

Linguistic Analysis of Translation Techniques in the Song 'Remember Me' from Coco Movie

Nisa Nofianty^{a.1*}, Juliea Mutiara Insani^{a.2}, Naidelin Indriyani^{a.3}, Refika Andriani^{a.4}, & Destina Kasriyati^{a.5}

^{a)} Universitas Lancang Kuning, Indonesia

¹⁾ nisanofianty@gmail.com; ²⁾ julicainsani@gmail.com; ³⁾ naidelinindriyani@gmail.com; ⁴⁾ refika@unilak.ac.id;

⁵⁾ destina@unilak.ac.id

* Corresponding Author. Nisa Nofianti, Email: nisanofianty@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Song lyric translation in animated films must preserve narrative and emotional cues while remaining natural and readable. The objective of this study was to examine how translation techniques used in a machine-generated Indonesian version of "Remember Me" (Coco) related to translation quality. A bilingual corpus of 13 English lyric lines was compiled from LyricsTranslate and was paired with unedited Indonesian outputs produced by DeepL in September–October 2025. Each line pair was coded using Molina and Albir's 18-technique taxonomy through investigator triangulation, and translation quality was assessed by two expert raters using Nababan and Nuraeni's rubric for accuracy, acceptability, and readability (1–3 scale). Technique mapping showed a refrain-driven profile: established equivalence dominated (38.46%), especially for the repeated line "Remember me," followed by modulation (23.08%) and literal translation (15.38%), with amplification, generalization, and calque occurring once each. Quality scores were generally high (mean accuracy 98.72%, acceptability 96.15%, readability 97.44%), but reductions clustered where calque-like collocations and connective-heavy modulation made the Indonesian phrasing less idiomatic and harder to process, particularly in one dense line. The findings suggested that MT lyric output could maintain meaning reliably in short repeated segments, while naturalness remained the main vulnerability in culturally and emotionally loaded lines.

Keywords: *Acceptability, Accuracy, Readability, Song Translation, Translation Techniques*

Submitted:	Accepted:	Published:
28 November 2025	9 February 2026	9 February 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

Song lyric translation in animated films functions as an element of audiovisual translation (AVT) that supports cross linguistic access to narrative development, culture bound references, and emotional cues. Major studios distribute films to Indonesian audiences through dubbing and subtitling, and translated lyrics often carry plot relevant information alongside the visual track. The song Remember Me in Coco by Pixar is repeated in the form of a lullaby and then in a scene of a reunion, thus the lyrics of the song is a narrative repetitive element that places the intergenerational memory and traditions that are culturally identified (Citra & Jumanto, 2023; Sari et al., 2024). Since the topics of family remembrance are common in many cultures, even Indonesian audiences use the Indonesian version to track the plot and receive cultural messages, to which the quality of translation is key in terms of the perception of the audience (Lubis et al., 2020; Maulina et al., 2025).

Within this AVT context, the research problem concerns how accurately the Indonesian translation transfers the source meaning, how acceptable it is as natural Indonesian, and how readable it is for viewers who process lyrics during film viewing. When lyrics are mistranslated or phrased unnaturally, viewers may miss narrative information that visuals alone do not fully supply (Lubis et al., 2020). Film

song lyrics are typically concise and culturally marked, so micro level choices such as lexical selection, shifts in perspective, or explicitation can reshape the nuance that audiences perceive at the macro level (Widiaswara & Jumanto, 2024; Yuda & Harared, 2023). Recent work in Indonesian translation studies also shows that technique selection influences the transfer of affective and interpersonal meanings in audiovisual texts, which strengthens the need for systematic quality assessment rather than analysis that remains limited to technique frequency (Atmojo & Nugroho, 2025; Muliawati, 2020).

To respond to this problem, this study applies a technique and quality framework that links micro level translation techniques to three quality indicators: accuracy, acceptability, and readability. The Indonesian translation of “Remember Me” is segmented into analyzable units, and each unit is classified using Molina and Albir’s eighteen translation techniques as a taxonomy for describing translator decisions in a consistent and comparable way (Pebina et al., 2024). The same units are then evaluated using the widely applied tripartite model of translation quality in Indonesian research accuracy, acceptability, and readability, so that technique choices are interpreted in relation to observable quality outcomes rather than in isolation (Ekalia & Jelimun, 2022; Mustafa et al., 2021). Taking translation as a series of heuristic judgments, which can be operationalized on the basis of clear categories and criteria, the article can help to increase the transparency of AVT analysis and provide more comprehensible answers to the question of why quality problems arise in certain segments (Ihsan et al., 2025; Juliani et al., 2026).

Towards this aim, the study in hand analyses literature on translation methods and the correlation between them and translation quality and situates film song lyrics as aural texts, the meaning of which is created by means of verbal text in connection with the narrative and visual situation. Technique based analyses are a typical method of recording the application of borrowing, calque, literal translation, modulation, transposition, amplification and reduction in media texts, such as subtitles and film scripts in the Indonesian translation research (Sari et al., 2024; Warda et al., 2024). There is also evidence that the technique used in popular film is contingent on narrative context (e.g., plot development and characterization), which is demonstrated by studies on selection of technique in religious and children texts (Inawati et al., 2022; Nila & Octavitri, 2020). Essentially, when assessing quality of translation in studies in Indonesian, the evaluation is based on the accuracy, acceptability, and readability, which is applied to text of educational, as well as technical texts (Ekalia & Jelimun, 2022; Mustafa et al., 2021). Nevertheless, when studying *Coco* in the field of AVT, works are inclined to focus on the subtitle questions or translation of dialogues, and the direct translation of the techniques and the quality of the Indonesian equivalents of *Remember Me* have not yet been examined (Lubis et al., 2020; Wulandari, 2023). The studies devoted to the related soundtrack focus also tend to neglect the technique quality dynamics of *Remember Me*, where the research is not conducted on the topic of different song titles in question (Citra & Jumanto, 2023). More importantly, many studies report technique frequencies without providing a detailed, triangulated explanation of how particular techniques simultaneously influence accuracy, acceptability, and readability in culturally and emotionally dense film song lyrics (Damarratri & Afifulloh, 2024; Nugroho et al., 2024). This conceptual gap motivates the present study’s novelty: it develops an integrated mapping that connects technique choice to three dimensions of translation quality within a single AVT text. In doing so, the study contributes to an existing issue in translation studies explaining how technique use shapes translation quality by moving from descriptive inventories toward an explanatory technique quality account that is relevant for evaluation and practice (Poyungi et al., 2021; Saputra et al., 2022; Sari et al., 2024; Yuda & Harared, 2023).

The study therefore asks which Molina and Albir techniques characterize the Indonesian version and how the observed technique patterns help explain strengths and weaknesses across the three quality indicators. By articulating technique quality relations at the unit level, the study provides evidence that can inform translator education and the development of more explicit, quality oriented guidelines for AVT lyric translation in Indonesia (Andriani et al., 2021; Inawati et al., 2022; Poyungi et al., 2021; Saputra et al., 2022). Accordingly, this study examines the Indonesian rendering of the lyrics of “Remember Me” by identifying the translation techniques applied to each lyric unit and assessing how the techniques relate to accuracy, acceptability, and readability in transferring narrative meaning, cultural references, and emotional nuance in the AVT context.

2. METHOD

This study used a mixed descriptive approach that combined qualitative document analysis of bilingual lyric lines with a descriptive quantitative component through expert-based Translation Quality Assessment (TQA). The study is framed as a machine-assisted translation investigation because the Indonesian target text represents a non-official machine-translation output rather than an authorized singable adaptation. All procedures were conducted digitally during September–October 2025, with DeepL functioning as the “translator” and the researchers acting as compilers and analysts who retrieved the source lyric text from LyricsTranslate, generated the machine output, aligned the bilingual corpus, and carried out coding and interpretation. As an initial limitation, the target text is not treated as an official Indonesian version of the song, and findings are interpreted strictly as patterns and quality indications within this specific MT rendition.

The population of this study comprises all lyric lines in the selected English lyric text of “Remember Me” and their potential Indonesian renderings when translated via machine translation, while the sample is the bounded set of line pairs included in the corpus. The unit of analysis is a single English lyric line, and the corpus consists of 13 English lyric lines analyzed and paired with their corresponding DeepL Indonesian output. Purposive sampling was applied in a replicable, rule-governed manner that fits an MT-output context: the sample was not chosen by comparing or ranking alternative Indonesian translations, but by delimiting a complete and alignable set of lines from a single source-language document and pairing each line with its unedited DeepL output. Inclusion criteria were line completeness such that each source-language line produces a corresponding target-language segment without omission, stable segmentation that supports one-to-one line alignment for analysis, and suitability for applying a micro-level translation-technique taxonomy to each paired unit. This rationale ensures that the dataset can be reproduced by using the same source-language lines and the same MT procedure, rather than by subjective selection of a “better” translation.

Data collection and instrument development followed a transparent compilation workflow. First, the source-language text was retrieved from LyricsTranslate and then verified operationally by cross-checking the wording against available official or authorized lyric publications and soundtrack materials; where discrepancies across versions were identified, the line wording supported by those available official/authorized materials was retained for analysis and any differences were documented to prevent version-mixing. Second, each verified source-language line was translated using DeepL (English to Indonesian) with no post-editing, and the raw MT outputs were preserved as the target-language dataset. Third, data management was conducted through a master bilingual dataset that included fixed line IDs, parallel source–target alignment, coding columns, and memo fields for justificatory notes; files were stored in versioned formats, including a spreadsheet and exported copies, to secure traceability. The research instruments consisted of a bilingual alignment worksheet with line numbering and paired English–Indonesian lyric lines, a codebook containing

operational definitions and decision indicators for Molina and Albir's 18 translation techniques including explicit rules for assigning a primary dominant and a theory-based TQA questionnaire or rubric for expert rating of accuracy, acceptability, and readability. The compilation, alignment, and documentation were supported by digital tools such as Microsoft Excel 2021 for alignment, tabulation, and frequency summaries, DeepL for MT generation, and Zotero 7.0.30 (64-bit) for reference management, with archived exports or screenshots of the source-language and target-language texts retained as part of the documentation trail.

Data analysis combined qualitative technique mapping with descriptive quantitative summarization of TQA outcomes. Qualitatively, each aligned line pair was coded using Molina and Albir's technique taxonomy because it enables systematic identification of micro-level translation operations at the short-unit level of lyric lines, allowing the researchers to report a dominant technique and any supporting techniques per line with explicit justification grounded in meaning transfer. Investigator triangulation was applied through independent coding by multiple researchers followed by consensus discussion, with decisions and revisions recorded in an audit trail to enhance dependability. The TQA component, quantitatively, applied an expert questionnaire to two experts, and included all of the three elements, that is, accuracy, acceptability, and readability, and the scoring rubric was clearly identified in a 1- 3 scale with low to high verbal categories. This 1–3 rubric was adapted from the TQA framework adopted in the study (Nababan & Nuraeni, 2012) and operationalized as low–moderate–high descriptors to standardize expert judgments at the line level. The rubric was provided to raters and was not automatically generated, and it was implemented by two experts in Translation Studies and English Education who scored each line on a 1–3 scale, where 1 indicates low, 2 indicates moderate, and 3 indicates high, for each dimension. Line-level scores were aggregated by averaging the two raters per line per dimension, with discussion conducted only when extreme discrepancies occurred, while routine differences were handled by averaging. Descriptive statistics reported include row percentage scores, the percentage equivalent for row-level reporting calculated by dividing by 6 and then multiplying by 100 (percentage = $(R1 + R2)/6 \times 100$), and overall percentages per dimension across the corpus, as well as frequency distributions and percentages of scores 1–3 per dimension; where available, simple rater agreement can also be summarized to provide context for scoring consistency. Limitations are stated explicitly: the target-language text is a non-official MT output, the corpus is limited to 13 lines, and the findings are not generalized as the quality of an official Indonesian version or as the performance of a human translator.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Analysis of Translation Techniques in the Song “Remember Me”

This part discusses the methods of translation that were employed in the translation of the lyrics of the song “Remember Me” (Coco) in English (Source Text) into Indonesian (Target Text). The analysis recognizes and categorizes the techniques that are found in the ST - TT lyric pairs through the use of the taxonomy that was suggested by Molina and Albir; such as established equivalence, modulation, literal translation, amplification, generalization and calque (Molina and Albir, 2002 as cited in Pebina et al., 2024).

Table 1 Translation technique mapping of “Remember Me” (ST) and DeepL Indonesian (TT)

Line	Source Text (ST)	Target Text (TT)	Type	Explanation
L1	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	Adopts an Indonesian equivalent of conventional imperative form of

Line	Source Text (ST)	Target Text (TT)	Type	Explanation
				remember me; the suffix -lah is a small linguistic amplification/poetic imperative to which the meaning does not alter.
L2	Though I have to say goodbye	Meskipun aku harus berpisah	Modulation	Restranslates saying goodbye (speech act) into "berpisah" (state/event of parting), changing perspective, maintaining the original meaning of parting.
L3	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	Presents the same traditional synonym, preserves refrain consistency and unity through repeated lines.
L4	Don't let it make you cry	Jangan biarkan hal itu membuatmu menangis	Literal translation	Close to word-to-word mapping: don't let, make you cry are translated as "jangan biarkan", "membuatmu menangis" it is translationally faithful with "hal itu" in the grammars of the Indonesian language.
L5	For even if I'm far away I hold you in my heart	Karena meskipun aku jauh, aku selalu menyimpanmu di hatiku	Amplification	Continuity is made explicit with adds "selalu" (always), an implicit continuity; otherwise the basic imagery of holding someone in my heart.
L6	I sing a secret song to you each night we are apart	Aku menyanyikan lagu rahasia untukmu setiap malam kita terpisah	Literal translation	Raw lexical and structural transfer which preserves the propositional message and time clause ("each night...") intact.
L7	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	Does not vary the already existing refrain equivalent, favoring repetition and memorability.
L8	Though I have to travel far	Meskipun aku harus pergi jauh	Generalization	Translates the more specific (travel) into the more general "pergi" (go) retaining distance but losing specificity on way of movement.
L9	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	Repeats the refrain using the same familiar equivalent and enhances text cohesion in the repetitions of the chorus.

Line	Source Text (ST)	Target Text (TT)	Type	Explanation
L10	Each time you hear a sad guitar	Setiap kali kau mendengar gitar sedih	Calque	Reiterates the ST phrase pattern literally (sad guitar) "gitar sedih", the imagery is retained through a literal structural carryover (calque-like phrasing).
L11	Know that I'm with you the only way that I can be	Ketahuiilah bahwa aku bersamamu dengan cara yang bisa aku lakukan	Modulation	Changes in framing of existential limitation as can be to action/means as "bisa aku lakukan" i.e. be do (viewpoint shift). The TT also incorporates explicit connective material ("bahwa, dengan cara"), though the word 'only' is not literally translated, but the restriction is implied by the phrase 'yang bisa aku lakukan', which still leaves an emphasis mellowing the main meaning but does not alter it.
L12	Until you're in my arms again	Sampai kau kembali dalam pelukanku	Modulation	Reinterprets a fixed situation (you in my arms) to a moving return event, ("kau kembali..."), changing the gaze, but maintaining the meaning of reunion.
L13	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	Preserves the same established refrain equivalent to close the lyric with consistent phrasing.

This subsection maps the translation techniques (Molina & Albir's taxonomy) used in translating the 13 English lyric lines of "Remember Me" (ST, LyricsTranslate; accessed September 2025) into Indonesian DeepL output (TT; non-official machine translation). The unit of analysis is one ST line paired with one TT line, producing 13 paired units for technique identification. Molina & Albir's framework is relevant for lyric-line analysis because it classifies micro-level translation operations (e.g., viewpoint shifts, additions, generalization) at the segment level rather than only at the text level. Using this taxonomy allows the analysis to systematically show how each line is transferred (operation-by-operation), which is crucial when small units (lines) carry major rhetorical and emotional functions in song lyrics.

The most obvious pattern in the 13 line pairs is the pre-eminence of established equivalence in the repeated refrain: the line "Remember me" is consistently translated as "*Ingatlah aku*" (5 out of 13 lines) and functions as the translation anchor. Beyond the refrain, the MT output often relies on modulation (3/13) to reframe meaning into a more natural Indonesian conceptualization, and on literal translation (2/13) for structurally transparent lines. Less frequent but analytically important techniques include amplification, generalization, and calque (each 1/13), which respectively make implicit nuance more explicit, broaden lexical scope, or reproduce an ST phrase pattern directly in Indonesian. Quantitatively, established equivalence accounts for 38.46% of all technique occurrences, followed by modulation at 23.08% and literal translation at 15.38%. Amplification, generalization, and calque each appear once (7.69% each). This distribution highlights a refrain-

driven stabilizing strategy supported by a smaller set of techniques that respond to line-specific transfer pressures.

These findings address the study's technique-oriented research problem by showing that, in this 13-line corpus, the Indonesian MT output is not random or purely "literal," but is organized around a refrain-first anchoring strategy. The repeated line "Remember Me" is consistently rendered through established equivalence ("*Ingatlah aku*"), while other lines are handled through a smaller set of supporting operations (literal translation, modulation, amplification, generalization, and calque). The data therefore supports a hierarchy rather than a flat list of techniques: one stabilizing technique dominates the refrain, and other techniques appear when line-level transfer becomes less direct.

The findings were obtained through a transparent micro-analytic procedure: each English line was paired with its DeepL Indonesian counterpart (13 pairs), and each pair was coded using Molina & Albir's technique taxonomy. Table 1 functions as the evidential base because it connects each technique label to an observable ST-to-TT operation (for example, reframing meaning, adding explicit material, or widening lexical scope), rather than relying on impressionistic judgments.

The dominance of established equivalence and literal translation is best explained by where they occur in the dataset. Established equivalence concentrates in the refrain lines, where the ST is short, repeated, and lexically basic; under these conditions, MT tends to choose a conventional, high-certainty mapping. The effect is a stable "hook" in the TT: because the refrain is repeated verbatim in the ST and remains repeated verbatim in the TT, the translation achieves strong internal cohesion through repetition at the micro-level. Literal translation, in contrast, becomes salient in lines whose structure can be mirrored in Indonesian without major reframing, such as the prohibition structure "Don't let it make you cry" and the declarative line about singing "a secret song." Here, the mechanism is direct lexical substitution with minimal restructuring, which tends to preserve propositional meaning reliably at the line level.

At the same time, the corpus shows that the MT output does not stay literal when the ST meaning is packaged in ways Indonesian typically conceptualizes differently. This is where modulation becomes the key interpretive signal: it clusters in lines that require a change in cognitive framing, not just a change in words. The mechanism is re-describing the same situation from a different conceptual angle, as when "say goodbye" is reframed as "*berpisah*" (shifting from a speech act to an event of separation) and when "you're in my arms again" becomes "*kau kembali dalam pelukanku*" (shifting from a static state to a return event). In these cases, modulation solves a line-level transfer problem by preserving the macro-intention (parting; reunion) while adjusting the micro-level viewpoint to fit Indonesian conceptualization. The line "Know that I'm with you the only way that I can be" is particularly revealing because its modulation is not merely stylistic: "can be" is reframed as "*bisa aku lakukan*," which changes "being" into "doing." This makes the line more readily interpretable in Indonesian, but it also creates a potential locus of nuance shift because the exclusivity implied by "only" is not explicitly maintained.

The less frequent techniques are analytically important because they expose how MT handles implicitness and lexical specificity. Amplification appears when the TT makes a nuance more explicit by adding *selalu* to the "hold you in my heart" imagery. This suggests an explicitation tendency: the TT strengthens continuity and may intensify affect, but it also changes informational explicitness at the line level. Generalization ("travel far" rendered as "*pergi jauh*") works in the opposite direction by preserving the distance meaning while loosening specificity about traveling as an activity, which can smooth comprehension but slightly flattens the "journey" nuance. Calque ("sad guitar" rendered as "*gitar sedih*") shows a structure-preserving move that keeps the imagery but may risk collocational

non-conventionality in Indonesian because it copies the English modifier–noun packaging rather than selecting a more idiomatic description.

In terms of technique interaction, Table 1 reports one dominant technique per line (as the coding rule requires), yet several examples also contain supporting moves. These include small additions that support grammaticality or discourse linkage (e.g., *-lah*, *bahwa*, *dengan cara*) and a possible reduction when the exclusivity associated with “only” is not carried explicitly in the “know that...” line. This interaction matters analytically because what appears as a single technique can be accompanied by minor additions or losses that subtly reshape emphasis, naturalness, and interpretive precision.

The broader significance is that this technique profile suggests a plausible quality trade-off that can be tested in the next subsection. The dominance of established equivalence and literal translation predicts relatively strong meaning stability in repeated and structurally transparent lines, while calque and certain modulations identify likely pressure points for acceptability (naturalness/idiomaticity) and for fine-grained accuracy (nuance preservation). Additionally, because the TT is an MT output rather than a purpose-built human adaptation, expansions and reframings in longer lines may affect textual economy and the packaging of information at the line level, which can be evaluated through the quality criteria in the next subsection.

3.2 Analysis of Translation Quality: Accuracy, Acceptability, and Readability

This subsection evaluates DeepL’s Indonesian lyric output line-by-line with 13 paired units, one ST line and one TT line, through a two-rater assessment across accuracy, acceptability, and readability carried out by two raters who are lecturers with expertise in Translation Studies and language education. To assess translation quality, this analysis applies the Translation Quality Assessment framework proposed by (Nababan & Nuraeni, 2012, as cited in (Atmojo & Nugroho, 2025), which uses these three criteria to judge how well meaning is preserved, how natural the translation sounds for Indonesian audiences, and how easily the lyrics can be understood. To ensure reliability, the assessment was conducted by two expert raters using an established rubric, and discrepancies were resolved through discussion. The findings are presented in two complementary ways: Table 2 reports per-line quality using verbal categories with brief criterion-specific justifications interpreted against the dominant technique context established in the previous subsection, while Table 3 reports the percentage summary of translation quality for each line and criterion.

The raters used Nababan & Nuraeni’s three-level rubric for each criterion (3 = High, 2 = Moderate, 1 = Low) and scored each line independently using a questionnaire sheet. The verbal labels in Table 2 are direct conversions of these rubric scores, and the short justifications clarify what the score level means for each ST–TT pairing. The “Quick Note” column was written by the researcher as a manual analytical interpretation linking the two raters’ score profile to the dominant technique coded by the researcher in Section 3.1. For Table 3, the two rater scores were summed (maximum = 6) and converted into normalized percentages using $(R1 + R2)/6 \times 100$ to facilitate line-by-line comparison.

Table 2 Translation Quality Categories of DeepL’s Indonesian Based on Two-Rater Assessment

Line	Technique	Accuracy (1–3)	Acceptability (1–3)	Readability (1–3)	Quick Note
L1	Established equivalence	High (3), meaning fully	High (3), idiomatic imperative, not machine-like	High (3), immediately clear	Refrain anchor, stable equivalent

Line	Technique	Accuracy (1–3)	Acceptability (1–3)	Readability (1–3)	Quick Note
		transferred, no distortion			strengthens all dimensions
L2	Modulation	Moderate (2), parting meaning kept, but “say goodbye” reframed	High (3), natural Indonesian packaging	High (3), clear clause flow	Viewpoint shift improves fit, but slightly alters speech-act nuance
L3	Established equivalence	High (3), no loss of meaning	High (3), fully natural refrain form	High (3), very easy	Repetition reinforces perceived quality across recurrence
L4	Literal translation	High (3), message preserved with minimal nuance loss	High (3), acceptable but slightly stiff (“hal itu”)	High (3), clear despite length	Literalness preserves sense, adds small machine-like explicitness
L5	Amplification	High (3), core imagery preserved, added continuity does not distort	High (3), generally natural in lyric register	High (3), long but organized	Explicitation “selalu” intensifies affect with limited fluency cost
L6	Literal translation	High (3), propositional content transferred	Moderate (2), understandable but somewhat rigid sequencing	High (3), easy enough to process	Accuracy stays strong while naturalness becomes more machine-like
L7	Established equivalence	High (3), fully transferred	High (3), fully natural	High (3), immediate	Refrain functions as a quality reset line
L8	Generalization	High (3), distance meaning preserved (“travel” broadened)	High (3), natural verb choice	High (3), short and clear	Smoother comprehension, slightly flatter journey specificity

Table 2 indicates that DeepL’s output is predominantly High (3) across the corpus, especially in accuracy and readability, with only a small set of Moderate (2) judgments that mark the main pressure points. The refrain lines (L1, L3, L7, L9, L13) show the most uniform profile because established equivalence repeatedly supplies the same conventional solution (“*Ingatlah aku*”), which stabilizes meaning transfer and keeps processing effort low. The most visible trade-offs emerge in non-refrain lines where technique choice affects how naturally the TT “packs” meaning. Accuracy shows its clearest reduction in L2, where modulation preserves the intended parting meaning but reframes the speech act “say goodbye” as “*berpisah*,” producing a Moderate (2) accuracy judgment even while acceptability and readability remain High (3). Acceptability is the dimension that drops most readily when Indonesian phrasing becomes less idiomatic or more structurally heavy: L6 is judged Moderate (2) in acceptability due to its rigid sequencing despite High accuracy and readability; L10 is judged Moderate (2) in acceptability because the calque-like “*gitar sedih*” preserves imagery but feels collocationally less idiomatic; and L11 is judged Moderate (2) in acceptability because connective-heavy scaffolding (“*bahwa*,” “*dengan cara*”) makes the line feel more procedural and less lyric-like. Readability remains High for most lines, and the main boundary case is L11, which is also judged Moderate (2) in readability because the TT is dense and invites rereading even though the core assurance is still conveyed.

Table 3 Percentage Translation Quality of DeepL’s Indonesian per Line Based on Two-Rater Assessment

Line	Source Text (ST)	Target Text (TT)	Type	Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability
L1	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
L2	Though I have to say goodbye	Meskipun aku harus berpisah	Modulation	83.33%	100.00%	100.00%
L3	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
L4	Don't let it make you cry	Jangan biarkan hal itu membuatmu menangis	Literal translation	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
L5	For even if I'm far away I hold you in my heart	Karena meskipun aku jauh, aku selalu menyimpanmu di hatiku	Amplification	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
L6	I sing a secret song to you each night we are apart	Aku menyanyikan lagu rahasia untukmu setiap malam kita terpisah	Literal translation	100.00%	83.33%	100.00%

Line	Source Text (ST)	Target Text (TT)	Type	Accuracy	Acceptability	Readability
L7	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
L8	Though I have to travel far	Meskipun aku harus pergi jauh	Generalization	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
L9	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
L10	Each time you hear a sad guitar	Setiap kali kau mendengar gitar sedih	Calque	100.00%	83.33%	100.00%
L11	Know that I'm with you the only way that I can be	Ketahuilah bahwa aku bersamumu dengan cara yang bisa aku lakukan	Modulation	100.00%	83.33%	66.67%
L12	Until you're in my arms again	Sampai kau kembali dalam pelukanku	Modulation	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
L13	Remember me	Ingatlah aku	Established equivalence	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Average				98.72%	96.15%	97.44%

The normalized percentage scores in Table 3 confirms the same pattern in a more compact form. Refrain lines (L1, L3, L7, L9, L13) repeatedly reach 100.00% across all three criteria, aligning with the qualitative pattern that established equivalence produces the most stable outcomes. Variation is concentrated in a small set of diagnostically meaningful reductions: L2 accuracy drops to 83.33%, matching the qualitative note that modulation keeps the parting meaning but reframes nuance; acceptability drops to 83.33% in L6, L10, and L11, indicating that Indonesian naturalness is the most fragile dimension when the TT becomes rigid or calque-like; and L11 readability is the lowest point at 66.67%, quantitatively identifying the same processing-load outlier highlighted in Table 2. The overall averages remain very high across criteria (Accuracy 98.72%, Acceptability 96.15%, Readability 97.44%), with acceptability being the lowest mean, supporting the tendency that naturalness/idiomaticity is more vulnerable than basic meaning transfer in this MT lyric output.

