1. How was the quality of the existing output by DeepL? Try to be specific.

It was not as bad as I had expected. I expected a google translate kind of translation, however DeepL managed to give quite accurate translations. It managed to change most of the sentence structures of the translation fitting to the target language and it even got certain typical Dutch phrases such as ‘gezellig’ and using the word ‘er’. It seemed very natural as if it was a human translation rather than a machine translation.

2. What was the nature of the changes you had to make? Try to be specific. For

example, lexical changes and the nature of them or syntactical changes and the

nature of them. Provide examples.

Most were syntactical changes so congruency of adjectives and the nouns. Think of ‘hele goede man’ instead of ‘heel goede man’. Other changes that were made were some lexical changes of words that had double meanings so ‘stilletjes staan’ might mean stand still or standing motionless.

3. What resources did you use for the translation and post-editing? Refer here to

linguistic resources, anything from dictionaries to websites to parallel corpora.

I used the monolingual dictionaries, for English the Collins and for Dutch the Encyclo. Furthermore, I used Google to look up expressions. I used Google translate to translate single words for the translation such as hoot.

4. In your opinion, which of three translations was the fastest to produce? Why do

you think this was?

I think that the editing translations were the fastest. It took me longer time to look up a translation for, for example, hoot. When I had the list of possible translations, I still had to go through them to see which ones would fit into the context and had the correct connotation and denotation. After translating I also need to post-edit which is not necessary for the texts that were already translated. With the post-editing texts, I only had to look at certain abnormalities.

5. Are you satisfied with the final quality? You can mention the time given as a

factor.

I took about the same time for the three different texts and I am more satisfied with the texts that were translated by DeepL than the text I had to translate myself. I had more time to look at the things that needed to be edited because those texts were already translated.

6. Which of the three translations are you the happiest with? Why?

I am the happiest with the second text. I feel that it is the most accurate translation while it not being a literal translation. I feel that it reads the most comfortable as well.

7. Did you like using MT as part of the translation process?

I liked it a lot, it made the search process a whole lot easier and efficient. MT also provides me different alternative translations that I wouldn’t immediately think of, and it is a lot faster than looking things up in a dictionary.

8. How was translating different from post-editing?

I feel that with translation, I focus on different aspects. First of all, I focus on providing a translation. Second, I focus on stylistic quality of my translation. I am constantly rethinking of how it reads to the reader. With post-editing I am looking closer at lexical and linguistic mistakes and whether those factors are correct in the target language and target culture.