Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies
Vol 11, No 2, 2019, pp. 57-80
http://ijals.usb.ac.ir

Translation Technology Tools and Professional Translators' Attitudes toward Them

Ali Beikian, PhD Candidate, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran, Email: a_beikian@yahoo.co.uk

Saeed Ketabi, Corresponding author, Associate Professor, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran, Email: ketabi@fgn.ui.ac.ir

Akbar Hesabi, Assistant Professor, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran, Email: a.hesabi@fgn.ui.ac.ir

Abstract

Today technology is an integral part of professional translation; and it is generally assumed that translators' attitudes toward translation technology tools influence their interaction with technology (Bundgaard, 2017). Therefore, the present two-phase study seeks to shed some light on what translation technology tools are and how professional translators feel toward them. The research method used is exploratory in nature, as it tends to discuss issues on which little research has been done and relies on secondary research for its data. The data required for answering the first question have been mined utilizing document analysis from language service providers' (LSPs) websites, while the data for working out the answer to the second question have been obtained from *ProZ.com Quick Polls*. Based on our findings, translation technology tools fall into eight broad categories, of which the most commonly used are translation memory (TM) or computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools. In addition, it was found that most translators either do not have a love-hate relationship with technology or love it. This research is envisaged to form the basis of more detailed and conclusive studies.

Keywords: CAT Tools, Machine Translation (MT), Professional Translators; Translation Memory (TM); Technology

Received: October 2018; Accepted: March 2019

1. Introduction

In her blog, Kelly (2014) has mentioned five reasons why translation technology and translators do not always get along: "society's definition of 'translation' has been changed by Google" (para. 4); development of translation tools has largely stagnated (para. 6); translators prioritize quality (para. 8); they are usually isolated from other phases of the translation process (para. 11); and they are often sidelined by translation technology companies (para. 17). She concludes her blog by acknowledging that "*hate* is a strong word, and of course, there are many translators out there who don't exactly hate translation technology - they can *live* with it, but they *don't love* it by any means" (Kelly, 2014, para. 19).

Taking a position similar to that of Kelly (2014), O'Brien (2012), Drugan (2013), Ehrensberger-Dow (2017), Koskinen, and Ruokonen (2017), and Moorkens (2017) argue that translation technology tools have made the translation process more complicated. Along the same vein, Bowker and Fisher (2010), Ehrensberger-Dow (2017), and LeBlanc (2017) contend that CAT software can both have negative effects on the quality of translation and impose unnecessary mental loads on translators. Furthermore, some scholars like Moorkens (2017) and Taivalkoski-Shilov (2019) maintain that the technologization of translation puts professional translators' livelihood at risk since it enables clients to replace professionals by less expensive solutions with faster turnarounds, such as crowd-sourcing and postedited machine translation.

The authors of the present paper, however, believe that the most important reason for translators' failure to get along with technology is their ill-informedness about translation technology tools as well as their purposes, capabilities, and shortcomings. Such ill-informedness can also be perceived on the part of some translation scholars and teachers, who take a position against using technology. In addition, in our view, some clients are also ill-informed

about the purposes, capabilities, and shortcomings of translation technology tools. Therefore, they expect too much of translation technology, thus asking for too fast turnarounds and too low prices.

In light of the foregoing, the present paper addresses the following questions specifically:

1. What are translation technology tools and their purposes?
2. What are professional translators' attitudes toward translation technology tools?

To this end, after a brief review of previous studies regarding translator attitudes toward technology in section 2, we present the design of the study and the method for data analysis in section 3. In section 4, we present the results of the analysis, followed by a discussion in section 5 and some concluding remarks in section 6.

2. Review of the Related Literature

Translators' attitudes toward technology influence their interaction with it (Bundgaard, 2017; Doherty & Moorkens, 2013; Guerberof, Depraetere, & O'Brien, 2012; Hutchins & Somers, 1992; Lange & Bennett, 2000; Teixeira 2014). The most widely used translation technology tool is the translation memory (TM), having been widely used since the late 1990s (Bowker & Barlow, 2008; Garcia, 2007; O'Hagan 2009; Somers 2003). According to Christensen and Schjoldager (2010), TM literature focuses on business and practical aspects such as products, translation rates, copyright, workflow management, and comparisons of different TM systems. They suggest, "While considerable knowledge is available about the technical side of TMs, more research is needed to understand how translators interact with TM technology…." (p. 125). Still, in

the rather scanty literature on translators' attitudes toward technology and how they interact with it, there are some trailblazing studies that contribute to our knowledge in this regard.

