory rendering when direct equivalence is unavailable, especially for cultural references, with the aim of improving target readers' understanding.

Example 1: Descriptive Equivalent

Source Text: The samurai protected their lords.

Target Text: Description Translation: Samurai, **pejuang aristokrat Jepang pada era feodal, melindungi tuannya.**

Example 2: Description Translation

Source Text: We ate panettone.

Target Text: *Kami makan kue tradisional Italia yang biasa dimakan saat tahun baru.*

5. Modulation ↔ Modulation

Aspect	Both Frameworks
Principle	Change viewpoint without changing meaning
Focus	Perspective shift

These are nearly identical concepts. Modulation changes these three things namely a) perspective, b) cognitive framing, and c) semantic angle, without changing intended meaning.

Translation Example 1: Literal

Source Text: You are going to be a father.

Target Text (Literal): *Kamu akan menjadi seorang ayah.*

Target Text (Modulation): *Kamu akan **memiliki** anak.*

Perspective changes: Fatherhood → having a child.

Translation Example 2: Literal

Source Text (Literal): It is not difficult.

Target Text (Modulation): *Itu **mudah**.*

Negative → positive viewpoint shift.

Note: Both Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques involve changing the perspective of the source text while preserving its meaning and enhancing the naturalness of the translation.

6. Compensation ↔ Compensation

Aspect	Both Frameworks
Goal	Recover lost meaning elsewhere
Focus	Stylistic or semantic loss

Sometimes, meaning cannot remain in the same position. Therefore, translators relocate it. Emotional force is compensated differently. "Both Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques prioritize preserving the communicative effect of the source text over its formal structure, relocating meaning as necessary to achieve an equivalent impact on the target audience.

Translation Example 1

Source Text: You little genius!

Target Text: *Wah, **pintar sekali ya kamu!***

Note: The ironic effect shifts from lexical choice to an intonation marker.

Translation Example 2

Source Text: Dear me!

Target Text: *Ya ampun!*

7. Transposition ↔ Transposition

Aspect	Both Frameworks
Goal	Change grammatical category
Focus	Structural adaptation

Both Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques acknowledge grammatical differences between languages and employ category shifts, such as noun–verb, adjective–noun, and structural transformations, to maintain meaning and naturalness in translation. A key similarity between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques is that both involve category shifts and structural modifications while preserving the meaning of the source text in the target language.

Translation Example 1:

Source Text: He will soon return.

Target Text (Literal): *Dia akan segera kembali.*

Target Text (Transposed): *Dia tidak lama lagi akan kembali.*

Translation Example 2:

Source Text: After his arrival, ...

Target Text (Literal): *Setelah kedatangannya, ...*

Target Text (Transposed): *Setelah dia tiba, ...*

Target Text: *Setelah dia tiba, ...*

Note: The noun “arrival” in English is translated into the verb “*tiba*” in the Indonesian language.

8. Recognized Translation ↔ Established Equivalent

Aspect	Newmark	Molina & Albir
Source of equivalence	Official translation	Conventional translation
Usage	Institutional terms	Common expressions

1 A key similarity between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques is that both rely on established and widely accepted usage rather than translator creativity, with translators selecting standardized translations that are Already recognized within the target language. Both Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques draw on conventional linguistic and translational norms to minimize ambiguity and improve the acceptability of the target text.

Translation Example 1: (Established equivalent)

Source Text: United Nations

Target Text: *Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa*

Note: This is institutionalized.

Translation Example 2: (Established equivalent)

Source Text: Time is money

Target Text: *Waktu adalah uang*

9. Through-Translation / Literal Translation ↔ Literal Translation / Calque

Aspect	Newmark	Molina & Albir
Operation	Word-for-word transfer	Direct lexical transfer
Focus	Preserve structure	Preserve structure

Both maintain close formal correspondence. A shared characteristic of Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques is their emphasis on preserving formal correspondence with the source text. Nevertheless, Newmark adopts a broader literal approach, whereas Molina and Albir treat literal translation and calque as distinct translation techniques.

Translation Example 1: (Literal)

Source Text: She is reading.

Target Text: *Dia sedang membaca*

Note: Structure preserved.

