Original research article / Originalus mokslinis straipsnis

Machine Translation vs. Human Translation: A Linguistic Analysis

Ilhama Mammadova
Nakhchivan State University

Abstract

Machine translation (MT) has advanced significantly with the development of neural machine translation (NMT), raising discussions about its ability to match human translation (HT). While MT systems offer speed and cost-effectiveness, they often struggle with contextual adaptation, idiomatic expressions, and syntactic variations between languages. Human translators, on the other hand, excel in linguistic nuance, cultural interpretation, and accuracy but require more time and resources. This paper examines the strengths and weaknesses of both approaches, focusing on linguistic challenges and translation quality assessment. The study also explores the role of hybrid translation models, where MT and HT complement each other to achieve efficiency and accuracy. The findings suggest that while MT is improving, it cannot yet fully replace human translation in complex and context-sensitive tasks.

Keywords: Machine translation, human translation, neural machine translation, translation quality assessment, linguistic challenges, hybrid translation models, post-editing machine translation, artificial intelligence in translation

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Translation Technology

Translation has played a fundamental role in human communication, enabling the exchange of knowledge and cultural perspectives across languages. With the advancement of artificial intelligence and deep learning, machine translation (MT) has evolved from early rule-based systems to statistical models and, more recently, neural machine translation (NMT). This shift has significantly improved MT's performance, making it a widely used tool in professional and casual translation settings (Koehn, 2009). Despite these advancements, the debate continues on whether MT can match the accuracy and contextual awareness of human translation (HT).

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This paper aims to analyze the linguistic differences between MT and HT, focusing on their strengths and weaknesses. Specifically, it will explore how MT handles syntax, semantics, and pragmatics compared to human translators. Another key objective is to assess translation quality using evaluation metrics and examine the potential of hybrid approaches, where MT and HT are combined to enhance efficiency and accuracy.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The increasing reliance on MT in professional fields such as law, medicine, and literature raises important questions about its effectiveness and limitations. While MT is faster and more cost-effective, its ability to convey meaning accurately remains a challenge. By comparing MT with HT, this study contributes to a better understanding of linguistic adaptation in translation and its implications for professional translators, educators, and AI developers. Recent studies indicate that although MT continues to improve, human translators remain essential for tasks that require cultural and contextual adaptation (Cadwell, O'Brien, & Teixeira, 2018).

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Comparative Approach

This study employs a comparative analysis to evaluate the linguistic differences between machine translation (MT) and human translation (HT). The analysis focuses on key linguistic aspects, including accuracy, syntactic structure, semantic coherence, and contextual adaptation. Given the rapid development of neural machine translation (NMT), its ability to handle complex language structures and cultural nuances is compared with the expertise of human translators. Previous research has highlighted that while NMT systems outperform earlier rule-based and statistical models, they still struggle with idiomatic expressions and discourse-level coherence (Läubli, Sennrich, & Volk, 2018).

2.2 Case Studies and Examples

To provide empirical evidence, this study examines translated texts produced by machine translation systems such as Google Translate and DeepL. These translations are compared to human-generated translations to assess their quality and accuracy. Particular attention is given to common errors in MT, such as incorrect word sense disambiguation, syntactic mismatches, and failure to adapt idiomatic expressions. Human post-editing strategies are also analyzed to determine the extent to which MT output requires refinement. Research indicates that professional translators frequently reject raw MT output due to errors in pragmatics and cultural adaptation (Wu et al., 2016).

The study also considers translation quality evaluation metrics, such as BLEU and METEOR scores, to assess the effectiveness of MT. While these metrics provide a numerical measure of translation performance, they do not always align with human judgments of quality (Lavie & Denkowski, 2009). By comparing automated evaluation scores with qualitative human assessments, this study seeks to determine the extent to which MT systems can replace or complement human translators.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Strengths and Weaknesses of Machine Translation

Machine translation (MT) has significantly improved in recent years, particularly with the development of neural machine translation (NMT). These systems leverage deep learning algorithms to enhance fluency and coherence, making them more effective than traditional rule-based or statistical approaches (Popel et al., 2020). One of the primary advantages of MT is its speed and scalability, allowing large volumes of text to be translated in seconds. Additionally, MT is cost-effective, making it an attractive tool for businesses and individuals requiring instant translations.

