

O'Hagan, Minako, ed. 2011. *Translation as a Social Activity. Community Translation 2.0*. Special issue of *Linguistica Antverpiensia New Series — Themes in Translation Studies* 10. 265 pp. ISBN 978 90 5487 977 0. ISSN 0304-2294. €35.

**Reviewed by Anthony Pym (Universitat Rovira i Virgili)**

This is an excellent collection of essays on an extremely timely topic (even now, some four years after its publication!). As web-based technologies allow information to be produced in an increasingly participative way (Web 2.0 is basically this), translation is becoming an activity in which many people can be involved collectively. Such would be the general sense of “community translation,” which is the term preferred by Minako O'Hagan, the editor of this volume. There is, however, much more than communitarianism at stake here — the field, like the volume, allows forays in multiple directions, with potentially confusing results. So let me begin with the terms, then move to rest.

I have a personal interest in the issue, since I have a published preference for the term “volunteer translation” (Pym 2011, 78). This is not because it is in any way the better cover term, but because I think the most worrying ethical issue is who gets paid for what, and in what way. Minako O'Hagan politely disagrees, preferring “community” because, for her, the important thing is that technology is enabling more people to work together (whereupon she freely admits that “community translation” has little to do with that other confusing misnomer “community interpreting”). Of course, there is no real conflict here. Volunteer translation is something that was happening well before the new interactive technologies (see, for example, Wolf 2006 on translators working for women's causes), and “community translation” can still be voluntary or paid. So there are actually two quite different phenomena at work. The confusion only arises because new collaborative technologies allow for more volunteer work, perhaps in the same way as the beginning of winter brings on more colds (okay, I have to work on the analogy) — we have two phenomena coming together in a causal way, without the two ever being one and the same thing. That is why I personally prefer terms that can keep them apart, at least for a while.

The confusion is not just mine. Désilets and van der Meer speak in this volume about “collaborative translation” (27) but then switch to “translation crowdsourcing” (28); Nataly Kelly et al. have “community translation” (75) in their title but then mainly discuss “collaborative translation”; Julie McDonough Dolmaya talks about

“crowdsourcing” (97), with scarcely a mention of “community”; Renée Desjardins likes “social networking” (175); Joanna Drugan prefers “the non-professional on-line community” (111); Alina Secară refers to “fansubbing and crowdsourcing” (155); Joanna Gough reports on “technologies based on openness” (215) — which is actually what this volume is mainly about, I suspect. So no one can pretend that the term “community translation” is wholly ruling this roost. Indeed, can we be wholly sure all these papers really belong together? I do have some doubts.

Désilets and van der Meer, speaking from the National Research Council of Canada and the Translation Automation Users Society (TAUS) respectively, offer a set of “best practices for collaborative translation” (27). The project sprang from a round-table of industry insiders held in October 2011 (but this entire volume is dated 2011?) and is thus splendidly non-academic. Now, “best practices” are what businesses are habitually interested in, since the term suggests there is an optimal way of doing something, no matter where you are and when you are doing it. We relativist academics tend to regard such marketable certitude with suspicion, since our world is full of cultural specificities. When we get into the actual recommendations, however, the language strangely shifts from “best practice” to “design pattern,” understood as “a formal way of documenting a common solution to a common problem” (35). And when we eventually get to the things themselves, they could happily be glossed as suggested solutions or even ideas (37). With the shift in terms and meanings comes a healthy commonsense plurality. For example, to check the quality of translators’ outputs, the menu comprises: Publish then Revise (37), Content-Specific Testing (39), Entry Exam (39), Peer Review (39), and so on (there are actually ten items to choose from). So which of these is best? No one is saying. When you go to the companion website to get the details (search the web for “collaborative-translation-patterns”), all you really get is a series of problem-solution pairs. And the authors then note that, to continue with the example, Kiva and Translators Without Borders use entry exams, whereas Adobe and Symantec prefer “fairly open practices” (41), and this difference is because translation quality is more important for the first two organizations (which use exams), since their main focus is translations. In sum, there are no best practices here — there are strokes for folks. Yes, if you like, there are formalized common solutions to common problems (35), but that, at best, aspires to common sense.

