



The Attitudes of Technical Translators in Türkiye Towards Post-Editing

Türkiye'deki Teknik Çevirmenlerin Makine Çevirisi Sonrası Düzeltme İşlemine Karşı Tutumları

Sevcan Seçkin¹



ABSTRACT

Today, the translation industry is moving towards a new dimension with the effect of technological developments. One extension of these developments is the artificial intelligence-based machine translation. This innovation, especially with the concept of post-editing, has completely changed the traditional understanding of translation and offered translators new roles such as post-editors. This study aims to examine the attitudes of technical translators in Turkey towards post-editing with an approach based on sociology of translation. In this regard, "habitus" and "interest", the key concepts of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, constitute the theoretical framework of the study. The reason technical translators are chosen as the research object is that machine translation offers very successful outputs in technical translation. The study concludes that technical translators in Turkey have a positive attitude towards post-editing as they are satisfied with the economic gains they have obtained from the field and have succeeded in adapting to the changing system with their habitus suitable for the needs of the field. Data collection was carried out using a questionnaire consisting of 13 open-ended questions. Since the study was conducted with a group of 10 participants from 3 different companies, additional empirical studies are required to support the findings.

Keywords: Bourdieu, MT, post-editing, sociology of translation, technical translators

ÖZ

Günümüzde, teknolojik gelişmelerin de etkisiyle çeviri sektörü yeni bir boyuta doğru ilerlemektedir. Bu gelişmelerin bir uzantısı ise, yapay zekâ tabanlı makine çevirisidir. Bu yenilik, özellikle makine çevirisi sonrası düzeltme işlemi (post-editing) kavramıyla, geleneksel çeviri anlayışını tamamen değiştirmiş ve çevirmenlere son-biçimleyici (post-editor) gibi yeni roller sunmuştur. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de teknik çeviri yapan çevirmenlerin makine çevirisi sonrası düzeltme işlemine yönelik tutumlarını çeviri sosyolojine dayalı bir yaklaşım ile ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda, Fransız sosyolog Pierre Bourdieu'nün anahtar kavramlarından olan "habitus" ve "çıkar" çalışmanın kuramsal çerçevesini oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma nesnesi olarak teknik çevirmenlerin seçilmesinin temel nedeni, makine çevirisinin teknik çeviri alanında çok başarılı çıktılar

¹Assist. Prof. Fatih Sultan Mehmet Foundation University, Department of Translation and Interpretation (Eng), İstanbul, Türkiye

ORCID: S.S. 0000-0002-9258-2276

Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar:

Sevcan Seçkin,
Fatih Sultan Mehmet Foundation University,
Department of Translation and Interpretation
(Eng), İstanbul, Türkiye
E-posta: sseckin@fsm.edu.tr

Submitted/Başvuru: 05.09.2022

Accepted/Kabul: 17.11.2022

Citation/Atf: Seçkin, S. (2022). The Attitudes of Technical Translators in Türkiye Towards Post-Editing. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Dergisi - Istanbul University Journal of Translation Studies*, 17, 135-150.
<https://doi.org/10.26650/ijuts.2022.1171110>



sunmasıdır. Çalışma, Türkiye'de teknik çeviri yapan çevirmenlerin alanın ihtiyaçlarına uygun habitus'ları sayesinde değişen sisteme uyum sağlamayı başardıkları için ve alandan elde ettikleri ekonomik kazanımlardan oldukça memnun olmalarından dolayı, makine çevirisi sonrası düzeltme işlemine yönelik olumlu bir tutum içinde buldukları sonucuna varmıştır. Veri toplama yöntemi olarak, 13 açık uçlu sorudan oluşan bir anket kullanılmıştır. Çalışma, 3 farklı firmada teknik çeviri yapan 10 kişilik bir katılımcı grubu ile gerçekleştirildiği için ortaya çıkan bulguları destekleyecek daha fazla ampirik çalışmaya ihtiyaç olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Bourdieu, MT, post-editing, çeviri sosyolojisi, teknik çevirmenler

1. Introduction

Post-editing (hereafter PE), which emerged in the wake of the latest technological developments, is a new research area in translation studies. In the post-editing process, the human translator takes on the task of controlling and editing the outputs of the machine translation (hereafter MT), and the person performing this task is called post-editor. The fact that artificial intelligence-based MT outputs give better results has paved the way for this system to become quite common in the translation industry, especially in the field of technical translation with its highly formulaic and repetitive nature. And obviously, this new way of translation, in which human translation and MT are intertwined, will become more common in the future. Although these tools provide significant benefits to translators and translation companies, many studies have revealed that the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence makes translators uneasy about post-editing and causes them to adopt a negative approach towards it. This reaction of translators is quite normal because change means uncertainty, and this alone is reason enough for concern. It is also a fact that they need an adaptation process to understand whether it poses a danger or threat to them. On the other side, in order not to be left out of the system in the future, translators should not be positioned against this new aspect of the translation industry. Based on this idea, a literature review was conducted on the attitudes of technical translators in Turkey towards PE. The reason this group of translators was chosen as the research object is that technical translation, which does not involve rhetoric or wordplay, is the most ideal type for post-editing. And existing studies in Turkish literature, which are quite limited compared to the size of its application, mostly focus on the scope of PE and the role of the translator in this process (Çetiner 2019, 2021; Odacıoğlu 2020; Barut 2022). There is no empirical study on the approaches of post editors, i.e., here technical translators who do PE work. The aim of this study is to reveal the attitudes of technical translators in Turkey towards PE and to present a sociological perspective to the findings.

