

Original Article

I or GAI? A Comparative Analysis of Human and Generative Artificial Intelligence Translations

Jasmine Mercado ^{1,*}, Clarence Jinwell Ramos ¹, Jon Paolo Ordoñez ¹

Received: 28 February 2026; Revised: 05 May 2026;

Accepted: 17 May 2026; Published: 19 May 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.66074/HUM44D66F5>

Abstract

The primary goal of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of human translation and Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) Translation in terms of Accuracy, Expression, and Elegance. The study used 20 translated texts sourced from both human translators and GAI platforms, which were analyzed using translation techniques such as word-for-word, grammatical, idiomatic, and communicative translation. The results revealed that while GAI translations generally excel in speed and consistency, human translations still surpass in capturing accuracy, expression, and elegance. Human translators most frequently used idiomatic and communicative techniques, while GAI translations tended to favor word-for-word and grammatical approaches. This study was anchored in Stanfield's 'The Measurement of Translation Ability' and Juliane House's Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) model, providing a theoretical lens for understanding translation choices and their impacts. Findings show that GAI translations are improving rapidly, but cannot fully capture the subtleties of human emotion and cultural adaptation. This analysis led the researchers to recommend improving the integration of GAI tools into translation tasks, emphasizing the need for human post-editing to ensure quality in professional and academic settings.

¹ College of Sciences,
Technology and
Communication, Inc.
* 20221818@cstc.
edu.ph

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence, human translation, translations, translation criteria, translation techniques

1. Introduction

Translation plays a crucial role in bridging linguistic and cultural gaps, enabling effective communication across diverse populations. Specifically, translation helps people communicate between different languages and cultures. As globalization continues to expand, the need for accurate and efficient translation has grown significantly across fields such as business, healthcare, diplomacy, and, especially, education and literature. This is evident in translation, which involves not only linguistic conversion but also cultural adaptation to preserve the original message's intended meaning and context. The study of translation has evolved, incorporating theoretical frameworks and technological advancements to enhance accuracy and efficiency. Traditional translation methods relied heavily on human expertise, emphasizing linguistic proficiency and cultural knowledge. Human translation is the process of converting text or speech from one language to another by a human translator.

However, the emergence of generated artificial intelligence has revolutionized the field, raising discussions about the balance between human and automated translation processes. Ulitkin's (2011) study further emphasized that, due to rapid advances in electronic hardware and software, technology has become a key part of any translator's skill set. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) translation is a technology that uses computer programs to translate languages (Lv, 2023) automatically. The rapid popularity of GAI stems from its ability to translate text and speech quickly, making communication across languages easier. Generative Artificial Intelligence GAI translation is used in apps, websites, and businesses to help people understand each other without the need for a human translator. Raising questions about its effectiveness compared to human translators.

In recent years, Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) has made significant progress in language translation. As stated by Yuxiu (2024), Generative Artificial Intelligence translation has made positive progress in improving translation quality and efficiency. According to global statistics, over 1 billion individuals have access to artificial intelligence, contributing to the usage of GAI translators. While GAI tools like Google Translate, Gemini, ChatGPT, and CiCi offer speed and efficiency, they often struggle to capture context, tone, and cultural nuances. Still, GAI translation needs improvement in some areas, such as logical expressions (Wang, 2023).

On the other hand, human translators rely on experience, intuition, and deep language understanding to produce accurate and meaningful translations. According to Paperpal (2024), human translation effectively considers cultural and contextual factors, making it a widely used and trusted method. Human translations are adept at handling cultural terminology to ensure the translated text is accurate and consistent. However, human translation still struggles, leading users to turn to generative artificial intelligence for translations. This is very evident in students' use of AI, who tend to find the fastest way to do things. This is supported by Argondizzo (2016), who noted

that, most of the time, people do not want to spend large amounts of money or time on manual translation.

Although these areas are greatly explored, they are explored separately. As stated by Awadh (2024), there is a lack of research comparing the effectiveness of GAI software with that of human translators across different types of texts. Additionally, most existing comparisons focus on traditional AI-based translation models rather than newer, more advanced generative AI systems. This research gap leaves uncertainty about how well generative artificial intelligence performs compared to human translators on complex or specialized texts. Therefore, this study aims to bridge this gap by providing a detailed comparative analysis of human translation and generative artificial intelligence, evaluating not only accuracy but also expression and elegance in terms of contextual understanding and the cultural appropriateness of the translated output.

