Mapping new translation practices into translation training

Promoting collaboration through community-based localization platforms

María del Mar Sánchez Ramos
University of Alcalá

Crowdsourcing and collaborative translation, activities emerging on the translation scene recently, are playing an increasingly important role in the world of professional translation and in the localization industry. This article focuses on a study carried out to analyze the perception of a group of translator trainees regarding these new translation practices. A total of 20 undergraduate students participated in the research and were asked to perform a collaborative localization task using an online collaborative platform. Data subjected to a quantitative and qualitative analysis suggest that online collaborative translation tasks enhance students' motivation towards collaborative translation and help consolidate their technical knowledge about specific localization tools and files.

Keywords: collaborative translation, localization, translation technology, translator training

1. Introduction

The rapid introduction of communication technologies (CT) has led to changes in the ways we access information, which has in turn let new translation scenarios and new translation products come into play. Under this context, translation has expanded into a user-generated landscape where translation of different digital products (i.e. websites, software or videogames) is carried out in a collaborative network. As an example, crowdsourcing and collaborative translation are gaining ground among users. This new technological panorama gives rise not only to new translation tools, new text genres and new translation models, but also to a change in the actual players involved in the translation process. With the evolution from

https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.00114.san | Published online: 4 December 2019
Babel issn 0521-9744 | e-issn 1569-9668

Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 – the latter term coined by O'Reilly (2005) – the user, previously passive, became an active user capable of controlling and sharing information with other users in a way that would have been unimaginable not so many years before (Cronin 2010; Zhao and Zhu 2012).

It is under this technological context that translation emerges as facing a multilingual society where almost everything can be translated. The activity involving the translation or *adaptation* of digital products is known as *localization*. The origins of the localization industry – an activity defined by Schäler as "the linguistic and cultural adaptation of digital content to the requirements and locale of a foreign market, and the provision of services and technologies for the management of multilingualism across the digital global information flow" (Schäler 2011: 157) – trace back to the United States in the 1980s. Due to the wide success of their products, some well-known companies such as Microsoft set their sights on foreign markets (i.e., Japan, France, Italy, Germany and Spain).

The localization industry is now unquestionably one of the most promising fields within translator training. Academic institutions are aware of the localization demand the industry market is shaping. As a result, many institutions offer learning programs focusing on the processes, tools and development of strategies involved in localization (Folaron 2006).

Crowdsourcing and collaborative translation, other activities emerging on the scene even more recently, are playing an increasingly important role in the world of translation and in the localization industry. Translators from around the globe are gathered into communities who generate multilingual content. This form of voluntary translation is particularly important for humanitarian work and emergency situations, with thousands of users enabling certain people, for example indigenous communities, to access vital information. In terms of localization, these collaborative practices require knowledge of the collaborative work platforms (i.e., Launchpad), online translation management systems (i.e., Pootle, POEditor) and specific formats (i.e., Gettext system, po-portable object files) used for working on open-source software localization processes and projects. This technological turn, as coined by O'Hagan (2013), poses undeniable changes in translators' daily lives and, therefore, likewise in the teaching of translation.

2. Translating in the digital era: Towards A 'technologization of translation'?

The Internet has gained an inexorable presence in the current day and age. Its influence extends deep into all professional sectors and it is an indispensable aspect of everyday operations. The Internet has become the greatest ever repos-

itory of information, exceptional for its speed and accessibility, facilitating the tasks of communication, documentation and production. It removes physical boundaries and makes information accessible from almost any location.

The field of translation is no different, and the digital revolution has brought new challenges and possibilities. According to O'Hagan (2013), the Internet and other new technologies have impacted on the entire translation ecosystem: they affect both the micro-environment (i.e. the translation tools and platforms) and the macro-environment of translation processes, with an expansion of text genres and translation practices:

> Technologies have significantly affected both the translators' microcosm, shaping their immediate local work environment, and also their macrocosm of global operating contexts in which new technologies are creating new content or products which require translation, as well as affording new ways of doing translation as illustrated by the current trend of crowdsourcing (Howe 2006, 2008).
>
> (O'Hagan 2013: 503)

Regarding the micro-environment, the main impact of technology is seen in the development of new tools and documentary resources for translators. In addition to computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools, translators have at their disposal a great array of computerized applications to aid their work, such as term bases, glossaries (monolingual, bilingual or multilingual), shared translation memories, various types of corpora (monolingual, parallel, comparable, etc.), electronic dictionaries, machine translation (MT) tools, and so on. Regarding the macro-environment, and as a consequence of globalization, technology has enabled information to be accessed in a wider range of formats. Translation has moved on from a sole focus on linguistic mediation to become a multimodal discipline (Fernández Costales 2012). Translation has widened its scope, focusing not only on the relationships between languages, but also on the adaptation of non-textual, semiotic and cultural elements. A good example is seen in localization, an activity examined more closely in the pages that follow. Conceived as the linguistic and cultural adaptation of a digital product to the demands of a certain market or *locale* (Schäler 2011), it is a discipline that clearly exemplifies the multimodal characteristic Fernández Costales (2012) attributes to translation. The term localization comes from the industry, and some debate has arisen regarding its relation to translation and, more specifically, regarding its inclusion within translation studies (Jiménez Crespo 2013). Leaving such arguments to one side, what remains clear is that localization has opened the door to new translation products and formats (software, websites, video games or mobile apps), requiring specific tools rather than a mere text processor or CAT tool.

Although translation activities are technologically-oriented nowadays, it can be stated that technology has been underrepresented within theories of translation. Scholars have tried to introduce the topic (Quah 2006), and have concluded that technology plays an indispensable role in translation today and that it is much more than a supporting tool for translation practice. A recent attempt is exemplified by O'Hagan (2016), who draws on the framework developed by critical theory of technology (CTT) to uncover the relationship between technology and translation. After reviewing CTT's theoretical foundations, whose roots can be found in the critical social theory of the Frankfurt School, O'Hagan considers that CTT provides "an analytical framework to understanding technology by combining philosophical (substantive) and sociological (constructivist) viewpoints" (O'Hagan 2016, 934). In this sense, technology is a key factor transforming social and professional practices.

2.1 Localization

The growth of the World Wide Web and other societal, political and economic changes have significantly increased the need for localized content (Bowker 2015). By the 1980s the localization industry had reached a stage of strong growth and wider recognition. Closely related to the term locale, which represents a specific combination of language, region and character encoding (Esselink 2000), localization is a core concept in our globalized era. Localization is closely related to GILT, an acronym which stands for *Globalization, Internationalization, Localization* and *Translation*. Since the rise of the Information Technology (IT) industry in the 1980s, the term GILT has been applied with increasing frequency. Becerril (2013) mentions that professionals usually describe GILT as a series of industry processes that are interdependent and must function to create efficiencies. In the context of the marketing of digital products, none of the processes and strategies should be understood separately, and a variety of factors (linguistic, extralinguistic, cultural and technical) should be considered.

Within the localization context, translation is defined as "the process of converting written or displayed text or spoken words to another language" (Esselink 2000: 4). More elements need to be added to this definition, as translation processes are complex and involve various specific skills. A translator is an individual who has mastered linguistic, extralinguistic, and cultural aspects of a given domain; translators do not merely engage in a "word-for-word 'global replacement' process", to use the same author's words (Esselink 2000). When it comes to conveying ideas and their meanings in localization, translation truly "requires that the full meaning of the source material be accurately rendered into the target language, with special attention paid to cultural nuance and style"

(Esselink 2000: 4). Translation for localization acquires certain additional distinguishing characteristics, as it is typical for localization projects to involve numerous file formats. Technical knowledge is needed to deal with such formats and specialized software. Furthermore, the objectives of translation projects and localization projects can vary. In localization projects, there are more activities, apart from terminology searches, page layout, editing or proofreading, that come into play: multilingual project management, conversion of translated documents to other formats, engineering and testing of software and online help, or multilingual product support (Somers 2003). In most cases, translation starts before the source material is final, so in localization projects the source files are updated several times during the translation process. Another difference between translation and localization projects is the level of adaptation. In this regard, the basic premise is that all local characteristics of the target market need to be implemented in the final product. In addition to language and culture, it is necessary to implement every type of regional standard possible, for example date/time formats, address formats, default page sizes, custom calendars, currencies, character sets, etc. (Somers 2003). Regarding the translation environment, translators normally use CAT tools in their translation projects. The localization industry additionally implements tools for the extraction and management of terminology, and MT systems and software localization tools for user interface translations.