Although technology in its golden age has made the translation work much easier, it has not eliminated the need for human translators. Therefore, this new concept, which came into our lives with the effect of technological developments and completely changed the traditional understanding of translation, has caused translators to assume a new role. Despite the speed and comfort MT offers, translators adopt different attitudes, such as resisting or accepting this new role. Considering that all human behaviors can be explained sociologically, the subject under question will be discussed from the perspective of translation sociology, which seeks answers to the “why” and “how” questions focusing on the inner reasons or driving forces behind human actions. Accordingly, examining the attitudes of translators with the tools offered by sociology will provide an in-depth insight into the subject. A sociological perspective, including an extensive analysis of “habitus” and “interest”, which are important key concepts of Pierre Bourdieu, will provide a very detailed presentation to scrutinize the roots of translators’ attitudes towards post-editing. My aim here is not to examine the habitus and

interests of translators, but to reveal the connections of their attitudes towards post-editing with these two concepts. An important parameter that can affect the findings here is the economic crisis, which was felt intensely in Turkey, especially after the pandemic. Therefore, the article should be read with this parameter in mind.

Recently, there has been a large volume of published studies on PE in the world. However, a significant part of these studies has investigated the technical side of the subject (Moorkens 2012; Moorkens, O'Brien 2013, Temizöz 2016), and much of the research examining translators' approaches to the subject under question has been descriptive in nature (Arenas 2013; Pérez 2020; Levanaite 2021; Cadwell, O'Brien and Teixeira 2017; Vieira 2020). Few researchers have been able to draw on any sociological study into the opinions and attitudes of translators towards post-editing (Sakamoto 2019; Sakamoto & Yamada 2020; Pym & Simon 2021). The study of Akiko Sakamoto entitled "Why do many translators resist post-editing? A sociological analysis using Bourdieu's concepts", is one of the most significant attempts to put forward the social mechanism of translation and post-editing in terms of the position taken by two groups of workers (post-editors and translators) (2019: 204). In her study, Sakamoto concludes that the cultural capital and the resultant symbolic capital, which preserve the respectable position of translators, are transformed into the economic capital with post-editing work and this causes to a "hysteresis effect" on translators. This change, which causes not only a change in position but also a decrease in total capital, creates a resistance for post-editing (2019: 212). The fundamental problem here is the change in position that causes a translator, who is already not valued enough as a human translator, to lose her/his symbolic capital as a human-machine translator. That is a remarkable result for translators who complain about working with excessive workload and low wages and who state at every opportunity that they want to benefit from economic capital fairly and equally. The study of Sakamoto (2019), which focuses on the position takings in accordance with the total capital, is of great importance to explain the underlying reasons of translators' attitudes to PE. Unlike this study, conducted with a focus group of 16 UK project managers, a survey of 155 company websites and 2 training manuals for post editors, i.e., without the ideas of translators doing PE work, the present study will examine the attitudes of technical translators, who actively engaged in PE work, towards PE and reveal the sociological mechanism behind them.

In the data collection process, I created a survey consisting of 13 open-ended questions and Google form was the tool used to publish this questionnaire. Since it is very difficult to reach the translators who do PE work, the data collection process took a long time and only 10 participants from three different translation companies were willing to answer the questions. Although the number of participants is small, with open-ended questions, it is thought that the participants will provide an in-depth insight on their PE experiences. Below are the open-ended questions asked to the participants within the scope of this study¹:

1 The questionnaire, prepared in Turkish, was translated by the author.

- 1) How long have you been translating?
- 2) How long have you been doing PE?
- 3) What topics do you mostly do PE on?
- 4) Have you received any training on PE?
- 5) In what language do you do PE?
- 6) Are you satisfied with the economic profitability of the PE projects?
- 7) How do you budget or invoice the PE projects (per word, per hour...)?
- 8) Is PE an opportunity or threat to translators? Why?
- 9) What do you think about the future of the translation profession?
- 10) Do you prefer to translate with the help of CAT tools or do PE? Why?
- 11) Do you use a specific translation tool for post-editing?
- 12) Do you prefer to be a post-editor or translator?
- 13) Is the satisfaction you receive from the translation process as a post-editor different from traditional translation?