Lange and Bennett (2000) observed that translators' productivity may actually be increased by combining TM and machine translation (MT) provided that they feel comfortable with their role as post-editors of machine-controlled translations. The said authors suggest that if the translator is negatively disposed toward MT, such a post-editing process may take longer than human translation. This is while Fulford and Granell-Zafra's (2005) study on U.K. freelance translators' uptake of information and communication technologies found that the translators tended to adopt general-purpose software applications (such as Office applications, desktop publishing software, etc.) more than special-purpose ones (such as TM, MT, and terminology management tools). Like Lange and Bennett (2000), Dillon and Fraser (2006) assert that professional translators using TM and/or having strong information technology (IT) skills seem to have more positive attitudes toward TM. They argue that the non-adoption of TM by some translators is rooted in their unfamiliarity with this technology.

In a similar study, Lagoudaki (2006) reports a survey of the adoption of TM technology and users' attitudes toward TM via an online questionnaire responded by 699 translation professionals from 54 countries. Unlike Fulford and Granell-Zafra's (2005) survey, she found that the uptake of TM technology was considerably high, as 82.5% of the respondents reported that they used a TM system. Lagoudaki asserts that the professionals specializing in technical texts are most likely to use TM tools, followed by those undertaking the translation of financial and marketing materials. Unlike Dillon and Fraser (2006), Lagoudaki did not find any significant difference in TM uptake between

novice and experienced professionals. However, like in Dillon and Fraser's (2006) study, she found that high IT proficiency was linked with high adoption of TM technology. In another study on the usage and benefits of MT-assisted TM, Lagoudaki (2008) reports that inexperienced translators express more favor toward MT, while experienced ones seemed to disfavor it more.

Christensen and Schjoldager (2011) report that student-translators offered negative comments indicating that TM made them think less for themselves and lose control of the translation process. Similarly, Moorkens and O'Brien (2013) and O'Brien and Moorkens (2014) report a high level of dissatisfaction with TM tools among translators and a general suspicion of MT. On the contrary, Guerberof (2013), contends that professional translators generally have a very practical and open attitude toward MT, although some did not like working with it. According to LeBlanc (2013), increased productivity, improved consistency, and the elimination of uninteresting repetitive work are among the advantages of using TM; while sentence-based segmentation, TMs being a barrier to creativity, and their contributing to error propagation constitute the disadvantages of TM technology.

Along the same vein, Bundgaard, Christensen, and Schjoldager's (2016) study on translator-computer interaction demonstrates that TM both aids translators and restrains them. It aids translators by helping them conform to project and client requirements and restrains them due to translators' resistance to the influence of TM tools. In another paper, Bundgaard (2017) asserts that although translators disfavor many aspects of MT, they acknowledge its positive facets, snice they expect that MT will play an important role in their future working lives. She adds that translators' not making many comments about TM may indicate that TM is a part and parcel of the translation process in today's market. Finally, providing an overview of the consequences of the recent

increase in technologization of translation, Taivalkoski-Shilov (2019) believes that the use of TM and interactive MT for literary translation seems to increase in the coming years. In her opinion, literary translators might even benefit from the change provided that all stakeholders include sustainable development in their views on translation quality.

The above-mentioned studies all contribute to our knowledge of translator attitudes toward translation technology tools by highlighting different aspects that professional translators favor and disfavor. The present study seeks to shed some more light on the said tools and their uptake by professional translators.

3. Method

The research method used in this two-phase study is exploratory in nature, as it tends to discuss issues on which little previous research has been done, and it is envisaged to form the basis of more detailed and conclusive studies.

The data required for the first phase of the study were collected by analyzing content from the websites of the top 20 LSP companies. These LSP companies were the ones having been ranked from 1 to 20 in a list of *Top 100 Language Service Providers* (Common Sense Advisory, 2019). The relevant data were mined through document analysis by gathering relevant texts, developing an organization and management scheme, and exploring the content.

