ANALYZING THE TECHNIQUES AND QUALITY OF TRANSLATED INSTRUCTIONS ON 'CODENAMES' BOARD GAME

Geraldus Pax Kurnia[1], K. M. Widi Hadiyanti[2]
[1,2]Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia
geraldkurnia02@gmail.com[1]; widi.hadiyanti@atmajaya.ac.id; widi.hadiyanti2021@gmail.com[2]

ABSTRACT

Digital board games are entertainment games where thinking strategically and enjoyable interaction occur; they are products that contain specific gameplay conventions - which could be influenced by the original culture or language - from their origin countries. As these particular games are distributed, translation comes along and plays a role: adapting the original content to the existing elements in that specific target language. The clarity of the instructions has to be clear and precise because board games rely on written explanations in the cards, rules, the board game, and the roleplaying characters. If one or more are translated inadequately, then the higher the chance of players to misinterpret the content and fail to experience the game as intended. Furthermore, a previous study conducted by Ardi (2016) believed that a selection of translation techniques could shape the overall quality of a translation. Therefore, it is highly mandatory to conduct this research by focusing on both distinct fields. This research investigates the Indonesian version of 'Codenames' board game instructions with two primary objectives. First, it is to identify the translation techniques employed in translating the original source (English) to the target language (Indonesian); and second, to assess the quality of the translation based on the aspects of Accuracy, Acceptability, and Readability. The study adopts Molina and Albir's (2002) classification of translation techniques and Nababan et al.'s (2021) translation quality assessment as its theoretical framework. The analysis demonstrates that 14 different translation techniques are utilized in the dataset, indicating considerable variation in strategy selection. Among these, Literal Translation appears most frequently, suggesting a strong tendency to preserve the structural and semantic forms of the source text. Linguistic Amplification ranks second, reflecting the translator's effort to add explicit information where necessary to support clarity. In terms of quality evaluation, the overall mean score of 2.69 indicates that the Indonesian instructions can generally be categorized as good. Accuracy (2.70) and Readability (2.86) obtain high scores, implying that the translated content successfully conveys meaning and remains easy to understand for target readers. However, Acceptability records a slightly lower mean score (2.59), signaling that certain segments require further adjustment to better conform to Indonesian grammatical patterns and cultural conventions. Overall, the findings suggest that while the translation is effectively transferred and coherent, refinement is still needed to enhance its naturalness in the target language context.

Keywords: *Translation Techniques, Translation Quality Assessment, 'Codenames', Digital Board Games*

ABSTRAK

Permainan papan tidak hanya menjadi sarana untuk berpikir strategis dan menciptakan interaksi yang menyenangkan, tetapi juga merupakan produk yang memuat konvensi permainan tertentu—yang dapat dipengaruhi oleh budaya atau bahasa dari negara asalnya. Ketika permainan tersebut didistribusikan ke berbagai negara, proses penerjemahan turut berperan dalam menyesuaikan konten asli dengan unsur-unsur yang berlaku dalam bahasa sasaran. Kejelasan instruksi harus disampaikan secara tepat dan akurat karena permainan papan bergantung pada penjelasan tertulis yang terdapat pada kartu, aturan permainan, papan permainan, serta peran karakter. Apabila satu atau lebih dari komponen tersebut diterjemahkan secara kurang memadai, maka semakin besar kemungkinan pemain salah menafsirkan isi permainan dan gagal merasakan pengalaman bermain sebagaimana yang dimaksudkan. Selain itu, penelitian sebelumnya oleh Ardi (2016) menunjukkan bahwa pemilihan teknik penerjemahan dapat mempengaruhi kualitas terjemahan secara keseluruhan. Oleh karena itu, penting untuk melakukan penelitian yang memfokuskan perhatian pada kedua aspek tersebut. Penelitian ini mengkaji versi Bahasa Indonesia dari instruksi permainan papan 'Codenames' dengan dua tujuan utama. Pertama, untuk mengidentifikasi teknik penerjemahan yang digunakan dalam menerjemahkan teks sumber (bahasa Inggris) ke dalam bahasa sasaran (Bahasa Indonesia). Kedua, untuk menilai kualitas terjemahan berdasarkan aspek Keakuratan, Keberterimaan, dan Keterbacaan. Penelitian ini menggunakan klasifikasi teknik penerjemahan yang dikemukakan oleh Molina dan Albir (2002) serta model penilaian kualitas terjemahan yang dikembangkan oleh Nababan, Sumarni, dan Sumardiono (2021) sebagai landasan teoritis. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa terdapat 14 teknik penerjemahan yang digunakan dalam data, yang mencerminkan adanya variasi strategi penerjemahan. Di antara teknik tersebut, Literal Translation merupakan teknik yang paling dominan, yang menunjukkan kecenderungan untuk mempertahankan bentuk struktural dan makna semantis teks sumber. Linguistic Amplification menempati posisi kedua, yang mencerminkan upaya penerjemah dalam menambahkan informasi secara eksplisit untuk mendukung kejelasan makna. Dari segi penilaian kualitas, skor rata-rata keseluruhan sebesar 2.69 menunjukkan bahwa instruksi dalam Bahasa Indonesia secara umum dapat dikategorikan baik. Aspek Keakuratan (2.70) dan Keterbacaan (2.86) memperoleh skor tinggi, yang mengindikasikan bahwa makna berhasil disampaikan dengan baik dan mudah dipahami oleh pembaca sasaran. Namun, aspek Keberterimaan memperoleh skor rata-rata yang lebih rendah (2.59), yang menunjukkan bahwa beberapa bagian masih memerlukan penyesuaian agar lebih sesuai dengan kaidah gramatikal dan norma budaya Bahasa Indonesia.

