Journal of English Teaching
e-ISSN: 2622-4224 | p-ISSN: 2087-9628
http://ejournal.uki.ac.id/index.php/jet
Volume 11. Number 1, February 2025, pp. 66-78

Translating Causative Have and Get: A Comparative Study between Google Translate Translation and Human Translation

Daniel Sbastian[1]* Gloria Putri Waang[2]

Article History:
Received: 11/12/2024
Revised : 16/01/2025
Accepted: 20/01/2025
Available Online: 20/01/2025

Keywords:
Causative, Google Translate, translation, periphrastic

ABSTRACT
Technological advances have made the ability to translate no longer exclusively belong to humans. Today, machine translation has turned into a tool with superior performance to convert text between languages without the need for human intervention. One of the translation research foci is the studies of causative translation, especially from English to several other languages. Yet, it might be interesting to compare the translation of that topic by human and machine translation. This study investigates the comparison of Google Translate and humans in terms of causative translation from English into Indonesian. The data were obtained from six English novels and their translations in Indonesian. To analyze the data, 100 clauses with causative have and get were selected from English novels and translated by Google Translate into Indonesian. The result showed that the translation and strategies used between Google Translate of causative have and get had similarity with human translation in relation to causative-to-causative translation. Through the investigation, the result is expected to be beneficial for further studies in the translation of causative have and get related to their translations into Indonesian analytic or morphological causative. Furthermore, the result of strategies compared is expected to be beneficial to the translation study regarding machine and human translation in causative, especially from English into Indonesian.

[1] Jakarta International University, Jakarta, Indonesia. Email: danielsbastian@jiu.ac
*Corresponding author
[2] Jakarta International University, Jakarta, Indonesia. Email: gloria@jiu.ac

INTRODUCTION

Causative form asserts an action that causes something to happen (Hurford, Heasley, & Smith, 2007). It means that to create the action, there is someone or the initiator who affects something, as an initiator, that causes an action to something or someone that. According to Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000), the initiator, so-called causer, refers to someone or something (which can be an event or state) that initiates or controls the activity. On the other hand, the affected one, so-called causee, is the entity or event that is changed or influenced by the causer and carries out the effect of the caused event (Gilquin, 2003, p. 127). This kind of causation relation is as seen as fundamental as a basic human concept and the underlying structure of human language (Baron, 1974; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 69).

In relation to basic human concepts and the underlying structure of human language, language and causative have relationships where languages tend to have a construction specifically designed to express causative relationships in which the causing event is not elaborated beyond the notion of cause (Kemmer & Verhagen, 1994, p. 118). In regard with languages and causative, several studies have investigated causative, especially comparative study to English causatives, in different languages such as Indonesian, Arawakan (spoken in Columbia and Peru), Dutch, French, and Persian (Gilquin, 2015; Levshina, Geeraerts, &Speelman, 2013; Seifart, 2012; Sneddon, Adelaar, Djenar, & Ewing, 2010). The studies show that the construction of causatives between English and other languages tend to have different constructions.

The studies in advance in relation to causative construction were employed by humans' works. It means that all the different constructions revealed between English and other target languages were translated by humans or as the products of human translation. It might be reasonable that successful translations occur as humans have indigenous capacity for language, diction knowledge, logic, and capability to correct themselves (van Rensburg, Snyman, & Lotz, 2012). However, those things might not be taken into account in the process of translating words or clauses by machine translator since, according to van Rensburg et al (2012), machine translators can only undergo the production of the data programmed from a database, which means their performance depends on the input they receive. Thus, it is interesting to know how a machine translator translates causative constructions from English, in this case, to Indonesian because there are several constructions between English and Indonesian, such as 'have something done by someone', with a passive verb, which comprise circumlocution (Sneddon et al., 2010). While, according to Rabab'ah (2008), circumlocution or paraphrase is one of the communication strategies in translation in which the ability to determine strategy in translation needs more than a programmed database and additional knowledge as humans do.

Since a machine translator merely translates the text based on the database received, therefore, this can be a fascinating study to investigate. In this case, the machine translator used was Google Translate which was taken into account as the most sophisticated machine translator. Hampshire and Salvia (2010) reported that Google Translate becomes the top-tier machine translator because of the quality of its translation.

Most existing studies (Li et al., 2014; Ahrenberg, 2017; Lu, 2024; Muftah, 2024) focus on general comparisons between human and machine translation, evaluating translation adequacy, efficiency, and accuracy across various language pairs, including Chinese-English, Swedish-English, and Arabic-English. These studies emphasize the strengths and weaknesses of machine translation (MT) compared to human translation

(HT), highlighting issues such as formality, cohesion, fluency, and cost-effectiveness. However, none specifically examine the translation of causative constructions, such as "have" and "get," from English to Indonesian. This linguistic phenomenon involves syntactic and semantic complexities that may challenge machine translation systems, making it an area that requires further investigation.

The novelty of this study lies in its comparative analysis of Google Translate and human translation in rendering English causative "have" and "get" into Indonesian. Unlike prior research, which primarily assesses overall translation adequacy and efficiency, this study zooms in on a specific grammatical structure that poses unique translation difficulties. By analyzing how these constructions are rendered by MT and HT, the study contributes to the growing body of research on machine translation limitations and provides insights into areas where human expertise remains essential.

The work of Google Translate in translating causative construction into Indonesian then raised curiosity since its ability in the translation is based on the database received compared to humans, who can do more in the translation. Furthermore, Arka (1993) stated that the translation of Indonesian causative cannot be undertaken simply because most of Indonesian causative translations result in morphological causative to make the translation acceptable and to avoid oddity. Therefore, it was absorbing to know how a machine translator, in this case, Google Translate, performs the translation compared to humans employ. The causative constructions translated in this paper were the constructions containing not only have, but also get. According to Gilquin (2003), causative have and get have closeness in purpose and meaning. Thus, the writer intended to investigate whether Google Translate was able to translate English causative construction into Indonesian causative construction. Concerning the first aim, the writer also intended to know how English causatives have and get translated into Indonesian, undertaken by humans. Besides, the study is also aimed at knowing what possible translation strategies are done by Google Translate compared to human translation in translating causative constructions containing have and get from English into Indonesian.

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

1. To compare the translation result of *Google Translate* and human translators of English causative constructions *have* and *get* and their past form into Indonesian causative constructions and,
2. To investigate the strategies used by Google Translate and human translators when translating English causative constructions into Indonesian causative constructions

To accomplish both purposes, there are two frameworks used. The first framework is to analyze the translation of machine and human translation, and the second framework is to analyze the strategies used.

The first objective is to know whether *Google Translate* was able to translate English causative *get* and *have* causatively into Indonesian compared to the product of human translation. To know both *Google Translate* translation and human translation translated causatively into Indonesian, the analysis of causative form itself was grounded according to the exposition of Sneddon et all (2010) and Arka (1993). They explain that causative form could simply in the form of a transitive verb which denotes that the subject

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

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

LITERATURE REVIEW

Causative construction is sometimes described in two events. Frawley (1992, p. 159) stated terms of these two events namely 'precipitating event' and 'a result'. Similarly, Shibatani (as cited in Dixon and Aikhenvald, 2000, p. 30) characterized as 'a causing event' and 'a caused event'. While, according to Talmy (2000), causation is a force-dynamic pattern that involves two main participants: the antagonist (which is usually labeled as the "causer" in the constructions that we examine in this study) and the agonist (the "causee"). The causer instigates a causing event or state, which affects the causee, who brings about the caused event. In prototypical causation, the causer succeeds in overriding the causee's natural tendency towards rest or action (Talmy 2000: 418). The constructions that are studied here all refer to this causation type, although they may have other meaning extensions.

Analytic causative constructions, or also known as periphrastic causative constructions, customarily constructed of a causer (or causing event), a causee (or caused event), and a non-finite complement (Gilquin, 2015) the construction shows an expression of some act undertaken successfully by the causee that is influenced by the causer's attempt. Moreno (1993) reported that in many languages, the construction of periphrastic causative can be described and frequently have an association with make-verbs.

The studies of causative constructions, especially periphrastic/analytic causatives in Indonesia, have received attention by several scholars (Arka, 1993; Purwo, 2002; Sneddon, Adelaar, Djenar, & Ewing, 2010; Son & Cole, 2008). Most of their discussions in periphrastic causatives have a propensity in mainly explaining *cause* and *make*, while *have* and *get* have no deep analyses in their studies. Therefore, the information about Indonesian causatives *have* and *get* in this paper might be a little specific. Alternatively, causative *have* and *get* tend to be discussed more generally and compared with another kind of causative to know its entity semantically and syntactically.