2. Theoretical Framework

The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, with his sociological understanding, has influenced almost all disciplines, including translation studies. Using his increasingly popular key concepts, many researchers in the field have studied on the various agencies and agents involved in the translation process (Gouanvic 2005, 2010; Inghilleri 2003; Sela-Sheffy 2005). In particular, Daniel Simeoni's seminal and inspiring work, based on the concept of habitus, is quite remarkable among the studies on translators (1998). The status of translators is another topic of interest among translation studies researchers (Sela-Sheffy 2008; Katan 2011; Hell & Zethsen 2010). In addition, as mentioned before, Sakomoto (2019) stands out with her study in which she explains the reasons for translators' fears and worries about MT and the resultant PE process, by using Bourdieu's concepts such as field, habitus, and capital.

As Bourdieu put it, "habitus becomes active only in the relation to a field and the same habitus can lead to very different practices and stances depending on the state of the field" (1990: 116). Accordingly, "both concepts of habitus and field are relational in the additional sense that they function fully *only in relation to one another*" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 19— italics are in the original). From this expression, we can draw two inferences: The first of these is that the two concepts are functionally interrelated, and one becomes meaningful with the other in terms of the needs of the field and the agents to meet them. Second, in order for the agents to be positioned in certain fields, they must have certain dispositions, i.e., a specific habitus, in Simeoni's words a "translational habitus" (1998: 33). Thus, it is of great importance to briefly touch on the notion of field, although not in detail, to understand the other concepts that we will focus on in the following pages.

According to Bourdieu, the field is the place of forces, struggles and relations defined by power relations (1991: 3) and all social fields are similar in terms of these features as well as their generic mechanisms, such as those that regulate the selection of newcomers and the competition between various producers (1991: 5). Since the field is an elusive concept, Bourdieu often uses the analogy of “game” to describe a field and make it easier to understand: “a social space where everyone has an interest in winning – that is, securing the most advantageous positions within it” (Grenfell, 2014: 154). Based on this analogy, it can be said that it is the field itself that determines what can be done in the game, the characteristics of the players, their profits, in short, everything about the game. Players involved in the game also act in a certain way to define and develop their positions in accordance with these rules and requirements of the field in which they are positioned. Additionally, in Bourdieu’s words, “the field of power is the space of the relations of force between the different kinds of capital or, more precisely, between the agents who possess a sufficient amount of one of the different kinds of capital to be in a position to dominate the corresponding field” ... (1998: 34). The four forms of capital defined by Bourdieu are as follows: “Economic (money and assets); cultural (e.g., forms of knowledge; taste, aesthetic and cultural preferences; language, narrative and voice); social (e.g. affiliations and networks; family, religious and cultural heritage) and symbolic (things which stand for all of the other forms of capital and can be “exchanged” in other fields, e.g. credentials)” (Grenfell, 2014: 67).

After briefly defining the field, let us move on to the concept of habitus. As Bourdieu put it, “habitus is both a system of schemes of production of practices and a system of perception and appreciation of practices. And, in both dimensions, its operation expresses the social position in which it was elaborated” (1989: 19). To put it another way, habitus is not independent of its social position and tends to perceive and reproduce practices suitable for the conditions that produce it. For Bourdieu who explains this situation with reference to phenomenology, “... points of view depend on the point from which they are taken, since the vision that every agent has of the space depends on his or her position in that space” (1989: 18). That is to say, “habitus is a system of schemes of perception and appreciation of practices, cognitive and evaluative structures which are acquired through the lasting experience of a social position” (1989: 19). However, according to Bourdieu/Wacquant, “habitus is perfectly “adapted” to the field without any conscious search for purposive adaptation, and one could say that the effect of habitus is then redundant with the effect of field” (1992: 129). From these statements, it turns out that the socially structured habitus is open to development and adapts to changes even if it resists. This process can be quite long and challenging for the agents. And, in every new situation encountered, habitus shows a similar reaction. Although it is not easy for the habitus to get used to new situations, it is not impossible either.

In Bourdieu’s words, the constituent elements of habitus, which is a part of the two-fold social genesis besides the field, are the schemes of perceptions, thought and action (1989:

14). Habitus is the practical knowledge and mastery of the patterns of the social world that, without even organizing these patterns in conceptual terms, allows our behaviour to adapt to these patterns and to be ascribed to these patterns as if they had been produced by them (Bourdieu, 2020: 67). Bourdieu explains this situation as follows: “There exist, within the social world itself and not only within symbolic systems (language, myths, etc.), objective structures independent of the consciousness and will of agents, which are capable of guiding and constraining their practices or their representations” (1989:14). In this regard, “he rejects the idea of social actors as conscious, calculative rational beings, although he does allow for the possibility of “rational choice” under specific circumstances” (Inghilleri, 2014: 128). In short, “habitus is the dispositions of agents... As perceptive dispositions tend to be adjusted to position, agents, even the most disadvantaged ones, tend to perceive the world as natural and to accept it much more readily than one might imagine-especially when you look at the situation of the dominated through the social eyes of a dominant.” (1989: 18). Accordingly, every agent, even the most disadvantaged, tends to get used to the conditions over time. Through habitus, agents easily understand and adapt to the social environment that restricts them, and they do not even realize that they are restricted.