Secara keseluruhan, temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa terjemahan telah tersampaikan secara efektif dan koheren, meskipun masih diperlukan penyempurnaan untuk meningkatkan tingkat kealamiahan dalam konteks bahasa sasaran.
Kata kunci: *Teknik Penerjemahan, Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan, 'Codenames', Permainan Papan Digital*

INTRODUCTION

Board games offer a social interaction where players can be tactical or just simply having fun. Moreover, this type of games provide the players a rest from the digital world (University of Pittsburgh, 2021; Game Nights 254, 2024). This is mainly because they are products that contain specific gameplay conventions that stand for rules, cards, board, and the role/characters (Wabbit Translation, 2021), which could also be influenced by the original culture or language - from their origin country. For instance, a game board called '*Mehen*' is inspired by a religious cult named The Sun Cult in Ancient Egypt (Attia, 2016). Therefore, as these games are distributed throughout the international market, translation comes along to play a role. The function of a translation is to adapt the original content to the existing elements in that specific target language to ensure quality and experience for the non-target language players (Transcom, 2024). Evans (2013, p. 15-23) believes that the clarity of the instructions must be present. In other words, the instructions have to be clean and transparent as board games rely on written explanations stated in the 4 previously mentioned principles - rules, cards, board, and roleplaying character. However, many translated boardgame instructions still exhibit issues such as unclear wording, inconsistent terminology, and unnatural expressions. These can negatively affect a player's understanding and overall gameplay experience (Evans, 2013), as rulebooks or instructions are the key points for players to grasp the overall experience of playing the board game.

A study conducted by Ardi (2016) highlights how a translator's choice of certain translation techniques can determine the quality of its translation. According to Molina and Albir (2002), translation techniques are different from translation methods. The former work on smaller units, such as word per word, phrases, and clauses. Techniques are meant to be flexible, depending on the context or the situation, which by nature, compares the Target Text (TT) to the original Source Text (ST). Meanwhile, the quality of a translation is indicated by the aspects of accuracy, acceptability, and readability (Nababan et al., 2012). Accuracy, first and foremost, is the most highly regarded by the three authors as it is condemned whether the translated text successfully conveys the original message or not. This aligns with what Anindya & Sutrisno (2019) state that Accuracy does not allow any distortion of meaning between the original and the new version. For Acceptability, it is simply described as something that is accepted and approved in the Cambridge Dictionary. Nababan et al. (2012) even describe further that this aspect makes sure that the translated version follows the cultural norms of the target language. Lastly, the Readability aspect is more whether the translated text is easy and enjoyable in the eyes of the readers.

Furthermore, there is a shortage of research that examines both translation technique and translation quality, particularly when it comes to board games, as the majority of previous studies either examines translation techniques or translation quality individually. Thus, the objectives of the current study are: analyzing translation techniques that were used, as well as evaluating the quality of the translated version of Codenames board game instructions. There were 4 categories inside of the instructions: the Setup Rules, the Gameplay Actions, the Valid Clues, and the Additional/Adjustment Rules.

METHODS

This study adopted a quantitative approach to analyze which translation techniques were used and the quality of the translation of 'Codenames*'* board game instructions. The methodology integrated two theoretical frameworks consisting of the translation techniques and quality assessment.

Translation Techniques

The first framework applied in this study was a classification framework proposed by Molina and Albir (2002). They defined translation techniques as strategies used by translators to solve problems at the micro-level of the text. From the original eighteen techniques, this study focused on fourteen techniques that were most relevant to instructional texts and frequently identified in previous studies. These decisions were made because, according to earlier research using this classification, the most widely used translation strategies were adaptation, amplification, borrowing, calque, established equivalent, generalization, reduction, and literal translation, regardless of whether the text was narrative, informative, or instructional target text from 4 previous studies. The aforementioned earlier research are: Putri, Rasyad, and Anggraini (2023) regarding the translation techniques employed in "Sarimin Webtoon"; Damarratri and Afifulloh (2024) dealing the translation techniques used in the television series "Cigarette Girl"; Afandi and Authar

(2021) discussing the translation techniques engaged in the film "*Ketika Cinta Bertasbih*", while Alvarez and Espinoza (2022) exploring the translation techniques employed in the board game “Gloomhaven”. The remaining methods had a part to play in this investigation even if they were hardly utilized. In essence, description and modulation gave the translator greater freedom when translating a particular term that called for an appropriate explanation or a meaning shift in the sentence's structure. Particularization was the twin mirror of generalization, which meant it could accomplish what generalization was unable to. The same was true for linguistic compression and amplification, which were comparable to reduction and amplification, respectively. These two linguistic strategies, however, differed slightly from one another, as linguistic compression condensed large sentences into shorter ones and linguistic amplification added linguistic elements that stood for adverb, adjective, and so on. Lastly, in terms of grammatical change, transposition and modulation were similar but distinct (Molina & Albir, 2002; Volf, 2020; Mahmud, Baysena, & Ampera, 2021. This study used Molina & Albir’s classification, whereas Volf and Mahmud et al. were added for further explanation).

Below are the explanations and a short example for each technique.

1. **Adaptation**
   Patthew Volf (2020) describes adaptation as replacing the foreign elements of the original source with the elements from the target language. In other words, to ensure the source text fits with the target audience’s culture, that it can be accepted by the audience.
2. **Amplification**
   Mahmud et al. (2021) explain that this technique adds an extra layer of words in the sentence of the target language. However, it does not add new information. Instead, it just makes the text more understandable.
3. **Borrowing**
   As its name implies, this technique takes a word from the original language and applies it in the translation without modifying it (Volf, 2020). Borrowing comes with two different types: natural borrowing adjusts the loaned words to the target language’s phonetic and morphology, whereas, pure borrowing just borrows the word without any change.
4. **Calque**
   A bit similar to Literal Translation, Calque adjusts words or phrases from the source text by following the text’s structure and the lexical aspect (Volf, 2020).
5. **Description**
   This technique allows the translator to equip an explanation for a foreign term (Volf, 2020). The explanation could be the meaning or the function.
6. **Established Equivalent**
   Molina and Albir (2002) classified this technique to utilize accepted terms as equivalent in the target language. It could be acknowledged through the dictionary or most frequently used in daily interaction/speech.
7. **Generalization**
   This technique applies when there is a term in the source text that does not have the same meaning in the target language, so Generalization allows the translator to use more general terms from the target language’s audience (Molina & Albir, 2002).
8. **Literal Translation**
   Literal Translation is basically translating word to word. However, translating a sentence directly from the source text to the target language could make the sentence sound awkward or ambiguous (Volf, 2020).
9. **Linguistic Amplification**
   This technique works similarly to Amplification. What distinguishes it is Linguistic Amplification includes language components in the translated text (Molina & Albir, 2002).
10. **Linguistic Compression**
    This technique also operates in a similar manner to reduction. This technique, however, focuses more on condensing a long sentence from the source text into a shorter version in the translation (Molina & Albir, 2002).
11. **Modulation**
    Modulation shifts the main focus of a sentence based on the structural and/or perspective aspect (Volf, 2020; Molina & Albir, 2002).

12. **Particularization**
    A contrast opposition towards Generalization as this technique translates certain terms into a more concrete one (Volf, 2020).
13. **Reduction**
    Just like the name itself, this technique reduces some words or phrases from the source text (Volf, 2020). This technique is comparable to removal (omission, deletion, or subtraction) in translation.
14. **Transposition**
    The last technique shifts a grammar structure (Molina & Albir, 2002), for example, a grammatical shift from subject to object, and vice versa.

Translation Quality Assessment

This study employed the theoretical framework model developed by Nababan et al. (2012). This model assessed translation quality based on three aspects: accuracy, acceptability, and readability. Accuracy measured how well the meaning from the source text was transferred into the target text. Acceptability evaluated whether the translation conforms to the grammatical, cultural, and linguistic norms of the target language. Readability examined how easily the translated text can be understood by the intended audience. Each aspect was rated on a scale of 1 to 3 (as shown in Table 1) with accuracy carrying the highest weight, followed by acceptability and readability. This model was selected due to its comprehensive and systematic framework, which allowed for both micro-level and macro-level text evaluation.

Table 1. The Assessment of Translation Quality

Aspect	***Grade***	***Meaning***
Accuracy	3	There is no misinterpretation in the transmission of meaning from SL to TL.
	2	The majority of the meaning is expressed, although there are a few minor omissions or ambiguities.
	1	The meaning is lost, misinterpreted, or not conveyed at all.
Acceptability	3	The translation sounds natural; it follows the grammar rules of the target culture.
	2	The translation seems odd, yet it is still acceptable.
	1	It is grammatically incorrect and it looks like a word-for-word translation.
Readability	3	It is easy to follow and comprehend due to its clean and fluid structure.
	2	A few sections demand rereading or closer attention to grasp their meanings.
	1	It is hard to understand the translation; incoherent in the reader's eyes.

