

The Translator's Profession from a Sociological Point of View

Evanthia Saridaki

Received:02-05-2026

Accepted:08-06-2026

Published:26-10-2026

Abstract: Translation is far more than the mechanical transfer of meaning from one language to another. It is a socially embedded practice shaped by institutions, power relations, cultural norms, and economic structures. From a sociological perspective, the translator's profession can be understood as a dynamic field in which individuals negotiate identity, authority and legitimacy while operating within broader systems of globalization, technology, and cultural exchange. The research explores the translator's profession through key sociological frameworks, including professionalization theory, Pierre Bourdieu's field theory, the sociology of work and globalization studies. It examines how translators construct their professional identities, how their labor is valued (or undervalued), and how technological and institutional changes are reshaping the field. It further develops the discussion through case studies, particularly within the European Union and literary translation, to illustrate how translators navigate institutional frameworks and cultural hierarchies. The central argument is that translators occupy an ambivalent position: they are highly skilled cultural mediators whose work is essential in a globalized world, yet they often face low visibility, precarious working conditions and limited professional recognition. Thus, by analyzing the profession sociologically, we can better understand both its structural constraints and its evolving opportunities.

Keywords: the sociology of work, translators as cultural mediators, the translator's profession, professionalization theory

1. Introduction

Sociologists have long examined how occupations become recognized as professions. Professionalization theory provides a useful starting point for analyzing translation. According to professionalization theory, a profession is characterized by specialized knowledge, formal training, ethical standards, and institutional recognition (Freidson, 2001). According to Freidson (2001), professions are characterized by specialized knowledge, autonomy and institutional legitimacy.

Translation occupies an ambiguous position in this regard. While it requires high levels of linguistic and cultural expertise, it has historically struggled to achieve the same level of status as professions such as law or medicine. While translators possess specialized linguistic and intercultural competence (Gouadec, 2007), their profession lacks uniform regulation and standardization across countries (Pym, 2012).

Unlike law or medicine, translation does not always require formal certification (Katan, 2009). Although degrees in Translation Studies are increasingly common, entry into the profession remains relatively open, which contributes to inconsistent quality standards and weak professional boundaries (Sela-Sheffy, 2006).

Etzioni (1969) describes such occupations as “semi-professions,” which have some characteristics of full professions but lack autonomy and authority. Translation fits this category well, as translators often depend on clients, agencies, or institutions that dictate terms of work, limiting their control over pricing and working conditions (Abdallah & Koskinen, 2007).

The lack of standardized accreditation across countries contributes to this ambiguity. Although organizations such as the International Federation of Translators (FIT) advocate for professional standards, entry into the field remains relatively open. This openness can undermine professional cohesion and contribute to inconsistent quality and pay. As a result, translators often experience what sociologists call “semi-professional” status (Etzioni, 1969), where they possess specialized skills but lack full institutional authority.

Professional associations play a crucial role in the process of professionalization (Dam & Zethsen, 2013). Organizations attempt to establish ethical codes, certification systems, and professional standards. However, their influence varies widely depending on national contexts. In the European context, efforts to standardize translation practices have been more successful due to institutional demand (Pym et al., 2012). Translators working for European institutions often undergo rigorous selection processes and adhere to strict guidelines, which enhances their professional status (Koskeniemi, 2008).

2. Theoretical Frameworks in the Sociology of Translation – Professionalization and Occupational Status

2.1. Bourdieu's Field Theory and Translation

Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of field, capital and habitus provide a powerful framework for analyzing translation. The “field” of translation is a structured social space in which actors—translators, publishers, clients, and institutions - compete for various forms of capital, including economic, cultural, and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1993). The translation field includes translators, authors, publishers, agencies and institutions (Simeoni, 1998). Each actor occupies a position determined by their access to economic, cultural, and symbolic capital.

Different forms of capital shape the translator's position. Economic capital determines income and job security, while symbolic capital relates to prestige and recognition (Bourdieu, 1993). Literary translators may gain symbolic capital through awards and critical acclaim, even if their economic capital remains limited (Heilbron & Sapiro, 2007).

Translators often demonstrate “disinterestedness” (as described by Bourdieu), emphasizing the non-material rewards of their work (intellectual satisfaction, creativity) rather than material pay, which can inhibit their ability to demand higher remuneration. The unequal distribution of capital reinforces hierarchies between translators and other actors (Casanova, 2004), explaining why translators often struggle for recognition despite their essential role.