Simeoni, who successfully adapted this term to translators, “takes as a starting point the notion of a complex, adaptive habitus finely tuned to the practical demands of the (special) field(s) in which it operates” (1998: 14) and indicates that “fewer of us are endowed with a specialized professional habitus” (1998: 18). According to Simeoni, “becoming a translator is a matter of refining a social habitus into a special habitus; on condition, that is, that the field of translation were construed as a specialized field”, which is here the field of technical translation (1998: 19) and “this specific habitus is *governed by the rules pertaining to the field in which the translation takes place* (1998: 20— italics are in the original). Bourdieu’s term of habitus is clearly a collection of sorts, i.e., a convenient stenograph for different default functions applying at different levels and in different domains (Simeoni, 1998: 17) This means that actors must have certain qualities to meet the requirements of the field, otherwise they will not be able to adapt to the field. The most striking feature of habitus, which is closely related to our subject, is that it is both “a structured and structuring mechanism” (Simeoni, 1998: 21-22). It is structured because it is acquired and shaped in the course of social life; and structuring because it contributes directly to the elaboration of norms and conventions (Simeoni, 1998: 21-22). In other words, habitus functions as a kind of reproduction mechanism by reinforcing the power of structures, which results in making it difficult to see new possibilities and different options.

“Sociology postulates that there is a reason in what agents do (in the sense that one speaks of a reason of a series) which must be found; this reason permits one to explain and to transform a series of apparently incoherent, arbitrary behaviors into a coherent series, into something that can be understood according to a unique principle or a coherent set of principles” (Bourdieu, 1998: 76). Bourdieu explains this situation with the notion of interest. “*Interest*, in Bourdieu’s

words, is to be there, to participate, to admit that the game is worth playing and that the stakes created in and through the fact of playing are worth pursuing; it is to recognize the game and to recognize its stakes” (1990: 77). Obviously, the notion is about finding answers to certain questions: Why do players want to play the game? What are the motivational sources of being in the game? What do they gain by playing the game? Therefore, interest, which reveals why the players are interested and volunteers in the game, is another important key concept in understanding the reasons for the agents’ actions.

So, what is this interest and why is it necessary for? “Interest is not a kind of universal property possessed by a universal agent; it is socially defined. Interest is always defined with reference to a field. Interest is the *illusio* of a particular field. Interest is determined in the relation between a habitus disposed to perceive certain solicitations and a social space where these solicitations arise” (Bourdieu, 2020: 97) and “even symbolic exchanges suppose the investment of interest, and the freest of games, like art or love, suppose a form of interest” (Bourdieu, 2020, 83). In addition, “there are as many interests as there are fields, and presumably subfields, although these interests must also be seen, and partly define themselves, in relation to each other” (Grenfell, 2014: 156). As for why it is necessary, in Bourdieu’s words, “each field imposes a tacit entrance fee” (1998: 78). So, in order to enter to a field, one must first be interested. The expressions such as “I am doing this job because I enjoy translating” or “I am quite happy to help and serve people” are true to a certain extent as these are basic entry conditions in the field. In short, interest is the precondition of the functioning of the field.

Bourdieu uses the notion of interest in the sense of being interested and adds that “when you have a feel for the game, you don’t enquire into the existence or the *raison d’être* of the game; you want to play, you have a *libido vivendi*. Each game imposes its own libido, and you could say that ‘interest = libido’. But you could just as well say ‘interest = *illusio*’” (2020: 82— italics are in the original). With these expressions, Bourdieu defends that the notion of interest can be replaced by the term of libido and illusion. And, in Bourdieu’s words, “there are in effect as many kinds of libido as there are fields” (1998: 78). These interests, libido, or *illusio*, for which the agents struggle, are of value only to those in the game, and they exist in relation to the field’s objectives. Being interested in a game, taking the risks, and believing it is worth is illusory to anyone outside of the game and someone who has the appropriate habitus cannot help playing (Bourdieu, 2020: 85). Therefore, Bourdieu’s notion of interest should not be interpreted as a principle of action independent of its conceptual framework.

Interest cannot be reduced to rational calculation. The notion borrowed from Nietzsche and Sigmund Freud refers to the fact that “all action is necessarily ‘interested’, but in order to look after our interests and ensure their success, we have to repress any overt sense of that interest” (Webb *et al.*, 2002: 14). Pursuant to this understanding, it can be said that even the agents themselves are unaware of their interests and what is going on at the unconscious level. As John B. Thompson put it simply, “since individuals are the products of particular histories

which endure in the habitus, their actions can never be analyzed adequately as the outcome of conscious calculation” (1991: 17). That means that the interests of individuals cannot be interpreted independently of the historical, cultural, and social context of their habitus. As a critic to the postulate of an individual reduced to the ability to make well-informed calculations, Bourdieu suggests “looking into the genesis of this singular individual” (2020: 94). Because, without knowing where individuals come from or where they have been grown up, such an analysis would be incomplete and even erroneous.

“Bourdieu understands actions in terms of *interests* (cultural and social benefits and loss, as well as economic) ...” (Grenfell, 2014: 160). And, as Michael Grenfell put it briefly, “individual’s attitude to the past, present and future is shaped by this interest” (2014: 154). It follows from this expression that interest is also the determinant of behaving in a certain way and preferring one thing over another. No action is free from desires, aspirations, and profits. In generating practices, perceptions, and attitudes, *illusio* is such an important concept that there is a vested interest in all actions whether it is economic, cultural, or social. Additionally, “interest – the *illusio* – has all the appearances of being natural, while it is indeed a product of the field, as a collective act, apprehended by individuals according to their own socially constituted habitus” (Grenfell, 2014:159). And “disinterestness” is not to the understanding of Bourdieu’s sociology (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 116). Basically, “interest is to see ends without posing them; a future which is quasi-present because it acts there; a game which is so good that it forgets that it is a game. Stated aims and objectives are therefore never as they appear, but the epiphenomena of interest” (Grenfell, 2014: 163).

As mentioned before, the notion of interest has an unconscious aspect in Bourdieu’s sociology. In this regard, Thompson (1991: 16) underlines that “Bourdieu assumes a fundamental link between actions and interests, between the practices of agents and the interests which they knowingly or unknowingly pursue, while at the same time he rejects the idea that interests are always narrowly economic”. The unconscious aspect of the interest necessitates researching the field and revealing the gains that the actors themselves are not aware of. This is expressed as the “heuristic principle”, which also calls upon the researcher to elucidate the specific interests at stake in the practices and conflicts which take place in particular fields (Thompson, 1991: 16). The present work will be shaped by this heuristic perspective of Bourdieu. In this direction, the connections between translators’ attitudes towards PE with habitus and interest will be investigated.

3. Analysis of the Questionnaire

3.1. General Profile of the Group

In this section, where questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 11 will be examined, the general profile of the participants will be discussed. The first question is aimed at learning about the experiences of the participants in the translation profession. Responses of the participants to this question

revealed that they have significant experience in the translation profession, ranging from 6 to 23 years. From the second question, it is understood that their experience of PE is relatively short compared to their professional experience, with a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 6 years. Since the participants of the survey are technical translators, the responses to the third question cover different branches of technical translation, such as informatics, medicine, law, marketing and automotive. Educational materials, interface translations, user manuals, medical device translations are among the documents translated by the participants. In response to the fourth question about training on PE, seven participants stated that they have certificates such as SDL, TAUS and MTPE and three expressed that they did not receive any kind of training. Considering the number of participants who received PE training, it is clear they are professionals who take their work seriously. PE language combinations that the participants work with are mainly EN-TR, TR-EN and only one participant added the following language combinations: FR-TR, FR-EN, EN-FR. In response to the translation fee question, all participants stated they charge PE projects per word, but there are also projects that are charged per hour at the request of the customer. Finally, the participants mostly answered yes to whether they used a specific translation tool in the PE process. Examples given by the participants include Trados, Smartcat, SDL and ContentQuo.

3.2. Results from the Translators' Questionnaire

In this section, the data gathered from the questions 6, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 13 will be evaluated from a sociological perspective, based on Bourdieu's key terms habitus and interest. In addition, direct quotations from the participants will be made in the analysis of some appropriate "why" questions. The sixth question concerns the economic profitability of PE projects and was asked to reveal the relationship between translators' interests in PE and economic gain. As this is a yes/no question, no direct quotes will be given. According to the responses, six out of ten participants indicated they are satisfied with the economic profitability of PE, consistent with the finding of Sakamoto's study. (2019). Three participants expressed dissatisfaction, while the remaining one said it depends on the client and type of text. It is understood from the responses of the participants that PE projects satisfy technical translators in terms of economic capital. Once the analysis of the other questions below is complete, it will also become clear whether this economic capital has brought a positive approach to PE. If we briefly recall the findings of the Sakamoto's study (2019), even if the translators are satisfied with the economic capital, they put up resistance to PE since the cultural capital and the resultant symbolic capital, which give them a respectable position in the field, are diminished. Considering that translators in Turkey often complain about low translation fees, it is intriguing to uncover the impact of PE's economic profitability on translators' attitudes.

The eighth question asked to the participants was whether PE is an opportunity or a threat to translators. Six out of ten participants regarded PE as an opportunity, three as a threat, and

the remaining one said both. It can be said that, in response to the question we wondered in the previous paragraph, those who participated in the survey tended to view PE more positively. Obviously, economic capital gained from the field has a genuine positive impact on the attitudes of technical translators towards PE. Some quotes explaining the reasons for the answers given by the participants are as follows: “It is an opportunity. More voluminous work can be done in less time and higher pay”. “I think it’s an opportunity because MT technology will no longer stand still and will evolve further. Translators who do not follow this development will not be able to get large and permanent jobs in the market, just like translators who once said, ‘I don’t use CAT’”. “This is an opportunity right now because traditional translation is dwindling and will become less frequent over time. We must take advantage of this new opportunity”. “I don’t see it as a threat because MT will never reach 100% accuracy. On the contrary, the translation volume of the translator will increase in the PE process”. “It is a threat. Costs are cut and translators are not paid the wages they deserve”. Looking at the overall responses, the increasing and accelerating translation volume, less tiring, profitable, and timesaving translation activities are the main reasons for the positive opinions on PE for the time being, while the possibility of reducing the volume of translation in the future, hindering the translator’s self-development and cost reductions are the main concerns. An important point that stands out from the responses given to this question in connection with the purpose of the study is that the participants stated that their economic earnings increased in parallel with the increasing translation work, and therefore they considered PE an opportunity. The fact that technical translators are satisfied with the economic profitability and regard PE as an opportunity in this respect reveals that economic interest has an important role in their positive attitudes towards PE. It should also be noted that the participants did not put any emphasis on cultural or social interest. The reason for this can be briefly explained by the fact that the aim of technical translators is to obtain economic capital rather than cultural or symbolic capital. The emphasis on adapting to this new trend, called PE, in order not to lose job opportunities in the future, is another prominent factor in the responses of the participants. Their effort to become compatible with PE is a clear sign of their field-structured habitus with high levels of adaptation.

Regarding the negative opinions of the participants about PE, the following question can be asked from a Bourdieusian point of view: Could certain behavior patterns be more directly related to survival needs? Because as MT gets smarter, some participants think they will not be needed any more, particularly in the field of technical translation. Thus, in the case of post-editing, it can be said that the attitudes of translators vary according to individual groups. For example, the chances are that the technical translators may have more negative feelings towards MT than the literary translators as the outcomes of technical translation with MT are quite satisfactory compared to literary translation. That may seem paradoxical, as the expected reaction is that the higher the quality of MT, the more it should be adopted by translators. However, since technical translators act with basic impulses, such as survival and existence,

these reactions are quite understandable. With their traditional habits, they resist the changing way of translation and their new role that is not embedded in their habitus. The important point for them is whether this newcomer in the game threatens their future job opportunities. This primitive impulse prevents them from seeing the possibilities it offers. In other words, translators are not against PE itself; they are just worried about losing their jobs in the future.

This argument can be extended with the ninth question, in which the participants put forward their thoughts on the future of the translation profession. Three out of ten participants expressed a negative opinion on this question and stated that the translation profession would disappear in the future. For example, one participant used the following expression: “In 5 years, half of the currently employed translators will be unemployed, and within 10 years, only 10% of these translators will continue to earn money doing this job.” On the other hand, the remaining seven participants indicated that even if the profession does not disappear, the role of translators will change, and they will do more PE work. In either case, traditional translation methods in technical translation will not be carried into the future and the role of translators will change radically. Considering the high rate of satisfaction among the participants, it can be said that this change no longer bothers translators, at least in Turkey. They seem to have accepted PE because they are satisfied with the benefits of it, such as financial gain, speed, higher throughput, and more translation work.

The tenth question is about whether translators prefer PE or translation with the help of CAT tools. Four participants preferred PE, three of them opted for traditional translation with the help of CAT tools, and the remaining three replied it could be both. Although there seems to be a balanced orientation to both options, it is noteworthy that the participants still preferred PE over translation with CAT tools. Some quotes from the participants are as follows: “I prefer to translate with CAT tools. From translation memory, I pick neat matches”. “I prefer PE, because it makes my job easier. I can get tired less and translate more”. “I have no such choice. Because customer demands determine what we will use and how we will use it at the end of the day. In both cases I use CAT tools”. When the responses of the participants are examined, the main reason for choosing PE seems to be that it allows faster translation with less effort and therefore speeds up translation time. It is clear there is no sharp negative view towards PE and that the translators accept the current change. At this point, the relationship between habitus and field comes to the fore in terms of translators’ adaptation to this (so called) new player that did not exist at the beginning. Knowing that they would be out of the game if they could not adapt to MT, actors started to accept this new and apparently permanent player in the field.

In the twelfth question, the participants were asked whether they preferred being a post editor or a translator. According to the responses, six participants expressed that PE is more attractive, two opted for translation, and the remaining two preferred both. Some quotes of the participants are as follows: “Although the translator’s freedom of interpretation is disappearing, PE is currently more attractive in order to provide more financial gain in today’s conditions”. “I

prefer PE. This is the evidence of my adaptability to new roles.” “Of course, PE, it is easier”. “Being a translator is more attractive. I think that in post-editing, the quality of translation has decreased, and MT has been brought to a reasonable quality level and the margin of error is higher”. Similar to the results of the questions above, most of the positive opinions are related to financial gain, convenience and keeping up with change, while the negative ones are related to the quality of the translation.

The last question concerned the degree of satisfaction that translators derive from their different roles in the two types of translation processes. The participants were asked whether the satisfaction they received from the translation process as a post-editor differed from the traditional translation. While four participants stated that traditional translation is much more enjoyable, high quality and creative, six participants expressed that PE is more satisfying both in terms of speed and financial gain. Some quotes of the participants are as follows: “It is different, because it’s better in terms of speed. I can do more work, of course, which affects the cost, but it should be noted that PE has developed and continues to develop for about two years, otherwise if this question was asked in the past, I would prefer traditional translation”. “It feels like doing some puzzles and understanding the machine. That’s why it’s so fun to experience that translation feeling in a different dimension”. “In PE, our freedom to interpret and play with words disappears, but we already have limited freedom in technical texts. I see little difference in terms of professional satisfaction as more financial satisfaction can be achieved”. The participant’s emphasis on limited freedom in technical texts well sums up why technical translators give weight to economic capital rather than cultural capital and must adapt to this new trend.

Of course, it is not possible to make an objective assessment without considering the economic conditions of the country, which are quite fragile these days. According to official figures, the unemployment rate in Turkey for the last four months is 11.3%, while the inflation rate for the last six months is 78.62%². Although we do not have sufficient data on how the general economic instability, unemployment and inflation caused by the crisis has affected the sector, it should be noted that the conditions in the country have increased the discomfort of all employees, including translators, about job security. The general climate of the country forces people to focus on protecting their current jobs and incomes. The most important goal is to survive in all business lines. Therefore, one reason they accept this change so easily may be the need to avoid this uncertainty. If we exclude this parameter and make our evaluation only based on the responses of the participants, it can be assumed that the reason technical translators are interested in the field is the economic capital they gain, and their habitus that helps them adapt to the newcomer of the field. According to this finding, it is clear their interest in the field is only about economic gains and not because of cultural or symbolic interest. However, more empirical studies are required to support these findings, as this is a conclusion drawn from the responses of a small group of ten participants.

2 <https://www.tuik.gov.tr/>

4. Conclusion

This study was conducted with a group of ten professional translators engaged in PE work. The survey method was used to collect information, and the participants answered 13 open-ended questions prepared by using Google Forms. The study concluded that technical translators in Turkey have a rather positive view of PE, contrary to the popular belief. The expressions used by the participants revealed that they adapted to their new roles in the field of technical translation. In other words, their discourses reflect an adaptive perspective rather than resistance to PE, unlike the findings of the world literature.

In the study, it has been revealed that the participants accept PE as a part of the future of the translation industry and do not feel uncomfortable working as a post editor. The impact of MT on economic gains is the main reason why they have a positive attitude towards PE. Since technical documents do not require creativity (user manuals, training documents, etc.), intellectual satisfaction or recognition associated with cultural and symbolic interest are resources that translators cannot reach anyway. Therefore, the main goal of most technical translators in the field is to obtain adequate and equitable economic capital rather than cultural and symbolic capital. Another point frequently emphasized by the participants is that MT provides the opportunity to do more translation work as it saves time and increases efficiency and productivity. It follows from this finding that time stands out as the definer of value for technical translators. Because more time means more economic capital. Obviously, there is a correlation between satisfaction with economic profitability and a positive attitude towards PE, i.e., the higher the economic profitability, the higher the satisfaction rate.

This situation can also be explained with the notion of habitus as well as the economic capital gained from the field. The fact that translators' initially negative attitudes turn into positive over time is clearly a direct result of their habitus. The structured and constructive feature of the habitus comes to the fore in adapting to the PE process. The agents, who structured their habitus as required by this new dimension of the field, managed to adapt to the changing way of translation, albeit with difficulty. It turned out that the tendency to adapt and be open to change, which was already encoded in the habitus of the agents positioned in the field, enabled them to gradually accept the new order. In conclusion, it is clear that technical translators in Turkey have a positive perspective on PE, mainly due to its effect on their economic gains in the field and their dispositions to keep up with changes to position themselves in the future of the translation industry.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

REFERENCES

- Arenas, A. G. (2013). What do professional translators think about post-editing? *The Journal of Specialised Translation*. 19, 75-95.
- Barut, E. (2022). İstatistiksel Makine Çevirisi İle Nöral Makine Çevirisinin Dilbilimsel Parametrelerle Karşılaştırılması: Google Translate. *Akdeniz Havzası ve Afrika Medeniyetleri Dergisi*, 4 (1), 103-118. DOI: 10.54132/akaf.1116949
- Bourdieu, P. (2020). *Habitus and Field: General Sociology*, Vol. 2. Lectures at the College de France (1982-1983). trans. Peter Collier, Cambridge: Polity. (2015).
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*. 7:1, 14-25.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). The Peculiar History of Scientific Reason. *Sociological Forum*. 6:1, 3-25.
- Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical Reason*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Çetiner, C. (2019). Makine çevirisi sonrası düzeltme işlemine (post-editing) yönelik kapsamlı bir inceleme. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö6), 462-472. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.649333
- Çetiner, C. (2021). Sustainability of translation as a profession: Changing roles of translators in light of the developments in machine translation systems. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö9), 575-586. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.985014
- Helle. V. D & Korning Zethsen, K, K. (2010). Translator Status: Helpers and Opponents in the Ongoing Battle of an Emerging Profession. *Target* 22 (2): 194–211.
- Grenfell, M. (2014). *Pierre Bourdieu Key Concepts* (2nd ed.). Abington: Routledge.
- Gouanvic, J. M. (2005). A Bourdieusian theory of translation, or the coincidence of practical instances - Field, 'habitus', capital and 'illusio'. *Translator*. 11. 147-166.
- Gouanvic, J. M. (2010). Outline of a Sociology of Translation Informed by the Ideas of Pierre Bourdieu. *MonTI. Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, 2, 119-129.
- Odacıoğlu. C. (2020). Çeviri Teknolojileri Bağlamında Çevirmenin Görünürlüğü. Ziya Tok (Ed.), *Çeviride Uygulama Süreci ve Teknoloji 1*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları. 125-149.
- Patrick C, O'Brien, S & Teixeira, S.C (2018). Resistance and accommodation: factors for the (non) adoption of machine translation among professional translators. *Perspectives*. 26:3, 301-321, DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2017.1337210
- Vieira, L. N. (2020) Automation anxiety and translators. *Translation Studies* 13:1, pages 1-21.
- Levanaitė K. (2021). Lietuvos vertimo rinkos dalyvių požiūris į mašininį vertimą ir postredagavimą. *Vertimo Studijos*, 14, 22-39. <https://doi.org/10.15388/VertStud.2021.2>
- Inghilleri, M. (2003). Habitus, field and discourse: Interpreting as a socially situated activity. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies* 15 (2), 243-268
- Katan, D. (2011). Status of Translators. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. 2, 146-152.
- Moorkens, J. (2012). Measuring Consistency in Translation Memories: A Mixed-Methods Case Study. PhD thesis. Dublin City University.
- Sharon O'Brien, S, Michel Simard and Lucia Specia (eds.) Proceedings of MT Summit XIV Workshop on Post-editing Technology and Practice, Nice, September 2, 2013, p. 19–25.

- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. (2005). How to be a (Recognized) Translator: Rethinking Habitus, Norms, and the Field of Translation. *Target*. 17. 1-26. 10.1075/target.17.1.02sel.
- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. (2008). The Translators' Personae: Marketing Translatorial Images as Pursuit of Capital. *Meta* 53 (3): 609–622.
- Pérez M, L. (2020). What Do Translators Think About Post-Editing? A Mixed-Methods Study of Translators' Fears, Worries and Preferences on Machine Translation Post-Editing. *Revista Tradumàtica. Tecnologies de la Traducció*, 18, 11-32. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/tradumatica.227>
- Pym, Anthony & Torres-Simón, Esther. (2021). Is automation changing the translation profession? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 2021. 10.1515/ijsl-2020-0015.
- Simeoni, D. (1998) The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*. 10, (1): 1-39.
- Sakamoto, A. (2019). Why do many translators resist post-editing? A sociological analysis using Bourdieu's concepts. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*. 31, 201-216.
- Sakamoto, A, Yamada, M. (2020). Social groups in machine translation post-editing. Moorkens, J, Kenny, D and Carmo, F (Eds.) In *Fair MT: Towards Ethical, Sustainable Machine Translation*. Translation Spaces. 9:1, 78-97. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.00022.sak>
- Temizöz, Ö. (2016) Postediting machine translation output: subject-matter experts versus professional translators, *Perspectives*, 24:4, 646 665, DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2015.1119862
- Thompson, J, B. 1991. Editor's Introduction to Bourdieu's *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Webb, J., Schirato, T., & Danaher, G. (2002). *Understanding Bourdieu*. London: SAGE Publications.