

Towards an Analytical Framework for Self-Translator's Social Identity: The Case of Margosyan*

Öz-Çevirmen Sosyal Kimliği İçin Bir Analitik Çerçeve Önerisi: Margosyan Örneği

Research/Araştırma

Ezginaz EMİRKADI MUTLU, A. Şirin OKYAYUZ*****

**Doktora Öğrencisi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Bölümü, emirkadiezgi@gmail.com, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-6946-2938

***Prof. Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Bölümü, sirinokyayuz@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-7512-2764

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the self-translation process based on the social identity of the translator. While self-translation is often associated with diaspora and transnational contexts in the translation studies literature, this study demonstrates that the practice of self-translation also exists within a national context. Accordingly, the study proposes an analytical framework for analysing the projections of the self-translator's social identity in the self-translation process. As the case study, the self-translation practices of Mıgırdıç Margosyan, a self-translator from the Armenian community, were chosen and analysed based on the Social Identity Approach and Social Identity Complexity Theory. The dataset consists of self-translation texts as well as paratexts that reveal the translator's identity. The analysis revealed that the strong identification of the self-translator with his ethnic membership and his low level of social identity complexity operate through the translation strategies adopted in self-translation. In this context, self-translation is considered an identity management practice, and the self-translation strategies applied are evaluated as micro-identity management strategies. Moreover, it has been shown that the

* This article is based on the doctoral dissertation of Ezginaz EMİRKADI MUTLU, supervised by Prof. Dr. Ayşe Şirin OKYAYUZ at Hacettepe University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Department of Translation and Interpreting in English.

relationship the self-translator establishes with the Turkish language used in the self-translated texts functions not as an indicator of assimilation, but rather as a space where ethnic identity is represented and made visible. These findings demonstrate that analysing self-translation through the lens of translator social identity, group belonging, and identity management processes offers an explanatory and expandable analytical basis for translator-centered approaches in the field of Translator Studies.

Keywords: Translator Studies, Translator Social Identity, Self-Translator, Self-translation, Social Identity Complexity

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, öz-çeviri sürecini çevirmenin sosyal kimliği temelinde incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Özellikle öz-çevirinin çeviribilim literatüründe çoğunlukla diaspora ve ulusasıırı bağlamlarla ilişkilendirilmesine karşın, bu çalışma öz-çeviri pratiğinin yalnızca bu bağlamlarla sınırlı olmadığını ve ulusal bir bağlamda da var olabileceğini göstermektedir. Buna göre, çalışma öz-çevirmen sosyal kimliğinin öz-çeviri sürecindeki izdüşümlerini analiz etmeye yönelik analitik bir çerçeve önermektedir. Çalışma kapsamında, Ermeni asıllı bir öz-çevirmen olan Mıgırdıç Margosyan'ın öz-çeviri pratikleri Sosyal Kimlik Yaklaşımı ve Sosyal Kimlik Karmaşıklığı Kuramı temel alınarak incelenmiştir. Veri seti, öz-çeviri metinlerinin yanı sıra çevirmenin kimliğini ortaya koyan yan metinsel üretimlerden oluşmaktadır. Bu veriler, öz-çeviri sürecinin yalnızca metinsel düzeyde değil, çevirmenin sosyal kimliği, kolektivite ve grup üyeliği bağlamında da değerlendirilmesine olanak tanır. Analiz sonucunda, öz-çevirmenin etnik grup üyeliğiyle kurduğu güçlü özdeşleşmenin ve düşük sosyal kimlik karmaşıklığı düzeyinin, öz-çeviride tercih edilen stratejiler aracılığıyla işlediği ve bu stratejilerin kimlik yönetimi işlevi gördüğü saptanmıştır. Bu bağlamda, Ermeni topluluğuna mensup bir öz-çevirmen için öz-çeviri, bir kimlik yönetimi pratiği olarak ele alınmış; uygulanan öz-çeviri stratejileri ise mikro kimlik yönetimi stratejileri olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Ayrıca, öz-çevirmenin öz-çeviri metinlerinde kullandığı Türkçe dil ile kurduğu ilişkinin, asimilasyon göstergesi olmaktan ziyade, azınlık kimliğinin temsil edildiği ve görünür kılındığı bir alan işlevi gördüğü ortaya konmuştur. Bu bulgular, öz-çevirinin çevirmen sosyal kimliği, grup aidiyeti ve kimlik yönetimi süreçleri üzerinden incelenmesinin, Çevirmen Araştırmaları alanında çevirmeni merkeze alan yaklaşımlar için açıklayıcı ve genişletilebilir bir analitik zemin sunduğunu göstermektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Çevirmen Araştırmaları, Çevirmen Sosyal Kimliği, Öz-Çevirmen, Öz-çeviri, Sosyal Kimlik Karmaşası

1. Introduction

This study examines the effect of social identity and the level of identity complexity on self-translation by introducing a translator-focused perspective. The study discusses how the social identities and levels of identity complexity of self-translators are reflected in the self-translation process. Self-translation is conceptualized here not only as a transnational or diasporic practice, as is often addressed in literature, but also as an intranational practice emerging in the context of historically established minority communities within national borders. Thus, self-translation is examined not only from an international perspective but also from a meso perspective within the context of minorities existing within a nation. This approach demonstrates that translation does not solely constitute a homogeneous field but allows for a discussion of the phenomenon of self-translation within the context of the ongoing relationships between minorities and the majority. This approach, which focuses on the identity of the self-translator, conceptualizes self-translation as identity management and the translation

strategies employed in self-translation as micro identity management strategies. The concept of identity management refers to the representation of the social identities of self-translators who are members of minorities vis-à-vis the majority.

In this context, the study presents an analytical framework focused on the social identity of the self-translator. The analytical framework, named as “Analytical Framework on Self-Translator Social Identity” and through which the self-translator's identity can be directly traced in the self-translation process, draws on the Social Identity Approach and Social Identity Conflict Theory. The framework was developed by integrating an identity approach not previously found in translation studies literature into the study of self-translation. In this way, the aim of this study is to fill the gap in literature and to achieve the following:

- To conceptualize self-translation not only as a transnational/diasporic phenomenon, but also as an intranational practice emerging in the context of minority communities settled within national borders.
- To develop an approach that examines self-translation through the translator's identity by integrating the concepts of social identity, group membership, and social identity complexity into the Translator Studies literature as analytical tools.
- To reinterpret self-translation strategies not as strategies of cultural transmission but as micro-level practices of identity management.

Therefore, this study assumes that self-translation can function as a form of identity management within national contexts, where translation strategies serve as micro-level identity management strategies. Methodologically, the study selected Mıgırdiç Margosyan, an Armenian-identified self-translator belonging to the Armenian community in Türkiye, a historically established group that has maintained its existence within Türkiye's national borders, and two self-translated texts as case studies. According to the “Analytical Framework on Self-Translator Social Identity”, the text analysis was conducted alongside biographical data, interviews, and paratextual materials; the translator's social identity categories were analyzed within the framework of the social identity approach and social identity complexity theory. The accorded identity model obtained was evaluated together with the translation strategies in the self-translated texts, revealing the projection of the self-translator's identity on self-translation strategies. In this way, the study proposes an analytical framework that integrates social identity approaches into self-translation research, contributing both theoretically and analytically to the literature on self-translation and Translator Studies (Chesterman, 2006, 2009; Kaindl & Evdokimov, 2024).

