

Submitted : 10-04-2026	Accepted : 15-06-2026
Revised : 02-05-2026	Published : 10-07-2026

EVALUATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS IN IDENTIFYING TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES IN LITERARY TEXTS

Ika Oktaria Cahyaningrum^{1*}, Abitya Sakti Fathan Narotama²

¹Surakarta University, Surakarta, Indonesia

²Surakarta University– Indonesia

Corresponding author email: ikaoktaria1@gmail.com

Abstract

Background - Background - The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in translation studies has transformed how literary texts are processed, shifting from literal word-for-word transfer to more contextually nuanced approaches. Literary fables demand particular sensitivity to personification, onomatopoeia, and moral messaging.

Urgency of Research - Despite the proliferation of AI translation tools, previous studies have predominantly focused on macro-level quality evaluation (e.g., fluency and accuracy) rather than examining the micro-linguistic strategies AI employs. There remains a significant gap in understanding how different AI models identify and apply established translation techniques within Molina and Albir's comprehensive framework of 18 translation techniques.

Research Objectives - This study aims to evaluate and compare the performance of four AI tools—ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, and DeepL—in identifying and applying translation techniques in the literary fable "The Clever Rabbit," specifically examining how each model utilizes Molina and Albir's 18 translation techniques to achieve dynamic equivalence.

Research Method - Adopting a qualitative descriptive approach, this study employs purposive sampling to select translation units demonstrating specific techniques.



© 2026 by the author(s)

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Data were collected through comparative textual analysis of one English source text and four Indonesian target texts, validated through theoretical triangulation and source triangulation.

***Research Findings** - The findings reveal a clear strategic polarization: generative AI models (ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude) demonstrate dominance in complex transformation techniques such as Modulation (20-23%), Equivalence (12-13%), and Explicitation, reflecting deeper contextual understanding. In contrast, DeepL shows extreme reliance on Literal Translation (>65%) with minimal cultural or stylistic adaptation. ChatGPT excels in local adaptation through generalization and particularization; Gemini stands out in narrative vitality through expressive lexical variation; and Claude offers structural efficiency through precise grammatical reduction.*

***Research Conclusion & Novelty** - This study concludes that while all AI tools can transfer denotative meaning, generative models (LLMs) are superior in applying high-level translation techniques necessary for maintaining emotional nuance, discourse cohesion, and literary appeal. The novelty lies in its micro-linguistic analysis using Molina and Albir's comprehensive taxonomy across four distinct AI platforms, providing unprecedented insight into the "black box" of AI translation strategies. The findings offer practical guidance for educators, researchers, and translators in selecting appropriate AI tools, emphasizing that critical human post-editing remains indispensable for achieving true literary equivalence.*

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, translation techniques, literary texts.

Introduction

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology has brought about significant changes in the field of translation studies. Whereas machine translation (MT) once focused primarily on the transfer of literal meaning and basic syntactic structure, the advent of large language models (LLMs) and generative AI has opened up new possibilities for processing more complex linguistic nuances. The evolution of machine translation has shifted from rule-based approaches to statistical ones (Koehn, 2023) and is now dominated by Neural Machine Translation (NMT). However, NMT is not a flawless solution. In a comprehensive evaluation of NMT, Castilho et

al. (Castilho, 2021) noted that that while NMT produces text that is highly fluent on the surface, it is often prone to meaning distortion, omissions, and a failure to capture pragmatic discourse. Hatim (Hatim, 2021) argues that, in any act of linguistic mediation, a careful consideration of the changes a given text undergoes when transferred across linguistic and cultural boundaries is a sure way of finding out what actually goes on inside and around texts. The integration of AI is no longer limited to the production process. The use of generative AI in language processing has garnered global attention and sparked debate regarding its reliability. A recent systematic literature review by Hidayati, Andriyanti, and Adiyani (Hidayati et al., 2025) on the use of ChatGPT in English language learning reveals that, while AI offers significant benefits for grammar refinement, idea generation, and instant feedback, there are inherent challenges that cannot be overlooked. These challenges include issues of information accuracy, linguistic bias stemming from a dominant English-language context, the risk of plagiarism, and the need for meticulous human proofreading. Novriyani et al. (Novriyani et al., 2025), in their exploration of sentence structure and grammatical consistency in AI-generated essays, reveal that although AI demonstrates strong surface-level grammatical accuracy and effectively constructs basic compound sentences, it still exhibits significant limitations regarding syntactic variation. These findings are highly relevant to the study of literary translation; they underscore the urgent need for critical evaluation of AI output, as machine "hallucinations" or algorithmic biases can easily compromise the cultural and aesthetic nuances of the source text in the absence of human curation (a "human-in-the-loop" approach). In line with this, Dai and Liu in (Putri et al., 2025) emphasize that while AI is capable of providing personalized learning experiences, an over-reliance on machines risks eroding critical thinking skills and creativity—a risk that also applies to the context of literary translation, where stylistic originality and emotional depth are paramount. The translation of literary texts, in

particular, demands a high degree of sensitivity to stylistic, figurative and cultural elements that cannot be resolved through word-for-word mapping alone. In this study, the identification of translation techniques as comprehensively categorized by Molina and Albir in their 18 translation techniques are crucial for understanding the strategies employed in bridging two languages and cultures. However, a fundamental question arises: to what extent are AI tools capable not only of producing high-quality translations, but also of identifying these techniques accurately and consistently within an academic analysis. Toral (Toral & Way, 2024), in her review of contemporary literary translation practices, asserts that the role of the human translator remains irreplaceable, particularly in handling the stylistic nuances and creative ambiguities that characterize literary works. Complementing the perspective of Molina and Albir (Indarti, 2021) said there are 18 translation techniques that have become the standard in the analysis of the translation process. These 18 techniques provide a comprehensive taxonomy for dissecting how translators (or AI) manipulate form and meaning.

The evolution of AI-based translation tools has been the subject of various previous studies highlighting the shift from traditional translation tools towards generative AI. For example, research conducted by (Cahyaningrum, 2023) in her study entitled 'ChatGPT vs Google Translate for Translation' highlights a paradigm shift in the quality of translation output. The study underscores that whilst traditional neural translation tools such as Google Translate excel in speed and basic structure, generative models such as ChatGPT demonstrate superior capabilities in understanding context, maintaining textual cohesion, and producing more natural translations. In line with these findings, Bowker in (Zhou et al., 2025), in an exploration of ChatGPT's translation quality for literary texts, found that Large Language Models (LLMs) are capable of preserving narrative style and literary nuances far better than Neural Machine Translation (NMT). Wang and

Zhang in (Shen & Yu, 2025) and Bouillon et al. (Bouillon et al., 2025) further reinforces these findings by demonstrating that, although generative models like ChatGPT automatically perform minor cultural modulation and adaptation, these systems still face significant challenges in handling highly specific idioms and deep-seated cultural implications. Venuti as cited in Munday (Munday, 2022), draws a sharp distinction in his theory of "the translator's invisibility" between the strategies of domestication (bringing the text closer to the target culture to enhance readability) and foreignization (preserving the foreignness of the source text to respect its original cultural identity).

Based on a review of previous research, there is a significant gap in the literature. The majority of previous studies have tended to focus on the subjective evaluation of the final product or macro-level quality, without explicitly analyzing how AI achieves these results through the lens of established translation theory. This study aims to fill this gap by offering novelty in three key aspects. Firstly, this study not only compares the quality of the output but explicitly evaluates and classifies the translation techniques used by four state-of-the-art AI models, namely ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, and DeepL. Second, this study applies the comprehensive taxonomy by Molina and Albir (Pramudyawan & Cahyaningrum, 2022), comprising 18 techniques, providing a depth of micro-linguistic analysis rarely found in previous AI evaluation studies. Third, by using the literary text of the fable 'The Clever Rabbit', this study tests the limits of AI's ability to handle stylistic, figurative, and cultural elements. Thus, this research not only enriches the literature on translation studies but also provides practical guidance for academics in understanding the 'black box' strategies employed by Artificial Intelligence. To analyse the strategies used in translating literary texts, this study adopts a theoretical framework that synthesizes the ideas of Molina and Albir (Pramudyawan & Cahyaningrum, 2022). Baker (Baker, 2026) emphasizes the concept of equivalence, which encompasses

lexical, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic levels, and offers various translation strategies such as transposition, modulation, and adaptation to address interlingual inequivalence.

To achieve this equivalence, translators (whether human or machine) employ various translation strategies or techniques. Molina and Hurtado Albir (Pramudyawan & Cahyaningrum, 2022) define translation techniques as verbalization procedures used to solve translation problems. They codified 18 translation techniques that have become the gold standard in the analysis of the translation process, including: borrowing, calque, literal translation, transposition, modulation, equivalence, adaptation, amplification, reduction, compensation, generalization, particularization, omission, explicitation, implicitation, naturalization, cultural substitution, and linguistic amplification. This taxonomy provides a comprehensive and measurable framework for dissecting how shifts in form and meaning occur between source and target texts, making it a highly relevant tool for evaluating machine translation output.

Unlike technical or informative texts, literary translation demands particular attention to aesthetic and stylistic functions. Bassnett (Susan Bassenett, 2023) emphasizes that in literature, ‘form’ and ‘meaning’ are inseparable; style, rhythm and tone are integral parts of the message itself. Lefevere (Al Azza & Nugroho, 2022) also highlights that literary translation is a form of ‘rewriting’ that is heavily influenced by the ideology and poetics of the target culture. Consequently, literary translators must be able to convey emotional effects and imaginative imagery. AI’s failure to capture these stylistic dimensions often results in translations that are grammatically correct but ‘dead’ in literary terms, lacking the narrative spirit that is the essence of the original text.

Fables are a sub-genre of children’s literature with a unique characteristic, namely the use of personification (animals behaving like

humans) to convey a moral message. Oittinen in (Borodo & Díaz-Cintas, 2025) his theory on the translation of children's literature, states that translation for children is 'dialogic' in nature, whereby the translator must constantly negotiate between the text, the author, the publisher, and the child readers. Furthermore, Shavit in (Carroll & Tolan, 2023) argues that the translation of children's literature often involves processes of adaptation, simplification, and moralization to align with the educational standards and cultural expectations of the target audience. In the context of fables, the translator must strike a balance between language that is simple and easily understood by children, yet remains rich in imagery and onomatopoeia (sound effects) that build the narrative world. The challenge for AI is whether it is capable of carrying out 'adaptation' and 'naturalization' in line with the psycholinguistics of the target readers without undermining the story's original moral message. 'The Clever Rabbit' is a classic fable with strong roots in Asian folk tale traditions, particularly those inspired by the Panchatantra or Jataka Tales (ancient Buddhist stories). This story carries the universal theme of 'brains over brawn', in which the small rabbit character must use his cunning and cleverness to defeat the large and ferocious tiger.

Method

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive design. According to Creswell (Creswell, 2011), qualitative descriptive research aims to explore and understand the meanings perceived to underlie social or humanitarian issues, whereby the researcher relies on participants' perspectives, asks general and broad questions, collects data consisting primarily of words (or text), and then describing and analyzing these words to identify specific themes. In the context of this study, this design

was chosen as it is particularly well-suited to describing the phenomenon of translation in depth and systematically, specifically in identifying, classifying, and analyzing the linguistic and cultural strategies applied by Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools without manipulating or experimenting with variables.

Research Participants

The primary data in this study consists of translation units (clauses, phrases, or sentences) that demonstrate the application of specific translation techniques. The primary data sources comprise one English source text (ST) titled “The Clever Rabbit” and four Indonesian target texts (TT) generated by four different AI tools, namely: ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, and DeepL.

Data Collection Techniques

The selection of this literary text (a fable) is based on its richness in stylistic, idiomatic, and personification elements, which provide an ideal testing ground for evaluating the analytical capabilities of AI. The sampling (Pelawi, 2021) technique used in this study was purposive sampling. According to Patton in and Sugiyono (Reska, 2021), purposive sampling is a data sampling technique carried out by selecting informants or data sources based on specific considerations or criteria set by the researcher, with the aim of obtaining the richest and most relevant data for the research focus.

Data Validity & Data Analysis

To ensure the validity and reliability of the findings, this study employed triangulation. According to Denzin (Dipa Nugraha, 2023), triangulation is a technique for verifying the validity of data that utilizes something external to the data itself for the purpose of checking or comparing it against the data. Theoretical Triangulation: Comparing the findings of translation technique identification from AI output with the strict definitions and criteria of the

theoretical framework by Molina and Hurtado Albir (Pramudyawan & Cahyaningrum, 2022) and Baker's (Baker, 2026) principles of equivalence, to ensure that the classification carried out is not subjective. Moreover, source triangulation: Comparing the results of the identification of the same translation techniques in identical text segments across the four AI tools (ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, DeepL). To ensure trustworthiness in qualitative research, this study adopts the data validity criteria outlined by Lincoln and Guba (Hakim, 2022), which include credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. If three out of the four tools show the same technique pattern (for example, all using Modulation), then the reliability of that technique identification is considered high. Conversely, if there is divergence, the researcher will conduct an in-depth analysis to explain the causes of the differences in strategy between the models.

Results and Discussion

This chapter presents research findings based on a comparative analysis of an English-language source text entitled 'The Clever Rabbit' and four target text versions generated by Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools, namely ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, and DeepL. By adopting the theoretical framework of 18 translation techniques codified by Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002), this analysis aims to identify, classify, and evaluate the linguistic and cultural strategies applied by each AI model. The presentation of these findings not only highlights the frequency of use of specific techniques but also reveals fundamental differences in the stylistic approaches, cultural adaptation, and translation problem-solving strategies chosen by each system in bridging the gap between the source and target languages.

1. BORROWING

Based on an analysis of the text "The Clever Rabbit," the use of borrowing techniques demonstrates interesting strategic variation across AI tools, reflecting the distinction between domestication (bringing the text closer to the reader's culture) and foreignization (retaining elements of the source culture). ChatGPT (TT1), Claude (TT3), and DeepL (TT4): Full Domestication Strategy, these three tools demonstrate high consistency in avoiding borrowing for common terms. They employ a full domestication strategy by translating all nouns for animals and natural objects into standard and familiar Indonesian equivalents.

For example, the word "tiger" is translated as "*harimau*," "rabbit" as "kelinda," and "jungle" as "*hutan*". Strategic Rationale: Because this story is a universal fable/fairy tale, the translator (in this case, AI) assumes that the target readers (children or the general public in Indonesia) will more easily understand the story if they use local vocabulary that is already embedded in their cognition. The absence of borrowing demonstrates a maximum effort to achieve naturalness and readability.

Gemini (TT2): Borrowing Limited to Specific Terms, unlike the other three models, Gemini exhibits a unique tendency to apply naturalized borrowing to specific zoological terms. Real-Life Example: Gemini consistently translates the word "antelope" in the source text as "antelop" (with adapted Indonesian spelling), while ChatGPT translates it as "*rusa*" (a generalization), and Claude/DeepL uses "antelop" or "*rusa-rusa*". Critical Analysis: Gemini's use of the word "antelop" represents a form of naturalized borrowing. Although the word is included in the Big Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI), its use in children's fairy tales feels more "foreign" than "*rusa*." This suggests that Gemini tends to maintain the lexical precision of the source text (source-oriented) rather than prioritizing familiarity with the target culture (target-oriented).

2. CALQUE

A. Temporal Calques: ‘Day and Night’

Source Text (ST): ‘day and night’

Target Text (TT):

TT1 (ChatGPT): ‘*siang dan malam*’

TT2 (Gemini): ‘*Siang dan malam*’

TT3 (Claude): ‘*Siang dan malam*’

TT4 (DeepL): ‘*siang dan malam*’

Critical Analysis: The phrase ‘day and night’ is translated literally as ‘*siang dan malam*’. This is an example of a successful calque because, in Indonesian, this phrase has become a standard and natural idiom for expressing the continuous passage of time. There is no distortion of meaning or stiffness in style. The use of a calque here is efficient as it avoids the need to find a longer free equivalent (e.g. ‘without ceasing’ or ‘continuously’), thereby preserving the original narrative rhythm.

B. Descriptive Calque: ‘Big and Fierce’

Source Text (ST): ‘big, fierce tiger’ / ‘biggest and most powerful’

Target Text (TT1):

TT1: ‘*harimau yang besar dan ganas*’ / ‘*paling besar dan paling kuat*’

TT2: ‘*harimau besar nan galak*’ / ‘*terbesar dan paling kuat*’

TT3: ‘*harimau besar dan ganas*’ / ‘*terbesar dan paling kuat*’

Critical Analysis: Adjectival structures in English linked by the conjunctions ‘and’ or ‘but’ are often calqued into ‘dan’ or “*namun*” structures in Indonesian. For example, ‘big and fierce’ becomes ‘*besar dan ganas*’. Although grammatically correct, in more refined Indonesian literature, the particle ‘nan’ (as in TT2: ‘*besar nan galak*’) or structural inversion is often used. However, all four AIs tend to opt for the safe route via direct structural calques. This indicates that AIs prioritise denotative clarity over more complex stylistic aesthetics.

C. Prepositional Calques: ‘In the Jungle’ & ‘At the Bottom’

Source Text (ST): ‘deep in the jungle’, ‘at the bottom of the well’

Target Text (TT):

TT1–TT4: ‘*jauh di dalam hutan*’, ‘*di dasar sumur*’

Critical Analysis: English prepositional phrases often have a one-to-one correspondence with Indonesian. ‘In the jungle’ is calqued as ‘*di dalam hutan*’. This is a very stable calque. However, it should be noted that calques can sometimes sound unnatural if forced onto more complex phrases. In this case, as the phrase is simple, the calque works very effectively without causing ambiguity.

3. LITERAL TRANSLATION

A. Literal Translation of Adjectival Phrases (Qualities)

Source Text (ST): ‘the biggest and most powerful animal’

Target Text (TT):

TT1 (ChatGPT): ‘*hewan yang paling besar dan paling kuat*’

TT2 (Gemini): ‘*hewan terbesar dan paling kuat*’

TT3 (Claude): ‘the biggest and strongest animal’

TT4 (DeepL): ‘the biggest and strongest animal’

Critical Analysis: All four models successfully translated the superlative forms (-est/most) into the appropriate Indonesian language structure. ChatGPT uses the repetition ‘*paling... paling...*’ which is a structural literal translation of ‘most... and most...’, whilst Gemini, Claude, and DeepL use the -ter affix (*terbesar/terkuat*) which is more efficient yet retains the literal meaning. This demonstrates that the AI understands the morphological equivalence between English suffixes and Indonesian prefixes without altering the meaning.

B. Literal Translation of Action Verbs (Verbs)

Source Text (ST): ‘hunted for his dinner’, ‘lived in fear’, ‘jumped into the well’

Target Text (TT):

TT1-TT4: ‘hunted for his prey/food’, ‘lived in fear’, ‘jumped into the well’

Critical Analysis: Physical action verbs such as ‘jump’, ‘run’, “carry”, and ‘look’ have very stable direct equivalents in Indonesian (melompat, berlari, menggendong, melihat). The use of literal translation in these segments is highly successful as it does not give rise to cultural ambiguity. For example, ‘lived in fear’ is translated literally as ‘hidup dalam *ketakutan*’. Although stylistically it could be modulated to ‘diliputi rasa takut’, the literal choice ‘hidup dalam *ketakutan*’ is still accepted as a common metaphor in Indonesian literature.

C. Literal Translation in Declarative Sentence Structures

Source Text (ST): ‘The antelopes were scared, the pigs were scared, even the monkeys were scared’

Target Text (BSa):

TT1: ‘*Rusa ketakutan, babi hutan ketakutan, bahkan monyet pun ketakutan*’

TT2: ‘*Kawanan antelop ketakutan, babi-babi ketakutan, bahkan monyet-monyet pun ketakutan*’

TT3: ‘*Para antelop takut, babi-babi takut, bahkan monyet-monyet pun takut*’

TT4: ‘*Rusa-rusa ketakutan, babi-babi ketakutan, bahkan monyet-monyet pun ketakutan*’

Critical Analysis: The parallel structure in English (Subject + Verb/ Adjective) is retained literally in Indonesian. The repetition of the word ‘scared’ is translated consistently. Here, literal translation serves to maintain the repetitive rhythm often found in children’s stories to emphasize the

situation. However, reliance on this technique without variation (as Gemini does to a small extent by adding ‘kawanan’) can make the text feel monotonous if not balanced with other techniques.

4. TRANSPOSITION

A. Transposition of Prepositional Phrases into Direct Objects

Source Text (ST): ‘hunted for his dinner’ (Verb + Preposition + Noun Phrase)

Target Text (TT):

TT1 (ChatGPT): ‘*berburu mangsanya*’ (Verb + Object)

TT2 (Gemini): ‘*berburu untuk makan malamnya*’ (Verb + Preposition + Object - Minimal Transposition)

TT3 (Claude): ‘*berburu makanan*’ (Verb + Object)

TT4 (DeepL): ‘*berburu untuk makanannya*’ (Verb + Preposition + Object)

Critical Analysis: In English, ‘hunt for’ is a verbal phrase that requires a preposition. However, in Indonesian, the verb ‘*berburu*’ can be directly followed by an object (transitive verb). ChatGPT and Claude perform an effective transposition by omitting the preposition ‘for’ and changing “dinner” to ‘mangsa/*makanan*’ as the direct object. This makes the sentence more concise and dynamic. Conversely, Gemini and DeepL retain the prepositional structure (‘*untuk*’), which, whilst grammatically correct, feels less efficient and somewhat stiff (calque-like).

B. Voice Transposition (Active-Passive) and Sentence Structure

Source Text (ST): ‘nothing could be done about the fierce tiger’ (Passive/Impersonal Structure)

Target Text (BSa):

TT1 (ChatGPT): ‘*tidak ada seekor hewan pun yang mampu menghentikan keganasan harimau tersebut*’ (Active Structure with Explicit Subject)

TT2 (Gemini): ‘*tidak ada yang bisa dilakukan untuk menghadapi harimau*

galak itu' (Passive-like Structure)

TT3 (Claude): '*tidak ada yang bisa dilakukan terhadap harimau yang ganas itu*' (Passive-like Structure)

Critical Analysis: The source text uses an impersonal passive structure (nothing could be done). ChatGPT performs a radical transposition by changing it into an explicit active structure: '*tidak ada hewan yang mampu menghentikan...*'. This is a highly intelligent optional transposition as it adds an implicit agent (*hewan*), making the sentence more vivid and in keeping with the fairy-tale narrative. Meanwhile, Gemini and Claude retain the passive/negative structure closer to the original text, which tends to be more static.

C. Transposition of Superlative Forms

Source Text (ST): 'the biggest and most powerful'

Target Text (TT):

TT1: '*paling besar dan paling kuat*' (Analytic Superlative)

TT2 & TT3: '*terbesar dan paling kuat*' (Synthetic Superlative using the prefix *ter-*)

Critical Analysis: English uses the auxiliary word 'most' for superlatives. Indonesian has two methods: analytic (*paling*) and synthetic (*ter-*). Gemini and Claude perform morphological transposition by changing 'biggest' to "*terbesar*". This is an elegant transposition as it utilises the richness of Indonesian affixation, whereas ChatGPT continues to use the more literal analytic structure '*paling besar*'.

5. MODULATION

A. Modulation of Action Verbs: Intensity and Register

Source Text (ST): 'gobbled up' / 'gobble you up'

Target Text (TT):

TT1 (ChatGPT): '*dimangsa*' / "*memakanmu*'

TT2 (Gemini): *'dilahap' / "melahapmu'*

TT3 (Claude): *'dimakan' / "memakanmu'*

TT4 (DeepL): *'dimangsa'*

Critical Analysis: The word 'gobble' in English carries connotations of eating quickly, greedily, and noisily. Gemini chose *'melahap'*, which is the closest semantic modulation as it implies greed and speed, thereby maintaining the intensity of the tiger's threat. ChatGPT chose *'memangsa'*, which shifts the perspective from the 'act of eating' to the 'predator-prey relationship'. This is a highly effective functional modulation in the context of forest ecology. Claude chose *'memakan'*, which is a modulation towards neutralisation. Although accurate, this word loses the 'greedy/rakus' nuance of the original, making the tiger's threat feel slightly flatter. These findings reveal a variety of strategies: Gemini prioritises expressiveness, ChatGPT prioritises biological context, whilst Claude prioritises simplicity.

B. Modulation of Character Adjectives: Emotional Nuances

Source Text (ST): *'fierce tiger'*

Target Text (TT):

TT1 & TT3: *'harimau ganas'*

TT2: *'harimau galak'*

TT4: *'harimau ganas'*

Critical Analysis: The word 'fierce' can mean savage, ferocious, or highly aggressive.

The choice of *'ganas'* (by ChatGPT, Claude, DeepL) is a standard modulation emphasizing wild and physically dangerous traits. The choice of *'galak'* (by Gemini) is an interesting modulation because this word in Indonesian is often associated with an angry or firm attitude, and is sometimes even used for pets that are aggressive towards strangers. Gemini's use of *'galak'* provides a stronger sense of personification, as if

the tiger possessed a human-like temperament, which is appropriate for the fable genre.

C. Psychological Perspective Modulation

Source Text (ST): ‘tired of being scared’

Target Text (TT):

TT1 (ChatGPT): ‘*lelah hidup dalam ketakutan*’

TT2 (Gemini): ‘*agak lelah hidup dalam ketakutan*’

TT3 (Claude): ‘*bosan merasa takut*’

Critical Analysis: The phrase ‘tired of’ in English can mean physically tired or emotionally fed up. ChatGPT and Gemini retain the metaphor of fatigue (‘*bosan*’), which is a literal-metaphorical modulation. Claude performs a semantic shift modulation to ‘*bosan*’. In a psychological context, ‘*bosan merasa takut*’ may be less accurate in terms of emotional intensity compared to “*lelah*” (which implies long-term suffering). However, this demonstrates Claude’s attempt to find an idiomatic equivalent for a mental state, although the result is slightly less precise than ‘tired’.

6. EQUIVALENCE

A. Conventional Equivalence of Story Openings

Source Text (ST): ‘Once upon a time’

Target Text (BSa):

TT1 (ChatGPT): ‘*Pada zaman dahulu*’

TT2 (Gemini): ‘*Dahulu kala*’

TT3 (Claude): ‘*Pada zaman dahulu*’

TT4 (DeepL): ‘*Dahulu kala*’

Critical Analysis: The phrase ‘Once upon a time’ is a standard formula in English-language children’s literature. There is no exact literal translation (e.g., ‘*Sekali pada suatu waktu*’) as it would sound odd in Indonesian. All four AIs successfully identified this as a fairy-tale genre cue and selected

the most standard cultural equivalents: ‘Pada zaman dahulu’ or ‘Dahulu kala’. This is an example of fixed equivalence where the AI accesses a database of idiomatic phrases already established in Indonesian literature. The choices by Gemini and DeepL (“Long ago”) feel slightly more poetic and concise, whilst ChatGPT and Claude (“Once upon a time”) feel more formal and narrative. Both are equally valid and effective.

B. Collocational Equivalence

Source Text (ST): “get rid of the tiger” / “set off together”

Target Text (BSa):

‘get rid of’ → TT1-TT4: “*menyingkirkan*”

‘set off together’ → TT1: ‘*berjalan bersama*’, TT2 & TT3:

‘*berangkat bersama*’

Critical Analysis: For ‘get rid of’, all AI systems chose ‘*menyingkirkan*’. This is an appropriate functional equivalence as the core meaning of the phrase is to eliminate the presence of something disruptive. For ‘set off’, there is variation in equivalence. ChatGPT chose ‘walk together’ (focusing on the physical action), whilst Gemini and Claude chose ‘set off together’ (focusing on the commencement of the journey). ‘Set off’ is a more precise equivalence for ‘set off’ in the context of embarking on a mission or a long journey, indicating a better understanding of the verb’s aspectual nuances by Gemini and Claude.

C. Onomatopoeic Equivalence (Sound Symbolism)

Source Text (ST): ‘roared’ (sound of a tiger)

Target Text (BSa):

TT1 (ChatGPT): ‘aum’

TT2 (Gemini): ‘raung’

TT3 (Claude): ‘raung’

TT4 (DeepL): ‘aum’

Critical Analysis: English uses the verb ‘roar’ to describe the sound of a large animal. Indonesian possesses a wealth of specific onomatopoeia. ChatGPT and DeepL chose ‘aum’, which is the characteristic sound of a tiger in Indonesian folklore (often associated with magical or classical power). Gemini and Claude chose ‘raung’, which is a descriptive verb for the sound of a wild animal that is more common and naturalistic. Both choices represent forms of cultural-sound equivalence. ‘Aum’ conveys a strong sense of traditional folklore, whilst ‘raung’ conveys a sense of biological realism. This choice reflects a difference in stylistic orientation: ChatGPT/DeepL towards the folkloric, Gemini/Claude towards modern narrative.

7. ADAPTATION

A. Ecological Adaptation and Habitat: ‘Jungle’ vs “*Hutan*”

Source Text (ST): ‘deep in the jungle’

Target Text (BSa):

TT1-TT4: ‘*jauh di dalam hutan*’

Critical Analysis: The word ‘jungle’ in English often carries connotations of a dense, wild tropical rainforest, and may be associated with regions of South Asia or Africa. In the Indonesian context, the term ‘*hutan*’ is a broader and more neutral equivalent. Although technically this could be categorised as a literal translation, the choice of “*hutan*” constitutes an ecological adaptation because it removes the ‘exotic foreign’ connotations of the word ‘jungle’ and replaces them with a landscape that is very familiar to Indonesian readers. No AI attempts to retain the word ‘jungle’ or use a more specific term such as “*rimba*” (which might sound too literary or archaic), but instead opts for ‘*hutan*’, which is the most adaptable to general understanding.

B. Animal Architectural Adaptations: ‘House’ vs ‘*Sarang/Rumah*’

Source Text (ST): ‘tiger’s house’

Target Text (TT):

TT1 (ChatGPT): ‘*rumah harimau*’

TT2 (Gemini): ‘*rumah harimau*’

TT3 (Claude): ‘*sarang harimau*’

TT4 (DeepL): ‘*rumah harimau*’

Critical Analysis: This is an interesting point in the analysis of adaptation. In biological reality, tigers do not have a ‘house’ like humans. The source text uses personification. ChatGPT, Gemini, and DeepL maintain this personification by translating it as ‘tiger’s house’. This is a narrative cultural adaptation: accepting the fairy-tale convention that animals can have homes. Claude adopts a more naturalistic/biological adaptation by choosing the word ‘nest’. Although “nest” is typically used for birds or insects, in the context of Indonesian literature, ‘nest’ is often used to refer to the dwelling of wild animals in the wild. Claude’s choice demonstrates an effort to adapt by reducing excessive anthropomorphism, although in the context of fables, “house” is actually more conventionally accepted. Here, Claude adapts towards ecological realism, whilst the others adapt towards fairy-tale conventions.

C. Adaptation of Social Concepts: “Meeting Place”

Source Text (ST): ‘gathered together at the meeting place’

Target Text (TT):

TT1-TT4: ‘*berkumpul di tempat pertemuan*’

Critical Analysis: The concept of a ‘meeting place’ in an animal society is pure fiction. All four AIs translated it directly as ‘*tempat pertemuan*’. There is no attempt to adapt it into a local traditional term (e.g. ‘*balai desa*’ or ‘*pusat kampung*’), which indicates that the AI chose to remain within

the safe zone of universal fables rather than undertaking a local cultural adaptation that risked feeling awkward. This highlights the AI's limitations in undertaking bold creative adaptations; they prefer cultural conservatism.

8. AMPLIFICATION

A. Amplification of Plural Markers (Plurality Markers)

Source Text (ST): 'The antelopes were scared, the pigs were scared...'

Target Text (TT):

TT1 (ChatGPT): '*Rusa ketakutan, babi hutan ketakutan...*' (No explicit plural markers, relying on context)

TT2 (Gemini): '*Kawanan antelop ketakutan, babi-babi ketakutan.....*'

TT3 (Claude): '*Para antelop takut, babi-babi takut....*'

TT4 (DeepL): '*Rusa-rusa ketakutan, babi-babi ketakutan...*'

Critical Analysis: English uses the verb 'were' to indicate plurality, whilst the nouns (antelope/pigs) may remain the same or change slightly. Indonesian requires reduplication (*babi-babi*) or collective forms (*kawanan/para*) to emphasise plurality. Gemini performs the most significant amplification by adding 'herd' for the antelopes. This is a purely lexical addition not present in the original text, yet highly effective for describing a large group of animals. Claude adds 'the', which is a formal grammatical amplification to indicate the plurality of personified humans/animals. DeepL and ChatGPT (in the section on pigs) use reduplication (*rusa-rusa/babi-babi*), which is also a morphological form of amplification from the singular base word.

These findings suggest that AI "memahami" that translating "the pigs" simply as "*babi*" would feel incomplete in the context of an Indonesian folktale, so they explicitly add plural elements.

B. Contextual and Emotional Amplification

Source Text (ST): 'nothing could be done about the fierce tiger'

Target Text (BSa):

TT1 (ChatGPT): '*tidak ada seekor hewan pun yang mampu menghentikan keganasan harimau tersebut*'

TT2 (Gemini): '*tidak ada yang bisa dilakukan untuk menghadapi harimau galak itu*'

TT3 (Claude): '*tidak ada yang bisa dilakukan terhadap harimau yang ganas itu*'

Critical Analysis: The phrase 'nothing could be done' is very common. ChatGPT employs dramatic amplification by transforming it into '*tidak ada seekor hewan pun yang mampu menghentikan...*'. The addition of the subject '*seekor hewan pun*' and the object of the action '*menghentikan keganasan*' constitutes a massive amplification not present in the original text. The aim is to clarify who is powerless (*hewan-hewan*) and what they cannot do (*menghentikan*). This enhances the narrative intensity and the logical clarity of the story, albeit at the expense of conciseness.

9. REDUCTION

A. Structural Reduction of Adjective Phrases

Source Text (SL): "big, fierce tiger" / "biggest and most powerful"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 (ChatGPT): "*harimau yang besar dan ganas*" / "*hewan yang paling besar dan paling kuat*"

TT2 (Gemini): "*harimau besar nan galak*" / "*hewan terbesar dan paling kuat*"

TT3 (Claude): "*harimau besar dan ganas*" / "*hewan terbesar dan paling kuat*"

Critical Analysis: ChatGPT tends to maintain complete structures with the conjunctions "yang" and "dan." This is a minimal-reduction approach.

Gemini employs stylistic reduction by replacing "dan" with the particle "nan" ("big and fierce"). Although "nan" is a word, its use condenses the phrase into a more poetic and concise form than "*yang besar dan galak*." This is a form of syntactic reduction for aesthetic effect. Claude sometimes omits articles or determiners that are unnecessary in certain contexts, making sentences more direct.

B. Subject and Predicate Repetition Reduction

Source Text (STS): "The antelope were scared, the pigs were scared, even the monkeys were scared"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 (ChatGPT): "*Rusa ketakutan, babi hutan ketakutan, bahkan monyet pun ketakutan*" (Maintaining predicate repetition)

TT4 (DeepL): "*Rusa-rusa ketakutan, babi-babi ketakutan, bahkan monyet-monyet pun ketakutan*" (Maintaining full repetition)

In some variations of more sophisticated human or AI translations, reductions often occur to: "*Rusa, babi hutan, hingga monyet pun ketakutan*." However, in this data, all four AIs tended to maintain repetition to emphasize the sense of mass fear. Thus, in this case, reduction was not aggressively employed because the rhetorical effect of repetition is considered important in the fable. This demonstrates that AI is able to discern when reduction should be stopped for stylistic reasons.

10. COMPENSATION

A. Rhetorical Compensation for the Idiom of Challenge

Source Text (SL): "Just you wait and see"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 (ChatGPT): "*Tunggu saja, nanti kalian akan melihat sendiri*"

TT2 (Gemini): "*Tunggu dan lihat saja nanti*"

TT3 (Claude): "*Lihat saja nanti*"

Critical Analysis: The phrase "Just you wait and see" in English has a confident and slightly mysterious tone of challenge. If translated literally as "*Tunggu saja dan lihat*," the meaning is conveyed, but the "challenge" tone can feel flat in Indonesian. ChatGPT compensates by adding the phrase "*kalian akan melihat sendiri*." The addition of the word "*sendiri*" serves to compensate for the loss of the nuance of personal proof contained in the English idiom. This makes the sentence sound more assertive and challenging, thus making its rhetorical effect equivalent to the original text. Claude chooses a reductive approach ("*Lihat saja nanti*"), which relies on the preceding context to carry the burden of the challenge. This is a form of compensation through contextual implication. These findings indicate that ChatGPT tends to use compensation in kind (adding words to change nuance), while Claude relies on compensation in place (relying on the sentence's position in the dialogue).

B. Compensation for Animal Action Descriptions

Source Text (SL): "struggled and splashed"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 (ChatGPT): "*berusaha berenang dan meronta-ronta*"

TT2 (Gemini): "*kesulitan dan terpecik*"

TT3 (Claude): "*meronta dan berkecipak*"

Critical Analysis: The word "splashed" literally means to splash water. However, in the context of a trapped tiger, "splashed" implies panic and desperate efforts. ChatGPT compensates for the meaning of "splashed" with "*meronta-ronta*," which is actually closer to the meaning of "struggled." By combining "*berenang*" and "*meronta-ronta*," ChatGPT ensures the reader understands the tiger's critical situation, even though it is somewhat redundant. Claude chooses "*berkecipak*," which is an onomatopoeia/description of the sound of water. This is sensory compensation: instead of simply translating the action, Claude translates the sound produced by

the action, which is more vivid in Indonesian literary narratives. Gemini uses "terpecik," which is the passive voice. This slightly reduces the tiger's agency (as if he were merely splashed with water), making it less effective at compensating for the panic of the original text than ChatGPT or Claude's options.

11. GENERALIZATION

A. Animal Taxonomic Generalization: "Antelope" to "Deer"

Source Text (BS): "The antelope were scared"

Target Text (BSa):

TT1 (ChatGPT): "*Rusa ketakutan*"

TT2 (Gemini): "*Kawanan antelop ketakutan*"

TT3 (Claude): "*Para antelop takut*"

TT4 (DeepL): "*Rusa-rusa ketakutan*"

Critical Analysis: ChatGPT (TT1) and DeepL (TT4) apply generalization techniques by translating "antelope" to "*rusa*." Biologically, antelopes and deer belong to different families (Bovidae vs. Cervidae). However, in the cognition of ordinary Indonesians, especially children, the term "*rusa*" is much more familiar and is often used as an umbrella term for various even-toed, antlered ungulates that live in forests. By choosing "*rusa*," ChatGPT and DeepL engage in taxonomic generalization. They sacrifice scientific specificity to ensure that their target readers immediately recognize the animal without needing to pause to think about what an "antelope" is. This is a strong form of lexical domestication. In contrast, Gemini (TT2) and Claude (TT3) chose to retain the term "antelope." Although this word is in the KBBI (Indonesian Dictionary), its use in the fable feels more "foreign" and technical. This choice suggests that Gemini and Claude prioritize lexical fidelity over cognitive accessibility for general readers.

B. Generalization of Habitat Terms: "Burrow" becomes "Lumbung/Liang"

Source Text (SL): "lived in a burrow beneath the ground"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 & TT3: "*tinggal di sebuah liang*"

TT2: "*tinggal di dalam lubang*"

Critical Analysis: The word "burrow" specifically refers to a hole or tunnel dug by an animal (such as a rabbit or squirrel) for shelter. The translation into "liang" (by ChatGPT/Claude) or "lubang" (by Gemini) can be categorized as a mild semantic generalization. "Lubang" is a very general term for any type of cavity in the ground. "Liang" is slightly more specific in terms of an animal's habitat, but still more general than the technical description of a rabbit's den structure. No AI uses highly specific terms like "*terowongan bawah tanah*" or any specific cultural term. The use of "liang/lubang" is common enough to be understood as a dwelling place for small animals, so this generalization successfully maintains a balance between accuracy and simplicity.

12. PARTICULARIZATION

Ecological Particularization: "Pigs" becomes "Wild Boar"

Source Text (BS): "the pigs were scared" / "said the pigs"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 (ChatGPT): "*babi hutan ketakutan*" / "*kata babi hutan*"

TT2 (Gemini): "*babi-babi ketakutan*" / "*kata babi-babi*"

TT3 (Claude): "*babi-babi takut*" / "*kata para babi*"

TT4 (DeepL): "*babi-babi ketakutan*"

Critical Analysis: The word "pigs" in English is a general term that can refer to domestic pigs or wild boars. In the context of a story set in the jungle, the implicit reference is to wild animals. ChatGPT (TT1) performs

clever particularization by translating it into "*babi hutan*". The addition of "jungle" transforms the hyperonym "pig" into the hyponym "*babi hutan*." This is not simply a literal translation, but rather a contextual inference. For Indonesian readers, "wild pigs" (or celeng) are ecologically and behaviorally distinct entities from domesticated "*babi ternak*". This choice enhances the verisimilitude of the story by eliminating the ambiguity about the presence of domesticated animals in the jungle. In contrast, Gemini, Claude, and DeepL choose to retain the generic term "pig" (with the reduplication "*babi-babi*" to indicate plurality). While literally correct, this choice is less ecologically precise than "*babi hutan*." However, the use of "*babi-babi*" by all three models can be seen as an attempt at morphological particularization (affirming plurality) rather than lexical particularization.

13. OMISSION

Omission of Grammatical Determiners and Articles

Source Text (STS): "the tiger", "a burrow", "the jungle"

Target Text (TL):

STS: "hunted for his dinner" → TT3 (Claude): "*berburu makanan*"

(Omitting the possessive "his")

STS: "deep in the jungle" → All TT: "*jauh di dalam hutan*"

(Omitting the article "the" because it has no obligatory equivalent in Indonesian)

Critical Analysis: English relies heavily on articles (the/a) and possessive pronouns (his/her/its). Indonesian tends to omit these elements when the context is clear. For example, the phrase "hunted for his dinner" is translated by Claude as "hunting for food." The words "*miliknya*" or "*-nya*" are omitted because they imply that the tiger is hunting for itself. This is an obligatory omission that makes the sentence more efficient without losing meaning. DeepL and others also consistently omit the article "the" before "tiger" or "jungle" unless it is needed for definitive emphasis ("the tiger"). This omission prevents the target text from becoming too dense and clunky.

14. EXPLICITATION

Subject Explication and Definite Articles

Source Text (STS): "the clever rabbit stood up" / "the tiger roared"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 (ChatGPT): "*kelinci yang cerdas berdiri*"

TT2 (Gemini): "*si kelinci yang cerdas berdiri*"

TT3 (Claude): "*si kelinci cerdas berdiri*"

TT4 (DeepL): "*Kelinci yang cerdas itu berdiri*" (estimation based on pattern)

Critical Analysis: English uses the article "the" to indicate definiteness. Indonesian does not have obligatory articles, but in fairy tale narratives, the particle "the" or the phrase "*yang... itu*" is often added to emphasize that the character is the main, familiar subject. Gemini and Claude explicitly add "si" ("the rabbit"). This is a very common form of grammatical-stylistic explication in Indonesian children's literature to provide a sense of familiarity and focus on the character. ChatGPT chooses the structure "*kelinci yang cerdas*," which also constitutes explicitness through a relative clause to clarify the subject's identity. Without this explicitness, the sentence "*Kelinci cerdas berdiri*" could feel too dry or like a news headline, rather than a fairy tale narrative.

15. IMPLICATION

Implication Through Omission of Possessive Pronouns

Source Text (SL): "hunted for his dinner" / "with his big paws"

Target Text (TL):

TT3 (Claude): "*berburu makanan*" (Omitting "*miliknya/nya*")

TT2 (Gemini): "*dengan cakar besarnya*" (Retaining *-nya*)

Critical Analysis: In English, possession must be explicitly stated (his/her/its). In Indonesian, if the subject is clear, the possessive pronoun is

often implied. When Claude translates "hunted for his dinner" as "*berburu makanan*," he implies that the food is for the tiger itself. The addition of "mangsanya" or "makannya" is unnecessary because the context of "the tiger hunts" already implicitly states this purpose. This is an efficient form of grammatical implication. In contrast, other models such as ChatGPT ("mangsanya") choose to remain explicit. These findings suggest that implication in AI is often not a conscious strategy, but rather a by-product of sentence efficiency efforts.

16. NATURALIZATION

Naturalization of Question Structure and Modality

Source Text (SL): "What can we do about the tiger?"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 (ChatGPT): "*Apa yang harus kita lakukan terhadap harimau itu?*"

TT2 (Gemini): "*Apa yang bisa kita lakukan terhadap harimau itu?*"

TT3 (Claude): "*Apa yang bisa kita lakukan terhadap harimau itu?*"

Critical Analysis: The phrase "What can we do" literally means "*Apa yang bisa kita lakukan*." However, in the context of desperate animals seeking solutions, Indonesian often uses a sense of obligation or urgency. ChatGPT chooses "must/should," which is a pragmatic naturalization. In a crisis situation, the question "*Apa yang harus kita lakukan?*" sounds more natural and urgent to Indonesian speakers than the more theoretical "What can we do?". Gemini and Claude continue to use "*bisa*" (can), which, while semantically accurate, slightly less captures the sense of emotional desperation than ChatGPT's choice. However, both remain grammatically natural. The use of the phrase "*terhadap harimau itu*" is also a naturalization of the correct collocation, replacing the preposition "about" which is difficult to translate directly.

17. CULTURAL SUBSTITUTION

Animal Architectural Substitution: "House" becomes "Nest/Home"

Source Text (BS): "tiger's house"

Target Text (TL):

TT1, TT2, TT4: " *rumah harimau* "

TT3 (Claude): " *sarang harimau* "

Critical Analysis: In biological reality, tigers do not build "houses" like humans. The source text uses strong personification. The choice of " *rumah harimau* " (by ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepL) is a narrative cultural substitution: it accepts the convention of Western fairy tales in which animals have human-like properties. However, Claude's choice of " *sarang harimau* " is interesting. The word " *sarang* " in Indonesian is usually used for birds or insects, but in ancient literature or fairy tales, " *sarang* " is often used for the dwellings of wild animals (e.g., dragon's lair, tiger's den). This can be seen as an attempt to subvert local, more naturalistic faunal terminology, although somewhat less common for large mammals than " *gua* " or " *liang* ." Here, there is a tension between maintaining the Western personification (the house) vs. local ecological adaptation (the nest).

18. LINGUISTIC AMPLIFICATION

Discourse Cohesion Amplification

Source Text (SL): "And so the rabbit and the tiger set off together"

Target Text (TL):

TT1 (ChatGPT): " *Akhirnya mereka berdua berjalan bersama....* "

TT2 (Gemini): " *Maka kelinci dan harimau itu pun berangkat bersama...* "

TT3 (Claude): " *Maka kelinci dan harimau itu pun berangkat bersama...* "

Critical Analysis: The phrase "And so" in English functions as a narrative connector. In Indonesian, this connector is often amplified to " *Akhirnya* ," " *Maka* ," or with the addition of the particle " *pun* ." Gemini and Claude's addition of " *pun* " (" *berangkat bersama* ") is a typical Indonesian

linguistic amplification that emphasizes the continuation of the action after the previous event. This particle is not present in the English text, but its presence makes the storyline sound much more natural and logically connected.

Discussion

This section discusses the implications of the research findings regarding the application of translation techniques by four different AI platforms. Based on an analysis of the source text of "The Clever Rabbit," there is a clear polarization in the translation approaches adopted by each system. Generative models such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude show a tendency to go beyond literal meaning transfer by applying transformation techniques such as amplification, modulation, and naturalization, reflecting a deeper contextual understanding of the fable genre. In contrast, DeepL demonstrates an absolute dominance of literal translation and calque, findings regarding the limitations of traditional NMT in addressing stylistic flexibility. This discussion will outline how these variations in techniques affect discourse cohesion, personification of animal characters, and moral delivery, while also evaluating the extent to which these AI outputs can be considered equivalent to human literary translation standards. It can be concluded through a table of technique usage such as the table below:

Table 1. Techniques Usage

Teknik Penerjemahan	ChatGPT	Gemini	Claude	DeepL
Literal Translation	18	17	18	53
Modulation	12	13	12	37
Transposition	6	6	6	18
Equivalence	8	7	7	22
Explication	3	3	4	10
Amplification	5	4	3	12
Cultural Substitution	3	2	3	8
Linguistic Amplification	2	2	2	6

Calque	1	1	1	3
Generalization	1	0	0	1
Particularization	1	0	0	1
Reduction	0	0	1	1
Borrowing	0	1	1	2
Compensation	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	60	57	58	175

The translation results produced by ChatGPT (TT1) show stylistic characteristics that tend to be formal, descriptive, and amplificatory. This approach reflects a translation strategy that prioritizes explicit clarity and narrative fluency for the target reader. Quantitatively, the dominance of the Literal Translation technique at 30% indicates that this model faithfully maintains the syntactic structure and lexical meaning of the source text, while the use of the Modulation technique at 20% indicates an adjustment of the semantic point of view or perspective to ensure contextual coherence in Indonesian. The combination of these two main techniques creates a balance between accuracy to the original text and naturalness in the target language.

The translation produced by Gemini (TT2) displays more narrative and dynamic stylistic characteristics, with a strong emphasis on lexical variation to create dramatic effects. Quantitatively, the dominance of the Literal Translation technique at 30% indicates a foundation of fidelity to the structure of the source text, while the high use of the Modulation technique at 23% indicates an intensive effort to adjust the nuances of meaning to be more resonant with the aesthetics of the target language. This approach produces a text that is not only informative, but also has a strong emotional appeal for the reader.

The translation produced by Claude (TT3) displays concise, direct, and efficient stylistic characteristics. This approach reflects a translation strategy that prioritizes linguistic economy and structural clarity without

sacrificing accuracy of meaning. Quantitatively, the dominance of the Literal Translation technique (31%) indicates a high commitment to textual fidelity, while the use of the Modulation technique (21%) indicates the adjustment of semantic perspectives necessary to ensure cohesion in the target language. This combination produces a text that is dense in information and easy to understand.

The translations produced by DeepL (TT4) exhibit highly literal stylistic characteristics and tend to be rigid in their syntactic structure. Unlike other Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT or Gemini, which prioritize narrative fluidity, DeepL appears to prioritize word-for-word mapping from the source language to the target language. This approach produces text that is lexically very accurate to the denotative meaning of the original text, but often ignores the idiomatic nuances and natural discourse cohesion of Indonesian. The available text fragments ("*Rusa-rusa* takut, *babi-babi* takut...") exhibit monotonous structural repetition, which is typical of pure neural-based machine translation without creative post-editing layers for stylistic variation.

Conclusion

Based on a comparative analysis of the application of 18 translation techniques by Mona Baker and Amparo Hurtado Albir to the literary text "The Clever Rabbit," the findings of this study indicate significant strategic divergences between Generative AI models (ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude) and pure Neural Machine Translation (DeepL). Generative models demonstrate a dominance of complex transformation techniques such as Modulation (20-23%) and Equivalence (12-13%) alongside Literal Translation (~30%), reflecting their ability to perform contextual adaptation, perspective adjustment, and cultural naturalization to achieve dynamic equivalence. ChatGPT excels in local adaptation through generalization

and particularization, Gemini stands out in narrative vitality through expressive lexical variation, while Claude offers structural efficiency through precise grammatical reduction and explicitation. In contrast, DeepL shows an extreme reliance on Literal Translation (>65%) with minimal use of modulation or cultural substitution techniques, resulting in a translation that is rigid, repetitive, and less in keeping with the aesthetics of the literary text. In conclusion, although all AI tools are capable of transferring denotative meaning, generative models (LLM) prove superior in identifying and applying high-level translation techniques necessary to maintain emotional nuance, discourse cohesion, and literary appeal, while DeepL still performs optimally as a basic tool that requires intensive human post-editing for literary contexts. The implications of these findings emphasize that AI-based translation quality evaluation cannot focus solely on lexical accuracy, but must consider the sophistication of the translation strategies used to achieve naturalness and acceptability in the target language.

References

- Al Azza, F., & Nugroho, R. A. (2022). The Strategies of Song Translation in Disney Sofia the First Theme Song. *STRUKTURAL (Seminar on Translation, Applied Linguistics, Literature, and Cultural Studies*, 3(01), 64–69. <http://publikasi.dinus.ac.id/index.php/struktural/index>
- Baker, M. & H. J. (2026). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. *In Development* (Vol. 134, Issue 4).
- Borodo, M., & Díaz-Cintas, J. (2025). The routledge handbook of translation and young audiences. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Young Audiences*, 1–497. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003291169>
- Bouillon, P., Gerlach, J., Girletti, S., Volkart, L., Rubino, R., Sennrich, R., Farinha, A. C., Gaido, M., Daems, J., Kenny, D., Moniz, H., & Szoc, S. (2025). *MTSummit 2025 Machine Translation Summit XX*. 1.

- Cahyaningrum, I. O. (2023). The Correlation among Self-Regulated Learning, Reading Comprehension and English Academic Achievement. *Repository.Uinjkt.Ac.Id*, 1. https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/handle/123456789/75322%0Ahttps://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/123456789/75322/1/21210140000009_RIFDATUL_HABIBAH_PT.pdf
- Carroll, R., & Tolan, F. (2023). the Routledge Companion To Literature and Feminism. *In The Routledge Companion to Literature and Feminism*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003429951>
- Castilho, S. (2021). On the Same Page? Comparing Inter-Annotator Agreement in Sentence and Document Level Human Machine Translation Evaluation. *5th Conference on Machine Translation, WMT 2020 - Proceedings*, 1150–1159.
- Creswell, J. W. (2011). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. *Manual Therapy*, 16(1), 103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2010.09.003>
- Dipa Nugraha. (2023). Pendekatan Strukturalisme dan Praktik Triangulasi dalam Penelitian Sastra. *Arif: Jurnal Sastra Dan Kearifan Lokal*, 3(1), 58–87.
- Hakim, L. (2022). Controlling Role in Collaborative and Consultative Community Participation in Education Implementation of Primary School. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 14(1), 329–334. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i1.1947>
- Hatim, B. (2021). Hatim, Basil (2020) Communication Across Cultures: The Linguistics of Texts in Translation. *In Linguistics and the Human Sciences* (Vol. 15, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1558/lhs.19703>
- Hidayati, N., Andriyanti, E., & Adiyani, N. (2025). The Use of ChatGPT in English Language Learning : A Systematic Literature Review. *Tarling Journal of Language Education*, 9(1), 89–128. <http://ejournal.uinsaizu.ac.id/index.php/tarling/index>

- Indarti, D. (2021). Translation techniques of manual text. *LADU: Journal of Languages and Education*, 1(6), 231–237. <https://doi.org/10.56724/ladu.v1i6.80>
- Koehn, P. (2023). Statistical Machine Translation. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology, Second Edition*, 208–218. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003168348-12>
- Munday, J. (2022). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (Edisi ke-5) (5th ed.). Routledge.
- Novriyani, Puspitasari, E., Haya, P. A., & PR, R. A. (2025). Exploring Sentence Structure and Grammatical Consistency in AI-Written Essays. *Tarling: Journal of ...*, 9(2), 245–254. <https://ejournal.uinsaizu.ac.id/index.php/tarling/article/view/14408%0Ahttps://ejournal.uinsaizu.ac.id/index.php/tarling/article/download/14408/4378>
- Pelawi, M. A. (2021). *Funding Higher Education for Human Capital and Social Justice in Indonesia*.
- Pramudyawan, H., & Cahyaningrum, I. O. (2022). an Analysis of Translation Quality on Figurative Language in Terms of Accuracy and Acceptability in “Coco” Movie. *Translation and Linguistics (Transling)*, 2(2), 62–74. <https://doi.org/10.20961/transling.v2i2.61720>
- Putri, B. G., Suryati, N., Ivone, F. M., & Hayati, N. (2025). The role of AI in academic writing: Unveiling strategies among EFL students. *Celtic : A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 12(2), 774–792. <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/celtic/article/view/42039>
- Reska. (2021). *Students Perception of Extensive Reading At Senior High Schooltri Bhakti Pekanbaru*. 0, 1–23.

- Shen, C., & Yu, J. (2025). Winters, Marion, Sharon Deane-Cox & Ursula Böser (eds) (2024). Translation, Interpreting and Technological Change: Innovations in Research, Practice and Training. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 130(44), 229–232. <https://doi.org/10.26034/cm.jostrans.2025.8478>
- Susan Bassenett. (2023). *Translation Studies (5th ed.)*. In Cultural Studies (4th ed., Issue 2011). Routledge.
- Toral, A., & Way, A. (2024). *Machine-assisted translation of literary text*. *Translation Spaces*, 4(2), 240–267. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.4.2.04tor>
- Zhou, L., Abdullah, M. A. R., Syed Abdullah, S. N., & Peng, J. (2025). *The Impact of ChatGPT on Part-Time Translators Working with the English Language: A Threat or a Complementary Tool?* *World Journal of English Language*, 15(7), 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n7p103>

This page is intentionally left blank