Human translation is shaped by factors such as the relationship between source and target languages, cultural context, and the individual translator's skill (Bassnett & Lefevere, 2002). In the translation process, decisions related to decoding and recoding, challenges of equivalence (Gentzler, 2001), issues of loss and gain, and instances of untranslatability (Bassnett, 2013) lead to diverse translated versions, as different translators interpret the source and target languages differently. Moreover, the importance of equivalence, in regard to formal and dynamic, affects the translation product significantly (Munday, Pinto, & Blakesley, 2022). Therefore, the products of

human translation are considered more acceptable and appropriate due to the translator's skills and knowledge in the process of translation.

In contrast, machine translation eliminates the influence of individual translator ability which leads to many errors in the product. Sutrisno (2020) points out that google was only effective in translating words and phrases. In another investigation, Afshin and Alaeddini (2016) reported that google was not able to translate a certain language in the level of verbs let alone in the level of passage. Moreover, Tongpoon-Patansorn and Griffith (2020) found that google translation produced errors in capitalization, punctuation, and fragmentation. Therefore, the absence of google ability in the sense of human skills in translation results in errors and affect the acceptability of the translation itself.

However, the quality of machine translation remains a significant concern. To assess this quality, it is essential to conduct a thorough and detailed comparison between machine translation, human translation, and the source text. This comparison should encompass multiple levels, including vocabulary, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse. Through such a comprehensive analysis, a clearer understanding of machine translation quality can be achieved in relation to both human translation and the original source language.

Google Translate is the most currently available translation tool which is widely accessed. Bellos (2012) points out that, as the huge amount of data it has, Google Translate is very well-developed translation tool thatfairly frequently has acceptable production of translation to target texts. Nevertheless, he also points out that both source and target language that Google Translate handles depend exceptionally on what translation results have been produced in advance to a new translation attempt. This means that Google Translate obtain cross-reference between two corpora - that of the source language and that of the target language. the more similar texts in both languages, the more accurate the translation will be as it can utilize recurring linguistic bundles in both languages. This, in turn, means that Google Translate is probably much more reliable when it comes to translations between the dominant language English and one that is also frequently used for the same purpose. In other words, it seems more likely to produce an accurate translation between English and French academic texts, both languages that have a long tradition of academic genres and a long history of translated seminal works, than to produce an accurate translation between English and a language that has not had such an extensive academic text production and exchange.

Several studies have investigated the accuracy of *Google Translate*. Ghasemi and Hasemian (2016) undertook a comparative study of Google Translate translations to find errors of English to Persian and the other way around. Another study of *Google Translate* application was conducted to assess its quality in translating six different text types which comprise Afrikaans to English and the other way around (van Rensburg, Snyman, Lotz, 2012). Furthermore, the study on *Google Translate* was conducted to know the ability of Google Translate in translating error-free text.

The studies of periphrastic causative constructions have received much attention (Dixon & Aikhenvald, 2000; Gilquin, 2003 & 2015; Levshina, Geeraerts, &Speelman, 2013; Moreno, 1993). The investigations have been undertaken semantically and syntactically across languages. As Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000) reported in investigating English periphrastic causatives in Macushi and Canela-Kraho, they found that cause In Macushi is marked for its function in the subordinate clause; and in English, it is marked for its function in the main clause (the clause with the causative verb); and in Canela-Kraho, it is marked for both of these. Furthermore, a study conducted by Moreno (1993) reported

that some languages such as Korean, Tamil, Telugu, Indonesian, Jacaltec, Modern Greek and Thai frequently form the periphrastic causative with *make*. Similar to Moreno, the investigation of Gilquin (2008) found that French only has *faire* as the counterpart of *make*. The studies above reported causatives in semantic and syntactic analysis. However, those analytical studies are inseparable from the role of translation. By analyzing the forms of periphrastic causatives, the analysis, indeed, needed to translate the target languages before being translated into English were subsequently compared.

The studies of causatives *have* and *get* regarding translation across languages indirectly have been generally conducted in the previous literature. Specifically, Gilquin (2003) conducted *have* and *get* directly in relation to the corpus. Nevertheless, the comparative study of causative *have* and *get* with machine translator, especially with *Google Translate*, have not been found. This study might be the first in investigating a translation of causative *have* and *get* with Google Translate in English to Indonesian.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

The approach of this study is a qualitative approach. Since the data of the research are text-based, according to Creswell (2018), the approach in connection with the data which are collected in a form of text database typically uses a qualitative approach. Furthermore, Creswell (2018) added that in the qualitative study, rather than using statistics, the data analyzed are words to describe a central phenomenon in a study. Furthermore, the result of the study is a form of causative constructions analysis that needs description and interpretation. Thus, the qualitative approach can be best used in this research as the data mostly deals with text and description.

Table 1. The Sources of Data

Source Text				**Translated Text**			
Title	**Author**	**Publisher**	**Page**	**Title**	**Translator**	**Publisher**	**Page**
A Tale of two Cities	Charles Dickens	Chapman and Hall	341	A Tale of two Cities	Reinitha Lasmana	Qanita	500
Pride and Prejudice	Jane Austin	T. Egerton, White Hall	585	Pride and Prejudice	Berliani Mantili Nugrahani	Qanita	585
The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Rings	J. R. R. Tolkien	Allen & Unwin	479	The Lord of the Rings: Sembilan PembawaCincin	Gita Yuliani K	PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama	512
The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King	J. R. R. Tolkien	Allen & Unwin	347	The Lord of the Rings: Kembalinya Sang Raja	Martin Dima	PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama	520
The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers	J. R. R. Tolkien	Allen & Unwin	415	The Lord of the Rings: Dua Menara	Gita Yuliani K	PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama	432
Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone	J.K. Rowling	Arthur Levine Books	223	Harry Potter dan Batu Bertuah	Listiana Srisanti	PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama	384

Corpora

The data of this study are taken from six English novels namely; *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Pride and Prejudice*, *The Lord of the Rings*: *The Return of the King*, *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers, The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring and Harry Potter* and *the Philosopher's Stones.* All of them have been translated into Indonesian. There are 100 sentences which consist of causative verbs have and get with present and past forms, and active and passive voices. The details of the novels are shown in Table 1.

Data Collection Methods and Instruments

The data were the source texts and the translated ones in the form of causative constructions conceiving causative verbs *have* and *get* which included their past forms from six English novels and their translations in Indonesian. The total of the constructions collected respectively from both English and Indonesian novels were 100 constructions. Both English and Indonesian novels were needed to tackle two research questions in relation to the ability of Google Translate and human translators and the translation of causative constructions, and to know what strategies used by Google Translate and human translators in translating causative constructions from English into Indonesian.

Data Collection Procedures

To answer the first and the second research question, causative constructions from English and their translations in Indonesian were obtained as the data. However, the data collected dealing with the second research question were merely from Indonesian novels, as the translation of causative constructions from English into Indonesian, and the translation of English causative constructions undergone by Google Translate. Firstly, the sources of the data were English and Indonesian novels. Subsequently, constructions conceiving causative have, had, get, and got were selected. The search for the data was undertaken by selecting as many causative verbs found as possible. After that, the constructions from English and the translation from Indonesian novels were grouped based on their category in *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got*. Eventually, the constructions from English novels were translated into Indonesian by using Google Translate to get the data from its translations.

Data Analysis Methods

After the data were collected based on the needs of the research problems, the next step was to analyze them to answer the first and second research questions. The analysis of the first research question aimed to determine whether humans and Google Translate were able to translate English causative constructions involving *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got* into Indonesian. Subsequently, the analysis related to the second research question was undertaken to identify the strategies used by human translators and Google Translate in translating causative constructions.

To answer the first research question, the data analysis began with the translation of causative English constructions into Indonesian by human translators. The analysis focused on whether the translations maintained causative forms in Indonesian. This step aimed to determine whether human translators were able to accurately translate English causative constructions. Next, the data analysis was applied to the translations produced by Google Translate, using data obtained from English novels. The analysis focused on whether Google Translate correctly translated English causative constructions into Indonesian causative forms. A comparative analysis method (Creswell & Creswell, 2018)

was employed to evaluate the accuracy and consistency of translations between human translators and Google Translate.