(Nababan et al., 2012)

Codenames Board Game

This study analyzed the instructional texts of the Codenames board game, originally written in English and translated into Indonesian. "Codenames" is a word-based team game in which players - or known as field operatives - ought to identify their team's agents through clues provided by a spymaster, as the agent's cards are hidden behind the 25 grid codenames. The objective of this game is relatively simple: find all the team's agent cards before the opponent team do, and avoid guessing one of the bystander cards, the assassin card or the team's turn automatically finish. The game procedure starts with one of the Spymaster offers thoughtfully selected one-word clues along with a number that represents the number of words that correspond to that clue. After that, field operatives discuss and choose phrases they think correspond; accurate guesses let the play continue, while errors might help the other team. The goal is to strike a balance between creativeness and accuracy because the rules prohibit spymasters from providing indications other than a single word or number. The game would be ended immediately if the assassin is selected or when one team correctly recognizes every phrase. The instructions include rules for game setup,

gameplay procedures, valid clues, and additional or adjustment rules. These instructional segments are selected as the primary data because they contain essential information that directly affects players' understanding and gameplay experience. Additionally, these segments are most likely the ones that players would instantly look up for.

The data of this study consisted of paired instructional segments in English (source text) and Indonesian (target text). These segments were categorized into 4 parts of the instructions as mentioned before - Setup Rules, Gameplay Actions, Valid Clues, and Additional/Adjustment Rules. These segments were taken from the source of data, which was the Codenames board game's instructions itself. The data then were collected through document analysis, before being identified and selected for the next analysis. The total of the selected segments were 87 instructional segments (21 from Setup Rules, 30 from Gameplay Action, 22 from Valid Clues, and 14 from Additional/Adjustment rules).

The research instrument included two main analytical tools: (1) an analysis rubric with its theory based on Molina and Albir (2002) as depicted in Table 2; and (2) a translation quality assessment rubric adapted from Nababan et al., (2012) as shown in Table 3. The classification techniques table contained two sentences from two different languages - English and Indonesian, a column for the interpreted translation technique(s), and the interpretation itself.

Table 2. Analysis Rubric for Translation Techniques

No.	*Source Text Statement (ENG.)*	*Target Language Text (IND.)*	*Interpretation Technique(s)*
1.			
2.			
3.			
Interpretation(s):			
1.			
2.			
3.			

Meanwhile, in analyzing the assessment of the translation quality, there was one additional rater, ensuring a more balanced evaluation. Due to time management issues, only two raters instead of three could evaluate the quality (Nababan et al., 2012). Each data unit was analyzed to identify the translation technique applied, followed by an assessment of its accuracy, acceptability, and readability based on the predefined criteria. The first step was each rater gave a score from 1-3 to each segment of the aspects. After giving the score, the next step was to combine the rating scores individually per aspect. An example of this case: two raters had finished giving scores for the accuracy aspect. To give a score, the rater must pay attention to the assessment criteria [See Table.3]. After that, the scores from both raters were combined to get the average scores.

Table 3. Accuracy Assessment Grading (Examples from Add./Adj. Rules)

No.	*Original Passage (ENG)*	*Translated Version (IND)*	*Grade by Rater 1*	*Grade by Rater 2*	*Average Grade*
1.	If there are only two of you, you can play on the same team. This two-player variant also works for larger groups of people who don't feel like competing against each other.	*Apabila yang bermain hanya ada dua orang, maka anda dapat berada dalam satu tim. Versi dua pemain ini dapat juga dimainkan untuk kelompok yang terdiri dari banyak orang tetapi mereka tidak mau bertanding satu sama lain*	2	3	2.5
2.	You will try to get a high score against a simulated opponent.	*Anda akan berusaha mendapatkan skor tertinggi menghadapi pihak lawan bayangan.*	3	3	3
3.	Set up the game as usual. One player will be the Spymaster and the rest will be field operatives.	*Persiapan dan aturan bermain sama seperti biasanya. Satu pemain akan menjadi kepala intel dan pemain lainnya akan menjadi personel lapangan.*	3	3	3
		Total Average			8.5

The total average of this category would then be added up with the other scores from different categories. This would result in the final score for Accuracy. These steps were applied similarly for both Acceptability and Readability. After that, the total average of each aspect was averaged to get the mean score. These mean scores were representing whether the aspect was good, medium, or bad. Nababan et al. did not provide a clear benchmark for categorizing scores as good, average, or poor. Insights from similar studies by Dewantari et al., Harjo et al., Putri et al., Simanjuntak, and Hanivah et al. suggest a three-level interpretation of translation quality scores (See Table. 4) Scores ranging from 2.6 to 3.0 are generally considered high quality, indicating that the translation is accurate, acceptable, and readable, as supported by findings where scores such as 2.84, 2.7, and 2.6 were all categorized as strong or near-perfect. Scores between 2.0 and 2.59 fall into a moderate category, reflecting partial accuracy and minor issues in grammar, naturalness, or clarity, though still generally understandable. Meanwhile, scores below 2.0 are classified as low quality, indicating significant problems such as inaccurate meaning transfer, poor grammatical conformity, or low readability.

Table 4. Translation Quality Scaling Interpretation

No.	***Level of Quality***	***Scale Grade***
1.	Good	2.6 – 3.0
2.	Medium	2.0 – 2.59
3.	Bad	< 2.0

Adapted from Dewantari et al. (2020), Putri et al. (2022), Simanjuntak (2024), Hanivah et al. (2024), Sitiharjo et al. (2024)

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

This section discusses the findings and the discussions of two analysed data: translation techniques and quality assessment. Each is depicted individually, starting from translation techniques.

The Findings of Translation Techniques

Table 5. Translation Techniques Distribution

No.	*Name*	*Percentage*
1.	Literal Translation	21.2%
2.	Linguistic Amplification	17.4%
3.	Modulation	11.9%
4.	Transposition	9.6%
5.	Borrowing	8%
6.	Calque	7.7%
7.	Amplification	7.3%
8.	Reduction	6.8%
9.	Particularization	4.9%
10.	Established Equivalent	2.6%
11.	Description	1.9%
12.	Adaptation	1.6%
13.	Generalization	1.3%
14.	Linguistic Compression	0.6%

The findings above indicate that Literal Translation (21.2%), Linguistic Amplification (17.4%), and Modulation (11.9%) were the only techniques that exceed with two digits, making them the most dominant ones. Literal Translation is frequently applied because most instructional segments do not involve cultural references or complex structural sentences, allowing for straightforward word-for-word translation. Meanwhile, Linguistic Amplification is used to enhance clarity by adding elements such as verbs, adverbs, and adjectives that are absent in the source text (English), but necessary in the target language (Indonesian). For Modulation, it appears that the translator might adjust the perspective of expressions without altering meaning for most of the segments, probably to adjust the source text to the Indonesian grammar rules and make it as natural as possible.

Techniques that fell beneath 10% were Transposition (9.6%), Borrowing (8%), Calque (7.7%), Amplification (7.3%), and Reduction (6.8%). These techniques demonstrate moderate usage and serve more specific purposes. It is interpreted that Transposition handled grammatical shifts between English and Indonesian structures. Borrowing is mainly used to retain key terms from the source text and most of them were 'Codenames'. Calque translated expressions while preserving the target language structure. Amplification clarified implicit meanings without adding new information, and Reduction removed redundant elements when the meaning was already implied.

The remaining techniques, each scoring below 5%, were used less frequently. This included Particularization (4.9%), Established Equivalent (2.6%), Description (1.9%), Adaptation (1.6%), Generalization (1.3%), and Linguistic Compression (0.6%). Based on the result of analysis, these techniques tended to be applied only in specific situations, such as clarifying terms or references, using recognized equivalents, or simplifying complex terms. Their limited usage suggested that the instructional text generally did not require extensive modification or cultural adjustment. Additionally, techniques like Generalization and Linguistic Compression were rarely used; since they might reduce clarity, which was crucial in board game instructions.

Table 6. Result of Quality Assessment

Aspect	***Mean Score***
Accuracy	2.70
Acceptability	2.59
Readability	2.86
Average Mean Score	2.69

From the findings above, it appears that the readability aspect has a better mean score compared to the other two, with a score of 2.80. Additionally, this aspect nails a higher score in each category, from setup rules to additional/adjustment rules. This shows that the translated instructions remain uncomplicated to understand despite a slight issue on the structural or stylistic issue. It is mainly thanks to the simplistic word choice, the organized instructional format, and the frequent application of linguistic amplification, which helps the intended actions to become more explicit in Indonesian. Sakulpimolrat (2019) described similarly, as procedural or instructional text generally produces a high readability score due to its straightforward nature and simple structure.

Accuracy has scored a 2.70, suggesting that, in general, the messages from the source text are conveyed accurately in the Indonesian translation. This is particularly evident in some of the sections such as gameplay actions and additional/adjustment rules, where the instructions are more direct and procedural in nature. However, the level of accuracy has decreased in the valid clues category, which may be influenced by slightly complex or conceptual statements that allow a greater shift in meaning. In addition, many of the identified issues stem from omissions in the translation. For example, in the Indonesian version (Setup Rules no. 1), the sentence "Players split up into two teams of similar size and skill" is trimmed to "*Para pemain dibagi menjadi dua tim*," which eliminates certain elements from the original text.

Lastly, Acceptability records the lowest mean score of 2.59, indicating that some translated sentences do not fully align with Indonesian linguistic norms. Referring to table 4 (Translation Quality Scaling Interpretation Table), this score falls within the moderate range. The issue largely arises from the retention of the literal grammatical pattern from English, which makes certain expressions sound rigid or less natural in Indonesian. Even so, the additional or adjustment rules category shows comparatively better results, possibly because the translator made more effort to refine the wording. Overall, this aspect appears to be most difficult when translating procedural texts from English to Indonesian, as translators tend to prioritize accurate meaning transfer over natural expression (White, 2025). This challenge is further influenced by the subjective nature of evaluation, including how well the translators know the target language (Indonesian), as well as cultural sensitivity to idioms, expressions, and compound forms (White, 2025).

Overall, the final average for the mean score is 2.69. It means that the overall quality is considered good. Despite the issue with the Indonesian's grammar, the message conveyment and the clarity of the instructions remain fairly good.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, all of the selected 14 techniques were identified and applied on translating the Codenames's instructions from the original source (English) to the target language (Indonesian). Out of these techniques, Literal Translation is the most used technique by the translator, by a total of 21.2%, before followed by Linguistic Amplification (17.4%) and Modulation (11.9). These three were the only ones which surpassed two digits, meaning that the English instructional sentences were interpreted straightforwardly or added with Indonesian linguistic elements.

For the translation quality, Accuracy scored relatively high (2.70), meaning that the source text was adapted adequately from English to Indonesia; Acceptability achieved (2.59), which indicated that some of the translated Indonesian instructional sentences did not meet the linguistic norms; and Readability (2.86), signifying that the instructional sentences were commonly straightforward and easy to understand for Indonesian readers.

The findings of this study lead to several suggestions for translators, game developers, and future researchers. For translators, it is essential to carefully select translation techniques based on context, as not all techniques are universally applicable. Factors such as text type, cultural differences, linguistic aspects, and the translator's level of knowledge influence this decision (Hidayat, 2020). Certain

techniques - such as Addition, Reduction, and Discursive Creation - may also cause a meaning shift and reduce accuracy if applied inappropriately (Aloojaha, Nababan, & Djamitka, 2018). Furthermore, translators must also maintain a balance between accuracy, acceptability, and readability, as these aspects determine the quality of its translation (Nababan et al. 2012, p. 13-15). In addition, the choice of a technique plays a crucial role to achieve this balance (Ardi, 2016). For game developers, it is recommended to collaborate with qualified translators who not only possess strong linguistic competence but also understand board game mechanics, terminology, and cultural nuances. Inaccurate or insensitive translations may harm the game's reputation and players' experience (Tarasiewicz, 2023). Finally, future researchers are encouraged to explore how players interpret and understand translated board game instructions - particularly Codenames - through methods such as observation, questionnaires, and/or interviews. This is mainly because players' understanding is mostly influenced by their cultural background and prior experience (Evans, 2020; Gomez & Marklund, 2018).

REFERENCES

Accelingo. 2023. *The Role of Cultural Nuances in Language Translation*. Retrieved April 5, 2025, from https://www.accelingo.com/cultural-nuances-in-language-translation-and-their-role-in-professional-language-services/#:~:text=Cultural%20nuances%20encompass%20the%20subtle,and%20historical%20references%2C %20among%20others

Afandi, M. D., & Authar, N. 2021. *Analysis of translation techniques in the English subtitle of the movie "KETIKA CINTA BERTASBIH 1"*. Semantic Scholar | AI-Powered Research Tool. Retrieved January 11, 2025, from https://www.semanticscholar.org/reader/5080443a93d1e9967eed0f40a5caf780b49915b8

Alvarez, P. G., & Espinoza, M. D. 2022. The translation of Board Games: Gloomhaven in Spanish. Universidad de Atacama.

Aloojaha, A., Nababan, M., & Djatmika. 2018. *The Impact of Translation Techniques on Shifting Meaning of Ordering Speech Act*. Research Gate. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331117259_The_Impact_of_Translation_Techniques_on_Shifting_ Meaning_of_Ordering_Speech_Act

Anindya, W. D., & Sutrisno, A. (2019). *Accuracy and Readability on The Translations of Onomatopoeia in The Maze Runner Novel into Indonesian language*. Repository Akademi Farmasi Surabaya. Retrieved June 22, 2026, from https://repository.akfarsurabaya.ac.id/id/eprint/202/

Anonymous. 2021. *Localising board games or RPGs: The advantages of a professional service*. Wabbit Translations. Retrieved January 8, 2025, from https://www.wabbit-translations.com/en/board-game-localisation/#:~:text=In%20the%20event%20of%20doubts,a%20clear%20and%20consistent%20manner

Anonymous. 2024. *All you need to know about gaming translation*. translateplus. Retrieved January 8, 2025, from https://www.translateplus.com/blog/all-you-need-to-know-gaming-translation/

Anonymous. 2024. *All you need to know about translation in the gaming industry*. Transcom. Retrieved January 8, 2025, from https://transcom.com/blog/all-you-need-to-know-about-translation-in-the-gaming-industry/

Anonymous. 2024. *The rise of modern board games: Why they're more popular than ever*. Game Nights 254. Retrieved January 8, 2025, from https://gamenights254.com/the-rise-of-modern-board-games-why-theyre-more-popular-than-ever/#:~:text=The%20creativity%20and%20storytelling%20involved,connecting%20with%20others%20through%20play!