Many scholars and institutions have offered definitions for the term localization. Esselink (2000: 1) states that "generally speaking, localization is the translation and adaptation of a software or web product, which includes the software application itself and all related product documentation." Pym (2004: 1) defines localization as follows: "Localization is the adaptation and translation of a text (like a software program) to suit a particular reception situation". From a different point of view, Pym (2004) does not talk about products, but *texts*. In his theory, the *text* is the key concept; translation is not consigned to being just one step in the localization process, but instead occupies a more influential role. Unlike the first edition (published in 1998) of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, the second edition by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha in 2011 did include an entry for localization. It was written by Reinhard Schäler, who defines localization as "the linguistic and cultural adaptation of digital content to the requirements and locale of a foreign market, and the provision of services and technologies for the management of multilingualism across the digital global information flow" (Schäler 2011: 157). In the same entry, Schäler (2011: 157) goes on to explain that "what makes localization, as we refer to it today, different from previous, similar activities, [is] namely that it deals with digital material. To be adapted or localized, digital material requires tools and technologies, skills, processes and standards that are different from those required for the adaptation

of traditional material such as paper-based print or celluloid (…)". In other words, the emphasis is on the medium in which a text is conveyed.

Closely involved with the localization cycle, internationalization is essential for the creation of functional products such as web sites or computer games and entails the filtering out of cultural and linguistic components to provide a culturally neutral version of the product. It influences significantly in the easiness of the localization of a product. As part of this process, the text and the source code are separated, to prevent translators from making inadvertent changes to the program's code (Esselink 2000). Corte (2002) comments that internationalization consists of the identification of all local information included on the website (or product). Such information depends very much on the language and the culture of the country in which the product is originally designed. Elements such as dates, numbers, currencies, etc. should be saved separately to allow for their adaptation to other languages and locales.

In the GILT industry, the term globalization is used to mean the integration of localization and internationalization as one process, showing their interrelation and interdependence with the GILT industry.

2.2 Collaborative translation practices: Crowdsourcing and online collaboration

Largely because of the multicultural and multilingual society we live in, the translation industry continues to grow. The rapidly increasing use of MT and collaborative translation environments are proof of the current demand for translations; project management platforms that incorporate collaborative translation environments (Wordbee, POEditor, SDL Cloud Translation Solutions) are good examples of this (Drugan 2013: 101). The recent explosions of technologies has facilitated not only access to information, but also voluntary collaborations on a variety of tasks. One need not look far to see that voluntary collaboration in the world of professional translation has long existed in one form or another (O'Brien 2011), in translator associations, mailing lists, email exchanges, forums, and so forth. As noted by Gaspari (2015: 579), "Usenet-based newsgroups were early online communities organized in hierarchical categories around topics of interests to their members, and designed to share textual messages via the nascent Internet infrastructure." The evolution towards collaborative forms of work represents a role reversal in translation's social processes. As pointed out by Cronin (2010: 4), "the consumer becomes an active producer or prosumer. It is no longer a question of the translator, for example, projecting a target-oriented model of translation on to an audience but the audience producing their own self-representation as a target audience."

The phenomenon of voluntary collaborative practices in translation – without entering yet into discussions regarding the terminology – is a direct result of technological, social and cultural changes. The Web 2.0 scenario provides a considerable number of opportunities for Internet users to take part in different online activities, contributing to the idea of translation democratization and shaping technology (O'Hagan 2016: 934). Consequently, this participatory landscape has also opened new directions in translation. We live in a connected world in a constant technological progress and, as mentioned above, this has had its effects on the fields of translation and localization. As indicated by Tawileeh (2010: 2), collaborative translation is "an innovative approach that responds to the rapidly changing trends in content production and dissemination by transforming the translation process to become more open, inclusive and collaborative.", and companies such as Twitter, Facebook, Google and TED Open Translation Project make use of volunteer translators from all over the world (McDonough Dolmaya 2012; Ray and Kelly 2011).