Considering the increasing reliance on both human and generative artificial intelligence for translation, this underscores the need for researchers to study and provide comparative analyses of their effectiveness across various translation contexts. By evaluating the accuracy, expression, and elegance of translations produced by generative artificial intelligence and human translators, this research seeks to highlight the strengths and limitations of both approaches. Understanding these differences is crucial in determining how GAI can be best utilized in the translation industry while ensuring that quality and meaning are not compromised. This research is particularly relevant as industries such as education and diplomacy continue to depend on accurate translations for effective global communication. By identifying the areas where GAI translation excels and where human expertise remains essential, this study can contribute valuable insights to the ongoing discussions about the future of translation. Thus, this research will help language professionals, businesses, and technology developers make informed decisions about integrating GAI while preserving the quality and integrity of human translation.

2. Methodology

This study was conducted with the following procedures. The research design employed was content analysis to compare human translation and generative artificial intelligence. The Content analysis was specifically done in analyzing the translated outputs line by line. It was analyzed through the lens of accuracy, expression, and elegance. It was conducted at an institution offering tertiary education, specifically Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English in Quezon, Province. The selection of this locale was linked to the number of participants needed. The 10 participants in this study are Third-Year College students in the Bachelor of Secondary Education, Major in English, ensuring a diverse range of perspectives on translation accuracy, expression, and elegance. The corpus of the study consists of the primary text analyzed to evaluate the translation outputs of both Human and Generative Artificial Intelligence. The selected text was “Sa Aking Mga Kabata” by Dr. José Rizal. This

historically and culturally significant poem emphasized the importance of one's native language in shaping identity and patriotism. To add to this, the poem was selected because it meets the translation criteria outlined in this study. These corpora were then evaluated by teachers who hold Master's degrees in Applied Linguistics. The evaluation criteria were anchored on Stansfield's (1992), Measurement of Translation Ability and Julliane House's (1997) Translation Quality Assessment (TQA). To make comparative metrics easier, numerical values were provided in the analyzed lines. In the human-produced corpus, the researchers ensure that ethical considerations and informed consent are presented. This is to adhere to the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173), ensuring that all collected data remains confidential and is used solely for research purposes. All personal information was anonymized and securely stored. Furthermore, APA citation guidelines were followed in the reference section of this research to maintain academic integrity.

This study employed a comparative content analysis approach to evaluate the data gathered from the translated output of the participants translating 'Sa Aking mga Kabata' by Jose Rizal, considering accuracy, expression, and elegance of human translation versus generative artificial intelligence (GAI) translation. The data were analyzed using qualitative methods to ensure a comprehensive assessment.

To ensure the reliability and validity of the translations, the researchers provided a table of criteria covering three key evaluation aspects: accuracy, expression, and elegance. The table will include predefined criteria for each aspect.

Scale	Indication
Accuracy	The meaning of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences from the source text is accurately conveyed in the target text. Therefore, there are no distortions in meaning.
Expression	The linguistic variables, such as fluency, style, syntax, and tone, which involve contextual understanding and cultural appropriateness, were incorporated into the translated output. Therefore, the translation was fluent.
Elegance	The functional equivalence between the source and target texts was recognized. The stylistic refinement, naturalness, and aesthetic quality are observed in the translated output, reflecting the elegance. Therefore, the translated output does not appear awkward to readers.

For accuracy and expression, the indications were based on Stansfield's (1992), Measurement of Translation Ability. While the elegance will be based on Julliane House's (1997) Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) which indicates that;

The findings from qualitative analyses were synthesized to determine overall translation quality. The Poems were divided into lines, and each line was analyzed for how it reflects the translation types and criteria. This allows the researchers to provide numerical equivalence to the analyzed data. Any patterns or differences were

discussed, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of human and GAI translation. By integrating evaluation, this analysis aims to provide a well-rounded understanding of the comparative analysis of human and GAI translation methods.

3. Results

Upon analysis, the following findings and discussion of the translation of Human and GAI (Generative Artificial Intelligence) in terms of translation criteria and translation techniques. This section also presents a comparative analysis of human and GAI translation with respect to the two variables cited.

3.1 Assessment of Translation Criteria from Data Sources

Table 1 presents the performance of human translation based on three main criteria: accuracy, expression, and elegance. The 95% accuracy indicates that the human-translated text remains highly faithful to the original. This means that almost all the essential ideas, meanings, and details from the source text are correctly transferred. It reflects the human translator’s ability to understand both the literal and contextual meanings of the text, preserving its intended message.

