



Analysis Of Consecutive Misinterpretations Of Japanese-Indonesian Language In An Erp System Development Meeting At Pt Global Collabo Tech

Yansen Pratama¹, Diwana Fikri Aghniya²

^{1,2}Japanese D3 Study Program, Takumi Polytechnic

Email: ¹2314010018@takumi.ac.id, ²diwana.dfa@takumi.ac.id

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jul 19, 2026

Revised Aug 24, 2026

Accepted Sept 22, 2026

Keywords:

Error Analysis; Consecutive Interpreting; Japanese Language; Multidimensional Quality Metrics; ERP System

ABSTRACT

Abstract: This study aims to identify the types of errors occurring in Japanese-Indonesian consecutive interpreting during an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system development meeting, to determine the most dominant type of error, and to analyse the factors causing these errors. This study employed a qualitative approach with a case study design. The data were obtained from a recording of an ERP system development meeting at PT Global Collabo Tech lasting approximately two hours, in which the researcher served as the interpreter. Data were collected through participant observation and documentation, then analysed using error analysis procedures with the Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MQM) typology in the Accuracy and Terminology dimensions as the classification framework, taking words or phrases as the unit of analysis. The results show that from 26 utterances examined, 32 errors were found, consisting of 26 errors or 81.25% in the Accuracy dimension and 6 errors or 18.75% in the Terminology dimension. The most dominant type of error was the Accuracy dimension with the omission subtype, accounting for 14 errors or 53.85% of that dimension. The causal factors identified include the length of source utterances, limitations in note-taking during the interpreting process, limited command of technical terminology in the field of information systems, fatigue as the meeting progressed, and the cognitive load of interpreting technical discussions. These findings indicate that the principal problems in consecutive interpreting within technical meetings lie in the completeness of message transfer and the accuracy of terminology selection

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Yansen Pratama

Japanese D3 Study Program, Takumi Polytechnic

Email: 2314010018@takumi.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

The Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system is an information system used to integrate and automate business processes in company management, so that each functional unit can share data and information with each other and ultimately increase synergy between elements in the company that implements it (Indrayani, 2022). However, its implementation does not always run smoothly. One of the problems that companies often face is the lack of updating the status of projects between divisions due to limited time to communicate, so that information exchange becomes difficult and the information obtained is often not up-to-date (Indrayani, 2022).

The problem of communication becomes even more complex when the development of the system is carried out through cooperation between companies from two countries with different languages, because the delivery of system needs from the user to the developer does not take place directly, but goes through the process of language transfer. This kind of cross-language communication need is not new in the Indonesian-Japanese work environment. In Japanese companies in Indonesia, oral communication activities in Japanese take place through discussions or meetings, presentations to superiors, customers, and suppliers, and communication with Japanese colleagues, while



Japanese-speaking Indonesian staff have difficulty choosing expressions that are appropriate to the context and purpose of the conversation (Nishfullayli et al., 2025).

In the meeting forum, the language transfer is realized through oral translation activities, which is the process of transferring messages from the source language to the target language which is done orally (Nasihin, 2015). This activity requires interpreters to go through four stages, namely listening, understanding, analyzing, and reconveying the message, and must be done quickly and flexibly, in contrast to written translation which still provides room for editing. This difference is also seen in the availability of assistive tools, because oral translators cannot use dictionaries or other reference materials during the message transfer process, and only have a very limited time to process the information they hear (Nugroho & Johanes, 2024).

These demands make oral translation prone to errors, especially in forums that contain technical terms. In the practice of oral translation by students of the Japanese Literature Study Program in a number of industries, two types of interference in the speech produced by interpreters were found, namely Indonesian interference and English interference, so that interpreters take a number of techniques to overcome them, including reduction, addition, and levy (Aryanto, 2015).

Similar obstacles were experienced by the author during his role as a Japanese-Indonesian interpreter at the ERP system development meeting. These obstacles are mainly related to two things, namely ignorance of the correct equivalent for the technical terms in the field of information systems that appear in the discussion, and the inability to keep up with the speaking tempo of the meeting participants so that some of the messages are not conveyed in their entirety. These two obstacles are directly related to the accuracy of the terms and the integrity of the message, which are the two aspects that most determine the delivery of technical information in the meeting.