The origins of these voluntary collaborative practices can be found in the activity known as 'crowdsourcing', whose beginning can be traced back to the business market. The neologism *crowdsourcing* is attributed to Jeff Howe, who introduced it in a magazine called *The Wired* in June 2006. The author defines the term as the activity performed by a company or institution which outsources a task to an undefined and large network of people in the form of an open call. Since Howe (2006), other authors have focused their research on crowdsourcing. This 'undefined and large network of people' is referred to as an instantation of 'collective intelligence' by Brabham (2013: xix). This author defines crowdsourcing as "an online, distributed problem-solving and production model that leverages the collective intelligence of online communities to serve specific organizational goals." Crowdsourcing represents a practice firmly grounded in the participatory nature of the Web 2.0, and it has been used by business, organizations, institutions, or collectives to harness the intelligence of the crowd, being it a large group of amateurs, experts, volunteers, professional, fans, or citizens, to accomplish a given task for free (Jiménez Crespo 2017). This is a practice that tends to be used by a variety of companies and institutions trying to find ways to lower costs. Its legal and ethical principles are not yet clearly defined though. Estellés Arolas and González Ladrón de Guevara (2012), after reviewing different approaches and definitions on crowdsourcing, provide the following definition, which includes the three key concepts of online activity, voluntary participation, benefits for the initiator and the participants:

> A type of participative online activity in which an individual, an institution, a non-profit organization, or company proposes to a group of individuals of

> varying knowledge, heterogeneity, and number, via a flexible open call, the voluntary undertaking of a task. The undertaking of the task, of variable complexity and modularity, and in which the crowd should participate bringing their work, money, knowledge, and/or experience, always entails mutual benefit. The user will receive the satisfaction of a given type of need, be it economic, social recognition, self-esteem, or the development of individual skills, while the crowdsourcer will obtain and utilize to their advantage what the user has brought to the venture, whose form will depend on the type of activity undertaken.
>
> (Estellés Arolas and González Ladrón de Guevara 2012: 197)

When looking at collaborative practices in translation, one must inevitably also discuss their terminology. Providing a clear definition for crowdsourcing is a task made harder and more uncertain by its relative newness and the fact that it is constantly evolving (Jiménez Crespo, 2017). O'Hagan (2011), meanwhile, asserts that doubts regarding the concept arise from its changeable terminology. Social translation, (Tawileeh 2010), collaborative translation (Désilets 2007), non-professional translation (Pérez González and Susam-Saraeva 2012), wiki translation (Cronin 2013), volunteer translation or amateur translation (Pym 2011; O'Brien and Schäler 2010), and CT3 (community, crowdsourced and collaborative translation) (DePalma and Kelly 2008) are some of the terms used to refer to various forms of this activity. In terms of definitions, García (2010, 1) refines Howe's (2006) original definition, describing the concept as "[r]oughly meaning the delegation to (unpaid) volunteers of tasks previously reserved for professionals." Other definitions add more characteristics to the concept and narrow the definition towards a more specific concept of crowdsourcing and translation. Declerq (2014: 46) refers to this new activity as "the outsourcing of a task (or several tasks at the same time) to an undefined, generally large, group of people or community, mutually connected through an e-medium." In all these definitions, terms such as collaboration, Internet and community are used to narrow and delimit the scope of this new translation model. The definition provided by Jiménez Crespo (2017: 76) seems the most complete:

> Collaborative translation processes performed through dedicated web platforms that are initiated by companies or organizations and in which participants collaborate with motivations other than those strictly monetary.

In contrast, the term online collaborative translation is defined by the same author as

> collaborative translation processes in the web initiated by self-organized online communities in which participants collaborate with motivations other than monetary, (…)

Taking into consideration the definitions given in the various works mentioned above, the fundamental differences between translation crowdsourcing and online collaborative translation can be seen as being rooted in their starting points. In the case of crowdsourcing, it is a company or institution that initiates the translation process, with the objective of reducing production costs (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn). In contrast, the starting point for online collaborative translations is the volunteers who, motivated by a range of factors, unite towards a primary objective of enabling other communities of users to access content in their own language. In the words of Fernández Costales (2012: 8), "users are interacting or collaborating in order to disseminate a message into other cultures." In this regard, the relationship established in crowdsourcing is of a vertical and hierarchical nature, whereas the norm for collaborative translations is a horizontal relationship, with processes established between equal peers. Online collaborative translation is similar in many ways to activities such as 'fansubbing' (O'Hagan and Mangiron 2013), its equivalent for comics, 'scanlations' (Ferrer Simó 2005), and the collaborative work performed on certain websites such as Wikipedia (McDonough Dolmaya, 2012).

