



## Analysis of Translation Techniques and Translation Procedures: Newmark's and Molina & Albir's Translation Frameworks

**Gunawan Tambunsaribu**

Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Indonesia

---

### Article Info

#### *Article history:*

Received 23-05-2026

Revised 27-6-2026

Accepted 30-06-2026

---

#### *Keywords:*

Translation Procedures,  
translation techniques,  
equivalence, translation  
studies

---

### ABSTRACT

This study examines the conceptual similarities between Peter Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques to determine the extent to which both frameworks share equivalent categories and theoretical orientations in explaining translation from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). Employing a qualitative descriptive method with a comparative theoretical approach, the study analyzes and compares the classifications proposed by both scholars to identify corresponding categories, conceptual parallels, and functional similarities. The findings reveal substantial equivalence between the two frameworks, particularly in the categories of transference–borrowing, naturalization–naturalized borrowing, cultural equivalent–adaptation, descriptive equivalent–description, modulation–modulation, compensation–compensation, transposition–transposition, recognized translation–established equivalent, and through-translation/literal translation–literal translation/calque. Both models similarly emphasize meaning preservation, cultural adaptation, grammatical restructuring, equivalence, and target-language acceptability, despite differing in terminology and classification. These findings suggest that Newmark's procedures and Molina and Albir's techniques are complementary rather than competing frameworks. While Newmark provides a procedure-oriented perspective, Molina and Albir offer a more systematic operational classification of translation choices. Integrating both frameworks contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of translation processes and offers a stronger theoretical foundation for translation analysis, pedagogy, and practice.

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



---

### *Corresponding Author:*

**Gunawan Tambunsaribu**

Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Indonesia

Email: [gunawan.tambunsaribu@uki.ac.id](mailto:gunawan.tambunsaribu@uki.ac.id)

---

## INTRODUCTION

Translation is a complex communicative process that involves transferring meaning from a source language (SL) into a target language (TL) while preserving semantic content, communicative purpose, and cultural values. Beyond linguistic substitution, translation requires translators to make informed decisions that reconcile differences in lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, and cultural systems (Nida & Taber, 1969; Baker, 2018). In the context of globalization, where multilingual communication increasingly supports international collaboration, scientific dissemination, education, and intercultural exchange, translation has become an indispensable means of facilitating access to knowledge across linguistic boundaries (House, 2015). Consequently, translators must possess not only linguistic competence but also a sound understanding of the theoretical frameworks that guide translation decision-making.

One of the central concerns in Translation Studies is explaining how translators solve translation problems while achieving equivalence between the source and target texts. Over the past several decades, numerous theoretical models have been proposed to describe translation operations at different levels of analysis, including translation methods, strategies, procedures, and techniques (Chesterman, 2016; Molina & Albir, 2002). Although these concepts share the common objective of explaining translators' choices, they differ in terminology, analytical scope, and theoretical orientation. This diversity has contributed to conceptual ambiguity, particularly regarding the distinction between translation procedures and translation techniques, which are frequently treated as interchangeable despite their different theoretical origins.

Among the most influential models are Peter Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques. Newmark defines translation procedures as problem-solving operations applied to relatively small linguistic units, such as words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. His framework includes procedures such as transference, naturalization, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, descriptive equivalent, transposition, modulation, compensation, paraphrase, recognized translation, through-translation, synonymy, and couplets, all of which are intended to help translators address linguistic and cultural differences while maintaining semantic equivalence (Molina & Albir, 2002; Newmark, 1988). Similarly, Molina and Albir conceptualize translation techniques as observable translation operations manifested in the final translated text. Their taxonomy consists of eighteen techniques, including borrowing, calque, literal translation, modulation, transposition, adaptation, amplification, reduction, compensation, description, established equivalent, particularization, generalization, substitution, variation, linguistic amplification, linguistic compression, and discursive creation. Unlike Newmark's procedural perspective, Molina and Albir emphasize the textual product and argue that translation techniques can be systematically identified through comparative analysis of source and target texts.

Although these frameworks emerged from different theoretical traditions, they exhibit remarkable conceptual similarities. Several categories correspond closely despite being labeled differently. For instance, Newmark's transference parallels Molina and Albir's borrowing, transposition and modulation retain identical conceptual functions, descriptive equivalent closely resembles description, recognized translation corresponds to established equivalent, and through-translation shares important characteristics with calque and literal translation (Molina & Albir, 2002; Newmark, 1988). Such similarities indicate that both frameworks may describe essentially comparable translation operations while employing different terminologies and classification principles.

Despite the widespread adoption of both frameworks in translation research, the relationship between them remains insufficiently theorized. Existing studies predominantly apply either Newmark's procedures or Molina and Albir's techniques independently to analyze literary, audiovisual, legal, technical, or religious translations (Gambier & Van Doorslaer, 2010; Molina & Albir, 2002). These studies have demonstrated the usefulness of each framework for explaining translator choices within specific translation contexts. However, relatively little attention has been devoted to systematically comparing the conceptual correspondences, semantic functions, and analytical orientations of the two models. As a result, the theoretical relationship between translation procedures and translation techniques

remains fragmented, and researchers often adopt one framework without explicitly justifying its distinction from or compatibility with the other.

This gap has important implications for Translation Studies. The absence of a comprehensive comparison may lead to inconsistent terminology, overlapping classifications, and conceptual confusion in both translation research and pedagogy. Because Newmark's procedures and Molina and Albir's techniques are among the most frequently employed analytical frameworks, clarifying their similarities and differences is essential for establishing greater theoretical consistency and improving methodological rigor in translation analysis. Moreover, understanding how the two frameworks complement one another can assist researchers in selecting more appropriate analytical tools and help translation educators explain translator decision-making more systematically (Chesterman, 2016; Ordudari, 2007; Venuti, 2017).

Recognizing this need, the present study conducts a comparative theoretical analysis of Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques. Specifically, it examines the conceptual correspondences between the two classifications, analyzes their functional similarities in explaining meaning transfer, and evaluates the extent to which they represent complementary approaches to translation problem-solving. By addressing an underexplored area in translation theory, this study seeks to provide a clearer conceptual mapping between two influential frameworks and to contribute to the development of a more coherent theoretical foundation for translation research, translator education, and professional translation practice.

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design**

This study employed a qualitative comparative research design using document analysis to examine the conceptual similarities between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques. A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the objective of the study was to interpret theoretical concepts, identify conceptual correspondences, and explain similarities in meaning and function rather than to measure relationships qualitatively (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Comparative document analysis enables researchers to systematically examine, compare, and interpret written theoretical sources in order to identify patterns, relationships, and conceptual consistencies across different frameworks (Bowen, 2009).

The primary data consisted of the complete classifications of translation procedures presented in *A Textbook of Translation* proposed by Newmark and the taxonomy of translation techniques proposed by Molina and Albir. These two works were purposively selected because they represent two of the most influential and frequently cited frameworks for analyzing translation at the micro-textual level in Translation Studies. Both models describe translation operations applied to lexical, grammatical, and semantic units, making them suitable for systematic theoretical comparison (Molina & Albir, 2002; Newmark, 1988). Secondary sources, including books and journal articles discussing translation theory, equivalence, and translator decision-making, were also consulted to support the interpretation of conceptual similarities and differences (Chesterman, 2016; Gambier & Van Doorslaer, 2010; Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013).

Data selection followed purposive sampling, focusing exclusively on translation categories that explicitly describe procedures or techniques operating at the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level. Broader concepts such as translation methods, strategies, or ideological approaches were excluded because they function at the macro-textual or process level and therefore fall outside the analytical scope of the present study (Molina & Albir, 2002). This criterion ensured that both datasets were comparable in terms of their linguistic unit of analysis and theoretical purpose.

The comparison process was conducted through three systematic stages. First, all translation procedures proposed by Newmark and all translation techniques identified by Molina and Albir were compiled into a comparative analytical matrix. Second, each category was examined based on three analytical criteria: (1) conceptual definition, referring to the theoretical explanation provided by each author; (2) functional purpose, referring to the translation problem or communicative function addressed by the category; and (3) operational application, referring to how the category is employed in transferring meaning from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). Categories were considered conceptually corresponding when they demonstrated substantial similarity across these three dimensions, even if different terminology was used.

Following the comparison, categories with similar conceptual definitions and translation functions were grouped into corresponding pairs, such as transference–borrowing, naturalization–naturalized borrowing, transposition–transposition, modulation–modulation, compensation–compensation, descriptive equivalent–description, recognized translation–established equivalent, cultural equivalent–adaptation, and through-translation/literal translation–literal translation/calque. Categories that did not demonstrate direct correspondence were analyzed separately to identify differences in theoretical orientation or analytical emphasis rather than being treated as equivalent.

The scope of the analysis was limited to theoretical comparison of the classifications proposed by Newmark (1988) and Molina and Albir (2002). The study did not analyze translated texts, translator behavior, or empirical translation products. Instead, the analysis focused on examining conceptual equivalence, semantic functions, and the practical roles of each category in explaining meaning transfer and translation problem-solving. Consequently, the findings are intended to clarify the theoretical relationship between the two frameworks rather than to evaluate their effectiveness in specific translation contexts.

To enhance the credibility of the analysis, interpretations were based directly on the original definitions provided by Newmark (1988) and Molina and Albir (2002) and were cross-checked against established literature in Translation Studies discussing translation procedures, techniques, equivalence, and translator decision-making (Chesterman, 2016; Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013). This process helped ensure that the comparison was grounded in the original theoretical intentions of both frameworks and minimized subjective interpretation.

### **Data Sources**

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

1. Newmark's *A Textbook of Translation* (1988), which presents various translation procedures and their applications in translation practice.

2. Molina and Albir's article *Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach* (2002), which introduces and explains the taxonomy of translation techniques.

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

### **Data Collection Technique**

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

The data collection process consists of several steps:

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

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

### **Research Instrument**

In qualitative research, the researcher serves as the primary instrument for collecting, interpreting, and analyzing data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The researcher systematically reviews the literature, identifies conceptual similarities, and interprets the relationships between translation procedures and translation techniques. To facilitate data organization, a comparison matrix is used as a supporting instrument. The matrix contains:

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

### **Data Analysis Technique**

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

- a) **Data Condensation:** The researcher selects and simplifies relevant information from the collected literature. Definitions, characteristics, and examples related to Translation Procedures and Translation Techniques are extracted and categorized according to their conceptual functions.

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

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

## **Research Procedures**

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

## **FINDINGS**

### **Similarities Based on the Direct Conceptual**

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

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

### 1. Transference ↔ Borrowing (Pure Borrowing)

The conceptual alignment between Peter Newmark's procedures and Molina and Albir's techniques is highly apparent when examining how both frameworks handle source-language terms that resist direct translation. Newmark refers to the direct transfer of an unedited source text item as transference, a process that functionally corresponds with what Molina and Albir term pure borrowing. To understand how these two operations share equivalent categories and theoretical orientations in preserving original forms, their core differences and similarities are systematically organized in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Conceptual and Functional Comparison between Transference and Borrowing Techniques

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

Source: Formulated by author based on Newmark (1988) and Molina & Albir (2002).

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

#### Translation Example

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

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

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

### 2. Naturalization ↔ Naturalized Borrowing

When a foreign term is retained but requires adjustments to better fit the phonetic and structural habits of the target language, translators shift from direct transference to a more integrative approach. Newmark identifies this modification as naturalization, an operational choice that mirrors Molina and Albir's category of naturalized borrowing. The specific criteria through which both models emphasize meaning preservation while promoting linguistic assimilation are outlined in Table 2.

**Tabel 2.** Conceptual and Functional Comparison between Naturalization and Naturalized Borrowing Techniques

Aspect	Naturalization (Newmark)	Naturalized Borrowing (Molina & Albir)
<b>Core idea</b>	Adapt pronunciation and	Adapt borrowed item to TL rules

	morphology	
<b>Main focus</b>	Linguistic assimilation	Orthographic adaptation
<b>Translation operation</b>	Foreign word adjusted to local usage	Borrowing + adaptation

Source: Formulated by author based on Newmark (1988) and Molina & Albir (2002)

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

The major similarity: foreign term retained + adjusted form

#### Translation Example

Source Text: The meeting was successful.

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

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

#### Other examples:

SL : Television

TL : *Televisi*

SLT : Democracy

TL : *Demokrasi*

### 3. Cultural Equivalent ↔ Adaptation

Linguistic adjustments often extend beyond phonological rules into the realm of cultural mediation, where literal transfers would likely obscure the author's intent or confuse target readers. In Newmark's model, substituting a source-culture reference with a familiar target-culture alternative is known as a cultural equivalent, which functions exactly like Molina and Albir's adaptation technique. A comparative breakdown of how both models prioritize cultural accessibility and reader response over formal correspondence is presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Conceptual and Functional Comparison between Cultural Equivalent and Adaptation Techniques

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

Source: Formulated by author based on Newmark (1988) and Molina & Albir (2002).

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

## Translation Example 1

Source Text: He loves playing baseball.

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

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

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

## Translation Example 2

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

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

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

## 4. Descriptive Equivalent ↔ Description

In cases where no equivalent cultural concept exists in the target environment, translators often resort to explanatory expansions to unpack the underlying meaning of a specific term. This operational solution is captured by Newmark’s descriptive equivalent and is highly synonymous with Molina and Albir’s category of description. To clarify how both approaches transform a single lexical item into an explanatory expression, Table 4 maps their conceptual boundaries and functional mechanisms.

**Table 4.** Conceptual and Functional Comparison between Descriptive Equivalent and Description Techniques

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

Source: Formulated by author based on Newmark (1988) and Molina & Albir (2002).

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

## Example 1: Descriptive Equivalent

Source Text: The samurai protected their lords.

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

## Example 2: Description Translation

Source Text: We ate panettone.

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

### 5. Modulation ↔ Modulation

Beyond shifting words or adding descriptions, achieving naturalness in translation frequently demands a change in the cognitive framing or perspective of the message. Interestingly, both frameworks retain identical terminology for this phenomenon, classifying it as modulation. To demonstrate how this shift in semantic angles operates across both systems without altering the intended core meaning, the conceptual features of this procedure are detailed in **Table 5**.

**Table 5.** Conceptual and Functional Features of Modulation Techniques in Both Frameworks

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

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

#### Translation Example 1: Literal

Source Text: You are going to be a father.

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

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

Perspective changes: Fatherhood → having a child.

#### Translation Example 2: Literal

Source Text (Literal): It is not difficult.

Target Text (Modulation): *Itu mudah.*

Negative → positive viewpoint shift.

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

### 6. Compensation ↔ Compensation

When a stylistic, pragmatic, or emotional nuance cannot be retained in its exact structural position from the source text, a translator must relocate that effect elsewhere in the passage. This strategy of balancing stylistic loss is defined as compensation in both Newmark's and Molina and Albir's taxonomies. The operational parameters showing how both models prioritize communicative effect over formal placement are structured in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Conceptual and Functional Features of Compensation Techniques in Both Frameworks

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

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

#### Translation Example 1

Source Text: You little genius!

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

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

#### Translation Example 2

Source Text: Dear me!

Target Text: *Ya ampun!*

### 7. Transposition ↔ Transposition

Linguistic disparities between grammatical systems routinely require translators to substitute one grammatical category for another to maintain structural acceptability. This structural realignment, known as transposition or shift, is a fundamental mechanism recognized across both theoretical traditions. To examine how category transformations—such as changing nouns into verbs or altering word order—are conceptualized by both scholars, a direct comparison is provided in Table 7.

**Table 7.** Conceptual and Functional Features of Transposition Techniques in Both Frameworks

Aspect	Both Frameworks
Goal	Change grammatical category
Focus	Structural adaptation

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

#### Translation Example 1:

Source Text: He will soon return.

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

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

## Translation Example 2:

Source Text: After his arrival, ...

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

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

## 8. Recognized Translation ↔ Established Equivalent

Translator intervention is sometimes limited by institutional norms or traditional usage, leaving little room for individual creativity when standardized translations already exist. Newmark accounts for this relying on conventionality through recognized translation, which conceptually aligns with Molina and Albir’s established equivalent. The dynamic under which both models draw on conventional linguistic norms to reduce ambiguity is synthesized in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Conceptual and Functional Comparison between Recognized Translation and Established Equivalent Techniques

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

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

## Translation Example 1: (Established equivalent)

Source Text: United Nations

Target Text: *Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa*

Note: This is institutionalized.

## Translation Example 2: (Established equivalent)

Source Text: Time is money

Target Text: *Waktu adalah uang*

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

When languages share close syntactic structures or semantic fields, a word-for-word transfer can often yield a highly accurate and transparent translation. Newmark groups these direct structural translations under through-translation or literal translation, while Molina and

Albir distinguish them through the more granular categories of literal translation and calque. The overarching formal correspondences shared between these direct lexical transfer methods are contrasted in **Table 9**.

**Table 9.** Conceptual and Functional Comparison between Through-Translation/Literal Translation and Calque Techniques

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

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

Translation Example 1: (Literal)

Source Text: She is reading.

Target Text: *Dia sedang membaca*

Note: Structure preserved.

Translation Example 2: (Calque)

Source Text: Skyscraper

Target Text: *Pencakar langit*

Note: Each component is translated directly.

The overall similarity between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques lies in their shared commitment to achieving translation equivalence, mediating cultural differences, allowing structural and grammatical adaptation, ensuring acceptability for target-language readers, and prioritizing communicative effectiveness. These common principles suggest that both frameworks ultimately pursue the same objective of facilitating meaningful and functional communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The strongest similarities between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques arise from the fact that Molina and Albir often reclassify and refine procedures already identified by Newmark. As a result, many categories exhibit nearly identical operational functions, differing primarily in their theoretical orientation: Newmark adopts a procedure-oriented, problem-solving perspective, whereas Molina and Albir employ a text-oriented, operational approach. Consequently, many of their categories can be viewed as parallel concepts expressed through different theoretical frameworks rather than as distinct translation phenomena. Look at the following table to see the matrix of the shared principle between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina & Albir's translation techniques.

**Table 10.** Matrix of Shared Translation Principles and Goals between Newmark and Molina & Albir

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

## B. Similarities Based on the Orientation

The similarities between Newmark's procedures and Molina & Albir's techniques are substantial, as both seek to categorize translator interventions during meaning transfer. Their strongest overlaps occur in: a) borrowing/transference strategies, b) cultural adaptation, c) grammatical restructuring, d) meaning expansion, e) perspective shifts, and e) equivalence management. The principal similarity between Newmark's translation procedures and Molina and Albir's translation techniques lies in their treatment of comparable translation phenomena; however, they differ in theoretical orientation, with Newmark emphasizing problem-solving procedures and Molina and Albir focusing on product-oriented, micro-textual operations. In this respect, Molina and Albir's framework can be seen as a more systematic refinement of processes already recognized by Newmark.

The comparison between Newmark's Translation Procedures and Molina & Albir's Translation Techniques demonstrates that the two frameworks share a substantial theoretical and practical overlap because both theories attempt to explain how translators intervene during the transfer of meaning from source language (SL) to target language (TL). Although they employ different terminologies and analytical perspectives, both models were developed to address the same central problem of translation studies: how meaning can be transferred across languages and cultures when direct equivalence is insufficient. Consequently, many categories in both frameworks correspond closely because they respond to similar linguistic, cultural, and communicative challenges encountered during translation practice. Rather than functioning as competing models, these frameworks can be understood as complementary approaches that describe similar translation operations from different analytical angles.

### 1. Borrowing and Preservation of Foreignness

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

Example:

Source Text: We ate sushi at the restaurant.

Target Text: *Kami makan sushi di restoran.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Transference	Borrowing

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

Example 2: (Adaptation to Target Norms)

Source Text: Technology develops rapidly.

Target Text: *Teknologi berkembang pesat.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Naturalization	Naturalized Borrowing

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

## 2. Recognition of Cultural Adaptation

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

Example:

Source Text: He enjoys baseball.

Translation Result: *Dia suka bermain sepak bola.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Cultural Equivalent	Adaptation

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

## 3. Grammatical Restructuring

Both Newmark’s translation procedures and Molina and Albir’s translation techniques acknowledge that linguistic differences between grammatical systems may require structural modifications in translation, based on the shared principle that semantic meaning can be preserved even when grammatical forms are changed.

Example:

Source Text: After his arrival, the meeting started.

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

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

#### 4. Meaning Expansion

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

Example:

Source Text: Ramadan begins tomorrow.

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

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Paraphrase / Notes	Amplification

#### 5. Acceptance of Perspective Shifts

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

Example:

Source Text: You are going to be a father.

Target Text: *Kamu akan memiliki anak.*

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Modulation	Modulation

#### 6. Management of Equivalence

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

Example:

Source Text: They are as alike as two peas.

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

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

Classification:

Newmark	Molina & Albir
Synonymy / Cultural Equivalent	Established Equivalent

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

## DISCUSSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Peter Newmark's Translation Procedures (1988) and Molina and Albir's Translation Techniques (2002) exhibit substantial conceptual and functional convergence despite emerging from different theoretical traditions. The comparative analysis indicates that both frameworks describe essentially the same micro-textual translation operations for resolving linguistic and cultural problems during meaning transfer from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). Strong conceptual correspondences were identified across several core categories, including transference–borrowing, naturalization–naturalized borrowing, cultural equivalent–adaptation, descriptive equivalent–description, transposition–transposition, modulation–modulation, compensation–compensation, recognized translation–established equivalent, and through-translation/literal translation–literal translation/calque (Molina & Albir, 2002; Newmark, 1988). These correspondences demonstrate that the two frameworks pursue common functional objectives, namely preserving meaning, managing cultural differences, restructuring grammatical forms, and achieving communicative equivalence.

Although the two models share similar operational functions, they differ in their theoretical orientation. Newmark (1988) conceptualizes translation procedures as problem-solving operations employed during the translation process, whereas Molina and Albir (2002) define translation techniques as observable textual manifestations of translation choices in the final translated product. Consequently, the distinction between the two frameworks lies primarily in analytical perspective rather than like the translation phenomena they describe. This finding supports the view that the two models should be regarded as complementary rather than competing frameworks for explaining translator decision-making at the micro-textual level.

From a scholarly perspective, this study contributes to Translation Studies by clarifying the conceptual relationship between two of the discipline's most influential analytical models. By systematically mapping their correspondences, the study helps reduce terminological ambiguity surrounding the concepts of translation procedures and translation techniques, thereby providing a more coherent theoretical foundation for comparative translation research. The findings also offer pedagogical value by assisting translation educators in explaining how different theoretical traditions describe comparable translation operations, while providing researchers and practitioners with a clearer basis for selecting analytical frameworks appropriate to their research objectives (Chesterman, 2016; Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013).

Nevertheless, this study has several limitations. First, the analysis is confined to a theoretical comparison of the classifications proposed by Newmark (1988) and Molina and

Albir (2002) without empirical validation through translated texts or translator performance. Second, the comparison focuses exclusively on conceptual definitions and functional equivalence at the micro-textual level; therefore, broader issues such as translation strategies, methods, translator cognition, and sociocultural influences remain beyond the scope of the study. Future research could extend the present findings by applying both frameworks to parallel translation corpora, investigating their explanatory power across different text genres, or examining how translators employ these categories in authentic translation processes. Such investigations would further strengthen the empirical understanding of the relationship between translation procedures and translation techniques and contribute to the continuing development of translation theory and practice.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Revised ed.). John Benjamins.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Gambier, Y., & Van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 1). John Benjamins Publishing.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 47(4), 498–512. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Brill.
- Ordudari, M. (2007). Translation procedures, strategies and methods. *Translation Journal*, 11(3).
- Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. Routledge.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage Publications.
- Venuti, L. (2017). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Vinay, J.P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Trans.). John Benjamins Publishing Company.