A Japanese team headed by Kyo Kageura reports on the set of MNH Japanese websites that allow volunteer translators to work in several ways. The first project to be developed was an open online translation hosting site with a translation-aid service (a two-pane interface with data feeds, but apparently not building translation memories?). This is designed for NGOs working mainly into Japanese and is used by several of them, although there were over 1,700 registered users (presumably including the NGOs) in August 2011. The second site is the same thing but

for clients and for some money, mainly working *from* Japanese. Here the translations are reported as being done by “foreign students in Japan” (54). The students receive between 1.0 and 1.6 yen per character; the translations are sold for about three times that; the normal rate for translations in Japan is about 15 times that. The third service is then a similar site designed to share expressions useful in disaster and post-disaster situations, following the East Japan Earthquake of March 2011. None of these sites has any mechanism for controlling the quality of translations. In sum, these three ventures tell a surprisingly common story: we have developed something that can be used by all for free; but we could make a bit of money from it, after all; but we maintain a clear conscience by supporting good causes — online vendor portals like ProZ similarly combine free services, profit, and an ideology of helping communities. I will return to these mixed ethics later.

Or perhaps now. A real surprise in this volume is an article by Kelly, Ray and DePalma, otherwise known as Common Sense Advisory, who here offer insights from their survey of 100 “community translation environments” (75). This is surprising because Common Sense Advisory is a company that makes money by selling information that has been collected from people who give it for free (sounds familiar?). The practice reaches sublime heights in their 2008 report on community translation as a political democracy: *Translation of, by, and for the people* (DePalma and Kelly 2008), runs their suggestively American title, but that report, which is available to those who pay a US\$9,500 annual membership license (reduced to US\$4,000 for universities), is of the people, by the people, but definitely not *for* the people. So does the article published in this volume now give us the gold for free? Hardly. The offering is little more than a set of samples or teasers, effectively advertising the more substantial product. Not that the sample is completely devoid of interest. For example, we are told that “these projects are handled within communities that already exist — it would not be possible for organizations to simply round up volunteers and convince them to join communities for their causes or their products” (92). This makes good intuitive sense, if only it did not seem to be directly contradicted by the Japanese experiences reported in the previous article. So we clearly need more information to decide the toss — we have to pay the money. We university people would never charge like that, would we? Should we pay the money? (To be continued.)

As should be becoming clear, the underlying problems concern ethics, on several interconnected levels. Julie McDonough Dolmaya confronts the issue head-on. She is astute and correct in refusing the simple position that volunteer work is good when done for non-profit organizations, but bad and exploitative when done for profit-making companies. That position is inadequate because, as we have seen above (with respect to both translation sites and the production of knowledge on translation), there are movements from profit to non-profit, and in the other

direction, with mixes in between. Awareness of this allows McDonough Dolmaya appropriately to sideline absurdities like Baker's condemnation of Translators Without Borders since it is nothing but "an offshoot of a commercial translation agency" (2006, 159) — since when are humanitarian causes the sole preserve of non-profits or unprofitable academics? McDonough Dolmaya also correctly refuses the simplism of condoning unpaid work on the basis that it is given voluntarily, since it may be that the volunteers "have been driven to participate — at least in part — by various marketing mechanisms" (103). (True, the poor souls didn't have clever academic activists to protect them.) And she is judicious in questioning those who claim, perhaps with Cronin (2010), that crowdsourcing can actually help translators by increasing their public visibility: "visibility alone will not make translation [be] seen as a high-status profession" (103). (It has never been entirely clear to me how the visibility of competent volunteers is supposed to help people love professionals.) McDonough Dolmaya then finds one very good thing to say about crowdsourcing: it promotes translations into minor languages, specifically by making feasible translations that would not have been done otherwise. So is all volunteer translating then a good thing? Not exactly. McDonough Dolmaya's final position seems to be that volunteer work is fine if and when it can make users aware that "translation is a skilled practice requiring training, accreditation and quality control mechanisms" (106–107). So bad translations will make people see why they need good translations? And thus, after all the fine critical work, McDonough Dolmaya's own ethics turns out to be simple nominalism: since translation is just one thing, for everyone the world over, everything blessed with the name should reveal the true nature of that one thing. Apparently. No matter that untrained people are using sites like the Japanese examples in order to produce useable but uncontrolled translations. No matter that, in fields like volunteer subtitling, translation is becoming far more creative and adventurous than it is in its stagnant professional variants. In sum, McDonough Dolmaya overlooks the ways the technologies themselves are allowing new senses and expectations to be attached to the term "translation," and in doing so she leaves herself without any coherent usage of the term "ethics" (nominalism plus this week's good causes?). But she will return, in better shape, I'm sure.

Joanna Drugan is on firmer empirical ground when she compares traditional professional codes of ethics with the codes produced by online communities. She locates two intriguing differences: first, the non-professional codes place more emphasis on "community policing," whereas the professional codes rarely suggest that members should be keeping tabs on each other; second, the professional codes are based on loyalty to one another (you are not supposed to denigrate a fellow professional's work), while the non-professional codes emphasize loyalty to the group as a whole. Drugan rightly points out that any code only makes sense

to the extent that there is a pre-existing community prepared to interpret and implement it (a code is not to be confused with a practice), and in this respect the non-professional codes actually seem closer to the ground, with a shared ethos and a conscious fostering of new leaders. The viability and efficiency of these communities was demonstrated by the many hundreds of translators who volunteered their services in the weeks following the 2010 Haiti earthquake. Indeed, suggests Drugan, the online translation community, “with its openness, shared values, and supportive colleagues, might offer an inspiring and positively ethical model” (122). In this empirical way, Drugan avoids McDonough Dolmaya’s nominalist trap, perhaps moving us forward.

Let me pause here to bring some strands together. Unpaid work can happen almost everywhere, even very close to us. Are our students paid for their work? Our research students? Are our activists paid to attend meetings and email propaganda? Are academic researchers paid for their articles, revision, reviews? (No, I am not being paid for this, and I sincerely hope you are not being paid to read it.) There is no particular need to single out translators here. As for humanitarian goals being incompatible with profit-seeking companies, as if there were some unbridgeable divide, some of the great achievements of ecological activism (although to a much lesser extent the causes of economic justice) have been precisely through their ability to adopt the language of commerce and to influence powerful companies. And the end of Apartheid came once the international banks pulled the plug (although that was certainly not the only cause). There is no automatic virtue in making a loss, and much potential hypocrisy in assumed immunity from money (Baker criticizes Translators Without Borders for being attached to a company, but remains somehow unaware that her own politically engaged research and prestige is sold through profit-making books and a postgraduate program that costs students up to 13,000 pounds a year). As our universities are turned into companies, and as knowledge about translation is being produced for profit (and not only in Common Sense Advisory), amateur status offers no moral high-ground.

Look around and ask yourself why so many people are doing things for free. You might soon realize that there is not much truly free about it. We are working in order to learn and improve skills, to make and enjoy being with friends, to engage politically with attempts to improve the world, to give meaning to our life, to give back to the community, to seek and maintain prestige, and as a condensation of all these, perhaps, sometimes hopefully to approach the highest of Aristotelian ethical goals, happiness, particularly the kind that comes from the search for knowledge (here I summarize Bourdieu’s capitals, to which happiness should be added). Only an inkling of that complexity enters into the articles here, specifically where O’Hagan correctly points out that translators are using free Internet material (15), with little question of scandal, so they might as well contribute to the

web by translating for free — but this does not go beyond the frame of economic exchange as justice. If we can approach the multiple reasons why people work voluntarily, we might understand why collaborative technologies are in many ways a boon to most, and of relatively minor consequence as a threat to the established translation professions. The articles in this volume, however, mostly focus on the tools, the companies, justice as balance, and on what are thus ultimately rather superficial debates.

