

Students' Translation Strategies in Translating General English Texts

Harnita Rosalia *

harnita.rosalia@unm.ac.id

Universitas Negeri Makassar

*corresponding author

Abstract

This study aims to examine the translation strategies used by fifth-semester EFL students at Universitas Negeri Makassar in translating general English texts into Indonesian. A qualitative descriptive approach was employed, involving the analysis of students' translated texts and semi-structured interviews with 18 purposively selected participants who had completed a translation course. The findings reveal that literal translation was the most frequently used strategy, followed by modulation, borrowing, reduction, and adaptation, with occasional use of amplification and transposition. While literal translation dominated due to students' preference for maintaining source-text structure, the use of modulation and borrowing indicates an emerging awareness of meaning, naturalness, and communicative intent. The study also identifies three key factors influencing students' strategy choices: linguistic proficiency, cultural and contextual awareness, and translator self-confidence. These results suggest that students are in a transitional stage of translation competence, shifting gradually from form-based to meaning-oriented decision-making. Understanding these factors is essential for designing translation instruction that not only teaches strategy use, but also supports reflective awareness and confidence-building in EFL learners.

Keywords: Translation strategies, EFL learners, translation competence.

INTRODUCTION

Translation plays a vital role in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning because it bridges the gap between linguistic knowledge and practical language use. According to Duff (1989), translation helps learners understand how meaning is structured and conveyed in both source and target languages. It enables students to develop grammatical awareness, vocabulary expansion, and cross-linguistic understanding (Cook, 2010). Translation thus functions not only as a means of communication but also as a pedagogical tool that supports comprehension and intercultural competence. For EFL students, especially in non-English-speaking countries, translation remains a valuable medium for developing linguistic accuracy and communicative ability.

Translation involves a complex process of decoding and re-encoding meaning between languages. Catford (1965) defines translation as "the replacement of textual material in one language by equivalent textual material in another language," emphasizing the importance of equivalence. However, as Hatim and Munday (2019) argue, translation is not a mere linguistic substitution but a communicative act shaped by cultural and contextual considerations. Similarly, Bell (1991) describes translation as a cognitive process that requires comprehension of the

source text and the reformulation of meaning in the target text. This multidimensional process requires both linguistic knowledge and problem-solving skills.

To manage linguistic and cultural complexities, translators employ specific strategies to achieve equivalence and naturalness. Translation strategies are defined by Molina and Albir (2002) as “procedures used by translators to solve translation problems and to achieve equivalence.” These strategies guide translators in dealing with lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic challenges during the translation process. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) distinguish between direct and oblique strategies, including literal translation, borrowing, calque, modulation, and adaptation. Likewise, Newmark (1988) proposes techniques such as transference, naturalization, and cultural equivalence, suggesting that effective translators must flexibly combine strategies depending on the text’s communicative purpose.

Despite the pedagogical value of translation, many EFL students face difficulties when translating English texts into their native language. According to Suryawinata and Hariyanto (2003), students often struggle to convey the intended meaning due to limited vocabulary, grammatical interference, and a lack of awareness of contextual meaning. These issues frequently result in literal translations that distort the naturalness of the target text. Baker (2011) emphasizes that inadequate mastery of equivalence leads to unnatural and semantically awkward renderings. Consequently, students’ reliance on word-for-word translation reflects both linguistic limitations and insufficient exposure to strategic translation training.

Understanding how students use translation strategies is crucial to improving translation pedagogy. As O’Malley and Chamot (1990) suggest, strategic awareness is central to effective language learning because it helps learners consciously manage their cognitive processes. Applying this to translation, awareness of strategies allows students to make informed decisions when facing lexical or structural difficulties. González Davies (2004) also asserts that translation strategy training enhances learners’ ability to reflect on their own translation process and develop autonomy. Thus, examining students’ strategy use provides insights into their problem-solving behavior and can inform more effective instructional design.

Previous research has investigated the use of translation strategies among EFL learners in various contexts. For instance, Rahman and Riazi (2018) found that students frequently use literal translation due to limited linguistic resources, while more proficient learners tend to apply modulation and equivalence strategies. Similarly, Apriliyani (2020) discovered that Indonesian students relied heavily on borrowing and literal translation when handling idiomatic expressions. Aini (2021) reported that EFL learners rarely used adaptation or transposition strategies due to limited awareness of contextual meaning, leading to lexical and stylistic errors. However, these studies were largely quantitative, focusing on frequency counts without exploring students’ underlying reasoning. As Creswell (2014) argues, qualitative inquiry is essential when researchers aim to understand human experiences and cognitive decision-making processes in depth. Hence, a qualitative approach is needed to reveal not only what strategies are used but also why and how students apply them.

A qualitative approach provides a more comprehensive understanding of students’ translation processes and strategic choices. Dörnyei (2007) notes that qualitative research enables a deeper exploration of learners’ perspectives and contextual influences on behavior. In the case of translation studies, it allows the researcher to capture students’ reflections, reasoning, and awareness while engaging in authentic translation tasks. This study therefore employs a

qualitative descriptive design to investigate students' translation strategies through both product analysis and interviews, ensuring a rich and holistic understanding of the translation phenomenon.

The present study was conducted with fifth-semester students of the English Department at Universitas Negeri Makassar who had completed the course Translating General Texts. These students have received basic theoretical instruction and practical exercises in translation, making them appropriate participants for the investigation. As Hatim and Munday (2019) suggest, general texts—such as articles, short essays, and news passages—serve as ideal materials for examining how novice translators deal with everyday language use. In this setting, students' translation performance provides a clear reflection of their strategic competence and linguistic awareness.

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe the translation strategies employed by students when translating general English texts, and to explore the factors that influence their strategy selection. Based on the above discussion, this study addresses the following research questions: (1) What translation strategies do students use in translating general English texts? and (2) What factors influence their choice of translation strategies?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Translation

Translation has been widely defined and conceptualized by scholars from various perspectives. According to Catford (1965), translation is “the replacement of textual material in one language by equivalent textual material in another language.” This early linguistic view focuses on the concept of equivalence, assuming that a good translation reproduces the same message across languages. However, this notion has evolved over time as researchers began to recognize that equivalence is not absolute but dynamic and functional (Nida & Taber, 1969). They define translation as reproducing the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, both in meaning and style, highlighting the importance of naturalness in communication.

Newmark (1988) further elaborates that translation is a craft that attempts to replace a written message in one language by the same message in another, with due regard for meaning, form, and function. Meanwhile, Hatim and Munday (2019) view translation as a process of mediation between linguistic systems and cultural contexts, emphasizing that it operates within a broader communicative and social framework. Similarly, Bell (1991) considers translation as a cognitive and linguistic process involving comprehension, transfer, and reformulation. Collectively, these definitions suggest that translation is not a mechanical act of word substitution, but a purposeful, context-bound act of communication that demands both linguistic and cultural competence.

Translation Strategies

Translation strategies refer to the conscious techniques that translators employ to overcome translation problems and achieve equivalence (Molina & Albir, 2002). These strategies serve as problem-solving tools that guide translators in managing linguistic, structural, and pragmatic challenges during the translation process. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) classified translation

procedures into direct (literal translation, borrowing, calque) and oblique (transposition, modulation, equivalence, adaptation) methods, reflecting a continuum from source-oriented to target-oriented translation. Their framework suggests that translators must balance fidelity to the source text with naturalness in the target language.

Newmark (1988) identifies several procedures such as transference, naturalization, cultural equivalent, descriptive equivalence, and modulation, all of which reflect varying degrees of adaptation to linguistic and cultural contexts. Baker (2011) emphasizes the role of equivalence at different levels—word, phrase, grammatical, and textual—and suggests that translators select strategies depending on where the equivalence problem occurs. Molina and Albir (2002) provide a more comprehensive taxonomy of 18 strategies, including amplification, reduction, borrowing, literal translation, adaptation, compensation, and discursive creation. Their model integrates both linguistic and functionalist perspectives, allowing researchers to analyze translation as a dynamic decision-making process. For the purpose of this study, Molina and Albir's framework is adopted as the analytical model because it captures the multifaceted nature of translation and is widely used in translation pedagogy and research (see also Munday, 2016).

