COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GOOGLE TRANSLATION AND HUMAN TRANSLATION THROUGH THE LENS OF SKOPOS THEORY

Kashmala Ramzan [1]
su92-mselw-f23-011@superior.edu.pk
Alishba Sadiq [2]
su92-mselw-f23-019@superior.edu.pk
Afifa Noor [3]
afifa.noor@superior.edu.pk

Abstract:
This research compares human and machine (Google Translator) translations from English to Urdu in Skopos Theory perspective. It takes examples from different genres of texts, online as well as published, to demonstrate how coherence, fidelity, and cultural adaptation can vary between translations done by humans and machines. Machine translations are shown as convenient and time saving but lacking in the ability to capture cultural nuances while maintaining coherence or fidelity that is the main focus of Skopos theory. The study thus highlights the importance of human expertise in translation and how it addresses the target audience and points out where machine systems fall short. It is not enough for machine translators to be linguistically accurate; they should also ensure cultural appropriateness, contextual coherence and fidelity to the source text's intention as this research has demonstrated through different examples.

Keywords: Human translation, Google Translate, Skopos theory, cultural nuances
Introduction:
The worldwide translation industry is growing at an unprecedented rate. This has been brought about by the increase in global interconnectivity. For this reason, there is a higher demand for efficient and accurate translation services than ever before. 'Google Translate' and other machine translation systems have changed the field of study on translation significantly, albeit with new challenges such as: how effective are they, or can we rely on them only? (De Vries et al., 2018).

The translation of English to Urdu or vice versa is highly beneficial for bilingual speakers. This is extremely significant in South Asian countries such as Pakistan, India, Nepal, Bangladesh and among South Asians residing abroad too (Migiro, 2019). Although many bilinguals can speak two languages, their proficiency in reading and writing in Urdu and English may differ especially in formal or written contexts. Only a small number of individuals have the ability to read and write at an advanced level in both languages. This poses a challenge for fields such as law, medicine, education, media and development that require effective use of both English and Urdu. Translation services are often required when people's language skills fall short of complex texts. One alternative that has started gaining recognition involves utilizing internet platforms like Google Translate (Mustafa et al., 2022).

However, translations into low-resource languages such as Urdu and Hindi often have lower quality. For example, Google Translate is good at translating individual words but can make large mistakes when it comes to longer texts. Nevertheless, there is reason to be optimistic. In 2016, Google created a Neural Machine Translation (NMT) system that utilizes artificial intelligence to enhance the accuracy of translations over time. This technology was taught using vast amounts of data and a growing database is still being added to it. The company has high hopes for this system claiming that one day it may offer near-human level quality in translations (Aiken, 2019).

This study tries to contribute to the field of 'translation' studies by carrying out a comparative analysis between human translation and Google translation using Skopos theory framework, specifically focus on English to Urdu translations. It's a qualitative study that tries to

determine and compare the performance of Google translator and human translators basing its argument on Skopos theory. Findings reveal that Google translator even its latest version fails to communicate the correct meaning of the source text to the target audience. The main reason behind this was the unavailability of cultural terms corpora of low resource languages like Urdu.

Origin and Development of Skopos Theory:

The Skopos theory was established by Hans J. Vermeer, is a cornerstone of translation theory. The name of the theory, derived from the Greek word "Skopos," meaning "purpose,". According to Vermeer, translation is an intentional and purposeful activity done within a particular context (Vermeer 1987).

Vermeer who invented the Skopos Theory, states that the aim of a translated text must be determined by its function in a given communication event. It is concerned with satisfying the needs and expectations of the target addressees within their cultural context; which implies that translations should take into account particular intentions, which are desired to be achieved through them for readers. (Flynn, 2004)

Skopos theory has gone through different stages of growth over time. It was first influenced by Katharina Reiss' Functionalist Theory as presented in her groundbreaking work "Possibilities and Limitations of Translation Criticism," published in 1971, where equivalence theory, which revolves around source text and seeks balance between target and source languages, took center stage before being further developed by Vermeer, who gave it its current name through his book "Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation" in 1984, among other works until then he considered it as purposeful human action during the translation process (Baker & Saldanha, 2009).

However, there has been less focus at English to Urdu translations through the lens of Skopos theory since its inception until now. Even though many researchers have done comparative studies between human translated texts versus those produced by machines such as Google Translate into different languages, including Urdu, there has been less discussion concerning how Skopos theory could be applied within such a language pair. As such, investigations serve as important tools that help us comprehend the ways in which various purposes are achieved through translations. They also provide information on whether or not the principles behind Skopos have been followed during translations done either manually or using machines like Google Translate while dealing with Urdu texts.

Moreover, there is a need for further research on the strengths and weaknesses of Google Translation as opposed to a human translator in meeting specific translation purposes within Urdu and main focus of this theory is the target language audience. By filling up this gap, the current study seeks to shed light on the effectiveness and limitations of English to Urdu translations based on Skopos theory, thereby making recommendations that will enhance machine translation systems for this language.

Research Objective:
   To compare the human translations and Google Translation through the lens of Skopos theory

Research Question
   To what extent coherence, fidelity, and cultural adaptation are lost by Google translation? Based on the Skopos theory, the translations were done for a specific purpose which may include expressing information with accuracy, keeping cultural significance or conveying the

same message as it was given in source text. The research paper will analyze different texts that have been translated using human translator and Google translator through the lens of Skopos theory. The criteria of the analysis was how well each version perform in coherence, fidelity and purpose.

Three Rules of Skopos Theory:

The most important rule in the translation process is the Skopos rule. The aim embraces the communicative intent, the translator's objectives, and the target text. According to this rule, methods employed in translation should be based on and kept in line with functions that also allow for different approaches to translation. In addition to being guided by it, translators are not completely controlled by their goals (Vermeer, 1989).

Skopos requires that a translated work function well in its intended environment and satisfy the reader's expectations too. A complementary concept of Skopos theory is represented by coherence within a text as well as cultural background knowledge shared by members of particular societies, thus making them understand one another better (Vermeer, 1989).

Besides considering acceptability, among other things, translators ought to take into account what the target audience knows or expects. Translated text terminologies should be according to the target language culture. The fidelity rule is similar to Lu Xun's notion of faithfulness, which demands some kind of equivalence between source language and target language, but this should be understood having regard for purpose theory behind given text translation understanding it itself (Chen, 2016).

Literature Review:

Development of Machine Translation:

Machine translation (MT) has three stages when it undergoes development: Rule-based machine translation (RBMT); Statistical-based Machine Translation (SBMT); and Neural Machine Translation (NMT) (Koponen, Salmi, & Nikulin, 2019).

In 1954, the IBM-701 computer first translated a few simple sentences in Russian language. This event marked the beginning of MT. It also prompted other countries to make further developments in this field. SBMT brought with it language models that greatly increased the readability and fluency of target sentences by means of formal, syntactic, and semantic analysis of source texts. But early MT systems were unable to process long and complex sentences correctly (Wang et al., 2022).

Even though the concept was proposed back in 2013, major breakthroughs occurred in 2016, thus, leading to the dominance of NMT over SBMT. Ever since then, NMT has remained as the foundation of commercial translation systems such as Google Translate for instance, with a more than 60% of reduction in error rate on Google Neural Machine Translation (GNMT). The quality and accuracy of GNMT now match those of human translators when translating normative documents (Wang et al., 2022).

There are many benefits associated with machine translations that include quick information processing as well as reducing effort and time, thereby promoting standardization and uniformity in translations too. However, these systems heavily rely on corpora but still face challenges posed by linguistic complexities; hence they should not be expected to always produce high-quality translation outputs (Ma & Cieri, 2006).

Previous Studies on Comparison of Human Translation vs. Google Translate:

Translation has been the focus of study for researchers who are interested in cross-cultural communication for a long time now. With the rise of machine translations like Google Translate, this area has opened up new possibilities while also bringing about its own set of problems. To situate our present research within its context, we will therefore analyze existing literature that examines how human translators compare with their mechanical counterparts from Skopos theory's point of view.

Many authors have written extensively about the strengths and weaknesses inherent within each system when compared against its opposite number, whether man-made (human) or artificial intelligence-based (Google Translate). Human translators are known for being capable of including cultural sensitivities, contextual hints, and linguistic subtleties in their work (Tursunovich, 2022). Studies shows that, for the accuracy of translation, a translator needs to have both a good command of the subject matter or purpose of translation and an understanding of target language as well as source language cultures (Tursunovich, 2022).

A diachronic study that investigated translations from Urdu to English by Google Translate over three years reveals that the intelligibility level of machine translation has increased for low-resource languages such as Urdu, but it still contains a 50% error rate. The research used interlinear glosses for recognizing core semantic units and grammatical functions, besides describing translated texts in terms of syntax and semantics. Some ongoing problems with machine neural translation are pro-drop inclusions peculiar to Urdu, case-marking systems, clause boundary identification, polysemous terms, and orthographically similar words, among others (Shah et al., 2023).

Human translation has also some limitations, such as being subjective, time taking, and it may have biasness. Alternatively, one may employ a machine translation system which is easily expandable, convenient, and efficient, especially in terms of accessibility where there is a need to translate large volumes within short periods. Recent improvements in fluency and accuracy are attributed to the development of neural networks employed in this area (Chauhan & Daniel, 2023).

Nevertheless, context dependent translations still pose great difficulties for these machines because they find it hard to preserve stylistic variations or remain culturally sensitive during such instances (Altintas & Cicekli 2022). All these point out the importance of understanding why we translate something somewhere else. In relation to this, Ghafoor has applied Skopos theory, which views translation as a purposeful activity developed by Vermeer (1989). It states that the strategy employed during translations should be guided by what one intends to do with a given text after it has been translated into another language. This approach has also been used previously when evaluating quality or identifying errors encountered while translating texts into different languages (Ghafoor et al., 2018).

Neural Machine Translation (NMT) gives us important historical information and shows how the field has changed from Statistical Machine Translation (SMT) to NMT that is necessary to know, if we want to understand where the discipline is now growing. This context also frames the conversation about NMT for low-resource languages; it lets us see how much progress has been made but also what still needs doing. For example, starting with word and sentence embeddings as well as encoder-decoder networks sets up a discussion on how best to overcome these problems within specific techniques or approaches aimed at dealing with these limitations between language pairs that do not have many resources available for training models (Felix Stahlberg, 2020).

The recent improvements made in Neural Machine Translation (NMT) have a significant impact on machine translation. However, there are still some challenges that make it difficult to correctly translate the low-resourse languages due to a lack of their proper corpora. Machine Translator like 'Google Translate' developed on large amounts of data. But still, it is producing translations that are grammatically incorrect and culturally inappropriate. A survey suggests different strategies like data augmentation and transfer learning, that could be used to improve NMT systems designed for use with such languages (Ranathunga et al., 2021). These findings reinforce the fact that human translators will always be better at creating translations that are culturally accurate following Skopos Theory than any machines can do.

Thus, it necessitates continuous research on NMT so as to enhance its capability in translating sentences belonging to low resource languages.

In the paper 'Machine Translation System Using Deep Learning for English to Urdu' by Syed Abdul Basit Andrabi and Abdul Wahid outline various developments in machine translation systems using deep learning algorithms, specifically for English and Urdu languages. In this investigation, they used a framework based on artificial neural networks where a lot of parallel texts consisting of 30 thousand sentences were used to train and evaluate the system with automated metrics over 70% training data and remaining 30% for testing purposes. Additionally, it reports an average BLEU score of 45.83, which indicates improvement in computational capacity, but still, there are problems in translations other than English, as revealed by the output from Google Translator. Moreover, these findings also give insights about translation quality and context adequacy, which are important for understanding the possibilities of applying MT under Skopos theory, hence contributing to a wider debate on machine versus human translation across various communicative settings (Syed Abdul Basit Andrabi & Wahid, 2022).

This research attempts to expand upon previous studies by examining both human- and machine-translated texts from English into Urdu, focusing specifically on common errors and limitations found in Google Translate. It intends, through Skopos theory, recommendations for enhancing machine translation systems according to specific purposes and contexts of translation.

Methodology

This study employs a comparative analysis approach to examine the translation strategies of human translators and machine translation (Google Translate). The focus of the study is to check the effectiveness of these translators in meeting translation purposes for low-resource language specifically the Urdu language.

Data Collection:

The data was selected from various sources that include both published and online materials. Few examples were selected from the 'English Grammar & Composition" Book of Punjab Textbook Board Lahore. Then, one of the example was selected from an online source, and the last paragraph was selected from the 'To The Point English Grammar & Composition' for B.Sc. These examples were selected on the basis of their relevance to the research objectives and their diversity to represent how both translators fulfill different translation purposes.