Anonymous. 2024. *What is Readability?* Readable.com. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from https://readable.com/readability/what-is-readability/

Anonymous. n.d.. *Translation Accuracy: Why does it matter?* US Translation. Retrieved January 10, 2025, from https://ustranslation.com/blog/translation-accuracy-why-does-it-matter/

Ardi, H. 2017. *THE IMPACT OF TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES TOWARD THE QUALITY OF TRANSLATION: A Case Study on a Social Text*. ResearchGate. Retrieved August 16, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317261724_

THE_IMPACT_OF_TRANSLATION_TECHNIQUES TOWARD_THE_QUALITY_OF_TRANSLATION_A_Case_Study_on_a_Social_Text

Attia, P. 2016. *The Full History of Board Games*. Medium. Retrieved October 27, 2024, from https://medium.com/@peterattia/the-full-history-of-board-games-5e622811ce89

Baker, M. 2018. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (3rd.ed.). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203832929/words-mona-baker-mona-baker

Bhattacharya, A. 2023. *Accuracy in translation*. LinkedIn. Retrieved January 10, 2025, from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/accuracy-translation-avi-bhattacharya/

Bussey, S. 2024. *The ultimate guide to games translation*. Andovar. Retrieved January 9, 2025, from https://blog.andovar.com/games-translation-ultimate-guide#:~:text=Game%20translation%20process&text=Generally%2C%20the%20translation%20process%20encompasses,or%20testing%20the%20translated%20cont ent

Cunningham, C. 2025. *What is readability and why is it important?* Yoast. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from https://yoast.com/what-is-readability/

Damarratri, H. S., & Afifulloh, m. 2024. *Translation techniques used for translating cultural aspects in the television series "Cigarette girl"*. Semantic Scholar | AI-Powered Research Tool. Retrieved January 11, 2025, from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Translation-Techniques-Used-for-Translating-Aspects-Damarratri-Afif ulloh/50d6819bafcce2986fd6e8206c70d5b57faebfec

Dewantari, S. S., Nababan, M. R., & Wibowo, A. H. 2024. *How Translation Techniques Affect the Quality of Metaphor Translation in Kesatria, Putri, Dan Bintang Jatuh?* International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding. Retrieved December 15, 2025, from https://ijmmu.com/index.php/ijmmu/article/view/6268/5116

Djamitka, Murdiyati, N., & Nababan, M. R. 2021. *Translation Techniques of Sentences Accommodating Satirical Language Styles in the Historical Novels Bumi Manusia and Anak Semua Bangsa*. Neliti. Retrieved January 12, 2025, from https://www.neliti.com/id/publications/553643/translation-techniques-of-sentences-accommodating-satirical-l anguage-styles-in-t

Evans, J. 2013. Translating Board Games: Multimodality and Play. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, (20), 15-32. https://researchportal.port.ac.uk/en/publications/translating-board-games-multimodality-and-play

Evans, J. 2020. *Translation, accessibility and variation in global analog gaming. Analog Game Studies, 7*. Welcome to Enlighten Publications. Retrieved December 15, 2025, from https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/221728/1/221728.pdf

Febryanto, M., Sulyaningsih, I., & Zhafirah, A. A. 2021. *ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES AND QUALITY OF TRANSLATED TERMS OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING IN ACCREDITED NATIONAL JOURNALS*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 14,2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348222068_ANALYSIS_OF_TRANSLATION_TECHN IQUES_AND_QUALITY_OF_TRANSLATED_TERMS_OF_MECHANICAL_ENGINEERING _IN_ACCREDITED_ NATIONAL_JOURNALS

Garry, B. 2018. A Guide to Board Game Themes. Zatu Games. Retrieved October 27, 2024, from https://www.board-game.co.uk/board-game-themes/

Gomez, C. N., & Marklund, B. B. 2018. *Games for cross-cultural training: A game-based tool for cross-cultural discussion: Encouraging cultural awareness with board games | International Journal of serious games*. International Journal of Serious Games. Retrieved December 15, 2025, from https://journal.seriousgamessociety.org/index.php/IJSG/article/view/259

Hanivah, N., Rozi, F., & Haryanti, R. P. 2024. *Accuracy, Acceptability, and Readability in the Translation of the Hounds of Baskerville Movie Subtitle*. Unnes. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/eej/article/view/5038

Harjo, S., Julina, & Ayuningtias, N. 2024. *Analyzing Translation Quality of Google Translate in Translating Chinese Proverbs about Dragon into Indonesian*. Talenta Conference Series. Retrieved December 15, 2025, from https://talentaconfseries.usu.ac.id/lwsa/article/view/2071

Hidayat, A. 2020. *PENERJEMAHAN HARFIAH: DOMINASI DALAM TEKNIK PENERJEMAHAN SURAT INFORMAL*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 15, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341185479_PENERJEMAHAN_HARFIAH_DOMINASI_DALAM _TEKNIK_PENERJEMAHAN_SURAT_INFORMAL

Jabbar, A. A., & Hilman, E. H. 2024. *EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF TRANSLATIONS PRODUCED BY MACHINES AS OPPOSED TO HUMAN*. Professional Journal of English Education, *7*(3), 603-616.

Johnson, J., & Tiwari, S. R. 2021. Chapter 17: Board Game. In *Handbook of Developmentally Appropriate Toys* (pp. 1-16). Rowman & Littlefield. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351009525_Board_Games

Lewis, C. 2023. *Catan: Playing with pieces of history*. Vita Brevis. Retrieved January 8, 2025, from https://vitabrevis.americanancestors.org/2023/10/catan-playing-with-pieces-of-history#:~:text=Game%20desi gner%20Klaus%20Teuber%20took,it%20would%20be%20the%20Vikings

Mahmud, E. Z., Baysena, B., & Ampera, T. 2021. *AMPLIFICATION TECHNIQUE OF TRANSLATION IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE NOVEL 'EARTH DANCE'*. Unimus. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/7703

Malmkjer, K. 2011. *Meaning and Translation. In K. Windle (Ed.)*, *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies* (pp. 86-95). Oxford Academy.

Mangiron, C., & O'Hagan, M. 2006. *Video Games Localisation: Unleashing imagination with Restricted Translation*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona Research Portal. https://portalrecerca.uab.cat/en/publications/video-games-localisation-unleashing-imagination-with-restricted- t

Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). *Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach*. ResearchGate. Retrieved August 16, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272899204_Translation_Techniques_Revisited_A_Dynamic_and_F unctionalist_Approach

Nababan, M., Nuraeni, A., & Sumardiono. 2012. *Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas Terjemahan*. Academia.edu - Find Research Papers, Topics, Researchers. Retrieved August 16, 2025, from https://www.academia.edu/79181073/Pengembangan_Model_Penilaian_Kualitas_Terjemahan

Newmark, P. 1988. *A textbook of translation*. Pearson Educatation Limited. http://ilts.ir/Content/ilts.ir/Page/142/ContentImage/A%20Textbook%20of%20Translation%20by%20Peter%2 0Newmark%20(1).pdf

Prasetya, I. Z., Hartono, R., & Yuliasri, I. 2019. *Accuracy, Readability and Acceptability in The Translation of Android Xiaomi Redmi Note 4*. Retrieved December 14, 2025, https://share.google/ecTmmjJ5M9lkeBQrz

Putri, A. A., Rasyad, H., & Anggraini, R. 2023. *Translation Techniques of Culture-Specific Items and Translation Ideology in Sarimin Webtoon*. journal.unesa. Retrieved January 11, 2025, from https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/nld/article/view/23242/9741

Putri, R. S., Sofyan, R., & Nasution, E. H. 2022. *Translation Quality Assessment on Medan City Tourism Official Web Pages*. TALENTA Publisher. Retrieved December 15, 2025, from https://talenta.usu.ac.id/lingpoet/article/view/6500

Sakulpimolrat, S. 2019. *The Analysis of Translation Techniques and Translation Quality of Directives Speech Act in the Little Prince Novel*. Prasasti, Journal of Linguistics. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/pjl/article/view/33048

Schäler, R. 2010. *Localization and Translation*. John Benjamins. Retrieved January 9, 2025, from https://benjamins.com/online/hts/articles/loc1#:~:text=Localization%20is%20the%20linguistic%20and,of%20 the%20important%20localization%20activities

Sensei's Library. 2013. *Common Go Terms*. Sensei's Library Website. Retrieved January 26, 2026, from https://senseis.xmp.net/?CommonGoTerms

Sianturi, E. R., Marpaung, E. M., Sipahutar, S. R., & Rambe, K. R. 2021. *Kinds of Translation Method used by The Student's in Translating Descriptive Text from English to Indonesian*. Forum UPB. https://forum.upbatam.ac.id/index.php/basis/article/view/3659

Simanjuntak, F. M. 2024. *Translation Quality Assessment of the Analysis of Deixis Made by Indonesian EFL Undergraduate Students Abstract*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 14, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378051939_Translation_Quality_Assessment_of_the_Analysis_of_ Deixis_Made_by_Indonesian_EFL_Undergraduate_Students_Abstract

Tarasiewicz, J. 2023. *Why your video game needs certified translation services?* ATL | Translation and AI Services. Retrieved December 15, 2025, from https://www.atltranslate.com/blog/video-game-translation-services-certified

Verhoeven, L. 2018. *The translation of board games' rules of play*. Utrecht University Student Theses Repository Home. Retrieved January 9, 2025, from https://studenttheses.uu.nl/handle/20.500.12932/28562

Volf, P. 2020. *Translation techniques as a method for describing the results and classifying the types of translation solutions*. Applied Translation. Retrieved January 11, 2025, from https://appliedtranslation.nyc/index.php/journal/article/view/1171

White, R. 2025. *Translation Problems: The Most Common Issues Translators Face*. Smartling. Retrieved December 15, 2025, from https://www.smartling.com/blog/common-challenges-of-translation#:~:text=Translation%20issues%20with%20idioms%20and,sense%20outside%20their%20cultural%20context

Wong, D., & Shen, D. 1999. *Factors influencing the process of translating*. Meta, 44(1), 78-100. https://doi.org/10.7202/004616ar

Wray, D., & Janan, D. 2013. *Exploring the readability of assessment tasks: The influence of text and reader factors*. HIPATIA PRESS. Retrieved December 14,2025, from https://hipatiapress.com/hpjournals/index.php/remie/article/view/remie.2012.04

CURRICULUM VITAE

Complete Name	Institution	Education	Research Interests
Geraldus Pax Kurnia	Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya	S1 - Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris	Penerjemahan/*Translation*, Permainan/*Games*
K. M. Widi Hadiyanti	Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya	S2 - Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris	*ELT, Translation*