Table 1. Assessment of human translation outputs
in terms of translation criteria.

Translator	Accuracy	Expression	Elegance
Human	95%	62.1%	95%

In terms of elegance, the human translation also achieved a 95 percent rating, showing that the translated output reads smoothly, naturally, and with stylistic quality. This high percentage implies that the translation is not only correct in meaning but also aesthetically pleasing. It maintains literary finesse, using appropriate vocabulary, rhythm, and sentence flow, which are especially important in literary texts like poetry.

The 62.1 percent is considered expressive, which is notably lower than the other two criteria. This percentage suggests that while the human translator was generally able to capture the emotions, tone, and style of the original, some depth of feeling or subtlety may have been lost. This could be due to personal interpretation, cultural differences, or the challenges of translating emotional content into a different language. Nevertheless, a score above 60 percent still indicates a strong grasp of expressive translation, although it leaves room for improvement in delivering the full emotional resonance of the source text.

Table 2 presents the performance of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) across three key translation areas: accuracy, expression, and elegance. 86.4 percent accuracy indicates that the GAI translations are mostly correct and understandable. However, this number also suggests that GAI occasionally misses important details or

slightly changes the meaning of some phrases. These errors are often due to the AI’s limited ability to fully grasp the cultural and contextual meaning of certain expressions, especially in literary texts.

Table 2. Assessment of generative artificial intelligence translation outputs in terms of translation criteria.

Translator	Accuracy	Expression	Elegance
GAI	86.4%	34.2%	70.7%

The most noticeable weakness is in expression, where GAI assessed only 34.2 percent of the lines as expressive. This low percentage reveals a significant gap in the GAI’s ability to reflect the original emotion, tone, and intention of the source material. Literary works often rely on subtle emotional cues and figurative language, which are difficult for AI to interpret correctly. As a result, the AI translations tend to sound flat, mechanical, or emotionally disconnected.

3.2 Assessment of Translation Techniques from Data Sources

Table 3 shows the different translation techniques used by human translators. Only 1.4 percent of the translations followed a word-for-word method, meaning translators rarely translated texts literally. This low number reflects a good understanding that direct translation often sounds awkward and unnatural. Instead of focusing on translating every word, human translators adopted more flexible, natural approaches.

Table 3. Assessment of human translation outputs in terms of translations techniques.

Translator	Word-for-word	Grammatical	Idiomatic	Communicative
Human	1.4%	53.6%	32.1%	28.6%

The most frequently used technique was grammatical translation, appearing in 53.6 percent of the samples. This shows that human translators preserved the structure of the original sentence while adjusting the grammar to fit the target language. Additionally, 32.1 percent of the translations were idiomatic, meaning they used expressions familiar to the target audience. This helps the text sound more fluent and culturally appropriate. Meanwhile, 28.6 percent were communicative translations, which focus on delivering the intended message clearly, even if the sentence structure had to change.

Table 4 shows how Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) handled the translation techniques in this study. Interestingly, only 2.9 percent of the translations were word-for-word, indicating that GAI rarely translated texts directly. This tells us that GAI avoids being too literal, which is good, since literal translations can sound

robotic or awkward. However, it also means that while GAI avoids rigid translations, it may still not fully grasp the emotional and cultural weight behind the words. It makes choices based on patterns in data, but not from lived experience or human understanding.

Table 4. Assessment of generative artificial intelligence translation outputs in terms of translation techniques.

Translator	Word-for-word	Grammatical	Idiomatic	Communicative
GAI	2.9%	64.2%	14.2%	20.8%

The most common technique used by GAI was grammatical translation, accounting for 64.2 percent of its output. This suggests that GAI focuses mainly on getting the sentence structure and grammar right. While this helps produce clean, readable sentences, it often results in translations that sound flat or lacking in emotional depth, especially in literary texts that rely on tone, rhythm, and feeling. Only 14.2 percent of GAI’s translations were idiomatic, which shows that it struggles to use natural, everyday expressions that would feel familiar to native speakers. Its use of the communicative technique, which aims to deliver the message clearly to the reader, was also fairly low at 20.8 percent. This shows that, although GAI tries to be clear, it still leans heavily on structure rather than meaning.

