



CHATGPT VS MANUAL TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON A TOURISM-FOCUSED BILINGUAL PROFILE BOOK

Yessy Purnamasari¹, Zewitra^{2*}, Krisna Yudha Bakhti³, Mohammad Febryanto⁴

zewitra@polban.ac.id

Politeknik Negeri Bandung, Jawa Barat

ABSTRACT

The rapid development of artificial intelligence technology, particularly in machine translation systems such as ChatGPT, has prompted extensive discourse regarding its efficacy compared to manual translation. This study aims to compare the quality of manual and ChatGPT-generated translations within the context of a tourism-focused bilingual profile book of 'Big Farmer', focusing on three analytical levels: lexical, syntactic, and textual. Utilizing a qualitative approach, the research examines the differences in word choice, sentence structure, and semantic accuracy between human and machine translations. The findings reveal that although ChatGPT excels in terms of speed and consistency, manual translation remains superior in preserving cultural nuances and linguistic subtlety, especially at the syntactic and textual levels. Distinct from previous studies that predominantly explored scientific, legal, or medical texts, this research highlights the unique challenges of translating a bilingual profile book in the context of tourism, where maintaining tone and brand identity is paramount. This study contributes to translation studies both theoretically, by expanding the knowledge base in English - Indonesian translation, and practically, by providing insights for translators on the prudent application of AI technologies in translation practices.

Keywords: Big Farmer, ChatGPT, machine translation, manual translation, profile book

INTRODUCTION

The development of information and communication technology, especially in the field of artificial intelligence (AI), has had a huge impact in various sectors, including translation (Wang, 2023). One form of technology that is now widely used in the world of translation is the use of AI-based language models, such as ChatGPT. Previously,



translation was done manually by human translators, who relied heavily on their linguistic knowledge and skills. However, with the advent of AI, especially systems like ChatGPT, the translation process can now be automated with greater speed and efficiency. However, the question arises as to whether the quality of automated translation is equivalent to or even better than manual translation.

Manual translation, performed by a human translator, has the advantage of understanding the cultural context, language nuances, and the ability to adjust the language style according to the audience or purpose of the text. Human translators can also interpret idioms, proverbs, or expressions that require a deep understanding of the source and target languages (Ordorica, 2023). However, manual translation requires more time, more human resources, and higher costs.

On the other hand, various AI-based translation technologies offer advantages in terms of speed and efficiency (Yuxiu, 2024). By using machine learning models trained on large amounts of text data, ChatGPT can generate translations automatically within seconds. The technology can also be used to translate very large volumes of text in a short period of time (Moneus & Sahari, 2024). However, while speed and efficiency are key advantages, AI translation can still sometimes fall short when it comes to understanding more complex contexts and highly culturally specific translations (Gordon, 2024).

Language in the tourism context possesses distinctive characteristics that set it apart from other fields, such as scientific, legal, or medical domains. Tourism texts often employ emotive and descriptive language to create vivid imagery and emotional connections (Rellon, 2024). Additionally, it is rich in cultural references, requiring translators to navigate cultural nuances carefully (Chen & Zhou, 2024). Understanding these differences is essential for translators and content creators working within the tourism industry to effectively communicate and resonate with their target audiences. Translators are urged to understand these aspects, especially when working on materials like bilingual profile books aimed at promoting tourism destinations.

The 'Big Farmer' bilingual profile book, which is used as data in this study, contains text compiled in two languages for the purpose of promotion and education of Kertawangi Tourism Village located in West Bandung Regency, Indonesia. The book contains information about Big Farmer's products, services, and profiles that have been translated into two different languages to reach a wider audience. The 'Big Farmer' profile in this context includes not only technical information but also elements such as organizational values, mission, and vision that often contain more subtle nuances and require careful translation. Big Farmer's bilingual profile book is therefore an ideal text to assess the quality of manual vs. ChatGPT translation.

This study aims to compare the quality of manual translation and translation using ChatGPT in Big Farmer's bilingual profile book. Given the importance of translation quality in maintaining a clear and accurate message between two languages,



as well as the challenges faced in automatic translation, this research has a high urgency. By comparing the results of manual translation and automatic translation, this study aims to evaluate which one is more effective in producing a good translation in terms of lexical, syntactic, and textual aspects (Baker, 2018), especially in the tourism context.

At the lexical level, the analysis focuses on the choice of words used in the translation by evaluating whether the words chosen in the translation match the intended meaning in the source language (Svider, 2021). In addition, technical terms as well as specialized words in profile books, such as business or product terms, are also evaluated when translated appropriately and consistently. Differences in inappropriate word choice can change the meaning and impression that the original text is trying to convey.

At the syntactic level, the analysis focuses on the sentence structure in the translation by checking whether the translated sentences maintain the correct structure in the target language. Syntax means sentence structure; the orderly arrangement, relation agreement, or parts of the sentence in accordance with usage, or custom and it has to do with the used of words, phrases, and clauses in a given sentence (J. Helmie 2015). This includes the use of proper grammar, appropriate word order, and connecting words between sentences (Ahmed, 2023). The translation of complex sentences is also evaluated to ensure that the context and ideas in the sentence remain clear and easy to understand.

At the textual level, the focus is on the overall meaning and context of the translated text by looking at the extent to which the translation preserves the core meaning of the text and its communicative purpose (Nufus, 2022). This includes cultural adaptation, substitution of idioms or expressions, and consistency of ideas between the source text and the translation. Cohesion and coherence within the text are also evaluated to ensure that the message remains intact and understandable to the target language reader (Jauhar Helmie and Sumitra 2024).

The main benefit of this research is to provide a deeper understanding of how ChatGPT can assist in producing quality translations when used alongside human translators, highlighting the potential for collaboration to achieve high-quality results within limited time constraints. The results of this study can provide practical guidance for translators, writers, or companies in choosing between manual translation and automatic translation based on the quality and purpose of the text to be translated. Specifically, this study evaluates the translation quality from three main aspects: lexical (vocabulary), syntactic (sentence structure), and textual (overall meaning and context). Thus, this study examines three main questions, namely:

- 1) How do manual and ChatGPT translations compare at the lexical level in the Big Farmer bilingual profile book?
- 2) How do manual and ChatGPT translations compare at the syntactic level in the Big Farmer bilingual profile book?



3) How do manual and ChatGPT translations compare at the textual level in the Big Farmer bilingual profile book?

Research on the comparison between the use of AI and manual translation yields varied findings with the use of diverse data. (Falempin & Ranadireksa, 2024) explored the impact of advanced language models in translation, highlighting their efficiency in automating translation-related work while emphasizing the importance of human expertise in handling complex communications. This study supports a collaborative approach that points to the fact that AI is capable of enhancing human abilities, and humans bring emotional and cultural intelligence to improve the accuracy of translation results. In line with this research, a comparative study to compare AI and human translation results showed that both have their own advantages in the translation of scientific texts, with GenAIT excelling in terminology accuracy and human translators being better at structuring complex sentences (Fu & Liu, 2024). While AI excels in some respects, such as speed and accessibility, translation using AI still suffers from certain scientific terms, idioms, cultural sensitivities, and ethical issues in the legal and medical fields (Alowedi & Al-Ahdal, 2023; Awadh, 2024; Shahmerdanova, 2025). For specific research using ChatGPT, Puppel, (2024) explored the impact of ChatGPT prompting techniques on translation quality. Three types of prompts were used-zero-shot prompt, context prompt, and few-shot with context prompt-to translate technical and creative texts from English to German. The analysis showed that most of the translation errors are related to language style. This study concludes that ChatGPT can produce coherent document translations by using simple prompts.

While various studies have compared AI and manual translation in the context of general and scientific texts, there are still some research gaps that have not been explored. Most previous studies have focused on the translation of scientific, legal, or medical texts. This study, on the other hand, focuses on a bilingual profile book on the tourism sector, which possesses different characteristics such as more flexible language styles and the need to maintain tone and brand identity. In addition, previous studies have mostly compared AI and manual translations directly from the original source text. This research offers a different approach by retranslating texts that have previously been manually translated, allowing for a deeper analysis of possible meaning changes, stylistic shifts, or information distortions due to repeated translations. Furthermore, previous studies have shown that AI excels in terminology accuracy, while humans are better at constructing complex sentences. However, this study goes into more detail in evaluating the quality of the translations by considering readability, fidelity to the source text, and the extent to which the AI is able to maintain the nuances of the language in accordance with the communication purpose of the profile book. Thus, this research is expected to fill the gap in the comparative study of AI and manual translation, especially in the translation of tourism-focused bilingual profile books with different



communication demands from scientific or legal texts.

METHOD

This study employed qualitative research methodology to analyze the results of manual translation and ChatGPT of the tourism-focused bilingual profile book of 'Big Farmer'. The main data were obtained from the text in the original Indonesian version and its English translation. In the preparation stage, a literature review was performed to find research gaps from similar studies that have been previously done. The research instrument was then prepared in the form of a comparison table containing seven columns: Number, Manual Translation, ChatGPT Translation, Comparison Classification (Lexical, Syntactic, Textual), and Comparison Analysis.

The implementation stage began with data collection. Two types of data were gathered: manual translation and AI-generated translation. The manual translation was sourced from the English version of the 'Big Farmer' bilingual profile book, which had been previously translated by the researchers as part of the 2024 community service program. In contrast, the AI-generated translation was produced by retranslating the Indonesian content of the same profile book into English using ChatGPT. These two translation outputs were then systematically compared to identify differences at the lexical, syntactic, and textual levels, in accordance with the research objectives.

The analysis focused on comparing the outputs of manual and ChatGPT translations, particularly in handling culturally specific terms, idiomatic expressions, and references to local practices found in the source text. It examined how these elements were translated or adapted in the target text. This study adopted Baker's (2018) framework to categorize the translation results into three levels: lexical, syntactic, and textual.

The first part of the analysis addressed the lexical level, focusing on the translators' choice of words and terms. The second part examined the syntactic level, analyzing how sentence structures were either maintained or modified. The third part evaluated the textual level, considering the coherence and contextual relevance of the overall translated text. The main objective was to compare how both translation methods—manual and ChatGPT—approached these three levels in the context of the bilingual profile book.

Data classification involved the systematic processing and coding of the Indonesian and English versions of the text. Each segment of the source and target text was categorized according to the three translation levels. This approach allowed the analysis to capture not only the linguistic choices made in each translation, but also the underlying cultural and communicative strategies that influenced the translators' decisions.



FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study focuses on three main areas of discussion: the comparison between ChatGPT and manual translation results at the lexical, syntactic, and textual levels. The upcoming part is structured accordingly.

Comparison of translation results at the lexical level

At the lexical level, this study analyzes three categories of culturally loaded words: (1) material culture-related terms, which refer to tangible cultural artifacts such as food, clothing, or traditional objects; (2) social culture-related terms, which encompass expressions tied to social practices, institutions, or community roles; and (3) linguistic culture-related terms, which include idioms, proverbs, or culturally bound expressions that reflect the unique worldview embedded in the language (Svider, 2021).

Material culture-loaded words

Material culture-loaded words refer to the terms in which each society produces and exchanges material goods, so that people can feed, clothes, shelter, and provide for themselves (Yu, 2020). This relates to real objects, geographical places, physical environments, food, clothing, architecture, etc.

Data 1

SL TL	<i>Terletak di kaki Gunung Burangrang, Desa Kertawangi diberkahi dengan udara yang sejuk, tanah yang subur, dan kekayaan alam yang melimpah.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Located at the base of Mount Burangrang, Desa Kertawangi is blessed with calm air, fertile land, and an abundance of natural wealth.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Located at the foot of Mount Burangrang, Kertawangi Village is blessed with cool air, fertile soil, and abundant natural resources.

The text is full of material culture-loaded words that reflect Indonesia's natural wealth and geographical conditions. Words such as mountain, cool air, fertile land, and natural wealth not only are physically descriptive but also have cultural values about human relationships with nature. TL1 retains some of the original terms, such as Kertawangi Village, which is lexically more literal and suitable for the local target audience. On the other hand, TL2 chooses words that are more idiomatic and natural in English, such as at the foot of the mountain, cool air, and natural resources. Therefore, lexically, both TLs can transfer cultural meaning while maintaining the fluidity of the target language for its readers.



Data 2

SL TL	<i>Berbagai tempat wisata telah didirikan antara lain Dusun Bambu, Curug Layung, Curug Cimahi, Curug Pelangi, Bumi Perkemahan Natural Hill, dan masih banyak lagi yang lainnya.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Numerous tourist spots have been established, including Dusun Bambu, Curug Layung, Curug Cimahi, Curug Pelangi, Natural Hill Campsite, and many others.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Various tourist attractions have been established, including Dusun Bambu, Curug Layung, Curug Cimahi, Curug Pelangi, Bumi Perkemahan Natural Hill, and many more.

The text is dominated by material culture-loaded words, especially the names of local tourist spots such as waterfalls, hamlets, and campgrounds. Both versions are quite lexically accurate as they both choose to retain the names of tourist attractions.

Data 3

SL TL	<i>Setiap akhir pekan dan hari libur, Desa Kertawangi dipenuhi mobil dan wisatawan dari berbagai penjuru kota, yang datang untuk menikmati kemewahan pemandangan kawasan tersebut.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Every weekend and public holiday, Desa Kertawangi is packed with cars and tourists from all over the city who come to take in the scenic splendor of the area.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Every weekend and holiday, Kertawangi Village is filled with cars and tourists from various parts of the city who come to enjoy the luxurious views of the area.

Lexically, TL1 uses more idiomatic and conventional diction in English travel narratives, such as ‘scenic splendor’, which sounds poetic but precise. Meanwhile, TL2 tends to be more literal but less natural in some parts, such as ‘luxurious views’, which sounds a bit awkward because ‘luxury’ in this context refers more to natural beauty, not physical luxury.

Data 4

SL TL	<i>Sayangnya, masyarakat Kertawangi sendiri tidak memperoleh manfaat maksimal dari keberadaan tempat-tempat wisata tersebut.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Sadly, Kertawangi people cannot fully benefit from these tourism potentials.



TL2 (ChatGPT)	Unfortunately, the people of Kertawangi themselves do not gain the maximum benefits from the presence of these tourist attractions.
--------------------------	---

In this sentence, there is a difference in the translation of the phrase ‘tourism potentials’ in TL1 and ‘tourist attractions’ in TL2. The manual translation chooses the word ‘potentials’ by considering the condition of Desa Kertawangi, which is surrounded by tourist attractions that hopefully have the potential to provide benefits to residents, but in reality, it does not. Meanwhile, ChatGPT tends to translate the phrase ‘*tempat wisata*’ into its equivalent English term ‘tourist attractions’ without considering the context.

Data 5

SL TL	<i>... dikelola oleh perusahaan swasta, menyisakan kemacetan lalu lintas dan tumpukan sampah yang harus diurus oleh masyarakat setempat.</i>
TL1 (manual)	... are run by private companies, leaving only traffic delays and accumulated trash for the local people to deal with.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	... are managed by private companies, leaving behind traffic congestion and piles of waste that must be dealt with by the local community.

The material culture-loaded words in data 5 refer to the phrase ‘*tumpukan sampah*’, which is translated as ‘accumulated trash’ in TL1 rather than ‘piles of waste’ as done by ChatGPT. This difference shows the use of the more general term ‘trash’ by the manual translator to make it easier for the reader to understand.

Social culture-loaded words

Social culture-loaded words refer to social ideology, which describes the system in terms of social and economic variables within a particular class or group, reflected in words loaded with social connotations (Zhuang, 2020). This relates to social systems, institutions, customs, and social norms.

Data 6

SL TL	<i>Bersama anggota Kelompok Sadar Wisata (POKDARWIS), ia mendirikan Big Farmer pada tahun 2020.</i>
------------------	---



TL1 (manual)	Together with the members of Kelompok Sadar Wisata (POKDARWIS), he established Big Farmer in 2020.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Together with the members of the Tourism Awareness Group (POKDARWIS), he established Big Farmer in 2020.

Data 6 features one social culture-loaded term, Kelompok Sadar Wisata (POKDARWIS). TL1 tends to use the preservation strategy by maintaining the original term. While TL2 uses substitutions by translating the term ‘POKDARWIS’ into the target language.

Data 7

SL TL	<i>Big Farmer menawarkan usaha dan solusi inovatif untuk membantu masyarakat lokal meningkatkan perekonomian mereka.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Big Farmer offers innovative enterprises and solutions to help local communities raise their economic standing.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Big Farmer offers innovative businesses and solutions to help the local community improve their economy.

In Data 7, there are no explicit culture-specific terms, but there are several phrases with socio-cultural nuances, such as ‘*usaha*’, which connotes MSMEs in Indonesia, and the phrase ‘local community’, which relates to the concept of locality in village development. Both TLs equivalently translate ‘*masyarakat lokal*’ into ‘local community’.

Data 8

SL TL	<i>Program ini menggandeng masyarakat desa untuk memanfaatkan secara maksimal potensi sumber daya alam dan manusia.</i>
TL1 (manual)	This program collaborates with the village people to fully use the potential of both natural and human resources.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	This program collaborates with the village community to make the most of the potential of natural and human resources.

The term ‘*masyarakat desa*’ is important because it reflects Indonesia's unique social structure, especially in the context of empowerment and development collaboration. By translating the phrase ‘*masyarakat desa*’ into ‘village people’, TL1 tends to be more literal and closer to the original structure.

Data 9



SL TL	<i>Lahan peternakan, perkebunan, dan pertanian ditawarkan ke dalam paket wisata, dan masyarakat lokal diperdayakan untuk membantu menjalankan program Big Farmer.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Farms, gardens, and agricultural lands are included in the tourism packages, and local people are employed to help run the Big Farmer program.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Livestock, plantation, and agricultural land are included in the tourism package, and the local community is empowered to help run the Big Farmer program.

Some terms, such as ‘*peternakan*’ and ‘*perkebunan*’, have important cultural content, especially in the context of rural community-based development in Indonesia. TL1 translates both phrases into ‘farms’ and ‘gardens’ as a more literal and functional translation, while TL2 becomes more specific but can cause a narrowing of meaning.

Data 10

SL TL	<i>Tujuan dari kegiatan ini selain untuk meningkatkan kecintaan terhadap alam juga untuk menjalin silaturahmi dan mempererat hubungan antar individu dalam organisasi.</i>
TL1 (manual)	In addition to fostering a greater appreciation for nature, this activity aims to forge camaraderie and strengthen relationships among individuals within the organization.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	The goal of these activities, besides fostering a love for nature, is to build camaraderie and strengthen relationships among individuals within the organization.

The term ‘*silaturahmi*’ belongs to a social-culturally loaded word that is unique to Indonesian culture, containing family values, brotherhood, and Islamic spirituality. Both TMs translate it with the term ‘camaraderie’, which, although semantically close, does not fully capture the cultural depth contained in the term. TL2 shows a more formal and natural use of structure, while TL1 tends to be more functional.

Linguistic culture-loaded words

Linguistic culture-loaded words refer to words with linguistic cultural connotations representing the phonetic meaning of a language at the family level (Zhuang, 2020). More specifically, words or expressions that are unique to a language because of their form or meaning cannot be directly translated into another language.

Data 11



SL TL	<i>Ranah industri Big Farmer bergerak dalam bidang agro-eduwisata pariwisata dengan memanfaatkan potensi desa.</i>
TL1 (manual)	By harnessing the village's potential, the Big Farmer sector is involved in agro-edutourism.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	The scope of Big Farmer's industry is focused on agro-edutourism, utilizing the potential of the village.

In the translation of the above data, the term 'Big Farmer' is linguistically retained in both TLs as an effort to introduce the organization to local and foreign target readers.

Data 12

SL TL	<i>Produk pertanian unggulan Desa Kertawangi adalah sayuran, buah, dan bunga sedangkan di bidang peternakan, masyarakat desa memelihara ternak rumahan, seperti sapi, kambing, domba, kelinci, dan lain-lain.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Vegetables, fruits, and flowers are Kertawangi's best agricultural products. In terms of animal husbandry, the village community keeps domestic cattle, including cows, goats, sheep, rabbits, and others.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	The main agricultural products of Kertawangi Village are vegetables, fruits, and flowers, while in livestock farming, the local community raises domestic animals such as cows, goats, sheep, rabbits, and others.

TL1 splits the sentence into two parts, while TL2 uses a more subtle 'while' structure that connects ideas-more common in formal but communicative English exposition.

Data 13

SL TL	<i>Pengunjung akan diajak berkeliling desa sambil belajar cara merawat tanaman dan ternak.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Visitors will be invited to tour the village while learning how to take care of plants and cattle.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Visitors will be taken on a tour of the village while learning how to care for plants and livestock.

In general, this sentence describes a typical form of community-based educational



tourism in rural Indonesia. The sentence ‘learning how to care for...’ is a more concise and general translation in the context of educational tourism than “learning how to take care of...” in TL1, which sounds more informal and lengthier.

Data 14

SL TL	<i>Aktivitas berjalan kaki melintasi perkebunan atau mendaki perbukitan. Aktivitas ini bertujuan untuk meningkatkan kesehatan fisik dan mental.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Walking across plantations or hiking hills. This activity intends to enhance both physical and mental health.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	The activities include walking through plantations or hiking the hills. These activities aim to improve both physical and mental health.

Linguistically, TL1 and TL2 rearrange the sentence structure with syntactic adjustments to fit the English rules. TL2 uses a more formal structure: “The activities include...” and ‘These activities aim to...’, while TL1 is more fragmentative.

Data 15

SL TL	<i>Secara fisik hiking akan melatih otot kaki dan pernafasan dan secara mental hiking dapat menjernihkan pikiran dengan menikmati pemandangan alam sehingga mengurangi stress.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Physically, hiking exercises the leg muscles and improves breathing, while mentally, it clears the mind by enjoying the natural scenery, thereby reducing stress.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Physically, hiking will train the leg muscles and improve breathing, while mentally, it can clear the mind by enjoying the natural scenery, thus reducing stress.

Linguistically, both TL1 and TL2 manage to maintain the parallel structure typical of TS, but TL2 shows a more formal and prospective expressive tone through the use of future tense and logical transitions such as "thus reducing stress". TL1 translates more literally and directly without adding deeper cultural or social context.

Comparison of translation results at the syntax level

Syntactically, there are two things analyzed in this study: the subject of each clause and verb types.

Subject of each clause

Data 16



SL TL	<i>Big Farmer merupakan sebuah program agro edu wisata yang digagas oleh masyarakat Desa Kertawangi, Kabupaten Bandung Barat, Jawa Barat.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Big Farmer is an agro-edutourism program of Desa Kertawangi, West Bandung Regency, West Java.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Big Farmer is an agro-edutourism program initiated by the community of Kertawangi Village, West Bandung Regency, West Java.

TL2 maintains two clauses with the subject implied through the participial clause form ('initiated by the community'), while TL1 uses only one main clause. In the data, TL2 combines linking verb (is) and passive transitive verb (initiated), while TL1 only uses linking verb. The use of the reduced relative clause form in TL2 also functions as a connective that represents the existing clausal structure in SL, while TL1 inserts a simpler prepositional phrase.

Data 17

SL TL	<i>Pengunjung akan disuguhi pemandangan yang menakjubkan, udara yang menyejukan, dan kehangatan masyarakat Desa Kertawangi di samping pengetahuan mengenai pertanian dan peternakan.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Visitors will be delighted by the stunning scenery, refreshing breeze, and warmth of the Kertawangi Village people, in addition to a practical understanding of agriculture and animal husbandry.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Visitors will be treated to breathtaking views, refreshing air, and the warmth of the Kertawangi Village community, along with insights into agriculture and livestock farming.

Syntactically, TL2 retains the main subject 'visitors' in a natural passive construction ('will be treated to'), while TL1 uses 'will be delighted by', which shifts the focus to the emotional response rather than the experience itself.

Data 18

SL TL	<i>Berbagai tempat wisata telah didirikan antara lain Dusun Bambu, Curug Layung, Curug Cimahi, Curug Pelangi, Bumi Perkemahan Natural Hill, dan masih banyak lagi yang lainnya.</i>
------------------------	---



TL1 (manual)	Numerous tourist spots have been established, including Dusun Bambu, Curug Layung, Curug Cimahi, Curug Pelangi, Natural Hill Campsite, and many others.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Various tourist attractions have been established, including Dusun Bambu, Curug Layung, Curug Cimahi, Curug Pelangi, Bumi Perkemahan Natural Hill, and many more.

Syntactically, both TL1 and TL2 are accurate and faithful to the original structure in the SL. They both employ an equivalent passive form (‘have been established’) and maintain a sentence order consistent with the SL: subject → passive verb → additive marker → list of objects. Minor differences in lexical choices, such as ‘tourist spots’ (TL1) vs ‘tourist attractions’ (TL2) do not affect the syntactic structure but convey slightly different stylistic nuances.

Data 19

SL TL	<i>Setiap akhir pekan dan hari libur, Desa Kertawangi dipenuhi mobil dan wisatawan dari berbagai penjuru kota, yang datang untuk menikmati kemewahan pemandangan kawasan tersebut.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Every weekend and public holiday, Desa Kertawangi is packed with cars and tourists from all over the city who come to take in the scenic splendor of the area.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Every weekend and holiday, Kertawangi Village is filled with cars and tourists from various parts of the city who come to enjoy the luxurious views of the area.

Syntactically, both translation versions—TL1 and TL2—have structures equivalent to the source text. The main subject and relative clause are kept consistent, and the passive-active forms are preserved, reflecting fidelity to the original structure. TL1 tends to use more expressive diction, such as “scenic splendor,” while TL2 opts for a more literal phrase like “luxurious views.”

Data 20

SL TL	<i>Bersama anggota Kelompok Sadar Wisata (POKDARWIS), ia mendirikan Big Farmer pada tahun 2020.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Together with the members of Kelompok Sadar Wisata (POKDARWIS), he established Big Farmer in 2020.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Together with the members of the Tourism Awareness Group (POKDARWIS), he established Big Farmer in 2020.



Both translations (TL1 and TL2) remain faithful to the syntactic structure of the source sentence. The main subject, verb, and object are preserved, and the introductory adverbial phrase is also maintained in prepositional form. The difference lies in the translation of *Kelompok Sadar Wisata*. TL1 retains the term in Indonesian to preserve originality, while TL2 translates it into English (Tourism Awareness Group) for clarity to foreign readers. Syntactically, both are accurate and parallel to the source language.

Verb Types

Data 21

SL TL	<i>Program ini menggandeng masyarakat desa untuk memanfaatkan secara maksimal potensi sumber daya alam dan manusia.</i>
TL1 (manual)	This program collaborates with the village people to fully use the potential of both natural and human resources.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	This program collaborates with the village community to make the most of the potential of natural and human resources.

Both translation versions successfully preserve the core meaning and basic syntactic structure of the source sentence. The main subject is followed by the collaborative verb “collaborates” and the objects of collaboration, “the village people” and “community.” The purpose of the collaboration is clearly conveyed through an infinitive structure (to + verb), which substitutes for “untuk memanfaatkan...”. Both are syntactically valid and accurately convey the intended message.

Data 22

SL TL	<i>Desa Kertawangi berada tepat di kaki Gunung Burangrang, Jawa Barat.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Desa Kertawangi is situated directly at the base of Mount Burangrang, West Java.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Kertawangi Village is located at the foot of Mount Burangrang, West Java.

TL1 is more formal and retains the original structure and terminology from the source language, such as ‘Desa Kertawangi’. TL2 uses more general English and renders the term as ‘Kertawangi Village’, along with the idiom ‘at the foot’. The TL1 translation preserves the original name more closely and carries a more formal tone.

Data 23



SL TL	<i>Big Farmer menawarkan usaha dan solusi inovatif untuk membantu masyarakat lokal meningkatkan perekonomiannya.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Big Farmer offers innovative enterprises and solutions to help local communities raise their economic standing.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Big Farmer offers innovative businesses and solutions to help the local community improve their economy.

Both TL1 and TL2 translate the verb ‘*menawarkan*’ using the same verb, “offers”, followed by a to-infinitive verb “to help” to render the word “membantu”.

Comparison of translation results at the textual level

Connectives

Data 24

SL TL	<i>Big Farmer berkomitmen untuk meningkatkan perekonomian masyarakat Desa Kertawangi dengan cara memberdayakan potensi yang dimiliki oleh masyarakat dalam program agro edu wisata.</i>
TL1 (manual)	Big Farmer is committed to improving the economic welfare of the Kertawangi people by empowering the potential of the community in the agro-edutourism program.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	Big Farmer is committed to improving the economy of the Kertawangi Village community by empowering the potential possessed by the community through the agro-edutourism program.

In the example above, there is a difference in the prepositional phrases ‘in’ and ‘through’ in both TMs. TL1 translates ‘dalam program agro edu wisata’ as ‘in the agro-edutourism program’, while TL2 translates it as ‘through the agro-edutourism program’. This difference in the connective preposition highlights an emphasis in TL2 on the context of using the program as a tool for empowerment.

Data 25



SL	<i>Ranah industri Big Farmer bergerak dalam bidang argo edu wisata pariwisata dengan memanfaatkan potensi desa.</i>
TL	
TL1 (manual)	By harnessing the village's potential, the Big Farmer sector is involved in agro-edutourism.
TL2 (ChatGPT)	The scope of Big Farmer's industry is focused on agro-edutourism, utilizing the potential of the village.

TL1 changes the sentence structure by adding 'by' at the beginning of the sentence. This translation makes the sentence in TL shorter and more natural in English style. In TL2, the word 'utilizing...' is used as a participial phrase after the main clause, maintaining a more linear structure that is closer to the SL.

CONCLUSION

The comparison of translation results between human translation and a popular machine translation tool launched in 2022, ChatGPT, is the focus of this study, which evaluates lexical, syntactic, and textual levels. Lexically, it can be concluded that manual translation generally shows more accurate, natural, and consistent word choices in the context of cultural translation and the English language structure. TL1 tends to use standardized and familiar terms in English for Tourism. Additionally, manual translation more frequently retains local place names and institutions in their entirety, creating a formal and accurate impression in conveying information. Syntactically, consistency in sentence structure and word choices also stands out as a strength of manual translation. The sentences in the manual translation are generally smoother to read and align with English syntactic norms. Manual translation also pays more attention to grammatical aspects such as subject-predicate agreement and the correct choice of verbs, as well as being more cautious in using idioms or appropriate stylistic elements. At a higher level, or textually, the sentences in the manual translation generally have a logical flow that is coherent and easy to follow, with the use of conjunctions, sentence structure, and word choices supporting the integration of meaning across sections. For example, in longer sentences containing descriptive or procedural information, manual translation consistently maintains the subject-predicate-object structure and avoids ambiguity. The findings of this study show that the translation results of the Big Farmer profile book by both methods have variations and strengths in different sectors. At a certain level, such as translating general statements, ChatGPT works effectively. Manual translation, however, faces limitations in terms of the cognitive and linguistic abilities of the translator, which sometimes leads to less accurate translation results. Unlike manual translation, ChatGPT, through continuous prompts, can automatically understand and adapt to different linguistic and cultural characteristics, resulting in translations that are more accurate, faster, and comprehensive.



There are several limitations in this study. First, the conclusions and implications may differ for other types of books, as they are based solely on a single bilingual profile book. Second, the AI used for comparison is limited to ChatGPT. Therefore, future research could include more than one profile book and use different AI tools to gain a better understanding of the translation outcomes between humans and AI.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded through the *Penelitian Madya Utama* scheme by Bandung State Polytechnic under contract number: 109.11/R7/PE.01.03/2025

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, M. N. (2023). Translation and the syntax of the complex sentence. *Journal of the College of Basic Education*, 29(119), 16–29.
<https://doi.org/10.35950/cbej.v29i119.10569>
- Alowedi, N. A., & Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2023). Artificial intelligence based Arabic-to-English machine versus human translation of poetry: an analytical study of outcomes. *Journal of Namibian Studies : History Politics Culture*, 33, 1523–1538. <https://doi.org/10.59670/jns.v33i.800>
- Awadh, A. N. M. (2024). Challenges and strategies of translating scientific texts: a comparative study of human translation and artificial intelligence. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 9898–9909.
<https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.4147>
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: a coursebook on translation*. Routledge.
- Chen, S., & Zhou, T. (2024). Culturally based semantic losses in Lonely Planet’s travel guides translations for Beijing, Shanghai, and Sichuan. *Frontiers in Communication*, 9(March), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1343784>
- Falempin, A., & Ranadireksa, D. (2024). Human vs machine: the future of translation in an AI-driven world. *Proceedings of the Widyatama International Conference on Engineering 2024 (WICOENG 2024)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-618-5>
- Fu, L., & Liu, L. (2024). What are the differences? A comparative study of generative artificial intelligence translation and human translation of scientific texts. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03726-7>
- Helmie, J. 2015. “Verb Go (Back To , On , And Out) in English For Tefl in the Novel of New Moon by Stephenie Meyer : The Syntactic And Semantic Analysis.” *Educare* 7 (february): 123–134.
- Helmie, Jauhar, and Raina Gesthia Sumitra. 2024. “Systemic Functional Grammar of



- Theme-Rheme Used in Folkative Instagram Account.” (1): 268–86.
- Gordon, S. F. (2024). Artificial intelligence and language translation in scientific publishing. *Science Editor*, 47(1), 8–9. <https://doi.org/10.36591/se-4701-05>
- Moneus, A. M., & Sahari, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence and human translation: A contrastive study based on legal texts. *Heliyon*, 10(6), e28106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28106>
- Nufus, T. Z. (2022). Analysis of translation problems arising from non-equivalence at word level, above word level, grammatical level, textual level, and pragmatic level based on JK Rowling manuscript of “Harry Potter.” *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(6), 2587–2594. <http://journalppw.com>
- Ordorica, S. (2023). *Comparing and contrasting AI and human translation*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbesbusinesscouncil/2023/06/05/comparing-and-contrasting-ai-and-human-translation/>
- Puppel, M. (2024). *A comparative study of technical and creative text translation: evaluating the performance of ChatGPT* (Issue June). L-Universita ta’Malta.
- Rellon, M. P. (2024). Language of emotions: Establishing connection with customers in tourism industries. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(10), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i10.3029>
- Shahmerdanova, R. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Addiction: Challenges and Opportunities. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*, 2(1), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02537176241274148>
- Svider, I. A. (2021). *Lexical aspects of specialised translation*.
- Wang, L. (2023). The impacts and challenges of artificial intelligence translation tool on translation professionals. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 163, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202316302021>
- Yu, K. (2020). A comparative study of the translation of material culture-loaded words of hongloumeng in the light of skopostheorie. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(2), 318–323. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1102.22>
- Yuxiu, Y. (2024). Application of translation technology based on AI in translation teaching. *Systems and Soft Computing*, 6(January), 200072. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sasc.2024.200072>
- Zhuang, Y. (2020). A Study of the Translation of Culture-Loaded Words in the Biography of Su Tungpo. *OALib*, 07(07), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1106518>