It should be noted that the primary aim of this study is not to provide an exhaustive analysis of a single case, but to introduce and demonstrate an analytical framework for examining self-translation through the lens of social identity. The case of Margosyan is employed as an illustrative example to operationalize the framework rather than as a basis for generalizable conclusions for every self-translator. Nevertheless, the framework proposed in this study is not restricted to this particular

case and can be applied to other self-translators by means of similar analyses of textual and paratextual materials, offering a transferable analytical tool for future research.

2. Analytical Framework on Self-Translator's Social Identity

"Analytical Framework on Self-Translator Social Identity" is developed to track translators' social identities and the complexity of these identities during the self-translation process. This framework's main theoretical grounding is based on the Social Identity Approach and the Social Identity Complexity Theory. It assumes that self-translation is not merely a textual practice; it is also a socio-psychologically structured activity. Accordingly, translation decisions made during the self-translation process are shaped by the self-translator's multiple social group memberships and the salience of these memberships in specific contexts. Developed from a meso-level perspective, this framework suggests that, like all socio-psychological beings, self-translators' social identities are constituted through multiple social categories (e.g., ethnicity, language, citizenship, gender, profession, ideological orientations, and religion). These categories are not fixed, static; rather, they gain varying degrees of salience depending on the social, political, and institutional context in which self-translation occurs.

Therefore, the framework does not treat self-translation as an entirely macro-level (sociological) or entirely micro-level (individual) phenomenon. Instead, it situates self-translation at the intersection of group-based affiliations and analyzes how the self-translators position themselves according to their social categories and how this positioning is projected in translation strategies and discursive choices. Under this approach, the self-translation process and the strategies used in this process can be explained not only through textual transformations, but also through which social identities the self-translators make visible, which ones they suppress or push into the background. Thus, the analytical framework moves self-translation studies beyond purely text-centered analyses and offers an identity-focused, translator-centered analytical model to the field of Translator Studies.

The steps of the "Analytical Framework on Self-Translator Social Identity" are as follows:

1. Identification of Social Categories (Translator-Centered Analysis)
2. Analysis of Category Saliency (Translator-Centered Analysis)
3. Analysis of Social Identity Complexity (Translator-Centered Analysis)
4. Identification of Self-translation Strategies (Text-Centered Analysis)
5. Describing the Relation Established with the Target Language (Both Translator and Text-Centered Analysis)

The first three steps of the analytical framework provide a translator-focused analysis aimed at explaining the self-translation process through the translator's social identity. These steps aim to identify which social categories the self-translator belongs to, which of these categories emerge in the self-translation process, and how this emergence produces an identity structure. The fourth and fifth steps then move the

analysis to the textual level by examining how this identified identity structure is reflected in the self-translation strategies used in the texts and in the relationship established with the target language. Therefore, the analytical framework consists of two complementary components: translator-focused and text-focused.

The first step involves identifying the social categories to which the self-translator belongs (e.g., ethnicity, language, citizenship, profession, gender, ideological orientations, etc.) within the framework of Social Identity Approach (Tajfel, 1979; Tajfel and Turner, 2004). This step conceptualizes the translator's identity not through individual characteristics but through group memberships and treats the translator as a socially positioned subject. Thus, the translator's identity is defined in the context of group membership. The second step examines which of these social categories become salient in the self-translation process within the framework of Self-Categorization Theory (Turner, 1999; Turner and Reynolds, 2012). This step analyzes which group(s) the translator identifies with, which norms, values, and prototypes he takes as reference, and which social identity comes to the fore in specific contexts. Thus, the context-sensitive, variable, and dynamic structure of identity is included in the analysis. The third step aims to determine the level of complexity in the translator's social identity. In this step, the extent to which the prototypes and category boundaries of the groups to which the self-translator belongs overlap or diverge is analyzed. As a result of this analysis, the self-translator's identity is classified as dominant, intersecting, compartmentalized, or merged identity structures within the framework of the identity models proposed by Roccas and Brewer (2002). This classification enables the detection of the degree of complexity of the self-translator's social identity. In this context, the most important steps for detecting the translator's level of identity complexity are the detection of the shared prototypes or category boundaries among the groups the translator is a member of.

Operating in a complementary manner, these three steps enable the systematic identification of the self-translator's social identity structure by linking category membership, saliency and the degree of overlap between categories, providing the basis for determining the social identity complexity of the self-translator. As a result, the analysis allows for describing the translation strategies that emerge in the self-translation process and the relationship established with the target language because of the translator's social identity. In this context, the data collected for the operationalization of these three steps aims to: (1) identify the social categories to which the translator belongs, (2) determine which of these categories become salient during the self-translation process, and (3) infer the resulting identity model and level of social identity complexity displayed in that process. The data required for these steps can be obtained through data gathering methods commonly used in Translator Studies, including the analysis of oral and written materials such as biographies, autobiographies, and paratexts, including oral or written interviews and questionnaires conducted with the self-translator.

Where these three steps can be concretely observed in self-translation are the translation strategies employed and the relationship the self-translator establishes with

the target language in which the self-translation is performed, encompassing the fourth and fifth steps.

The fourth step describes the self-translation strategies. The goal here is to trace how the translator's social identity complexity and identity management strategies manifest at the textual level through specific linguistic and stylistic translation choices. In this context, translation strategies are approached not merely as textual choices, but as micro-identity management strategies vis-a-vis the majority. The fifth step describes the position of the target language used in self-translation. This step reveals how language choice operates under salient social identity, reflecting the self-translator's negotiation between his multiple group memberships. At this step, the target language is conceptualized as a symbolic field that reveals which group the self-translators address, which group they align with, and which identity they bring to the fore or keep in the background. Therefore, the relationship established with the target language is interpreted within the framework of the translator's social category memberships, the degree of compatibility between these categories, and the degree of identity complexity.

When these two steps are considered together, it becomes clear how identity management manifests itself at the textual level in the self-translation process. The translator-centered identity analysis developed in the first three steps is transferred to the text in these last two steps, systematically analyzing how the translator's social identity is concretized through translation strategies and language use. The sections below are structured in line with this analytical approach. The focus of the case study is the social identity of Mıgırdıç Margosyan as an intra-national self-translator and the reflections of this identity in his self-translated texts. Margosyan possesses a suitable social identity for studying self-translation at the national level as an in-group member belonging to a Armenian community in Türkiye. The main reason for choosing Margosyan as a case study is that he has a body of work in which the practice of self-translation can be clearly traced at both textual and discursive levels.

In this context, Margosyan's social identity has been examined through the social categories to which he belongs (e.g., ethnic, national, citizenship-based categories); and the relative saliency of these categories in the self-translation process. The data sets was constructed by examining biographical texts, prefaces, and interviews. Subsequently, an analysis made to decide the complexity of social identity of the self-translator based on the prototype and category overlaps or divergencies of the detected social categories. This analysis enables the interpretation of Margosyan's self-translation process as an identity management strategy. Each section below aims to systematically operationalize the analytical framework presented.

3. Operationalization of the Analytical Framework

3.1. Identification of Social Categories and Category Saliency (Step 1 & Step 2)

In the context of this study, the aim is to determine whether the social categories overlap for the relevant self-translator during self-translation and to examine the

reflections of the resulting social identity complexity in self-translation. Accordingly, a thematic analysis was conducted on paratextual and biographical materials such as interviews, prefaces, author statements, and autobiographical narratives to identify Margosyan's social category memberships (citizenship, ethnic, religious, and so on) and the saliency of these memberships. For this purpose, two main analytical codes were employed: Social Category Membership and Self-Categorization. The main codes were determined based on Social Identity Approach.

3.1.1. Identification of Social Categories

The Social Category Membership code is used to identify the social categories to which the self-translator structurally, historically, and biographically belongs, independent of discursively activated identities. This code focuses on revealing category membership rather than self and social identification processes. Within the framework of Social Identity Approach, social identity is understood as relational and multiple rather than singular or fixed. For this reason, Social Category Membership analysis provides the contextual grounding for examining self-identification processes.

These categories are sometimes more readily recognized in social interactions (e.g., ethnicity) and sometimes defined by ideological or institutional frameworks (e.g., profession, national identity, citizenship status). Accordingly, a thematic analysis was conducted on biographical texts to identify the social category memberships of Margosyan. This analysis revealed that Margosyan is structurally included in the Armenian ethnic community, the Armenian Apostolic religious community, the Armenian and Turkish language communities, and Turkish citizenship. Furthermore, the constant references to Diyarbakır in the narratives and the literary construction of Armenian life indicate a localized identity rather than a purely spatial affiliation. These social category memberships form the structural basis for analyzing self-categorization, identity saliency, and identity management processes that emerge in self-translation. In other words, the analysis of social category membership, which constitutes the first step in identifying social identity complexity, becomes meaningful with the second step, the examination of self-categorization.

3.1.2. Analysis of Category Saliency

The use of the 'self-categorization' code in the analysis of saliency is grounded in the theoretical relationship between these two concepts. Within the Social Identity Approach, saliency is not treated as an independent variable, but as an outcome of the self-categorization process. That is, in a given context, individuals categorize themselves in terms of a particular social identity, and this act of self-categorization renders that category salient while backgrounding others. Self-categorization, understood as the process through which the self-translator aligns with particular group memberships, was analyzed thematically based on the identified social categories. The dataset was constructed from two publicly available interviews with Margosyan and the prefaces of the two self-translated texts examined in this study, resulting in a total of 16 entries. The thematic analysis identified four social categories of self-categorization: ethnicity, minority, language, and citizenship. In this study, the social category of ethnicity is

addressed within the framework of religion, culture, ancestry, Armenian identity, and native language elements. In other words, the elements that would enable the self-translator to identify as Armenian were taken as the basis. For the purposes of this study, the social category of minority is conceptualized as an experiential dimension. The social category of language is addressed in the context of being a member of a specific linguistic community. In other words, self-categorization via language, particularly in the context of being a minority group has been evaluated as an in-group membership aimed at understanding how identity is effective in self-translation through language. The citizenship social category is defined as belonging to a state legally and politically. This is evident in the self-translator's statements such as "I am a citizen of the Republic of Türkiye" and "I pay taxes." To show the category memberships in the self-categorization, representative examples of each category membership are presented in the table.

Table 1**Table on Self-Categorization Code*

No	Data	Type of Self-Categorization
1	A: Ama sizin bir Türk isminiz yok, değil mi? M: -Hayır. Babam bu konuda çok hassastı. Biz yedi kardeşlik, hiçbirimize ikinci bir isim kullandırmadı. Burada halen bu var mı? Evet, halen var. A: Kendi adıyla var olma duygusu. M: Evet. İlla Mıgırdıç olsun (...) (Akman, 2010, para.8). (A: But you don't have a Turkish name, do you? M: No. My father was very sensitive about this. There were seven of us siblings, and he did not allow any of us to use a second name. Does this still exist here? Yes, it still does. A: A sense of existing through one's own name. M: Yes. It has to be Mıgırdıç (...)).	Self-categorization via ethnicity
2	G: Kendi kitabının adıyla soruyorum: Söyle Margos nirelisen? M: Ben nireliyem? Herhalde Diyarbakırlıyım, Amedliyim, Hançepekliyim, ama asıl Gavur Mahallesindenim (Gürses, 2018, para.3). (G: I am asking using the title of your own book: <i>Tell me, Margos, where are you from?</i> M: Where am I from? I suppose I am from Diyarbakır, from Amed, from Hançepék—but above all, I am from the <i>Gavur Mahallesi</i>).	Self-categorization via ethnicity
3	M: Benim ana dilim Ermenice olduğu halde 15 yaşına kadar Ermenice bilmiyordum. İstanbul'a geldiğimde başladım yeni yeni Ermenice öğrenmeye. İlk kitabım Ermenice. Mer Ayt Goğmeri. 'Bizim Oralar' diye çevrilen bu kitap daha sonra da 'Gavur Mahallesi' adıyla	Self-categorization via language

* English translations of the Turkish excerpts are provided solely for accessibility purposes.

	yayınlandı. Ben İstanbul'a geldiğim zaman, bilmediğim bu dili belki de bir kompleks gibi çok kısa süre içinde öğrendim. (Gürses, 2018, para. 12).	
	(M: Although my mother tongue is Armenian, I did not know Armenian until I was fifteen. When I came to Istanbul, I gradually began to learn Armenian. My first book was in Armenian, <i>Mer Ayt Goğmeri</i> . This book, translated as <i>Bizim Oralar</i> , was later published under the title <i>Gavur Mahallesi</i> . When I arrived in Istanbul, I learned this language—which I had not known—very quickly, perhaps almost as if it were a kind of complex)	
	M: 'Git oğlum, oku, büyük adam ol. Ana dilimizi öğren!' Ana dilini öğrenmek, büyük adam olmanın birinci kuralıydı ona göre... (Gürses, 2018, para. 15).	Self-categorization via language
4	(M: "Go, my son, study, become a great man. Learn our mother tongue!" Learning one's mother tongue was, in his view, the first rule of becoming a great man.)	
5	M: 50'li yıllarda Diyarbakir'de bir sürü etnik kökenden insanların beraber olduğu bir yerdi Gavur Mahallesi. (Gürses, 2018, para. 6). (In the 1950s, in Diyarbakir, <i>Gavur Mahallesi</i> was a neighborhood, where people from many different ethnic backgrounds lived together	Self-categorization via minority
6	M: Bana Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşı diye bir pasaport, bir nüfus kâğıdı veriyor bu ülke. Vatandaş olarak belli haklarım ve tabii görevlerim var. Ben bu görevlerimi yerine getirebilmek için uğraşıyorum. Askere gidiyorum, vergi veriyorum (...) (Akman, 2010, para. 48). (The country gives me a passport, an identity card for Turkish citizenship. I surely have rights and responsibilities as a citizen. I try my best to fulfill these responsibilities. I do military service, pay taxes.	Self-categorization via citizenship

Accordingly, 8 out of the 15 data belong to the social category of ethnicity, 3 to the social category of minority, 2 to the social category of language, and 2 to the social category of citizenship. Therefore, Margosyan's strongest and most stable self-categorization is built around ethnic identity, whereas the minority category functions more as an experienced position, and the citizenship category as a normative and critical frame of reference. From these perspectives, it can be said that Margosyan developed a high self-categorization with the ethnic social category.