Beyond Indonesia, studies in other EFL contexts (e.g., Lee, 2019; Wang, 2020) have shown similar trends, indicating that learners' strategic use of translation is closely linked to their language proficiency, exposure to authentic texts, and instructional background. However, as González Davies (2004) argues, most of these studies have been product-oriented, focusing primarily on the final translation outcomes rather than the cognitive processes behind students' decisions. There remains limited qualitative research exploring why students choose specific strategies and how contextual and pedagogical factors shape those choices. This gap underlines the need for more exploratory, process-oriented studies to reveal the underlying reasoning and awareness that guide students' translation performance.

Translation Strategies by Molina and Albir

Molina and Albir (2002) define translation strategies as procedures used by translators to solve problems that arise when translating a text from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). Translation strategies are decision-making tools that help translators achieve accuracy, clarity, and naturalness in the target text while maintaining the intended meaning of the source text.

They emphasize that translation is not simply a word-for-word transfer but a process that involves adaptation to linguistic, cultural, and contextual factors. Therefore, translators need strategies to handle differences in grammar, vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, cultural references, and stylistic features.

Table 1. The Translation Strategies by Molina & Albir

No.	Strategy	Explanation	Example
1	Adaptation	Replacing cultural elements with ones familiar in the target culture.	<i>Thanksgiving</i> → <i>Lebaran</i> (context-dependent)
2	Amplification	Adding information that is implicit in the SL to make it explicit in the TL.	<i>Ramadhan</i> → <i>the Islamic fasting month of Ramadhan</i>
3	Borrowing	Taking a word directly from the SL without translation.	<i>Computer</i> → <i>komputer</i>
4	Calque	Literal translation of a phrase or structure.	<i>Skyscraper</i> → <i>pencakar langit</i>
5	Compensation	Introducing a stylistic element in another part of the text to make up for a loss.	Replacing lost humor elsewhere in the sentence.
6	Description	Replacing a term with a description of its meaning.	<i>Sushi</i> → <i>rice rolls with raw fish</i>
7	Discursive Creation	Creating a temporary, unpredictable equivalent, often in creative texts.	Movie title: <i>Home Alone</i> → <i>Rumah Sendirian</i> (hypothetical, not official)
8	Established Equivalent	Using a commonly accepted TL equivalent.	<i>Police</i> → <i>polisi</i>
9	Generalization	Using a more general term in the TL.	<i>Sparrow</i> → <i>bird</i>
10	Linguistic Amplification	Adding linguistic elements, often in spoken translation.	<i>I love you</i> → <i>Aku sangat mencintaimu</i>
11	Linguistic Compression	Reducing linguistic elements, opposite of amplification.	<i>Aku sangat mencintaimu</i> → <i>Love you</i>
12	Literal Translation	Translating word-for-word <i>when possible</i> and meaningful.	<i>I miss you</i> → <i>Aku merindukanmu</i>
13	Modulation	Changing the perspective or cognitive category.	<i>It is not difficult</i> → <i>It is easy</i>
14	Particularization	Using a more specific term.	<i>Fruit</i> → <i>mango</i>
15	Reduction	Reducing information in the TL that is unnecessary or understood already.	<i>Ramadhan, the holy fasting month</i> → <i>Ramadhan</i>
16	Substitution (linguistic or paralinguistic)	Replacing linguistic elements with non-linguistic (or vice versa).	Nodding replaced with <i>ya</i> , or <i>okay</i> replaced with thumbs up.
17	Transposition	Changing the grammatical	Noun → verb: <i>She gave a</i>

		structure.	<i>smile</i> → <i>Dia tersenyum</i>
18	Variation	Changing linguistic or paralinguistic elements affecting tone or dialect.	Translating formal into informal speech based on audience.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design, which aims to provide a detailed understanding of students' translation strategies. As Creswell (2014) explains, qualitative research focuses on exploring a phenomenon in its natural context to gain deep insights rather than numerical generalizations. In this study, the phenomenon under investigation is the way EFL students apply translation strategies when translating general English texts. The qualitative descriptive approach is appropriate because it allows the researcher to describe the strategies as they occur naturally and interpret the underlying factors influencing students' choices.

Participants

The participants of this study were 18 fifth-semester students of the English Department at Universitas Negeri Makassar who had completed the course Translating General Texts during the 2025/2026 academic year. These students were considered suitable for the study because they possessed basic theoretical knowledge and practical experience in translation. Their consent was obtained prior to data collection, and their participation was entirely voluntary.