Translators accumulate cultural capital through linguistic competence and knowledge of source and target cultures. However, their symbolic capital - recognition and prestige - is often limited, especially compared to authors. This asymmetry is evident in the frequent invisibility of translators, whose names may appear in small print or be omitted entirely from publications (Venuti, 1995). Translators typically possess high cultural capital due to their linguistic expertise (Inghilleri, 2005), but they often lack symbolic capital. Their contributions are frequently overshadowed by authors, especially in literary contexts (Venuti, 1995; Chesterman, 2009).

Habitus, or the internalized dispositions shaped by social experience, influences how translators approach their work. For instance, a translator trained in a literary tradition that

values fluency may prioritize readability over fidelity, reflecting broader cultural norms within the field. For example, translators trained in Anglo-American traditions may prioritize fluency and readability (Venuti, 1995), while others may emphasize fidelity to the source text (Toury, 1995). These preferences reflect broader norms within the translation field (Hermans, 1999). Habitus also shapes how translators perceive their roles - whether as invisible mediators or visible co-creators (Simeoni, 1998).

2.2. The Sociology of Work and Precarity

2.2.1. Labor conditions

From the perspective of the sociology of work, translation is increasingly characterized by precarious labor conditions. The rise of freelance work, outsourcing and digital platforms has transformed translation into a gig-based occupation for many practitioners (Pym et al., 2012). While this offers flexibility, it also leads to income instability, lack of benefits and limited job security.

Precarity is exacerbated by global competition. Translators in high-income countries often compete with lower-cost labor markets, driving down rates. This phenomenon aligns with broader trends in neoliberal economies, where labor is increasingly commodified and workers bear greater risks (Standing, 2011).

2.2.2. Freelancing and the Gig Economy

The majority of translators today work as freelancers (Pym et al., 2012). This reflects broader labor market trends toward flexibility and project-based work (Standing, 2011). While freelancing offers autonomy, it also introduces risks such as income instability and lack of benefits (Kalleberg, 2009). Freelance translators must manage their own workload, negotiate rates, and handle administrative tasks (Risku et al., 2016). This aligns with the concept of the “precariat,” a class of workers characterized by insecurity and instability (Standing, 2011).

2.2.3. Global Competition

Globalization has intensified competition in the translation market (Cronin, 2003). Digital platforms allow clients to outsource work globally, putting downward pressure on rates (Moorkens, 2017). This creates inequalities between translators in different regions (Pym, 2012). At the same time, globalization increases demand for translation services in areas such as business, law, and technology (Biel, 2011).

2.2.4. Emotional and Cognitive Labor

Translation involves significant cognitive and emotional labor (Hubscher-Davidson, 2017). Translators must interpret meaning, adapt cultural references and ensure accuracy under time constraints (Risku, 2014). Emotional labor is particularly relevant when translating sensitive content (Inghilleri, 2010). Translators must navigate ethical dilemmas and cultural tensions, often without institutional support.

3. The Translator’s Professional Identity

3.1. Visibility and Invisibility

One of the central sociological issues in translation is the translator’s visibility. Lawrence Venuti (1995) argues that translators are often rendered invisible due to dominant norms that prioritize fluency and transparency. When a translation reads as if it were originally written in the target language, the translator’s labor disappears from view.

This invisibility has social consequences. It diminishes the translator’s cultural authority and reinforces hierarchical relationships between authors and translators. In some contexts, however, translators actively resist invisibility by asserting their presence through prefaces, footnotes, or public engagement.

3.2. Identity Negotiation

Translators frequently navigate complex identities. They act as cultural mediators, bridging linguistic and cultural divides. This role requires not only technical skill but also ethical judgment and intercultural competence.

Sociologically, this can be understood as a form of “boundary work” (Gieryn, 1983), where translators negotiate the boundaries between languages, cultures and professional roles. For example, literary translators may see themselves as co-creators, while technical translators may emphasize accuracy and neutrality.

Identity is also shaped by institutional contexts. Translators working for international organizations may adopt a bureaucratic identity, adhering to strict guidelines and terminologies. In contrast, freelance translators may develop entrepreneurial identities, focusing on self-promotion and client relations.

3.3. Power Relations in Translation

Power asymmetries are a defining feature of the translation field. Authors typically occupy a higher position in the cultural hierarchy, while translators are often seen as secondary figures. This hierarchy is reinforced by publishing practices, copyright laws and cultural norms. However, this relationship is not static. In some cases, translators gain significant influence, particularly when they specialize in a specific author or genre. Their choices can shape how a text is received in the target culture, giving them a form of cultural power.

3.4. Institutional Power

Institutions such as publishing houses, international organizations and translation agencies play a crucial role in shaping the profession. They set standards, determine rates, and influence working conditions. For example, large organizations may impose strict deadlines and standardized terminology, limiting translators’ autonomy. From a sociological perspective, these institutions function as gatekeepers, controlling access to resources and opportunities. Translators must navigate these power structures, often balancing professional ideals with economic realities.

3.5. Language Hierarchies

Global language hierarchies also affect the translator’s profession. Languages such as English occupy dominant positions in the global linguistic economy, while others are marginalized (De Swaan, 2001). Translators working from dominant languages may have more opportunities but face greater competition, while those working from less widely spoken languages may occupy niche markets.

These hierarchies reflect broader patterns of cultural and economic power, highlighting the interconnectedness of translation and globalization.

3.6. Technology and the Changing Nature of Translation

The rise of machine translation (MT) and artificial intelligence has significantly impacted the profession. Tools such as neural machine translation systems can produce high-quality outputs for certain types of texts, particularly in technical and repetitive domains.

From a sociological perspective, this shift can be understood through the lens of technological determinism and labor displacement. While some fear that machines will replace human translators, others argue that technology is reshaping rather than eliminating the profession. Translators increasingly engage in post-editing, quality assurance, and specialized translation tasks that require human judgment.

3.7. Platform Economy

Digital platforms have transformed how translation services are delivered. Online marketplaces connect clients and translators across the globe, facilitating access but also intensifying competition. These platforms often prioritize speed and cost over quality, contributing to the commodification of translation.

This aligns with broader trends in the platform economy, where intermediaries extract value while workers face downward pressure on wages (Srnicek, 2017). Translators must adapt by developing niche expertise, building personal brands, or leveraging professional networks.

3.8. Ethics and Responsibility

Translation involves ethical considerations that extend beyond linguistic accuracy. Translators must navigate issues such as cultural representation, censorship, and ideological bias. For example, translating politically sensitive texts may require balancing fidelity to the source with the norms of the target culture.

From a sociological perspective, these ethical dilemmas reflect the translator's position within power structures. Translators are not neutral conduits; they actively shape meaning and influence how cultures are perceived. As such, they bear social responsibility for their choices. Professional codes of ethics, such as those established by translator associations, aim to guide practice. However, adherence to these codes varies, particularly in freelance and informal contexts.

3.9. Globalization and Cultural Exchange

Globalization has expanded the demand for translation, driven by international trade, migration, and digital communication. Translators play a crucial role in facilitating cross-cultural exchange, enabling the flow of information, literature, and ideas. However, globalization also introduces inequalities. The dominance of certain languages and cultures can lead to asymmetrical translation flows, where texts from powerful cultures are widely translated while others remain underrepresented.

3.10. Cultural Mediation

Translators act as cultural mediators, shaping how texts are adapted for new audiences. This involves not only linguistic transfer but also cultural interpretation. Decisions about tone, style, and references can significantly influence how a text is received. Sociologically, this highlights the translator's agency within structural constraints. While they operate within institutional and market pressures, they also exercise creativity and judgment, contributing to cultural production.

4. Case Studies

Case Study 1: Translators in the European Union

The European Union provides a highly structured environment for translation, with 24 official languages (Pym et al., 2012). EU translators work within regulated institutions such as the European Commission (Koskeniemi, 2008). They follow strict guidelines, use terminology databases and collaborate through advanced tools (Biel, 2011). This environment offers stable employment and professional recognition, contrasting with freelance conditions (Pym et al., 2012).

EU translators develop a bureaucratic identity focused on accuracy, consistency and neutrality (Koskinen, 2008) while creativity is secondary to clarity and standardization (Biel, 2011). Despite advantages, institutional translation can limit autonomy (Koskinen, 2008). Indeed, standardization may reduce creativity and reinforce hierarchical structures. Below we will analyze the notions of Field, Habitus and Capital (Bourdieu, 1993) for translators working in the European Union.

1. The Field: A Multilingual Technocracy

The European Union (EU) operates under a policy of institutional multilingualism, where 24 official languages have equal status. This creates a highly specific "field" (in Bourdieusian terms) where translation is not an after-thought but a legal requirement for democratic legitimacy.

- Institutional Constraints: Unlike freelance literary translators, EU translators work within a "closed" system. Their habitus is shaped by strict stylistic guidelines, the "Interinstitutional Style Guide," and a heavy reliance on shared translation memories.
- The Goal: To produce "equally authentic" texts across 24 versions, ensuring that a law read in Greek has the exact same legal force as the version in German.

2. Habituation and "Eurospeak"

Sociologically, EU translators develop a specific institutional habitus.

- Neutralization of Voice: The translator must remain entirely invisible. The goal is a "de-hybridized" language that often results in Eurospeak - a standardized, technical version of a language that may feel "alien" to native speakers in their home countries but functions perfectly within the Brussels bubble.
- Collective Authorship: Translation here is a social, collaborative process. A single document passes through translators, revisers, and legal experts, erasing individual agency in favor of institutional authority.

3. Capital and Status

- Cultural Capital: High. EU translators are recruited through *concours* (highly competitive exams), marking them as a linguistic elite.
- Symbolic Capital: They possess the prestige of being "civil servants of Europe." However, they face a paradox: they are essential to the EU's survival but are often blamed by the public for the "bureaucratic" and "complex" nature of EU communications.
- Economic Capital: They enjoy high job security and salaries, placing them in a different social class than the typical "precarious" freelance translator.

4. The Challenge of "De-nationalization"

A key sociological aspect of the EU translator is the tension between their national identity and their supranational role.

- They are native speakers of their "Target Language," yet they live in Brussels or Luxembourg, often becoming socially detached from the evolving slang or cultural shifts of their home country.
- They act as gatekeepers, deciding how concepts like "Rule of Law" or "Sustainability" are framed in their mother tongue, effectively "importing" European concepts into national discourses.

Case Study 2: Literary Translators as "Cultural Mediators"

In contrast to the institutional "anonymity" of EU officials, the literary translator operates in a field characterized by individual prestige, creative tension, and often, economic precariousness. Literary translators act as cultural mediators, shaping how texts are received (Casanova, 2004). Their choices influence interpretation and reception (Heilbron & Sapiro, 2007).

1. The Field: The Market of Symbolic Goods

The literary translation field is a "prestige-driven" market. Success is measured less by technical accuracy and more by symbolic capital (awards, reviews in major newspapers and name recognition).

- The Power Dynamic: There is an inherent struggle for power between the author (the "original" creator) and the translator. Sociologists like Lawrence Venuti argue that the field often demands "fluency" and "domesticating" strategies, which makes the translator invisible and erases the cultural "otherness" of the text.

- The Publisher's Role: Publishers act as the primary gatekeepers. They decide which foreign books are "translatable" based on their own cultural capital and the perceived taste of the local audience.

2. The Habitus: The "Double Loyalty"

Literary translators possess a unique habitus shaped by a "double loyalty": one to the original author and another to the target culture's literary tradition.

- The Creative Identity: Unlike technical translators, literary translators often view themselves as artists or secondary authors. Their habitus is built on deep empathy and aesthetic intuition.
- The "Illusion of Independence": While they have more linguistic freedom than EU translators, they are often socially marginalized. They are expected to be "co-authors" in terms of talent, but "servants" in terms of pay and public recognition.

3. Capital: High Prestige, Low Pocket

- Cultural Capital: Exceptionally high. They are often "polymaths" with deep knowledge of history, slang, and cultural nuances.
- Economic Capital: Generally low. Sociological studies (like those by CEATL) consistently show that literary translators earn significantly less than technical or institutional translators, often relying on grants or second jobs. Literary translators often face low pay and instability (Sela-Sheffy, 2006), highlighting the gap between symbolic and economic capital (Bourdieu, 1993).
- Social Capital: They are part of a global network of intellectuals. Their "social value" comes from being the bridge that allows a national literature (e.g., Japanese) to enter the "World Literature" canon.

4. Visibility vs. Invisibility

A major sociological debate in this field is the politics of invisibility. Venuti (1995) argues that translators are rendered invisible in Anglo-American culture. Fluency norms conceal the translator's presence (Hermans, 1999). However, some translators resist invisibility by asserting authorship (Chesterman, 2009).

- Domesticating (Invisible): Making the translation sound so "natural" that the reader forgets it's a translation. This reinforces the idea that the translator is a "pane of glass."
- Foreignizing (Visible): Intentionally leaving traces of the original culture in the text to remind the reader they are traveling through a different world. This elevates the translator's role as a visible cultural ambassador.

Conclusion

The application of sociological theories highlights the profession's ambiguous status. Professionalization remains incomplete, symbolic capital is unevenly distributed and technological change continues to reshape the field. At the same time, translators demonstrate agency by adapting to new conditions, negotiating their identities and contributing to cultural production.

