

# A Comparative Analysis of the Cognitive Processes in Machine Translation and Human Translation

Huan Jin\*

Hohai University, Nanjing, 211100, China

\*Corresponding author: Zanna245199@gmail.com

**Abstract:** With the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence technology, machine translation systems have demonstrated significant advantages in handling multilingual information conversion. However, the fundamental differences between machine translation and human translators at the cognitive level have not yet been systematically explained. Based on a cognitive science framework, this paper conducts an in-depth analysis of their essential differences in cognitive mechanisms. The study finds that machine translation is built upon computational models and data-driven approaches, characterized by formal processing and probabilistic optimization. In contrast, human translation relies on the complex cognitive system of the biological brain, possessing advanced cognitive capabilities such as contextual understanding, dynamic knowledge management, and creative decision-making. By constructing a systematic comparative analysis framework, this research elucidates the fundamental differences from three dimensions: language comprehension, knowledge application, and decision-making processes. Furthermore, based on cognitive complementarity, a new model of human-machine collaborative translation is proposed. This research not only deepens the theoretical understanding of the cognitive processes in translation but also provides a crucial foundation for developing efficient human-machine collaborative translation systems.

**Keywords:** machine translation, human translation, cognitive processes, cognitive mechanisms, human-machine collaboration, comparative analysis

## Introduction

In contemporary society, characterized by the deep integration of globalization and informatization, the demand for language services has experienced explosive growth. Although advancements in machine translation technology have significantly enhanced translation efficiency, a quality gap between machine and human translation persists. The differences in cognitive mechanisms underlying this disparity require in-depth exploration. Current research predominantly focuses on technological optimization and improvement, lacking systematic and profound comparative analysis of their intrinsic processing mechanisms from the perspective of cognitive science. This theoretical shortcoming directly constrains the innovative development of human-machine collaborative translation models and proves inadequate for effectively guiding quality improvement in translation practice. Therefore, investigating the inherent differences and complementary potential between machine translation and human translation from a cognitive process perspective holds significant theoretical value by deepening our understanding of the cognitive mechanisms in language processing. Furthermore, it possesses urgent practical significance, offering a scientific basis for breaking through the current developmental bottlenecks in translation technology and constructing new paradigms for human-machine collaboration. By establishing a systematic cognitive comparison framework, this study aims to reveal the fundamental distinctions between the two in core areas such as language comprehension, knowledge application, and decision-making processes. It seeks to provide new ideas and methods for advancing translation theory and technology.

## 1. An Exploration of the Cognitive Mechanisms in Machine Translation and Human Translation

### 1.1 The Cognitive Basis and Processing Mechanism of Machine Translation

The cognitive basis of machine translation does not originate from the intelligent activities of a biological brain. Instead, it is founded upon computational linguistics and statistical models. Its

processing mechanism essentially treats source language text as a data sequence amenable to mathematical modeling, achieving the mapping and transformation between symbols through complex algorithmic operations. Early rule-based machine translation systems relied on expert-compiled grammatical lexicons and transformation rules. Their cognitive process simulated formal logical deduction, attempting to generate translations through symbolic operations and syntactic analysis [1].

In contrast, the currently mainstream neural machine translation adopts an end-to-end processing model. Its cognitive basis aligns more closely with distributed representation and probabilistic prediction within deep neural networks. Through training on massive corpora, these systems automatically learn complex associations and statistical patterns among language symbols within multi-layer networks, forming an implicit knowledge model that encompasses lexical, syntactic, and shallow semantic information. Its information processing workflow is a black-box operation from encoding to decoding. A source language sentence is transformed into a distributed representation in a high-dimensional vector space, and the decoder then generates the target language sequence word by word probabilistically, based on this representation and the previously generated context. This mechanism embodies a process of pattern recognition and probabilistic optimization driven by data. The depth and breadth of its "cognition" are entirely constrained by the scale and quality of the training data.

### ***1.2 The Cognitive Process and Mental Representation in Human Translation***

The cognitive process of human translation is a highly dynamic intelligent behavior that integrates multiple complex mental activities. It begins with the translator's in-depth reading and comprehension of the source text. This initial stage involves not merely the decoding of linguistic symbols but also the construction of a mental model based on world knowledge and contextual information. By activating language schemas and conceptual structures stored in long-term memory, the translator proactively analyzes, filters, and reconstructs the textual information, forming a holistic mental representation of the original intent, emotional tone, and logical structure.

During the conversion phase, the translator's cognitive activity is not a simple code substitution. Instead, it involves cross-mapping, meaning negotiation, and conceptual integration between the bilingual mental lexicon and the conceptual system. This process is accompanied by extensive internal decision-making and judgment, requiring the resolution of category gaps and expressive conflicts arising from linguistic and cultural differences.

The final text production phase is a process of creative reconstruction driven by target language norms and communicative purposes. The translator must coordinate automated language generation processes with conscious monitoring and evaluation, ensuring the translated text achieves equivalence to the original across multiple dimensions, including meaning, function, and style. The entire cognitive process engages advanced mental functions such as perception, memory, thought, decision-making, and creativity, exhibiting marked initiative, flexibility, and purposiveness.

### ***1.3 Construction of a Comparative Framework for Cognitive Mechanisms***

Constructing a comparative framework for the cognitive mechanisms of machine translation and human translation requires examining the systematic differences between the two across multiple dimensions: processing units, knowledge sources, and operational nature. Regarding processing units, machine translation tends to operate on basic units of locally co-occurring word sequences and sentences, with its operations based on statistical associations of surface forms; human translation, however, utilizes meaning propositions and the entire discourse as its processing units, operating based on deep conceptual and intentional analysis.

In terms of knowledge sources, machine translation derives its knowledge from closed, pre-annotated training datasets, with knowledge represented as neural network parameters that are difficult to interpret; human translation knowledge, conversely, originates from open-ended, continuously updated personal experiences and socio-cultural practices, with knowledge stored as abstract conceptual systems and schematic structures.

From the perspective of operational nature, the core of machine translation is mathematical pattern matching and probabilistic calculation, pursuing formal statistical optimality; the core of human translation is comprehension, reasoning, and creation, aiming for dynamic functional equivalence in communication. This comparative framework reveals that machine translation simulates the fast,

automated, shallow information processing mode of human cognition, whereas human translation demonstrates the slow, controlled, deep meaning processing capacity. This fundamental difference in mechanisms provides a theoretical basis for understanding the capabilities, limitations, and complementary potential of both approaches, and also indicates directions for subsequent exploration of feasible paths for human-machine collaboration [2].

## **2. Analysis of the Differences and Complementarities in the Cognitive Processes of Machine Translation and Human Translation**

### ***2.1 Key Dimensions of Differences in Cognitive Processes***

#### ***2.1.1 The Dichotomy of Formalization and Contextualization in the Dimension of Language Understanding***

The cognitive process of machine translation is based on formalized processing. It achieves a surface-level understanding driven by statistical regularities by mapping linguistic elements into a high-dimensional vector space for computation. This approach is essentially a probabilistic reconstruction of language patterns, lacking grasp of the deep semantics and contextual associations of the text. In contrast, human translation exhibits highly contextualized cognitive characteristics. Translators can mobilize rich world knowledge and contextual information to construct a complete mental representation. When dealing with complex linguistic phenomena, human translation demonstrates a profound comprehension of implied meaning, emotional nuance, and cultural connotation, representing a cognitive height currently difficult for machine systems to attain.

#### ***2.1.2 The Division Between Static Implicitness and Dynamic Explicitness in the Dimension of Knowledge Application***

The knowledge system of machine translation exhibits static characteristics. Its knowledge structure is solidified within the parameters of the trained model, manifesting as a closed knowledge retrieval mode during the application phase. This implicit knowledge system struggles to achieve real-time updates and dynamic expansion. In contrast, human translation is built upon an explicit knowledge management system. Translators can flexibly mobilize both declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge, and perform targeted knowledge integration based on task requirements. When encountering knowledge gaps, translators can proactively expand their cognitive resources, demonstrating a powerful capacity for knowledge updating and adaptation [3].

#### ***2.1.3 Coexistence of Probability Optimization and Constraint Weighing in the Dimension of Decision-Making Processing***

The decision-making mechanism of machine translation is fundamentally an optimization process based on probability models. It selects the optimal target language sequence in a statistical sense through algorithmic computation. This decision-making method exhibits linear and deterministic characteristics. In contrast, the decision-making process in human translation involves complex trade-offs under multiple constraint conditions. It requires comprehensive consideration of various factors, including textual fidelity, reader acceptability, stylistic requirements, and time cost. Each decision made by the translator represents a "satisficing solution" sought within a specific cognitive context, reflecting the dialectical and flexible nature of human cognition.

### ***2.2 The Origins and Manifestations of Differences***

#### ***2.2.1 The Computational Nature versus Biological Nature of Intelligent Agents***

The root cause of these cognitive differences lies in the fundamental distinction between the natures of their intelligent agents. Machine translation is grounded in formal computation, with its intelligence manifesting as a data-driven pattern recognition capability. Although this computational intelligence possesses efficiency and consistency, it lacks genuine comprehension and creativity. Human translation, conversely, is based on the biological neural system, which possesses advanced cognitive functions such as perception, consciousness, and metacognition. This biological foundation enables deep reasoning and emotional resonance, which constitute the core advantage in handling complex tasks such as literary translation.

### ***2.2.2 The Division Between Pattern-Based and Creative Processing Capabilities***

In terms of specific processing capabilities, machine translation excels at handling structured and pattern-based language content, demonstrating excellent performance in translating standardized texts such as technical documentation. However, when confronted with creative uses of language, such as literary rhetoric and poetic expression, machine systems often prove inadequate. Human translation, through aesthetic judgment and linguistic creativity, accomplishes a process that extends from language conversion to artistic recreation, thereby exhibiting a uniquely creative processing capacity.

### ***2.2.3 Comparison of Mechanical Rigidity versus Flexible Agency in Contextual Adaptability***

Machine translation demonstrates significant limitations in contextual adaptability. Its processing units are typically confined to the sentence level, lacking the capacity to grasp the overall structure of a discourse. This mechanistic approach results in notable deficiencies in maintaining stylistic consistency and emotional coherence. In contrast, human translation can construct global cognitive schemata, ensuring that each local choice remains coordinated with the overall context, thereby demonstrating superior macro-contextual adaptation capabilities <sup>[4]</sup>.

## ***2.3 Potential Areas and Value of Complementarity***

### ***2.3.1 Task Division Based on Cognitive Load Theory***

From the perspective of cognitive load theory, machine translation can effectively assume the external cognitive load during the translation process. By automating fundamental tasks, it frees up valuable cognitive resources for the translator. This division of labor enables translators to concentrate on complex aspects requiring advanced cognitive processing, thereby achieving an optimized allocation of overall cognitive resources. This cognitive partnership between human and machine opens up new possibilities for enhancing translation efficiency and quality.

### ***2.3.2 The Iterative Optimization Model of Human-Machine Collaboration***

The complementary potential between human and machine is also manifested in a dynamic, iterative optimization process. Establishing a collaborative closed loop of "machine pre-translation → human fine-editing" can form a virtuous cycle of continuous improvement. The modifications made by the translator provide high-quality feedback data for the machine system, promoting its continuous optimization. This collaborative model not only enhances the quality of the current translation task but also provides impetus for the long-term evolution of machine systems.

### ***2.3.3 Paradigm Restructuring Towards New Translation Competence***

The deepening development of human-machine collaboration is driving a restructuring of the translation competence system. Future professional translators will need to develop metacognitive abilities based on human-machine collaboration, including the capacity to diagnose machine-translated output, perform deep editing, and conduct pre-translation preprocessing. This new competence paradigm emphasizes the understanding and integration of both cognitive systems, which is key to realizing the maximum value of human-machine collaboration. This paradigm shift not only enhances individual translation efficacy but also promotes a cognitive upgrade for the entire translation industry.

## **3. Research on Human-Machine Collaborative Translation Models Based on Cognitive Process Complementarity**

### ***3.1 The Theoretical Foundation of Human-Machine Collaborative Translation***

The construction of a human-machine collaborative translation model is not a simple technological add-on. Rather, it is rooted in the intersection and fusion of a series of interdisciplinary theories, which provide a deep scholarly foundation for its rationality and necessity. One of its core theoretical foundations is the perspective of cognitive ecology. This perspective posits that cognition is not isolated within an individual brain but is distributed across the entire system composed of the individual, tools, and the environment <sup>[5]</sup>.

Within this framework, machine translation is regarded as a functional component within the translator's cognitive ecosystem. Its role is to extend the boundaries of human cognition by undertaking information processing subtasks that are high in cognitive load and low in creativity for humans. Another key theoretical foundation is the theory of cognitive coupling in human-computer interaction.

This theory focuses on how human intelligence and artificial intelligence form tight feedback loops during collaborative work. In an ideal coupled state, the computational power of the machine and the judgment capabilities of the human interact in real time. The rapid output of the machine provides material for human decision-making, while the immediate corrections from the human offer supervisory signals for the machine's subsequent learning, thereby forming a continuously evolving intelligent consortium.

Furthermore, activity theory provides a framework for understanding the division of labor and role dynamics within a collaborative system. It emphasizes the central role of tool mediation in human goal-directed activities and focuses on the interactions between individuals and the community as governed by rules. Together, these theories lead to one conclusion: the most effective translation system may not be a fully autonomous artificial intelligence, but rather a carefully designed collaborative system capable of achieving a deep integration of the respective cognitive strengths of humans and machines.

### ***3.2 Design Principles for Collaborative Models***

To ensure the efficient operation of human-machine collaborative translation models and the genuine realization of cognitive complementarity, their design must adhere to a series of fundamental principles guided by the core of cognitive processes. The primary principle is the human-centered principle, meaning the entire system's design should aim to enhance and empower the translator, not to replace them. The machine should be positioned as a "cognitive collaborator," and its functional design must be dedicated to reducing the translator's cognitive load, thereby directing the translator's attentional resources towards the complex decision-making stages that most require human intelligence.

The second principle is the dynamic cognitive coupling principle. This principle requires the system design to move beyond a simple linear "pre-translation — post-editing" pipeline towards supporting real-time, bidirectional intelligent interaction. This implies that the system should be able to dynamically adjust its support strategies based on the translator's behaviors (such as pausing, revising, or querying). For instance, it could provide alternative translations when the translator hesitates or offer risk warnings upon detecting potential cultural conflicts, thereby achieving a responsive form of cognitive collaboration.

The third principle is the interface cognitive transparency principle. The user interface and interaction logic of the collaborative system must adequately expose the machine's "cognitive state" and the rationale behind its decisions. For example, the system should be able to visualize the confidence levels for key segments of the translation, provide probability rankings for alternative translations, or even explain the core source language fragments that informed specific translation choices. This transparency helps the translator quickly understand the machine's operational logic, accurately pinpoint issues, and thus efficiently apply their own advanced cognitive abilities to the most critical quality control aspects.

### ***3.3 Implementation Pathways and Effectiveness Evaluation***

Translating theoretical principles into feasible practice requires a clear, stepped implementation pathway, supported by a multi-dimensional effectiveness evaluation system to verify and guide the development of the collaborative model. The implementation pathway can begin with task-oriented, refined division of labor. This involves pre-defining different levels of human-machine collaboration workflows based on text type, complexity, and quality requirements. For highly informational and patterned texts, a "machine translation + light post-editing" model can be adopted. For texts demanding high creativity and precision, a "machine-assisted (e.g., with term bases, translation memories) + human-led creation" model is more suitable [6].

An advanced pathway involves developing embedded intelligent assistance tools. This means decomposing machine capabilities into micro-services and seamlessly integrating them into the translator's working environment. These include functions such as real-time quality checks, context-aware terminology suggestions, and style consistency verification. This shifts machine assistance from a singular post-processing step to contextualized support that permeates the entire cognitive process of translation.

The highest-level pathway is constructing a self-adaptive, learning-enabled collaborative system.

This system would continuously learn and personalize its output strategies and assistance content by analyzing a specific translator's revision patterns, preferences, and ultimately adopted translations. The goal is to achieve long-term adaptation and co-evolution with the individual translator's cognitive style.

Regarding effectiveness evaluation, it is crucial to move beyond traditional, singular automatic translation quality metrics and construct a comprehensive evaluation matrix that integrates cognitive efficiency and product quality. This matrix should include both process-oriented indicators and result-oriented indicators. Process-oriented indicators focus on the impact of the collaborative model on the translation cognitive process. These can be measured by analyzing behavioral data, such as from eye-tracking and keystroke logging, to assess changes in the translator's cognitive load, task completion efficiency, and decision-making focus. Result-oriented indicators, meanwhile, must incorporate expert evaluation of higher-level quality dimensions like creativity and cultural appropriateness, in addition to traditional assessments of fluency and fidelity. Only through such a multi-dimensional evaluation can we comprehensively and objectively measure whether the human-machine collaborative translation model has genuinely achieved the optimization of cognitive processes and added value to the final output, thereby providing scientific guidance for its iteration and development.

## Conclusion

This study, through a systematic comparison of the cognitive processes in machine translation and human translation, reveals their fundamental differences in cognitive basis, processing mechanisms, and decision-making models. Machine translation, characterized by its formal processing and probabilistic optimization, holds an advantage in the rapid processing of standardized texts. In contrast, human translation, leveraging its capabilities for contextual understanding, dynamic knowledge management, and creative decision-making, demonstrates irreplaceable value in the deep processing of complex linguistic phenomena. The human-machine collaborative translation model, constructed based on cognitive complementarity, achieves an optimized allocation of cognitive resources through three levels: task division, iterative optimization, and system integration. Future research should focus on developing more adaptive intelligent assistance systems, deepening the exploration of the cognitive neural mechanisms of translation, and establishing a more comprehensive effectiveness evaluation system for human-machine collaboration. Concurrently, attention must be paid to innovating the translation education system to cultivate translators' human-machine collaboration skills, thereby promoting the transformation and upgrading of the translation industry in the era of artificial intelligence. These research directions will contribute to the deep integration of human and machine intelligence, paving the way for a new paradigm characterized by the synergistic enhancement of both translation quality and efficiency.

## References

- [1] Shi Guocui. "A Comparative Study of Machine Translation and Human Translation." *Chinese Character Culture*. 19(2025):172-174.
- [2] Sun Yiqun. "Literary Translation in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Comparative Study of Machine Translation and Human Translation of Mo Yan's Works." *Journal of Ocean University of China (Social Sciences Edition)*. 06(2025):148-160.
- [3] Zhang Jing, and Jin Xin. "Research on the Construction of a Cooperative Model between Machine Translation and Human Translation: Taking Chinese-Korean Translation as an Example." *Chinese Korean Language*. 05(2025):87-96.
- [4] Che Mingming, and Li Hongyu. "A Corpus-Based Comparative Analysis of ChatGPT Translation and Human Translation: Taking the Translation of Modern and Contemporary Chinese Prose as an Example." *Translation Research and Teaching*. 03(2025):104-110.
- [5] Zhou Yi. "On the Strengths and Weaknesses of AI Translation and Its Complementary Collaboration with Human Translation." *English Square*. 18(2025):15-18.
- [6] Wang Yihan, and Tong Qing. "Research on the Challenges Posed by the Development of AI Translation to Human Translation and Corresponding Strategies." *Jiaying Literature*. 11(2025):107-109.