3.3 Comparison of Translation Outputs from the Data Sources

Table 5 provides a comparative analysis of Generative Artificial Intelligence Translations (GAIT) and Human Translations (HT) based on three key criteria: accuracy, expression, and elegance. In terms of accuracy, human translations accumulated 95%, showing a higher level of accuracy. While GAI performs reasonably well at 86.4 percent. The difference in expression is more noticeable. Human translators at 64.1 percent are almost twice as effective as GAI at 34.2 percent in capturing the tone, style, and emotional depth of the original text. Moreover, when it comes to elegance, how smooth, polished, and natural the translation reads, human translators with an accumulated 70.7 percent again outperform GAI at 28.6 percent by a significant margin.

Table 5. Comparison of human and generative artificial intelligence translations in terms of translation criteria.

Accuracy		Expression		Elegance	
GAIT	HT	GAIT	HT	GAIT	HT
86.4%	95%	34.2%	64.1%	70.7%	95%

Note: GAIT stands for generative artificial intelligence translations, while HT stands for human translations.

The results in Table 5 show a clear interpretation of the differences between HT and GAI translations. While Generative Artificial Intelligence Translations (GAIT) do a decent translation, especially in accuracy (86.4 percent), they still don't quite reach the level of precision that human translators (HT) achieve with their 95 percent accuracy. This means that although GAI can usually get the general meaning right, humans are better at capturing the full message without losing important details.

Table 6. Comparison of human and generative artificial intelligence translations in terms of translation techniques.

Word-for-word		Grammatical		Idiomatic		Communicative	
GAIT	HT	GAIT	HT	GAIT	HT	GAIT	HT
2.9%	1.4%	64.2%	53.6%	14.2%	32.1%	20.8%	28.6%

This table compares the translation techniques used by Generative Artificial Intelligence Translations (GAIT) and Human Translations (HT). GAIT relies heavily on grammatical translation at 64.2 percent, while HT uses it slightly less at 53.6 percent. Human translators favor idiomatic (32.1 percent) and communicative (28.6 percent) approaches more than GAIT, which scores 14.2 percent and 20.8 percent, respectively. Both show minimal use of word-for-word translation, with GAIT at 2.9% and HT at 1.4%.

Table 6 provides a comparative analysis of Generative Artificial Intelligence Translations (GAIT) and Human Translations (HT) based on four primary translation techniques: word-for-word, grammatical, idiomatic, and communicative translation. The data highlights not only the distinct approaches each employs but also the varying levels of effectiveness in capturing meaning, nuance, and cultural sensitivity.

4. Discussion

Generally, the results have shown significant similarities and differences between Human and Generative Translators. In the context of translation criteria, humans out-translated the Generative Artificial Intelligence. This is supported by Lau et al. (2024), who noted that human translators continue to play an indispensable role in the translation of literary texts due to their capacity to interpret complex meanings and cultural subtleties. Moreover, human translators excel in expressing emotional depth and cultural sensitivity. Similarly, Metleaeva (2021) stated that human translators bring emotional and cultural intelligence to the translation process, enabling them to preserve the original tone and sentiment of the source text.

Additionally, Singh (2025) highlights that human translators are particularly skilled at handling complex texts that include idiomatic expressions, nuanced meanings, and cultural references. Their ability to interpret these intricacies is enhanced by intuition and experience, enabling more accurate, contextually appropriate translations.

Furthermore, when it comes to elegance in translation, human translators maintain a clear edge over GAI systems. To support this, the emotional depth, cultural sensitivity, and nuanced expertise that human translators contribute are indispensable for generating translations that read naturally and effectively resonate with the target audience (Moneus & Sahari, 2024).

In terms of elegance, GAI receives a 70.7 percent rating, indicating that it can produce translations that are generally fluent and grammatically correct. However, the overall style may lack the smoothness, creativity, and refinement that human translators naturally include. The translations may sound stiff or unnatural, especially when translating poetry or expressive texts.

In the context of literary translation, GAI offers advantages in efficiency and lexical selection; however, it falls short in conveying cultural nuance and emotional depth compared to human translators, as noted by Li and Li (2022). To support this, West et al. (2023) introduce the concept of the "Generative AI Paradox," which suggests that while GAI may be capable of producing complex outputs, its ability to understand what it generates truly remains limited. It is emphasized that although GAI demonstrates efficiency in translation tasks, it cannot frequently and accurately convey emotional nuances and cultural viewpoints (Li & Li, 2022).

GAI translation tools are also less reliable when interpreting complex language nuances, as stated by Mohsan & Durr-e-Nayab (2024). While GAI shows efficiency in word choice and narrative structure, it still cannot match the nuanced elegance of human translators, particularly in conveying the artistic and cultural subtleties of the original text (Li & Li, 2024).

In Table 3, it can be claimed that human translators can produce accurate translations that also sound natural and meaningful. The low percentage of word-for-word translations indicates that humans avoid rigid, mechanical translation, which can often result in awkward or unnatural sentences. Instead, the high percentage of grammatical (53.6 percent), idiomatic (32.1 percent), and communicative (28.6 percent) translations reflects the translator's skill in making the text both correct and expressive. This demonstrates not only their knowledge of grammar and vocabulary but also their understanding of tone, culture, and emotion. Human translation captures not just the meaning of words, but also the feelings and intent behind them. This makes the translation more elegant, relatable, and emotionally relatable for readers. One factor that may have influenced the results is that the human translators are from BSEd 3-English Majors, which likely contributed to a stronger emphasis on grammatical accuracy.

Excerpts from human translations that show the word-for-word translation techniques:

ST: *"Na kaya nawala'y dinatnan ng sigwa, ang lunday sa lawa noong dakong una"*

HT4: *"So that was gone encountered a problem, the boat in the lake a long time ago."*

Excerpts from human translations that show grammatical translation techniques:

ST: “*At ang isang tao’y katulad, kabagay, ng alin mang likha noong Kalayaan*”

HT3: “*And a person is like, akin, to anyone created by freedom*”

Excerpts from human translations that show idiomatic translation techniques:

ST: “*Pagka’t ang salita’y isang kahalutalan sa bayan, sa nayo’t mga kaharian*”

HT9: “*For language is a judgment passed, on country, people, kingdoms vast*”

Excerpts from human translations that show communicative translation techniques:

ST: “*Katulad ng ibong nasa himpapawid*”

HT8: “*Just like a bird in the air*”

Singh (2025) argues that human translators are more adept at understanding subtle meanings and cultural nuances. This was supported by Vula and TyfekÅ (2024), who illustrated how human translators skillfully handle cultural differences when interpreting idiomatic translations. Moreover, Mahdi and Sahari (2024) showed that human translators effectively maintain idiomatic meanings by using techniques such as paraphrasing and finding suitable equivalents. Similarly, Sheng and Kong (2023) demonstrated that human translators are better able to manage the ideological and cultural depth of complex texts.

Tracing the results of translation techniques shows that GAI is good at producing grammatically correct translations but often misses the heart of the message. It tends to fall short when dealing with emotions, cultural references, or the poetic feel of a text—things that human translators naturally pick up on. GAI can be a helpful tool, especially for quick or simple translations, but it still needs human judgment to make the text sound meaningful and emotionally connected. In the end, humans still have the upper hand in capturing the full beauty and intention of the original text.

Excerpts from generative artificial intelligence translations that show word-for-word translation techniques:

ST: “*Kapagka ang baya’y sadyang umibig*”

GAI3: “*When the nation truly loves*”

Excerpts from generative artificial intelligence translations that show grammatical translation techniques:

ST: “*Sapagkat ang Poong maalam tumingin Ang siyang naggawad, nagbigay sa atin*”

GAI1: “*For God, who sees all with infinite grace, gave us our language to embrace*”

Excerpts from generative artificial intelligence translations that show idiomatic translation techniques:

ST: “*Ang hindi magmahal sa kanyang salita, mahigit pa sa hayop at malansang isda*”

GAI4: “*He who does not love his language, is worse than a beast and a foul fish*”

Excerpts from generative artificial intelligence translations that show communicative translation techniques:

ST: *"Kapagka ang bayay sadyang umibig"*

GAI7: *"Because the people love it so much"*

According to Grundkiewicz and Junczys-Dowmunt (2018), integrating statistical and neural models into hybrid translation systems has enabled GAI to produce grammatically correct outputs consistently in grammar-correction tasks. In line with this, Maučec and Donaj (2019) describe neural machine translation (NMT) as a forward-looking technology capable of maintaining grammatical precision across multiple language combinations. Additionally, Singh (2025) states that while GAI excels in speed and scalability, its main challenges lie in handling idiomatic language and deep cultural context rather than grammar. Moreover, Läubli et al. (2018) also note that GAI systems are now capable of matching professional translation standards in specific tasks, particularly those requiring grammatical correctness. Toral et al. (2018) reinforce this view, noting that although GAI still has limitations in context-heavy scenarios, it performs well in structured linguistic domains such as grammar. These sources demonstrate that GAI's high grammatical performance stems from powerful algorithms, large-scale training data, and optimized processing of language rules.

The real gap starts to show in expression. With only 34.2 percent for GAI compared to 64.1 percent for HT, the criterion with the highest difference was 29.9 percent in the expression of the translations. GAI struggles to convey the original text's tone, emotion, and personality. Human translators are much more effective at picking up on the subtleties, whether it is a sarcastic remark, a heartfelt sentence, or a poetic turn of phrase, and making sure it feels the same in the translated version.

While GAIT is fast and fairly accurate, it's still far from matching the human touch, especially in the translation's feeling, flow, and style. This highlights why, even in the age of advanced GAI, skilled human translators are still essential, especially for texts that require more than just the right words, but the right voice. The data clearly shows that human translations outperform generative AI translations across all three criteria. While GAIT can offer fast, relatively accurate translations, it falls short of capturing the emotional tone, stylistic nuance, and overall readability that human translators can deliver. These gaps highlight why human involvement remains essential, especially for tasks that require more than literal accuracy.

Looking at the comparison, in word-for-word translation, both GAIT (2.9%) and HT (1.4 %) show minimal reliance on this technique. This low percentage is expected, as word-for-word translation often ignores context and can result in awkward or inaccurate interpretations. The slightly higher use by GAIT may indicate a tendency to fall back on literal translation in complex scenarios, whereas human translators appear to avoid this method more consciously. In terms of grammatical translation, GAIT shows a dominant usage rate of 64.2 percent, while HT follows closely at 53.6 percent. This suggests that both GAI and humans prioritize maintaining

proper structure and grammar in the target language. However, GAI relies more heavily on this method, possibly reflecting its algorithmic focus on syntax and rule-based patterns. Human translators, while also attentive to grammar, balance this with more nuanced strategies. The differences become more pronounced with idiomatic translation.

Here, human translators significantly outperform GAIT—32.1 percent compared to 14.2 percent. The criteria with the highest difference showed a 17.9 percent difference in idiomatic translations. Idiomatic translation requires a deep understanding of both source and target cultures to convey expressions, humor, and figurative language accurately. The higher percentage for HT shows that humans are better equipped to recognize and adapt idioms naturally, making them feel more culturally and emotionally authentic. GAIT's lower score in this area reflects a key limitation in interpreting and adapting non-literal language. Moreover, in communicative translation, which focuses on making the message clear and appropriate for the target audience, human translators again lead with 28.6 percent, while GAIT scores 20.8 percent. This indicates that humans are more successful at tailoring translations to be meaningful and relevant to the reader, rather than just accurate. GAI does make an effort in this area, but lacks the deeper cultural and contextual understanding needed to match human effectiveness.

This emphasizes that while GAI performs strongly in grammatical translation, it falls short in techniques that require cultural insight and linguistic flexibility, such as idiomatic and communicative translation. Human translators, on the other hand, apply a more balanced mix of techniques, especially excelling in areas that demand cultural intelligence and expressive adaptation. This data shows the strengths and limitations of GAI in translation work. GAI can generate grammatically correct and generally understandable output quickly, but it lacks the sensitivity and adaptability that human translators bring to the task. HT's greater reliance on idiomatic and communicative techniques demonstrates a more reader-centered, culturally informed approach. Furthermore, while GAI can assist with translation tasks, human expertise remains crucial to ensure that the final product is not only technically correct but also emotionally resonant and culturally appropriate.

According to Mohammed et al. (2024), although GAI translation tools have greatly improved, human translators still tend to outperform them when translating idiomatic expressions, religious texts, and culturally nuanced material. To support this, Zaid and Bennoudi (2023) stated that human translators are particularly skilled at capturing subtle meanings, maintaining cultural depth, and interpreting context with precision. This is clearly shown in the data, as the human translators used 32.1 percent of idiomatic translation techniques, half as many as the 14.2 percent used by the GAI translations. In the context of literary translation, GAI offers advantages in efficiency and lexical selection; however, it falls short in conveying cultural nuance and emotional depth compared to human translators (Li & Li, 2022).

In contrast, Metleaeva & Moldova (2021) stated that human translators bring emotional and cultural intelligence to the translation process, enabling them to

preserve the original tone and sentiment of the source text. Based on these findings, it is likely that GAI will complement human translators rather than replace them, potentially creating new roles within the translation industry (Valente, 2024).

5. Conclusion

The comparative analysis between human and generative artificial intelligence (GAI) translations in this study provides a clearer understanding of how each approach functions in rendering literary texts. As GAI continues to evolve, the role it plays in translation must be examined through the lens of not only efficiency but also cultural and emotional accuracy. Continued exploration in this field is necessary to establish where AI can support and where human expertise remains irreplaceable.

Thus, the conclusions drawn from this study are as follows: First, Human translation outperformed GAI in accuracy, particularly for translating culturally and contextually rich texts. It can be concluded that human translators have a stronger ability to preserve the intended meaning of the source text due to their linguistic sensitivity and awareness of cultural references. Second, the significant difference in expression between human and AI-generated translations highlights the human capacity to convey emotion, tone, and nuance—elements that GAI systems currently lack. This confirms that while GAI can structure sentences grammatically, it struggles to reflect deeper emotional or stylistic layers. Third, in terms of elegance, human translators produced more polished and naturally flowing outputs. Thus, it can be concluded that elegance in translation remains a domain where human creativity and intuition outperform the algorithmic processing of GAI. Fourth, the findings also suggest that human translation techniques are more diverse and contextually adaptive. Human translators favor idiomatic and communicative approaches, while GAI shows heavy reliance on grammatical accuracy. This supports the conclusion that while GAI is capable of surface-level translation, it lacks the flexibility and contextual intelligence that human translators bring to the process. Lastly, while GAI offers speed and basic accuracy, it cannot yet replace the artistry and depth provided by human translators, especially in literary translation, where culture, expression, and elegance are crucial. GAI is best used as a supporting tool, not as a substitute, in translation practice.

Acknowledgment

This study would not be possible without the generous assistance and support of several individuals who, in one way or another, contributed their valuable time and expertise to the preparation and completion of the study. The research instructor, adviser, the panel members of the oral examination committee, specialist informants, their respondents, to parents, and most importantly, to Almighty God.

Their guidance, encouragement, time, and expertise have been valuable throughout this journey. Whether through academic support, constructive feedback, technical assistance, or moral encouragement.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors state no conflict of interest in the paper. The authorization of this paper lies with all the authors listed in this paper. No financial or relationship interests will burden the status of this publication.

References

- Argondizzo., (2016). Standard machine translation vs. Human translation | argo translation. (n.d.). Retrieved March 9, 2025, from https://www.argotrans.com/blog/machine-vs-human-translation?hs_amp=true
- Awadh, 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://kuey.net/index.php/kuey/article/download/4147/3440/12144>
- Grundkiewicz, R., & Junczys-Dowmunt, M. (2018, June). Near human-level performance in grammatical error correction with hybrid machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)* (pp. 284-290). <https://aclanthology.org/N18-2046.pdf>
- House, J. (1997). Translation quality assessment: A model revisited. Gunter Narr Verlag. [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=D16aYuTCBJ0C&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=House,+J.+\(1997\).+Translation+quality+assessment:+A+model+revisited.+Gunter+Narr+Verlag.&ots=4ZW1N01Un3&sig=wfEz6SI7-bTLw2ibkPS2pvGI-X4](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=D16aYuTCBJ0C&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=House,+J.+(1997).+Translation+quality+assessment:+A+model+revisited.+Gunter+Narr+Verlag.&ots=4ZW1N01Un3&sig=wfEz6SI7-bTLw2ibkPS2pvGI-X4)
- Lau, Y. L., Yong, Z. X., Chia, C. E., Yong, Z. H., Abu Bakar, A. L., Ku, C. J., ... & Arumugam, B. (2024, February). Comparing translation accuracy in Belt and Road Malaysia children's literature: Malay and Chinese native speakers vs ChatGPT. In *Forum for Linguistic Studies* (Vol. 6, No. 1, p. 2069).<https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v6i1.2069>
- Läubli, S., Sennrich, R., & Volk, M. (2018). Has machine translation achieved human parity? a case for document-level evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing* (pp. 4791-4796). <https://aclanthology.org/D18-1512.pdf>
- Li, W., & Li, R. (2022). CE Translation of Political Discourse: Perspective of Faithfulness, Expressiveness and Elegance—A Case Study on the Report of the 19th National Congress of the CPC. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 12(2), 139-147. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2022.122011>
- Lv, M., & Jiang, L. (2023). A Corpus and Computer-Assisted Translation-Based Study on English Translation of Intangible Cultural Heritage Terms. In *Modern Management Based on Big Data IV* (pp. 307-313). IOS Press. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA230197>

