ISSN: 3066-7194
Research Article
Novel Journal of Applied Sciences Research

Machine Translation and Human Cognition: A Comparative Study

Qilin Xuan*

Gongqing Institute of Science and Technology, Jiu Jiang 360400, China

***Corresponding author:** Qilin Xuan, Gongqing Institute of Science and Technology, Jiu Jiang 360400, China.

Submitted: 23 January 2025 **Accepted:** 27 January 2025 **Published:** 30 January 2025

https://doi.org/10.63620/MKNJASR.2025.1041

***Citation:** Xuan, Q. (2025). Machine translation and human cognition: a comparative study. Nov Joun of Appl Sci Res, 2(1), 01-05.*

Abstract

With the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) and natural language processing (NLP) technologies, machine translation (MT) has made significant progress in terms of efficiency and accuracy. However, MT continues to face numerous challenges in understanding linguistic context, addressing cultural differences, and handling complex semantic transformations. In contrast, human translation (HT) exhibits unique advantages in managing ambiguity, metaphor, and emotional expression. This paper explores the similarities and differences in the cognitive mechanisms involved in MT and HT during the translation process. By comparing the performance of MT and HT in various translation tasks and integrating theories from cognitive science, this study analyzes cognitive load, decision-making mechanisms, and information processing patterns inherent in translation. The goal is to uncover the limitations and potential of MT and to investigate the possibilities of collaboration between MT and HT in the future.

Keywords: Machine Translation and Human Translation (MT & HT), Cognitive Load, Semantic Processing, Artificial Intelligence (AI), Natural Language Processing (NLP)

Introduction

Research Background and Problem Statement

As globalization accelerates, language barriers have emerged as a significant challenge in international communication. Recent years have witnessed substantial advancements in the accuracy and efficiency of machine translation (MT), largely attributable to breakthroughs in technologies such as deep learning [1, 2]. MT technology has been widely applied to promote cross-cultural communication, particularly excelling in translating standardized content such as news and technical documents.

However, despite the considerable progress made, MT still struggles with certain challenges, including the translation of complex linguistic structures and texts marked by significant cultural differences. Compared to human translation (HT), MT exhibits deficiencies in semantic comprehension, integration of cultural context, and linguistic creativity [3].

Therefore, a detailed investigation into the differences in cognitive processes and translation performance between MT and HT is essential. Such an exploration not only provides valuable insights for the further development of MT technology but also opens new avenues for interdisciplinary research in fields such as cognitive science and linguistics.

Historical Development of Machine and Human Translation

The concept of machine translation dates back to the 1940s, with early research focused on word-for-word translation between languages. Early systems, such as rule-based machine translation (RBMT), relied on rules designed by linguists to process syntactic and semantic information [4, 5]. However, these systems faced limitations when dealing with complex grammatical structures and polysemous words. The 1990s saw the emergence of statistical machine translation (SMT), which significantly improved translation quality by leveraging large-scale bilingual corpora and probabilistic computation [6].

In the 21st century, neural machine translation (NMT) has revolutionized the field, employing neural networks and deep learning techniques to better understand and generate natural language texts [7]. Unlike its predecessors, NMT excels in managing long-range dependencies and contextual information, resulting in more nuanced translations.

In contrast, human translation (HT) boasts a history spanning several millennia, grounded in the intricate interplay between cognitive abilities and cultural contexts. Early handwritten translations, exemplified by the Septuagint and Buddhist scriptures, prioritized faithful reproduction of linguistic forms but demonstrated limited comprehension of cultural and contextual nuances [8]. During the Renaissance, the translation of classical literary works reintroduced Europe to the intellectual legacy of ancient Greece and Rome, invigorating advancements in science and the arts [9]. At this stage, translation began to shift from mere literalism to a balanced approach that accounted for the source text's cultural and contextual subtleties.

The proliferation of the printing press in the 15th century catalyzed the expansion of translation activities, extending its scope beyond religious texts to encompass science, literature, and philosophy [10]. By the 20th century, translation studies had evolved into a theoretical discipline, emphasizing that translation transcends linguistic transference to become a vehicle for cultural representation and contextual conveyance [11]. Foundational theories such as Nida's Dynamic Equivalence and Vermeer's Skopos theory redefined translation practice, steering it from the replication of linguistic forms toward the profound articulation of culture, emotion, and context [12].

From the verbatim translations of ancient religious manuscripts to the development of translation theories underpinning modern literary and technical works, HT has undergone a transformation—from a focus on linguistic forms to an emphasis on meaning and, ultimately, its role as a tool for intercultural communication.

Research Objectives and Significance

This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of the cognitive processes and translation performance of MT and HT, focusing on their similarities and differences in language processing, contextual comprehension, and cultural adaptation.

The significance of this research lies in three key areas:

1. By uncovering the limitations of MT through comparative analysis, it offers valuable insights for the further development of MT technology.
2. By exploring the cognitive mechanisms underlying HT, it enhances our understanding of the intricate cognitive activities involved in translation.
3. It provides theoretical support for interdisciplinary studies in translation research, cognitive science, and artificial intelligence while exploring the complementary potential of human and machine translation.

Theoretical Foundation

Cognitive Science and Translation

Cognitive science, an interdisciplinary field that studies the mind and intelligence, spans multiple domains, including psychology, linguistics, computer science, and philosophy [13]. In the translation process, human translators engage in complex cognitive activities such as information processing, decision-making, and problem-solving. This process encompasses various dimensions, including linguistic comprehension, semantic inference, and cultural integration. Translation transcends mere linguistic transformation, it embodies a multifaceted cognitive operation. The application of cognitive science in translation studies elucidates how human translators construct meaning across languages and adapt to differences in culture, context, and semantics. Analyzing translation through the lens of cognitive science provides a deeper understanding of cognitive load and sheds light on how the human brain integrates information during translation tasks.

Principles of Machine Translation

Machine translation (MT) operates through automated algorithms and data-driven models, typically employing three primary methodologies: rule-based machine translation (RBMT), statistical machine translation (SMT), and neural machine translation (NMT). RBMT relies on rule libraries curated by linguistic experts to process syntactic and semantic information. While it offers stability in handling grammatical structures, it struggles with more complex linguistic phenomena [14]. SMT leverages extensive bilingual corpora to train models by constructing probabilistic frameworks and selecting translations based on statistical likelihood and its core principle involves using statistical probabilities to determine the most optimal translation outcome, however, its ability to manage contextual and syntactic intricacies remains limited [15]. NMT employs deep neural networks and utilizes end-to-end learning to directly establish mappings within bilingual datasets, enabling more effective handling of long-range dependencies and contextual information [16]. Despite the significant advancements achieved through NMT, challenges persist, including translation errors and inadequate comprehension of cultural nuances.

Cognitive Processes in Human Translation

Human translation (HT) is a highly intricate cognitive task involving linguistic comprehension, semantic inference, and contextual integration [17]. The cognitive activities in translation can be categorized into several critical stages. First, the source text must be thoroughly understood, encompassing vocabulary, syntactic structures, and semantic content. This is followed by the integration of context and culture, where translators adapt linguistic expression to the specific context. Finally, the target language text is generated, requiring careful consideration of natural fluency and cultural appropriateness in the target language.

Compared to machine translation (MT), human translators possess unique cognitive abilities and cultural sensitivity, enabling them to adeptly navigate semantic nuances and convey accurate meanings. By leveraging contextual analysis, grammatical structures, semantic inference, and rhetorical devices such as metaphors and analogies, human translators achieve a deeper understanding of cultural and emotional undertones. They address the complexities of context by holistically considering linguistic and non-linguistic factors—such as situational elements, emotions, and speaker intent—to ensure coherence and precision. Furthermore, they adeptly manage cultural disparities by recognizing and accommodating differences in cultural norms, values, and modes of expression. This involves adjusting phrasing, restructuring sentences, or incorporating explanatory elements, thereby enhancing the acceptability and resonance of the translation for the target audience.

Comparative Analysis of Machine Translation and Human Translation

Semantic Processing

In semantic processing, machine translation (MT) relies on extensive corpora and algorithms to directly match words and phrases, enabling the rapid generation of target language texts. However, due to the complexity of linguistic phenomena such as polysemy, fixed expressions, and metaphors, Machine translation (MT) lacks the capacity for deep comprehension of polysemous words in context, often leading to erroneous word choices. It tends to translate idiomatic expressions or fixed collocations on a word-for-word basis, resulting in semantic distortion. Moreover, the interpretation of metaphors requires profound cultural knowledge and semantic reasoning—an area where MT falls short. Rather than truly grasping these implicit meanings, MT relies solely on pattern matching within pre-existing data, which frequently hinders its ability to handle such nuances with precision. For instance, the English word “bank” may refer to a financial institution or a riverbank. In the absence of sufficient contextual information, MT may fail to make the correct semantic choice.