As to the second phase of the study, the data were obtained from *ProZ.com Quick Polls,* which are quick, convenient one-question surveys designed to encourage the exchange of information among translators. Site members suggest the polls and ProZ.com staff members vet, authorize, edit, and queue them up. ProZ.com acknowledges that "quick polls are not conducted scientifically and the data gathered should be taken merely as a basis for

discussion or further polls" (ProZ, 2020). Despite this, the data thereof do satisfy the needs of the present study, which is exploratory in nature.

4. Results

4.1. Translation Technology Tools

The first phase of the study was conducted to find out the answer to the first research question as follows:

1. What are translation technology tools and their purposes?

The results of this phase are as follows:

4.1.1. Computer-assisted Translation (CAT) Tools

CAT tools enable translators to build databases of the texts that they have translated for each of their clients and to consult these databases each time they work on new translations. Their primary purpose is to enhance translators' productivity by saving them from re-translating segments whose matches are found in the TM and helping them handle fiddly files. In addition, they increase the quality of the translation by providing tools such as editors, glossaries, QA checkers, and TM in a single integrated environment. These tools have evolved along with the computing and networking industries from stand-alone tools used on a single computer to server-based ones using a company network as their platform and, more recently, to cloud-based tools equipped with TM, MT, terminology management systems, project workflow management systems, and quality assurance tools.

4.1.2. Terminology Management Systems

When it comes to using TM, terminology management also comes to the fore. Most translation projects involve a rather high number of terms which need to be managed systematically. In other words, they have to be stored, translated, and shared accurately and consistently. Failure to manage terminology systematically can lead to inconsistent and, thus, inaccurate translations. Terminology management systems enable users to create and manage glossaries by providing access to all those involved with applying terminology and ensuring accurate, consistent, and high-quality content from source text production to the provision of finalized translation.

4.1.3. Translation Quality Assurance (TQA) Tools

TQA software products assist in identifying common mistakes in translations by analyzing target segments against their corresponding source segments and recording all suspicious segments in the form of a QA report. Then, upon reviewing the QA report, the user decides whether those suspicious segments really contain mistakes or not. Typical mistakes detected by TQA tools are as follows: different ending punctuation marks; spelling mistakes; case (lowercase, Uppercase, CamelCase, and ALLUPPERCASE) issues; formatting tags; double spaces, spaces before punctuation marks, and trailing spaces; incorrect decimal separators, numbers, and measurement units; inconsistency between source segments and their corresponding target segments in terms of abbreviations, acronyms, etc.; inconsistent translations for the same source segment; the same translation for different source segments; untranslated segments; terms not translated consistently with the glossary; character

limitations and forbidden characters; and incorrect brackets and quotation marks.

4.1.4. Translation and Localization Project Management (TLPM) Systems

Being at the heart of everything which happens in an LSP company, project managers link customers, contractors, freelancers, partners, and internal stakeholders. The typical project manager handles each translation and/or localization project through a seven-step process as follows: a) handling the customer's request; b) preparing the project; c) finding freelancers; d) executing the translation or localization; e) assuring quality; f) delivering the project to the customer; and g) managing the financial affairs related to the project. Modern TLPM systems help project managers by automating the following sub-steps: receiving the request, calculating the word count, preparing a quote, checking additional requirements, removing sensitive data, pre-processing and analyzing the files, calculating internal statistics, planning internal deadlines, checking freelancers, monitoring progress, handling questions from freelancers, avoiding missed deadlines, reusing historical data before the process, controlling quality during the process, learning lessons after the process, handling customer complaints, preparing completed files, delivering the result, calculating volume-based and hourly payables, getting paid by the customer, and paying freelancers.

4.1.5. Audio-video Transcription Tools

LSPs usually receive requests for three types of transcription services: basic same language transcription, standard translated transcription, and source-target transcription. More often than not, transcriptions need to be timestamped to identify the exact point in an audio or video where the given text was spoken.

Audio-video transcription tools help users to automatically or semi-automatically transcribe audio and video files and convert them into searchable, editable, and interactive transcripts. They are usually equipped with a vocabulary builder which enables users to upload custom lists of words for the software to learn. In addition, they can be set up to account for multiple accents and trained to recognize voices in the interests of improving the overall accuracy of transcripts. Last but not least, they have facilities for automatic or semi-automatic timestamping.