Assuming that self-translation can occur not only in transnational contexts but also within national borders, citizenship social category membership is analytically examined in terms of its effect on the translator's social identity and self-translation practice. Citizenship is conceptualized here as a legal and political form of membership in the context of the modern nation-state; it is evaluated as an institutional identity that does not necessarily overlap with cultural, ethnic, and historical forms of belonging. Therefore, citizenship is not a homogeneous identity category; it is approached as a form of belonging that can intersect, overlap, or diverge with other social category memberships. In the Turkish context, citizenship is conceptualized at the constitutional level as the fundamental category defining national identity. According to Örs and Komsuoğlu (2007), Article 66 of the Constitution of the Republic of Türkiye equates citizenship with 'Turkishness.' However, this definition may increase contextual salience of different social category memberships. In this study, minorities are approached, in line with Valentine's (2004) definition, as communities that are differentiated from the majority society based on characteristics such as language, religion, culture, and historical heritage, and that construct their self-identity around these characteristics. In this sense, Armenians in Türkiye are a historically settled, institutionally recognized, and culturally distinguishable community (Örs & Komsuoğlu, 2007). In Margosyan's example, citizenship as a social category membership does not necessarily coincide with ethnic minority membership; this difference becomes more noticeable in certain contexts and paves the way for the social categories constituting minority identity to become more salient.

3.2. Analysis of Social Identity Complexity (Step 3)

As a result of data analysis, we can clearly state that Margosyan has multiple group memberships, revealing the hybridity and ambivalence of identity, while also referring to the relationship between the relevant group memberships. The degree to which an individual perceives their group memberships to overlap or remain distinct reflects the complexity of their social identity. In this context, Social Identity Complexity (SIC) is interested in overlaps or divergencies between the multiple group memberships of an individual around four models that show how multiple group memberships are subjectively represented in an individual. When these four models are placed on the complexity scale, they range from least to most complex and include the intersection, dominance, compartmentalization, and merger models, respectively.

Intersection refers to the convergence of all group memberships into a single ingroup representation. Dominance involves adopting one primary group identity to which all other memberships are subordinated. Compartmentalization emphasizes the contextual salience of different group memberships, whereby distinct identities become salient in different situations. Finally, the merger model recognizes and embraces multiple non-convergent group memberships simultaneously, defining social identity as the sum of one's combined group identifications. Together, these models indicate varying levels of social identity complexity.

There are two important considerations in determining these models: prototype similarity between categories and category boundaries. In terms of prototypes, if

prototypes are very similar to each other (e.g., in terms of values, norms, and behavioral patterns), the individual perceives these identities as mentally close; if prototypes are different, the individual keeps the identities separate, and the likelihood of experiencing conflict between identities increases. Category boundary overlap, on the other hand, concerns the extent to which the same individuals are perceived as members of multiple in-groups. Rather than focusing on shared characteristics, this dimension addresses how group memberships intersect. When category boundaries overlap significantly, individuals tend to perceive their group memberships as interconnected; when boundaries are distinct, identities are compartmentalized. In short, the overlap between the prototypes and memberships of the social categories affects the complexity of identity. In the simplest terms, the greater the overlap, the lower the complexity, and social identity becomes integrated, whereas divergence between them leads to higher identity complexity.

3.2.1. Analysis of Self-Translator's Social Identity Model

When Margosyan's social categories outlined above are examined in terms of prototypes and membership representations, it is seen that the ethnicity social category is particularly salient, meaning that a high level of identification is developed with this category. The ethnicity category demonstrates a high degree of prototype and membership representation overlap with minority and language categories, while showing a comparatively lower degree of overlap with the citizenship category. This overlap assessment is based on the recurrence, consistency, and co-articulation of category references across interviews and paratextual elements in self-translated texts. However, this does not imply that ethnic identity is fragmented or contradictory within itself; on the contrary, it shows that the ethnicity category functions in high harmony with its subcomponents, such as language, culture, and historical experience. The analysis of interviews, along with paratextual elements in self-translated texts, reveals that Margosyan primarily positions himself through his Armenian identity. Therefore, Margosyan's social self-categorization is closer to a dominance model organized around ethnicity rather than a fragmented or co-centric structure. Moreover, this dominance is not limited to the field of literary production; it also functions as a recurring reference point in political, cultural, and everyday contexts. This suggests that self-translation is not merely an aesthetic choice for Margosyan, but rather an intrinsic form of positioning within his life practices.

Although the low overlap between the citizenship and ethnicity categories might suggest a higher level of social identity complexity, the data indicate that Margosyan seems to organize his identity primarily around ethnicity rather than citizenship. This pattern points to a dominance model, in which one category becomes central in structuring identity boundaries. Accordingly, despite the divergence between certain categories, Margosyan's overall level of social identity complexity remains low. This configuration is also reflected in his self-translation practices. Rather than functioning as a neutral transfer between languages or cultures, self-translation emerges as a form of identity management within national borders, aimed at maintaining and rearticulating a dominant ethnic identity.

Accordingly, self-translation is examined directly in terms of (social) identity. Margosyan's salience of Armenian/ethnic identity and possession of a dominant identity model, coupled with a low level of social identity complexity, make self-translation amenable to examination not only at the international level but also at the national/local level. Margosyan's situation represents an intranational minority identity rather than a transnational one. This identity is shaped not by migration or transnational affiliations, as in the cases of African, Latinx, or immigrant minorities, but by historically rooted sociocultural differences. Therefore, Margosyan's self-translation practice is a representation based on social identity rather than an act aimed at international cultural circulation.

On the other hand, considering that Margosyan has a multicultural, multi-ethnic, and multilingual identity, and that being a minority currently brings diversity, Margosyan may be expected to have a complex social identity. This perspective is surely based on framework of multiculturalism and multilingualism, which is also quite debated in translation studies. Again, a response based on SIC is required:

(S)imultaneous membership in groups that vary in their distinctiveness may result in a representation of the social identity that is dominated by the most distinctive group, and other self-categorizations may be subservient to it. Research on patterns of identities of immigrants supports this reasoning. (Roccas & Brewer, 2002, pp. 96-97)

Thus, in other contexts, merger identity model may occur among self-translators with other multiethnic identities. For example, in contexts where third spaces are created, hyphenated identities persist, and self-translation is discussed within the framework of third spaces, high social identity complexity and the merger model can be expected. It is precisely at this point that this identity-based approach to self-translation repositions self-translation not as a single and fixed form of identity negotiation, but as an identity management strategy that varies according to the level of identity complexity. In the context addressed in this study, self-translation becomes a practice of making visible the dominant identity (in this case, ethnic social identity) that causes self-translation, rather than creating a third space. Therefore, Margosyan's self-translation practice is an intranational identity management strategy rather than an international or diasporic 'third space' experience. In this context, self-translation does not signify an expression of identity convergence but rather the reproduction of the dominant identity.

4. Identification of Self-Translation Strategies (Step 4)

As is clear, this study approaches self-translation as an identity management strategy. In the first phase of the analysis, the salience level of social category memberships was examined; it was determined that Margosyan's ethnic identity, among different group affiliations, became dominant in the literary, political, and social spheres of his life, thus exhibiting a dominant identity model and a pattern of low social identity complexity. Within this framework, while self-translation is an identity management strategy, self-translation strategies are evaluated as micro-identity management strategies used to make the translator's ethnic identity visible and distinct.

When detecting relevant self-translation strategies, two self-translated texts titled *Söyle Margos Nerelisen?* (1995) and *Biletimiz İstanbul'a Kesildi* (1998) have been examined. The reason these two texts are considered self-translations is that the author has rewritten his experiences and daily life, blending Turkish, Armenian, Kurdish, and Arabic into Turkish, the target language. Furthermore, when examining the preface of the self-translated text titled *Biletimiz İstanbul'a Kesildi*, the fact that the three stories in the text were published in Armenian under the title *Mer Ayt Goğmeri* in the Marmara Newspaper and then translated into Turkish by the self-translator is entirely consistent with the classic definition of self-translation, as discussed by Popovic (1976). However, as stated in the preface, "this book should not be perceived as a translation. While remaining faithful to the originals, the author has rewritten the stories in Turkish for this edition, expanding and modifying them in places" (*Margosyan, 1998, p. 7*). For this reason, both texts here correspond to the first self-translation description.

In data gathering, purposive sampling is adopted, where only those textual segments containing interlingual translation (from Armenian to Turkish) or intralingual translation (from regional dialect of Turkish into standardized Turkish), all marked by italicization, quotation or glosses are selected, referring to elements such as religion, culture, and tradition. Textual analysis is employed as the data analysis method. As a result of textual analysis conducted on the data collected, self-translation strategies, as micro identity management strategies, have been determined as interlingual self-translation strategies and intralingual self-translation strategies.

4.1. Interlingual Self-Translation Strategies

Under interlingual translation strategies, it has been observed that Armenian words, expressions, and elements were provided with their Turkish translations. Purposive sampling was chosen as the data collection method, and italicized, quoted, glossed, or footnoted expressions were selected. When the 42 pieces of data collected were examined using textual analysis, three main translation strategies were identified as in-text translation and in-text contextualization, as outlined by Bandia (2008), and explanation via footnote. In-text translation is explicitly translating a foreign element within the text. It is reader-centered and makes the asymmetrical language relationship visible. In-text contextualization is establishing meaning through context rather than directly translating the foreign element. Explanation via footnote involves moving the explanation to the paratext.

Among these, 25 of the data were identified as in-text translation, 10 of the data as in-text contextualization, and 7 of the data as explanation via footnote translation strategies. Reviewing classical translation studies literature, it may be thought that the identified translation strategies are aimed at domestication. However, when these strategies are approached from an identity-based perspective, it becomes apparent that they are not aimed at domesticating representation but at highlighting differences. This stems from the low social identity confusion of the self-translator. In other words, the self-translator is aware of their difference and adopts these translation strategies not to eliminate their own difference, but to represent it, and especially to show that they have their own distinctiveness, even in a national context. How such a perspective is reached

is shown in the table below, based on the collected data. Due to space limitations, two representative examples are provided for each strategy from the interlingual self-translation data set.

Table 2

Table on Interlingual Self-Translation Strategy

No	Data	Interlingual Translation Strategy	Function
1	(...) her gün yediğimiz hatz/ekmek, banır/peynir, ve kilerimizden gizli gizli aşırıldığım çamiç /kuru üzüm, inguyz/ceviz, ayrıca dedrag/defter, madid/kalem, kahana/papaz sözcüklerini hem yazıyor hem de okuyabiliyordum (Margosyan, 1998, p. 27). (I could read and write the words that we used on daily basis such as the hatz/bread that we ate everyday, çamiç/raisin that I sneaked from the cellar, inguyz/walnut, as well as, dedrag/notebook, madid/pen, kahana/priest)	In-text translation	Construction of hierarchy between Armenian and Turkish.
2	Diyarbakır Ermenicesiyle söyledikleri bir de mani öğrenmiştim: Eğçig enunti Eğse Şibeken kızı disse Ego eğçig bek mi dur Eğnem bebuti pese. (...) Tabi ben bu maniyi söylerken sözlerinin aşağı yukarı şu manaya geldiğini nereden bilebilirdim: "Kız senin adın Anna Pencereye baksana Gel kız öpücük ver Damat olam babana" (Margosyan, 1998, p. 25). (I also had learned a poem that was sang in Armenian used in Diyarbakır: Eğçig enunti Eğse Şibeken kızı disse Ego eğçig bek mi dur Eğnem bebuti pese. (...). But how could I had known that these lines meant more or less that: "Girl, your name is Anna. Look at my window, Give me a kiss. Let me be son-in-law to your father.)	In-text translation	Construction of hierarchy between Armenian and Turkish.
3	(...) Onun Ermenice dualarla, "aleluya, aleluya" deyip vaftiz etmesi gerekirken, şimdi durup dururken Ebune Hore Keldanice dua edecek ve de "aleluya, aleluya" yerine "keddişe, keddışe"	In-text contextualization	Emphasizing differences.

	diyecek! Allahtan tek teselli, onun da Hristiyan olması!" (Margosyan, 1995, p. 27). (Although he should have said "aleluya, aleluya" during baptize, Ebune Hore will now pray in Chaldee as "keddişe keddişe"! At least thanks God he is a Christian!)		
4	Bozanların evi, Hañcepek'in, Gavur Mahallesinin sonunda, bizim Moşe, Kürtlerin Cehü, Türkçede Yahudi dediğimiz insanların yaşadığı mahallenin başındaydı. (Margosyan, 1995, p. 92). (The house of Bozans was at the end of Gavur Mahallesi and right next to the neighborhood of Jews, whom we called as Moşe, whom the Kurds called Cehü and Jews as we say in Turkish).	In-text contextualization	Emphasizing differences
5	Sahildeki balıkçı kahvesinden küfürle karışık, ihtiyar Zangoç'un Ermenice ve Türkçe karışımı sözleri sokağa döküldü: "Gela evladıs* gela... Gela mançıs* gela..." (Margosyan, 1998, p. 62). *-ıs: Ermenice birinci tekil şahıs iyelik eki; (evladıs: evladım). *mançıs: Ermenice uğuk(um)." (From the fishermen's coffeehouse by the shore, the curse-laden, mixed Armenian-Turkish words of old Zangoç spilled out into the street: "Gela evladıs* gela... Gela mançıs* gela..." *-ıs: first-person singular possessive suffix (evladıs: my child) in Armenian *mançıs: Armenian uğuk(um)	Explanation via footnote	Maintaining a symbolic boundary between the group the self-translator belongs to and the majority out group.
6	Mir meftunen bılğurov O yar dıle, yar dıle Meçn el suğh bığdınusov O yar dıle, yar dıle..."* * Diyarbakır kökenli Onning Dinkçiyan'ın Ermenice şarkısının ilk dördüğü: "Bizim meftunemiz, yanında bulgur içinde soğan ve de maydanoz..." Müzisyen ve şarkıcı olarak tanınmış olan Oning Dinkçiyan, günümüzde Diyarbakır Ermenicesini eşsiz güzellikte	Explanation via footnote	Maintaining a symbolic boundary between the group the self-translator belongs to and the majority out group.

konuşan ve bu ağzı duru bir biçimde
yaşatan ender insanlardan biridir"
(Margosyan, 1998, p. 99).

(Mir meftunen bılğurov
O yar dile, yar dile
Meçn el suğh bığdınusov
O yar dile, yar dile..."*

*The first quatrain of an Armenian song by Onning Dinkçiyan, originally from Diyarbakır: "Our beloved, accompanied by bulgur with onions and parsley..." Known as a musician and singer, Onning Dinkçiyan is today one of the rare individuals who speaks the Diyarbakır variety of Armenian with exceptional beauty and preserves this dialect in a clear and vivid manner.

Examining the in-text translation dataset, as illustrated in Examples 1 and 2, Margosyan's affiliation with the social category of ethnicity, together with his membership in the minority group, can be observed in his self-translation practices. These examples can be interpreted as suggesting that Armenian functions as the language through which the conceptual framework is initially constructed, while Turkish provides access to this conceptual framework by providing the equivalent of each Armenian lexical item. From this perspective, Turkish can be interpreted as functioning as a mediating language rather than the primary site of meaning construction. Accordingly, this translational practice can be interpreted as positioning Armenian as the primary conceptual frame and Turkish as the language that mediates access to it. Such a configuration may further be interpreted as contributing to the construction of a hierarchical relationship between the two languages.

Examining the in-text contextualization dataset, as can be seen in examples 3 and 4, this strategy does not eliminate, introduce, or provide information about the difference; rather, it serves to emphasize the difference. From the perspective of self-translator social identity, this translation strategy can be interpreted as being consistent with Margosyan's low identity complexity and dominant ethnic category. Accordingly, the practice of self-translation can be understood as being framed by ethnic group affiliation. Examining the dataset of explanation via footnote, as can be seen in examples 5 and 6, this translation strategy also serves to highlight the difference while maintaining distance from the target language and its receiver. Based on the social identity model of the self-translator, although the use of footnotes appears to serve an informative and introductory function on the surface, it essentially functions as a paratext that highlights difference. In this way, the receiver's rhythm is disrupted, and the information provided

does not become a natural component of the narrative. Thus, the symbolic boundary between identities is regulated and maintained. Overall, interlingual self-translation strategies function as micro identity management strategies and frame how the self-translator represents his identity in the target language. Such self-translation, as discussed, primarily concerns the self-translator's subjective representation of their own identity.

Moreover, as shown below, the textual analysis reveals that the relevant micro-identity management strategies place emphasis on “us” as a minority not only on the source language–target language axis but also on the target language–target language axis. The target language–target language axis refers to how the self-translator experiences his social identity as a member of the minority social category not through his mother tongue but through his primary language, Turkish. It means that, then, Turkish plays a dominant role alongside Armenian, where the social category membership of a minority group is emphasized. It has been detected that socio-cultural and ideological elements referring to ‘us as a minority’ have undergone intralingual translation.

4.2. Intralingual Self-Translation Strategies

The intralingual self-translation strategy employed by the self-translator transforms into an identity management strategy that centers the self-translator's ethno-cultural identity by creating a distance not between two linguistic systems but between different cultural positions within the same language community. In short, intralingual translation practice is not merely an intralingual translation act from Turkish to Turkish; it is a way of expressing the group-based concept of “us.” Although the elements translated intralingually are linguistically Turkish, they do not belong to the Turkish majority in terms of cultural ownership; their meaning are encoded within the memory of the minority group. Purposive sampling was chosen as the data collection method, and italicized, quoted, glossed expressions were selected. When the 14 of the data collected were examined through textual analysis, two main translation strategies were identified: In-text translation and in-text contextualization. Out of 14 data collected, 9 data are detected as in-text translation, and data are detected to be in-text contextualization. Due to space limitations, three representative examples are provided for each strategy from the intralingual self-translation data set.

Table 3

Table on Intralingual Self-Translation Strategy

No	Data	Intralingual Translation Strategy	Function
1	(...) kiminden de otlamaya bırakılan eşek, katır ve atların ayaklarına takılan köstek, bizim tabirimizle keyd yapmış, sonra da yorgun argın (...). (Margosyan, 1998, p. 28)	In-text translation	

	(He made tether, or <i>keyd</i> in our terms, for the grazing donkey, mule and horses (...).		
2	(...) hala küçük keklen oğullarıydım. Keklen, yani, henüz altını pislemekten kurtulamamış bir çare çocuk!" (Margosyan, 1998, p.30). (I was their little, <i>keklen</i> boy. Keklen, meaning that a miserable boy, who was still pissing himself).	In-text translation	
3	(...) avluyu sokağa bağlayan "zabok"u, yani dar ve loş koridoru, her zamanki gibi tam on bir adımda geçmişti (Margosyan, 1995, p. 31). (As always, in eleven steps, he paced the "zabok", narrow and lightly-dimmed hallway that intersects the yard to street.)	In-text translation	Construction of "we-ness" and emphasizing the in-group
4	Omzunda hep kocaman bir mendil, bir ""marhama"" taşırdı (Margosyan, 1995, p. 39). (He alwaysed carried a big handkerchief, "marhama" on his shoulder.)	In-text contextualization	
5	Benim gibi birkaç keklenle birlikte Diyarbakır'dan yola çıktığımızda, istasyona kadar bizi yolculamaya, uğurlamaya, gelenler mendil, marhama sallayıp evlerinin yolunu tuttuklarında (...) (Margosyan, 1998, p. 30). (When a few <i>keklen</i> like myself and I set out from Diyarbakır, those who came to see us off as far as the station waved handkerchiefs and <i>marhama</i> and then made their way back to their homes (...).	In-text contextualization	
6	Ağacan Dayı güleç bir adamdı. Çocuklarla şakalaşır, ""hanek"" eder, (...). (Margosyan, 1995, p. 40). (Uncle Ağacan was a cheerful man. He joked with the children, engaging in <i>hanek</i> , (...).	In-text contextualization	

In examples evaluated within the scope of intralingual self-translation strategy, it is observed that lexical elements specific to regional and local Turkish are provided alongside their standard Turkish equivalents. These examples can be interpreted as

suggesting that this practice functions not merely as an explanatory or informative intralingual transfer, but as an identity-driven act. In other words, what is at stake here is not just intralingual rewording; it is an identity performance through which the self-translator situates himself within a specific social, cultural, and geographical position.

Therefore, the transfer of a regional Turkish variant into standard Turkish does not fully correspond to the concept of intralingual translation (rewording) as defined by Jakobson (1959/2004). However, this study approaches translation not only in terms of linguistic distance, but also as the relocation of meaning across socially and normatively differentiated linguistic communities. Within this framework, the movement from regional dialect to standard Turkish, although occurring within the same language system, is conceptualized here as a type of intralingual self-translation practice because it involves a border crossing between two symbolically unequal linguistic domains.

When examining the in-text translation dataset, as shown in examples 1, 2, and 3, the intralingual translation strategy appears to serve a different function than the in-text translation strategy used in interlingual self-translation. While the function of the strategy used in interlingual translation can be interpreted as positioning Armenian as the primary conceptual frame and Turkish as a language that provides access to it, this strategy is deemed to ensure that the local discourse is preserved. Thus, the distinction between 'us' and 'them' is made visible; however, this distinction is not based on a hierarchy of superiority or inferiority, but on the coexistence of different worlds of experience. This structure is consistent with Margosyan's low identity complexity and dominant ethnic category membership, ensuring that the intralingual translation strategies he applies in his self-translation practice are understood through his identity. Examining the in-text contextualization data set, the function of this translation strategy bears similarities to in-text contextualization used in interlingual context. Here too, rather than localizing meaning for the target receiver to facilitate their understanding, differences are made visible, placing the receiver outside the group being described and producing an implicit us/them distinction. These usages, while deviating from standard Turkish, are not marked as deviations within the narrative; rather, they are presented as natural, ordinary, and spontaneous linguistic practices within the self-translator's world. This converges with the low social identity complexity of the self-translator. In this context, the function of both translation strategies has been determined as the 'construction of we-ness and emphasizing the in-group.'

Therefore, this data set provides a strong basis for the assumption that self-translation is practised not only in transnational contexts, where it is considered that "displacement, whether forced or not, acts as a catalyst for self-translation" (Grutman & Van Bolderen, 2014, p. 326), but also by minority groups that are historically settled within state borders and have social continuity. While interlingual self-translation strategies also support this assumption, intralingual self-translation strategies confirm it.

5. Describing the Relation Established with the Target Language (Step 5)

Focusing on social identity complexity in self-translation process brings not only interlingual translation practices but also intralingual translation practices to the fore. This requires examining the relationship the self-translator establishes with the dominant language, which is the target language in the translation. From these perspectives, it is suggested that the self-translator's level of social identity complexity affects how the primary language used as the target language is positioned and used in self-translation. Addressing this relationship constitutes the final step of the analysis. Although no direct translation strategies are analyzed in this step, it provides meaningful data for identity-based analysis.

Within the framework of the dominance identity model, Margosyan's use of Turkish as the target language in his self-translated texts can be examined in relation to his status as a member of the Armenian community. The fact that he writes in Turkish in his self-translations can be considered an identity management strategy to represent himself. Considering his status, the use of Turkish can be seen as a way of life for him. For this reason, the use of Turkish as the target language in self-translation becomes especially important from an identity-based self-translation perspective. During the data collection process, particular attention was paid to expressions that reflected a dialect different from standard Turkish and to expressions that create opposition. As a result of textual analysis, it was observed that the relationship established with Turkish, the target language in self-translation, operated on the following two themes:

- Style Transfer
- Pronoun Alignment

Due to space limitations, three representative examples are provided from the data set.

Table 4

Table on the Position of the Target Language Used in Self-Translation

No	Data	Strategy	Function
1	İki dağın arasında kalmışam Bülbül kimi daldan dala konmuşam Ne gün gördim ne de murad almışam Yazığ bahan, cahal ömrım çürüttım (Margosyan, 1998, p. 12). (I am left between two mountains, I have perched from branch to branch like a nightingale. I have seen no good days, nor have I attained my desire. Poor me—my youthful life has withered away)	Style Transfer	Preservation of differences
2	Zati götürecağtım! Ne vurisan? Zati... (Margosyan, 1998, p. 33)."	Style Transfer	Preservation of differences

	(I was going to take it anyway! Why are you hitting me?)		
3	"Gözün kor olmiya, di hade!" Çocuk, "gözün kör olmasın, hadisene!" sözlerini duymuyor (...). (Margosyan, 1998, p. 32). (May your eyes not go blind—come on!" The child does not hear the words "may your eyes not go blind, (...)"	Style Transfer	Preservation of differences
4	Ben anadilimiz Ermenice'nin harflerini ilk kez hecelelemeye çalıştığımda on üç yaşlarındaydım. (Margosyan, 1998, p. 10)." (I was around thirteen years old when I first tried to spell out the letters of our mother tongue, Armenian).	Pronoun Alignment	Reflection of "we-ness"
5	Ne ki, el ele, diz dize kavun karpuz tarlalarında gezinmelere, bizim oralarda, yani Diyarbakır'da, sadece rüyalarımızda ulaşabiliyorduk. (Margosyan, 1998, p. 46). (Yet hand in hand, knee to knee, wandering through melon and watermelon fields—in our homeland, that is, in Diyarbakır—was something we could reach only in our dreams.)	Pronoun Alignment	Reflection of "we-ness"
6	Bizim oralarda, bizim yörelerde, Diyarbakır'da, Dicle kıyılarında, ulu Tanrı'mızın güneşi, özellikle yaz aylarında güneş olmaktan çıkar (...). (Margosyan, 1995, p. 9) (In our homeland, in our region, in Diyarbakır, along the shores of the Tigris, our great God's sun ceases to be merely the sun, especially during the summer months (...).	Pronoun Alignment	Reflection of "we-ness"

Examining the style transfer dataset, as shown in examples 1, 2, and 3, it can be suggested that the self-translator does not construct a standard Turkish narrative voice. Instead, a regionally, verbally, and ethnically situated speech style is consciously

preserved. These examples can be interpreted to show that the self-translator views the target language not as a communication tool, but as a structure that plays a role in representing identity. Thus, the target language becomes a space where the self-translator maintains his own voice, rather than a structure to which he adapts.

As illustrated in examples 4, 5, and 6, pronoun alignment examples can be interpreted as suggesting that the self-translator's social identity is reflected in the relationship established with the target language during the self-translation process. The groups the self-translator self-categorizes as a member of are reflected in the target language using "we" rather than "I". In this way, the identified dominance identity model becomes visible through pronoun alignment. Expressions such as "our mother tongue," and "in our region" in the target language can be interpreted to shift the narrative from individual memory to collective identity; they remove the place and language from personal experience and turn them into the domain of group identity. From this perspective, the target language can be understood as functioning as a carrier of the self-translator's social identity. Thus, pronoun alignment is suggested to contribute to the construction of 'we-ness' and reinforce the in-group functions observed in self-translation strategies. In this sense, the self-translator's positioning of the target language parallels the translation strategies he employs. From these perspectives, the positioning of the target language, like the self-translation strategies applied, becomes a form of identity management for the self-translator.

6. Conclusion

The data analysis shows that Margosyan's identity is multiple, yet its level of complexity is low, as ethnic identity constitutes the dominant social category. Although he belongs to multiple, sometimes overlapping social categories, this configuration gives rise to self-translation and positions Turkish differently from Armenian. Margosyan's self-translation seems to indicate his social membership, whereby Turkish functions both as a language of citizenship and as a language of contact with the other. Writing in Turkish does not signal identification with a citizenship-based identity; rather, it reflects the continuity of minority identity as an everyday practice shaped by geographical and sociocultural positioning. At the same time, the frequent presence of Armenian words, expressions, and cultural references in self-translated texts indicates that ethnic identity remains dominant and is reproduced textually. Through these practices, Armenian ethnic identity group membership is made visible within the boundaries of the majority language, reflecting identity management associated with low social identity complexity, where the minority voice is preserved at the stylistic level rather than fully aligned with majority language norms, explaining why he does not write in Armenian but in Turkish. Therefore, identity (and its complexity) is one of the reasons to self-translate that is different from the ones suggested by Grutman and Van Bolderen (2014) that "this seems all the more unfortunate since gaining access to a new (and ideally larger) audience is probably the most commonly given reason for translating one's work" (p. 325) or "another motive for resisting self-translation would be the perception that a particular language is inherently suitable to a certain work, thereby rendering other languages unsuitable" and dissatisfaction with the existing translations (p. 325).

The analysis reveals that self-translation strategies serve the purpose of protecting, emphasizing, and making visible the self-translator's membership of an ethnic group. In this way, this study, which goes beyond simply examining self-translated texts, also allows for addressing translation strategies from a different perspective, referring to them as micro-identity management strategies in the self-translation process, based on group identity, group identification, and social identity complexity.

Therefore, the findings of the study present a different perspective on self-translation by transcending classical views in literature, and reframe it as a social-identity driven, meso-level translation practice. Hence, social identity in self-translation should be understood not as an individual or idiosyncratic construct, but as a collective identity shaped by group memberships. In this sense, group belonging plays a determining role in the formation of a 'we' perspective for the self-translator, which is then projected onto self-translation practices through translation strategies and the relationship established with the target language. Moreover, the observed low level of social identity complexity indicates that the use of the majority language cannot be explained simply by assimilation or a desire to identify with the majority. On the contrary, the majority language in self-translation functions as a linguistic space in which the minority sustains its everyday practices and rearticulates its identity vis-à-vis the majority. In this context, addressing self-translation as a social identity-driven act enables us to consider the self-translator not as a mere individual but as a group member, where the collectivity of his identity is traced in the practice. Hence, a different perspective on the representation of minority experience is provided.

This study contributes to Translator Studies by introducing an interdisciplinary, identity-centered analytical framework for examining self-translation. Moving beyond purely text-based approaches, the framework incorporates discursive and paratextual data to foreground the self-translator's social identity and its role in shaping self-translation practices. The findings demonstrate that self-translation cannot be reduced to neutral linguistic transfer but operates as a form of identity management shaped by the self-translator's social identity configuration and level of social identity complexity. In this respect, the study shows that different configurations of social identity may lead to different translation strategies and relations with the target language. Furthermore, by conceptualizing self-translation as an intranational practice, this study challenges the dominant view that associates self-translation primarily with transnational or diasporic contexts. It thus reveals that translation is not a homogeneous phenomenon even within a single national context, but rather a fragmented and multi-layered practice shaped by identity dynamics. Finally, the proposed analytical framework is not limited to this case study and can be applied to different self-translation contexts. Future research may further explore how varying degrees of social identity complexity influence self-translation practices across different linguistic and socio-cultural settings.

Author Contributions

First Author: Ezginaz Emirkadı 50% (literature review, method, theoretical framework, discussion)

Second Author: A. Şirin Okyayuz 50% (literature review, method, theoretical framework, discussion)

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Financial Support: The authors declare that they received no financial support for this study.

Use of Artificial Intelligence: No artificial intelligence (AI)-based or generative AI tools were used in the preparation of this manuscript.

Yazar Katkıları

Birinci Yazar: Ezginaz Emirkadı 50% (literatür taraması, yöntem, kuramsal çerçeve, tartışma)

İkinci Yazar: A. Şirin Okyayuz 50% (literatür taraması, yöntem, kuramsal çerçeve, tartışma)

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazarlar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

Finansal Destek: Yazarlar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

Yapay Zekâ Kullanımı: Bu makalenin hazırlanması sürecinde herhangi bir yapay zekâ tabanlı araç veya üretken yapay zekâ sistemi kullanılmamıştır.

References

- Akman, N (2010.04.2025). Kafes'i duyduğumda 6-7 Eylül'ü hatırladım. Aras Yayıncılık. <https://www.arasyayincilik.com/basindan/kafesi-duyugumda-6-7-eylulu-hatirladim/>
- Bandia, P. (2008). *Translation as Reparation: Writing and Translation in Postcolonial Africa*. Routledge.
- Chesterman, A. (2009). Questions in the sociology of translation. In J. Ferreira Duarte, A. Assis Rosa, & T. Seruva (Eds.), *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines* (pp. 9-27). John Benjamins.
- Gürses, K. G. (2018.09.25). "Diyarbakırlıyım, Amedliyım, Hançepekliyım ama asıl Gavur Mahallesindenim" K24. <https://www.k24kitap.org/diyarbakirliyim-amedliyim-hancepekiyim-ama-asil-gavur-mahallesindenim-1863>
- Grutman, R. & Van Bolderen, T. (2014). Self-translation. In S. Bermann & C. Porter (Eds.). *A Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 323-332). John Wiley and Sons.
- Jakobson, R. (1959/2014). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 113-118). Routledge.
- Kaindl, K. & Evdokimov, M. (2024). Translator studies and translators as social actors. In S. Tyulenev & W. Luo (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Sociology* (pp. 147-162). Routledge.
- Margosyan, M. (1995). *Söyle Margos Nerelisen?*. Aras Yayıncılık.
- Margosyan, M. (1998). *Biletimiz İstanbul'a Kesildi*. Aras Yayıncılık.
- Örs, B. & Komsuoğlu, A. (2007). Turkey's Armenians: A Research Note on Armenian Identity. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 13(3), 405-429.
- Popović, A. (1976). *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. University of Alberta.
- Roccas, S. & Brewer, M.B. (2002). Social Identity Complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 6(2), 88-106.
- Tajfel, H. (1979). Individuals and groups in social psychology. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18. 183-190.

- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In J.T. Jost, & J. Sidanius (Eds.) *Political psychology: Key readings (276-293)*. Psychology Press.
- Turner, J.C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears & B. Dossje (Eds.). *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp.6-34). Blackwell.
- Turner, J.C. & Reynolds, K.J. (2012). Self-categorization theory. In P.A.M. Van Lange, A.W. Kruglanski & E.T. Higgins (Eds.). *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 399-417). Sage Publications.
- Valentine, J.R. (2004). Toward a definition of national minority. *Denver Journal of International Law & Policy*, 32(3), 445-473.