Arabic. In an earlier study, he discusses the relation between linguistics and MT. (Al-Najjar 1999).

From an evaluative perspective, Al-Salman (2004) attempts to carry a comparative study to assess the effectiveness of three different MT programs. Al-Wasiti (2005) stresses that the quality of machine translation does not reach the same level of human translation. He demonstrates his conclusion by translating three text types from English into Arabic using *Al-Wafi*. Abdo (2007) tackles the rendition of pronouns in MT. His analysis shows that the system under inverstigation erroneously renders the pronouns resulting in ill-formed structures. Abdul-Hameed (2008) attempts on devising a framework for evaluation of MT. He conducts an assessment on three different tools: *Al-Nakel, Al-Arabi 2.00, Golden Al-Wafi 1.00 and Al-Mutarjim Al-Araby 3.00*. The findings of his evaluation show that the systems mentioned above produce average or below average quality. Analogues to Abdul-Hammed, Abu-Al-Sha'r & Zughoul (2009) evaluate the translations of six different online services in which *Google Translate* is among them. They reveal that the services produce texts that are incomprehensible. However, *Google Translate* produces better quality outputs when it comes to translating English into Arabic.

Al-Dabbagh (2013) has conducted an assessment on *Google Translate* by choosing four different text types, namely the journalistic, the economic, the scientific and the technical, two of which are extracted from web pages and the other two from books. She has found that the system produces Arabic texts that abound with lexical, grammatical and textual flaws. The analysis indicates that the errors recur regardless of the text type, text length, text difficulty and input mode. In another study, Al-Dabbagh (2010) carries out a questionnaire which investigates how the readers rate the quality of translated texts by *Google Translate*. Her