Conversely, human translators possess greater semantic flexibility, leveraging contextual understanding and inference to discern the intended meaning of words with greater precision. For example, when translating "bank" in a context mentioning "river," a human translator can easily deduce that the term refers to a riverbank, whereas MT might produce a mistranslation.

Contextual Understanding and Cultural Differences

Contextual understanding is a critical aspect of translation, particularly when navigating cultural differences. MT typically translates within a limited contextual window, often falling short in cross-cultural interpretation. For instance, the Chinese phrase “吃醋” (literally "eat vinegar") is a metaphor for jealousy. If translated directly as “eat vinegar,” it would likely confuse readers of the target language.

Human translators, however, drawing upon their cultural knowledge and linguistic creativity, can adapt the expression of cultural metaphors during the translation process. This enables them to accurately convey the original meaning while aligning the translation with the target cultural context. Such adaptability enhances the effectiveness of cross-cultural communication, ensuring both fidelity to the source and resonance with the audience. This cultural adaptability enables translations to convey the deeper meanings of the source text more effectively. By tailoring their translations to cultural nuances, human translators ensure the text resonates with the target audience.

Linguistic Creativity and Metaphor Handling

Linguistic creativity is a hallmark of human language, particularly in literary translation, where metaphors, puns, and other rhetorical devices present significant challenges. MT, which relies on pre-existing corpora, often lacks the flexibility to handle the intricate meanings of such creative expressions. For example, the phrase “as busy as a bee” might be translated by MT as “像蜜蜂一样忙碌” (literally "busy like a bee"). While this is accurate, it may lack the natural flow and cultural resonance of a more context-appropriate translation such as “忙得不可开交” (busy to the point of being overwhelmed).

Human translators excel in this domain, adapting expressions to align with the idiomatic conventions of the target language. This flexibility and creativity enable human translators to deliver nuanced and contextually appropriate translations, a task where MT continues to face significant limitations.

Cognitive Load Analysis in the Translation Process

Cognitive Load in Machine Translation

The cognitive load in machine translation (MT) primarily lies in model training and parameter optimization, as the translation process itself is an automated, "unconscious" activity for the system. MT’s cognitive load is largely associated with the complexity of data processing and the refinement of algorithms.

For instance, when dealing with polysemous words or complex syntactic structures, MT relies heavily on extensive training data and sophisticated algorithms for prediction and selection. However, this approach does not always produce translations that are contextually or logically accurate. In handling long sentences, MT might overlook long-distance dependencies due to translation window limitations, resulting in errors. Take the English compound sentence “Despite the rain, the match continued.” MT might translate this accurately as “尽管下雨，比赛继续”. However, in more complex sentences, MT often struggles to process the dependency between main and subordinate clauses, leading to deviations in intended meaning.

Cognitive Load in Human Translation

Human translators experience significant cognitive load due to the need for deep comprehension of semantics, context, and cultural nuances. Translators must simultaneously manage multiple layers of information, including vocabulary, syntax, pragmatics, and cultural background. For example, in translating a political speech, a translator must not only convey the speaker’s literal meaning but also consider the tone, the audience’s cultural context, and the political intent. This multitasking greatly increases cognitive demands.

A typical case involves translating the term “freedom” into Chinese. Depending on the context, the translator must decide whether to use “自由” (freedom) or “自主” (autonomy) to ensure the translation is both accurate and fluent. Such decisions necessitate balancing linguistic precision with cultural sensitivity, a task that requires considerable cognitive effort.

Comparison of Decision-Making Mechanisms and Information Processing Modes

In decision-making, MT relies on probabilistic models embedded in its algorithms, while human translators draw upon experience and cognitive reasoning. For example, when confronted with a polysemous word, MT selects the most statistically frequent translation from its training data, whereas human translators analyze the context to determine the most appropriate meaning.

Consider the English word “present,” which can mean “to present” (verb) or “a gift” (noun). In the sentence “Can you present this to the board?” MT might incorrectly translate it as “你能把这份礼物给董事会吗?” due to data biases. In contrast, a human translator, interpreting the context, would correctly render it as “你能向董事会展示这个吗?” This distinction underscores the human ability to integrate contextual understanding with linguistic intuition, resulting in more accurate and nuanced translations.

Case Studies

Comparative Analysis of Human and Machine Translation

Translation tasks vary significantly across different contexts, leading to distinct performances from machine translation (MT) and human translation (HT). This section examines their effectiveness in three scenarios: news translation, technical document translation, and literary translation.

Case 1: News Translation
News translation typically uses standardized, straightforward language, making it well-suited for MT. For example, the sentence, "Global markets saw a sharp decline today due to political instability." might be translated by MT as "由于政治不稳定全球市场今天出现了大幅下跌". The translation is grammatically correct and semantically accurate, demonstrating MT's efficiency and precision in handling news content. The neutral and formulaic style of news writing aligns well with MT algorithms, enabling reliable syntactic and lexical matches.

Case 2: Technical Document Translation
Technical documents demand consistent terminology and structured syntax, areas where MT excels. For example, "Click on the start button to begin installation." is reliably translated as "点击开始按钮以开始安装". However, MT may struggle with more intricate sentences. For instance, "Once the configuration is complete, the system will automatically restart." might translate correctly to "配置完成后，系统将自动重启". While the syntax is accurate, implicit user instructions (e.g., whether action is required) may not be fully conveyed.

Case 3: Literary Translation
Literary translation highlights MT's limitations, as it involves complex expressions, emotions, metaphors, and cultural contexts. For instance, in The Old Man and the Sea, the sentence "Man is not made for defeat." might be translated by MT as "人不是为了失败而生". While correct in a literal sense, the philosophical depth of the original is lost. An HT alternative like "人不应该被失败打倒" better conveys the author's intent and resonates with the audience, demonstrating HT's superiority in interpreting nuanced meaning and context.

Analysis of Common Errors
MT often encounters issues with polysemous words, long-distance dependencies, and cultural nuances. Below are examples illustrating these typical errors and occasional successes:

Case 1: Misinterpretation of Polysemous Words
Handling polysemy is a frequent challenge for MT systems. For instance, in "John gave Mary a ring.", the word "ring" could mean a piece of jewelry or a phone call. Without adequate context, MT might default to "戒指" when the intended meaning is "电话". HT, through contextual analysis, can identify the correct interpretation, offering a more accurate translation.

Case 2: Long-Distance Dependencies
Complex sentences with long-distance dependencies often lead to MT errors. For instance, "Despite the heavy rain, the match continued without any interruptions." might be translated as "尽管大雨，比赛继续没有任何中断" While grammatically correct, the translation lacks fluency and naturalness. HT would likely produce "尽管下着大雨，比赛仍然顺利进行", a more contextually appropriate and idiomatic translation.

Case 3: Ignoring Cultural Nuances
Cultural idioms challenge MT. For instance, the English phrase "It's raining cats and dogs.", if translated literally as "天上下猫下狗", is nonsensical in Chinese. HT would render it as "倾盆大", preserving the original meaning and aligning with the target culture's idiomatic expressions.

Analysis of MT Success Cases
Despite its limitations, MT performs well in specific contexts, particularly with simple, clear sentences.

Case 1: Daily Phrases
For common expressions, MT delivers quick and accurate translations. For example, "Please enter your username and password." is effectively rendered as "请输入用户名和密码", requiring no complex semantic inference.

Case 2: Proper Names and Fixed Terms
MT excels in translating proper names and geographical locations. For instance, "Google headquarters is located in Mountain View, California." is correctly translated as "谷歌总部位于加利福尼亚州的山景城", maintaining accuracy and standard translation practices.

Case 3: High-Repetition Technical Terms
In technical translations involving repetitive terminology, MT ensures consistency and efficiency. For instance, "Click the install button to continue." might appear multiple times in software manuals. MT reliably and uniformly translates this as "点击安装按钮以继续", outperforming HT in speed and maintaining terminological consistency.

In summary, while MT excels in structured, standardized texts, its limitations in handling complexity, ambiguity, and cultural context highlight the indispensable role of human translators in ensuring translation accuracy and cultural relevance.

Limitations and Prospects of Machine Translation

Current Limitations of Machine Translation
Despite significant advancements in neural machine translation (NMT) technologies, MT systems still exhibit notable limitations in certain areas. Firstly, MT systems have limited capacity to process polysemy and synonyms, often failing to accurately interpret complex semantics. Secondly, MT struggles with cultural differences and metaphorical language, making it difficult to naturally integrate cultural connotations from the source language into the target language. Moreover, when dealing with long or structurally intricate sentences, MT often neglects contextual dependencies, resulting in incoherent or inaccurate translations. For instance, in translating poetry or literary works, MT struggles to preserve the original text's emotional resonance and rhythm.