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected in three stages. First, students completed the translation task individually under timed conditions. Second, their translated products were collected and analyzed to identify the strategies applied. Third, semi-structured interviews were conducted with each participant to gain deeper insights into their decision-making processes. All interviews were recorded, transcribed, and verified with participants (member checking) to ensure accuracy and credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Triangulation of multiple data sources—translation products, interviews, and observation notes—was used to strengthen the validity of the findings.

Data Analysis

Data analysis followed the framework proposed by Molina and Albir (2002) for identifying translation strategies. The process consisted of four main steps:

- a. Identification – Dividing each student's translation into units of analysis (phrases or sentences).
- b. Classification – Labelling each translation segment according to the strategy used (e.g., literal, modulation, borrowing, adaptation).
- c. Interpretation – Examining patterns in students' choices and the reasons expressed during interviews.
- d. Conclusion Drawing – Synthesizing the data to describe overall tendencies and factors influencing strategy selection.

FINDINGS

The Use of Translation Strategies

The analysis of students' translated texts and interview transcripts revealed a diverse use of translation strategies among the participants. Although all 18 students completed the same translation task—a general English text about environmental awareness—their approaches varied depending on their linguistic competence, confidence, and interpretative awareness. The data show that literal translation emerged as the most frequently used strategy, followed by modulation, borrowing, reduction, and adaptation. A few instances of amplification and transposition were also identified, though these appeared inconsistently across the data set.

The following table summarizes the overall frequency of translation strategies used by the students:

Table 2. The Use of Translation Strategies

Translation Strategy	Frequency (%)	Example
Literal Translation	33%	"Saving energy" → "Menyimpan energi"
Modulation	28%	"Keep our planet clean" → "Menjaga kebersihan bumi kita"
Borrowing	22%	"Plastic pollution" → "Polusi plastik"
Adaptation	11%	"Green lifestyle" → "Gaya hidup ramah lingkungan"
Reduction	6%	"due to excessive waste generation" → "karena sampah berlebih"

Overall, students' translations were found to lean heavily toward source-text orientation, characterized by literal renderings and minimal reformulation of sentence structures. However, qualitative evidence from interviews indicates that some students intentionally applied strategies such as modulation or adaptation when they perceived the literal translation as inadequate or awkward in Indonesian.

These mixed tendencies suggest that while EFL students at this level possess a foundational awareness of translation strategies, their applications remain partial, inconsistent, and strongly influenced by linguistic familiarity rather than functional or communicative goals.

a. Literal Translation as a Dominant Strategy

Among all strategies identified, literal translation was by far the most dominant, accounting for approximately one-third of all translation instances. This finding aligns with prior studies (Apriliyani, 2020; Rahman & Riazi, 2018), which also observed that EFL learners frequently rely on literal translation, especially when dealing with general or non-technical texts.

Literal translation was most often used in sentences that contained concrete nouns and verbs, as students found it easier to match these directly across languages. For example, "reduce plastic waste" was translated literally as "mengurangi limbah plastik", which is acceptable and natural in Indonesian. However, when the source expression carried idiomatic or figurative meanings, literal renderings resulted in awkward or even incorrect phrases, such as "saving energy" becoming "menyimpan energi" rather than "menghemat energi."

During interviews, students admitted that they used literal translation because it felt “safer” and “closer to the original meaning.” One student remarked: “*I prefer to translate word by word because I am afraid to change the meaning. If I modify it, I might lose the author’s intention.*”

This response reflects a form-based orientation, where fidelity to the source text structure is prioritized over communicative equivalence. According to Newmark (1988), this is typical among novice translators who lack the confidence to depart from literal forms. While such reliance ensures lexical accuracy, it often sacrifices stylistic naturalness. Therefore, the dominance of literal translation in this study illustrates the transitional stage of students’ competence—from a focus on form toward an emerging awareness of meaning and function.

b. Modulation and Borrowing as Emerging Strategic Awareness

The second most frequent strategies were modulation and borrowing, both reflecting students’ attempts to adjust meaning and tone when literal translation was insufficient. Modulation involves a shift in perspective or cognitive category to convey the same message more naturally in the target language (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995). In this study, modulation appeared in cases where students changed grammatical form, word order, or conceptual emphasis.

For example:

- 1) “*Keep our planet clean*” → “*Menjaga kebersihan bumi kita*” (focus shifts from *planet* to *kebersihan*).
- 2) “*Take action now*” → “*Bertindaklah sekarang juga*” (imperative modulation).

These examples demonstrate students’ growing sensitivity to natural expression in the target language. Several students explained that they used modulation “to make the translation sound smoother” or “to match Indonesian grammar.” Such awareness aligns with Molina and Albir’s (2002) argument that modulation allows translators to achieve functional equivalence even when direct correspondence fails.

Borrowing, on the other hand, was often used for environmentally related terms such as “*recycling*,” “*plastic*,” and “*eco-friendly*.” Students justified this strategy by claiming that these English terms were already familiar to Indonesian audiences. Indeed, in modern Indonesian discourse, lexical borrowings from English are widely accepted, particularly in scientific and environmental contexts. One student stated: “*If I translate ‘eco-friendly’ literally, it sounds too long. People are used to the English term.*”

This reflects practical decision-making based on audience awareness. In functionalist terms (Nord, 2005), the use of borrowing shows an understanding of the target text’s communicative purpose. Rather than being a sign of deficiency, such selective borrowing demonstrates that students can strategically balance fidelity and readability.

c. Limited Use of Adaptation and Reduction

While modulation and borrowing showed evidence of strategic development, adaptation and reduction were rarely employed. Adaptation, which involves modifying culturally bound concepts to fit the target context, requires advanced cultural and pragmatic awareness (Nida & Taber, 1969). In the current study, only a few students attempted adaptation.

A notable example is the translation of “*think green*” into “*berpola pikir ramah lingkungan*”, produced by two students. Most others rendered it literally as “*pikir hijau*,” which

does not carry the intended connotation in Indonesian. This demonstrates that adaptation is a more complex skill, demanding not only vocabulary knowledge but also the ability to interpret implied meanings and cultural associations.

Reduction—the omission or simplification of elements deemed redundant—was also used sparingly. For instance, one student translated “*due to excessive waste generation*” as “*karena sampah berlebih*,” removing the term “*generation*” while retaining the core idea. While such reductions can improve fluency, they may risk meaning loss if applied without careful judgment. Molina and Albir (2002) caution that reduction should preserve essential content while improving readability.

Overall, the limited use of adaptation and reduction suggests that students’ strategy range remains narrow. Their tendency to avoid strategies requiring interpretive flexibility reveals a dependence on literal transfer, likely rooted in classroom emphasis on accuracy rather than creativity.

Factors Influencing Students’ Strategy Choices

The interviews identified three major factors shaping the students’ choice of translation strategies: linguistic proficiency, cultural and contextual awareness, and translator confidence and risk-taking

a. Linguistic Proficiency

Students’ varying levels of linguistic proficiency significantly impacted their strategy selection. Learners with limited vocabulary and syntactic flexibility tended to rely on literal translation, as this approach requires minimal structural reformulation. This explains the high frequency of literal translation strategies identified in the data. As one participant noted: “*Sometimes I don’t know the exact Indonesian word, so I just translate each word directly.*”

In contrast, students with stronger command of both English and Indonesian demonstrated greater flexibility in applying strategies such as modulation or adaptation, allowing for more natural phrasing. This pattern aligns with Newmark’s (1988) assertion that literal translation is commonly chosen when translators are uncertain about restructuring meaning at the sentence level.

b. Cultural and Contextual Awareness

Cultural knowledge and sensitivity also influenced students’ strategic decisions. When students recognized that a phrase carried cultural or conceptual nuance, they were more likely to apply adaptation or amplification to enhance clarity and communicative naturalness. One student commented: “*‘Green lifestyle’ sounds strange if translated word for word. I changed it to ‘gaya hidup ramah lingkungan’ because that is how people understand it here.*”

However, students with limited cultural awareness tended to default to borrowing or literal translation, sometimes resulting in awkward phrasing. This supports Molina and Albir’s (2002) argument that effective translation requires attention not only to linguistic form but also to cultural equivalence and context.

c. Translator Confidence and Risk-Taking

Students' confidence in making interpretive decisions emerged as a key factor shaping their strategy use. Those who felt uncertain about their translation ability preferred "safe" strategies—primarily literal translation and borrowing—to avoid the risk of altering meaning. As one participant stated: *"I translate it word for word because I'm afraid the meaning will change if I modify it."*

In contrast, students with higher confidence were more willing to take risks by applying modulation or reduction when the literal version sounded unnatural. Another participant explained: *"If I translate 'eco-friendly' literally, it sounds too long. People are used to the English term, so borrowing is better."*

This reflects Hatim and Munday's (2004) view of translation as a deliberate evaluative process requiring judgment and flexibility.

DISCUSSIONS

This supports González Davies' (2004) argument that translation pedagogy must move from product-based evaluation to process-based reflection. Without guided training on strategic flexibility, students may continue to prioritize linguistic form over pragmatic function.

These findings collectively highlight that translation strategy use is not only a matter of linguistic ability but also of pedagogical influence and cultural awareness.

The findings of this study confirm that EFL students, particularly those at the intermediate level, are in a transitional stage of translation competence. Their strong preference for literal translation reflects a reliance on surface-level equivalence, a common phenomenon in foreign language contexts (Newmark, 1988). However, the presence of modulation and borrowing strategies—though less frequent—signals an emerging awareness of functional equivalence and reader-oriented translation.

From a pedagogical perspective, this progression aligns with the developmental model of translation competence proposed by González Davies (2004), where novice translators first imitate linguistic forms before gradually internalizing communicative and cultural considerations. The shift from literal to meaning-based strategies therefore represents a cognitive and metalinguistic maturation process.

The findings also suggest that translation teaching in EFL settings should explicitly incorporate strategy training, allowing students to understand not only what strategies exist but also when and why to apply them. Task-based activities, reflective discussions, and comparative analyses between student translations and professional models can help raise awareness of the multiple ways meaning can be transferred effectively. As Nida and Taber (1969) remind, the ultimate goal of translation is not formal equivalence but dynamic equivalence—achieving a natural response from the target reader.

In broader terms, the study underscores the importance of integrating translation as both a linguistic and cognitive practice in EFL curricula. By encouraging learners to reflect on their strategic decisions, teachers can nurture autonomy, analytical thinking, and intercultural understanding competencies that extend beyond translation and enrich overall language learning.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the translation strategies used by EFL students in translating a general English text about environmental awareness into Indonesian. The analysis identified several strategies employed by the students, with literal translation being the most dominant, followed by modulation, borrowing, adaptation, and reduction. The reliance on literal translation indicates that students perceive this approach as the most secure and straightforward means of conveying meaning, despite the fact that it sometimes resulted in unnatural or awkward expressions. Meanwhile, the presence of modulation and borrowing reflects an emerging awareness of communicative appropriateness and cultural relevance.

The findings suggest that the students are currently in a transitional stage of translation competence. Their translations remain largely source-oriented, indicating limited flexibility in restructuring meaning when faced with figurative or culturally nuanced expressions. However, the instances where students used modulation or adaptation demonstrate developing sensitivity toward the function and readability of the target text. This aligns with the understanding that translation is not merely a formal linguistic transfer, but a strategic and communicative act that integrates linguistic knowledge, cultural understanding, and the translator's self-confidence.

From a pedagogical perspective, the study underscores the importance of explicit strategy instruction in translation teaching. Instructors should not only present translation strategies but also guide students in deciding when and why certain strategies should be applied. Task-based translation activities, reflective dialogue, and comparative evaluation between student and professional translations can encourage students to justify their strategic choices, thereby fostering greater awareness, autonomy, and confidence. Encouraging learners to prioritize meaning, context, and audience—rather than form alone—can help shift their practice from literal rendering toward more natural and reader-oriented translation outcomes.

Theoretically, these findings support functionalist perspectives on translation (Nord, 2005), which emphasize that translation choices are influenced by communicative intent and contextual appropriateness. They also reinforce Molina and Albir's (2002) view of translation strategies as dynamic problem-solving procedures shaped by linguistic proficiency, cultural familiarity, and self-confidence. Although this study is limited by its focus on a single text type and a relatively small participant group, it provides insight into how novice translators begin to develop strategic awareness in EFL contexts. Future research could expand to different genres, larger samples, or comparative proficiency levels to provide deeper understanding. Despite its limitations, the study highlights the importance of integrating strategy awareness and reflective practice into translation pedagogy to improve translation quality and enhance overall language competence.

REFERENCES

- Abduh, A., Sakkir, G., Rosmaladewi, R., Andrew, M., & Yasdin, Y. (2022). Teachers' Perceptions of English Teaching Strategies in the Current Curriculum Change. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(6), 437-444.
- Aini, R. (2021). *Translation strategies used by EFL learners in translating news texts*. *Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 5(2), 120–128.
- Apriliyani, D. (2020). *An analysis of students' translation strategies in translating English idioms*. *Jurnal Transformatika*, 14(1), 23–35.
- Atmowardoyo, H., & Sakkir, G. (2023). Cohesion in descriptive discourse written by the sixth semester students of the English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(1), 21-36.
- Atmowardoyo, H., & Sakkir, G. (2023). Online-based English Reading Learning Model in the New Normal Era (Post-Pandemic Covid-19). *Celebes Journal of Language Studies*, 75-82.
- Atmowardoyo, H., Weda, S., & Sakkir, G. (2021, March). Learning Strategies in English Writing used by Good Language Learners in Millennial Era: A Positive Case Study in Universitas Negeri Makassar. In *Proceeding Book the Language Teacher Training and Education International Conference* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 187-196). Program Magister Pendidikan bahasa Inggris Fakultas keguruan dan ilmu pendidikan Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Baker, M. (2011). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge.
- Bell, R. T. (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. Longman.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Chandra, S. I. L., Dollah, S., & Sakkir, G. (2024). An Analysis of Students' Strategies in Writing Recount Text. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 4(3), 376-385.
- Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching: An Argument for Reassessment*. Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th Ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Duff, A. (1989). *Translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Fadli, M. A., Baharuddin, & Wardana, L. A. (2023). *Exploring students' translation strategy on the "Glimpse of Us" song by Joji*. *Journal of English Education Forum*, 19–29.
- González-Davies, M. (2004). *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom*. John Benjamins.
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.
- Lee, H. (2019). Investigating EFL students' translation strategies through think-aloud protocols. *Asian EFL Journal*, 23(2), 45–62.

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.
- Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs*, 47(4), 498–512. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
- Muis, S., Salija, K., Nur, S., & Sakkir, G. (2023). Translanguaging in EFL Classroom at A Private University in South Sulawesi. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 3(3), 396-406.
- Multazam, M. N., Korompot, C. A., & Sakkir, G. (2023). Cohesion of paragraph in EFL textbook of essay writing class of Universitas Negeri Makassar. *Klasikal: Journal of Education, Language Teaching and Science*, 5(2), 291-300.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Brill.
- Nord, C. (2005). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application to English*. Rodopi.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Putra, D. A., & Rullyanti, M. (2021). Investigating students' strategies and methods in translating English text into Indonesian. *JDER: Journal of Dehasen Education Review*, 2(3), 56–62.
- Rahman, M., & Riazi, M. (2018). Students' translation strategies and their relationship to translation quality. *Translation & Interpreting Studies Journal*, 13(3), 245–260.
- Sandra, R. A. (2018). From English to Indonesia: Translation problems and strategies of EFL student teachers – A literature review. *International Journal of Language Teaching and Education*, 2(1), 13–18
- Setiawati, N. S., Sunra, L., & Sakkir, G. (2023). EFL Teacher's Strategies in Online Learning Environment at SMK Nasional Makassar. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(4), 519-530.
- Su, H. (2025). Critical thinking-embedded EFL translation instruction and its impact on EFL translation learners. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 57, 101827. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2025.101827>
- Suryawinata, Z., & Hariyanto, S. (2003). *Translation: Bahasan Teori dan Penuntun Praktis Menerjemahkan*. Kanisius.
- Tatipang, D. P., Dollah, S., Weda, S., Sakkir, G., Liando, N. V., & Lengkoan, F. (2025). I am well aware of it, Yet, my Students have to Learn in comfort way: Translanguaging as Mediated English Language Pedagogy. *Journal of English Culture, Language, Literature*

and Education, 13(2), 277-296.

- Tran, H., Crosthwaite, P., & Pham, Q. H. P. (2025). *Students' self-determination in using machine translation and generative AI tools for English for academic purposes. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 66*, 101578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2025.101578>
- Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. John Benjamins.
- Weda, S., Sakkir, G., & Sakti, A. E. F. (2023). Students' English learning strategies in dealing with Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka (MBKM) curriculum in Indonesia: Perceptions and factors. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 6(2)*, 343-356.