The translator's profession is shaped by complex sociological dynamics, including professionalization, power relations and globalization. Translators are essential yet undervalued actors in global communication (Pym, 2012; Venuti, 1995). While technological and economic changes create challenges, they also offer opportunities for adaptation and growth. Understanding translation sociologically provides deeper insight into its role in society and highlights the need for greater recognition and improved working conditions.

From a sociological perspective, the translator's profession is a complex and evolving field shaped by power relations, institutional structures and global dynamics. Translators navigate ambiguous professional status, negotiate their identities and operate within systems that often undervalue their labor. At the same time, they play a vital role in cultural exchange and knowledge dissemination.

The application of sociological theories, such as professionalization, Bourdieu's field theory and the sociology of work, reveals the multifaceted nature of translation. It underscores the need for greater recognition of translators' contributions and more equitable working conditions.

For students of Translation Studies, understanding the sociological dimensions of translation is crucial. It allows for a more comprehensive view of the profession, recognizing both its challenges and its significance. As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, the role of translators will only grow in importance, making it essential to address the structural issues that shape their work.

To conclude, the translator's profession, when examined through a sociological lens, reveals a complex interplay of skills, power and structures. Translators are essential actors in a globalized world, facilitating communication and cultural exchange. Yet they often operate under conditions of precarity, limited recognition and institutional constraints. As technology and globalization continue to reshape the profession, translators must adapt while advocating for their rights and visibility. Understanding translation through a sociological lens not only enriches our appreciation of the profession but also highlights its significance in an increasingly interconnected world.

References

- Abdallah, K. and Koskinen, K. (2007) 'Managing trust: Translating and the network economy', *Meta*, 52(4), pp. 673–687.
- Biel, Ł. (2011) 'Training translators or translation service providers? EN 15038:2006 standard of translation services and its training implications', *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 16, pp. 61–76.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Casanova, P. (2004) *The world republic of letters*. Translated by M.B. DeBevoise. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (2009) 'The name and nature of Translator Studies', *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, pp. 13–22.
- Cronin, M. (2003) *Translation and globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Dam, H.V. and Zethsen, K.K. (2013) 'Translators in international organizations: A special breed of high-status professionals? Danish EU translators as a case in point', *Fachsprache*, 35(3–4), pp. 146–170.
- De Swaan, A. (2001). *Words of the World: The Global Language System*. Polity Press.
- Etzioni, A. (ed.) (1969) *The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers*. New York: Free Press.
- Freidson, E. (2001) *Professionalism: The third logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gouadec, D. (2007) *Translation as a profession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Heilbron, J. and Sapiro, G. (2007) 'Outline for a sociology of translation: Current issues and future prospects', in Wolf, M. and Fukari, A. (eds.) *Constructing a sociology of translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 93–107.
- Hermans, T. (1999) *Translation in systems: Descriptive and system-oriented approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2017) *Translation and emotion: A psychological perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Inghilleri, M. (2005) 'The sociology of Bourdieu and the construction of the "object" in translation and interpreting studies', *The Translator*, 11(2), pp. 125–145.
- Inghilleri, M. (2010) *Interpreting justice: Ethics, politics and language*. London: Routledge.
- Kalleberg, A.L. (2009) 'Precarious work, insecure workers: Employment relations in transition', *American Sociological Review*, 74(1), pp. 1–22.
- Katan, D. (2009) 'Translation theory and professional practice: A global survey of the great divide', *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, pp. 111–153.
- Koskinen, K. (2008) *Translating institutions: An ethnographic study of EU translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Moorkens, J. (2017) 'Under pressure: Translation in times of austerity', *Perspectives*, 25(3), pp. 464–477.
- Pym, A. (2012) *On translator ethics: Principles for mediation between cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pym, A., Grin, F., Sfreddo, C. and Chan, A.L.J. (2012) *The status of the translation profession in the European Union*. London: Anthem Press.
- Risku, H. (2014) 'Translation process research as interaction research: From mental to socio-cognitive processes', *MonTI Special Issue*, 1, pp. 331–353.
- Risku, H., Dickinson, A. and Pircher, R. (2016) 'Knowledge in translation practice and translation studies: Intellectual capital in modern society', *Translation Spaces*, 5(1), pp. 45–62.
- Sela-Sheffy, R. (2006) 'The pursuit of symbolic capital by a semi-profession: The case of literary translators in Israel', in Wolf, M. (ed.) *Übersetzen – translating – traduire*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 243–252.
- Simeoni, D. (1998) 'The pivotal status of the translator's habitus', *Target*, 10(1), pp. 1–39.
- Srnicek, N. (2017) *Platform capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Standing, G. (2011) *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Venuti, L. (1995) *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge.