



Universidad de Valladolid

FACULTAD de FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS
DEPARTAMENTO de FILOGÍA INGLESA
Grado en Estudios Ingleses

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

Translation Quality Assessment of Google Translate
and Microsoft Bing Translator

Beatriz Sánchez Martín

Tutor: Isabel Pizarro Sánchez

2016/2017

ABSTRACT

The assessment of quality has always been a controversial topic regarding on-line Machine Translation systems. Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator are two of the on-line Machine Translation systems most used nowadays. The aim of this paper is to assess the quality of their translations in order to present which Machine Translation system provides an inadequate quality level. Nevertheless, there is not still a unique methodology to assess the real quality of the translations accomplished by these tools. A combination of two processes is used to measure the translations: the error analysis method and the corpus-based method. Also, a specialized text and a non-specialized text are used in order to show their possible influence in the performances of the Machine Translation systems.

Key words: Machine Translation system, Google Translate, Microsoft Bing Translator, quality assessment, business translation, error analysis.

La evaluación de la calidad de los sistemas de Traducción Automática siempre ha sido un tema polémico. Google Translate y Microsoft Bing Translator son dos de los sistemas de Traducción Automática más utilizados hoy en día. El objetivo de este trabajo es evaluar la calidad de sus traducciones para presentar qué sistema de Traducción Automática produce un nivel de calidad inadecuado. Sin embargo, todavía no existe una única metodología capaz de evaluar la verdadera calidad de las traducciones llevadas a cabo por estas herramientas. Una combinación de dos métodos ha sido empleado para evaluar las traducciones: el análisis de errores y el enfoque basado en corpus. También, un texto especializado y un texto divulgativo han sido utilizados para enseñar su posible influencia en los resultados de los sistemas de Traducción Automática.

Palabras clave: sistema de Traducción Automática, Google Translate, Microsoft Bing Translator, evaluación de la calidad, análisis de errores, traducción económica.

Content Table

1. Introduction.....	6
2. Theoretical Framework.....	7
3. State of the Art.....	12
4. Methodology.....	13
5. Results.....	19
5.1. Specialized Text.....	20
5.1.1. Translation from Google Translate.....	20
5.1.2. Translation from Microsoft Bing Translator.....	24
5.2. Non-Specialized Text.....	27
5.2.1. Translation from Google Translate.....	27
5.2.2. Translation from Microsoft Bing Translator.....	29
6. Discussion.....	30
7. Conclusion.....	34
8. Bibliography.....	35

1. Introduction

Through centuries, translation has been used as a method to obtain information and knowledge from texts which are not written in the original language of that concrete society, or to communicate with other civilizations. The main reason is that language and society have always been connected with translation, being dependent one from the other. This dependence still happens at the present moment.

Language users live in a multilingual environment due to the coexistence of languages in the entire world. This is a common situation in various countries in which two or more languages are spoken and accepted in the community. However, not everybody has the same level of development and acquisition of a language. One language is always more dominant than the other due to the amount of language input received or the language usage.

Language users need a tool to translate the number of texts which are produced every day. It is not possible to think that someone is capable of translating all the languages spoken in the world. This is the main use of on-line machine translation (MT) systems - providing proper translations to the end users. The idea of breaking the barriers of language began around the decade of 1940. Warren Weaver and Andrew D. Booth are the precursors of this new model of translation. Leaving behind the Second World War, their objective was that people could have the possibility of communicating among them without the issue of knowing different languages. The first prototypes of MT were very basic and far from being perfect due to the complexities and features of the different languages. (Torres, 2015-2016)

Taking this first attempt as reference, the first researches started to be carried out. Nevertheless, with the publication of the ALPAC report in 1966, the view of MT changed. Researchers started to consider if MT systems could produce high quality translations. Gradually, this perspective changed with the creation of the first on-line MT systems. Most of the modern MT systems are created by private companies which continue with the investigations. (Ibid.)

Taking two of the on-line MT systems most used –Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator- into account, the hypothesis of this study is, which MT system, or maybe both, would produce more inadequate and imperfect translations of the four aspects

analyzed –terms, abbreviations and acronyms, linking words and passive structures. The other hypothesis of this study is that the four translations accomplished by Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator can be influenced by the level of specialization of the texts used. A fragment from *The Santander Group* website is taken as the specialized text, and a news report extracted from the English edition of the newspaper *El País –El País in English-* is taken as the non-specialized text. Therefore, the objective of this paper is aimed at the quality assessment of the translations performed by Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator of two texts belonging to different degrees of specialization –specialized and non-specialized- from English into Spanish.

This paper is divided into seven sections being this introduction the first one. Then several aspects and concepts concerning MT systems –quality, specialized and non-specialized texts, types of MT systems, translation quality assessment- are explained in the theoretical framework. Afterwards, previous studies and researches carried out regarding MT systems and quality assessment are presented in the third section. The next section deals with the methodology –the combination of the error analysis method and the corpus-based method. Once the translations of each text are accomplished by each MT system, the results obtained are presented and commented. Finally, the hypothesis and the results are discussed including a summary of the main goals.

2. Theoretical Framework

It might be assumed that an MT is capable of translating all type of texts with a good quality. Nevertheless, quality is one of the main issues that MT systems have presented during the past few years. Quality and MT systems have always been two elements that depend one from the other. A person that uses an MT wants to obtain an acceptable and correct translation of the original text. For this reason, assessing the quality of a translation can be difficult for an end user as Stejskal says in the following quote, “Obviously, such person is unable to independently assess the quality of the translation because even if the translated text reads beautifully, it could say something completely different than the original.” (2006: 18) This fact does not seem to be complicated for a professional translator, but the lack of a unique methodology for assessing the quality of translations provokes controversy. (Linna, 2013: 10; Martinez Mateo, 2014: 73; Koponen, 2010: 1)

Before explaining the different methodologies used to evaluate translations, the concept of quality has to be explained. It is necessary to comprehend what it is understood as quality. There is not a proper definition of quality because of the lack of agreement in “academic translation studies.” (Lommel, Burchardt and Uszkoreit, 2013: 1) In his article, Muzii tries to provide a basic definition of quality as the following, “[...] an integration of the features and characteristics that determine the extent to which output satisfies the customer’s needs.” (2006: 19) This definition might be a correct interpretation of the concept highlighting one of the main features that an MT system must take into account, the user’s needs.

Conversely, instead of providing a definition as Muzii does, the majority of the researchers have preferred to establish the basic steps or suggestions that someone assessing a translation should take into account. Martinez Mateo points out that there are three steps which should be followed by anyone in order to provide an appropriate evaluation. The first step highlights the importance of the evaluator’s knowledge about quality. The second and third steps deal with the selection of an accepted methodology and the performance of a proper analysis taking into account that methodology. (2014: 73) In addition to present a possible definition of quality, Muzii proposes two suggestions that should be taken into consideration regarding the assessment too. He establishes that quality is not perceived in the same way by everyone, and that quality is limited by certain requirements. (2006: 16) Those requirements are the demands requested by the possible customer in which he claims in detail the type of methodology that must be carried out during the assessment of the translation.

Other important element that influences to the performance of MT systems and it determines the quality of a translation is the degree of specialization of the text. Depending on the level, the process of translation is different. Specialized language is defined as “every language variety” (Bergenholtz and Tarp, 1995: 18) That variety depends on the level of specialization required in a certain communicative situation; in particular, the degree of specialization is higher in a technical text than in a textbook. (Ibid.) Specialized texts are addressed to a discourse community which is “a group of people who link up in order to pursue objectives” (Swales, 1990: 471) The members focus on a goal which maintains the communicative needs of the community. The translation of a specialized text can be problematic for an MT system because it requires having a great amount of information in terminology, in the use of abbreviations or

acronyms, in affixes based on Greek and Latin morphemes or in the use of the passive voice. (Nagy, 2014: 267; Lobato Patricio and Ruiz García, 2013: 334)

Non-specialized language is defined as the general language used by everybody in a communicative situation. This language can be also used in news reports which try to resemble “the description of general language” (Bergenholtz and Tarp, 1995: 18) Non-specialized texts are addressed to a speech community which is a group of people who share the same language and linguistic rules. The communicative needs are the group itself because all the members depend on each other to maintain the community. (Swales, 1990: 471) Non-specialized texts are seen less problematic for an MT in comparison with specialized texts. Non-specialized texts have also their own characteristics that MT systems should take into account, in particular, the use of the active voice, second person pronouns or subordinate structures. (Nagy, 2014: 267)

Once the two main issues that MT systems could face during the process of translation are explained -quality and the degree of specialization-, it is necessary to define the last concept, dealing with translation, which is translation quality assessment. Translation quality assessment is the term used to describe the different evaluation systems developed to assess the performance of an MT by the end user. (Koponen, 2010: 1) These methodologies are explained in the fourth section.

Before explaining the different types of MT systems and the aspects that have been analyzed about them, it is necessary to present a definition of what an MT system is. Nevertheless, there is still not a proper definition of this topic. The definition has changed due to the influence of new MT perspectives. For that reason, in order to have a general idea of what an MT is the following statement might be useful, “[...] the attempt to automate all, or part of the process of translating from one human language to another.” (Arnold et al, 1994: 1)

MT systems are composed by a monolingual and bilingual dictionary, and a parser -maintaining the assigned structure from the source text (ST) to the target text (TT). (Torres, 2015-2016) MT systems can be classified according to three methods of translation: direct translation, rule-based approach and corpus-based approach. The direct translation is considered the oldest and the most primitive one. It is to translate a ST word into its TT equivalent without a previous linguistic analysis (Arnold et al., 1994: 59) The rule-based approach takes the lexicon which contains the morphological,

syntactic and lexical information and the rules that constitute the syntactic knowledge to perform the translations. (Linna, 2013: 20) There are two types of rule-based approaches: interlingua MT system and transfer MT system. The interlingua MT system consists on "[...] analyzing input sentences into some abstract and ideally language independent meaning representation from which translations in several different languages can potentially be produced." (Arnold et al., 1994: 2) Nevertheless, it does not have been created an MT system capable of doing this yet. The transfer MT system puts forward three stages in order to accomplish a translation. The process of translation starts by:

[...] analyzing input sentences into a representation which still retains characteristics of the original, source language text. This is then input to a special component (called a transfer component) which produces a representation which has characteristics of the target (output) language, and from which a target sentence can be produced. (Ibid. 2)

The corpus-based approach takes as reference a compilation of STs and their translations. STs and TTs segments are aligned while their equivalent examples are extracted from a corpus. Afterwards, using statistical methods, those examples are matched in the translation. (Ibid. 191) There are two types of corpus-based approach: statistical approach and example-based approach.

Both of them follow the basic procedure previously mentioned. The statistical approach determines the likelihood of a ST segment aligned with a bilingual corpus. However, this approach can produce issues during the process of translation because "[...] it is heavily dependent on the availability of good quality bilingual or multilingual data in a very large proportions, something which is currently lacking for most languages." (Ibid. 193) In contrast, the example-based approach focuses on matching the closest example of a ST segment to its TT segment. The following quotation supports this explanation, "The basic idea is to collect a bilingual corpus of translation pairs and then use a best match algorithm to find the closest example to the source phrase in question." (Ibid. 188)

Once the main methods of translation are explained, it is necessary to present the difference between MT systems and computer-aided translation (CAT). CAT is "the use of computer software to assist a human translator in the translation process." (Gambier and van Doorslaer, 2010: 60) This contrasts with MT systems which perform a

translation that might be pre- or post-edited by a human translator. The most popular CAT tools are workbench –combination of all CAT tools-, translation memory system – classification of STs and TTs and comparison with new texts-, terminology management system –storage of terminological information in a termbase-, localization tools and corpora.

Focusing on the two on-line MT systems used in this paper, their basic features are explained. Google Translate is an application created by Google Inc. in order to translate words, sentences, texts and websites instantly. As it appears in the official webpage of Google Translate, the objective is to “connect with people, places and cultures across language barriers.” This MT system has a statistical approach using the following process:

When GT [Google Translate] generates a translation, it searches for patterns from hundreds of millions of documents to help make a decision on the best available translation. By identifying patterns in documents that have already been translated by human translators GT can make quick decisions as to what a suitable translation could be. (Linna, 2013: 22)

Google Translate collects thousands of STs and TTs in its translation memory system. For that reason, Google Translate is capable of translating into so many languages. There are over 100 languages being among them Bengali and Luxembourgish. Each of these languages is classified in several categories -type, talk, snap, see, write and offline- depending on the amount of data.

The second on-line MT system is Microsoft Bing Translator. Microsoft Bing Translator is an application or an “automatic translation service” from Microsoft Translator as it explains its website. Microsoft created this service in 2006, being expanded in 2014 with the introduction of speech translation. As Google Translate, this MT system has a statistical approach as it is announced in its website, “Microsoft Translator unites the power of statistical methods with linguistic information to produce models that generalize better and lead to more comprehensible translations.” Microsoft Bing Translator is capable of translating into more than 50 languages with expectations of expanding this range.

3. State of the Art

Being a recent subject and in constant development, the number of articles discussing MT systems have increased. As it has been mentioned, quality is an essential part of MT systems. For this reason, several researchers have focused on the importance of quality in translation.

Matti Linna (2013) focuses on comparing the quality of six translations from Finnish to English performed by three on-line MT systems -Google Translate, Microsoft Bing Translator and iTranslate4. Besides, Linna analyses the possible influence that an unusual language –Finnish- can have in the translations carried out by the MT systems. A similar investigation is carried out by Susan Lotz and Alta van Rensburg (2014). They focus on the quality of the translations that Google Translate does from Afrikaans to English. Lotz and van Rensburg compare the translations accomplished by this MT system during three years. Besides comparing the translations, Lotz and van Rensburg analyze one text type -slide show- using an error analysis method. The method focuses on the errors that can produce a wrong term, and on the errors that do not affect the meaning of the text. Thus, Lotz and van Rensburg want to confirm their results which show that Google Translate has improved through those years.

Rebecca Fiederer and Sharon O'Brien's article (2009) pays attention to the quality of MT systems too, although they compare MT translations with human translations from English to German. Doing this, Fiederer and O'Brien want to test if MT translations are more accepted by a group of evaluators than human translations. In addition to have a group of evaluators in order to assess the translations, three evaluation criteria are also included in this investigation -clarity, accuracy and style.

These studies present how quality translation is assessed from three different perspectives. Linna's article shows the similarities and the differences that tree on-line MT systems can have in terms of quality. However, Linna does not pay attention to the influence that texts with different levels of specialization can have in MT systems as it is done in this paper. Fiederer and O'Brien compare the work and the knowledge of a human translator with the quality and the data of an MT. The third view shown in Lotz and van Rensburg's article presents the evolution and development of Google Translate during a period of time. This perspective allows seeing how Google Translate improves

in terms of data. It is necessary to point out that neither of the studies has focused in translations from English to Spanish as it is shown in this paper.

Also the articles written by Julia Lobato Patricio and Carlos Ruiz García (2013), and Imola Katalin Nagy (2014) present the terminological, morphological and syntactical problems that specialized and non-specialized texts can generally produce. Lobato Patricio and Ruiz García explain the possible problems that a translator can have translating economic texts. Despite the fact that this article focuses on French to Spanish translations, the article gives a wide range of solutions to avoid certain issues, in particular, acronyms, metaphors and polysemy. Nagy's article presents a similar topic, describing specialized and non-specialized languages in general. She explains what a specialized and a non-specialized language is and the main features of each of them. She thinks that a specialized language should have a specific linguistic code – clear, precise and unambiguous-, whereas a non-specialized language is the general language spoken by everyone.

4. Methodology

This study carries out the assessment of texts written in English and translated into Spanish because in all the translation courses, which I have assisted at, the translation from English into Spanish was taught. Besides, my mother tongue is Spanish, making easier the understanding and the identification of errors or possible omissions in the translations.

Two STs and their certified translations have been selected according to their degree of specialization –specialized and non-specialized. Both STs belong to the same field - economy- and they deal with topics that are directly affecting this country nowadays: the crisis, the budget deficit and the economic growth. As I am familiarized with these topics, I have decided to take advantage of this knowledge in order to assess the translations.

The fragment from *The Santander Group* and the news report from *El País in English* were published in a period of less than a year. Both fragments are available on their respective websites. Besides, the number of words is similar in both texts: *The Santander Group*'s fragment has 654 words and the news report has 468 words.

The translations of each text used to support the assessment and the judgment of the translations performed by the MT systems are extracted from the same websites that the STs. They are validated by an economic expert and native speaker. The translations have been considered proper and correct translations of the STs. The term certified translation would be used to make reference to the official translations. The number of words in both translations is longer than in the STs because of the use of Spanish.

The methods which assess translation quality differ depending on the aspect or element that the evaluator wants to analyze. Jiri Stejskal (2006) divides translation quality assessment in three areas: provider –the translator-, process –the product of the translation- and product -the translation. Stejskal explains that these three areas have to be taken into account when the quality of the translation is assessed. Translation companies and translators must have certifications in order to prove the quality of their translations. These certifications are normally named standards or metrics and they define the processes carried out to obtain a proper translation. The main objective of metrics is to present the end user a good assessment of the translation. Through the years, new metrics or standards have been created or those which already existed have been developed.

SAE J2450 is a quality metric developed to assess any type of specialized language. At the beginning, it was created to assess only “automotive service information” (SAE J2450, 2001: 2), but now it can be applied to any other specialized language. Besides, this metric “[...] may be applied regardless of the source language or the method of translation (i.e., human translation, computer assisted translation or machine translation).” (Ibid.) This metric can be applied to the methodology use to assess the quality of an MT system.

SAE J2450 assesses the errors that might be found in translations. These errors are tagged linguistically in seven categories: wrong term, syntactic error, omission, word structure or agreement error, misspelling, punctuation error and miscellaneous error. SAE J2450 does not pay attention to the style, tone and register of a translation because it does not consider these aspects as important as linguistic errors. (Ibid. 3) Moreover, this metric gives a guideline to the evaluators in order to avoid subjectivity. Subjectivity is one of the main issues in translation quality assessment. (Martínez Mateo, 2014: 74; Linna, 2013: 41; Muzii, 2006: 20) SAE J2450 does not want that an evaluator is

influenced by anything, provoking a lack of objectivity in the assessment of a translation. For this reason, evaluators have to follow five steps in order to assess a translation. Once the errors are identified by the evaluator, he has to indicate if the errors are serious or minor. In this case, it is necessary that the evaluator gives a judgment call about the level of seriousness of the error. SAE J2450 tries to justify this in the following passage, “This again is completely arbitrary, but it seems the safer alternative since safety may be an issue in a service text.” (2001: 3)

Another significant metric is LISA QA Model (Localization Industry Standards Association Quality Assessment) which is used in localization projects. LISA is designed from “[...] customizable set of templates, forms, and reports” (Stejskal, 2006: 21) It establishes seven error categories –mistranslation, accuracy, terminology, language, style, country and consistency- in order to tag them in a translation. LISA also has a guideline for the evaluators and “[...] a template for marking the translation as Pass or Fail” (Martínez Mateo, 2014: 77) Therefore, LISA shares features with SAE J2450 –error categories, the level of seriousness of an error and a guideline for translators-, showing that metrics are normally similar, although they differ in the type of specialized language that they assess.

The last metric described is TAUS (Translation Automation User Society) Dynamic Quality Evaluation Model. TAUS is created from “[...] practices, reports, templates and a number of tools to evaluate translations made both by human translators and MT engines.”(Görög, 2014: 445) TAUS applies an error typology –language, terminology, accuracy and style-, focusing on “[...] the content type, the purpose of the content and its audience.” (Ibid.) The assessment of the quality is done through three parameters as “Utility, Time and Sentiment (UTS)” (Ibid. 446) Utility focuses on the functionality of a translation; Time, the period necessary to carry out a translation; and Sentiment, the end user’s opinion. Then TAUS does not only focus on linguistics otherwise in the process of translation too. In order to use TAUS, it is necessary to create an account in its website. Once you have a user name, you can upload your translation in order to assess its quality. However, as Martínez Mateo declares, TAUS leaves aside certain types of texts, in particular, legal or economic ones. (2014: 84) TAUS analyzes only texts that match with UTS rating, principally, marketing material or social media.

Other option of assessing the quality of translations is a corpus-based methodology. This method is developed in Rosa Rabadán, Belén Labrador and Noelia Ramón García's article (2009). The objective of their article is to analyze three problematic areas in English into Spanish translations: quantifiers, modifiers of nouns and the translation of the English Past Simple form. Rabadán, Labrador and Ramón want to show the differences between both languages. In order to see and compare the translations, Rabadán, Labrador and Ramón have used two monolingual corpora and a parallel corpus. The reason for applying a corpus-based methodology is to use corpora in researches, which is their main goal. (2009: 306) The English monolingual corpus is the Cobuild's Bank of English, whereas the Spanish monolingual corpus is CREA (Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual). The parallel corpus is compiled by the University of León and its name is P-ACTRES.

Rabadán, Labrador and Ramón's methodology is divided in several steps. Once the corpora have been selected, an interlinguistic contrastive analysis is carried out by choosing the elements that are going to be analyzed depending on the case study. The analysis is performed in the monolingual corpora and later in the parallel corpus. Afterwards, a cross-linguistic translation analysis is performed by comparing the terms from the Spanish corpus -CREA- and the parallel corpus -P-ACTRES. Lastly, an intralinguistic analysis is carried out with the results obtained. These analyses present the possible problems found due to the influence of one language to the other, or a particular norm of translation.

Noelia Ramón García (2004) presents a similar aim in her article about the analysis of nouns in English and Spanish texts. Ramón's purpose is to find translation patterns that would help to translate English nouns into Spanish. She uses two monolingual corpora which are the same ones used in the previous article -CREA and Cobuild's Bank of English. The methodology of the article is quite similar to the preceding one. Ramón selects ten common nouns and she divides them into three categories: human nouns, inanimate concrete nouns and abstract nouns. Afterwards, Ramón compares and analyzes the results in order to obtain the translation patterns.

Taking as reference the methods previously mentioned, I have decided to include in my methodology elements and aspects from the error typology described in the metrics, and from the corpus-based analysis presented in the preceding articles. Both methodologies

have been already used in several articles related with the translation quality assessment, obtaining good and reliable results. The specialized and non-specialized texts are analyzed taking into account the same elements. These aspects are acronyms and abbreviations, terms or complex terms -lexical units of a language with a specialized value-, linking words and passive structures.

The error categories selected for this study have been taken from SAE J2450. SAE J2450 defines each of the error categories in a clear way in order to avoid issues with the different classifications. The definitions provided by SAE J2450 are part of the methodology too because it is necessary to have a definition of each of the error categories in order to understand the classification. Nevertheless, not all the error categories have been chosen for this methodology. Only, it has been selected those errors which are relevant for the analysis. The error categories selected are wrong term, syntactic error, omission and word structure or agreement error.

Acronyms, abbreviations and terms are matched with the wrong term category. A wrong term is any word that “Is inconsistent with other translations of the source language term in the same document or type of document unless the context for the source language term justifies the use of a different target language term,” and that “Denotes a concept in the target language that is clearly and significantly different from the concept denoted by the source language term.” (SAE J2450, 2001: 5)

Linking words are classified in conjunctions and sentence adverbials. Conjunctions connect two clauses in the same sentence, whereas sentence adverbials connect a sentence with another sentence or the whole text. Sentence adverbials can have different positions in the sentence. For this reason, linking words are matched with syntactic error. A syntactic error is defined like “A source term [that] is assigned the wrong part of speech in its target language counterpart.” and “ The target language words are correct, but in the wrong linear order according to the syntactic rules of the target language.” (Ibid. 6)

The passive structures cannot be matched with any of the error categories because they are analyzed from a stylistic perspective. As it has been mentioned, SAE J2450 does not focus on stylistic elements because it does not consider them significant. Although this error is not considered important in the majority of the metrics, I think that it is

necessary to analyze it. A translation has to sound as natural as possible for the end user and this is not possible if this aspect is not evaluated.

The last two error categories are omission and word structure. Omission has been selected in case of any term “[...] has been deleted from the target language” (SAE J2450, 2001: 7) Word structure or agreement error has been included in case of “An error of incorrect word structure has occurred if an otherwise correct target language word (or term) is expressed in an incorrect morphological form,” (Ibid.) An example of an incorrect morphological form would be a lack of agreement in gender and number.

Basically, the error categories selected and the elements assessed in each category are the following:

- Wrong term is matched with acronyms, abbreviations, and terms or complex terms.
- Syntactic error is matched with linking words.
- Omission.
- Word structure or agreement error.

Focusing on the corpus-based method, Rabadán, Labrador and Ramón present three case studies in which this method is applied. These researchers focus on three specific aspects -quantifiers, modifiers of nouns and the English Past Simple form- with three corpora available on the Internet. The fact of having an amount of texts collected in different corpora “[...] has become an essential factor in contrastive studies over the past few years.” (Ramón, 2004: 173) This is the main reason for using a corpus as part of the methodology because the compiled texts validate that the information examined is produced by native speakers. The terms appeared in the corpus are grammatically and linguistically accepted.

For the methodology applied in this paper, the Spanish monolingual corpus CREA has been taken as reference corpus to support the error analysis categories. This means that the corpus is used when it is necessary to confirm that a certain word is properly translated into Spanish. CREA can be only used to examine the non-specialized terms because this corpus collects texts from books, newspapers and magazines. For that reason, a specialized database has been used to examine the specialized terms: IATE (Inter-Active Terminology for Europe). It is a terminological database created by the

European Union. As it is defined in its webpage, IATE is built from “[...] the collection, dissemination and shared management of EU-specific terminology.” The book *Diferencias de Usos Gramaticales entre el Español y el Inglés* has been used to evaluate the stylistic aspects –passive structures- of the translations. This book shows the possible translations that passive structures can have in Spanish.

5. Results

It is necessary to point out that this paper presents a case study in which four aspects from each language are analyzed. All the aspects are extracted manually from each fragment and, afterwards, they are compared with the translations accomplished by each MT system and with the certified translation of that text.

The terms or complex terms have been evaluated according to their order of appearance in the STs. In order to identify correctly the economic terms, an economic expert has helped me to select the appropriate terms. There are terminological tools which help to the extraction of terms, but they do not have been used in this case study because of the short extension of the STs.

The acronyms and abbreviations have been evaluated according to their order of appearance too. The linking words are analyzed according to their position in the sentence. Their meaning has also been taken into account in case of being used as conjunctions instead of sentence adverbials.

Lastly, the passive structures are selected according to the basic structure of the English passive form. Afterwards, those structures are analyzed and compared taking into consideration the several forms that the passive can have in Spanish. Paying attention to the agreement between the verb and the subject, the variety of passive forms in Spanish is of great importance to assess the style.

In order to present clearly the results, two images with the copies of each ST, each of the translations from Google Translate, each of the translations from Microsoft Bing Translator and each certified translation are attached to the end of this paper. In the two images, there is a caption in which is explained how the four aspects are marked.

5.1. Specialized text: Financial report 2015 (January-March)

5.1.1. Translation from Google Translate

The terms or complex terms analyzed in the specialized text are *economic environment, developed countries, emerging markets, euro zone, emerging economies, growth rate, Federal Reserve, underlying inflation, interest rate, jobless rate, upper target range, structural reforms, benchmark rate, central bank, key interest rate, bond-buying programme, real disposable incomes, domestic demand, private consumption, net job creation, household incomes* and *economic fundamentals*. Afterwards, the terms are compared with the translation performed by Google Translate and the certified translation, showing that *economic environment, euro zone, emerging economies, Federal Reserve, underlying inflation, jobless rate, structural reforms, benchmark rate, central bank, domestic demand, private consumption, net job creation* and *economic fundamentals* are correctly translated. They are considered correct because the terms and their equivalents in the certified translation are consistent and both denote the same concept.

Developed countries, emerging markets, growth rate, interest rate, upper target rate, key interest rate, bond-buying programme, real disposable incomes and *household incomes* are classified as wrong terms. They are considered wrong terms because the terms are different to their equivalents in the certified translation due to literal translations and the concepts denoted are not the same.

The term *developed countries* –in a more favourable economic environment in developed countries- is translated as *países desarrollados*–en el primer trimestre en un entorno económico más favorable en los países desarrollados. By contrast, the certified translation translates the term as *economía avanzada* –en un entorno económico más favorable en las economías avanzadas. Both terms might be consistent, but *país desarrollado* does not denote the same meaning that *economía avanzada*. *Economía avanzada* is the term used by the IMF to make reference to those areas or continents which have a high economic level, whereas *país desarrollado* is used to refer a country with a high economic level.

The term *emerging markets* presents a similar problem. In the translation, *emerging markets* –in many of the emerging markets where it operates- is translated as *mercados emergentes* –en muchos de los mercados emergentes en los que opera-, but in the certified translation is translated as *economías emergentes* –en buena parte de las economías emergentes. The main problem is that *mercados emergentes* does not denote the same concept. *Mercado emergente* refers to a market that is starting to develop, whereas *economía emergente* makes reference to a country that is starting to develop.

The term *interest rate* is repeated twice in the ST. In the first appearance, *interest rate* is translated correctly because it denotes the same concept in the ST, the translation and the certified translation. The certified translation translates the term as *tipos de interés* which is accepted as correct because it is a synonym of *tasas de interés*. The last appearance combines a wrong term error and a word structure or agreement error. The term appears in a clause with a subject, a verb and an object: *The central bank lowered interest rates*. In the translation, the whole clause is considered by Google Translate a complex term; consequently, it provokes a lack of agreement among the subject, the verb and the object: *Las tasas del banco central rebajado de interés*. As a consequence, this translation does not denote the correct meaning of *interest rate*.

The term *growth rate* –Poland kept up a satisfactory growth rate- is translated as *tasa de crecimiento* –Polonia mantienen una tasa de crecimiento satisfactoria-, but in the certified translation is translated as *ritmo de crecimiento* –Polonia mantiene un ritmo de crecimiento satisfactorio. The term *tasa de crecimiento* is correct according to the IATE database. Nevertheless, this term is not valid in this context because the text does not make reference to any rate otherwise it refers to a progressive development of the country in terms of a constant growth.

The translation of the complex term *upper target range* –These hikes aim to contain inflation, which was 8.1% in March, above the upper target range- has nothing to do with the term used in the certified translation. Google Translate translates *upper target range* as *rango meta superior* –Estas alzas apuntan a contener una inflación, que fue del 8,1% en marzo, por encima del rango meta superior. It is a wrong term because the term is not consistent with the translation of the certified translation –Estas subidas tienen como objetivo contener la inflación, que se situó en marzo en el 8,1%, excediendo el límite superior de la banda objetivo. Google Translate performs a literal translation.

Key interest rate –the central bank to keep its key interest rate at 3%- is translated as *tasa de interés clave* –al banco central para mantener su tasa de interés clave en un 3%. The certified translation translates the term as *tasa de interés oficial* –el banco central mantenga la tasa de interés oficial en el 3%. As Google Translate does not identify the complex term, it carries out a literal translation. *Key* is translated from one side and *interest rate* on the other side.

The terms *programa de compra de bonos* –Esto llevó al BCE para aprobar un programa de compra de bonos- and *programa de compra de deuda* –Esto impulsó al BCE a aprobar un programa de compra de deuda- might denote the same concept. Nevertheless, I consider the term translated by Google Translate -programa de compra de bonos- a wrong term. The main difference between both terms is the meaning of the words *bonos* and *deuda*. The word *deuda* refers to the debts issued by a government, but *bonos* refers to a fixed-income security. Despite of both words denote similar concepts and they are sometimes exchange; there is a slight difference in their meaning.

The complex term *real disposable incomes* –spurred by solid fundamentals and real disposable incomes- is translated as *ingresos reales disponibles* –impulsado por sólidos fundamentales y los ingresos reales disponibles-, and the certified translation translates it as *renta disponible real* –apoyado en la solidez interna, y al impulso de la renta disponible real. The term produced by Google Translate is completely wrong because it performs a literal translation of the term.

The last wrong term is *household incomes* –an increase in household incomes, inflation at 0%. It is translated by Google Translate as *ingresos familiares* –un aumento de los ingresos familiares, la inflación en el 0%- and not as *renta familiar* –en un entorno de aumento de la renta familiar, inflación en el 0%- as the certified translation does. *Ingresos familiares* might be accepted as a correct term, but it cannot be accepted in this specialized text. Specialized texts use terms with a high level of specialization and those terms must be translated with that level. The degree has to be the same in the ST and in the TT.

The acronyms and abbreviations analyzed are *US*, *UK*, *GDP*, *b.p.*, *Banxico* and *ECB*; afterwards, they are compared with the translation accomplished by Google Translate and the certified translation. *US*, *UK*, *GDP*, *Banxico* and *ECB* are properly translated. They are considered correct because the acronyms and abbreviations, and their

equivalents in the certified translation are consistent, denoting the same concept. The only one wrong is *b.p.* –after rising 50 b.p. in March, 100 b.p., since the end of 2014 and 200 b.p. in 12 months. It is translated as *p.e.* –después de haber aumentado un 50 p.e. en marzo, 100 p.e. desde finales de 2014 y 200 p.e. en 12 meses- in the three appearances of the acronym. The correct translation is *p.b.* which means *puntos básicos* –tras subir 50 puntos básico en marzo. Con ello, aumenta 100 p.b. en 2015 y 200 p.b. en doce meses.

The linking words analyzed are *and*, *also*, *on the other hand*, *although*, *but*, *after*, *since*, and *once again*. Afterwards, they are compared with the translation performed by Google Translate and the certified translation. The certified translation omits or changes the position of several linking words. For example, in the sentence: *the economy secured its recovery in the fourth quarter and grew 2.1% in the whole of 2014*, the conjunction *and* is omitted in the certified translation: *la economía afianzó en el cuarto trimestre su proceso de recuperación, alcanzando un crecimiento en el conjunto del año del 2,1%*. Those linking words which do not appear in the certified translation, but they denote the correct concept and they are in the proper position are accepted as correct.

All the linking words are properly translated except for the sentence adverbial *once again* –The evolution of inflation once again cooled expectations. The certified translation translates it as a verb, *ha vuelto* –La evolución de los precios ha vuelto a enfriar las expectativas. Normally, *again* is translated as *volver a* when it is next to a verb, so this is not an unusual translation of the sentence adverbial. Despite this fact, in the translation performed by Google Translate, *once again* is translated as *una vez* –La evolución de la inflación una vez enfriado las expectativas- which is not the correct translation of the sentence adverbial.

The passive structures analyzed are *hit by*, *affected by*, *backed by*, *spurred by*, *shown by*, *to be supported by* and *is estimated*. Afterwards, they are compared with the translation performed by Google Translate and the certified translation. *Hit by* –Among the emerging economies growth in Brazil, hit by adjustment policies-, *affected by* –Inflation, affected by the fall in oil prices-, and *is estimated* –the cycle cuts is estimated to have ended- are translated as in the certified translation. These are the translations performed by Google Translate: *Entre el crecimiento entre las economías emergentes de Brasil,*

afectada por las políticas de ajuste; La inflación, afectada por la caída de los precios del petróleo; and el ciclo de los recortes se estima que ha terminado.

Backed by –2016 remained, backed by more investment- and *spurred by* –the strong contribution of consumption, spurred by solid fundamentals-, which appears twice, are translated by Google Translate according to the basic structure of the passive form in Spanish: verb ‘to be’, participle and ‘by’. For instance, *2016 se mantuvo, respaldada por más de inversión* and *la fuerte contribución del consumo, impulsado por sólidos fundamentales.*

Shown by –the net job creation shown by the rise- is translated by Google Translate as *se muestra por* –la creación neta de empleo se muestra por el aumento. This sentence is formed by ‘se’ and the verb in third person of singular. The ‘se’ does not have an impersonal use in this case. *To be supported by* –a trend which will continue to be supported by domestic demand- is translated by Google Translate with a transposition by changing the verb into a noun –una tendencia que continuará con el apoyo de la demanda interna. As a result, there is not passive form in the translation.

5.1.2. Translation from Microsoft Bing Translator

The complex terms or terms analyzed are the same ones as in Google Translate. Afterwards, the terms are compared with the translation performed by Microsoft Bing Translator and the certified translation. *Developed countries, emerging markets, growth rate, upper target range, key interest rate, real disposable incomes* and *household incomes* are considered wrong terms because the terms are different to their equivalents in the certified translation due to literal translations and the concepts denoted are not the same.

Microsoft Bing Translator has similar problems with the translation of the terms *developed countries* -in a more favourable economic environment in developed countries- and *emerging markets* -in many of the emerging markets where it operates. The terms provided by the MT system do not denote the same concepts as the terms in the certified translation. *Developed countries* is translated by Microsoft Bing Translator as *en un entorno económico más favorable en los países desarrollados*; and *emerging markets* is translated as *en muchos de los mercados emergentes donde opera.*

Growth rate –Poland kept up a satisfactory growth rate- is translated as *tasa de crecimiento* –Polonia mantuvo una tasa de crecimiento satisfactoria-, but in the certified translation is translated as *ritmo de crecimiento* –Polonia mantiene un ritmo de crecimiento satisfactorio. The term *tasa de crecimiento* is correct according to the IATE database. Nevertheless, this term is not valid in this context because the text does not make reference to any rate otherwise it refers to a progressive development of the country in terms of a constant growth.

Upper target range -These hikes aim to contain inflation, which was 8.1% in March, above the upper target range- is translated as *rango superior de la blanco* –Estas caminatas pretenden contener la inflación, que fue de 8,1% en marzo, por encima del rango superior de la blanco. The certified translation translates this term as *límite superior de la banda objetivo* -Estas subidas tienen como objetivo contener la inflación, que se situó en marzo en el 8,1%, excediendo el límite superior de la banda objetivo. The term is wrong because Microsoft Bing Translator performs a literal translation.

Key interest rate –the central bank to keep its key interest rate at 3%- is translated as *tasa clave de interés* –al banco central mantener su tasa clave de interés a 3%. The certified translation translates the term as *tasa de interés oficial* –el banco central mantenga la tasa de interés oficial en el 3%. Microsoft Bing Translator does not identify the term and it carries out a literal translation.

Real disposable incomes -spurred by solid fundamentals and real disposable incomes- is translated as *reales ingresos* –estimulado por fundamentos sólidos y reales ingresos- instead of *renta disponible real* -apoyado en la solidez interna, y al impulso de la renta disponible real. Microsoft Bing Translator does not translate one of the elements of the term –disposable-, presenting a literal translation.

Household incomes -an increase in household incomes, inflation at 0%- is translated as *ingresos de los hogares* –un aumento de ingresos de los hogares, la inflación en el 0%. The certified translation translates the term as *renta familiar* -en un entorno de aumento de la renta familiar, inflación en el 0%. *Ingresos de los hogares* might be accepted as a correct term, but it cannot be accepted in this specialized text. Specialized texts use terms with a high level of specialization and those terms must be translated with that level. The degree has to be the same in the ST and in the TT.

Paying attention to the acronyms and abbreviations, *US, UK, GDP, Banxico* and *ECB* are properly translated, denoting the same concepts that their equivalents. The abbreviation *b.p.* is not translated by Microsoft Bing Translator -after rising 50 b.p. in March, 100 b.p., since the end of 2014 and 200 b.p. in 12 months. Microsoft Bing Translator has maintained the English form of the abbreviation -después de los 50 levantamiento b.p. en marzo de 100 BP desde el final de 2014 y 200 b.p. en 12 meses. Each of the appearances is presented in a different way. The second one is in capital letters without punctuation, and the other two are without capital letters and with the proper punctuation.

The linking words are the same ones as in Google Translate. *And, also, on the other hand, although, but, after, and since* are correctly translated. As it has been shown in Google Translate, the certified translation omits or changes linking words. Those linking words which do not appear in the certified translation, but they denote the appropriate concept and they are in the proper position are accepted as correct.

Once again -The evolution of inflation once again cooled expectations - is translated by the certified translation as a verb, *ha vuelto* -La evolución de los precios ha vuelto a enfriar las expectativas. Microsoft Bing Translator translates it as *una vez más* -La evolución de la inflación refrigerado una vez más por las expectativas- which is a correct translation of the linking word despite of the transposition.

The passive structures analyzed are the same ones as in Google Translate. Afterwards, they are compared with the translation performed by Microsoft Bing Translator and the certified translation. *Hit by* -Among the emerging economies growth in Brazil, hit by adjustment policies-, *affected by* -Inflation, affected by the fall in oil prices, was around 0%-, *spurred by* -the strong contribution of consumption, spurred by solid fundamentals- and *is estimated* -the cycle cuts is estimated to have ended- are translated as in the certified translation. These are the translations carried out by Microsoft Bing Translator: *Entre las economías emergentes el crecimiento en Brasil, golpeado por las políticas de ajuste; Afectada por la caída en los precios del petróleo, la inflación rondaba el 0%; la fuerte contribución del consumo, estimulado por fundamentos sólidos; and, se estima que el ciclo de recortes han terminado.*

Backed by –2016 remained, backed by more investment- is translated in the active voice with the third person of singular in the certified translation, whereas Microsoft Bing Translator translates it in the basic structure of the Spanish passive form –2016, respaldado por más inversión. *To be supported by* -a trend which will continue to be supported by domestic demand- is translated literally by Microsoft Bing Translator. There is a lack of agreement between the verb and the subject, for example, *una tendencia que continuará a ser apoyada por la demanda interna*. *Shown by* -the net job creation shown by the rise- is completely omitted by the MT system –la creación neta de empleo por el aumento.

5.2. Non-specialized text: Spanish economy set to grow 3.1% this year, but will fail to 2.3% in 2017.

5.2.1. Translation from Google Translate

The terms or complex terms analyzed in the non-specialized text are *fiscal policy*, *Fitch rating agency*, *household spending*, *labor market*, *expansive fiscal policy*, *internal imbalances*, *European Central Bank*, *economic policies*, *deficit target*, *economic cycle*, *public accounts*, *budget goal* and *European Union*. Afterwards, the terms are compared with the translation performed by Google Translate, showing that *fiscal policy*, *Fitch rating agency*, *household spending*, *labor market*, *expansive fiscal policy*, *internal imbalances*, *European Central Bank*, *economic policies*, *deficit target*, *economic cycle*, *public accounts* and *European Union* are correctly translated. They are considered correct because the terms and their equivalents in the certified translation are consistent and both denote the same concept.

Budget goal is the only one classified as wrong term –will exceed the budget goal of 3.1%. This term is translated as *presupuesto objetivo* –superará el presupuesto objetivo del 3,1%- and not as *objetivo presupuestario* as it appears in the certified translation –superaría el objetivo presupuestario fijado en el 3,1%. Google Translate does not identify correctly the term and the MT translates it as two independent words.

A similar situation takes place with the term *fiscal policy*, appearing three times in the ST. In the first and third appearances, the term is correctly translated because it is consistent with its equivalents –*política fiscal*. In the second appearance, the certified translation translates this term as *materia fiscal*. At first sight, both terms seem to be different, but both denote the same concept, being used as synonyms. Both terms make reference to taxation, although *materia fiscal* pays more attention in that aspect.

Another confusing term is *household spending* –Household spending will continue to drive growth. Google Translate translates this term as *gasto de los hogares* –gasto de los hogares seguirá impulsando el crecimiento-, whereas the certified translation translates it as *consumo de los hogares* –El consumo de los hogares va a seguir siendo. *Gasto de los hogares* could be considered a wrong term, but the term denotes the same concept as *consumo de los hogares*.

The acronyms and abbreviations analyzed are *Brexit*, *OECD*, *IMF*, *UK*, *EU* and *GDP*; afterwards, they are compared with the translation performed by Google Translate and the certified translation. All are correctly translated because the acronyms and abbreviations, and their equivalents in the certified translation are consistent, denoting the same concept. *EU* is translated by Google Translate as *UE*; and, in the certified translation, as *Bruselas*. This is another form for translating European Union, by using the place where the majority of the European institutions are. *Brexit* does not have an equivalent in Spanish otherwise the English term is used by itself.

The linking words analyzed are *but*, *and*, *while*, *at the same time*, *still*, *although*, and *as soon as possible*. Afterwards, they are compared with the translation performed by Google Translate and the certified translation. All the linking words are correctly translated. The certified translation omits or changes several linking words; namely, in the sentence: *the OECD's, which predicts 2.8%, while the government's figure is 2.9%*, the conjunction *while* is omitted in the certified translation: *La OCDE augura un 2,8%. Las predicciones oficiales del gobierno*. Those linking words which do not appear in the certified translation, but they denote the correct concept and they are in the proper position are accepted as correct.

The passive structures analyzed are *fed by*, *has not been fined by*, *to be implemented*, *is expected* and *will be reduced*. Afterwards, they are compared with the translation performed by Google Translate and the certified translation. *Fed by* –says the BBVA,

fed in part by “improvements-, *to be implemented* –the policies to be implemented in the coming years- and *has not been fined by* –the country has not been fined by the EU- are translated according to the basic structure of the passive form in Spanish: verb ‘to be’, participle and ‘by’. For example, *según el BBVA, alimentado en parte por “mejoras; las políticas a implementar en los próximos años* and *el país no ha sido multada por la UE.*

Will be reduced by appears twice in the ST. In the first appearance, *will be reduced by* – The deficit for 2016 will be reduced by just 0.6 percentage points- is translated with ‘se’ and the verb in third person of singular –El déficit para el 2016 se reducirá a tan solo 0,6 puntos porcentuales-, maintaining the future tense in the translation and in the certified translation. The second appearance –the deficit will only be reduced to 3.6%- is translated with the same structure, but it does not maintain the future tense otherwise it is in present tense –el déficit solo se redujo al 3,6%. *Is expected* –it is expected that the economic cycle- is translated with the impersonal form of ‘se’ and the verb in third person of singular –se espera que el ciclo económico.

5.2.2 Translation from Microsoft Bing Translator

The complex terms or terms analyzed are the same ones as in Google Translate. Afterwards, the terms are compared with the translation performed by Microsoft Bing Translator and the certified translation. *Household spending* and *budget goal* are considered wrong terms because the terms are different to their equivalents in the certified translation due to literal translations and the concepts denoted are not the same.

Household spending -Household spending will continue to drive growth- is translated as *hogar el gasto* –Hogar el gasto para impulsar el crecimiento. Microsoft Bing Translator exchanges the positions of the noun and the pre-modifier. As consequence, the term does not denote the right meaning. *Budget goal* -will exceed the budget goal of 3.1%- is translated as *meta del presupuesto* –superará la meta del presupuesto de 3,1%. Microsoft Bing Translator presents a mistranslation of *goal*, by translating it with other meaning. The MT denotes the concept of marking the end of a competition instead of achieving an objective.

The acronyms and abbreviations analyzed are properly translated, *Brexit*, *OECD*, *IMF*, *EU* and *GDP*. They denote the same concepts as their equivalents. The abbreviation *Brexit*, which might be the most problematic one, maintains the English term. The linking words are the same ones as in Google Translate. *But*, *and*, *while*, *at the same time*, *still*, *although*, and *as soon as possible* are translated correctly. As it has been shown in Google Translate, the certified translation omits or changes linking words. Those linking words which do not appear in the certified translation, but they denote the correct meaning and position are accepted as correct.

The passive structures analyzed are the same ones as in Google Translate. Afterwards, they are compared with the translation performed by Microsoft Bing Translator and the certified translation. *Fed by* -says the BBVA, fed in part by “improvements-, *will be reduced by*, in its two forms, -The deficit for 2016 will be reduced by just 0.6 percentage points and the deficit will only be reduced to 3.6%, and the deficit will be only reduced to 3,6%-, and *is expected* -it is expected that the economic cycle- are translated as in the certified translation. These are the translations accomplished by Microsoft Bing Translator: *dice el BBVA, alimentado en parte por “mejoras; El déficit para el 2016 se reducirá a sólo 0,6 puntos porcentuales and el déficit se reducirá solo al 3,6%; and, el déficit se reducirá solo al 3,6%; and, se espera que el ciclo económico.*

Has not been fined by is translated according to the basic structure of the passive form in Spanish: verb ‘to be’, participle and ‘by’. Namely, *the country has not been fined by the EU* and *el país no ha sido multado por la UE*. *To be implemented* is also translated according to the basic structure -the policies to be implemented in the coming years. Microsoft Bing Translator translates the structure as *a implementarse* -las políticas a implementarse en los próximos años-, whereas the certified translation as *a implementar* -las políticas a implementar en los próximos años. Microsoft Bing Translator introduces the ‘se’, trying to emphasize that the policies have to be achieved.

6. Discussion

Firstly, it was presupposed that at least one of the two MT systems assessed would produce inadequate translations of the four aspects analyzed –terms, abbreviations and acronyms, linking words and passive structures. This supposition was evaluated through

the comparison between the translations produced by Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator and the certified translations of the specialized text and the non-specialized text.

Assessing the quality of the four aspects, Google Translate presents more quality problems translating the terms than Microsoft Bing Translator in the specialized text. Google Translate shows 13 correct translations of 22 terms analyzed, whereas Microsoft Bing Translator presents 15 correct translations of 22 terms. Specialized terms are more problematic for Google Translate than Microsoft Bing Translator. The main problem is that Google Translate does not denote the right concept of the terms in the TT. Microsoft Bing Translator presents also problems in the specialized text, but they are not associated with the meaning of the terms. The MT system has the tendency of producing literal translations of the terms when they are not identified by the MT.

The non-specialized text presents fewer problems for both MT systems regarding the terms. It has to be taken into account that the complexity of the specialized terms is completely different to the non-specialized terms. This does not mean that any of the MT systems do not have errors. In this text, Microsoft Bing Translator presents more quality problems translating the terms than Google Translate. Microsoft Bing Translator shows 11 correct translations from 13 terms assessed, whereas Google Translate shows 12 correct translations from 13 terms.

This is directly related with the statistical approach of Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator. Both MT systems choose the most suitable term for the translation depending on its level of use among the texts that compose the database. For this reason, certain terms are correctly translated and others are translated with a literal translation. Namely, Google Translator does this with *labor market* –correctly translated- and *budget goal* –literal translation. Mistaking the meaning of a term can provoke a change in the purpose or the message that the text intends to transmit.

Regarding acronyms and abbreviations, and linking words, Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator present similarities in the specialized text. 5 of the 6 acronyms and abbreviations assessed are correctly translated, being one abbreviation – b.p.- the only error in both MT systems. Likewise, 7 of the 8 linking words assessed are properly translated, except for one linking word –once again-, which was translated

literally by both MT systems. Hence, the basic meaning and the structure of the translations are maintained.

The acronyms and abbreviations of the non-specialized text are correctly translated by Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator. Being common acronyms and abbreviations –UE or OECD-, they are part of the database composed by non-specialized texts. Likewise, the linking words are properly translated and in their right position by both MT systems.

The passive structures are properly translated by using the basic structure of the passive form in Spanish, ‘se’ and the verb in third person of singular, or by a transposition. Focusing on the style, the variety of passive structures is quite important in order to present a natural language to an end user. This can be a difficult aspect for MT systems; however, Google Translate is capable of presenting the language in a natural form in the specialized text. Thus, the language seems to be more fluid avoiding repetitions.

The only exception is *to be supported by* which sounds a little bit estrange in comparison with the certified translation. Google Translate has deleted the passive form doing a transposition by changing the verb into a noun. It seems that there is not a connection between the main clause and the subordinate clause where the passive structure is. Microsoft Bing Translator does not have that facility in the specialized text; even Microsoft Bing Translator omits one of the passive structures.

Microsoft Bing Translator shows a different perspective in terms of passive structures in the non-specialized. It is capable of combining the forms of translations previously mentioned, showing a more natural language. Google Translate maintains that facility of translating passive structures.

In general, Microsoft Bing Translator produces inadequate translations regarding terms and passive structures. This MT system has quality problems identifying the terms and being consistent with the translations in the ST and in the TT. As Microsoft Bing Translator does not recognize the term, it decides to carry out a literal translation of the term. With respect to passive structures, Microsoft Bing Translation is not capable of presenting a wide variety of passive structures. This provokes that the language is not as fluid as it should be in an acceptable translation.

Secondly, it was assumed that Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator would be influenced by the degree of specialization of the text assessed –specialized and non-specialized. The specialized text has caused more problems with respect to the translation of the terms for both MT systems. The main problem is to denote the right meaning of the terms to their equivalents in the TT.

The concept has to be the same in the ST and in the TT. The ST and the TT must have the same level of specialization. Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator maintain this level in all the translated terms, except with the term *household income*. The term is correctly translated, but it is inconsistent with the level of specialization. Google Translate translates this term as a non-specialized one. This cannot be accepted in a translation with a specialized communicative situation and an end user. Specialized and non-specialized terms cannot be exchanged or used in the same text.

In contrast, the terms from the non-specialized text are not difficult to translate for Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator. Both MT systems have only one wrong term, showing that those terms are familiar for Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator. They are capable of transmitting the right meaning from the term of the ST to its equivalent in the TT.

In the specialized text and the non-specialized, there is a great variety of passive structures. Google Translate has more facility to translate the passive structures in the specialized text than in the non-specialized one. Conversely, Microsoft Bing Translator has fewer difficulties to translate the passive structures in the non-specialized text. Despite this, the fluency in the translations of the passive structures avoids repetition of the basic passive structure. The translations produce a more natural and fluid language.

Basically, Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator are influenced by the STs positively or negatively depending on their degree of specialization. Non-specialized texts influence positively to both MT systems in the translation of terms, acronyms and abbreviations, whereas the translations of the specialized texts present a natural language.

7. Conclusion

In short, Microsoft Bing Translator produces more quality errors in its translations than Google Translate. Microsoft Bing Translator has more difficulties translating the terms of the specialized text. This MT system carries out literal translations when it is not capable of identifying the term; hence, the right meaning of the terms is not denoted. This does not happen with the translation of the terms of the non-specialized text. Microsoft Bing Translator translates correctly all of them –the term and its equivalent are consistent and the meaning is correct– without any quality problem.

Besides, Microsoft Bing Translator does not present as much variety as Google Translate in terms of style. Microsoft Bing Translator translates the passive forms with the same structures: ‘se’ and the verb in third person of singular, or the verb ‘to be’, participle and ‘by’. The MT exchanges them continually in both translations – specialized and non-specialized. The translation of the passive structures is correct, although the language is not natural. The TT has to present a fluid and uniform language for an end user.

The literal translations of the terms show that Microsoft Bing Translator does not have the same amount of specialized texts and non-specialized texts in its database. As Microsoft Bing Translator has more quality errors in the specialized text, the number of compiled texts would be minor. Translating into fewer languages, it is another reason for assembling a short database. The lack of texts in a database is related with the stylistic features too. The meaning that a translation tends to transmit can be misunderstood due to the presentation of an unnatural language.

Moreover, the translations of the non-specialized text carried out by Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator show the influence that the level of specialization of a text can have in an MT. Both MT systems present translations with great quality of the non-specialized text regarding the four aspects assessed –terms, acronyms and abbreviations, linking words and passive structures. Using a general language and having common abbreviations and acronyms –UE or ECB-, it facilitates the identification of the four aspects in the ST in order to find their equivalents.

Probably, Google Translate and Microsoft Bing Translator have in their databases a high amount of non-specialized texts -articles from newspapers or fragments from

books- in which terms, abbreviations or passive structures appear constantly. Consequently, those aspects can be easily identified, denoting their right meaning.

This study reflects how translation quality can be assessed in MT systems, taking into account that there is not a fixed methodology to analyze the quality. It is aimed at proving the fact that MT systems have quality problems, especially in identifying specialized terms and denoting their concept and their equivalent in the TT. This study can be improved by increasing the length of words in the specialized text and the non-specialized text, or by extending the number of MT systems assessed in order to have a broad perspective.

8. Bibliography

Arnold, Douglas et al. *Machine Translation. An Introductory Guide*. NCC Blackwell. 1994.

Bergenholtz, Henning and Sven Tarp. *Manual of Specialized Lexicography. The Preparation of Specialized Dictionaries*. John Benjamins, 1995.

Bueso Fernández, Isabel and Pilar Casamián Sorrosa. *Diferencias de Usos Gramaticales entre el Español y el Inglés*. Edinumen, 2001.

Fiederer, Rebecca and Sharon O'Brien. "Quality and Machine Translation: A Realistic Objective?" *The Journal of Specialized Translation*. no. 11, 2009, pp. 52-74.

Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer. *Handbook of Translations Studies: Volume 1*. John Benjamins Publishing. 2010.

Google Translate. <<https://translate.google.com/?hl=en>> 4. Oct. 2016.

Görög, Attila. "Quantifying and benchmarking quality: the TAUS Dynamic Quality Framework" *Revista Tradumàtica: tecnologies de la traducció*. no. 12, 2014, pp. 443-454.

Inter-Active Terminology for Europe. *IATE- The UE's multilingual term base*. 2004. <<http://iate.europa.eu/SearchByQueryLoad.do?method=load>> 17. Oct. 2016.

Koponen, Maarit. "Assessing Machine Translation Quality with Error Analysis" *Electronic proceedings of the KäTu symposium on translation and interpreting studie*. vol. 4, 2010, pp. 1-12.

Linna, Matti. *Quality of Machine Translations by Google Translate, Microsoft Bing Translator and iTranslate4*. 2013.

Lobato Patricio, Julia and Carlos Ruiz García. "Las técnicas de traducción en los textos económicos de divulgación (francés-español): resolución de problemas" *Cédille, revista de estudios franceses*. no 9, 2013, pp. 331-345.

Lommel, Arle Richard, Aljoscha Burchardt and Hans Uszkoreit. *Multidimensional Quality Metrics: A Flexible System for Assessing Translation Quality*. 2013.

Lotz, Susan and Alta van Rensburg. "Translation technology explored: Has a three-year maturation period done Google Translate any good?" *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*. vol. 43, 2014, pp. 235-259.

Martínez Mateo, Roberto. "A Deeper Look Into Metrics For Translation Quality Assessment (TQA): A Case Study" *Miscelánea: a journal of English and American studies*. vol. 49, 2014, pp. 73-94.

Microsoft Bing Translator. <<https://translator.microsoft.com/neural>> 4. Oct. 2016.

Muzii, Luigi. "Quality Assessment and Economic Sustainability of Translation" *International Journal of Translation*. 2006, pp. 15-38.

Nagy, Imola Katalin. "English for Special Purposes: Specialized Languages and Problems of Terminology" *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae*. vol. 6, no 2, pp. 261-273.

Notes from "Introducción a la Traducción Automática (Inglés/Español)" imparted by Beatriz Torres Serna during the year 2015-2016.

SAE International. *SAE J2450: Translation Quality Metric*. 2001.

Stejskal, Jiri. "Quality Assessment in Translation" *Alert! Magazine*. 2006, pp. 18-22.

Swales, John. "The Concept of Discourse Community" *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. 1990. pp. 21-32.

Rabadán, Rosa, Belén Labrador and Noelia Ramón. "Corpus-based contrastive analysis and translation universals. A tool for translation quality assessment English-Spanish." *Babel*. 2009, vol. 55:4, pp. 303-328.

Real Academia Española: Banco de datos (CREA) [en línea]. *Corpus de referencia del español actual*. <<http://www.rae.es>> 18. Oct. 2016

Real Academia Española. *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*. <<http://www.rae.es/recursos/diccionarios/dpd>> 15. Oct. 2016.

Ramón García, Noelia. "Modifying Nouns: An English-Spanish Corpus-Based Contrast Of Three Word Pairs" *Journal Of English Studies*. vol. 4, 2003-2004, pp. 171-184.

Specialized Text: Financial report 2015 (January-March)

Source Text (ST)	Google Translate	Microsoft Bing Translator	Certified Translation
<p>General background</p> <p>Grupo Santander conducted its business in the first quarter in a more favourable economic environment in developed countries and also in many of the emerging markets where it operates. The expansion remained firm in the US and UK and in the euro zone the recovery began to consolidate, particularly in Germany and Spain. Among the emerging economies growth in Brazil, hit by adjustment policies, drought and some waning of confidence, slowed. Mexico and Chile, on the other hand, picked up and Poland kept up a satisfactory growth rate.</p>	<p>antecedentes generales</p> <p>Grupo Santander ha desarrollado su actividad en el primer trimestre en un entorno económico más favorable en los países desarrollados y también en muchos de los mercados emergentes en los que opera. La expansión se mantuvo firme en los EE.UU. y el Reino Unido y en la zona euro, la recuperación comenzó a consolidarse, sobre todo en Alemania y España. Entre el crecimiento de las economías emergentes de Brasil, afectada por las políticas de ajuste, la sequía y alguna disminución de la confianza, ralentizado. México y Chile, por el contrario, recogidos y Polonia mantienen una tasa de crecimiento satisfactoria.</p>	<p>Antecedentes generales</p> <p>Grupo Santander llevó a cabo su negocio en el primer trimestre en un entorno económico más favorable en los países desarrollados y también en muchos de los mercados emergentes donde opera. La expansión se mantuvo firme en los EE.UU. y en Reino Unido y en la zona del euro la recuperación comenzó a consolidarse, particularmente en Alemania y España. Entre las economías emergentes el crecimiento en Brasil, golpeado por las políticas de ajuste, la sequía y cierta pérdida de confianza, se redujo. México y Chile, por otra parte, recogió y Polonia mantuvo una tasa de crecimiento satisfactoria.</p>	<p>Marco externo general</p> <p>En el primer trimestre de 2015, Grupo Santander ha desarrollado su actividad en un entorno económico más favorable en las economías avanzadas y también en buena parte de las economías emergentes. En EE.UU. y Reino Unido la expansión se ha mantenido firme y en la Eurozona la recuperación ha comenzado a afianzarse (sobresalen Alemania y España). Entre las economías emergentes Brasil, afectado por las políticas de ajuste, la sequía y un cierto deterioro de la confianza, registró una clara atonía de la actividad. Sin embargo, México y Chile apuraban una reactivación de la actividad y Polonia mantiene un ritmo de crecimiento satisfactorio.</p>
<p>United States: growth moderated in the first quarter although the trend remains close to 3%. Inflation, affected by the fall in oil prices, was around 0%, but the Federal Reserve, more attentive to the situation on the ground (underlying inflation of 1.3%) is preparing the market for a rise in interest rates that could begin in the summer.</p>	<p>Estados Unidos: un crecimiento moderado en el primer trimestre, aunque la tendencia se mantenga cercana al 3%. La inflación, afectada por la caída de los precios del petróleo, fue de alrededor de 0%, pero la Reserva Federal, más atento a la situación sobre el terreno (la inflación subyacente del 1,3%) está preparando el mercado de un aumento en las tasas de interés que podría comenzar en el verano.</p>	<p>Estados Unidos: crecimiento moderado en el primer trimestre, aunque la tendencia sigue siendo cerca de 3%. Afectada por la caída en los precios del petróleo, la inflación rondaba el 0%, pero la Reserva Federal, más atenta a la situación sobre el terreno (inflación subyacente del 1,3%) está preparando el mercado para un aumento en las tasas de interés que podría comenzar este verano.</p>	<p>EE.UU.: moderó el crecimiento en el trimestre, aunque la tendencia se mantiene próxima al 3%. La inflación, afectada por la caída del precio del petróleo, se situó en el entorno del 0%, pero la Fed, más atenta a la situación de fondo (tasas de inflación subyacente del 1,3%), va preparando al mercado para una subida de los tipos de interés que podría comenzar en el verano.</p>
<p>Latin American economies performed to</p>	<p>las economías de América Latina</p>	<p>Economías de América Latina realizan</p>	<p>Las economías de Latinoamérica</p>

<p>varying degrees:</p>	<p>realizaron en diversos grados:</p>	<p>en diversos grados:</p>	<p>mostraron una evolución desigual:</p>
<p>• Brazil: GDP grew 0.3% in the fourth quarter of 2014 (+0.1% in the year). The jobless rate remains low (5.9% in February 2015). The Selic rate was 12.75%, after rising 50 b.p. in March, 100 b.p. since the end of 2014 and 200 b.p. in 12 months. These hikes aim to contain inflation, which was 8.1% in March, above the upper target range (6.5%). The real depreciated 20% against the dollar in the first quarter, partly reflecting the dollar's appreciation and the weaker growth, and 7% against the euro.</p>	<p>• Brasil: PIB creció un 0,3% en el cuarto trimestre de 2014 (+0,1% en el año). La tasa de desempleo sigue siendo baja (5,9% en febrero de 2015). La tasa Selic fue 12,75%, después de haber aumentado un 50 p.e. en marzo, 100 p.e. desde finales de 2014 y 200 p.e. en 12 meses. Estas alzas apuntan a contener la inflación, que fue del 8,1% en marzo, por encima del rango meta superior (6,5%). El verdadero depreció 20% frente al dólar en el primer trimestre, lo que refleja en parte la apreciación del dólar y el crecimiento más débil, y un 7% frente al euro.</p>	<p>• Brasil: PIB creció 0,3% en el cuarto trimestre de 2014 (0,1% en el año). La tasa de desempleo sigue siendo baja (5,9% en febrero de 2015). La tasa Selic fue 12,75%, después de los 50 BP levantamiento b.p. en marzo de 100 BP desde el final de 2014 y 200 b.p. en 12 meses. Estas caminatas pretenden contener la inflación, que fue de 8,1% en marzo, por encima del rango superior de la blanco (6,5%). El real depreció 20% frente al dólar en el primer trimestre, reflejando en parte la apreciación del dólar y el crecimiento más débil y el 7% frente al euro.</p>	<p>• Brasil: el PIB creció un 0,3% en el cuarto trimestre de 2014 (+0,1% en el año). La tasa de desempleo sigue siendo reducida, 5,9% en febrero de 2015. La tasa Selic se ha situado en el 12,75%, tras subir 50 puntos básicos en marzo. Con ello, aumenta 100 p.b. en 2015 y 200 p.b. en doce meses. Estas subidas tienen como objetivo contener la inflación, que se situó en marzo en el 8,1%, excediendo el límite superior de la banda objetivo (6,5%). El real se ha depreciado un 20% frente al dólar en el trimestre, reflejando en parte la senda de apreciación del dólar y el tono más débil de la actividad. Frente al euro, depreciación del 7% en el trimestre.</p>
<p>• Mexico: the economy secured its recovery in the fourth quarter and grew 2.1% in the whole of 2014. The expectations of a gradual strengthening during 2015 and 2016 remained, backed by more investment and structural reforms. With inflation under control, Banxico has held its benchmark rate at 3% since June 2014. The peso depreciated 3% against the dollar in the first quarter of 2015 and appreciated 8% against the euro.</p>	<p>• México: la economía se aseguró su recuperación en el cuarto trimestre y creció un 2,1% en el conjunto de 2014. Las expectativas de un fortalecimiento gradual durante 2015 y 2016 se mantuvo, respaldada por más de inversión y las reformas estructurales. Con la inflación bajo control, Banxico ha mantenido su tasa de referencia en 3% desde junio de 2014. El peso se depreció un 3% frente al dólar en el primer trimestre de 2015 y apreciada 8% frente al euro.</p>	<p>• México: la economía había asegurado su recuperación en el cuarto trimestre y creció 2,1% en el conjunto de 2014. Mantuvo las expectativas de un gradual fortalecimiento en 2015 y 2016, respaldado por más inversión y reformas estructurales. Con la inflación bajo control, Banxico ha celebrado su tasa de referencia al 3% desde junio de 2014. El peso depreció 3% frente al dólar en el primer trimestre de 2015 y había apreciado 8% frente al euro.</p>	<p>• México: la economía afianzó en el cuarto trimestre su proceso de recuperación, alcanzando un crecimiento en el conjunto del año del 2,1%. Las expectativas de progresivo fortalecimiento a lo largo de 2015 y 2016 se mantienen, apoyadas en la reactivación de la inversión y en las reformas estructurales. Con la inflación bajo control, Banxico mantiene su tasa de referencia en el 3% desde junio de 2014. El peso se ha depreciado un 3% frente al dólar en el primer trimestre, pero frente al euro se aprecia un 8%.</p>
<p>• Chile: the economy showed clear signs</p>	<p>• Chile: la economía mostró signos</p>	<p>• Chile: la economía mostró claros</p>	<p>• Chile: la economía mostró en el cuarto</p>

<p>of recovery in the fourth quarter, lifting growth for the year to 1.8%. Growth in 2015 is forecast at close to 3%. The expectations of moderate inflation have enabled the central bank to keep its key interest rate at 3% since October 2014. The peso depreciated 3% against the dollar in the first quarter and appreciated 9% against the euro.</p>	<p>claros de recuperación en el cuarto trimestre, el levantamiento de crecimiento para el año hasta el 1,8%. El crecimiento en 2015 se pronostica en cerca de un 3%. Las expectativas de inflación moderada han permitido al banco central para mantener su tasa de interés clave en un 3% desde octubre de 2014. El peso se depreció un 3% frente al dólar en el primer trimestre y se aprecia un 9% frente al euro.</p>	<p>signos de recuperación en el cuarto trimestre, crecimiento para el año a 1,8% de elevación. Crecimiento en el año 2015 se prevé en cerca del 3%. Las expectativas de inflación moderada han permitido al banco central mantener su tasa clave de interés a 3% desde octubre de 2014. El peso depreció 3% frente al dólar en el primer trimestre y había apreciado 9% frente al euro.</p>	<p>trimestre de 2014 claros indicios de mayor actividad, elevando su crecimiento interanual hasta el 1,8%. Para 2015 se prevé un crecimiento cercano al 3%. Las expectativas de moderada inflación permiten que el banco central mantenga la tasa de interés oficial en el 3% desde octubre de 2014. El peso se ha depreciado un 3% frente al dólar en el primer trimestre de 2015, pero frente al euro registra una apreciación del 9%.</p>
<p>• Euro zone growth accelerated in the fourth quarter of 2014 to 0.3% quarter-on-quarter (0.9% year-on-year). The figures at the start of 2015 confirm the trend of a gradual upswing, although varying by country. Inflation has been negative since December, exerting downward pressure on inflation expectations. This led the ECB to approve a bond-buying programme between March 2015 and September 2016, which is favouring a softening of financial conditions and brought the euro to \$1.08/€1.</p>	<p>crecimiento de la zona euro se aceleró en el cuarto trimestre de 2014 a 0,3% trimestre a trimestre (0,9% año a año). Las cifras en el inicio de 2015 confirman la tendencia de una recuperación gradual, aunque varían según el país. La inflación ha sido negativa desde diciembre, ejerciendo una presión a la baja en las expectativas de inflación. Esto llevó al BCE para aprobar un programa de compra de bonos entre marzo de 2015 y de septiembre de 2016, que está favoreciendo a un ablandamiento de las condiciones financieras y llevó al euro a \$ 1.08 / 1 €.</p>	<p>Crecimiento de zona euro se aceleró en el cuarto trimestre de 2014 al 0,3 por ciento en el trimestre (0,9% en el año). Las cifras en el inicio de 2015 confirman la tendencia de una mejora gradual, aunque variando por país. La inflación ha sido negativa desde diciembre, ejerciendo presión a la en las expectativas de inflación. Esto llevó al BCE a aprobar un programa de compra de bonos entre marzo de 2015 y de 2016 de septiembre, que está favoreciendo a un ablandamiento de las condiciones financieras y el euro a \$ 1,08/1€.</p>	<p>• En la Eurozona el PIB aceleró su tasa de crecimiento al 0,3% intertrimestral (0,9% interanual) en el cuarto trimestre de 2014. Los datos de inicio de 2015 confirman la tendencia de gradual mejora de la actividad, aunque con diferencias por países. La inflación se ha situado en valores negativos desde diciembre, presionando a la baja las expectativas de inflación. Esto impulsó al BCE a aprobar un programa de compra de deuda entre marzo de 2015 y septiembre de 2016, lo que está favoreciendo una relajación de las condiciones financieras y ha llevado el tipo de cambio del euro hasta US\$1,08=1€.</p>
<p>• Germany: notable performance, with GDP growth in the fourth quarter of 0.7% quarter-on-quarter due to the strong contribution of consumption, spurred by solid fundamentals and real disposable</p>	<p>• Alemania: notable rendimiento, con crecimiento del PIB en el cuarto trimestre de 0,7% trimestre a trimestre debido a la fuerte contribución del consumo, impulsado por sólidos</p>	<p>• Alemania: rendimiento, con crecimiento del PIB en el cuarto trimestre del 0,7% en el trimestre debido a la fuerte contribución del consumo, estimulado por fundamentos sólidos y</p>	<p>• Alemania: comportamiento destacado, con un PIB que creció a una tasa del 0,7% trimestral en el cuarto trimestre de 2014 debido a la fuerte contribución del consumo, apoyado en la solidez interna,</p>

<p>incomes.</p> <p>Spain: faster pace of growth in the first quarter (+0,8% Bank of Spain estimate), a trend which will continue to be supported by domestic demand and private consumption. Factors behind this are the international environment (oil price, euro), the net job creation shown by the rise in social security contributors and the better financial conditions for the private sector.</p> <p>Portugal: ended 2014 with faster growth of 0,5% quarter-on-quarter, spurred by exports.</p> <p>United Kingdom: growth still robust, due the impact of lower oil prices on consumption, an increase in household incomes, inflation at 0% and sterling's appreciation. The evolution of inflation once again cooled expectations of interest rate rises in the markets in the middle of 2016.</p>	<p>fundamentales y los ingresos reales disponibles.</p> <p>España: una aceleración del crecimiento en el primer trimestre (+0,8% Banco de España estimación), una tendencia que continuará con el apoyo de la demanda interna y el consumo privado. Los factores detrás de esto son el entorno internacional (precio del petróleo, euro), la creación neta de empleo se muestra por el aumento de los cotizantes a la seguridad social y las mejores condiciones financieras para el sector privado.</p> <p>Portugal: terminó 2014 con un crecimiento más rápido del 0,5% trimestre a trimestre, impulsado por las exportaciones.</p> <p>Reino Unido: el crecimiento sigue siendo robusto, debido al impacto de los precios del petróleo en el consumo, un aumento de los ingresos familiares, la inflación en el 0% y apreciación de la libra esterlina. La evolución de la inflación una vez enfriado las expectativas de subidas de tipos de interés en los mercados en medio de 2016.</p> <p>Polonia: GDP en el cuarto trimestre subió un 0,7% trimestre a trimestre (3,1% año a año). Los fundamentos económicos</p>	<p>reales ingresos.</p> <p>España: ritmo más rápido de crecimiento en el primer trimestre (+0,8% estimación de banco de España), una tendencia que continuará a ser apoyada por la demanda interna y el consumo privado. Los factores detrás de esto son el entorno internacional (precio del petróleo, euro), la creación neta de empleos por el aumento de cotizantes de la seguridad social y las mejores condiciones financieras para el sector privado.</p> <p>Portugal: terminado el 2014 con un crecimiento más rápido de 0,5% trimestre a trimestre, impulsado por las exportaciones.</p> <p>Reino Unido: crecimiento aún robusto, debido el impacto de los precios del petróleo más bajos en consumo, un aumento de ingresos de los hogares, la inflación en el 0% y apreciación de la libra esterlina. La evolución de la inflación refrigerado una vez más por las expectativas de subidas de tipos de interés en los mercados en medio de 2016.</p> <p>Polonia: PIB en el cuarto trimestre subió un 0,7% en el trimestre (3,1% en el año). Fundamentos económicos siguen</p>	<p>y al impulso de la renta disponible real.</p> <p>España: aceleró su actividad en el primer trimestre (+0,8% trimestre estimado por el Banco de España), tendencia que se prevé continúe apoyada en la demanda interna y el consumo privado. A ello contribuirá el entorno internacional (precio del petróleo, euro), la creación neta de empleo apuntada por la afiliación a la Seguridad Social y las mejores condiciones financieras al sector privado.</p> <p>Portugal: cerró 2014 con una aceleración del crecimiento del PIB hasta el 0,5% intertrimestral, apoyado en las exportaciones.</p> <p>Reino Unido: el crecimiento continúa siendo robusto, por el efecto que los menores precios del petróleo está teniendo en el consumo, en un entorno de aumento de la renta familiar, inflación en el 0%, y apreciación del tipo de cambio. La evolución de los precios ha vuelto a enfriar las expectativas del mercado de subidas de tipos de interés que la sitúan a mediados del próximo año.</p> <p>Polonia: el PIB del cuarto trimestre aumentó el 0,7% trimestre (3,1% interanual). En general, los</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>solid. Inflation reached a floor in February (-1.6%) and in March began to rise. The central bank lowered interest rates (key rate at 1.5%) and the cycle of cuts <u>is estimated to have ended</u>.</p>	<p>siguen siendo sólidos. La inflación alcanzó un piso en febrero (-1,6%) y en marzo comenzó a subir. Las tasas del banco central rebajado de interés (tasa clave a 1,5%) y el ciclo de los recortes <u>se estima que ha terminado</u>.</p>	<p>siendo sólidos. Inflación alcanzó un piso en febrero (-1,6%) y en marzo comenzó a levantarse. El banco central redujo las tasas de interés (tasa clave a 1,5%) y <u>se estima que el ciclo de recortes han terminado</u>.</p>	<p>fundamentos económicos permanecen sólidos. La inflación tocó suelo en febrero (-1,6%) y en marzo inició una senda ascendente. El Banco Central bajó los tipos de interés (1,5% el tipo de intervención) y <u>se estima que haya cerrado el ciclo de bajadas</u>.</p>
---	--	--	--

- Complex terms or terms (bold type)
- Acronyms and abbreviations (double underline)
- Linking words (italics)
- Passive structures (underline)

Non-specialized text: Spanish economy set to grow 3.1% this year, but will fail to 2.3% in 2017

ST	Google Translate	Microsoft Bing Translator	Certified Translation
<p>BBVA bank blames Brexit fallout and uncertainty over policies for slowdown next year</p>	<p>BBVA culpa a Brexit lluvia y la incertidumbre sobre las políticas de desaceleración el próximo año</p>	<p>Banco BBVA culpa Brexit fallout y la incertidumbre sobre las políticas de desaceleración el año próximo</p>	<p>El servicio de estudios calcula que el PIB cerrará 2016 con un alza del 3,1% pero corrige a la baja la predicción del siguiente ejercicio hasta el 2,3%</p>
<p>Spain's economy will register growth of more than 3.1% for 2016, but will manage only 2.3% for next year, largely due to the impact of Brexit and the government's fiscal policy, says the latest report from BBVA Research.</p>	<p>La economía de España registrará un crecimiento de más de 3,1% para el 2016, pero se encargará de sólo el 2,3% para el próximo año, en gran parte debido al impacto de Brexit y la política fiscal del gobierno, según el último informe de BBVA Research.</p>	<p>La economía española registrará crecimiento de más de 3,1% para el 2016, pero conseguirá solamente 2,3% para el próximo año, en gran parte debido al impacto del Brexit y la política fiscal del gobierno, dice el último informe de BBVA Research.</p>	<p>Una de cal y otra de arena. Esa es la perspectiva que tiene para la economía de este año y el próximo BBVA Research, el servicio de estudios de la entidad. De cara a 2016 los analistas han revisado al alza la perspectiva de crecimiento en 0,4 puntos, hasta el 3,1%, y no descartan incluso que pueda llegar al 3,2%. Sin embargo, para 2017 son menos optimistas: creen que el PIB se elevará un 2,3% "por el deterioro del entorno exterior, ligado principalmente al Brexit" y por la falta de cambios en la política fiscal española, justifican.</p>
<p>The forecast for this year is more optimistic than the OECD's, which predicts 2.8%, while the government's figure is 2.9%, the same as the Fitch rating agency. Economic think tank Fungas goes for 3%, while the IMF is gloomiest, with 2.6%.</p>	<p>La previsión para este año es más optimista que el de la OCDE, que predice un 2,8%, mientras que la figura del gobierno es del 2,9%, la misma a que la agencia de calificación Fitch. grupo de reflexión económica de Fungas va de 3%, mientras que el FMI es más pesimista, con el 2,6%.</p>	<p>El pronóstico para este año es más optimista que la de la OCDE, que predice 2,8%, mientras que el gobierno es 2,9%, lo mismo que la Agencia de calificación Fitch. Reflexión económica Fungas va de 3%, mientras que el FMI es más, con 2,6%.</p>	<p>Los analistas de la entidad se sitúan, con una previsión del 3,1% para este año, entre los más optimistas hasta ahora. La OCDE augura un 2,8%. Las predicciones oficiales del Gobierno, actualizadas hace unas semanas, son del 2,9%. La agencia de calificación Fitch lo situó días atrás también en el 2,9%. Fungas considera que estará en el 3%. Y el FMI lo mantiene incluso en el 2,6%</p>
<p>Household spending will continue to drive growth, says the BBVA, fed in part by "improvements to the labor market</p>	<p>gasto de los hogares seguirá impulsando el crecimiento, según el BBVA, alimentado en parte por "mejoras en el</p>	<p>Hogar el gasto para impulsar el crecimiento, dice el BBVA, <u>alimentado en parte por "mejoras en el mercado de</u></p>	<p>El consumo de los hogares va a seguir siendo este año el motor de la recuperación, <u>alimentado en parte, según</u></p>

<p>and borrowing as well as an expansive fiscal policy and progress in correcting internal imbalances.”</p>	<p>mercado laboral y el endeudamiento, así como una política fiscal expansiva y el progreso en la corrección de los desequilibrios internos.”</p>	<p>trabajo y préstamos, así como una política fiscal expansiva y progresos en la corrección de los desequilibrios internos.”</p>	<p>considera BBVA, por "la mejora del mercado laboral y de las condiciones de financiación, así como el tono expansivo de la política fiscal y el grado de avance de la corrección de los desequilibrios internos". Además, España sigue aprovechando los efectos del plan de compra de bonos del Banco Central Europeo y el petróleo empieza a encarecerse, pero sigue en niveles relativamente baratos. Todo eso justifica, según los analistas, que este año el PIB pueda terminar con un crecimiento muy parecido al de 2015.</p>
<p><i>At the same time, the bank points out that Spain will continue to benefit from the European Central Bank's bond purchases, and while oil prices are rising, they are still relatively low, all of which will give Spain similar growth rates to 2015, among the highest in the EU.</i></p>	<p><i>Al mismo tiempo, el banco señala que España va a seguir beneficiándose de las compras de bonos del Banco Central Europeo, y mientras los precios del petróleo están aumentando, todavía son relativamente bajos, todo lo cual le dará a España las tasas de crecimiento similares a 2015, entre el más alto de la UE.</i></p>	<p><i>Al mismo tiempo, el Banco señala que España seguirán beneficiándose de las compras de bonos del Banco Central Europeo y mientras los precios del petróleo están aumentando, son todavía relativamente bajos, que dará tasas similares de crecimiento de España a 2015, entre el más alto de la UE.</i></p>	<p>El economista jefe de Economías Desarrolladas de BBVA Research, Rafael Doménech, incluso señala que "si la tendencia que se espera para la segunda mitad del año se confirma, el crecimiento será del 3,2%", una décima más de la apuntado en el informe de hoy y exactamente la cifra con la que terminó el pasado año.</p>
<p>"If the tendency in the second half of the year continues as expected, growth could reach 3.2%, says Rafael Doménech, BBVA's head of research at its Developed Economies unit.</p>	<p>"Si la tendencia en la segunda mitad del año continúa como se esperaba, el crecimiento podría alcanzar el 3,2%, dice Rafael Doménech, jefe de Estudios de BBVA en su unidad de economías desarrolladas.</p>	<p>"Si la tendencia en la segunda mitad del año continúa como se esperaba, el crecimiento podría llegar a 3,2%, dice Rafael Doménech, Director de BBVA de investigación en la unidad de economías desarrolladas.</p>	<p>El economista jefe de Economías Desarrolladas de BBVA Research, Rafael Doménech, incluso señala que "si la tendencia que se espera para la segunda mitad del año se confirma, el crecimiento será del 3,2%", una décima más de la apuntado en el informe de hoy y exactamente la cifra con la que terminó el pasado año.</p>
<p>But BBVA says that Spain will not be able to sustain growth above 3% for a third year running and that 2017 will see a slowdown.</p>	<p>Pero BBVA dice que España no será capaz de sostener el crecimiento por encima del 3% por tercer año consecutivo, y que 2017 verá una desaceleración.</p>	<p>Pero BBVA afirma que España no será capaz de sostener el crecimiento por encima del 3% por tercer año consecutivo, y que a 2017 ver una desaceleración.</p>	<p>Sin embargo, tras los puntos fuertes, llegan las debilidades, que se pueden cebar con el crecimiento el 2017. "El entorno de elevada incertidumbre sobre la política económica se mantiene" advierte BBVA. Y es que, aunque España se ha librado de la multa de Bruselas pese a incumplir el déficit, tiene sobre la mesa la necesidad de hacer ajustes para este año y el próximo, y cambios en materia fiscal. "Es</p>
<p>"The atmosphere of extreme doubt about economic policies will continue," warns the BBVA, noting that although the country has not been fined by the EU for failing to meet its deficit target, it must</p>	<p>"La atmósfera de duda extrema acerca de las políticas económicas continuarán", advierte el BBVA, señalando que aunque el país <u>no ha sido multado</u> por la UE por no cumplir con su objetivo de déficit,</p>	<p>"La atmósfera de duda extrema sobre políticas económicas continuarán," advierte el BBVA, tomando nota de que aunque el país <u>no ha sido multado</u> por la UE por no cumplir con su objetivo de</p>	<p>la política económica se mantiene" advierte BBVA. Y es que, aunque España se ha librado de la multa de Bruselas pese a incumplir el déficit, tiene sobre la mesa la necesidad de hacer ajustes para este año y el próximo, y cambios en materia fiscal. "Es</p>

<p>still press ahead with further adjustments this year and the next, as well as implementing changes to fiscal policy.</p>	<p>que todavía debe seguir adelante con más ajustes este año y el siguiente, así como la implementación de los cambios en la política fiscal.</p>	<p>déficit, debe aún avanzar con ajustes adicionales este año y el siguiente, así como aplicar cambios a la política fiscal.</p>	<p>particularmente importante que se resolviera dado el compromiso de reducir el déficit a niveles en torno al 3% del PIB a finales del año siguiente", recuerda BBVA. "Se vuelve necesario tener certidumbre lo más pronto posible sobre las políticas a implementar durante los próximos años", advierten.</p>
<p>"It is particularly important to resolve this given the commitment to reduce the deficit to levels of around 3% of GDP by the end of next year," says BBVA. "It is becoming necessary to have some certainty as soon as possible about the policies to be implemented in the coming years," its researchers warn.</p>	<p>"Es particularmente importante para resolver este dado el compromiso de reducir el déficit a niveles de alrededor del 3% del PIB a finales del año que viene", según BBVA. "Cada vez es más necesario contar con cierto grado de certeza tan pronto como sea posible acerca de las políticas a implementar en los próximos años", advierten los investigadores.</p>	<p>"Es particularmente importante resolver esto dado el compromiso de reducir el déficit a niveles de alrededor del 3% del PIB a finales del próximo año," dice el BBVA. "Se está volviendo necesario tener cierta certeza tan pronto como sea posible sobre las políticas a implementar en los próximos años", advierten los investigadores.</p>	<p>La incertidumbre en el programa de ajustes, cree el servicio de estudios, puede pasar factura en 2017. "El déficit de 2016 se reducirá tan solo 0,6 puntos porcentuales hasta el 4,4% del PIB, ligeramente por debajo del nuevo objetivo de estabilidad (4,6%). Para 2017, se espera que el ciclo económico continuará corregir el deterioro en las cuentas públicas, pero dentro de un escenario donde no ha habido cambios a la política fiscal, el déficit se reducirá sólo al 3,6% del PIB, y superará la meta del presupuesto de 3,1%," agrega.</p>
<p>This uncertainty about further adjustments will make itself felt in 2017, continues BBVA. "The deficit for 2016 will be reduced by just 0.6 percentage points to 4.4% of GDP, slightly below the new stability objective (4.6%). For 2017, it is expected that the economic cycle will continue to correct the deterioration in public accounts, but within a scenario where there have been no changes to fiscal policy, the deficit will only be reduced to 3.6% of GDP, and will exceed the budget goal of 3.1%," it adds.</p>	<p>Esta incertidumbre sobre nuevos ajustes se hará sentir in 2017, continúa BBVA. "El déficit para el 2016 se reducirá a tan sólo 0,6 puntos porcentuales, hasta el 4,4% del PIB, ligeramente por debajo del nuevo objetivo de estabilidad (4,6%). Para 2017, se espera que el ciclo económico continuará para corregir el deterioro de las cuentas públicas, pero dentro de un escenario en el que no se han producido cambios en la política fiscal, el déficit sólo se reducirá al 3,6% del PIB, y superará el presupuesto objetivo del 3,1%," añade.</p>	<p>Esta incertidumbre sobre más ajustes hará sí mismo sentir en 2017, sigue el BBVA. "El déficit para el 2016 se reducirá a sólo 0,6 puntos porcentuales a 4,4% del PIB, ligeramente por debajo del nuevo objetivo de la estabilidad (4,6%). Para 2017, se espera que el ciclo económico continuará corregir el deterioro en las cuentas públicas, pero dentro de un escenario donde no ha habido cambios a la política fiscal, el déficit se reducirá sólo al 3,6% del PIB, y superará la meta del presupuesto de 3,1%," agrega.</p>	<p>Si a eso se le añade la tormenta del Brexit y la peor perspectiva del sector exterior, la economía del 2017 apunta a una situación algo más débil que este</p>
<p>Add to this the fallout from the UK's decision to leave the European Union and the worsening export outlook, the Spanish economy will be decidedly</p>	<p>Añádase a esto las consecuencias de la decisión del Reino Unido para salir de la Unión Europea y el empeoramiento de las perspectivas de exportación, la</p>	<p>A ello se suma las consecuencias de la decisión del Reino Unido a salir de la Unión Europea y el deterioro del panorama de la exportación, la economía</p>	<p>Si a eso se le añade la tormenta del Brexit y la peor perspectiva del sector exterior, la economía del 2017 apunta a una situación algo más débil que este</p>

weaker next year than this.	economía española será decididamente más débil del año próximo o que esto.	española será decididamente más débil el año que viene más.	año.
-----------------------------	--	---	------

- Complex terms or terms (bold type)
- Acronyms and abbreviations (double underline)
- Linking words (italics)
- Passive structures (underline)