



Proceedings of the
**21st Annual Conference of
the European Association
for Machine Translation**

28–30 May 2018
Universitat d'Alacant
Alacant, Spain

Edited by

Juan Antonio Pérez-Ortiz
Felipe Sánchez-Martínez
Miquel Esplà-Gomis
Maja Popović
Celia Rico
André Martins
Joachim Van den Bogaert
Mikel L. Forcada

Organised by



Universitat d'Alacant
Universidad de Alicante

transducens
research group



The papers published in this proceedings are —unless indicated otherwise— covered by the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 International (CC-BY-ND 3.0). You may copy, distribute, and transmit the work, provided that you attribute it (authorship, proceedings, publisher) in the manner specified by the author(s) or licensor(s), and that you do not use it for commercial purposes. The full text of the licence may be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/deed.en>.

© 2018 The authors

ISBN: 978-84-09-01901-4

Perception vs. Acceptability of TM and SMT Output: What do translators prefer?

Pilar Sánchez-Gijón

Grup Tradumàtica

Dept. de Traducció i d'Interpretació i
d'Estudis de l'Àsia Oriental

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

pilar.sanchez.gijon@uab.cat

Joss Moorkens

ADAPT Centre

School of Computing

Dublin City University, Ireland

joss.moorkens@dcu.ie

Andy Way

ADAPT Centre

School of Computing

Dublin City University, Ireland

andy.way@computing.dcu.ie

Abstract

This paper reports the results of two studies carried out with two different groups of professional translators to find out how professionals perceive and accept SMT in comparison with TM. The first group translated and post-edited segments from English into German, and the second group from English into Spanish. Both studies had equivalent settings in order to guarantee the comparability of the results. It will also help to shed light upon the real benefit of SMT from which translators may take advantage.

1 Introduction

Machine Translation (MT) remains unpopular among translators. Even though MT seems to be rejected because of its lack of quality, translators may be reluctant to use MT for many other reasons (Ferrerias, 2017). This paper tries to approach translators' perception of SMT raw output in comparison with TM.

For that purpose, two different studies were carried out. The first one involved seven professional translators (Moorkens and Way, 2016). They were asked to rate 60 English-German translated segments. 30 of them were segments from a domain-appropriate TM, but without the quality threshold being set. The other 30 segments were translated through an SMT system. This study was replicated (Rico, Sánchez-Gijón and Torres-Hostench) with professional translators from English to Spanish.

2 Aim of this proposal

This paper aims to determine whether translators' reluctance to use MT correlates their preferences choosing translation suggestions. The research questions that will be addressed in this paper are:

- Do translators edit any MT translation proposal if it is available?
- Do translators prefer TM high fuzzy matches (up 85%) than MT proposals when there is no information about their origin (i.e., proposals are presented without any metadata)?
- Are there any difference in their preferences between EN-DE and EN-ES translators?
- Is the methodology of these studies suitable to measure MT degree of acceptance in comparison to TM while translating or post-editing?

Results will show that, in fact, MT acceptance increases when translation proposals are presented without metadata.

References

- Ferrerias, Olga. 2017. *La satisfacción de los usuarios con la traducción automática*. Masters' Dissertation, Màster Traduàtica: Traducció i Tecnologies, UAB, July 2017.
- Moorkens, J., and Way, A 2016. *Comparing Translators Acceptability of TM and SMT Outputs*. Baltic J. Modern Computing, 4(2):141-151.
- Rico, C., Sánchez-Gijón, P., and Torres-Hostench, O. (2018). The Challenge of Machine Translation Post-editing: An Academic Perspective. *Trends in E-Tools and Resources for Translators and Interpreters*, Brill: 203-218.

© 2018 The authors. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons 3.0 licence, no derivative works, attribution, CC-BY-ND.