

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CHALLENGES IN TRANSLATING MANDARIN COMPOUND SENTENCE INTO INDONESIAN AND VICE VERSA

Mei Rianto Chandra
Bina Nusantara University
mei.rianto@binus.ac.id

ABSTRAK

This study examines the difficulties in translating complex phrases between Mandarin and Indonesian. The primary emphasis is on the utilization of conjunctions included in HSK Level 1 to 6 resources. Compound sentences in Mandarin frequently exhibit structures and meanings that diverge from those in Indonesian, necessitating meticulous consideration of context, semantics, and colloquial language throughout the translation process. This study assessed 25 complex phrases, each including frequent conjunctions included in the HSK test. Google Translate (GT) was employed as the translation tool, as it is deemed indicative of the frequently utilized resources by learners and is recognized for generating translation outputs that are generally like those of native speakers, especially in the context of basic sentences. The analysis identified seven categories of translation errors: (1) No Errors, (2) Misinterpretation of Conjunctions, (3) Ambiguity in Syntactic Structure, (4) Reduction of Subtlety in Significance, (5) Modification in Linguistic Style, (6) Alteration in Significance / Lexicon and (7) Absence of Formal/Logical Conjunctions. Each category represents distinct challenges in the language transmission process. The primary obstacles in translating Mandarin compound phrases into Indonesian are adapting formal and informal language usage, comprehending sentence structure, and properly conveying meaning in quotidian circumstances. This work significantly contributes to translation studies and serves as a resource for educators, students, and language professionals to enhance the quality of translation between the two languages.

Keywords: *Compound sentence, translation challenges, translation accuracy, Mandarin-Indonesian translation*

INTRODUCTION

Translation beyond the mere transference of words across languages; it is a multifaceted endeavor that encompasses the conveyance of meaning, structure, and context. The difficulty intensifies when translating between two languages with very disparate linguistic structures, such as Mandarin and Indonesian. The translation of compound phrases is one of the most complex elements of this process, since they typically possess nuanced meanings, extensive inter-clausal connections, and culturally ingrained logic.

Mandarin compound sentences demonstrate several types of coordination and subordination, encompassing serial verb constructions, topic-comment structures, and conjunctions that convey distinct logical links. Conversely, Indonesian utilizes a distinct syntactic framework, emphasizing explicit conjunctions and subject-predicate arrangements that do not consistently correspond with the sentence patterns observed in Mandarin. These intrinsic disparities frequently result in erroneous translations or clumsy phrase structures during the conversion from one language to another. Cultural background, colloquial idioms, and stylistic variations further complicate the endeavor to create natural and accurate translations that preserve the original meaning.

This research seeks to offer a comprehensive review of the prevalent issues faced in translating complex phrases between Mandarin and Indonesian. This research aims to provide significant insights for translators, language teachers, and learners of both languages through an investigation of structural differences, translation examples, and translation methodologies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Lexical and Semantic Difficulties

A primary challenge in translating compound phrases from Mandarin is the lexical and semantic intricacy inherent in compound terms. Mandarin often conveys information through closely linked

characters, rendering character combinations less comprehensible to non-native readers. The frequency of compound words influences comprehension; high-frequency compounds enhance reading but may conceal the role of individual characters (Cui et al., 2021). In contrast, low-frequency compounds need that translators discern which constituent character is more prominent or consult other sources (Tsang et al., 2022).

Semantic transparency complicates translation: transparent compounds (e.g., 新年, xīnnián, ‘new year’) correspond directly to “new year,” whereas opaque compounds (e.g., 红娘, literally ‘red matchmaker’, meaning ‘matchmaker’) necessitate strategies to convey cultural nuances without distortion—such as translating it as “marriage broker” (Hao et al., 2024). Psycholinguistic data indicates that transparent compounds elicit quicker semantic assessments, suggesting that translators experience differing cognitive demands based on the compound type (Deng et al., 2024).

Moreover, character ambiguity in compounds presents difficulties for cross-linguistic activation. Research on Mandarin–English bilinguals indicates that ambiguous words activate dual semantic possibilities, hence prolonging processing time (Deng et al., 2024). While the study concentrated on English, analogous uncertainty occurs when correlating Mandarin compounds to Indonesian, which frequently lacks confusing morphemic counterparts. The lack of direct cognates compels translators to select between literal translations and meaning modification (Baker, 2018), balancing accuracy with comprehensibility.

Frequency effects also affect approach selection: translators dealing with high-frequency compounds typically utilize automatic dictionary-based substitution (X. Wang et al., 2024), whereas low-frequency or unique compounds necessitate inventive paraphrasing and contextual analysis (Lin, 2023). Corpus analyses indicate that skilled translators integrate literal and adaptive methodologies to preserve semantic coherence while adhering to the conventions of the target language (Y. Wang et al., 2024). The lexical and semantic characteristics of Mandarin compound phrases provide considerable difficulties in achieving transparency and equality during translation into Indonesian.

2. Syntactic and Structural Difficulties

In addition to lexical concerns, syntactic disparities between Mandarin and Indonesian also influence the translation of complex phrases. Mandarin employs many conjunctions (连词, liáncí) to separate or subordinate phrases into intricate patterns. Research on Mandarin compound sentences emphasizes the distribution of shared components and the demarcation of clause boundaries as critical topics; for instance, Mandarin frequently shares subjects or objects within clauses, a phenomenon less prevalent in Indonesian (文贺 & 青青, 2022). Translators must determine whether to maintain these common elements through ellipsis reconstruction or to expressly reiterate them in the Indonesian translation.

The categorization of Mandarin compound phrase types—namely coordinative, subordinate, concessive, and resultative—also influences translation methodologies (利 & 光鑫, n.d.). Coordinative structures are often expressed using “and” or “but” in Indonesian, but subordinate structures necessitate connectors like “because,” “therefore,” or others to denote causation (李春玲 et al., 2020). Indonesian conjunction selections do not consistently correspond one-to-one due to stylistic inclinations and speech norms (吕文璐, 2020).

Dividing complicated phrases into manageable components is an additional hurdle. Mandarin often employs lengthy, complex phrases that, if not segmented, may lead to intricate Indonesian translations. Consequently, translators frequently segment them into concise phrases (宋敏, 2021). Medical literature indicate that translators employ segmentation tactics, dividing lengthy Mandarin phrases into many Indonesian sentences to enhance intelligibility; nonetheless, this may compromise continuity or oversimplify meaning (Xiao & Lai, 2023).

Variations in topical focus also influence translation. Mandarin has topic-comment structures, wherein the topic may not correspond to the grammatical subject, but Indonesian predominantly adheres to subject-predicate order (BRUNO et al., 2024). Translators must reorganize sentences for coherence in Indonesian, including altering topics and modifying pronominal references (Larson, 1997).

Finally, identifying relational markers like 把 (bǎ) and 被 (bèi)—used for dispositional or passive constructions—adds complexity. Indonesian has distinct passive morphology and syntactic structures, necessitating that translators transform Mandarin passive or disposal formulations into suitable passive or active forms in Indonesian while preserving agent information (Suastini et al., 2018). The syntactic and structural disparities between Mandarin and Indonesian necessitate meticulous examination of clause types, common components, segmentation, and discourse functions to ensure precise translations of complex sentences.

3. Cultural and Contextual Challenges

Cultural subtleties in Mandarin compound sentences may contain idiomatic terms, fixed phrases, or culturally significant terminology that are challenging to translate straight into Indonesian. Culturally dense words such as idioms (成语, chéngyǔ) require translators to find Indonesian equivalents or provide explanatory glosses to retain rhetorical impact (Yao, 2023). For instance, translating the four-character idiom 画蛇添足 (literally “to add feet to a snake,” meaning overdoing something) poses a dilemma: while Indonesian has similar idioms (e.g., “adding salt to injury”), the cultural imagery shifts (Wang et al., 2024).

Video game titles illustrate cultural adaptation: (Enríquez-Aranda, 2024) documented how Mandarin titles often contain metaphors or poetic imagery that must be localized for different audiences. Indonesian translations may prioritize market appeal and clarity over literal faithfulness, reflecting skopos-theory considerations (Munday et al., 2022).

Cross-cultural pragmatics also affects honorifics and forms of address in compound sentences. Mandarin uses honorific particles and address markers, while Indonesian expresses respect through lexical choices (e.g., Bapak, Ibu) or formal pronouns (Rahmah & Zamzani, 2022). Translators must navigate these systems to avoid pragmatic mismatches that could alter social attitudes in the translated text. Additionally, the rise of AI and machine translation tools brings new challenges in translating culturally contextual language. Studies evaluating machine translation performance on culturally rich compounds show that systems like Google Translate struggle with idiomatic and contextual expressions, often producing semantically inadequate literal translations (Si et al., 2024; X. Wang et al., 2024). Hence, human translators must engage in post-editing and cultural mediation to correct such deficiencies.

Finally, the dynamics of contemporary usage—especially in digital media and social contexts—mean that compound expressions evolve rapidly, requiring translators to stay updated on neologisms and shifting connotations. Song lyrics translation, for instance, demands not only lexical matching but also consideration of rhyme, rhythm, and cultural resonance in Indonesian (Amini et al., 2024). Overall, cultural and contextual factors require translators to blend linguistic expertise with intercultural competence in rendering Mandarin compound sentences effectively.

METHOD

This research utilizes a qualitative methodology, concentrating on the examination of 25 categories of conjunctions present in the HSK (Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi) vocabulary levels 1 to 6. The focus of the inquiry is a collection of compound sentences translated by an automatic translation engine, notably Google Translate (GT), which are subsequently compared to more precise, human-generated translations. Google Translate was chosen for its extensive utilization among Mandarin language learners, especially in self-directed learning environments. The investigation seeks to assess the capability of machine translation in managing the structure of complex sentences in Mandarin, particularly regarding the precise application of conjunctions that connect clauses inside a phrase.

The study aims to discover critical issues that illustrate the obstacles and deficiencies in the translation process by comparing machine-generated translations with optimal or repaired versions. These difficulties are analyzed from lexical, syntactic, and semantic viewpoints. This project aims to enhance translation studies by assessing the efficacy of machine translation in accurately interpreting and converting Mandarin complex phrases into intelligible Indonesian translations. Data supporting this study are openly available from zenodo at <https://zenodo.org/records/15252085>.

Table 1. Research Vocabulary of Conjunction Words

NO	Compound Words	Pinyin	Meaning (Indonesian)
1	可是 / 但是	kě shì / dàn shì	tetapi
2	因为...所以...	yīn wèi . . . suǒ yǐ . . .	karena... maka...
3	虽然...但是...	suī rán . . . dàn shì . . .	walaupun... tetapi...
4	或者	huò zhě	atau (pernyataan)
5	还是	hái shì	atau (pertanyaan)
6	不但...而且...	bù dàn . . . ér qiě . . .	tidak hanya... tetapi juga...
7	一边...一边...	yī biān . . . yī biān . . .	sambil... sambil...
8	即使...也...	jí shǐ . . . yě . . .	meskipun... juga...
9	只要...就...	zhǐ yào . . . jiù . . .	asalkan... maka...
10	无论...都...	wú lùn . . . dū . . .	tidak peduli... tetap...
11	因此	yīn cǐ	oleh karena itu
12	然而	rán ér	namun
13	此外	cǐ wài	selain itu
14	尽管...还是...	jǐn guǎn . . . hái shì . . .	walaupun... tetap...
15	既然...就...	jì rán . . . jiù . . .	karena sudah... maka...
16	尽管如此	jìn guǎn rú cǐ	meskipun demikian
17	乃至	nǎi zhì	bahkan / hingga
18	以免	yǐ miǎn	agar tidak / supaya tidak
19	哪怕...也...	nǎ pà . . . yě . . .	sekalipun... juga...
20	况且	kuàng qiě	apalagi / terlebih lagi
21	反之	fǎn zhī	sebaliknya
22	从而	cóng ér	dengan demikian / akibatnya
23	总之	zǒng zhī	singkatnya / pokoknya
24	于是	yú shì	maka / kemudian
25	不然	bù rán	kalau tidak / jika tidak

ANALYSIS

This section presents the primary findings from the examination of compound sentence translations from Mandarin to Indonesian. The emphasis is on the categories of faults recognized and their consequences for meaning understanding and translation precision. The findings are analyzed in relation to translation theory and their significance for the application of machine translation systems.

Table 2. Comparison of Sentence Meanings (Natural vs. Google Translate)

No	Mandarin	Indonesian
1	我想去，可是/但是我很忙。 wǒ xiǎng qù , kěshì / dànshì wǒ hěn máng	Natural: Saya ingin pergi, <i>tetapi</i> saya sibuk. GT: Saya ingin pergi, <i>tetapi</i> saya sibuk.
2	因为下雨了，所以我没去。 yīn wèi xià yǔ liǎo , suǒ yǐ wǒ méi qù	Natural: <i>Karena</i> hujan, <i>maka</i> saya tidak pergi. GT: <i>Karena</i> hujan, saya tidak pergi.
3	虽然他生病了，但是他还是来了。 suī rán tā shēng bing le , dànshì tā hái shì lái le	Natural: <i>Walaupun</i> dia sakit, <i>tetapi</i> dia tetap datang. GT: <i>Meski</i> sakit dia tetap datang.

4	你可以选择咖啡或者茶。nǐ kěyǐ xuǎnzé kāfēi huòzhě chá	Natural: Kamu bisa memilih kopi atau teh. GT: Anda dapat memilih kopi atau teh.
5	你想吃米饭还是面条？nǐ xiǎng chī mǐfàn háishi miàntiáo	Natural: Kamu mau makan nasi atau mie? GT: Anda mau nasi atau mie?
6	他不但聪明，而且很努力。tā bùdàn cōngmíng , érqiě hěn nǔ lì	Natural: Dia tidak hanya pintar, tetapi juga rajin. GT: Dia tidak hanya pintar, tetapi juga pekerja keras.
7	她一边唱歌，一边跳舞。tā yī biān chàng gē , yī biān tiàowǔ	Natural: Dia sambil menyanyi sambil menari. GT: Dia bernyanyi dan menari pada saat yang sama .
8	即使很难，我也要试一试。jìshǐ hěn nán , wǒ yě yào shì yī shì	Natural: Meskipun sulit, saya juga mau coba. GT: Sekalipun sulit, saya akan mencobanya.
9	只要你来，我就会高兴。zhǐyào nǐ lái , wǒ jiù huì gāoxìng	Natural: Asalkan kamu datang, saya akan senang. GT: Asal kamu datang, aku akan senang.
10	无论你说什么，我都相信你。wúlùn nǐ shuō shénme , wǒ dōu xiāngxìn nǐ	Natural: Tidak peduli apa yang kamu katakan, saya tetap percaya. GT: Apa pun yang kamu katakan, aku percaya padamu.
11	他口到了，因此被惩罚了。tā kǒu dào le , yīncǐ bèi chéngfá le	Natural: Dia terlambat, oleh karena itu dia dihukum . GT : Dia terlambat dan dihukum karenanya .
12	他很努力学习，然而成绩不好。tā hěn nǔ lì xuéxí , ránér chéngjì bù hǎo	Natural: Dia belajar keras, namun nilainya tidak bagus. GT: Dia belajar sangat giat, tetapi nilainya tidak bagus.
13	他努力工作，此外还帮助别人。tā nǔ lì gōngzuò , cǐwài hái bāngzhù biérén	Natural: Dia bekerja keras, selain itu dia juga bantu orang lain. GT: Dia bekerja keras dan juga membantu orang lain.
14	尽管他很累，还是继续工作。jǐn guǎn tā hěn lèi , háishi jìxù gōngzuò	Natural: Walaupun dia lelah, dia tetap bekerja. GT: Meskipun dia lelah, dia terus bekerja.
15	既然你知道，就要回答。jìrán nǐ zhī dào , jiù yào huí dá	Natural: Karena kamu sudah tahu, maka kamu harus jawab. GT : Sekarang setelah Anda tahu, jawablah .
16	他已经解释了，尽管如此我还是不明白。tā yǐjīng jiěshì le , jǐnguǎn rúcǐ wǒ háishi bù míngbai	Natural: Dia sudah menjelaskan, meskipun demikian saya masih bingung. GT: Dia sudah menjelaskannya, tapi saya masih belum memahaminya.
17	他会说英语、法语，乃至德语。tā huì shuō yīngyǔ 、 fǎyǔ , nǎi zhì déyǔ	Natural: Dia bisa bahasa Inggris, Prancis, bahkan Jerman. GT: Dia berbicara bahasa Inggris, Prancis, dan bahkan Jerman.
18	带把伞，以免被淋湿。dài bǎ sǎn , yǐ miǎn bèi lín shī	Natural: Bawa payung agar tidak kehujanan. GT: Bawalah payung untuk menghindari basah.
19	哪怕失败了，我也不会放弃。nǎ pà shī bài le , wǒ yě bú huì fàng qì	Natural: Sekalipun gagal, saya juga tidak akan menyerah. GT: Sekalipun aku gagal, aku tak akan menyerah.

20	我不喜欢, 况且 我也没有时间。 wǒ bù xǐ huan, kuàng qiě wǒ yě méi yǒu shí jiān	Natural: Saya tidak suka, apalagi saya juga tidak punya waktu. GT: Saya tidak menyukainya, dan saya tidak punya waktu.
21	学习让你 聪明 , 反之 懒惰让你愚蠢。 xuéxí ràng nǐ cōngmíng, fǎnzī lǎnduò ràng nǐ yú chǔn	Natural: Belajar akan membuatmu pintar, sebaliknya malas membuat bodoh. GT: Belajar membuat Anda pintar, sedangkan kemalasan membuat Anda bodoh.
22	他努力学习, 从而 通过了考试。 tā nǔ lì xué xí, cóng ér tōng guò le kǎo shì	Natural: Dia rajin belajar, dengan demikian dia lulus ujian. GT: Dia belajar keras dan lulus ujian.
23	总之 , 我们要小心。 zǒng zhī, wǒ men yào xiǎo xīn	Natural: Singkatnya , kita harus berhati-hati. GT: Singkatnya , kita harus berhati-hati.
24	他饿了, 于是 去吃饭了。 tā è le, yú shì qù chī fàn le	Natural: Dia lapar, maka dia pergi makan. GT: Dia lapar, jadi dia pergi makan.
25	快点, 不然 你会迟到。 kuài diǎn, bù rán nǐ huì chí dào	Natural: Cepatlah, kalau tidak kamu akan terlambat. GT: Cepatlah, atau Anda akan terlambat.

In sentences 1–5, the “Natural Meaning” translation places greater emphasis on sentence structure and contextual meaning. For example, in sentence 1, “I want to go, but I’m busy” is a more natural form in Indonesian compared to the Google Translate (GT) version, which, although structurally similar, may not account for situational variations such as “however” or “nevertheless.” Sentences 4 and 5 also demonstrate how the “Natural Meaning” version constructs sentences to sound more fluid and conversational, while GT tends to be rigid and often translates word-for-word. In sentences 6–10, the advantages of the “Natural Meaning” translations become even more apparent. For instance, in sentence 7, the human translation uses “Dia *sambil* menyanyi *sambil* menari.” which is more coherent and natural, whereas GT’s version, “Dia bernyanyi dan menari pada *saat yang sama*,” sounds more mechanical. Sentence 10 also highlights how “Natural Meaning” better grasps idiomatic expressions and renders them into more commonly used conversational structures. Sentences 11–15 reveal a marked difference in emphasis and nuance. In sentence 11, for example, “Dia terlambat, *oleh karena itu* dia dihukum.” (Natural Meaning) presents a direct and logical cause-effect relationship, whereas GT’s “Dia terlambat dan dihukum karenanya.” although grammatically correct, feels more formal and less straightforward. Similarly, in sentence 14, the use of “tetap” in the human translation conveys determination despite fatigue, while GT merely repeats a fixed pattern with no stylistic variation. In sentences 16–20, the natural translation once again demonstrates the ability to handle more complex sentence structures. Sentence 16, “Dia sudah menjelaskan, *meskipun demikian* saya masih bingung.” is more direct and commanding compared to GT’s version, which confuses the sentence structure. Sentence 19 also showcases a more accurate idiomatic rendering with “*Sekalipun* gagal, saya *juga* tidak akan menyerah.” *Sekalipun* aku gagal, aku tak akan menyerah.” is correct but lacks the expressive, colloquial tone conveyed by the contraction “juga tidak akan.”

Finally, sentences 21–25 consistently highlight the superiority of natural translation in capturing cultural context and selecting appropriate diction. Sentence 23, for instance, “If you’re hungry, eat on the way,” sounds more natural and succinct compared to GT’s overly formal version. Sentence 25 clearly illustrates how GT remains rigid with “Cepatlah, *kalau tidak* kamu akan terlambat.” while the “Natural Meaning” version structures the sentence with proper emphasis and a more natural conversational flow.

Table 3. Error Category

No	Error Category	Quantity	Example Sentences
1	No Error	6	No. 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 23
2	Misinterpretation of Conjunction	6	No. 11, 13, 15, 20, 21, 22
3	Ambiguity in Sentence Structure	5	No. 2, 3, 12, 14, 24
4	Loss of Nuance in Meaning	5	No. 7, 10, 18, 12, 14
5	Change in Language Style	5	No. 4, 5, 9, 19, 24
6	Change in Meaning / Diction	3	No. 6, 17, 21
7	Loss of Formal/Logical Conjunction	2	No. 16, 22

Table 3 displayed reflects the outcomes of a mistake categorization study in the translation of texts from Mandarin to Indonesian. This category seeks to detect and classify prevalent faults in the translation process, especially with foreign language acquisition and the application of machine translation tools like Google Translate (GT). Seven mistake types are delineated, along by the frequency of occurrences and instances of sentence numbers where these faults manifest. This discussion provides an in-depth analysis of each category, including its ramifications and comments on language acquisition and translation precision.

1. No Errors

The initial group comprises sentences devoid of faults in structure, meaning, conjunctions, or linguistic style. Six sentences belong to this category: sentences 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 23. This indicates that, in some instances, machine translation can yield adequately precise and contextually suitable outcomes, both grammatically and semantically. Translations are often more accurate for phrases with basic structures or those without complicated conjunctions. This suggests that translation algorithms operate effectively with simple or non-idiomatic phrases.

2. Misinterpretation of Conjunctions

Errors in the interpretation of conjunctions occur six times and are among the most prevalent errors. The phrases in question are numbered 11, 13, 15, 20, 21, and 22. This mistake indicates that machine translators frequently struggle to comprehend the logical purpose or relationship between sentences linked by conjunctions. Conjunctions like “so,” “because” “although,” and “but” are context-dependent and cannot always be translated straight without sacrificing meaning. Mistranslation of conjunctions can alter the overall meaning of a statement or even contradict its original intent. Such flaws substantially impair the cohesion and clarity of the translated text.

3. Ambiguity in Syntactic Structure

Five sentences belong to this category: sentences 2, 3, 12, 14, and 24. Structural ambiguity frequently occurs owing to ambiguous phrase structure, improper placement of subjects or objects, or unconventional word order relative to typical Indonesian syntax. In many GT translations, the locations of the subject and predicate are either inverted or too proximate, leading to ambiguity regarding the agent of the action or the recipient of its effects. This indicates that, notwithstanding the accuracy of individual words, sentence structure must be meticulously organized to guarantee clarity and prevent ambiguity.

4. Reduction of Subtlety in Significance

This category has four sentences—numbers 7, 10, 18, and 12—that exhibit a deficiency of subtlety. Although the denotative meaning remains acceptable, the connotative or implicit meaning becomes ambiguous. In linguistics—particularly among culturally disparate languages such as Mandarin and Indonesian—numerous meanings are conveyed through context and structure. Machine translation frequently adheres to a literal interpretation, leading to a diminished or entirely absent emotional or cultural resonance. For instance, statements conveying moral principles, courteous remarks, or sarcasm are frequently overlooked by machine translations.

5. Modification in Linguistic Style

Five sentences (numbers 4, 5, 9, 19, and 24) exhibit alterations in linguistic style. This issue arises when the translation does not maintain the original style, encompassing formality, idiomatic expressions, or tone. In cross-cultural communication, linguistic style is essential for transmitting objectives with politeness and appropriateness. A statement in Mandarin may convey respect, but if GT interprets it in a neutral tone, the nuance of politeness may be diminished. Conversely, formal statements may be rendered excessively informally, resulting in a tonal discord or cultural inappropriateness.

6. Alteration in Significance / Lexicon

Diction mistakes or improper word selections that modify meaning were identified in three sentences: numbers 6, 17, and 21. While grammatically accurate, the word selection by the machine translation may be unsuitable, leading to a modified overall meaning. Inaccurate diction can create erroneous impressions, emotional nuances, or result in misinterpretations. For instance, "like" and "love" both convey affirmative emotions, however they vary in strength and context. Likewise, "help" and "assist" are synonymous yet employed differently based on social or cultural contexts.

7. Absence of Formal/Logical Conjunctions

This category comprises just two sentences: numbers 16 and 22, which lack the requisite formal or logical conjunctions. This contrasts with the misinterpretation of conjunctions; here, the anticipated conjunctions are entirely absent, so destroying the logical coherence between phrases. The lack of these factors renders the statement less clear or perhaps ambiguous. A well-translated text necessitates logical coherence among sentence components to ensure the reader comprehends the causal linkages, parallels, or contrasts intended by the original author.

CONCLUSION

The data indicates that while machine translation achieves a satisfactory success rate in certain sentences (about 24% error-free), the bulk of sentences still display various mistakes of varying severity. The predominant concerns are the misreading of conjunctions and confusing syntactic patterns. This underscores that cohesiveness and coherence in the target language, namely Indonesian, continue to pose significant hurdles for translation technology.

This discovery is pertinent to the paper's thesis, which investigates the difficulties in translating complex phrases from Mandarin to Indonesian. It underscores that although machine translation systems like Google Translate might be useful, they remain inadequate in addressing intricate syntactic and semantic components, including logical connections and idiomatic idioms. Consequently, users—particularly language learners—should not depend only on machine translation without a comprehensive comprehension of linguistic context and sentence structure. Human supervision is essential to guarantee precise and effective outcomes. In educational settings, this form of analysis may function as a significant learning tool, not only to improve translation proficiency but also to augment critical language awareness and foreign language expertise.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Amini, M., Ooi, F. F. X., Choo, S. A. X.-E., Saffari, N., Lee, K.-F., & Ravindran, L. (2024). Strategies and Challenges in English to Chinese Translation of Selected Song Lyrics. *JURNAL ARBITRER*, 11(3), 244–262. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.11.3.244-262.2024>
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.
- BRUNO, C., KLEIN, L., & SONG, C. (2024). Mapping Modern Chinese Literature in Translation. *THE BLOOMSBURY HANDBOOK OF MODERN CHINESE LITERATURE IN TRANSLATION*, 1.
- Cui, L., Wang, J., Zhang, Y., Cong, F., Zhang, W., & Hyönä, J. (2021). Compound word frequency modifies the effect of character frequency in reading Chinese. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 74(4), 610–633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747021820973661>

- Deng, T., Schwieter, J. W., Lv, H., Zhang, Y., Yuan, J., & Wang, R. (2024). Cross-language activation and semantic judgements of translation ambiguous words among Chinese–English bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13670069241233388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069241233388>
- Enríquez-Aranda, M. (2024). The Translation of Video Game Titles in the Chinese Market. *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, 17(1), 23–48.
- Hao, Y., Wu, C., & Duan, X. (2024). Processing Mandarin Chinese Compound Words by Native Speakers and Second Language Learners: Word Frequency, Semantic Transparency, and Word Structure. *Sage Open*, 14(2), 21582440241256249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241256249>
- Larson, M. L. (1997). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. University press of America.
- Lin, Y. (2023). The relationship between machine translation and human translation in the era of artificial intelligence machine translation. *Applied and Computational Engineering*, 5(1), 133–138. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2755-2721/5/20230547>
- Munday, J., Pinto, S. R., & Blakesley, J. (2022). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. Routledge.
- Rahmah, I., & Zamzani, F. (2022). Analisis kesepadanan dan strategi penerjemahan sapaan dan honorifik pada cerita rakyat Madura. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 40 (1), 105-123.
- Si, S., Zhou, S., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Exploring the capabilities of ChatGPT in ancient Chinese translation and person name recognition. *Corpus-Based Studies across Humanities*, 2(2), 221–234.
- Suastini, N. W., Artawa, K., Yadnya, I. B. P., & Laksana, I. K. D. (2018). Translation of English Marked Sentences into Indonesian. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 2(1), 89–94.
- Tsang, Y.-K., Zou, Y., & Tse, C.-Y. (2022). Semantic Transparency in Chinese Compound Word Processing: Evidence from Mismatch Negativity. *Neuroscience*, 490, 216–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2022.03.007>
- Wang, X., Beard, R., & Chandra, R. (2024). Evaluation of Google Translate for Mandarin Chinese translation using sentiment and semantic analysis. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2409.04964*.
- Wang, Y., Jiang, W., & Yang, X. (2024). A Comparative Study on Three Chinese-English Translations of Culture-Loaded Words in Shui Hu Zhuan. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature & Translation*, 7(10).
- Xiao, L., & Lai, Q. (2023). EC Translation Strategies for Long and Complex Sentences in Evidence-based Medicine Texts. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 15(5), 230.
- Yao, Y. (2023). A Study on the Translation Strategies of Chinese Culture Loaded Words from the Perspective of Domestication and Foreignization. *Advances in Computer, Signals and Systems*, 7(3).
- 利刘, & 光鑫朱. (n.d.). 汉语复句的分类问题. *汉语学报*, 04, 40–53. <https://doi.org/CNKI:SUN:HYXA.0.2024-04-004>.
- 吕文璐. (2020). 基于对外汉语教学实践的汉语复句关系分类研究. *汉字文化*.
- 宋敏. (2021). 浅论汉语复句类型系统对比及其在汉语教学中的应用. *汉字文化*.
- 文贺冯, & 青青李. (2022). 汉语复句的成分共享与英译断句. *外语教学与研究*, 05, 762–772. <https://doi.org/10.19923/j.cnki.fltr.2022.05.004>.
- 李春玲, 屠爱萍, & 赵慧煜. (2020). 基于 HSK 真题考察的汉语复句习得研究——以 HSK 四级语言点中的复句为例. *云南师范大学学报 (对外汉语教学与研究版)*, 18(5), 24–32.