The combined evidence shows that DeepL's MT lyric translation at the line level is patterned rather than uniform. When the ST line is short and repeated, DeepL consistently selects a conventional Indonesian equivalent that secures meaning transfer and keeps processing effort low, producing the strongest, most stable profile in the corpus. In this dataset, the refrain does more than repeat content; it repeatedly reuses a low-variance solution, which helps stabilize the perceived quality of the TT around an anchor line.

The way the findings were obtained is traceable at the level of units and evidence. Each ST line was paired with its corresponding DeepL TT as the unit of analysis (13 pairs), each pair retained the dominant technique label already fixed in Section 3.1, and the translation quality was evaluated across accuracy, acceptability, and readability using two raters. The subsection then presents complementary evidence: Table 2 verbalizes criterion-based judgments to clarify what the ratings mean at the line level, while Table 3 summarizes the same outcomes as percentages to show the distribution of strengths and weak points in a compact, comparable format.

Interpreting the outcomes becomes clearer when the quality pattern is read through the technique context. Established equivalence for “Remember me” minimizes semantic risk and aligns well with Indonesian imperative norms, producing maximally stable ratings across accuracy, acceptability, and readability. Literal translation, by contrast, tends to maintain accuracy through close structural mapping of propositional content, but it can yield heavier Indonesian phrasing or explicit fillers that sound more machine-like, which is reflected in lower acceptability even when readability remains adequate. Calque at line 10 reflects a common MT trade-off: direct mapping preserves the ST image and basic meaning, yet the resulting collocation is less idiomatic in Indonesian, placing pressure primarily on acceptability.

The most informative boundary case is line 11, where modulation preserves the core assurance but yields the densest TT, and the percentage results identify this line as the clearest readability outlier (66.67%). The mechanism is not random error but line-level processing load: reframing plus connective scaffolding produces a longer, more procedural phrasing that is less lyric-like in Indonesian, so the line becomes harder to read even though its gist remains largely accessible.

Relating the results to settled knowledge in translation-quality assessment and MT tendencies, the subsection reinforces that accuracy, acceptability, and readability are related but non-identical dimensions. MT can preserve meaning well in many cases while still producing phrasing that is less idiomatic or less appropriate to lyric register, which is captured most sensitively by acceptability and, in extreme cases, by readability. Building on this, the findings suggest a refinement for MT lyric evaluation at the micro level: refrain-based repetition translated through established equivalence can create a quality anchoring effect, while quality degradation concentrates at technique-conditioned pressure points such as calque-like collocations and connective-heavy modulation. This framing moves the analysis beyond reporting scores by explaining where quality is robust and where it predictably strains; overall, DeepL’s output in this corpus is strongest in meaning transfer, while Indonesian naturalness remains the primary locus of vulnerability.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examined DeepL’s non-official Indonesian machine translation of 13 lyric lines from “Remember Me” by mapping Molina & Albir’s translation techniques and linking them to expert ratings of accuracy, acceptability, and readability. The findings show a refrain-driven pattern in which established equivalence dominates and repeatedly anchors the chorus through “Ingatlah aku”, while modulation and literal translation appear mainly in non-refrain lines to handle conceptual reframing and structurally transparent clauses. Overall quality is very high across the corpus (Accuracy 98.72%, Acceptability 96.15%, Readability 97.44%), but the most consistent vulnerability lies in acceptability and occasional processing load, especially where calque-like collocations (e.g., “gitar sedih”) and connective-heavy modulation (e.g., “Ketahuilah bahwa... dengan cara...”) make the output less idiomatic and less lyric-like, with line 11 identified as the clearest readability outlier. Practically, these results suggest that MT-assisted lyric translation can preserve core meaning reliably when conventional equivalents are available (particularly for repeated hooks), yet it still requires targeted

human review at technique-conditioned “risk points”, notably collocation naturalness and unnecessary scaffolding that reduces lyric economy, if the goal is audience-friendly Indonesian phrasing. For future research, a larger lyric corpus and comparisons across MT systems and post-editing conditions are needed to test whether the same technique–quality pressure points recur, and to extend evaluation beyond line-level meaning transfer to include lyric register appropriateness and viewer processing in audiovisual contexts.

REFERENCES

- Andriani, R., Putri, A., & Kasriyati, D. (2021). Using Video Subscribe to Improve Students’ Speaking Ability. *ELT-Lectura*, 8(1), 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v8i1.6112>
- Atmojo, P. M. A., & Nugroho, R. A. (2025). Translation Techniques Used in the English Version of Andmesh Kamaleng Song’s Hanya Rindu Translated by Emma Heesters. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 10(1), 97–97. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v10i1.1410>
- Citra, A. S. F. K., & Jumanto, J. (2023). Translation Techniques on Official Soundtrack of Moana Film’s Song. *The International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Technology (ICESST)*, 2(2), 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.55606/icesst.v2i2.283>
- Damarratri, H. S., & Afifulloh, M. (2024). Translation Techniques Used for Translating Cultural Aspects in the Television Series “Cigarette Girl.” *Loquēla (Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Education)*, 2(2), 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.61276/loquela.v2i2.44>
- Ekalia, Y. J., & Jelimun, M. O. (2022). Translation Techniques Utilized by the EFL Students in Translating Short Narrative Text. *English Language Education Journal (ELEJ)*, 1(1), 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.36928/elej.v1i1.1585>
- Ihsan, N. W., Halim, J. A., Fritsca, C., & Andriani, R. (2025). *Quantum Translation: A New Heuristic for Cognitive Uncertainty in the AI Era*. 10.
- Inawati, I., Savitri, D., Fitriani, D. R., & Listiyaningtyas, N. (2022). Translation techniques of Indonesian children’s picture book: The Sacred Crocodile. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language Journal*, 1(1), 56–63. <https://doi.org/10.12928/tefl.v1i1.164>
- Lubis, A. R. K., Muchtar, M., & Mono, U. (2020). Translation Techniques and Translation Quality of Indonesian Subtitles of Coco Movie: A Comparative of Two Subtitlers. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 7(2), 227–235. <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.203>
- Lusi, L. J., Zubaidah, N., Isabel, C., & Andriani, R. (2026). TRANSLATION STRATEGIES IN EFL/ESL AND MTGEN/AI POST-EDITING. *ELTR Journal*, 10(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v10i1.294>
- Maulina, P. A., Zulyani, L., & Anwar, R. F. (2025). *CULTURAL INTEGRATION IN THE TRANSLATION PROCESS: UNIFYING SEMANTICS, MORPHOSYNTAX, AND PRAGMATICS*. 8(3).
- Muliawati, N. W. P. (2020). Analisis Teknik Penerjemahan Istilah Kebudayaan dalam Kumpulan Cerita Pendek: Karma. *Jurnal Penerjemahan*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.64571/ojp.v7i2.66>
- Mustafa, F., Aziz, Z. A., & Khabri, I. (2021). Translation techniques used in translating a smartphone user manual. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(1), 33–33. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i1.10494>

- Nababan, M., & Nuraeni, A. (2012). PENGEMBANGAN MODEL PENILAIAN KUALITAS TERJEMAHAN. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 24(1).
- Nila, S. F., & Octavitri, Y. (2020). Translation Techniques of Islamic Terminologies in Bilingual Children Story Books. *JURNAL ARBITRER*, 7(1), 81–85. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.7.1.81-85.2020>
- Nugroho, M. A. B., Agustiana, V., & Budi, F. F. K. (2024). TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES OF RACIAL SLURS IN THE MOVIE “42” SUBTITLES. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 9(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v9i1.8619>
- Pebina, T., Sembiring, M., & Simamora, N. (2024). Translation Techniques Used In Translating Proverbs Related To “NEBU-NEBU” From Karonese Language Into English. *Sintaksis : Publikasi Para Ahli Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris*, 2(4), 270–283. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v2i4.906>
- Poyungi, Y. S., Nababan, M., & Santosa, R. (2021). Translation Techniques of Modality Metaphor in Anne of Green Gables. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, 11(1), 68–68. <https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.11.1.2021.68-79>
- Saputra, N., Sulistyani, S., Fatmawati, E., & Herman, H. (2022). Translation techniques of subtitle from english into indonesian in a movie: A case on literature. *ScienceRise*, (2), 30–36. <https://doi.org/10.21303/2313-8416.2022.002422>
- Sari, E. Y., Mayasari, M., & Zuindra, Z. (2024). Translation Techniques In The Movie Script ‘Encanto.’ *Sintaksis : Publikasi Para Ahli Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris*, 2(3), 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v2i3.556>
- Warda, U., Ashari, E., Sinaga, J. B., & Adam. (2024). The Analyze of Translation Techniques in Despicable Me 3 Movie. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)*, 12(Query date: 2025-10-13 16:19:16), 3595–3602. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijrm/v12i09.el03>
- Widiaswara, R. A., & Jumanto, J. (2024). Translation techniques of the positive politeness utterances in the Pay It Forward movie. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 7(2), 281–290. <https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v7i2.932>
- Wulandari, R. (2023). *Contrast Analysis And Subtitles In The English Translation Of The Movie “Coco.”* 6(2).
- Yuda, D. A., & Harared, N. (2023). AN ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES USED IN THE SUBTITLE OF SHANG-CHI AND THE LEGEND OF THE TEN RINGS MOVIE. 6(4).