Translation Example 2: (Calque)

Source Text: Skyscraper

Target Text: *Pencakar langit*

Note: Each component is translated directly.

Conclusion about the Similarity between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina & Albir's translation techniques based on the direct conceptual and functional equivalences:

The overall similarity between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques lies in their shared commitment to achieving translation equivalence, mediating cultural differences, allowing structural and grammatical adaptation, ensuring acceptability for target-language readers, and prioritizing communicative effectiveness. These common principles suggest that both frameworks ultimately pursue the same objective of facilitating meaningful and functional communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

The strongest similarities between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques arise from the fact that Molina and Albir often reclassify and refine procedures already identified by Newmark. As a result, many categories exhibit nearly identical operational functions, differing primarily in their theoretical orientation: Newmark adopts a procedure-oriented, problem-solving perspective, whereas Molina and Albir employ a text-oriented, operational approach. Consequently, many of their categories can be viewed as parallel concepts expressed through different theoretical frameworks rather than as distinct translation phenomena. Look at the following table to see the matrix of the shared principle between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina & Albir's translation techniques.

Shared Principle	Explanation
Preserve meaning	Both aim for equivalence
Cultural mediation	Both manage culture-bound elements
Structural flexibility	Both allow grammar changes
Reader orientation	Both consider TL acceptability
Functional approach	Communication prioritized

B. SIMILARITIES BASED ON THE ORIENTATION

The similarities between Newmark's procedures and Molina & Albir's techniques are substantial, as both seek to categorize translator interventions during meaning transfer. Their strongest overlaps occur in:

- borrowing/transference strategies,
- cultural adaptation,
- grammatical restructuring,
- meaning expansion,
- perspective shifts,
- equivalence management.

The principal similarity between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques lies in their treatment of comparable translation phenomena; however, they differ in theoretical orientation, with Newmark emphasizing problem-solving procedures and Molina and Albir focusing on product-oriented, micro-textual operations. In this respect, Molina and Albir's framework can be seen as a more systematic refinement of processes already recognized by Newmark.

The comparison between Newmark's Translation Procedures and Molina & Albir's Translation Techniques demonstrates that the two frameworks share a substantial theoretical and practical overlap because both theories attempt to explain how translators intervene during the transfer of meaning from source language (SL) to target language (TL). Although they employ different terminologies and analytical perspectives, both models were developed to address the same central problem of translation

studies: how meaning can be transferred across languages and cultures when direct equivalence is insufficient. Consequently, many categories in both frameworks correspond closely because they respond to similar linguistic, cultural, and communicative challenges encountered during translation practice. Rather than functioning as competing models, these frameworks can be understood as complementary approaches that describe similar translation operations from different analytical angles.

1. Shared Focus on Borrowing and Preservation of Foreignness

One major similarity is that both frameworks preserve source-language elements, even when translation risks cultural loss. Newmark addresses this through transference and naturalization, whereas Molina & Albir classify similar operations as borrowing. Both frameworks assume that preserving foreign lexical items may maintain authenticity and cultural identity. This overlap demonstrates that both frameworks recognize the importance of preserving foreignness when necessary.

Example 1:

Source Text: We ate sushi at the restaurant.

Target Text: *Kami makan **sushi** di restoran.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Transference	Borrowing

Note: The lexical item remains unchanged because cultural specificity is prioritized.

Example 2: (Adaptation to Target Norms)

Source Text: Technology develops rapidly.

Target Text: *Teknologi berkembang pesat.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Naturalization	Naturalized Borrowing

Note: The foreign term becomes integrated into target-language spelling conventions.

2. Shared Recognition of Cultural Adaptation

Both frameworks strongly emphasize that translation is also a process of cultural mediation. When direct transfer creates comprehension problems, translators may replace source-cultural references with culturally accessible alternatives. Shared assumption: cultural accessibility may outweigh lexical precision.

Example:

Source Text: He enjoys baseball.

Translation Result: *Dia suka bermain **sepak bola**.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Cultural Equivalent	Adaptation

Note: Although the word “baseball” is not the same sport as “sepak bola”, the translation succeeds because readers receive a familiar cultural reference. This demonstrates that both frameworks prioritize communicative effectiveness over strict lexical preservation.

3. Shared Emphasis on Grammatical Restructuring

Both Newmark’s translation procedures and Molina and Albir’s translation techniques acknowledge that linguistic differences between grammatical systems may require structural modifications in

translation, based on the shared principle that semantic meaning can be preserved even when grammatical forms are changed.

Example:

Source Text: After his arrival, the meeting started.

Target Text: *Setelah dia tiba, rapat dimulai.*

Note: The translation of *arrival* (noun) as *tiba* (verb) exemplifies transposition in both Newmark's and Molina and Albir's frameworks, highlighting their common acceptance of grammatical category shifts as a routine strategy for achieving equivalence across languages."

4. Shared Use of Meaning Expansion

A further major overlap between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques lies in their acceptance of explanatory expansion when direct lexical equivalence is inadequate. Both frameworks are founded on the principle that some meanings can be more effectively conveyed through description or paraphrase than through direct substitution. Additional explanation helps readers understand cultural significance.

Example:

Source Text: Ramadan begins tomorrow.

Target Text: *Ramadan, bulan suci umat Islam ketika umat Muslim berpuasa, dimulai besok.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Paraphrase / Notes	Amplification

5. Shared Acceptance of Perspective Shifts

Both Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques acknowledge that translation equivalence can be achieved through changes in conceptual perspective, provided that the communicative meaning of the source text is preserved in the target text.

Example:

Source Text: You are going to be a father.

Target Text: *Kamu akan memiliki anak.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Modulation	Modulation

6. Shared Management of Equivalence

Both Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques recognize that translation equivalence is not an absolute or fixed relationship. Rather, they support the use of approximation, functional substitution, and established conventions to achieve communicative equivalence, viewing equivalence as a negotiated construct shaped by linguistic and cultural contexts.

Example:

Source Text: They are as alike as two peas.

Target Text (Literal): *Mereka mirip seperti dua kacang polong.*

Target Text (Equivalent): *Mereka seperti pinang dibelah dua.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Synonymy / Cultural Equivalent	Established Equivalent

Note: The imagery changes, but the communicative effect remains.

DISCUSSION

The findings reveal that the similarities between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques are more substantial than their differences. This result supports Newmark's (1988) argument that translation procedures are practical strategies employed by translators to solve linguistic and cultural problems encountered during the translation process. The frequent correspondences identified between procedures such as transference and borrowing, transposition and transposition, descriptive equivalent and description, as well as recognized translation and established equivalent, suggest that many translation operations are fundamentally shared across theoretical frameworks despite being labeled differently.

The findings also support Molina and Albir's (2002) view that translation techniques are observable textual operations used to achieve equivalence in the target text. The strong overlap between the two models indicates that Molina and Albir's framework largely systematizes and refines procedures that had already been recognized by Newmark. Consequently, the distinction between the two approaches appears to be methodological rather than substantive, with Newmark emphasizing translator decision-making and Molina and Albir focusing on the resulting textual manifestations.

Furthermore, the results are consistent with Nida's (1964) theory of dynamic equivalence, which argues that successful translation should prioritize equivalent effect and communicative meaning rather than formal correspondence. The overlaps observed in procedures involving cultural adaptation, modulation, descriptive expansion, and equivalence management demonstrate that both frameworks permit structural and lexical changes in order to preserve meaning and produce a natural response in the target audience. This finding confirms Nida's assertion that translation often requires adjustments in form to achieve functional equivalence.

The findings also align with Catford's (1965) theory of translation shifts. The recurring correspondence between Newmark's transposition and Molina and Albir's transposition reflects Catford's claim that grammatical and structural shifts are inevitable when languages organize meaning through different linguistic systems. The example involving the transformation of a noun into a verb illustrates how both frameworks accept grammatical restructuring as a legitimate strategy for maintaining semantic equivalence.

In addition, the findings support Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) model of translation procedures, particularly regarding borrowing, modulation, transposition, and equivalence. Many categories identified in both Newmark's and Molina and Albir's frameworks can be traced to translation operations originally proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet. This suggests that both models belong to a broader tradition of translation scholarship that recognizes a common set of mechanisms through which meaning is transferred across languages.

The findings may also be interpreted through the perspective of Baker's (2018) theory of equivalence, which emphasizes that translation equivalence operates at multiple levels and often requires negotiation rather than direct correspondence. The presence of approximation, functional substitution, descriptive rendering, and cultural adaptation in both frameworks demonstrates that translators frequently construct equivalence through contextual and communicative considerations rather than relying solely on lexical matches.

Overall, the findings suggest that Newmark's procedures and Molina and Albir's techniques

should not be viewed as competing theories but as complementary analytical frameworks. While Newmark (1988) provides a procedure-oriented explanation of how translators solve translation problems, Molina and Albir (2002) offer a more systematic description of the textual operations that result from those solutions. Their extensive overlaps reinforce the broader theoretical consensus within Translation Studies that translation is fundamentally a process of negotiating meaning across linguistic and cultural boundaries rather than merely replacing words from one language with those of another.

CONCLUSION

Based on the comparative analysis of the findings, this study concludes that Peter Newmark's (1988) Translation Procedures and Molina and Albir's (2002) Translation Techniques exhibit a substantial conceptual and operational overlap. Rather than operating as competing or mutually exclusive systems, they function as parallel, complementary frameworks that describe nearly identical translator interventions under different theoretical taxonomies.

The integration of the research findings reveals two primary dimensions of similarity:

1. Direct Conceptual and Functional Equivalences

The textual and operational behaviors of the two models are functionally identical across nine core categories. The study demonstrates that both frameworks share identical underlying mechanisms to resolve micro-textual translation problems:

- a. Preservation of Foreignness: Managed interchangeably via Transference / Naturalization (Newmark) and Pure / Naturalized Borrowing (Molina & Albir).
- b. Cultural Adaptation and Mediation: Addressed through Cultural Equivalent and Adaptation, prioritizing reader accessibility over strict lexical precision.
- c. Structural and Cognitive Shifts: Executed via Transposition (for grammatical restructuring) and Modulation (for perspective shifts).
- d. Meaning Expansion and Contextualization: Solved using Descriptive Equivalent / Paraphrase and Description / Amplification when direct lexical equivalents are absent.
- e. Conventional Standardization: Embedded in Recognized Translation and Established Equivalent, relying on official usage over individual creativity.

2. Shared Orientations

While both taxonomies address the same central challenge of translation studies—navigating linguistic and cultural gaps when direct equivalence fails—their primary divergence lies not in what they describe, but in how they conceptualize the process:

- Newmark adopts a procedure-oriented, problem-solving perspective, viewing these categories as a priori decisions made by the translator during the process of translation.
- Molina & Albir present a product-oriented, micro-textual operational perspective, analyzing the final translated text to categorize how equivalence was achieved.

Summary of Findings

Core Principle	Newmark's Translation Procedures (1988)	Molina & Albir's Translation Techniques (2002)	Operational Reality
Foreign Identity	Transference / Naturalization	Pure / Naturalized Borrowing	Preserves original roots & adapts spelling.
Cultural Adaptation	Cultural Equivalent	Adaptation	Replaces source culture with target culture familiarity.
Grammatical Shift	Transposition	Transposition	Alters word classes (e.g., noun to verb) smoothly.
Viewpoint Change	Modulation	Modulation	Shifts cognitive framing while keeping meaning constant.

Ultimately, Molina and Albir's taxonomy can be understood as a dynamic, text-based refinement and systematization of the foundational processes already recognized in Newmark's earlier model. Both models share the ultimate functional goals of preserving communicative intent, allowing structural flexibility, and navigating cultural mediation to ensure target language acceptability. Consequently, researchers and practitioners can utilize both frameworks interchangeably as dual-angled analytical tools to evaluate or guide translator decision-making at the micro-textual level.

REFERENCES

- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Gambier, Y., & Van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 1). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 47(4), 498–512. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Brill.
- Ordudari, M. (2007). Translation procedures, strategies and methods. *Translation Journal*, 11(3).

Vol. 4, No. 1, June 2026

Gunawan Tambunsaribu

Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. Routledge.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage Publications.

Venuti, L. (2017). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Vinay, J.P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Trans.). John Benjamins Publishing Company. (Original work published 1958) (*)