4.1.6. Subtitling and Captioning Tools

Subtitling involves several phases: a) pinpointing the input and output times of the subtitles synchronized with the sound; b) translating from the source language and adapting it to the text character limits and the timing of the subtitles; c) previewing subtitles applied to the video image and sound and verifying that all criteria are met; and d) revising the text. Captions are of particular use to deaf and/or hard-of-hearing individuals, since they supplement for other relevant parts of the soundtrack that need describing. Subtitling and captioning tools are efficient in creating, adjusting, and synchronizing subtitles and captions. Most of them are equipped with multi-language spell checkers, reading and writing engines, and other customizing tools. Moreover, they provide users with features such as basic text formatting, multiple subtitling modes, importing and exporting subtitle formats, keyboard shortcuts, network suggestions, speed indicators, and automatic subtitling and captioning.

4.1.7. Controlled Authoring Tools

Controlled authoring tools, which are used even before translation begins, maximize the quality and consistency of the source text. These tools provide such key features as spellcheck and grammar correction, terminology management, brand protection, and source text pre-editing and its preparation for machine translation.

4.1.8. Machine Translation (MT) Software

Machine translation comes handy when users are on too tight a budget to afford human translation, look for immediate translation, and/or feel satisfied with a less-than-perfect quality. Among other users of machine translation are LSPs, who leverage machine translation to improve productivity for professional translators; governments, who use machine translation as part of their monitoring activities; enterprises, who use customized machine translation for customer support and data mining; and law firms, who use machine translation in their eDiscovery processes. Faster turnaround time, lower price, and the possibility of adding a human review to improve the quality, using TMs to remember key terms, and integrating machine translation with cloud-based TMs are among the strengths of machine translation.

4.2. Professional Translators' Attitudes toward Technology

The second phase of the study was conducted in order to find out the answer to the second research question as follows:

2. What are professional translators' attitudes toward translation technology tools?

Since the area of translation technology is too broad to be included in one paper, only the results of the quick polls aimed at investigating professional translators' attitudes toward the most common translation technology tools, namely IT, TM, and MT, are provided here. It is noteworthy that the list of archived polls contained over 60 polls on the aforementioned three areas; however, only the results of 34 most relevant ones are presented here.

The findings of this phase of the study are presented in Tables 1 to 3 below. The data provided about each quick poll in the aforesaid tables comprise the poll itself (question, link to the poll, and responses), the number of responses, and the percentage of each response. Table 1 shows the professional translators' uptake of information technology (IT).

Table 1. *Professional Translators' Uptake of Information Technology (IT)*

Questions	Responses
1. Do you have a love-hate relationship with technology (computers, CAT tools, etc.)?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/11237?action=results&poll_ident=11237&sp=polls	***1349 Responses***
Yes	*34.20%*
No, just love	*29.30%*
No	*28.80%*
Other - N/A	*3.90%*
No, just hate	*3.80%*
2. Do you think that new advances in technology will reduce the need for human translation?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/14303?action=results&poll_ident=14303&sp=polls	***1259 Responses***
Yes, to a point	*44.60%*
No	*42.50%*
Yes, definitely	*6.50%*
I don't know	*5.30%*
Other - N/A	*1.10%*
3. Would you still be a translator without the aid of the Internet and PC?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/4951?action=results&poll_ident=4951&sp=polls	***1716 Responses***
I would have to reconsider	*37.80%*
Yes, definitely	*33.90%*

No way	*25.40%*
Other - N/A	*2.90%*
4. Can you imagine your life as a translator without the Internet?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/5423?action=results&poll_ident=5423&sp=polls	***1683 Responses***
No	*75.50%*
Yes	*12.10%*
I'm not really sure	*7.80%*
I've never thought about it	*2.60%*
Other - N/A	*2.00%*
5. Could you have completed your last project without an Internet connection?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/13094?action=results&poll_ident=13094&sp=polls	***1168 Responses***
No	*57.40%*
Yes, but quality would have suffered	*23.50%*
Yes, with about the same quality	*15.20%*
Other - N/A	*3.90%*
6. Do you only work via the internet or do you have clients that come to your office as well?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/13096?action=results&poll_ident=13096&sp=polls	***1180 Responses***
Only via internet	*81.40%*
Clients also come to my office	*12.70%*
Other - N/A	*5.80%*

Professional translators' adoption of translation memory (TM), or CAT tools, has been depicted in Table 2.

Table 2. *Professional Translators' Adoption of TM (CAT Tools)*

Questions	Responses
1. Do you use CAT tools? What is your age range?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/archived?poll_id_link=468	***1365 Responses***
I do, I'm below 40	*49.50%*
I don't, I'm below 40	*20.80%*
I do, I'm over 40	*20.40%*
I don't, I'm over 40	*9.40%*
2. Are you a technical translator? Do you use CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/archived?poll_id_link=1059	***1379 Responses***
I am, I do	*50.70%*
I am not, I do	*17.80%*

I am, I do not	*16.90%*
I am not, I do not	*14.60%*
3. How long have you been translating professionally? Do you use CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/1061?action=results&poll_ident=1061&sp=polls	***1364 Responses***
More than 3y, Yes	*51.20%*
More than 3y, No	*21.60%*
Less than 3y, Yes	*17.10%*
Less than 3y, No	*9.60%*
I'm not a translator	*0.50%*
4. Do you use CAT tools on a regular basis?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/10534?action=results&poll_ident=10534&sp=polls	***1342 Responses***
Yes	*65.60%*
No	*31.90%*
Other - N/A	*2.50%*
5. How long did it take you to learn to use CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/10004?action=results&poll_ident=10004&sp=polls	***1299 Responses***
< 1 week	*36.00%*
I don't use CAT tools	*20.10%*
1 - 2 weeks	*17.90%*
Other - N/A	*8.70%*
3- 4 weeks	*6.90%*
> 3 months	*6.00%*
1 - 3 months	*4.50%*
6. Has your investment in CAT tools paid off?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/14767?action=results&poll_ident=14767&sp=polls	***1243 Responses***
Yes, definitely	*54.60%*
Yes, to some extent	*16.30%*
I don't use CAT tools	*14.60%*
No	*7.90%*
Other - N/A	*6.60%*
7. Do CAT tools increase your translation output?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/13834?action=results&poll_ident=13834&sp=polls	***1189 Responses***
Yes, definitely	*46.50%*
Yes, sometimes	*28.40%*
I don't use a CAT tool	*13.30%*
No, not really	*7.70%*
No, definitely not	*2.40%*

Other - N/A	*1.80%*
8. Do you think CAT tools improve the quality of translations?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/9545?action=results&poll_ident=9545&sp=polls	***1801 Responses***
No, not necessarily	*56.20%*
Yes	*35.30%*
I have no idea	*5.90%*
Other - N/A	*2.50%*
9. Do you think that CAT tools could lead you to a more literal translation?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/archived?poll_id_link=1350	***1052 Responses***
No	*32.80%*
Sometimes	*27.10%*
Yes	*21.20%*
I don't know	*15.10%*
N/A	*3.90%*
10. Does using CAT tools increase work opportunities?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/7265?action=results&poll_ident=7265&sp=polls	***1756 Responses***
Yes	*74.00%*
No	*15.30%*
Other - N/A	*10.70%*
11. How have CAT tools affected your income?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/794?action=results&poll_ident=794&sp=polls	***984 Responses***
My income has increased	*39.40%*
No effect	*29.50%*
I don't know	*26.30%*
My income has decreased	*4.80%*
12. How dependent are you on CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/14923?action=results&poll_ident=14923&sp=polls	***1273 Responses***
I use them all the time	*32.80%*
I use them most of the time	*30.10%*
I use them rarely/never	*18.10%*
I use them some of the time	*15.50%*
Other - N/A	*3.50%*
13. Do you think knowledge of CAT tools is essential for a translator?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/13793?action=results&poll_ident=13793&sp=polls	***1314 Responses***
Yes, definitely	*42.20%*
No, not really	*20.90%*
Yes, perhaps	*16.90%*