Studies on Japanese-Indonesian translation errors have actually been carried out before. Analysis of student translation results found that the most common types of errors appeared in the form of interference problems, both at the lexical and grammatical levels (Nugroho, 2022). The study of students' essays found that lexical errors were motivated by a lack of mastery of Japanese diction and the difficulty of distinguishing vocabulary that was almost similar in shape (Harisal et al., 2022). However, both studies focused on translation and written essays. As for the oral domain, the research available as far as the author's research is still focused on general field activities (Aryanto, 2015), while studies that specifically examine consequential oral translation errors at the system development meeting forum using the MQM typology have not been found.

Based on these gaps, this study aims to identify the types of consecutive interpretation errors of the Japanese-Indonesian language that appear in ERP system development meetings, determine the most dominant types of errors based on the frequency of their occurrence, and analyze the factors that cause these errors to occur.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Sistem Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)

ERP stands for three elements of the word, namely enterprise (company or organization), resource (resource), and planning (planning). These three elements reflect the concept of an integrated planning aspect in an organization, so that the resources owned can be planned and managed properly (Indrayani, 2022). The ERP system is composed of various modules and submodules that represent business components and can be selected according to the needs of the organization, including human resources, inventory, sales and marketing, purchasing, finance and accounting, customer relations, manufacturing, and supply chain management.

Because ERP requires data integration between units, the information discussed in the development process is technical and specific, including terms tied to specific modules and business processes. This condition makes the system development meeting forum full of special terminology, which in turn becomes one of the points prone to misinterpretation.

Japanese Oral Communication in the Work Environment

In Japanese companies in Indonesia, Japanese language proficiency has a significant role in smooth communication, especially in second- and third-tier companies (Nishfullayli et al., 2025). Japanese-language oral communication activities in these environments include internal communication (*shanai*) and external communication (*shagai*), which are generally used to complete work through discussions or meetings, presentations to superiors, customers, and suppliers, and communication with Japanese colleagues.

The difficulties experienced by Indonesian Japanese-speaking staff can be seen in the difficulty in choosing expressions that are appropriate to the context and purpose of the conversation. The findings show that meetings are one of the main communication spaces in the Indonesian-Japanese work environment, as well as a space that holds potential language barriers.

Interpreting



Oral translation or interpretation is the process of transferring messages from the source language to the target language which is done orally. In essence, this activity takes place through the stages of listening, understanding, analyzing, and re-expressing (Nasihin, 2015).

The fundamental difference between written translation and oral translation lies in the availability of time. Written translation has enough time to express the intention precisely and can do editing, while oral translation must be done quickly and flexibly because translators are required to be able to mediate and create mutual understanding between the two speakers (Nasihin, 2015). The difference between the two can also be reviewed from three aspects, namely the media used, the products produced, and the way and situation of work. In terms of how and working situations, oral translators cannot use dictionaries or other reference materials during the process of transferring messages (Nugroho & Johanes, 2024).

Based on speaking time, oral translation can be divided into simultaneous oral translation, consequential oral translation, and oral translation in summary. Consequential oral translation is carried out alternately with the speaker, namely the translator listens to the segments of ideas conveyed by the speaker and makes notes when necessary, then relays the ideas into the target language when the speaker stops speaking (Nasihin, 2015).

Error Analysis

Language error analysis is the study of mistakes made by language learners, especially second languages or foreign languages. Language errors are defined as deviations in using a target language item as a result of not being fully understood or mastered (Sa'adah, 2016).

Errors need to be distinguished from mistakes. Mistakes are systematic or consistent language deviations and are caused by competency factors, while mistakes are deviations that are made accidentally and occur due to performance factors, such as lack of concentration, fatigue, or haste (Sa'adah, 2016). This distinction has methodological implications, because not every deviation that appears in interpretation can be immediately classified as an error.

The error analysis procedure includes six steps, namely data collection, error identification, error description, error explanation, error classification, error classification, and error evaluation (Sa'adah, 2016). The classification step requires the existence of category limits set by the researcher, so a category framework that is in accordance with the nature of the data being analyzed is needed.

Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MQM)

Multidimensional Quality Metrics (MQM) is a translation quality assessment framework that has been developed and maintained by the MQM Council (MQM Council, 2026) since 2016. This framework was originally developed through the EU-funded QTLanchPad project, compiled based on the analysis of more than twenty pre-existing translation quality assessment models, and provides a catalogue of error types that can be applied to both human and machine translation (Lommel et al., 2013).

MQM relies on two main components, namely a hierarchically arranged error typology and a scoring model that converts errors and their severity into quality values. In the current version, the MQM error typology consists of seven high-level dimensions, namely Terminology, Accuracy, Linguistic Conventions, Style, Locale Conventions, Audience Appropriateness, and Design and Markup, each of which has a more detailed subtype of error (MQM Council, 2026).

This study focuses on two dimensions, namely Accuracy and Terminology. The subtypes in both dimensions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Error Subtypes in Accuracy and Terminology Dimensions

Yes	Dimensions	Subtypes	Error Coverage
1	Accuracy	Mistranslation	The message content in the target text does not match what is intended in the source text
2	Accuracy	Omission	Some of the message content in the source text is not delivered in the target text
3	Accuracy	Addition	The target text contains a message load that is not contained in the source text
4	Accuracy	Overtranslation	The message content is conveyed more forcefully or in more detail than the source text
5	Accuracy	Undertranslation	The content of the message is conveyed in less detail than the source text
6	Accuracy	Untranslated	Parts of the source text are left unredirected to the target language
7	Accuracy	Do not translate	The part of the source text that shouldn't be redirected is instead redirected



Yes	Dimensions	Subtypes	Error Coverage
8	Terminology	Wrong term	The term in the target text is not the exact equivalent of the term in the source text
9	Terminology	Inconsistent with termbase	Terms don't match the source of the applicable terminology
10	Terminology	Inconsistent use of terminology	The same terms are used inconsistently in a single text

Source: MQM Council (2026)

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach with a case study type of research. The qualitative approach was chosen because it collects data from a natural setting and utilizes researchers as key instruments, rather than producing data in the form of procedures or statistical calculations (Malahati et al., 2023). Case studies are used when researchers want to understand a situation in depth, so that the depth of the study produced is actually sourced from a limited number of cases (Assyakurrohim et al., 2023).

The data was sourced from the recording of an ERP system development meeting at PT Global Collabo Tech, Bekasi Regency, which lasted approximately two hours. The meeting was attended by seven participants outside the author, consisting of six people from the Indonesian side and one person from Japan, with the author acting as an interpreter. The determination of the subject was carried out by purposive sampling technique, which is the selection of subjects based on certain considerations that are adjusted to the purpose of the research.

Data collection was carried out through participatory observation and documentation. Scanning was carried out on the entire recording to mark segments that were indicated to contain interpretation errors, then the segments were transcribed in pairs between the source language speech and the interpreted speech. Transcription was selective with the consideration that the unit of analysis of this study was an interpretation error, so that the segment whose interpretation results were commensurate did not provide data that could be analyzed. Through this process, 26 speeches were obtained which were further analyzed.

Data is analyzed through an error analysis procedure that includes data collection, error identification, error description, error classification, frequency calculation, and causative factor analysis (Sa'adah, 2016). The classification is carried out based on the MQM typology in the Accuracy and Terminology dimensions. The limitation on these two dimensions is taken for two considerations. First, the data is in the form of oral speech so that the dimensions related to the written form cannot be applied. Second, oral interpretation takes place in a limited time and without tools, so the results cannot be required to meet all quality dimensions as written text.

It should be noted that MQM was initially designed as a framework for assessing the quality of written translations. Its application to oral data is possible because the speech that becomes the data is first transcribed into written form, so that the speech of the source language and the target language can be juxtaposed and compared as written text. The unit of analysis in this study is in the form of a unit of words or phrases, not a sentence as a whole.

The frequency calculation is carried out with the formula $P = (F/N) \times 100\%$, with P as the percentage of a type of error, F as the frequency of occurrence of that type of error, and N as the total number of errors found. The calculation is not intended as a statistical analysis, but rather as a means of determining the most dominant type of error.

In order to ensure the validity of the data, the results of the analysis were validated by an expert assessor who was one of the meeting participants with Japanese language skills equivalent to N3 level and work experience in a Japanese-speaking environment in the field of information technology for approximately eight years. Validation used a Likert scale of one to five against eight assessment indicators.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Overview

Of the 26 speeches examined, 20 speeches contained errors while the other 6 speeches after careful examination turned out to be error-free. Overall, 32 errors were found. The number of errors is more than the number of speeches because in one speech more than one lexical unit can be found that have deviations. The distribution of research data is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of Research Data

No	Direction of Interpretation	Number of Speeches	Speech Contains Errors	Number of Errors
1	Japanese to Indonesian	21	15	26
2	Indonesian to Japanese	5	5	6



No	Direction of Interpretation	Number of Speeches	Speech Contains Errors	Number of Errors
	Quantity	26	20	32

Types of Consequential Interpretation Errors

The errors found are spread across the two dimensions of the MQM typology with six subtypes, as presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Types of Errors Based on MQM Typology

No	Dimensions	Subtype	Data Code
1	Accuracy	Omission	D2, D4, D5, D11, D13, D16, D17, D19, D21, D22, D24, D26, D28, D32
2	Accuracy	Mistranslation	D1, D3, D6, D14, D27, D29
3	Accuracy	Addition	D8, D10, D15, D18
4	Accuracy	Untranslated	D23
5	Accuracy	Overtranslation	D25
6	Terminology	Wrong term	D7, D9, D12, D20, D30, D31

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that of the seven subtypes available in the Accuracy dimension, only five subtypes were found in the data. The subtypes of undertranslation and do not translate were not found at all. Similarly in the Terminology dimension, of the three available subtypes, only the wrong term subtype was found. This shows that the problem faced does not lie in the inconsistency of the use of the term, but in the inaccuracy of the choice of the term itself.

The following are some examples of data. The presentation uses the abbreviations BSu for the source language speech and BSa for the target language speech.

Data D19 is classified as a subtype of omission.

Words on BSu	Grouping ID
Equivalent to BSa	(not delivered)
Shape should be	grouping ID

The term グループID is the core of the technical proposal submitted by the speaker, namely that the order detail table is equipped with grouping markers so that data filtering can be carried out. The term does not appear at all in the interpretation results, so the Indonesian side only accepts a description of the problem without obtaining a proposed solution.

D21 data is also classified as a subtype of omission.

Words on BSu	Order ledger
Equivalent to BSa	(not delivered)
Shape should be	Order Receipt Ledger

The term 受注台帳 is a key concept in the speaker's conclusion regarding the reason for designing tables on the system used by his company. The absence of the term results in the speaker's conclusion missing its most important part.

Data D6 is classified as a subtype of mistranslation.

Words on BSu	Unique ID
Equivalent to BSa	The Product
Shape should be	Separate ID

The phrase 特有のID which means a separately created ID is transferred to a product. The two terms refer to different things in database design. As a result, the speaker's question that originally contradicted the part number with its own ID turned into a contradiction between the part and the product, so that the answer given by the Indonesian side no longer answered the actual question asked.

Data D9 is classified as a subtype of the wrong term in the Terminology dimension.

Words on BSu	field
Equivalent to BSa	File
Shape should be	field

The term field refers to the unit of columns in a database table. In the result of the interpretation, the term is changed to ファイル which means file, even though the exact equivalent is フィールド. The two terms refer to



completely different things in the field of information systems. This mistake is thought to stem from the similarity in sound between the two terms.

D23 data is classified as an untranslated subtype.

Words on BSu	parent-child relationship
Equivalent to BSa	Oya ko Buhin
Shape should be	Parent and Descendant Relationships

The term 親子の関係 was not transferred to Indonesian, but was restated in Japanese. As a result, meeting participants from the Indonesian side who did not master Japanese did not get the meaning of the term.

Dominance of Error Types

Frequency calculations are carried out to determine the most dominant type of error. The results of the calculation are presented in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 4. Frequency and Error Percentage Based on MQM Dimensions

Yes	MQM Dimensions	Frequency	Percentage
1	<i>Accuracy</i>	26	81,25%
2	<i>Terminology</i>	6	18,75%
	Quantity	32	100%

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage of Subtypes in the Accuracy Dimension

No	Subtype	Frequency	Percentage
1	<i>Omission</i>	14	53,85%
2	<i>Mistranslation</i>	6	23,08%
3	<i>Addition</i>	4	15,38%
4	<i>Untranslated</i>	1	3,85%
5	<i>Overtranslation</i>	1	3,85%
	Quantity	26	100%

The Accuracy dimension was the most dominant type of error with 26 errors or 81.25%, while the Terminology dimension amounted to 6 errors or 18.75%. Within the Accuracy dimension, the most dominant subtype was omission with 14 errors or 53.85%, or 43.75% of the total errors.

The dominance of the omission subtype shows a typical tendency in consequential interpretation. When the author faces difficulties during the interpretation, the action that arises tends to be in the form of skipping difficult lexical units, rather than imposing potentially erroneous redirects. This can be seen from the comparison between the omission subtype which has 14 errors and the mistranslation subtype which only amounts to 6 errors. This tendency on the one hand prevents the listener from receiving wrong information, but on the other hand it actually results in some information not reaching at all.

A study of the direction of interpretation showed that the direction of Japanese to Indonesian resulted in an average of 1.24 errors per speech, while the opposite direction produced 1.20 errors per speech. The two figures are practically not different, so the conjecture that switching into a foreign language is more error-prone is not proven in this study. Thus, the cause of errors is more likely to stem from the conditions of interpretation itself than from the mastery of one language.

Factors Causing Errors

Based on inductive analysis of patterns that appear in the data, five factors that cause errors were identified.

The first factor is the length of the speech of the source language. The distribution of errors based on speech length is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Distribution of Errors Based on Speech Length of the Source Language

No	Speech Length	Number of Speeches	Number of Errors	Average
1	Less than 50 characters	12	7	0,58
2	50 to 150 characters	4	7	1,75
3	More than 150 characters	10	18	1,80
	Quantity	26	32	

Based on Table 6, there is a clear trend between the length of speech and the number of errors. Ten speeches that are classified as long, although only about one-third of the total data, account for 18 errors or 56.25% of all errors found.

The second factor is the limitation of recording during the interpretation process. Of the 14 errors in the form of the omission of lexical units, 10 of them occurred in speech that was relatively long. In addition, lexical units that are not conveyed tend to be at the end of speech, so that the beginning is still caught in the note while the last part is missed.

The third factor is the limited mastery of technical terms in the field of information systems. All errors in the Terminology dimension are related to the term of the field. In addition, a number of technical terms and personal names are not conveyed at all, including グループID, 受注台帳, SQL Management Studio, 構成テーブル, and the name of the WILL system. This finding is in line with previous research that found that lexical errors are motivated by a lack of diction mastery and the difficulty of distinguishing vocabulary that are almost similar in shape (Harisal et al., 2022).

The fourth factor is fatigue as the meeting progresses. The distribution of errors by time span is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Error Distribution by Meeting Time Range

No	Time Range	Speech Code	Number of Speeches	Number of Errors	Average
1	Minutes 0 to 10	T1 to T12	12	9	0,75
2	10 to 50 minutes	T13 to T17	5	7	1,40
3	50 to 90 minutes	T18 to T22	5	9	1,80
4	Minutes 90 to 114	T23 to T26	4	7	1,75

The average error increased from 0.75 at the beginning of the meeting to 1.80 in the third part, then flattened to 1.75 at the end. However, the increase did not continue until the last range, and the effect was mixed with the factor of speech length, so this factor was presented as a visible tendency in the data, rather than as a stand-alone cause-and-effect relationship.

The fifth factor is the cognitive load in translating technical discussions. In the overall data, eleven markers of doubt were found in the form of expressions such as what the name is, how to explain it, and briefly, which almost all of them appear in long and technically charged speech. This condition is aggravated by the nature of oral translation that does not allow the use of dictionaries or reference materials during the process (Nugroho & Johanes, 2024).

Expert Validation Results

The validation results obtained a total score of 37 out of a maximum score of 40 with an average score of 4.63 out of a maximum scale of 5. The validator provided one input that demanded follow-up, namely that Data D29 was more accurately classified as a mistranslation than an omission. The input was followed up and all related frequency calculations were adjusted. Overall, the validator stated that the results of this analysis were worth using with minor revisions.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study corroborate the statement regarding the role of recording in consequential interpretation. In consequential oral translation, interpreters have the opportunity to make notes while listening to the speaker's speech (Nasihin, 2015). This study shows the opposite side, namely that when recording cannot be done adequately, the most common form of failure is in the form of the loss of lexical units.

This finding is also in line with previous research that found that interference in interpreters' speech arises due to ignorance of equivalent terms in the target language (Aryanto, 2015). However, there are differences in the form of handling that appear. In the previous study, the ignorance of equivalents was handled by inserting words from other languages, while in this study the more prominent tendency was to skip the term altogether. This difference is suspected to be related to the nature of the forum being studied, because in technical meetings the term that is not mastered is often a concept that is not understood in meaning.

As for the research gaps stated earlier, this study provides two contributions. First, expanding the scope of Japanese-Indonesian oral translation studies from general field activities to technical work meeting forums. Second, it shows that the MQM typology that was originally designed for written translation can be applied to speech transcription resulting from oral interpretation, with adjustments in the form of dimension restrictions and the determination of word units as units of analysis.



6. CONCLUSION

Of the 26 consecutive interpretation speeches examined, 32 errors were found spread across the two dimensions of the MQM typology. In the Accuracy dimension, five subtypes were found, namely omission, mistranslation, addition, untranslated, and overtranslation, while in the Terminology dimension, only the wrong term subtypes were found. The subtypes of undertranslation, do not translate, inconsistent with termbase, and inconsistent use of terminology were not found in the data.

The most dominant type of error was the Accuracy dimension with 26 errors or 81.25%, and in it the omission subtype occupied the largest portion with 14 errors or 53.85% of the dimension. This dominance shows that the main problem in the consequential interpretation studied lies in the non-conveyance of some lexical units, not in the erroneous delivery.

The causative factors include the length of the source language, the limitation of recording during the interpretation process, the limitation of mastery of technical terms in the field of information systems, fatigue as the meeting progresses, and the cognitive burden in translating technical discussions. These five factors do not stand alone, but are interrelated and mutually reinforcing their influences.

7. RECOMENDATION

For interpreters who carry out interpretation at technical work meetings, it is recommended to compile a list of bilingual terms before the meeting takes place, especially terms related to the field to be discussed. In addition, it is also recommended to improve recording skills, considering that the elimination of lexical units is the most common form of error and occurs especially in long speech.

For meeting organizers, it is recommended to agree on the mechanism for giving pauses by the speaker, so that the speech delivered is divided into segments that can be handled by the interpreter. In meetings that last a long time, it can also be considered that there is a break and the change of interpreters to maintain the quality of interpretation.

For further research, it is recommended to expand the scope of data by analyzing several meetings at once and performing a thorough transcription, so that the proportion of errors to the overall speech can be determined. Further research can also apply the MQM dimension that is not used in this study, or complement the analysis of the causative factors with interviews with interpretation actors.

This study has limitations that need to be stated, namely the typology of MQM was initially designed for written translation so that its application to oral data requires adjustment, the data is sourced from one meeting so that it is not intended to be generalized, and transcription is carried out selectively so that it does not present a comparison of the whole speech.

REFERENCES

- Aryanto, B. (2015). Interference and strategies of oral translation in the out-of-class activities of students of the Japanese Literature Study Program, Dian Nuswantoro University. *LITE: Journal of Language, Literature, and Culture*, 11(1), 44–63. <https://doi.org/10.33633/lite.v11i1.1056>
- Assyakurrohim, D., Ikhrum, D., Sirodj, R. A., & Afgani, M. W. (2023). Case study methods in qualitative research. *Journal of Science and Computer Education*, 3(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.47709/jpsk.v3i01.1951>
- Harisal, Darlina, L., Kanah, & Dyah, W. (2022). Lexical errors in Japanese essays by students of the Department of Tourism at the Bali State Polytechnic. *HUMANIKA*, 29(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.v29i1.44835>
- Indrayani, N. L. A. (2022). The application of the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system in construction service companies. *CRANE: Civil Engineering Research Journal*, 3(2). <https://ojs.unikom.ac.id/index.php/crane/article/view/8159>
- Lommel, A. R., Burchardt, A., & Uszkoreit, H. (2013). Multidimensional quality metrics: A flexible system for assessing translation quality. Dalam *Proceedings of Translating and the Computer 35*. London.
- Malahati, F., B, A. U., Jannati, P., Qathrunnada, & Shaleh, S. (2023). Qualitative: Understanding research characteristics as a methodology. *Journal of Basic Education*, 11(2), 341–348. <https://doi.org/10.46368/jpd.v11i2.902>
- MQM Council. (2026). *The MQM error typology*. <https://www.themqm.org/mqm-pillars/typology/>
- Nasihin, A. (2015). Oral translation strategies and techniques. *Kagami: Journal of Japanese Education and Language*, 6(1), 1–14.



-
- Nishfullayli, S., Dwiwardani, W., & Kharismawati, M. (2025). Japanese oral communication in the workplace: A study of Japanese speakers in the KIIC Industrial Estate. *KIRYOKU: Journal of Japanese Studies*, 9(1), 141–153. <https://doi.org/10.14710/kiryoku.v9i1.141-153>
- Nugroho, A. (2022). Forms of Japanese-Indonesian translation errors. *Kagami: Journal of Education and Japanese Language*, 13(1), 39–48.
- Nugroho, A. D., & Johanes. (2024). The urgency of the need for regional language oral translators in courts. *Journal of Translation*, 11(2), 140–159.
- Sa'adah, F. (2016). Analysis of language errors and their role in foreign language learning. *Wahana Akademika: Journal of Islamic and Social Studies*, 14(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.21580/wa.v14i1.351>



THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK