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ABSTRACT

Farlin, Sonny. 2015. *Semantics analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using Google Translate*. Yogyakarta: Teachers Training and Education Faculty, Department of Language and Arts Education, English Language Education Study Program, Sanata Dharma University.

Generally, students in academic field are required to make their abstract on their final thesis or final paper. In Indonesian context, students are required to make their abstracts both in Indonesian and in English. They might be students use Google Translate to translate the abstracts. Considering the needs for this translation, the writer aims to investigate how Google Translate works in translating an Indonesian abstract into English and intends to figure out or identify the semantics analysis in it. This study is a document analysis that aimed to develop a set of semantics analysis in the translation of an abstract into English using Google Translate that will be analyzed qualitatively. The problem is formulated as: “Is the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by Google Translate semantically correct?”

The result has shown that in general, it still needs support from humans to improve the results in translation. In this study, it is to link the preposition properly, translate missing important words, place the preposition properly, replace or reproduce thoughts or messages from the Source Language into the Target Language, analyze omitted / eliminated words, either will be included in the translation or not. By using Barthes’ Semiotic theory (1968), Google Translate were destined to firstly a journalism and secondly a civilization. Meanwhile using Parker’s pragmatic concept (1986), Google Translate results a translation which is understandable but less acceptable. Next, using Gramsci’s discourse concept (2004), there were only two of three main branches of scientific field found in the translations results, they are formal sciences and social sciences. Those are sciences that study human behaviour and societies.

Finally, the writer stated that the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by Google Translate semantically is not always correct. The students have to pay their attention if they are dealing with translating Indonesian abstract into English because Google Translate is only a translation machine, not the professional translator. Google Translate will help you in translating, but it also needs support from a translator (professional translators) to improve the quality of its results.

**Keywords**: Google Translate, Translation, Semantic
ABSTRAK


Umumnya, mahasiswa akademik diminta untuk membuat abstrak pada skripsi atau tugas akhir. Di dalam konteks Indonesia, mahasiswa diminta membuat abstrak baik dalam bahasa Indonesia dan dalam bahasa Inggris. Ada kemungkinan bahwa mahasiswa menggunakan Google Translate untuk menterjemahkan abstrak. Dengan mempertimbangkan kebutuhan akan penerjemahan ini, maka penulis bermaksud untuk meneliti bagaimana Google Translate bekerja dalam menerjemahkan abstrak Indonesia kedalam bahasa Inggris dan hendak mencari tahu atau mengidentifikasi analisa semantiknya. Studi ini merupakan analisa dokumen, yang bertujuan untuk mengembangkan serangkaian analisa ilmu semantik dalam penerjemahan abstrak ke dalam bahasa Inggris dengan menggunakan Google Translate yang akan dianalisa secara kualitatif. Rumusan masalahnya yakni: "Apakah penerjemahan abstrak bahasa Indonesia ke dalam bahasa Inggris yang dihasilkan oleh Google Translate benar secara semantik?"


Akhirnya, penulis menyatakan bahwa terjemahan abstrak bahasa Indonesia ke dalam bahasa Inggris yang dihasilkan oleh Google Translate secara semantik tidak selalu benar. Mahasiswa harus memperhatikan mereka apabila mereka berhadapan dengan menerjemahkan abstrak bahasa Indonesia ke dalam bahasa Inggris sebab Google Translate hanyalah mesin penerjemahan, bukan penerjemah yang profesional. Google Translate akan membantu dalam menerjemahkan, namun juga perlu dukungan dari seorang penerjemah (penerjemah profesional) untuk memperbaiki kualitas hasil nya.

Kata kunci : Google Translate, terjemahan, semantik
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Jesus for His blessing so that I can accomplish this final paper.

I am especially grateful to my major sponsor, V. Triprihatmini, S.Pd., M.Hum., M.A., for her encouragement, guidance, patience, and suggestions. I also would like to express my sincere gratitude to Henny Herawati, S.Pd., M.Hum., Drs. Bambang Hendarto Y., M.Hum., and Drs. Barli Bram, M.Ed., Ph.D..

I dedicate this thesis to my family: my mother, my father, my brothers, and my sisters. They have given me great support, prayers, care, and love. They are my strength.

Many friends have contributed to the ideas and discussions in this paper. I would like to thank my best friends Michael Dhani, Adi, and Memei, for their willing assistance, care and support.

I would like to express my appreciation to my communities: CMVE Jateng-DIY, CPA Trans Tour and Travel, Jogja Streetfire Club, and Sada Pardomuan Sanata Dharma for their splendid support, faith and effort. Throughout the making of this thesis, Mr Romi Susanto, Ms Irina Tassya Manurung and Mas Parman, have supported me. Therefore, I also would like to thank them. Finally, I thank the people who I could not mention here.

Sonny Farlin
TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE ................................................................................................................................. i
APPROVAL PAGES .................................................................................................................. ii
DEDICATION PAGE................................................................................................................... iii
STATEMENT OF WORK’S ORIGINALITY ........................................................................... iv
PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI .................................................................v
ABSTRACT ............................................................................................................................... vi
ABSTRAK ................................................................................................................................... vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.......................................................................................................... viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS............................................................................................................... ix

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION...............................................................................................1
   A. Background of the Study .................................................................................................1
   B. Research Method ..............................................................................................................4

CHAPTER II DISCUSSION.....................................................................................................8
   A. Review of Related Theories ............................................................................................8
      1. Definitions of Translation .........................................................................................11
      2. Definition of Semantic ...............................................................................................13
      3. The roles of Semantics in Translation ......................................................................16
   B. Findings of the Study .....................................................................................................17
      1. Google Translation of the Abstract ...........................................................................18
      2. Semantic Meanings of the abstracts ...........................................................................35
CHAPTER III CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..............46

A. Conclusions..................................................................................................................46

B. Suggestions ..................................................................................................................48

REFERENCES ......................................................................................................................49

APPENDICES .....................................................................................................................52

A. Appendix 1 ......................................................................................................................52

B. Appendix 2 ......................................................................................................................55

C. Appendix 3 ......................................................................................................................58
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, the investigated problem and the method.

A. Background

Google Translate (GT) as a free statistical multilingual machine-translation service, as well as an automatic translation tool, really plays its role in one of many translations services. It can translate written text from one language into another such as book, magazine, newspaper and the other. It also helps the users and readers to understand the general content of those foreign documents. GT has been fascinated with many areas of work, such as business, economy, political, education, etc. There might be many people use GT for instance: businessperson, educator, politician, technologist, artist, the administrative employee, economist, lecturer / teacher, and student.

GT helps the users in translating the document and transferring it into another language. In using it, the users still need to have an appropriate and applicable translation skill, especially the consideration when using it. By having basic knowledge regarding how to use it, on one side will help them get an acceptable translation result in the Target Language (TL). These activities will cover their skills in using GT to translate the document from one language into other languages.
Generally, students in the academic field are required to make a final thesis or a final paper. It is a partial fulfillment to obtain student college degree. A thesis or final paper generally consists of abstract, complementary, main chapters, references and appendices. Students will make an abstract as summary of their works to complete their thesis or final paper.

Aryani, et.al. (2011) defined, “abstract is a concise single paragraph summary of completed work or work in progress” (p.6). Abstract has a function to give a brief and concise overview, the approach taken, and the recommended solutions of what students have studied or researched in their final thesis or final paper.

In Indonesian context, students are required to make their abstracts both in Indonesian and in English. There might be a possibility that students use GT to translate the abstracts into English. Therefore, in order to have an appropriate and applicable translation, they have to acknowledge translation skills using GT especially in translating their abstracts from Indonesian into English.

Translating Indonesian’s Source Language (SL) into Target Language (TL) on one side still uses Indonesian structure. It is to explain that there are many translators having low mastery of the ability in translating and having different ways of translating. In the meantime, translators here may not change the message of the SL into TL. “Cahyani (2004) stated that many works of translations available in this country are the product of individual and unprofessional translator (as cited in Luly Nur Hamidah, 2008,p.3). The unprofessional translator might also include the students themselves. The Students might translate abstracts
concerning with getting equivalent thought, revising and reproducing the abstract in TL using GT but they do not consider about methods, strategy or procedures, grammatical structure and others aspects when using GT as their tool. Luly Nur Hamidah (2008) describes this situation as ponderous situation. She put this situation in the dilemma. “In one way, we need to encourage our people to do translation, yet, in another way; the quality of their translation is still questionable and unsatisfactory” (p.3). From that phenomenon with the big numbers of students who must translate their abstracts, the writer then acknowledges that it is important to do a study in this scope.

Since the abstract consist of Indonesian and English version, therefore, in this study the writer tried to choose only the Indonesian version and translated it into English using GT. Moreover, considering the needs of translation above, there is a possibility that GT might not provide a perfect translation as expected. Using GT might lead to misconception or violation in the translation. This study, then, aims to investigate the works of GT and intends to figure out or identify semantic analysis in its translation.

This study is a document analysis that aimed to develop a set of semantic analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT that will be analyzed qualitatively. The problem is formulated as: “Is the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by GT semantically correct?”
B. Research Method

Arikunto (1998:114) states that the source of data refers to a subject from which the data are obtained. The data can be discourse, sentences, clauses, phrases or words. There are two kinds of data, they are (1) Primary data: The data are directly taken as a result of collecting the data individually and it is an original datum from the source; (2) Secondary data: The data are taken from the second person and they are copies of the original data. Therefore, in this study, the writer used secondary data. The writer randomly took twenty-two abstracts of each study programs from the library of Sanata Dharma University on July 2013 and made them as the data.

The writer conducts this study in order to obtain the purpose of the study stated in the previous sub-chapter. Thus, the writer choose a qualitative research, in order to seek the answer to the problem stated in the previous sub-chapter. It is to find out if the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by GT semantically correct or not.

Since this is a document analysis; therefore, the writer applies a document or content analysis research as the suitable method to answer the problem. Typically, research is divided into two broad categories: quantitative and qualitative research. Each approach has its own terminology, methods, and techniques. Document analysis in Jacobs’s work (2008) explains that it is part of qualitative research. Qualitative research is research that seeks to understand a phenomenon by focusing on the total picture rather than breaking it downs into variables. It is qualitative research because this study aims to describe the
obtained data in the field. Document analysis focuses on analyzing and interpreting recorded material within its own context. The material may be public records, textbook, letters, film, tapes, diaries, themes, reports, etc. In this study, the material is a student’s abstract. The writer uses such documentary source in which the writer also established the authenticity of the document itself, as well as the validity of its contents (p.22-28). The writer here uses content analysis, to study an abstract for the readability or to determine the coverage given to a certain topic especially about semantic analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT. This study considers as a document analysis research because it analyze the document / data, an Indonesian abstract, which was randomly taken from the library in Sanata Dharma University. Moreover, this study is a qualitative study. Therefore, the writer only uses, analyzes and deepens his attention upon one of those abstracts. The writer randomly choose one abstract.

According to Fraenkel (2008), content analysis is a method that has wide applicability in educational research (p.473). Furthermore, he describes it as a technique that enables researchers to describe information, to check the findings, or to obtain information useful in dealing with educational problems (p.497). Thus derived from that definition, the writer conducts this study based on the document analysis of an abstract that belongs to a student of psychology study program named Michael Ricky Afianto.
This study is to obtain the information for devising subsequent in-depth study about semantic analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT.

In conducting this study, several steps are taken as its procedures.

1. Find the problem

Based on the background study, the writer states the problem as: “Is the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by GT semantically correct?”

2. Read related theories

In this study, the writer used three supporting theories. Those are Nida and Taber’s theory (2003) about translation, Newmark theory (1988) about semantic translation and Odgen and Richard’s theory about semantics rules which is related to semiotic (Barthes, 1968), pragmatic (Parker, 1986) and discourse (Gramsci, 2004).

3. Classify Data

In this step, the writer firstly chooses an abstract. It is an abstract of psychology student that was taken from the library of Sanata Dharma University on July 2013. After that, he counts the number of sentences and tabulates them. By applying simple purposive sampling, then he finally had 13 sentences from that abstract. After that all sentences was translated using GT and the translation’s results were tabulated. The tables are arranged in such a way so that each sentence would be side by side with its translation. In the table, SL (Source Language) is the original sentence in Indonesia and English, TL (Target Language) is the sentences’ result...
after translated by GT, and Remark is a written comment based on the attentions and notices found after translating source language into the target language using GT.

4. Analyze the data

In this step, the writer analyzes the data with the relevant theories. The writer employs Odgen and Richard’s theory of semantics which is related to semiotic (Barthes, 1968), pragmatic (Parker, 1986) and discourse (Gramsci, 2004). In addition, he also tries to explain the findings and give some suggestion related to the translation.

5. Report the result

After analyzing the data, the writer reports the findings. He elaborates the findings to the theories, and also gives the suggestion (if any) toward the problem. In this step, he also formulates the major ideas from the experts toward the findings. Those theories help him to work on a large amount of the descriptive information he find.

6. Conclusion and result

In this part, the writer concludes what he finds with the result and gave suggestions, regarding the problem he worked on. This part will be the summary of his study.
CHAPTER II

DISCUSSION

This chapter covers the review of related literature and the findings of the study. The review of related literature is a sub-chapter in which the writer defines Google Translate (GT) in general and followed by discussing the three theories used. The writer will discuss the relevance of the theories in supporting the problem discussed in this study. The second part is the findings of the study. In this part, the writer will discuss the interpretation of the findings that would be used in the conclusion of the study.

A. Review of Related Literature

In this part, the writer firstly elaborates on the definition of GT in general. According to Franz Och (Research at Google, 2006) GT is an online Machine Translation (MT) system published by Google, which provides automatic translation for 42 to 51 languages in the world, including Indonesian. Hutchins (1995) describes MT as a computerized system responsible for the production of translations with or without human assistance. GT provides everyone with access to the entire world's information, including information written in every language. GT is produced with some approach: the computer is fed with billions of words of text, both monolingual text in the target language, and aligned text consisting of examples of human translations between the languages. Then it applies statistical
learning techniques to build a translation model. GT systems in use, today have been developed using a rules-based approach and require a lot of work by linguists to define vocabularies and grammars. Retrieved January 7, 2015 from http://googleresearch.blogspot.com/2006/04/statistical-machine-translation-live.html

GT works on the principle of statistical MT. In Schulz (2013), Franz Och, the principal scientist and head of MT at Google Inc., explains how GT incorporates statistical MT as follows: “[...] what the system is basically doing (is) correlating existing translations and learning more or less on its own how to do that with billions and billions of words of text”.


In a bid, GT Blog (2013) describes that Google Inc. has created the Google Translator Toolkit to involve users to help improve the quality of translations into their languages. Google has also established other ways in which volunteers can contribute in improving some languages; one can sign up as a volunteer, and it seems that a Google Community Translation feature is under way in this regard. Retrieved January 11, 2015 from http://googletranslate.blogspot.it/ The more data available, the better the GT system works. Therefore, the Internet being a platform that contains an enormous amount of data, including an abundance of already existing translations from which the GT system can learn, is a crucial component of Google Translate. Retrieved January 11, 2015 from http://www.google.com/intl/en/about/
According to Angela Moscaritolo, GT is getting a boost with the addition of new languages. With the new additions, GT now supports 90 languages worldwide. She also described what Google said, that it would not have been able to launch some of the new languages without the help of the Google Community Translation. While our translation system learns from translated data found on the Web, sometimes GT needs support from humans to improve its algorithms. GT is very grateful for all the support from the community and hoping can continue improving translation quality for the languages. Retrieved January 7, 2015 from http://www.pcmag.com/article2/0,2817,2473580,00.asp

From those definitions, the writer concludes that GT is an online powerful Machine Translation system that works on the principle of statistical, which has a mission to organize the world’s information and make it universally accessible and useful through translation. Although it is powerful, GT still needs support from humans to improve its algorithms in translation.

Mainly, there are three supporting theories discussed in this study. Those are Nida and Taber’s theory (2003) of translation, Newmark theory (1988) of semantic translation and Odgen and Richard’s theory of semantics rules which is related to semiotic (Barthes, 1968), pragmatic (Parker, 1986) and discourse (Gramsci, 2004).

Furthermore, by combining those theories, the writer aims to analyze the semantics roles in the translation. All of these elaboration’s theories would be explained below:
1 Definitions of Translation

There are many definitions of translation. Every expert certainly has his/her own definition based on his/her own perspectives. In this study, the writer will describe three theories of which less acceptable to ones that are more acceptable.

According to Brislin, (2003) translation is a general term that refers to the transfer of thoughts and ideas from one language to another, whether the language in written form or oral form. This is not a complete definition, because he only involves the transfer of thoughts and ideas, and ignores the TL form. He also expresses the transferred thoughts and ideas in TL and, in addition, it is too general (p.19).

According to Catford (2003), he defines the translation as the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL). Therefore, the textual material must be the same between the source language and the target language. It can be in the same vocabulary. At this point, he only mentions the textual material, does not mention the meaning in which he only focuses on text material. However, it is impossible for the translator to change the textual material of SL with TL and ignore their structure and style because the two languages typically have different structures. Therefore, this is less acceptable definition (p.19).

According to Nida and Taber in Suryawinata and Hariyanto (2003), they see translating as the process of reproducing the text in the receptor language; the closest natural equivalent of the SL message in the term of meaning and style. In
other words, the translation is transferring meaning, message, and style both SL and TL. From the theories above, the writer acknowledges that this is an acceptable definition, as they discuss the meaning, message and style of the source language and the target (p.12).

Nida and Taber (1974) categorize translation study as a study in the scope of the linguistic area, which means a study of the applications, methods and results of linguistics. Newmark (1988) then defines the meaning of translation. He said, “Translation is a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or in another language” (p.7). The point that he wants to remark here is to distinguish between translation and interpretation. Translation deals with written text and interpretation deals with spoken. The second point is the means to do a translation by the translator. It is good for the translator(s) to have a wide understanding; have enough knowledge about two languages used in the process of replacing the message from a SL into a TL. Nida and Taber define a translator as a person who thinks about the actual transfer. The actual transfer here means translating the meaning from SL into TL (p.97-99). This definition is the explanation that translator also need to know about the translation. Moreover, the translator also needs a certain knowledge such as the theory of translation, a procedure or the strategy of translation skill.

From the explanations above, the writer concludes that the translation is the process of replacing / reproducing / transferring ideas / thoughts / messages from the SL into the TL to maintain or preserve the meaning and style. Since this
study deals with translation especially the semantics analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT, therefore the writer will discuss the meaning and message from the SL into TL. This theory will be used and considered as the standard theory to investigate either the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by GT, is it semantically correct or not.

2 Definition of Semantic

Translation main objective is to transfer the meaning from the SL to the TL. Since translation main objective is “meaning”, it is very important to study about theory of meaning. According to Bergmann (2007), Semantics is the subfield of linguistic that studies meaning in language. Semantics deals with the meanings of words as well as the meanings of phrases and sentences. Hence, semantic plays a very important role in translation. This part will discuss about the semantics and its roles in the translation.

Peter Newmark, in his works “Approaches to Translation as found in Wang Miaomiao’s research (2014), divided the translation into “Communicative and Semantic translation” (p.26). Newmark (1988b) explained that semantic translation ‘attempts to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the target language grammatical structure’ (p.58).

According to Newmark’s theory, the semantic translation requires the translators to reproduce the original form from the SL to the TL as much as possible. It regards the original words and phrases as sacred, even if there are some ambiguities and errors in the original text.
Newmark (1988a) stated that semantic translation is suitable for ‘expressive’ texts translation, where the specific language of the speaker or writer is as important as the content. This is mainly because semantic translation intends to present every detail of the contextual meaning of the source text by means of maintaining the text’s characteristics and expressions. Therefore, any authoritative texts should normally be translated semantically from a writer-oriented perspective, as ‘the unit of translation is likely to be small, since words rather than sentences contain the finest nuances of meaning’ (p.50).

The semantic translation aims to replicate the original texts’ forms within the target language, reproduce the original context, and retained the characters of the SL culture in the translation. It can be subdivided into two types. They are semantic translation from the pronunciation level (transliteration) and from the meaning level (paraphrase). Semantic translation from the pronunciation level refers to abiding by the pronunciation rules and adopts the way of transliteration in the translation process. Meanwhile, semantic translation analysis from the meaning level refers to finding corresponding words directly in the TL in accordance with their meaning in the original text.

Miaomiao in her study, the semantic translation analysis, quoted Newmark’s idea about Semantic Translation.

Peter Newmark’s semantic translation intends to reserve the form of the original in translation and to reproduce the original contextual meaning as closely as possible. Keeping the SL culture’s characteristics, focusing on the mediator’s thinking process, and organizing key information, it can help the TL readers to comprehend the text’s meaning. (2014, p.28).
According to Newmark (1988b), the characteristic of the semantic translation attempts to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the target language grammatical structure. A semantic translation was created to retain the cultural element, the registered writers and the unique expression in the source language. Thus, by applying semantic translation, the structure of sentences and the order of segments in the target language can be transferred close to the source language. (p. 58)

Newmark (1988b) believed that a semantic translation attempts to preserve its author’s idiolect, his peculiar form of expression, in preference to the “spirit” of the source or the target language (p.47). He also stated that ‘a semantic translation is always inferior to its original since it involves the loss of meanings’ (p.42).

From the theories above, the writer summarizes the meaning of semantic as: semantics is the subfield of linguistic that studies meaning in language that deals with the meanings of words as well as the meanings of phrases and sentences that plays a very important role in translation. Meanwhile, semantic translation is a translation that requires to replicating the original form from the SL to the TL, regarding the original words and phrases, retaining the characteristic of the culture, focusing on the mediator’s thinking process, which is all, is suitable for ‘expressive’ texts translation where the specific language of the writer is as important as the content.
3 The Roles of Semantics in Translation

Windiari, in her writing about ‘The Roles of Semantics in Translation’, explained that in the semantics, there are five methods of analyzing the meaning of a word. They are the triangular concept of meaning, the componential analysis method, the Natural Semantic Metalanguage, Hermeneutics, and the lexical semantics. Retrieved December 19, 2014 from http://www.academia.edu/1426730/The_Roles_of_Semantics_in_Translation

From the methods above, the writer only focused on one of them to find out and analyze semantics analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using Google Translate. It is the triangular concept of meaning. Firstly, this triangular concept of meaning is proposed by Ogden and Richard. They proposed the triangular concept of meaning in which the semantics is also related to semiotics, pragmatics, and discourse. In this triangular concept semiotics, pragmatics and discourse became the three main important points. In this concept, to understand the meaning, the translator also needs to relate it to the context (pragmatic). Semiotic, based on Barthes (1968) , is destined to be absorbed into trans-linguistics in which the material might be a myth, a narrative, journalism, or on the other hand the objects of our civilization (p.11). Based on Parker (1986), pragmatic is the study of how language is used to communicate. Pragmatic is distinct from grammar. Pragmatic is the study of the internal structure of language (p.11). Discourse, based on Gramsci in Peter Ives (2004), means the process of reasoning, most narrowly from premise to consequence, but also a discussion or conversation. In a common language, it is most often used to mean a treatise or a
systematically written document about a given topic (p.139). A given topic here means a topic that is well related to the scientific field. In general there are three main branches of the scientific field. They are the natural sciences (which study natural phenomena, including fundamental forces and biological life), the formal sciences (such as mathematics and logic, which use an a priori, as opposed to factual methodology) and the social sciences (which study human behaviour and societies).

From the theories above, the writer summarizes the semiotics, the pragmatics, and the discourse as: (1) Semiotic, in this study, is destined to be absorbed into trans-linguistics, in which the translation’s result of Indonesian abstract into English produced by GT, which is divided into myth, narrative, journalism, or on the other hand objects of civilization. (2) Pragmatic wants to acknowledge that the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by GT is acceptable, less acceptable or not acceptable in terms of communication. (3) Discourse wants to decide the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by GT would belong to natural sciences, formal sciences or social sciences.

B. Findings of The Study

The writer has stated previously that this study used Nida and Taber’s theory of translation (2003), Peter Newmark’s theory of semantic translation (1988), and Ogden and Richard’s theory of semantic rules. This part presented the results and the findings of the study to answer the research problem either the
analysis found in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT is semantically correct or not. Further explanation about discussing the method could be seen in the first chapter. In this part, the writer would discuss what he had found and what he did based on the findings.

1. **Google Translation of the abstract**

   This part would discuss the result of the data in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using Google Translate. The abstract was taken from the library of Sanata Dharma University on July 10, 2013. These findings were presented based on the sequence of the data list.

   GT is an online powerful machine translation system that works on the principle of statistical, which has a mission to organize the world’s information and make it universally accessible and useful through translation. Although it is powerful, GT still needs support from humans to improve its algorithms in translation.

   Translation is the process of replacing or reproducing or transferring ideas or thoughts or messages from the Source Language into the Target Language to maintain or preserve the meaning and style. Since this study deals with translation especially the semantics analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using Google Translate, therefore the writer acknowledges that this Nida and Taber’s theory is more acceptable to investigate the result of the translation.

   This part presented the results of the analysis in the form of an abstract, which was made into tabular form in accordance with the theory used in the
previous chapter. In this part, there was a classification analysis of a table. In the first and the second tables (see appendices) would be seen how the shape of the translation of Google Translate were. Then the results were described briefly and clearly.

Based on the results of the translation in the Table of the translation (see appendix 1), the thirteen sentences would be discussed and the following would explain those of them.

a. Sentence one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan antara keadilan organisasi dengan kinerja pada pramuniaga. | The purpose of this research was to understand the correlation between the organizational justice and the job performance of the salesgirls. | This study aimed to determine the relationship between organizational justice with the clerk's performance. | - Penelitian (noun): research (noun), study (noun), investigation (noun)  
- Pramuniaga (noun): clerk (noun), salesman (noun), salesgirl (noun)  
- Bertujuan/Tujuan: aimed (verb), purpose (noun)  
- Keadilan organisasi (noun) / organizational justice (noun)  
- Kinerja (noun): performance (noun)  
- antara keadilan organisasi dengan kinerja pada pramuniaga / between organizational justice with the clerk's performance |

In the first sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system that was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and make it universally accessible. From that sentence, GT was able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas or thoughts or messages from the SL into TL, as it translated Penelitian (noun): study (noun), Pramuniaga (noun): clerk (noun),
Bertujuan/Tujuan: aimed {verb}, purpose{noun}, Keadilan organisasi {noun} / organizational justice {noun}, Kinerja {noun} : performance {noun}.

In translating ‘...antara keadilan organisasi dengan kinerja pada pramuniaga’, it was translated ‘...between organizational justice with the clerk's performance.’ Since there were two things that were compared, therefore the translation needed was ‘between’ instead ‘among’. GT was able to choose ‘between’ {Adverb} instead of ‘among’, but failed to choose its link preposition. It was translated into ‘between procedural justice with the performance’. From that sentence, “between was followed by ‘with” while between” is most effectively linked with “and”; “from” most effectively linked with “to”. In this sentence, GT was not able to link preposition ‘between’ with ‘and’. However, GT was still able to transfer the ideas from SL into the TL though it failed to link the preposition. In this sentence, GT still needs support from humans to improve its algorithms translating and linking the word ‘between’ and its preposition. Here, the writer wrote a suggestion for the translation, that is: ‘This study aimed to determine the relationship between organizational justice and the clerk's performance.’ In this sentence, the writer changed the link in preposition ‘with’ into ‘and’ to show the relevant preposition.

GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL, regarded the original words and phrases’, and retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, but it failed linking the preposition.
b. Sentence two

In the second sentence, GT as an online powerful Machine Translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and make it universally accessible though the word ‘diajukan’ was omitted. In translating ‘…antara keadilan organisasi dengan kinerja pramuniaga’, it was translated ‘….between organizational justice salesperson performance’. Since there were two things that were compared, therefore the translation needed was ‘between’ instead ‘among’. GT was able to choose ‘between’ {Adverb} instead ‘among’, but failed to link the preposition. It was translated into ‘between organizational justice salesperson performance’. From that sentence, ‘between was not followed by ‘and’ while between’ is most effectively linked with “and”; “from” most effectively linked with “to”. In this sentence, GT also eliminated one word “diajukan”, it was also not able to link preposition ‘between” with “and”. In translating “pramuniaga”, GT translated it differently as the previous sentence, which was translated as ’clerk’. However, GT was still able transfer the ideas from SL into TL though it failed to link the preposition. In this sentence, GT still
needed support from humans to improve its algorithms translating and to link the word ‘between’ and its preposition. Here, the writer wrote a suggestion toward the translation, that is ‘….between organizational justice and salesperson performance.’ In this phrase, the writer added the link in preposition ‘with’ with ‘and’ to show the relevant preposition.

Google somehow was able to replicate the original form from SL into TL, regarded the original words or phrases, retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, which were suitable or acceptable, but GT was inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context.

c. Sentence three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjek dalam penelitian ini adalah 105 orang pramuniaga toko yang telah lolos masa uji coba dan menjadi karyawan tetap.</td>
<td>For this research, the subject was 105 salesgirls that has passed the training period and has been confirmed to be permanent employee in the organization.</td>
<td>Subjects in this study were 105 persons who have passed the store clerk trial period and a permanent employee.</td>
<td>- Pramuniaga {noun}: person, clerk - Uji coba: trial, training - dan menjadi karyawan tetap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the third sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and made it accessible but it was missed to translate a verb which was very important word in that sentence. In the phrase ‘…dan menjadi karyawan tetap’ GT translated it into ‘…. and a permanent employee.’ The word ‘menjadi’ was translated become ‘a’. The word ‘menjadi’ is a verb meanwhile the translation ‘a’ is a particle. From that sentence, GT was still able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas or
thoughts or messages from the SL into TL though it missed to translate an important word in that sentence. In this finding, GT needs support from humans to improve its algorithms in translation.

In translating ‘pramuniaga’, GT translated it as 'person'. This word was different in the previous sentences, which was translated as 'clerk' and ‘salesperson’. The translation was still suitable or acceptable. Google was able to replicate the original form from the SL into TL, regarded the original words and phrases’, retained the characteristic of the culture, focusing on the mediator’s thinking process but GT was inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context.

d. Sentence four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliabilitas skala keadilan organisasi diuji menggunakan teknik Alpha dari Cronbach.</td>
<td>The Reliability of organizational justice scale was tested using Alpha technique by Cronbach.</td>
<td>Organizational justice scale reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha technique of.</td>
<td>- ....menggunakan teknik Alpha dari Cronbach/ using Cronbach's alpha technique of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the fourth sentence GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to not organize and but still translate the SL’s information and make it universally accessible. It was not organized well the place of the preposition. This made the phrase quite elusive. In the phrase ‘....menggunakan teknik Alpha dari Cronbach.’, it was translated into ‘... using Cronbach's alpha technique of.’ GT was incorrect in placing the preposition ‘OF’. This made the
phrase quite elusive. In this finding, GT needed support from humans to improve the translation especially to place the preposition 'of' and suggest a translation. The writer wrote a suggestion for the translation, that is: ‘……using the technique of Cronbach's alpha.’ In this sentence, the writer added the conjunction ‘the’ and placed the preposition ‘of’ between the word ‘technique and Cronbach’.

In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL into TL, regarded the original words and phrases’, retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, but not all were suitable or acceptable as it failed to place or to organize the position of the preposition.

e. Sentence five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skala keadilan prosedural memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.826, skala keadilan distributif memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.902, dan skala keadilan interakional memiliki koefisien Alphasebesar 0.885.</td>
<td>Alpha coefficient for procedural justice scale was 0.826, Alpha coefficient for distributive justice was 0.902, Alpha coefficient for interactional was 0.885.</td>
<td>Procedural justice scale has Alpha coefficients for 0826, scale distributive justice have Alpha coefficient of 0.902, and interactional justice scale Alpha coefficient of 0.885.</td>
<td>- Prosedural {adjective}: Procedural ...sebesar 0.826, .....sebesar 0.902, dan ... sebesar 0.885 / ..... for 0826, .... of 0.902, and ... of 0.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the fifth sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and made it universally accessible but still failed to transfer ideas or thoughts from the SL. In the phrase ‘Skala keadilan prosedural memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.826’, GT translated it into ‘Procedural justice scale has Alpha coefficients for 0826.’ The
word “Sebesar” in SL wanted to show an equivalent value between “Skala keadilan prosedural memiliki koefisien Alpha” and “0.826” and in which, it needed a proper translation to show a relationship between them. From that sentence, GT was not able to replace or reproduce thoughts or messages from the SL into TL. In this finding, GT needed support from humans to improve the translation especially to translate the word ‘Sebesar’ into a word that would help to make ‘Skala keadilan prosedural memiliki koefisien Alpha’ and ‘0.826’ became equivalent. In order to show the equivalence as mentioned before, the writer wrote a suggestion for the translation, that is ‘Procedural justice scale has Alpha coefficients of 0826…’ In this sentence, the writer changed the preposition ‘For’ into ‘Of’ to show the equivalence.

Just like in the sentence four, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL into TL, regarded the original words and phrases’, retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, but did not translate the word “Sebesar” in order to show the equivalence. In this sentence, the translation of the word ‘sebesar’ was less suitable or less acceptable.

f. Sentence six

Table 2.6
Sentence six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedangkan reliabilitas skala kinerja diuji dengan melihat konsistensi antar penilai.</td>
<td>The reliability of job performance scale was tested by considering the consistency of the tester.</td>
<td>While the performance scale reliability was tested by looking at the inter-rater consistency.</td>
<td>Kinerja [noun] : performance [noun]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the sixth sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and made it universally accessible. From that sentence, GT was able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas or thoughts or messages from the SL into TL.

GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL into TL, regarded the original words and phrases’, and retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, which were suitable or acceptable.

g. Sentence seven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hasil perhitungan menunjukkan koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.649 berdasarkan hasil uji normalitas, data keadilan procedural dan kinerja termasuk dalam distribusi normal.</td>
<td>Result shows that the Alpha coefficient was 0.649. However, based on normality test, the procedural justice data, and the job performance data was normal.</td>
<td>The calculations show Alpha coefficients for 0649. based on the results of the normality test, procedural fairness and performance of data included in the normal distribution.</td>
<td>- Menunjukkan {verb}: show, - Show / Indicate - Keadilan {noun} : justice {noun} - Kinerja {noun} : performance {noun} - Distribusi {noun} : distribution {noun}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the seventh sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and made it universally accessible though the word ‘hasil’ was omitted. Besides that, it translated he word ‘menunjukkan’ was also translated using a word that might be less scientific. Indeed, the use of the word ‘show’ was not wrong. From that sentence, GT was able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas, thoughts or messages from the SL into TL, as it translated *Menunjukkan* {verb}: Show /
Indicate {verb}, *Keadilan* {noun}: justice {noun}, *Kinerja* {noun}: performance {noun}, *Distribusi* {noun}: distribution {noun}.

In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL into TL, regarded the original words and phrases’, and retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, which was suitable or acceptable for ‘expressive’ texts translation.

h. Sentence eight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sedangkan data keadilan distributif dan keadilan interaksional tidak termasuk dalam distribusi normal. | Whereas the distributive justice data and the interactional justice data was not normal. | While the data distributive justice and interactional justice are not included in the normal distribution. | - Sedangkan (bilamana, kapan, sejak kapan, kalau) {adverb}: when {adv.}  
- sedangkan (padahal, sebaliknya) {conjuntion}: whereas {conjuntion} |

In the eight sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize but not able to translate the SL’s information. In the phrase ‘*Sedangkan data keadilan distributif*’ It was translated into ‘while the data distributive justice...’. The word ‘*sedangkan*’ in that phrase aimed to compare or show disagreement with the previous sentence that was ‘*keadilan interaksional tidak termasuk dalam distribusi normal.*’ Therefore, the conjunctions “While” was less precise in that phrase. The word ‘while’ is appropriately used to show differences, not to contrast two things. From that sentence, GT was able to replace or reproduce but not to transfer the ideas or thoughts or messages from the SL into
TL, as it ‘Sedangkan’ into while instead whereas. In this finding, GT needs support from humans to improve its algorithms in translating the word ‘sedangkan’.

GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL into TL though it was less precise in that phrase, but it was inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context as found in translating ‘keadilan distributif’, GT translated it as ‘distributive justice’. This phrase was different with the fifth sentence, which was translated as ‘distributive justice’, but the translation is still suitable or acceptable.

i. Sentence nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hasil uji linearitas menunjukkan bahwa keadilan procedural memiliki hubungan yang linear dengan kinerja.</td>
<td>Furthermore, in the linearity test, the result shown that the procedural justice and job performance have a linear correlation</td>
<td>Linearity test results showed that procedural fairness has a linear relationship with performance.</td>
<td>- Linearitas {noun}: linearity {noun}, - Keadilan: fairness {noun}, - Procedural {adjective}: Procedural {adjective}, - Linear {adjective}: linear {adjective}, - Kinerja {noun}: performance {noun}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ninth sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and made it universally accessible. From that sentence, GT was able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas, thoughts or messages from the SL into TL as it translated *Linearitas* {noun}: linearity {noun}, *Keadilan* {noun}: fairness {noun},
Prosedural {adjective}: Procedural {adjective}, Linear {adjective} : linear {adjective}, Kinerja {noun} : performance {noun}.

GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL into TL, which was suitable or acceptable though it was less precise in that phrase. In translating ‘keadilan prosedural’, GT translated it as ‘procedural fairness’. This phrase was different with the fifth sentence, which was translated as ‘Procedural justice’, but the translation was still suitable or acceptable.

j. Sentence ten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedangkan keadilan distributif dan keadilan interaksional tidak memiliki hubungan yang linear dengan kinerja.</td>
<td>While distributive justice and interactional justice do not have a linear correlation with performance.</td>
<td>While distributive justice and interactional justice does not have a linear relationship with performance.</td>
<td>- Sedangkan {adverb}: when (adv.) sedangkan {conjunction}: whereas (conjunction) - Keadilan {noun} : justice {noun} - Distributif {adjective} : distributive {adjective} - Interaksional {adjective} : interactional {adjective} - Tidak memiliki: do/does not have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the tenth sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize but not able to translate the SL’s information. In the phrase ‘Sedangkan keadilan distributif’ was translated into ‘While distributive justice...’ as in the eighth sentence appeared, the word ‘sedangkan’ in this sentence also aimed to compare or show disagreement with the previous sentence. Therefore, the conjunctions “While” was less precise in that phrase. The word ‘while’ is appropriately used to show differences, not to contrast two things. From that
sentence, GT was able to replace or reproduce but did not transfer the ideas, thoughts or messages from SL into the TL, as it ‘Sedangkan’ into ‘while’ instead ‘whereas’. In this finding, GT needed support from humans to improve its algorithms in translating the word ‘sedangkan’. In addition, in the tenth sentence also found the mistake that lied in translating the phrase ‘tidak memiliki’ in the sentence ‘Sedangkan keadilan distributif dan keadilan interaksional tidak memiliki hubungan yang linear dengan kinerja.’ It was translated into ‘does not have’. The translation result ‘does’ was not correct, since the subject of the sentence was in plural form ‘keadilan distributif dan keadilan interaksional.’ Therefore, GT was failed to notice the use of “do/does” when the subject was in plural form. In this finding, GT needed support from humans to improve its algorithms in translating the phrase ‘tidak memiliki’ in which the subject was in plural form. Here, the writer wrote a suggestion for the translation, that was ‘Whereas distributive justice and interactional justice do not have a linear relationship with performance.’ In this sentence, the writer changed the verb ‘Does’ into ‘Do’ to show the relevant verb toward the plural subject.

GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL into the TL, regarding the original words and phrases’, retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, but it was not acceptable since it did not acknowledge the subject of the sentence which was in plural. GT translated it into ‘does’ instead ‘do’ and the translation here is not suitable or acceptable.
In the eleventh sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and make it universally accessible though the word ‘penelitian’ was omitted. From that sentence, GT was still able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas or thoughts or messages from the SL into TL though it eliminated one word in that sentence.

GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL into the TL, regarding the original words and phrases, retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, which was suitable or acceptable though it eliminated one word in that sentence.
In the twelfth sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and made it universally accessible though the word ‘hasil’ was omitted. In translating “…antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja”, it was translated “….between procedural justice with the performance….”, Since there were two things that were compared, therefore the translation needed is ‘between’ instead ‘among’. GT was able to choose ‘between’ {Adverb} instead ‘among’, but failed to choose its preposition. It was translated into ‘between procedural justice with the performance’. From that sentence, ‘between’ was followed by ‘with’ while ‘between’ is most effectively linked with ‘and’ and ‘from’ most effectively linked with ‘to’. In this sentence, GT was not able to link preposition ‘between’ with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hasil korelasi antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja sebesar 0.217 dengan $p = 0.013 (p < 0.05)$, yang berarti terdapat hubungan positif dan signifikan antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja. | Based on this correlation test, the result shows that the correlation between procedural justice and job performance was 0.217 with $p = 0.013 (p <0.05)$, which means there are positive and significant correlation between procedural justice and job performance. | The correlation between procedural justice with the performance of 0.217 with $p = 0.013 (p <0.05)$, which means that there is a positive and significant relationship between procedural justice with the performance. | - Korelasi {noun} : correlation {noun}  
- Hasil korelasi / The correlation  
- Antara {adverb}: Among, between _____ and _____ {adverb}  
- “…antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja / between procedural justice with the performance “  
- Antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja / between procedural justice with the performance. |
‘and’. However, GT was still able to transfer the ideas from SL into the TL though it failed to link the preposition. In this sentence, GT still needs support from humans to improve its algorithms translating and linking the word ‘between’ and its preposition. Here, the writer wrote a suggestion for the translation, that is: ‘The result of the correlation between procedural justice and the performance was 0217 with \( p = 0.013 \) \( (p < 0.05) \), which means that there is positive and significant relationship between procedural justice and the performance.’ In this sentence, the writer changed the link in preposition ‘with’ into ‘and’ to show the relevant preposition.

Google in somehow was able to replicate the original form from the SL into the TL, regarding the original words and phrases, retaining the characteristic of the culture, focusing on the mediator’s thinking process, which was suitable or acceptable but GT was inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context though it eliminated one word in that sentence and failed to link the preposition.

m. Sentence Thirteen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (Indonesian)</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (English)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kata kunci: keadilan organisasi, kinerja, pramuniaga</td>
<td>Key words: Organizational justice, job performance, salesgirl</td>
<td>Keywords: justice organization, performance, salesman</td>
<td>- Keadilan organisasi {noun} / organizational justice {noun}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Keadilan organisasi / justice organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Kinerja {noun} : performance {noun}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pramuniaga {noun} : Salesman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the last sentence, GT as an online powerful machine translation system was able to organize and translate the SL’s information and make it universally accessible. From that sentence, GT was able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas or thoughts or messages from the SL into the TL, as it differently translated though it translated the word ‘Pramuniaga’ into ‘salesman.’, and ‘keadilan organisasi’ into ‘justice organization’.

Google in somehow was able to replicate the original form from the SL into the TL, regarded the original words and phrases, retained the characteristic of the culture, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, which was suitable or acceptable, but GT was inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context as found in translating ‘Pramuniaga’ and ‘keadilan organisasi’. Those words and phrases were different with the previous sentence. Supposedly, the translation result in the first sentence to ‘Pramuniaga’ is ‘clerk’, as it has been used in the previous sentence. Besides, the phrase ‘Keadilan organisasi’ translated into ‘justice organization’ instead of ‘Organizational justice’ as found in the first sentence. In this sentence, GT still needed support from humans to improve its consistency.

The result of the translation from SL into using GT has shown that in the whole text, there were nine (9) of thirteen (13) sentences and GT as an online powerful machine translation system generally was not always able to organize and translate the SL’s information and made it universally accessible.

GT was not always able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas or thoughts or messages from the SL into the TL. It failed to link the preposition as
found in sentences {two and twelve}, missed to translate an important word in that sentence as found in sentence {three}, was incorrect in placing the preposition as found in the sentence {four}, was not able to replace or reproduce thoughts or messages from the SL into the TL as found in sentences {five, eight, and ten}, omitted / eliminated words in the sentences as found in sentences {seven and eleven}. Therefore, from the result of this study GT in general still needed support from humans (translators) to improve the translation results. In this case it is to link the preposition properly, translate the missing important words, place the preposition properly, replace or reproduce thoughts and messages from the SL into the TL, analyze the omitted / eliminated words either will be included or not in the translation.

2. **Semantic Meanings of the abstracts**

This part discussed the result of semantic analysis data in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT based on the theories used. Semantics dealt with the meanings of words as well as the meanings of phrases and sentences. Meanwhile, semantic translation is a translation that requires to replicate the original form from the SL into the TL, regarding the original words and phrases, retaining the characteristic of the culture, focusing on the mediator’s thinking process, which is all are suitable for ‘expressive’ texts translation where the specific language of the writer is as important as the content.

Peter Newmark’s semantic translation intended to reserve the form of the original in translation and to reproduce the original contextual meaning as closely
as possible. Keeping the SL cultures’ characteristic, focusing on the mediator thinking process, and organizing key information, it could help the TL readers to comprehend the text’s meaning. It was applicable to complicate, a detail-attentive and an information-intensive translation work. Semantic translation from the meaning level, as the name implies, means to find a corresponding words directly in the TL in accordance with their meanings in the original text. In the translation of the abstract, it was usually applied to the things that do exist in real life.

In this part, the writer presented the results of semantics analysis which consist of three main parts; they were semiotics, pragmatics, and discourse. In the table of triangular concept of meaning (see appendix 2) would be seen how the shape of the translation of Google Translate, which were classified based on the triangular concept of meaning by Ogden and Richard. Classification was a way of how to form the sentences or words contained in the abstract, whether the sentences or words in the abstract was part of the semiotics, pragmatics, and discourse or not.

Based on the results of the translation in the table of triangular concept of meaning (see appendix 2), the thirteenth sentence would be discussed and the following discussion would explain those of them.

a. Sentence one

1. *This study aimed to determine the relationship between organizational justice with the clerk's performance.*

In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL but failed to link the preposition. In terms of semiotic, this sentence was
destined to the material of objects of our civilization. In terms of pragmatic, it was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, it contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘the relationship between organizational justice with the clerk's performance.’ The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms social in ‘sciences’, which studied human behaviour and societies especially Psychology.

b. Sentence two

‘The hypothesis of this study is that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice salesperson performance.’

In this sentence, GT in somehow was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL but it was inconsistent in translating the same word in as found in the first sentence. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to the material of journalism. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘The hypothesis of the study that have a positive relationship between organizational justice and salesperson performance.’ The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in ‘social sciences’, which studied human behaviour and societies especially Psychology.
c. Sentence three

‘Subjects in this study were 105 persons who have passed the store clerk trial period and a permanent employee.’

In this sentence, GT translated “pramuniaga”, as ‘person’. This word was different in the previous sentences, which was translated as ‘clerk’ and ‘salesperson’. The translation was less acceptable, besides it was inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context. This is based on what was found in the first sentence and the second sentence. In addition, it was failed to translate an important word ‘menjadi {verb} and it was translated into a particle ‘a’. This failure made the translation less acceptable. In terms of semiotic, this sentence was destined to the material of objects of our civilization e.g. employee. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘Subjects of the study that consist of 105 employees. They were those who have passed the store clerk trial period and became permanent employee.’ The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in ‘social sciences’, which studied human behaviour and societies especially Psychology.

d. Sentence four

‘Organizational justice scale reliability was tested using Cronbach’s alpha technique of.’

In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL not all were suitable or acceptable as it failed to place or to organize the
position of the preposition ‘Of’. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to the material of journalism. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘Organizational justice scale reliability that was tested using Cronbach’s alpha technique.’ The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in ‘social sciences’, which studied human behaviour and societies.

e. Sentence five

‘Procedural justice scale has Alpha coefficients for 0.826, scale distributive justice have Alpha coefficient of 0.902, and interactional justice scale Alpha coefficient of 0.885.’

Just like in the sentence four, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL but did not translate the word ‘Sebesar’ to show the equivalence. In this sentence, the translation of the word ‘sebesar’ was less suitable or less acceptable. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to the material of which may be a myth, narrative, journalism, or on the other hand objects of our civilization. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contains a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about “Procedural justice, scale distributive justice, and interactional justice. The discourse in this sentence was the use of
certain terms in ‘formal sciences’ (mathematics and logic) and ‘social sciences’, which studied human behaviour and societies (Psychology).

f. Sentence six

‘While the performance scale reliability was tested by looking at the inter-rater consistency.’

In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL, which was suitable or acceptable. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to the material of journalism. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘The performance scale reliability that was tested by looking at the inter-rater consistency’. The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in social sciences, which studied human behaviour and societies.

g. Sentence seven

‘The calculations show Alpha coefficients for 0649, based on the results of the normality test, procedural fairness and performance of data included in the normal distribution.’

In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL, which was suitable or acceptable for ‘expressive’ texts translation. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to the material of our civilization. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a
discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘The calculations that show Alpha coefficients, procedural fairness and performance of data’ The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in ‘formal sciences’ and ‘social sciences’.

h. Sentence eight

‘While the data distributive justice and interactional justice are not included in the normal distribution.’

In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL though it was less precise in that phrase. In addition, GT was also inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context. As found in translating ‘keadilan distributif’, GT translated it as ‘distributive justice’. This phrase was different with the fifth sentence, which was translated as ‘distributive justice’, but the translation was still suitable or acceptable. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to the material of journalism. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about “Data distributive justice and interactional justice that are not included in the normal distribution” The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in ‘social sciences’, which studied human behaviour and societies.

i. Sentence nine

‘Linearity test results showed that procedural fairness has a linear relationship with performance.’
In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL though it was less precise in that phrase. In translating ‘keadilan procedural’, GT translated it as ‘procedural fairness’. This phrase was different with the fifth sentence, which was translated as ‘Procedural justice’, but the translation was still suitable or acceptable. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to civilization. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence is understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematic written document about “Linearity test results that showed procedural fairness has a linear relationship with performance.” The discourse in this sentence is the use of certained terms in social sciences, which studied human behaviour and societies.

j. Sentence ten

‘While distributive justice and interactional justice does not have a linear relationship with performance.’

In this sentence, GT was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL, but it was not acceptable since it did not acknowledge the subject of the sentence which was in plural form. GT translated it into ‘does’ instead of ‘do’ and the translation here was not suitable or acceptable. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to the material of civilization. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about “Distributive justice and interactional justice that do not have a linear relationship with performance”.
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The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in ‘social sciences’, which studied human behaviour and societies.

k. Sentence eleven

‘Data analysis was performed using product-moment correlation test of Pearson.’

In this sentence, GT was able to replicating the original form from the SL to the TL, which was suitable or acceptable though it eliminated one word in that sentence. In terms of semiotic this sentence is destined to the material of civilization. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘Data analysis that was performed using product-moment correlation test of Pearson.’ The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in social sciences, which studied human behaviour and societies.

l. Sentence twelve

‘The correlation between procedural justice with the performance of 0217 with p = 0.013 (p < 0.05), which means that there is a positive and significant relationship between procedural justice with the performance.’

In this sentence, GT in somehow was able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL, but it was inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context. In addition, it eliminated one word in that sentence and was failed to link the preposition. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to the material of journalism. In terms of pragmatic, this sentence was understandable.
and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘The correlation between procedural justice with the performance’ The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in ‘formal sciences’ and ‘social sciences’, which studied human behavior and societies.

m. Sentence thirteen

‘Keywords: justice organization, performance, salesman.’

In this sentence, GT was able to replicating the original form from the SL to the TL but it was inconsistent in translating the same word in the same context. It was found in translating ‘Pramuniaga’ and ‘keadilan organisasi’. Those words and phrases were different with the previous sentence. Supposedly, the translation result in the first sentence to ‘Pramuniaga’ is 'clerk', as it had been used in the previous sentence. Besides that, the phrase ‘Keadilan organisasi’ translated into ‘justice organization’ instead ‘Organizational justice’ as found in the first sentence. In this sentence, GT still needed support from humans to improve its consistency. In terms of semiotic this sentence was destined to civilization. In terms of Pragmatic, this sentence was understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. In terms of discourse, this sentence contained a discussion to mean a treatise or systematically written document about ‘Keywords in the abstract’. The discourse in this sentence was the use of certain terms in ‘social sciences’, which studied human behaviour and societies.
The result of the translation from SL into using GT has shown that in terms of semantic translation, GT was not always able to replicate the original form from the SL to the TL, regarded the original words and phrases’, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, which made the result of the translation were acceptable and less/not acceptable in this study. GT was inconsistent in translating the same word or phrase in the same context, failed to place or to organize or link the position of the preposition, did not acknowledge the subject of the sentence which was in plural form that made the translation were unacceptable and translated plural subject using ‘does’ instead ‘do’.

Using Barthes’ Semiotic (1968), in general GT were destined to firstly ‘journalism’ as found in the sentences 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 12; secondly ‘civilization’ as found in the sentences 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, and13. Meanwhile using Parker’s concept of pragmatic (1986) in general, GT produced the translation in TL that were understandable and the language used was able to show a communication. Lastly, using Gramsci’s concept of discourse (2004) in general, there were only two of three main branches of the scientific field found. They were formal sciences and social sciences, which study human behaviour and societies.
CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the conclusion and suggestion based on the study. The conclusion consists of important things which were found in this study. Meanwhile, the suggestions in general are addressed to business-person, educator, politician, technologist, artist, administrative employee, economist, lecturer, teacher, and student who are the users of GT. Particularly it is addressed to the students who will use GT to translate their abstract from Indonesia into English and other researchers who are interested in conducting further study of the ‘Semantic analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using Google Translate’.

A. Conclusion

In this sub-chapter, the writer has done his work on the semantic analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT. Based on the problem formulation in this study “Is the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by GT semantically correct?”, therefore, the writer bravely stated a general and fundamental result.

GT had shown that upon the whole text, GT as an online powerful Machine Translation system generally was NOT able to organize and translate the SL’s information and make it universally accessible. GT was NOT ALWAYS
able to replace or reproduce or transfer the ideas or thoughts or messages from the SL into the TL. GT, in this study, sometimes failed to link the preposition, missed to translate an important word, was incorrect in placing the preposition, not always replace or reproduce all thoughts or messages from the SL into the TL, and sometimes omitted / eliminated one word in translating a sentence. Generally, GT in this study still needs support from humans (translator) to improve its algorithms in translation especially to link the preposition properly, to translate missing important words, to place the preposition properly, to replace or reproduce thoughts or messages from the SL into the TL, and to analyze omitted / eliminated words either will include or not in the translation.

Moreover in terms of semantic translation, GT was NOT ALWAYS able to replicate the original form from the Source Language to the Target Language, regarding the original words and phrases’, focused on the mediator’s thinking process, which made the result of the translation were acceptable and less/not acceptable in this study. GT was inconsistent in translating the same word or phrase in the same context, failed to place or to organize or link the position of the preposition, did not acknowledge the subject of the sentence which were in plural form that made the translation were unacceptable and translated plural subject using ‘does’ instead ‘do’.

Using Barthes’ Semiotic (1968), in general, GT was destined to firstly journalism and secondly civilization. Meanwhile using Parker’s concept of pragmatic (1986) in general, the GTs result were understandable, acceptable and the language used was able to show a communication in the TL. Lastly, using
Gramsci’s concept of discourse (2004) in general, there were only two of three main branches of the scientific field found. They are formal sciences and social sciences, which study human behavior and societies.

Finally, based on the problem formulation in this study, the writer stated that the translation of Indonesian abstract into English produced by Google Translate semantically is not always correct. The students have to pay their attention if they are dealing with translating Indonesian abstract into English because GT is only a machine translation, not a professional translator. GT will help you in translating, but it also needs support from translators (professional translators) to improve the quality of its results.

B. Suggestions

The suggestions related to these findings will be specifically directed to the students who will use GT to translate their abstract from Indonesia into English. Considering the findings in Semantics analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT, they can use these findings in order to manage and to be aware to use GT. They can also use these findings as references to observe the result of translation of GT.

In addition, more detailed studies need to be done to substantiate the findings of this study in order to investigate semantics analysis in the translation of Indonesian abstract into English using GT. Other writers are also encouraged to conduct a similar study with different focus analysis, for example the pragmatics.
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Appendix A. Table of Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SOURCE LANGUAGE (SL)</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE (TL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan antara keadilan organisasi dengan kinerja pada pramuniaga.</td>
<td>This study aimed to determine the relationship between organizational justice with the clerk's performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hipotesis yang diajukan dalam penelitian ini adalah ada hubungan positif antara keadilan organisasi dengan kinerja pramuniaga.</td>
<td>The hypothesis of this study is that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice salesperson performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Subjek dalam penelitian ini adalah 105 orang pramuniaga toko yang telah lolos masa uji coba dan menjadi karyawan tetap.</td>
<td>Subjects in this study were 105 persons who have passed the store clerk trial period and a permanent employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Reliabilitas skala keadilan organisasi diuji menggunakan teknik Alpha dari Cronbach.</td>
<td>Organizational justice scale reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha technique of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Skala keadilan prosedural memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.826, skala keadilan distributif memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.902, dan skala keadilan interaksional memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.885.**

6. **Sedangkan reliabilitas skala kinerja diuji dengan melihat konsistensi antar penilai.**

7. **Hasil perhitungan menunjukkan koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.649. berdasarkan hasil uji normalitas, data keadilan prosedural dan kinerja termasuk dalam distribusi normal.**

8. **Sedangkan data keadilan distributif dan keadilan interaksional tidak termasuk dalam distribusi normal.**

9. **Hasil uji linearitas menunjukkan bahwa keadilan prosedural memiliki hubungan yang linear dengan kinerja.**

10. **Sedangkan keadilan distributif dan keadilan interaksional**

Procedural justice scale has Alpha coefficients for 0.826, scale distributive justice have Alpha coefficient of 0.902, and interactional justice scale Alpha coefficient of 0.885.

While the performance scale reliability was tested by looking at the inter-rater consistency.

The calculations show Alpha coefficients for 0.649. Based on the results of the normality test, procedural fairness and performance of data included in the normal distribution.

While the data distributive justice and interactional justice are not included in the normal distribution.

Linearity test results showed that procedural fairness has a linear relationship with performance.

While distributive justice and interactional justice does not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Indonesian Text</th>
<th>English Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Analisis data penelitian dilakukan menggunakan uji korelasi product-moment dari Pearson.</td>
<td>Data analysis was performed using product-moment correlation test of Pearson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Hasil korelasi antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja sebesar 0.217 dengan $p = 0.013 (p &lt; 0.05)$, yang berarti terdapat hubungan positif dan signifikan antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja.</td>
<td>The correlation between procedural justice with the performance of 0.217 with $p = 0.013 (p &lt; 0.05)$, which means that there is a positive and significant relationship between procedural justice with the performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kata kunci: keadilan organisasi, kinerja, pramuniaga</td>
<td>Keywords: justice organization, performance, salesman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Table of Triangular Concept of Meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE (TL)</th>
<th>TRIANGULAR CONCEPT OF MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEMIOTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This study aimed to determine the relationship between organizational justice with the clerk's performance.</td>
<td>civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAGMATICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCOURSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The hypothesis of this study is that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice salesperson performance.</td>
<td>journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAGMATICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>understandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCOURSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Subjects in this study were 105 persons who have passed the store clerk trial period and a permanent employee.</td>
<td>objects of civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAGMATICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCOURSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organizational justice scale reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha technique of.</td>
<td>journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAGMATICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCOURSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Procedural justice scale has Alpha coefficients for 0826, scale distributive justice have Alpha coefficient of 0.902, and interactional justice scale Alpha coefficient of 0.885.</td>
<td>journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRAGMATICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>less acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCOURSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>While the performance scale reliability was tested by looking at the inter-rater consistency.</td>
<td>journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The calculations show Alpha coefficients for 0649 based on the results of the normality test, procedural fairness and performance of data included in the normal distribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>While the data distributive justice and interactional justice are not included in the normal distribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Linearity test results showed that procedural fairness has a linear relationship with performance.</td>
<td>civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>While distributive justice and interactional justice does not have a linear relationship with performance.</td>
<td>civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Data analysis was performed using product-moment correlation test of Pearson.</td>
<td>civilization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal sciences - Mathematics - Logic - Social sciences - Psychology

Social sciences - Psychology

Civilization - Social sciences - Psychology

PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI
12. The correlation between procedural justice with the performance of 0217 with $p = 0.013$ ($p < 0.05$), which means that there is a positive and significant relationship between procedural justice with the performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords: justice organization, performance, salesman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>journalism</th>
<th>acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>civilization</th>
<th>acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Formal sciences
- Mathematics
- Logic
- Social sciences
- Psychology

13. Keywords: justice organization, performance, salesman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>civilization</th>
<th>acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Social sciences
- Psychology
HUBUNGAN ANTARA KEADILAN ORGANISASI DENGAN KINERJA PADA PRAMUNIAGA TOKO

Mikhael Ricky Afianto

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan antara keadilan organisasi dengan kinerja pada pramuniaga. Hipotesis yang diajukan dalam penelitian ini adalah ada hubungan positif antara keadilan organisasi dengan kinerja pramuniaga. Subjek dalam penelitian ini adalah 105 orang pramuniaga toko yang telah lulus masa uji coba dan menjadi karyawan tetap. Reliabilitas skala keadilan organisasi diuji menggunakan teknik Alpha dari Cronbach. Skala keadilan prosedural memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.826, skala keadilan distributif memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.902, dan skala keadilan interaksional memiliki koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.885. Sedangkan reliabilitas skala kinerja diuji dengan melihat konsistensi antar penilai. Hasil perhitungan menunjukkan koefisien Alpha sebesar 0.649. Berdasarkan hasil uji normalitas, data keadilan prosedural dan kinerja termasuk dalam distribusi normal. Sedangkan data keadilan distributif dan keadilan interaksional tidak termasuk dalam distribusi normal. Hasil uji linearitas menunjukkan bahwa keadilan prosedural memiliki hubungan yang linear dengan kinerja. Sedangkan keadilan distributif dan keadilan interaksional tidak memiliki hubungan yang linear dengan kinerja. Analisis data penelitian dilakukan menggunakan uji korelasi product-moment dari Pearson. Hasil korelasi antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja sebesar 0.217 dengan p = 0.013 (p < 0.05), yang berarti terdapat hubungan positif dan signifikan antara keadilan prosedural dengan kinerja.

Kata kunci: keadilan organisasi, kinerja, pramuniaga
THE CORRELATION BETWEEN ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE AND
JOB PERFORMANCE OF THE SALESGIRLS

Mikhael Ricky Aflanto

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this Research was to understand the correlation between the organizational justice and the job performance of the salesgirls. The hypothesis proposed in this research was the positive correlation between organizational justice and job performance of the salesgirls. For this research, the subject was 105 salesgirls that has passed the training period and has been confirmed to be permanent employee in the organization. The Reliability of organizational justice scale was tested using Alpha technique by Cronbach. Alpha coefficient for procedural justice scale was 0.826, Alpha coefficient for distributive justice was 0.902, Alpha coefficient for interactional was 0.885. The reliability of job performance scale was tested by considering the consistency of the tester. Result shows that the Alpha coefficient was 0.649. However, based on normality test, the procedural justice data and the job performance data was normal. Whereas the distributive justice data and the interactional justice data was not normal. Furthermore, in the linearity test, the result shown that the procedural justice and job performance have a linear correlation while distributive justice and interactional justice do not have a linear correlation with performance. The data was analysed using the Pearson product-moment correlation technique. Based on this correlation test, the result shows that the correlation between procedural justice and job performance was 0.217 with p = 0.013 (p<0.05), which means there are positive and significant correlation between procedural justice and job performance.

Key words: Organizational justice, job performance, salesgirl