Miguel A. Jiménez-Crespo surveys concepts of translation quality in a “social network era” (131). The basic suggestion here is quite clever: Facebook’s use of peer-review and voting to select translations, novel as it seems, might be seen as applying ideas that have been kicked around in translation theory for decades: Nida’s dynamic equivalence, Skopos functionalism, even corpus use as an appeal to majorities. As tedious as the article sometimes becomes when detailing these approaches, the fundamental insight remains: in the past, there was no practical way of implementing those democratic notions of quality; now it is technologically possible to do so. Jiménez-Crespo might even be more insightful than he knows: Nida’s theories underpinned the long-standing use of Bible translation committees comprising non-professional end-users, with coordination by a professional “consultant,” and that traditional type of collaborative and democratic translation is indeed now experimenting with electronic technologies, producing Bible translation via crowdsourcing (Gravelle 2012). That said, Jiménez-Crespo perhaps misses a superb opportunity to ask some uncomfortable questions about those previous theories of quality. Yes, perhaps we had the right answers but lacked a practical way of applying them. Then again, if quality is a matter of who has the *authority* to say what is good, perhaps the previous theories were actually quite happy with where they placed that authority: in the hands of the Bible consultants (justified by the theorists), the translation teachers (Skopos was a teachers’ theory), the clients (but then the same theorists added that the clients had to be trained) and the people compiling the corpora (usually to represent national languages, and thus nations, while strangely excluding translations from the main “authentic” databases). Seen in this light, the shift of authority to end-users might be rather more radical than Jiménez-Crespo would have us believe.

A second aside here. The ability of Web 2.0 to question previous modes of authority is usefully raised by O’Hagan in her introduction, where she mentions the possibility that the “rise of the amateur” is really the “crisis of the experts” (citing Gee and Hayes 2011, 44). Where the teachers and academics once presumed to know all, now good knowledge is publicly available and mostly anonymous. We can indeed see something of this crisis in the translator-training community, where an older generation still mistrusts anything online, and a younger generation is embracing it, learning to be more open than expert. In theory, we are

witnessing a power shift from producers to consumers. Yet there is a constant risk of overstating the weekly revolutions. As Kageura et al. note in an astute endnote (72), the original sense of “crowdsourcing” was supposed to be “the application of open-source principles to fields outside of software” (Howe 2006), and this should involve consumers as both selecting between solutions and defining the *problems*. In the technologies that we are using at the moment (including the open-source tools for translators), we certainly have users selecting solutions (deciding between translations, for example, or deciding what to translate), but not really defining the problems. The problem-deciders are still the people who develop and operate the software, and who find ways to have their efforts rewarded. There are still experts out there, and thankfully so. But now they tend to be experts in IT engineering and business models — let’s not pretend the crowds are really pulling the levers. Further, the vying models of Web 3.0 threaten to increase this trend, driving us toward greater “personalization” of the user’s “web experience” (you put together your homepage; you get the messages in the main language of the country you happen to be in; you suffer pop-up ads for products based on what you have looked at online, and so on) (for an extreme critique, see Keen 2007). This boils down to clever marketing, boxing the user into positions from which real selections are possible, but the definition of problems seems ever more distant.

Now, do the rest of the articles really belong in this book? Let’s see.

Alina Secară discusses the novel subtitling practices that are associated with volunteer communities. She presents data from eye-tracking experiments on the way “unregimented” subtitles are received. However, with just four participants and no control of inter-subject variation (each subject only received subtitles under one set of conditions), there is not a lot to write home about. (Significance might come easier if each subject responds under both conditions.) Anyway, subjects do get faster at processing non-conventional signs the more those signs are used (i.e., people learn). And that is nice to know.

Renée Desjardins looks at the way social networking can be used in translator training. It turns out she uses a Facebook site to give the class an online identity, which could surely concern any class at all. A great teaching suggestion does emerge, however: get students to compete to do the fastest translations of Twitter messages (okay, tweets). And there is value in another suggestion here: get students to design a Facebook page for their fictitious translation company (but I personally prefer them to build a free online website, and to do product presentations using it).

Joanna Gough presents the findings of a 2010 survey of translators’ attitudes to Web 2.0 technologies. The usable sample was 224 professional translators from 42 countries, which is a relatively small and fairly uncontrolled spread. About 80 percent of the respondents are using a translation tool of some kind; some 70 percent

know about translation-memory sharing; 30 percent are willing to share translation-memory databases; but the questionnaire seems not to have asked who *actually* shares, which is a pity. What the questionnaire does ask about is open-source software (which is certainly in the spirit of Web 2.0 albeit not quite the same thing as users contributing to production, is it?). Anyway, over half the respondents did not know about open-source (207), so that block of questions scarcely gets off the ground. And then, the questions that do concern Web 2.0 seem to assume a lot of prior knowledge: respondents are asked to say how familiar they are with “interactive web applications,” “cloud computing,” “crowdsourcing/Community Translation,” and “collaborative translation” (220), without it ever becoming clear whether these are supposed to be mutually exclusive categories (they are certainly not!) or what you do when the one tool fits into two, three or four of them. The fact that 224 people managed to navigate the questions is impressive in itself.

The results of this survey seem fairly normal: knowledge of technology tends to develop from professional practice rather than formal education, and the key factor is the subject’s general attitude to technology. Both these things are common fare in general discussions of technology, as is the sex differential (unfortunately not explored here). The general recommendation is also well known: formal education programs have to give basic training in electronic tools, particularly with respect to underlying attitudes. Personally, I see this happening in many translator-training programs, and it is a pity that this questionnaire did not ask where and when the respondents received training in translation (if at all) — we might have found that our current educational institutions are not as dire as they are portrayed here.

And that’s all, almost. Since this book wants to be a journal, it comes with several book reviews, a few of which are on related topics. Now, some of these reviews are strangely punctilious, listing typos and the like. But minor errors hide in all publications — should we really be so worried? Anyway, just for people in glass houses, this particular volume has lacked proofreading on pages 56, 69, 103, 107, 134, 135, 145, 151, 160, 162, 167, 201, 203, 208, 233, and 256. It bears the noble scars of a labor of love, very probably volunteer collaboration, for our small, dedicated yet occasionally professional community.

## References

- Baker, Mona. 2006. *Translation and Conflict. A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge.
- Cronin, Michael. 2010. “The Translation Crowd.” *Tradumàtica* 8. <http://ddd.uab.cat/pub/tradumatica/15787559n8a4.pdf>. Accessed December 2012.
- DePalma, Donald A., and Nataly Kelly (Common Sense Advisory). 2008. *Translation of, by, and for the People: How User-Translated Content Projects Work in Real Life (preview)*. <http://www.>

- [commonsenseadvisory.com/Portals/\\_default/Knowledgebase/ArticleImages/081218\\_R\\_community\\_trans\\_Preview.pdf](http://commonsenseadvisory.com/Portals/_default/Knowledgebase/ArticleImages/081218_R_community_trans_Preview.pdf). Accessed December 2012.
- Gee, James Paul, and Elisabeth R. Hayes. 2011. *Language and Learning in the Digital Age*. London: Routledge.
- Gravelle, Gilles. 2012. "Crowdsourcing as a Method of Bible Translation. Rough Unedited Draft." Unpublished manuscript. Research and Innovation, The Seed Company, Arlington, TX.
- Howe, Jeff. 2006. "The Rise of Crowdsourcing." *Wired* 14 (6). <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/14.06/crowds.html>. Accessed December 2012.
- Keen, Andrew. 2007. *The Cult of the Amateur: How Today's Internet Is Killing Our Culture*. New York: Doubleday.
- Pym, Anthony. 2011. "Translation Research Terms – a Tentative Glossary for Moments of Perplexity and Dispute." In *Translation Research Projects 3*, ed. by Anthony Pym, 75–99. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2006. "The Female State of the Art: Women in the "Translation Field"" In *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*, ed. by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Zuzana Jettmarová, 129–141. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.  
DOI: [10.1075/btl.67.17wol](https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.67.17wol)

### *Reviewer's address*

Anthony Pym  
Universitat Rovira i Virgili  
Avinguda Catalunya 35  
45002 TARRAGONA  
Spain  
[anthony.pym@urv.cat](mailto:anthony.pym@urv.cat)