- Mahdi, H. S., & Sahari, Y. (2024). A corpus-based study of translating idioms from English into Arabic using audio-visual translation. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 41(3), 244-261. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-07-2023-0128>
- Maučec, M. S., & Donaj, G. (2019). Machine translation and the evaluation of its quality. In *Recent trends in computational intelligence*. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.89063>
- Metleaeva, L. M. (2021). Arta traducerii și inteligența artificială. *Revista de Știință, Inovare, Cultură și Artă „Akademos”*, 61(2), 133-140. http://old.akademos.asm.md/files/Akademos_3_2022_web_0.pdf
- Mohammed, W., Agrawal, S., Farajian, A., Cabarrão, V., Eikema, B., Farinha, A. C., & C. De Souza, J. G. (2024). Findings of the wmt 2024 shared task on chat translation. In B. Haddow, T. Kocmi, P. Koehn, & C. Monz (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation* (pp. 701–714). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.wmt-1.59>
- Mohsan, M., & e Nayab, D. (2024). Estimating and Comparing Translation Skills: A Comparative Study of ChatGPT and Human Translation. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 5(3), 75-86. [https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2024\(5-III\)08](https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2024(5-III)08)
- Moneus, A. M., & Sahari, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence and human translation: A contrastive study based on legal texts. *Heliyon*, 10(6). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28106>
- Paperpal., (2024). Machine translation vs human translation: Which is reliable for academic research? Paperpal Blog. <https://paperpal.com/blog/researcher/machine-translation-vs-human-translation-which-is-reliable-for-academic-research>
- Republic of the Philippines. (2012). *Republic Act No. 10173: Data Privacy Act of 2012*. Official Gazette. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2012/08/15/republic-act-no-10173/>
- Sheng, A., & Kong, Y. (2023). Neural machine translation and human translation: A political and ideological perspective. *Babel*, 69(4), 483-498. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.00332.she>
- Singh, D. (2025). Machine translation vs. Human translation: A comparative linguistic analysis. *International Journal of Linguistics Applied Psychology and Technology (IJLAPT)*, 3(1) 31–41. <https://ijlapt.strjournals.com/index.php/ijlapt/article/view/72>
- Stansfield, C. W., Scott, M. L., & Kenyon, D. M. (1992). *The measurement of translation ability*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76(4), 455–467. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/330046>
- Toral, A., Castilho, S., Hu, K., & Way, A. (2018, October). Attaining the unattainable? reassessing claims of human parity in neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the third conference on machine translation: Research papers* (pp. 113-123). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W18-6312>
- Ulitkin, I. (2011). *Computer-assisted translation tools: A brief review*. *Translation Journal*, 15(1). <http://translationjournal.net/journal/55computers.htm>
- Valente, F. (2024). The Impact of AI on Human Translation: Will Translators and Localisation Experts Disappear in the Job Market and be Replaced by AI-Powered Translation Tools. In *11th SWS*

International Scientific Conferences on ART and HUMANITIES—ISCAH Proceedings 2024 (Vol. 11).
https://ssalibrary.at/sgem_jresearch_publication_view.php?page=view&editid1=5409

Vula, E., & TyfekÅ, N. (2024). Navigating non-literal language: The complexities of translating idioms across cultural boundaries. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 13.
<https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2024-0049>

Wang, L. (2023). The impacts and challenges of artificial intelligence translation tool on translation professionals. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 163, p. 02021). EDP Sciences.https://www.shs-conferences.org/articles/shsconf/pdf/2023/12/shsconf_icssed2023_02021.pdf

West, P., Lu, X., Dziri, N., Brahman, F., Li, L., Hwang, J. D., ... & Choi, Y. (2023). The Generative AI paradox:" What it can create, it may not understand". *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00059*.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.00059v1>

Yuxiu, Y. (2024). Application of translation technology based on AI in translation teaching. *Systems and Soft Computing*, 6, 200072. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sasc.2024.200072>

Zaid, A., & Bennoudi, H. (2023). Ai vs. Human translators: Navigating the complex world of religious texts and cultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 6(11), 173–182. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.11.21>

Author Contributions: Mercado, J., Ramos, C.J., Ordoñez, J.P.; Study design, method conception, data collection, data analysis, and manuscript writing.