To answer the second research question, the analysis focused on the strategies used by human translators and Google Translate in translating causative constructions into Indonesian. The analysis involved comparing the source language (ST) and target language (TT). The translations in TT were then analyzed using Newmark's (1988) translation strategies to identify the specific strategies employed by both human translators and Google Translate. This qualitative analysis method allowed for a detailed examination of the translation approaches and their effectiveness in conveying causative meanings.

FINDINGS

In the process of analyzing data of causative constructions from six novels in English, Google Translate was examined to translate 100 constructions, which consisted of *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got*. All those constructions were translated from English into Indonesian to know whether *Google Translate* was able to translate them causatively. By using the framework explained by Sneddon et al (2010) and Arka (1993), the data obtained is displayed in Table 2.

As shown in the table, one hand, the total of causative constructions translated causatively by *Google Translate* from English into Indonesian was 88 sentences that consisted of *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got*. On the other hand, the total of constructions that were translated in non-causative form is 12 constructions. The greatest causative verb used in the constructions selected in this study is *have*. There are 58 constructions that use *have*, 21 constructions of *had*, 16 constructions of *get*, and 5 constructions of *got*. In this case, active and passive forms were involved in the process of the translation as the construction of causatives *have* and *get* are followed not only by *effect* (the event performed by the *causee*) in active forms, but also in passive voice (Gilquin, 2003).

Table 2. The Total of Causative and Non-causative Translations

Translation Results	Google Translate	Human Translation
Translated in Causative Form	88	72
Translated in non-causative Form	12	28
Total	**100**	**100**

The translation of causative constructions from English into Indonesian is affected by the active and passive voice. One of the results is that the constructions are translated causatively in TT. Furthermore, it is found that the translation of causative constructions from English which comprise passive voice results in more causative constructions in Indonesian rather than the translation of causative constructions which comprise active voice. The constructions which were translated causatively consist of all verbs; *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got*. All these verbs were translated causatively both of which consist of active and passive voice. In addition, the most translated constructions causatively were the constructions with *have* as it is the verb which is mostly found in this study.

The data analysis of human translation taken from English novels and Indonesian novels result in two kinds of constructions. The first type of translation resulted in causative constructions and the second type of the translation resulted in non-causative constructions. These two kinds of data were analyzed from 100 constructions taken from

6 English novels and their translations in Indonesian novels. the constructions analyzed consist of causative *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got*. However, the most constructions found are the constructions comprising *have* which means the most constructions analyzed are the constructions with *have* as shown in table 2.

Table 3. Translation Strategies employed by GT vs. Human

Translation Strategy	GT	Human
Modulation	66	95
Through Translation	31	0
Couplets	3	1
Reduction	0	4
Total	**100**	**100**

The framework used to analyze the strategies is according to Newmark's (1988) translation procedures. Through the analysis, the researcher found that there are three strategies used by Google Translate in translating English causative constructions to Indonesian causative constructions namely; modulation, through translation, and couplets.

As shown in Table 3, the most widely used strategy by *Google Translate* is *modulation* which amounts to 66 procedures. The second most strategy used is *through translation* which amounts to 31 procedures. The least strategy used is couplets which amount to 3 procedures. All strategies occurred in all types of causative constructions: *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got*. However, they merely occurred entirely in causative constructions which are translated with causative *have*. The possibility of this occurrence seemed to be affected by the number of the constructions collected, given to causative *have* was the most widely found from 6 novels selected by the researcher in this study.

The analysis of the data from human translation found that there were three strategies used in translating causative construction conceiving *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got* from English into Indonesian. One hand, two strategies are the same as Google Translate applied to. On the other hand, there is one different strategy applied in human translation. As has been mention, there are three strategies applied in human translation, namely; modulation, couplets and reduction. In addition, there are 95 times of occurrence of modulation strategy as the greatest strategy applied in the translation. Subsequently, the rest two strategies are followed by reduction which consists of 4 times of occurrence, and couplets which consists of 1 time of occurrence shown in Table 3.

DISCUSSION

This study has two research questions. The first one was intended to know whether machine translator is able to translate English causative constructions into Indonesian causative constructions. In response to the question, *Google Translate* is the machine translator used due its ability as the most sophisticated machine translator. Furthermore, the second research question in this study is related to comparison of strategies used in translating causative constructions that consist of *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got* between *Google Translate* and humans, or human translation. To answer it, the results of the translation between machine translation and human translation were compared by analyzing the strategies used.

Google Translate and Human Translation

In relation to the first research question, Google Translate was used as the machine translator to examine whether it is able to translate English causative constructions into Indonesian causative constructions. Besides, human translation is also as the objective of the first research-question data attributing to the humans' ability in translating causative constructions. The data of the analysis of google and human translation were taken from six English novels which consisted of causative *have*, *had*, *get*, and *got*. One hand, the data analysis of *Google Translate* where the constructions conceiving causative verbs were translated from English into Indonesian in order to know the result of the translation in TT. On the other hand, the data analysis from human translation were undertaken through two novels which English novels as ST, and Indonesian novels as TT.

The analysis revealed that Google Translate is able to translate 88 constructions out of 100 in causative forms. Subsequently, the occurrence of constructions which were translated causatively from English into Indonesian was affected by the existence of both passive and active *effects*. From 88 constructions, one hand, the constructions which were translated causatively occurs 26 times from causative verbs which are followed by active *effects*. On the other hand, the number of the translation affected by passive *effect* is 62 constructions. Furthermore, the total of causative construction translated by human in causative forms affected by active *effect* is 20, and the total of the constructions affected by passive *effect* is 52.

The total of the analysis implies that the existence of *effect* plays the role in the translation. According to Levshina et al (2013), there is connection of meaning in relation to effected predicates or *effects* in causative translation. Furthermore, Son and Cole (2008) stated that the translation of constructions with causative, especially *have* and *get* was dependent on the elements in the construction. Therefore, the translation of causative from English to Indonesian which was undertaken by Google and human was affected by the elements in the construction itself, in this case, the constructions translated in this study were affected mostly by *effects*; active and passive.

In the context of translating causative constructions like "have" and "get," Google Translate tends to retain the causative form more consistently than human translators, who may adapt or simplify the structure for naturalness and clarity. In line with Hasibuan (2020), general machine-translation tools, like Google Translate, often produce overly literal or nonsensical translations. However, advanced translation companies now use engines trained by human translators, fed with professionally translated content to learn sector-specific terminology for different markets. While raw machine translations may suffice for low-quality, high-volume needs, higher-quality results are achieved through post-edited machine translation, where human translators refine the output for accuracy and cultural appropriateness.

The Comparison of Strategies Used

The analysis of two research questions in relation to analyzing causative constructions sourced from periphrastic causative *have, had, get* and *got* results some points. Firstly, the findings of the first research problem show that google was able to translate 88 constructions of causative out of 100 from English into Indonesian which mostly occurred in passive forms in English. Therefore, passive forms in English seemed to affect the success of translating causatively the constructions. Secondly, the findings of the second

research problem were related to the comparison of two kinds of translation; Google Translate and human translation. Through the analysis, Google Translate translation applied three strategies in translating periphrastic causative *have, had, get,* and *got*; they are modulation, through translation, and couplets. Similarly, human translation also applied two identical strategies namely modulation and couplets. Meanwhile, one different strategy applied from humans is *reduction*. In addition, the application of modulation strategy between google and humans had the same result which modulation was the greatest strategy applied. As stated by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), modulation is used to translate abstract<>concrete or particular<>general, and active<>passive. Those points are quite reasonable given that the translation of causative from English into Indonesian has abstract meaning if it is not translated with modulation and other strategies such as couplets (which might be needed in a harder construction) and reduction (which might be needed in omitting one or more words), especially causative *have* and *get*.

CONCLUSION

The investigation of this study resulted two comparative ways of causative translation in relation to causative and non-causative forms, and two comparative ways of translation strategies used in translating causative constructions. The data were collected from English novels and their translations in Indonesian. The first two results showed that the translations of Google Translate and professionals resulted similarity in translating causative constructions comprising have and get. Both mostly translated English causative constructions into Indonesian causative constructions or causative-to-causative constructions. The total of Google Translate translation from causative-to-causative forms were 88 times. Meanwhile, the translation of humans from causative-to-causative constructions were 72 times. In addition, the translation of causative-to-non-causative in both translators also resulted lesser than the causative-to-causative ones. The second two results showed that the strategies used by google translator and humans in translating causative constructions from English into Indonesian also have similarity. The similarity occurred when both Google Translate and humans applied the same strategies. Both translations applied modulation, couplets, and reduction strategies in the particular constructions that were constructed similarly. Thus, the investigation in causative translation undertaken by Google Translate and humans resulted similar causative-to-causative translation from English into Indonesian, and the strategies used also have similar result in between.

REFERENCES

Afshin, H., & Alaeddini, M. A. (2016). A contrastive analysis of machine translation (Google Translate) and human translation: Efficacy in translating verb tense from English to Persian. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(4), 40–48. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2016.v7n4p40

Arka, I. W. (1993). *Morpholexical aspects of the -kan causative in Indonesian* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Sydney.

Baron, N. S. (1974). The structure of English causatives. *Lingua, 33*(4), 299–342. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024

Bassnett, S. (2013). *Translation studies*. Routledge.

Bellos, D. (2011). *Is that a fish in your ear?: Translation and the meaning of everything*. Faber and Faber.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Higher Ed.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Dixon, R. M., & Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2000). *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge University Press.

Frawley, W. (1992). *Linguistic semantics*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Gentzler, E. (2001). *Contemporary translation theories* (Vol. 21). Multilingual Matters.

Ghasemi, H., & Hasemian, M. (2016). A comparative study of Google Translate translations: An error analysis of English-to-Persian and Persian-to-English translations. *English Language Teaching, 9*(3), 13–17.

Gilquin, G. (2003). Causative *get* and *have*: So close, so different. *Journal of English Linguistics, 31*(2), 125–148. https://doi.org/10.1177/0075424203251995

Gilquin, G. (2008). Causative *make* and *faire*: A case of mismatch. In M. A. Gonzalez, J. L. Mackenzie, & M. G. Alvarez (Eds.), *Current trends in contrastive linguistics: Functional and cognitive perspectives* (Vol. 60, pp. 177–204). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gilquin, G. (2015). Contrastive collostructional analysis: Causative constructions in English and French. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 63*(3), 253–272.

Hampshire, S., & Salvia, C. P. (2010). Translation and the internet: Evaluating the quality of free online machine translators. *Quaderns: Revista de Traducció, 17*, 197–209.

Hasibuan, Z. (2020). A comparative study between human translation and machine translation as an interdisciplinary research. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*, *3*(2), 115–130.

Hurford, J. R., Heasley, B., & Smith, M. B. (2007). *Semantics: A coursebook* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Kemmer, S., & Verhagen, A. (1994). The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics, 5*(2), 115–156.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (2002). *Translation/history/culture: A sourcebook*. Routledge.

Levshina, N., Geeraerts, D., & Speelman, D. (2013). Mapping constructional spaces: A contrastive analysis of English and Dutch analytic causatives. *Linguistics, 51*(4), 825–854.

Moreno, J. C. (1993). "Make" and the semantic origins of causativity: A typological study. In B. Comrie & M. Polinsky (Eds.), *Causatives and transitivity* (pp. 155–176). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Munday, J., Pinto, S. R., & Blakesley, J. (2022). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall International.

Purwo, B. K. (2002). The benefactive and instrumental *-kan*: Their syntactic ambiguity in the bitransitive and causative constructions. *6th International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics* (p. 158). Bintan Island, Riau, Indonesia.

Rabab'ah, G. (2008). Communication strategies in translation. *International Journal of Translation, 20*(2), 97–109.

Sneddon, J. N., Adelaar, A., Djenar, D. N., & Ewing, M. C. (2010). *Indonesian reference grammar*. Allen & Unwin.

Sutrisno, A. (2020). The accuracy and shortcomings of Google Translate translating English sentences to Indonesia. *Education Quarterly Reviews, 3*(4). https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1993.03.04.163

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics: Volume 1: Concept structuring systems* (Vol. 1). MIT Press.

Tongpoon-Patanasorn, A., & Griffith, K. (2020). Google translate and translation quality: A case of translating academic abstracts from Thai to English. *Pasaa, 60*(1), 134–163.

van Rensburg, A., Snyman, C., & Lotz, S. (2012). Applying Google Translate in a higher education environment: Translation products assessed. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, 30*(4), 511–524.

Vinay, J., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English* (Vol. 11). John Benjamins Publishing Company.