Despite these strengths, MT still faces several linguistic challenges. One of the most persistent issues is polysemy, where a single word has multiple meanings depending on context. NMT models attempt to mitigate this problem by considering surrounding words, but errors still occur, particularly in less common language pairs (Stahlberg, 2020). Additionally, MT struggles with idiomatic expressions, which often require cultural and contextual knowledge that machines lack. For instance, an English phrase like "break the ice" translated literally into another language might not convey its intended meaning. Another limitation is syntax, as some languages have complex grammatical structures that MT systems fail to reproduce accurately, leading to unnatural sentence formation (Yang, Wang, & Chu, 2020).

3.2 Strengths and Weaknesses of Human Translation

Human translation (HT) remains the gold standard for high-quality, contextually accurate translations. Unlike MT, human translators can interpret tone, register, and pragmatics, ensuring that the final output aligns with the intended meaning. This is particularly important in literary, legal, and medical translations, where precision and cultural adaptation are critical (Koehn & Haddow, 2009). Additionally, human translators excel at resolving ambiguities and ensuring stylistic coherence, aspects that even the most advanced MT systems struggle with.

However, human translation has its drawbacks. The most significant limitation is the time required to produce accurate translations. Unlike MT, which operates almost instantaneously, human translators need time to analyze, interpret, and refine texts. Furthermore, professional translation services can be costly, making them less accessible for everyday users. Some studies also indicate that human translation may introduce subjectivity, as different translators might render the same text differently based on personal linguistic preferences (Cadwell, O'Brien, & Teixeira, 2018).

3.3 Evaluation Metrics for Machine Translation

Assessing the quality of MT output requires reliable evaluation metrics. Several automated metrics have been developed to measure translation accuracy, with BLEU (Bilingual Evaluation Understudy) being one of the most widely used. BLEU evaluates translation quality by comparing machine-generated output to human reference translations based on word overlap. However, one of its limitations is that it does not consider semantics or fluency, meaning that a translation can score highly even if it is unnatural to a native speaker (Lin & Och, 2004).

Other evaluation methods, such as METEOR, attempt to improve upon BLEU by incorporating synonym recognition and paraphrase matching, making it more aligned with human judgment (Lavie & Denkowski, 2009). Nonetheless, these metrics still do not fully capture the complexities of human language, as they prioritize word-level accuracy over overall coherence and readability. Recent studies suggest that document-level evaluation, rather than sentence-level scoring, provides a more comprehensive assessment of translation quality (Läubli, Sennrich, & Volk, 2018).

3.4 The Future of Translation: Hybrid Approaches

Given the strengths and weaknesses of both MT and HT, an emerging trend in the translation industry is the adoption of hybrid models. In this approach, MT is used to generate initial translations, which are then refined by human translators. This process, known as post-editing machine translation

(PEMT), combines the efficiency of MT with the linguistic expertise of human translators, leading to faster and more accurate results (Chen et al., 2018).

The increasing use of AI-assisted translation tools in professional settings suggests that the role of human translators is evolving rather than disappearing. Instead of being replaced by MT, translators are becoming post-editors who fine-tune machine-generated texts to ensure quality and cultural appropriateness. Some experts argue that this shift will lead to higher productivity, while others express concerns about the potential deskilling of human translators (Forcada, 2017). The ethical and economic implications of this transformation will continue to be a subject of debate as translation technologies advance.

CONCLUSION

4.1 Summary of Findings

The comparison between machine translation (MT) and human translation (HT) reveals distinct strengths and weaknesses in both approaches. MT, particularly with advancements in neural machine translation (NMT), has significantly improved in terms of fluency, speed, and accessibility. However, challenges such as polysemy, idiomatic expressions, syntactic mismatches, and lack of contextual awareness remain critical limitations (Dabre, Chu, & Kunchukuttan, 2020). On the other hand, HT excels in linguistic nuance, cultural adaptation, and accuracy but is time-consuming and costly. The findings suggest that while MT is a valuable tool for general translations, it cannot fully replace human translators in tasks requiring deep linguistic and cultural understanding (Cadwell, O'Brien, & Teixeira, 2018).