It depends	*11.10%*
No, definitely not	*8.00%*
Other - N/A	*0.90%*
14. Which best reflects your opinion of CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/15664?action=results&poll_ident=15664&sp=polls	***773 Responses***
CAT tools are great, I'm glad I use them	*49.50%*
Sometimes CAT tools are helpful	*28.50%*
I don't know, I've never used one	*6.20%*
I dislike using them	*5.30%*
I refuse to use CAT tools	*4.00%*
They're necessary, but I'd prefer not to use one	*3.90%*
Other - N/A	*2.60%*
15. What is your honest feeling regarding CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/8482?action=results&poll_ident=8482&sp=polls	***1587 Responses***
I like some, but dislike others	*31.20%*
I love them	*25.20%*
I don't like them but I put up with them	*14.00%*
Indifferent	*13.40%*
I hate them	*10.00%*
Other - N/A	*6.20%*
16. If it is not specified [by the client], do you prefer using CAT tools when translating?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/5794?action=results&poll_ident=5794&sp=polls	***1937 Responses***
Yes	*59.00%*
No	*33.40%*
Other - N/A	*7.60%*
17. Have any of your clients ever specifically asked you not to use CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/10925?action=results&poll_ident=10925&sp=polls	***1345 Responses***
No	*74.60%*
Yes	*20.90%*
Other - N/A	*4.50%*
18. How much do you spend on CAT tools and their upgrades annually in USD?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/8515?action=results&poll_ident=8515&sp=polls	***1440 Responses***
< 500	*63.60%*
Other - N/A	*29.00%*
500-999	*6.00%*
1000-2000	*0.80%*

> 2000	*0.60%*
19. How often do you update your CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/8579?action=results&poll_ident=8579&sp=polls	***1102 Responses***
When my current CAT tool becomes outdated	*33.20%*
I don't use CAT tools	*23.30%*
Whenever there is a new update	*18.10%*
Never	*10.50%*
Other - N/A	*8.90%*
Every other year	*3.30%*
Every year	*2.80%*
20. Is it fair for agencies to request freelance translators have specific CAT tools?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/8543?action=results&poll_ident=8543&sp=polls	***1813 Responses***
Yes	*34.70%*
No	*33.80%*
It depends	*29.20%*
Other - N/A	*2.30%*

Finally, Table 3 shows whether professional translators favor or disfavor machine translation (MT).

Table 3. *Professional Translators' Attitudes toward MT*

Questions	Responses
1. Do you ever use machine translation?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/15586?action=results&poll_ident=15586&sp=polls	***773 Responses***
No	*55.90%*
Yes, but not professionally	*19.40%*
Yes, for professional purposes	*17.70%*
Other - N/A	*7.10%*
2. Do you use machine translation to do a first draft?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/8978?action=results&poll_ident=8978&sp=polls	***1708 Responses***
No	*72.00%*
Yes, sometimes	*12.30%*
No, but I've been meaning to give it a try	*8.40%*
Yes, always	*5.30%*
Other - N/A	*2.00%*
3. Would you pay to use MT software if it were customized for your areas of expertise?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/14386?action=results&poll_ident=14386&sp=polls	***1128 Responses***
No	*67.70%*

Yes	*18.60%*
Other - N/A	*10.80%*
I already do	*2.80%*
4. Do you accept assignments to post-edit machine translations?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/14194?action=results&poll_ident=14194&sp=polls	***1309 Responses***
No	*67.20%*
Yes, but at a higher rate than proofreading	*13.30%*
Yes	*11.20%*
Other - N/A	*8.40%*
5. Do you think machine translation will significantly reduce the need for human translation?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/12020?action=results&poll_ident=12020&sp=polls	***1600 Responses***
No, absolutely not	*55.20%*
Perhaps	*25.80%*
Yes, definitely	*10.90%*
I don't know	*6.20%*
Other - N/A	*1.90%*
6. Will machine translation ever replace human translators?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/8008?action=results&poll_ident=8008&sp=polls	***1961 Responses***
No, never	*69.00%*
I don't know	*19.80%*
Yes	*7.80%*
Other - N/A	*3.40%*
7. Do you feel threatened by machine translation?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/15092?action=results&poll_ident=15092&sp=polls	***1231 Responses***
No	*66.00%*
Yes, to some extent	*28.90%*
Yes, definitely	*3.70%*
Other - N/A	*1.50%*
8. Machine Translation: a translator's friend or foe?	
http://www.proz.com/polls/10300?action=results&poll_ident=10300&sp=polls	***1833 Responses***
Foe	*42.80%*
I don't know yet	*28.10%*
Friend	*20.40%*
Other - N/A	*8.70%*

5. Discussion

Based on the aforementioned quick poll results and what was said about various translation technology tools and their purposes, it can easily be concluded that most professional translators actually not only *do not hate* technology, rather they *love* it. They use technology to support the entire process of translation. To begin with, they avail themselves of speedy computers to run the many software programs that they use. They use the Internet for marketing their services, sending and receiving documents, and searching large online corpora to find the most accurate, natural, adequate, and clear equivalents fitting the contexts of the document being translated.

The technology which they use helps them to translate faster and be more productive. CAT tools help translators build databases of the texts that they have translated for each of their customers; therefore, they can consult these databases each time they work on new translations for them. This means that in addition to being saved from the labor re-translating the segments whose matches are found in the TM, they can keep track of their specific terminology and ensure that their translations are consistent.

TQA tools increase productivity, catch common errors, and encourage the use of consistent style and terminology; and TLPM systems reduce the load of work imposed on project managers, who are at the heart of everything which happens in an LSP company.

Translation technology helps translators to provide solutions for their customers and meet their needs. It helps them deal with fiddly files and tricky file types involved in desktop publishing (DTP), localization, audiovisual translation, transcreation, and linguist validation projects. For example, SDL Trados 2019, a famous instance of CAT tools, can support up to 41 various type files, most of which are too thorny to handle without the help of CAT tools. If a

customer needs a web page edited, an InDesign document translated, or a game or software localized, any translator using the relevant tools tailored for such purposes can simply do this.

Even in the case of machine translation, which some translators consider their foe, it can be said that translators should feel absolutely delighted with it. By looking through rose-colored glasses, we can see that free online translation has made it much easier for businesses to find possible partners and customers around the world. These businesses are translators' customers, so translators should be glad that their customers are now more able to make connections internationally across cultures and languages. Businesses that use free online translation also quickly see the limitations of MT and understand that human translation is necessary for their key business communications. Last but not least, because translators are such big users of technology, they sometimes complain when translation tools do not work as they should or do not meet their needs. Still, this does not mean that they *hate* technology – it means that they want it to be even better. To put it in a nutshell, technology, if looked at from the right angle, makes translators fall in love with translating.

6. Conclusion

Inspired by Kelly's (2014) blog, where she has mentioned five reasons why translation technology and translators do not always get along, the authors of the present paper decided to conduct this exploratory study. While partly agreeing to the reasons Kelly has mentioned for some of the translators' failure to get along with translation technology, the authors contend that the most important reason for such a failure is ill-informedness about the nature of translation technology tools as well as their purposes. This entailed that the most commonly-used translation technology tools and their applications, capabilities,

and limitations be mentioned. Having explained the foregoing, the authors concluded that the said tools are only aids to human translators and are not meant to replace them. In the second part of the paper, it was argued that despite what Kelly maintains, most translators either do not have a love-hate relationship with translation technology tools or love it. They use such tools for speeding up and facilitating the process of translation, meeting, and even exceeding their clients' ever-growing demands, improving the quality of their work, and making translation even more enjoyable. This study was explanatory in nature, and it was intended to motivate translation studies researchers and scholars to expand the realm of their studies to such areas and conduct more detailed studies on them.

References

Bowker, L. & Barlow, M. (2008). A comparative evaluation of bilingual concordances and translation memory systems. In E. Yuste Rodrigo (Ed.), *Topics in language resources for translation and localization* (pp. 1-22). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bowker, L., & Fisher, D. (2010). Computer-aided translation. In Y. Gambie, r & L. Van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies online* (pp. 27-49). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bundgaard, K. (2017). Translator attitudes towards translator-computer interaction-findings from a workplace study. *HERMES-Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, *56*, 125-144.

Bundgaard, K., Christensen, T. P., & Schjoldager, A. (2016). Translator-computer interaction in action: An observational process study of computer-aided translation. *Journal of Specialised Translation, 25,* 106-130.

Christensen, T. P. & Schjoldager, A. (2010). Translation-memory (tm) research: what do we know and how do we know it? *HERMES-Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, *44*, 89-101.

Christensen, T. P. & Schjoldager, A. (2011). The impact of translation memory (tm) technology on cognitive processes: Student-translators' retrospective comments in an online questionnaire. In B. Sharp, M. Zock, M. Carl, & A. L. Jakobsen (Eds.), *Human-machine Interaction in Translation* (pp. 119-130). Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.

Common Sense Advisory (2019). *The top 100 language service providers: 2019*. CSA Research. https://csa-research.com/More/Featured-Content/Global-Market-Study/Top-100-LSPs

Dillon, S., & Fraser, J. (2006). Translators and TM: An investigation of translators' perceptions of translation memory adoption. *Machine Translation, 20*(2), 67-79.

Doherty, S., & Moorkens, J. (2013). Investigating the experience of translation technology labs: Pedagogical implications. *Journal of Specialised Translation, 19*, 122-136.

Drugan, J. (2013). *Quality in professional translation: Assessment and improvement*. London: Bloomsbury.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2017). An ergonomic perspective of translation. In J. W. Schwieter, & A. Ferreira (Eds.), *The handbook of translation and cognition* (pp. 332-349). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Blackwell.

Fulford, H., & Granell-Zafra, J. (2005). Translation and technology: A study of UK freelance translators. *Journal of Specialized Translation 4*, 2-17.

Garcia, I. (2007). Power-shifts in web-based translation memory. *Machine Translation, 21*, 55-68.

Guerberof, A. (2013). What do professional translators think about post-editing. *Journal of Specialised Translation, 19*, 75-95.

Guerberof, A., Depraetere, H., & O'Brien, S. (2012). What we know and what we would like to know about post-editing. *Revista Tradumàtica*, *10*, 211-218.

Hutchins, W. J., & Somers, H. L. (1992). *An introduction to machine translation*. London: Academic Press.

Kelly, N. (2014, August 19). *Why so many translators hate translation technology.* HuffPost [Online]. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/why-so-many-translators-h_b_5506533

Koskinen, K., & Ruokonen, M. (2017). Love letters or hate mail: Translators' technology acceptance in the light of their emotional narratives. In D. Kenny (Ed.), *Human issues in translation technology: The IATIS yearbook* (pp. 8-24). London: Routledge.

Lagoudaki, E. (2006, November 25). *Translation memories survey 2006. translation memory systems: Enlightening users' perspective*. Imperial College London [online]. http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/portal/pls/portallive/docs/1/7307707.PDF

Lagoudaki, E. (2008, October). The value of machine translation for the professional translator. In *Proceedings of the 8th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas* (pp. 262-269). Waikiki, Hawaii.

Lange, C. A., & Bennett, W. S. (2000). Combining machine translation with translation memory at Baan. In R. C. Sprung & S. Jaroniec (Eds.), *Translating into success* (pp. 203-218). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

LeBlanc, M. (2013). Translators on translation memory (TM): Results of an ethnographic study in three translation services and agencies. *Translation and Interpreting, 5*(2), 1-13.

LeBlanc, M. (2017). 'I can't get no satisfaction!' Should we blame translation technologies or shifting business practices? In D. Kenny (Ed.), *Human issues in translation technology: The IATIS yearbook* (pp. 64-81). London: Routledge.

Moorkens, J. (2017). Under pressure: Translation in times of austerity. *Perspectives, 25*(3), 464-477.

Moorkens, J., & O'Brien, S. (2013). User attitudes to the post-editing interface. In S., O'Brien, M., Simard, & L. Specia (Eds.), *Proceedings of MT summit XIV workshop on post-editing technology and practice* (pp. 19-25).

O'Brien, S., & Moorkens, J. (2014). Towards intelligent post-editing interfaces. In W. Baur, B., Eichner, S., Kalina, N., Keßler, F., Mayer, & J., Ørsted (Eds.), *Man vs Machine? Volume I: Proceedings of the XXth FIT World Congress* (pp. 131-137).

O'Hagan, M. (2009). Computer-aided translation (CAT). In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 48-51). London & New York: Routledge.

O'Brien, S. (2012). Translation as human–computer interaction. *Translation Spaces*, *1*(1), 101-122.

Somers, H. (2003). *Computers and translation: A translator's guide*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, K. (2019). Ethical issues regarding machine (-assisted) translation of literary texts. *Perspectives, 27*(5), 689-703.

Teixeira, C. (2014). *The impact of metadata on translator performance: How translators work with translation memories and machine translation.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universität Rovira i Virgili and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.