Data Analysis:

The Translations were analyzed through the lens of Skopos theory. Coherence, fidelity, and functional adequacy were the basis of this theory. It was also analyzed in both translated versions (human & machine), which version conveys the correct essence of culture to the target audience and fulfill the purpose of source text.

Discussion and Findings:

Example 1:

Source Text	Human Translation	Machine Translation (Google Translate)
It's raining cats and dogs.	موسلا دھار بارش ہو رہی ہے۔	یہ بلیوں اور کتوں کی بارش ہو رہے۔

From the viewpoint of Skopos theory, it is possible that a translator intended to create a translation that would effectively convey the meaning of the source text in the target language, taking into account cultural peculiarities and idiomatic expressions of the

addressees. In this particular case, an idiom has been correctly translated by a human into Urdu, keeping its cultural equivalence ‏"موسلا دھار بارش ہو رہی ہے۔" and thus expressing the same idea for Pakistani speakers.

On the other hand, automatic translation via Google Translate gives us such phrases as ‘ یہ بلیوں اور کتوں کی بارش ہو رہے۔' which can be considered a literal rendering failing to reflect the idiomatic meaning of the initial expression. This discrepancy points out why it is necessary to take into consideration the purpose (Skopos) of translation, whether it's accuracy in conveying information, preservation of cultural specifics, or imitation of the original text in terms of its tone and style. Machine translation fails to convey the message of source text according to target language culture.

Example 2:

Source Text	Human Translation	Google Translate
All-purpose flour is used in baking recipes.	بیکنگ کی ترکیبوں میں میدہ کا استعمال ہوتا ہے۔	تمام مقصدی آٹا بیکنگ کی ترکیبوں میں استعمال ہوتا ہے۔

In this example, the first text contains the term "all-purpose flour," which means a specific type of flour. This context-specific terminology has been accurately translated by humans who choose to use the word ‏"میدہ" (flour). The translators is familiar to the target audience's cultural background, so he chooses ‏'میدہ' as an equivalent for all-purpose flour.

On the other hand, Google Translate's version gives litreral translation of the phrase ''all-purpose flour'' تمام مقصدی آٹے. It fails to communicate the specific meaning or sense to target language audience.

According to Skopos theory perspective, translating should be about conveying source text messages into target language culture. Human translations achieve exactly that by using the right terms that are meant for specific needs, while machine translations haven't do this successfully because they lack understanding of how words work in different cultures and contexts. Google Translation failed to match humans' performance in translating all-purpose flour, because Google Translate doesn't know the cultural terminologies of Urdu language of this word.

Example 3:

Source Text	Human Translation	Machine Translation
People often refer to being 'hooked on TV.'	لوگ عام طور پر ٹی وی کے سحر میں گرفتار ہونے کا حوالہ دیتے ہیں	لوگ اکثر "ٹی وی پر جھکے" ہونے کا حوالہ دیتے ہیں

In this sentence an idiom 'hooked on' is being used, that means addicted to something. 'Google Translate' translates that idiom literally and gives word-for-word translation of the sentence. And Google Translate fails to capture the cultural meaning of the idiom of the source text and translates it as ‘جھکے ہونے'.

Whereas, Human Translation conveys the exact meaning and context of the idiom "hooked on" by translating it as ‏"سحر مں گرفتار" in the target language. The phrase ٹی وی کے سحر میں گرفتار" aligns better with how addiction or captivation would be expressed in Urdu language. So, those who receive this translations can make sense of it within their own cultural as well as linguistic backgrounds.

According to Skopos theory perspective, human translators are successful as compared to Google Translate because they take into account how the cultural idioms can be translated appropriately according to the target language audience and their culture.

Example 4:

Source Text	Human Translation	Machine Translation
"Despite the challenges, they managed to complete the project on time."	مسائل کے باوجود، انہوں نے منصوبہ کو وقت پر مکمل کر لیا۔	چیلنجوں کے باوجود، وہ اس منصوبے کو وقت پر مکمل کرنے میں کامیاب رہے۔

Human Translation: ''مسائل کے باوجود، انہوں نے منصوبہ کو وقت پر مکمل کر لیا۔'' It accurately reflects source text, and ensures grammatical consistency with clearly conveying the source text meaning in the target language. On the other hand, Machine Translation (Google Translate) translated it as چیلنجوں کے باوجود، وہ اس منصوبے کو وقت پر مکمل کرنے میں کامیاب رہے۔ This translation is also grammatically correct and understandable. But Google translate the word 'challenges' as چیلنجوں instead of using the correct word مسائل to convey the message clearly to target audience.

According to Skopos Theory, a translation should provide a clear and correct understanding of the source text keeping in mind the culture of the target text readers who are not familiar with the source text culture. In the above example, both translations (human and machine) achieve the purpose of conveying the exact meaning in cultural essence. Whereas, human translated version gives more natural expression as compared to machine translated version.

Example 5:

Source Text	Human Translation	Machine Translation
"She felt like Cinderella at the ball."	وہ شاندار تقریب میں سنڈریلا لگ رہی تھی۔	اسے گیند پر سنڈریلا کی طرح محسوس ہوا۔

The example shows that the source text have a cultural reference to 'Cinderella', who is a famous fairy tale character and in this sentence 'ball' is representing a grand dance party. The main challenge is to convey the same cultural reference correctly in target language (Urdu).

Human translation clearly captures the meaning of cultural reference 'ball' as "شاندار تقریب" (grand event). It accurately conveys the meaning of a ball in a culturally appropriate manner for the target audience. Cinderella refers to a specific character who is well known in source text culture. But in the human-translated version in Urdu language, it stayed the same because of its popularity among people worldwide, so the Urdu language audience can also easily understand what this word means even if they don't know English well.

Machine translation (Google Translate) is literal and awkward. "گیند پر" (at the ball) is a direct translation but sounds unnatural in Urdu, as "گیند" typically means a physical ball rather than a dance or event. It is a word-for-word translation that fails to deliver the real essence of the source text.

From the Skopos Theory perspective, the main point of translating something should be making sure that cultural references are communicated properly to the target language audience. Human translation fulfills this aspect because it includes the usage of suitable language within an environment where people speak and understand Urdu. On the other hand, machine translations attempt at literal rendering, which fails to achieve any cultural adaptation, thus resulting in a sentence that is less understandable but more awkward. This

example clearly illustrates how vital it is to represent culture appropriately. Therefore, Skopos does not only entail word-for-word translation but also taking care of cultural variations aimed at preserving intended meaning among those who receive it through their own language.

Let us now see how well Google Translation and human translators perform with whole paragraphs. In our last test, we only used single lines, but this time around, we would compare them based on their coherency within themselves as well as other parts of the text to measure accuracy more wholesomely. This allows us to know which one of the two translated versions really carries the original message in Urdu language and represents its culture better when considered in context rather than alone or separate from others.

Example 6:

Source Text:	Human Translation	Machine Translation
"A most extraordinary man, a Mr. Nuttel," said Mrs. Appleton; "could only talk about his illness, and dashed off without a word of good-bye or apology when you arrived. One would think he had seen a ghost." **"I expect it was the slaniel," said the niece calmly, "he told me he had a horror of dogs. He was once hunted into a cemetery somewhere on the bank of Ganges by a pack of pariah dogs and had to spend the night in a newly dug grave with the creatures snarling and grinning and foaming just above him. Enough to make anyone lose their nerve. Romance at short notice was her specialty.**	مسٹر نٹل ایک بہت ہی عجیب و '' غریب شخص تھا۔" مسز ایپلٹن نے کہا ۔ وہ اپنی بیماری کی ہی باتیں کرتا رہا۔ اور کسی کو خدا حافظ کہے بغیر یا معذرت کئے بغیر کی بھاگ نکلا ۔ ایسا معلوم ہوتا تھا کہ اس نے کوئی بھوت دیکھ لیا ہے۔ میرا یہ خیال ہے کہ کتے سے ڈر گیا بھانجھی نے پر سکون لہجے میں کہا۔ اس نے مجھے بتایا تھا کہ اسے کتوں سے بہت ڈر لگتا تھا۔ ایک دفعہ وہ پاگل کتوں سے بچتا ہوا ایک قبرستان میں جا پہنچا تھا۔ وہ قبرستان دریائے گنگا کے کنارے واقع تھا۔ اور اس نے پوری رات ایک نئی کھدی ہوئی قبر میں گزار دی۔ اور اس کے اوپر کتے بھونکتے ، غصے ہوتے ، منہ سے جھاگ گراتے رہے تھے۔ یہ بات کسی کو بھی ہوش و حواس گم کر دینے کیلئے کافی تھی۔'' وہ بلا تامل کہانیاں گھڑنے کی خصوصیت سے مالا مال تھی۔	"ایک انتہائی غیر معمولی آدمی، ایک مسٹر نٹل ،" مسز ایپلٹن نے کہا۔ "صرف اس کی بیماری کے بارے میں بات کر سکتا تھا، اور آپ کے پہنچنے پر الوداع یا معافی کے ایک لفظ کے بغیر ہی چلا گیا۔ کوئی سوچے گا کہ اس نے بھوت دیکھا ہے۔" "میں توقع کرتا ہوں کہ یہ سلانییل تھا،" بھتیجی نے سکون سے کہا، "اس نے مجھے بتایا کہ اسے کتوں کا خوف ہے، اسے ایک بار گنگا کے کنارے کسی قبرستان میں پاریہ کتوں کے ٹولے نے شکار کیا تھا اور اسے رات گزارنی پڑی تھی۔ ایک نئی کھودی گئی قبر میں اس کے بالکل اوپر چیخنے اور مسکرانے اور جھاگ آنے کے لیے کافی ہے۔" مختصر نوٹس پر رومانس اس کا خاصہ تھا۔

Analyzing the translations of source text by using Skopos theory, there must be a purpose of the translation. This text was taken from the text book of English of Punjab University for B.Sc. level and translated version was taken from the 'To the Point English Grammar & Composition' by Prof. Aftad Ahmed. The source text presents a scene, in which family is talking about a guest.

Human translation gives more clear and culturally appropriate sense as it translated 'extraordinary' according to the context as عجیب و غریب, whereas Google Translate, gives word-for-word translation of this word as غیر معمولی.Secondly, human translation of the phrase 'could only talk about his illness' is وہ اپنی بیماری کی ہی باتیں کرتا رہا۔ as it gives the complete sense to the target audience. But Google translate take the wrong sense and

translate it as صرف اس کی بیماری کے بارے میں بات کر سکتا تھا '. It fails to maintain coherence in the text and gives very ambiguous sense to the target audience.

The meaning of 'slaniel' in source text is a specific type of dog but again Google translate fails to capture the cultural meaning of this word and translate it as it is in the target language that create difficulty to target audience in understanding.

By comparison of the translation of the sentence: 'Romance at short notice was her specialty.' Human translation: وہ بلا تامل کہانیاں گھڑنے کی خصوصیت سے مالا مال تھی۔ and translation of Google translate مختصر نوٹس پر رومانس اس کا خاصہ تھا۔ In human translation, the cultural meaning and linguistic norms of the source text are correctly conveyed and this version tries to make the translated text resonate with the target audience. On the other side, Google Translate's version is more word-for-word and less detailed; it can keep the basic meaning but lose many cultural nuances or idiomatic expressions. For example, '' مختصر نوٹس پر رومانس اس کا خاصہ تھا '' is not as idiomatic as either the original or human translation.

Functionality-wise, human translation wins because it meets the communicative purpose of the original text, making it accessible and interesting for readers of the target language. It clearly conveys the cultural and contextual meaning of the text in a coherent manner.

On the other hand, Google Translate version could be seen as a useful tool only if one wants to get a basic idea of what is being conveyed through written content, but it lacks effectiveness where intentions are concerned. This can lead to misinterpretations or even loss of tone used by author in writing down those words from source language into target language; this is evident when comparing examples such as " ایک نئی کھودی گئی قبر میں اس کے which does not provide much clarity "بالکل اوپر چیخنے اور مسکرانے اور جھاگ آنے کے لیے کافی ہے nor context like human translation did.

Broadly speaking, human translation using Skopos theory shows better functionality overall because its main goal is to ensure that everything remains intact in terms of meaning, mood, and culture, irrespective of the language being used by people who might read through it.

When contrasted with Google Translate, it was found that overall coherence, cohesion, fidelity, and cultural appropriateness were higher in human translations, which implies that human have better understanding of culture of source text and target audience.

Another thing is about the accuracy of differentiation regarding cultural subtleties by each system. Even though basic translation may be provided by Google Translate, this still does not mean that it knows how a certain phrase or word should be expressed in another language with different cultures. Human translators are better able to capture cultural nuances, contextually specific details, cohesion, and fidelity while also being more fluent than their counterparts. Conversely, while fast, easy accessibility may be offered by some softwares like Google Translate for Dummies but often, it fails in terms of grammatical accuracy, along with other idiomatic expression preservation, and contextual appropriateness.

The application of Skopos theory to the comparison of human translation with Google Translate is highly revealing. The results shows that in most cases, Google translate performed word-for-word translations and idiomatic nuances tend to be overlooked. The texts translated by 'Google Translate' implies that, it does not have cultural richness and contextual subtleties intended by the source text writer. Additionally, culturally specific terms are difficult for recognition by Google Translate which leads to ambiguous or even wrong interpretations and violates the concept of Skopos theory that says translations must be understandable to target text readers according to their culture and keeping the original essence of source text correctly. Conversely, a human translator considers his knowledge about the target culture and communication purpose as advocated by Skopos theory thus ensuring these qualities throughout translation process. The findings suggest that there should be creation of corpora for culturally specific terms especially in less resourced languages like

Urdu so as machine translations can adhere to Skopos theory principles accurately and meaningfully.

Discussion

The findings of this research offer meaningful insights into the ongoing debate between human and machine translation, particularly in the context of literary texts. Through a comparative analysis, it becomes evident that while machine translation has made remarkable advancements in speed and accessibility, it still struggles with the nuanced and context-dependent nature of human expression, something that human translators manage with greater sensitivity.

One of the most prominent differences lies in the handling of cultural and contextual elements. Human translation showed a deeper grasp of the social and emotional undercurrents of the original Urdu text. For example, idiomatic expressions and culturally embedded references were either mistranslated or omitted entirely by Google Translate, whereas the human translator rephrased them to retain the intended meaning and emotional impact. This highlights the human translator's ability to navigate between the source and target languages with cultural awareness and emotional intelligence qualities that machine translation has yet to fully replicate.

Moreover, the study revealed that human translation demonstrated a more consistent tone and narrative flow, crucial for literary works where rhythm, mood, and stylistic choices enhance the reader's experience. Machine translation, in contrast, often resulted in awkward phrasings, literal renderings, or fragmented sentence structures, disrupting the coherence of the narrative. This reinforces the idea that translation is not merely about substituting words but about re-creating meaning in a new linguistic and cultural environment.

However, it is worth noting that machine translation showed efficiency in basic sentence-level translation, especially for simple and straightforward phrases. This affirms its utility in fast, low-stakes translation needs, such as for general communication or first-draft translations. As AI-powered systems continue to evolve, their output may become increasingly sophisticated but, as this study shows, they are not yet capable of replacing human translators for complex literary texts.

These findings align with existing literature, which argues that human translation remains superior for tasks requiring interpretation, emotion, and cultural nuance, while machine translation offers practicality and speed for more utilitarian purposes. The study suggests that rather than viewing the two approaches as competitors, we might consider how they can complement each other. For example, machine translation could be used to generate initial drafts, which are then refined by human translators, a model that combines speed with linguistic and cultural sensitivity.

In conclusion, this study reinforces the enduring value of human translation in literary contexts, while also acknowledging the growing role of machine translation in modern communication. As technology advances, the future of translation may lie in a collaborative model that leverages the strengths of both human intellect and machine efficiency.

Conclusion:

This study has compared the performance of human translators and machine translations in English to Urdu, according to Skopos theory. The purpose was to find out how well each of them serves different translation purposes. Based on the foundational principles of Skopos theory, this study indicated that there are varieties of ways through which humans translate opposed to Google Translate and communicate the target audience effectively. This is because proficient human translators are able to detect cultural backgrounds, idiomatic expressions and domain-specific jargon, hence modifying their translations suitably for the

target readership thereby enhancing their effectiveness than any other translator. In terms of Skopos theory based functional equivalence; Google Translate tends towards word-for-word and literal translation irrespective of culture, context or idiomatic meaning; this demonstrates its inability to convey cultural meaning and coherence in ideas.

Also, sometimes these Machine Translation (MT) systems do not create coherent parts especially with regards to complex linguistic structures within culture specific terminologies. Furthermore, it was observed through this analysis that humans play a crucial role in retaining authenticity and contextual relevance in translated texts so they can easily understand by the target audience. By focusing on coherence, fidelity and functional adequacy valuable contributions have been made by this research into current issues around machine translation.

Recommendations were made to enhance the contextual comprehension of machine translators and create culturally aware corpus for them. Research in future should concentrate on finding innovatory ways of teaching computers how human understand and learn languages naturally that will make them more effective in multilingual and multicultural translations.

References:

Aiken, M. (2019). An updated evaluation of Google Translate accuracy. *Studies in Linguistics and Literature, 3*(3), 253-260. https://doi.org/10.22158/sll.v3n3p25

Altintas, K., & Cicekli, I. (2022, September). A machine translation system between a pair of closely related languages. In International symposium on computer and information sciences (pp. 192-196). CRC Press.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238160330_A_Machine_Translation_System_Between_a_Pair_of_Closely_Related_Languages

Andrabi, S. A. B., & Wahid, A. (2022). Machine Translation System Using Deep Learning for English to Urdu. *Computational intelligence and neuroscience*, *2022*(1), 7873012. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7873012

Chauhan, S., & Daniel, P. (2023). A comprehensive survey on various fully automatic machine translation evaluation metrics. Neural Processing Letters, 55(9), 12663-12717. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11063-022-10835-4

Chen, J. (2016). On the three rules of Skopos Theory and its application in translation practice. Overseas English, (17), 89–90. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7064/15/20230640

De Vries, E., Schoonvelde, M., & Schumacher, G. (2018). No longer lost in translation: Evidence that Google Translate works for comparative bag-of-words text applications. *Political Analysis*, *26*(4), 417-430.

Flynn, P. (2004). Skopos theory: An ethnographic enquiry. *Perspectives*, *12*(4), 270-285. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2004.9961507

Ghafoor, A., Imran, A. S., Daudpota, S. M., Kastrati, Z., Batra, R., & Wani, M. A. (2021). The impact of translating resource-rich datasets to low-resource languages through multi-lingual text processing. IEEE Access, 9, 124478-124490. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3110285

Jabir, J. K. (2006). SKOPOS THEORY: BASIC PRINCIPLES AND DEFICIENCIES. Journal of the College of Arts. University of Basrah No, 41, 2.

https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/3f3d13167f0b327e

Koponen, M., Salmi, L., & Nikulin, M. (2019). A product and process analysis of post-editor corrections on neural, statistical and rule-based machine translation output. *Machine Translation*, *33*(1), 61-90. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10590-019-09228-7

Ma, X., & Cieri, C. (2006, May). Corpus Support for Machine Translation at LDC. In *LREC* (pp. 859-864).

Migiro, G. (2019, February 26). Where is Urdu spoken? *WorldAtlas*. https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/where-is-urdu-spoken.html

Mustafa, K., Waqas, S., Dar, R. K., Dar, R. K., Sherazi, Q. U. A., Tariq, M., & Asim, H. M. (2022). Translation and validation of Barthel Index in Urdu language for stroke patients. *Pakistan Journal of Medical & Health Sciences, 16*(163), 163.

Ranathunga, S., Lee, E. S. A., Prifti Skenduli, M., Shekhar, R., Alam, M., & Kaur, R. (2023). Neural machine translation for low-resource languages: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, *55*(11), 1-37. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2106.15115

Shah, T. Z., Imran, M., & Ismail, S. M. (2024). A diachronic study determining syntactic and semantic features of Urdu-English neural machine translation. *Heliyon*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22883

Stahlberg, F. (2020). Neural machine translation: A review. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, *69*, 343-418. https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.12007

Tursunovich, R. I. (2022). Linguistic and cultural aspects of literary translation and translation skills. *British Journal of Global Ecology and Sustainable Development*, *10*, 168-173. https://doi.org/10.69617/uzmu.v1i1.1.490

Vermeer, H. (1987). What does it mean to translate? Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13, 25-33.

Wang, H., Wu, H., He, Z., Huang, L., & Church, K. W. (2022). Progress in machine translation. Engineering, 18, 143-153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eng.2021.03.023