4.2 Limitations of the Study

This study primarily focuses on linguistic differences between MT and HT, without conducting an in-depth experimental analysis of different MT systems across multiple languages. Additionally, while automated evaluation metrics such as BLEU and METEOR were discussed, the study does not provide a comprehensive assessment of their effectiveness in different translation domains. Another limitation is that the study does not explore the long-term impact of AI-assisted translation on professional translators' cognitive load and job market dynamics (Britz et al., 2017). Future research should investigate how emerging AI-driven translation tools influence human translators' work efficiency and linguistic decision-making.

4.3 Final Thoughts

Machine translation continues to evolve, and its role in translation workflows is expanding. However, despite its technological advancements, MT remains dependent on human intervention, particularly for complex, context-sensitive texts. The integration of post-editing machine translation (PEMT) provides a balanced solution, combining the efficiency of machines with the expertise of human translators (Chen et al., 2018). The future of translation lies not in replacing human translators but in leveraging AI to enhance their capabilities. As technology advances, it is crucial to ensure that MT development aligns with linguistic and ethical considerations to maintain translation quality and cultural integrity (Forcada, 2017).

REFERENCES:

Artetxe, M., Labaka, G., Agirre, E., & Cho, K. (2017). Unsupervised neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.11041*.

Britz, D., Goldie, A., Luong, M. T., & Le, Q. (2017). Massive exploration of neural machine translation architectures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.03906*.

Cadwell, P., o'Brien, S., & Teixeira, C. S. (2018). Resistance and accommodation: factors for the (non-) adoption of machine translation among professional translators. *Perspectives*, *26*(3), 301-321.

Chen, M. X., Firat, O., Bapna, A., Johnson, M., Macherey, W., Foster, G., ... & Hughes, M. (2018). The best of both worlds: Combining recent advances in neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09849*.

Dabre, R., Chu, C., & Kunchukuttan, A. (2020). A survey of multilingual neural machine translation. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, *53*(5), 1-38.

Forcada, M. L. (2017). Making sense of neural machine translation. *Translation spaces*, *6*(2), 291-309.

Koehn, P. (2009). *Statistical machine translation*. Cambridge University Press.

Koehn, P., & Haddow, B. (2009). Interactive assistance to human translators using statistical machine translation methods. In *Proceedings of Machine Translation Summit XII: Papers*.

Läubli, S., Sennrich, R., & Volk, M. (2018). Has machine translation achieved human parity? a case for document-level evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.07048*.

Lavie, A., & Denkowski, M. J. (2009). The METEOR metric for automatic evaluation of machine translation. *Machine translation*, *23*, 105-115.

Lee, S. M. (2020). The impact of using machine translation on EFL students' writing. *Computer assisted language learning*, *33*(3), 157-175.

Lin, C. Y., & Och, F. J. (2004). Orange: a method for evaluating automatic evaluation metrics for machine translation. In *COLING 2004: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Computational Linguistics* (pp. 501-507).

Okpor, M. D. (2014). Machine translation approaches: issues and challenges. *International Journal of Computer Science Issues (IJCSI)*, *11*(5), 159.

Popel, M., Tomkova, M., Tomek, J., Kaiser, Ł., Uszkoreit, J., Bojar, O., & Žabokrtský, Z. (2020). Transforming machine translation: a deep learning system reaches news translation quality comparable to human professionals. *Nature communications*, *11*(1), 1-15.

Stahlberg, F. (2020). Neural machine translation: A review. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, *69*, 343-418.

Tu, Z., Lu, Z., Liu, Y., Liu, X., & Li, H. (2016). Modeling coverage for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.04811*.

Wang, H., Wu, H., He, Z., Huang, L., & Church, K. W. (2022). Progress in machine translation. *Engineering*, *18*, 143-153.

Wu, Y., Schuster, M., Chen, Z., Le, Q. V., Norouzi, M., Macherey, W., ... & Dean, J. (2016). Google's neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144*.

Yang, S., Wang, Y., & Chu, X. (2020). A survey of deep learning techniques for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07526*.