Future Developments in Machine Translation
The future of machine translation research is likely to trend toward greater intelligence and personalization. MT systems are expected to enhance their capabilities in contextual analysis and semantic reasoning to better handle long-distance dependencies and complex syntactic structures. Furthermore, with the expansion of cross-cultural corpora, MT may achieve breakthroughs in handling cultural nuances and metaphorical expressions. Per-

sonalized MT systems could also emerge, adapting translations to user preferences and stylistic requirements. For instance, MT systems could automatically adjust translation strategies to cater to specific text types, ensuring optimal translation quality across diverse contexts.

Potential for Human-Machine Collaboration

Human-machine collaboration is poised to become the dominant trend in future translation practices. MT can undertake preliminary translation tasks, particularly for large-scale texts, thereby enhancing efficiency, while human translators (HT) can perform subsequent editing and cultural adaptation. Such collaboration not only improves translation efficiency but also ensures quality. For example, translation agencies can utilize MT to generate initial drafts, which are then refined by HT to achieve linguistic accuracy and fluency. This synergy combines the technical strengths of MT with the creative expertise of human translators, leading to more efficient and higher-quality translation outcomes.

Conclusion

This study, through a comparative analysis of machine translation (MT) and human translation (HT) in semantic processing, contextual understanding, and cognitive load, elucidates their similarities and differences in the translation process. While MT demonstrates advantages in speed and efficiency, it remains deficient in areas where HT excels, such as contextual comprehension, cultural adaptation, and creative expression. As technology advances and human-machine collaboration models gain prominence, MT is anticipated to play a more significant role in complex translation tasks. Simultaneously, research into cognitive mechanisms during the translation process offers new directions for enhancing MT's level of intelligence.

References

1. Peng, R. (2020). Attention-Based Neural Machine Translation with Grammar Knowledge. Guangdong University of Technology. doi: 10.27029/d.cnki.ggdgu.2020.001747
2. Wang, G. B., & Li, Y. M. (2023). Intertextuality Research of Generative AI and Narrative Design. Chinese Arts, (05), 20-27.
3. Wen, J. Y. (2022). Error Analysis and Post-Editing Research in Machine Translation. Airborne English, (9), 767-769. doi: 10.12255/j.issn.1672-6677.2022.09.256.
4. Jing, Y., & Chen, C. W. (2008). Report on Rule-Based English-Chinese Translation Techniques. Proceedings of the Fourth National Conference on Machine Translation, China Association for Chinese Information Processing, Xi'an Huishen Software Co., Ltd., 6.
5. Shiwen Y, Xiaojing B. (2014). Rule-based machine translation. Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Technology. Routledge. 186-200.
6. Koehn P. (2009). Statistical machine translation. Cambridge University Press.
7. Stahlberg F. (2020). Neural machine translation: A review. Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research. 69: 343-418.
8. Russell, P. (2023). Sacrament an altar. The sacrament of the altar. A critical edition with translation ed. by DH Frost. North American journal of Celtic studies, 7(2), 280-282.
9. Smith, C., & Reeves, A. (2023). Europe's Centuries of Crises and Recovery (1300-1600). He Huaka'i Honua: Journeys in World History I, to 1500 CE Honolulu CC HIST 151.
10. Howard, N. (2022). Loath to Print: The Reluctant Scientific Author, JHU Press.1500–1750.
11. Holmes, J. S. (2021). Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies. With an introduction by Raymond van den Broeck. Brill, 7.
12. Edina, H. (2024). The system of transfer operations from English into Hungarian/Ukrainian. Filológia Tanszék, Beregszás, 69.
13. Hatfield G. (2002). Psychology, philosophy, and cognitive science: Reflections on the history and philosophy of experimental psychology. Mind & Language. 17(3): 207-232.
14. Ma, J. J. (2010). Comparative Analysis of Ambiguity Issues in Rule-Based and Statistical Machine Translation. Journal of Dalian University of Technology (Social Science Edition), 31(3), 114-119. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-407X.2010.03.022.
15. Liu, Q., Xiong, D. Y., & He, Z. J. (2007). Statistical Machine Translation. Information Technology Bulletin, 5(4), 10.
16. Song, K. (2022). Research on Neural Network Machine Translation Intervention Techniques. Soochow University. doi: 10.27351/d.cnki.gszhu.2022.001899.
17. Mardani T. (2023). Exploring the Role of Speaker Meaning in Translation: A Pragmatic Approach. International Journal of Language and Translation Research. 3(3): 1-16.