As in institutions, organizations and online communities, the popularity of translation as a social activity has also grown within the discipline of translation studies, and various research efforts have been made to give more visibility to social practices in translation (Cronin 2010; Desjardins 2011; Fernández Costales 2012; Jiménez Crespo 2015, 2017; O'Hagan 2011). They reflect the progress made in our field, for instance, by focusing attention on the description of the implications of social translation within different translator training programmes (Desjardins 2011; McDonough Dolmaya 2012; Sánchez Ramos 2015). Other works, such as those by Morado Vázquez et al. (2011) debate the wider role of volunteers in translation in different contexts, such as emerging situations; and others focus on more specific matters, such as the factors that motivate a group of volunteers to get involved in this type of translation (Dombek 2014; O'Brien and Schäler 2010). Anastasiou and Gupta (2011) compare translation crowdsourcing to machine translation. Désilets (2007) focuses on the figure of the translator and the main challenges presented by online collaborative translation. Desjardins (2011) offers a descriptive work on a teaching strategy used in a range of courses and advocates the integration of social media – specifically Facebook – as part of translator training. She concludes that the inclusion of this kind of technology encourages teamwork and collaboration among students, as well as the creation of a community within the learning environment. A study by Gough (2011) looks at the attitudes of translation professionals towards the new collaborative environments. Several authors have also approached the issues of ethics and quality. Drugan (2011), for instance, explores the context of the professional and non-professional

code of ethics. McDonough Dolmaya (2011) can also be taken as an example. Her article entitled "The ethics of crowdsourcing" tries to answer questions such "how participants are remunerated, how the perception of translation is affected, and how minority languages are impacted" (2011: 97).

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants, task and procedure

The study took place in the first half of 2016 and was conducted on the 3rd year compulsory Translation Technology subject of the Bachelor's Degree in Modern Languages and Translation Studies at the University of Alcalá (Spain). A total number of 20 students participated in the study, who were divided into four groups of five students each. The task assigned to introduce collaborative translation into the translator training curriculum and know our students' perception about using specific collaborative platforms took place over two weeks, two days per week, and with a total of three face-to-face hours.

In terms of the research design, the experiment was divided into two stages. Our first approach was quantitative. A questionnaire was designed and administered to the participants after they had finished the task. Students were asked to fill a 7-point Likert scale questionnaire. The questionnaire included questions about the methodology use, the learning environment, and motivational factors (see Appendix A). The second stage was devoted to a qualitative approach. Once they had finished the task, a one-hour session was devoted to a discussion in form of a debate among the participants to reflect on the different issues related to collaborative translation and the specificities of the task. Each group had between 10–15 minutes to present the process and the product of the translation, the main advantages and disadvantages of the platform they had used, and any other comment they considered relevant. The teacher took notes of all the comments and doubts students had during the activity (two sessions of two hours each), and the final debate of the one-hour session. The teacher, assuming the role of facilitator, intervened in the debate only to bring the discussion back to some specific points (e.g., in terms of file formats, problems with the platform) or to link comments between the participants. A face to face semi-structured interview was conducted by the main researcher and the four groups to elicit information about the experience of introducing of using online collaborative translation. Participants were recorded, common responses were identified and analyzed.

Students were asked to work collaboratively on a translation from English into Spanish as part of a larger localization project using Pootle, a community-

based localization platform. Students registered and looked for the translation project assigned. They organized all the tasks they had to carry out. In this sense, one of the students worked as a project manager and distributed the different tasks. Once they were logged in, they had to work on the TuxPaint project, the translation of a bitmap graphics editor for young children. Students were encouraged to visit the webpage provided by the developer and use the editor before translating. Spanish is a very popular language in Pootle and almost all projects were nearly completed. Tuxpaint had a total of 16,157 words, and only half of the project needed to be translated into Spanish. Students were asked to translate 2,000 words. Although the platform incorporates an interface very similar to a CAT tool, users can also work offline and download the files in .po or .xliff format to work on them using a suitable program and then upload their output.

Before the activity, students attended a theoretical session where they were introduced to the main concepts related to collaborative translation (definitions, typology, organizations, actors involved, etc.). In both quantitative and qualitative data collection processes the course instructor assumed the role of facilitator, answering questions and clarifying doubts during the two sessions. Taking this role and using note-taking as the main instrument for gathering data, the teacher was the main data collector, as solving problems and answering queries revealed students' attitude to teamwork and their attitude to the activity. After the two sessions focused on the activity, the debate session was devoted to discussing and reflecting upon the activity performance and the topic of collaborative practices in translation. The main idea underlying this type of data-collection instrument was to set the classroom as a discussion and debate-focused learning environment. It was especially useful for discussing the controversial issue of collaborative practices in translation and the role the translator plays.

3.2 Results

A descriptive analysis was carried out on (a) quantitative data: a questionnaire, where a descriptive statistical approach was followed (see Appendix A) and (b) qualitative data: the one-hour debate session and the semi-structured face-to-face interviews.

The general picture that emerged from the data analysis suggests that students showed a positive attitude both to the task organization and the online collaborative practices. Most questions obtained a high mean average. Only two questions (Q2 and Q3) offer a mean average of 4.26 and 4.91 respectively. They are related to the online collaborative platform itself and the difficulties students found. In terms of task performance, group work seems that even the platform posed some problems, they were comfortable with the task organization (Q4,

Q5, Q6, Q7). Using online collaborative platforms also had a positive effect on students' motivation towards new practices in translation (Q8) and translation technology in general (Q9). Q10 highlights an issue that opens a discussion about the threat of altruism and volunteers in the profession of translation. It must be highlighted that most of the students show some fear of online collaboration intruism (Anastasiou and Gupta 2011).

Qualitative data provided sources of information related to group work and opinions about (online) collaborative translation as a new practice into the translation sphere. All the students have a positive attitude towards the task and online collaborative translation. However, they pointed out some negative issues. Advantages highlighted by the students included the opportunity to know projects that could only be localized by means of online collaboration. Although they work with English and Spanish, they were aware that collaborative translation is the only way for minority languages to access to information. This social contribution made by collaborative translation was one of the issues the students highlighted most, in close connection with tasks relating to commitment and social responsibility within the community. Among the disadvantages, the final debate and the interview students commented ethical issues and the questionable quality of the translations. Some of the students stated that they did not feel comfortable at the beginning using the platform, but this problem was sorted out thanks to the group work.

As other studies have highlighted (Gough 2011), a certain degree of awareness is growing among translation students in our study for the new tools and processes in the translation technology era, such as online collaborative translation. However, a real engagement into the process is still in its infant stage. From the perspective of the course instructor, a considerable number of improvements were identified, both in the development of the activity over the sessions and in the final debate. For instance, this activity and the discussion and debate session consolidated their technical knowledge about open tools and files. In the same line as the study carried out by Desjardins (2011), students shared a feeling of enjoyment and motivation while performing the activity. It was very positive for them to share their problems with the rest of the students and discuss their main points of view regarding collaborative translation. The activity was also an example of how social translation can be used as a training tool within the translation classroom to explore real voluntary translation contexts (Jiménez Crespo 2017). There was undoubtedly an improvement in the interactions between students and the course instructor, increased motivation in teamwork tasks, and a positive attitude towards the group work activity.

4. Conclusion

Following the steps of other scholars that claim more attention and research on the integration of social and technological tools in the contemporary translator training settings, our paper aimed at studying translator trainees' perception regarding the use of community-based localization platforms. The study was framed under a non-experimental descriptive methodology build upon quantitative and qualitative data collection tools. It suggests that the group of students that participated in the questionnaire, debate and focus-group interviews had a positive attitude towards the task itself and felt comfortable sharing their points of view on collaborative translation.

In our opinion, it is important to provide translator trainees with the appropriate learning tasks and contexts to introduce new translation practices such as collaborative translation. It is evident that translation collaborative practices are gaining ground nowadays and they cannot be ignored. By incorporating a task focused on collaborative translation, our study has sought to supplement existing works on translator training and collaborative translation and provide a teaching method turning the classroom into an open space for collaborative work among participants. It made it possible to generate an exceptional learning atmosphere for exchanges of opinion and the development of a critical spirit towards new translation models. We are aware of our limitations as the study has been focused on a small number of students. However, our work, while by no means conclusive, offers a starting point for future teaching research and a contribution to the existing debate on collaborative translation.

References

Anastasiou, Dimitra; and Rajat Gupta. 2011. "Crowdsourcing as Human-Machine Translation (HMT)". *Journal of Information Science* XX (X): 1–15.

Baker, Mona; and Gabriela Saldanha (Eds). 2011. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Becerril, Mizar. 2013. "Kwintessential: A Guide to G.I.L.T." [PDF file]. http://www.kwintessential.co.uk/contact/47

Brabham, Daren. 2013. *Crowdsourcing*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9693.001.0001

Bowker, Lynne. 2015. "Computer-aided translation: translator training". In *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology*, ed. by Chan Sin-wai, 88–104. London: Routledge.

Corte, Noelia. 2002. "Localización e Internacionalización de Sitios Web [Website Localization and Internationalization]". *Tradumàtic* 1: 1–8.

Cronin, Michael. 2010. "The Translation Crowd". *Tradumàtica* 8.
https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/tradumatica/15787559n8/15787559n8a4.pdf
https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/tradumatica.100

Cronin, Michael. 2013. *Translation in the Digital Age*. London. Routledge.

Declerq, Charles. 2014. "Crowd, Cloud and Automation in the Translation Education Community". *Cultus* 7: 37–56.

DePalma, Donald; and Natally Kelly. 2008. "Translation of, for, and by the People: How User-Translated Content Projects Work in Real Life". In *Translation and Localization Project Management: The art of the possible*, ed. by Keiran J. Dunne; and Elena S. Dunne, 379–408. American Translators Association Scholarly Monograph Series XVI]- 2011. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xvi

Désilets, Alain. 2007. "Translation Wikified: How will Massive Online Collaboration Impact the World of Translation? Translating and the computer 29".
http://www.mt-archive.info/Aslib-2007-Desilets.pdf

Desjardins, Renée. 2011. "Facebook me!: Initial Insights in Favour of Using Social Networking as a Tool for Translator Training". *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 10: 175–192.

Dombek, Magadalena. 2014. A Study into the Motivation of Internet Users Contributing: The Case of Polish Facebook User-Translators. PhD Dissertation. Dublin: Dublin City University.

Drugan, Joanna. 2011. "Translation Ethics Wikified: How do Professional Codes of Ethics and Practice Apply to Non-professionally Produced Translation?" *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 10: 111–127.

Drugan, Joanna. 2013. *Quality in professional translation: assessment and improvement*. London. Bloomsbury.

Esselink, Bert. 2000. *A Practical Guide to Localization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
https://doi.org/10.1075/liwd.4

Estellés Arolas, Enrique; and Fernando González Ladrón de Guevara. 2012. "Towards an Integrated Crowdsourcing Definition". *Journal of Information Science* 38 (2): 189–200.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551512437638

Fernández Costales, Fernando. 2012. "Collaborative Translation Revisited: Exploring the Rationale and the Motivation for Volunteer Translation". *Forum* 10 (1): 115–142.
https://doi.org/10.1075/forum.10.1.06fer

Ferrer Simó, María Rosario. 2005. "Fansubs y scanlations: la influencia del aficionado en los criterios profesionales". *Puentes* 6: 27–43.

Folaron, Deborah. 2006. "A Discipline Coming of Age in the Digital Age". In *Perspectives on Localization*, ed. by Kieran Dunne, 195–219. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xiii.16fol

García, Ignacio. 2010. "The proper place of professionals (and non-professionals and machines in web translation". *Tradumática* 8.
https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/tradumatica/15787559n8/15787559n8a2.pdf
https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/tradumatica.98

Gaspari, Federico. 2015. "Online translation". In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Technology*, ed. by Chan Sin-wei, 578–593. London: Routledge.

Gough, Joanna. 2011. "An empirical study of professional translators' attitudes, use and awareness of Web 2.0 technologies, and implications for the adoption of emerging technologies and trends". *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 10: 195–217.

Howe, Jeff. 2006. "Crowdsourcing: A definition". *Wired Blog Network: Crowdsourcing*, 14. http://crowdsourcing.typepad.com/cs/2006/06/crowdsourcing_a.html

Jiménez Crespo, Miguel Ángel. 2013. *Translation and Web Localization*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203520208

Jiménez Crespo, Miguel Ángel. 2017. *Crowdsourcing and Online Collaborative Translations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.131

McDonough Dolmaya, Julie. 2011. "The Ethics of Translation". *Linguistica Antverpensia* 10: 97–110.

McDonough Dolmaya, Julie. 2012. "Analyzing the Crowdsourcing model and its Impact on Public Perceptions of Translation". *The Translator* 18 (2): 167–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2012.10799507

Morado Vázquez, Lucía; Dimitra Anastasiou; Chris Exton; and Ian O'Keefe. 2011. "Web 2.0 and Localisation". In *First International Workshop on Social Media Engagement*, held in Hyderabad, India, 29 March 2011. http://d-anastasiou.com/Publications/WWW_final.pdf

O'Brien, Sharon. 2011. "Collaborative translation". In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. by Yves Gambier; and Luc van Doorslaer, 17–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.2.col1

O'Brien, Sharon; and Reinhard Schäler. 2010. "Next Generation Translation and Localisation: Users are Taking Care". *Translating and the Computer* 32. http://doras.dcu.ie/16695/1/Paper_6.pdf

O'Hagan, Minako. 2011. "Introduction: Community translation: Translation as a social activity and its possible consequences in the advent of Web 2.0 and beyond". *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 10: 1–10.

O'Hagan, Minako. 2013. "The Impact of New Technologies on Translation Studies. A Technological Turn?" In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. by Carmen Millán; and Francesca Bartrina, 503–518. London: Routledge.

O'Hagan, Minako. 2016. "Massively Open Translation: Unpacking the Relationship Between Technology and Translation in the 21st Century". *International Journal of Communication* 10: 929–946.

O'Hagan, Minako; and Carme Mangiron. 2013. *Videogame Localization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.106

O'Reilly, Tim. 2005. *What is Web 2.0? Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software*. O'Reilly Media. http://www.oreilly.com/pub/a/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html?page=1

Pérez González, Luis; and Sebnem Susam-Saraeva. 2012. "Non-professionals Translating and Interpreting". *The Translator* 18: 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2012.10799506

Pym, Anthony. 2004. *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation, and Distribution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.49

Pym, Anthony. 2011. "Translation Research Terms: A Tentative Glossary for Moments of Perplexity and Dispute". In *Translation research projects 3*, ed. by Anthony Pym, 75–110. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.

Quah, Chiew. 2006. *Translation and Technology*. Houndmills Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230287105

Ray, Rebecca; and Kelly, Nataly. 2011. *Crowdsourced Translation: Best Practices for Implementation*. Lowell (MA): Common Sense Advisory (CSA).

Sánchez-Ramos, María del Mar. 2015. "Exploring Social Translation and Ethics in the Classroom: Some Implications for Translator Training". In *Papers in Translation Studies*, ed. by Sattar Izwaini, 96–113. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishers.

Schäler, Reinhard. 2011. "Localization". In *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. by Mona Baker; and Gabriela Saldanha, 157–161. London: Routledge.

Somers, Harold (Ed.). 2003. *Computers and Translation: A Translator's Guide*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.35

Tawileh, Anas. 2010. "Managing Social Translation: Online Tools for Translators' Communities". *Translating and the Computer* 32.
http://mt-archive.info/Aslib-2010-Tawileh.pdf

Zhao, Yuxian; and Qingghua Zhou. 2012. "Evaluation on crowdsourcing research: Current Status and Future Direction". *Information Systems Frontiers* 16 (3): 417–434.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-012-9350-4

Appendix A

7 point Likert-scale questions		Mean	Standard deviation
1.	The teacher guided me to better understand and perform the activity	6.26	0.68
2.	The online localization platform is user-friendly and easy to understand	4.26	0.91
3.	Editing the files was easy	4.91	0.94
4.	Collaborative work was an excellent medium to carry out the activity	6.21	0.73
5.	Collaborative work made me feel confident when sharing different points of view with other students	6.21	0.73
6.	I found the one-hour discussion session useful to share my point of view about online collaboration projects	6.43	0.78
7.	Online collaborative translation task organization increased my interest	5.30	0.92
8.	Performing the task has increased my interest on crowdsourcing and online collaborative localization	5.73	0.84
9.	This task has increased my interest about translation technology	5.826086957	0.88
10.	I believe that online community based projects can bring down the translator professional sector	6.130434783	0.62

Appendix B

Focus group interview questions:

- Could you comment about your overall experience regarding the task?
- In terms of localization, what was the most relevant issue about working with an online collaborative platform?
- Could you please mention any challenging issues?
- Did you feel comfortable while working in groups?
- What do you think about the quality of collaborative translations?

Résumé

Le crowdsourcing et la traduction collaborative, des activités récemment apparues sur la scène de la traduction, jouent un rôle de plus en plus important dans le monde de la traduction professionnelle et dans l'industrie de la localisation. Cet article se concentre sur une étude réalisée pour analyser la perception d'un groupe d'étudiants en traduction à l'égard de ces nouvelles pratiques de traduction. Au total 20 étudiants de premier cycle ont participé à la recherche et ont été invités à effectuer une tâche de localisation collaborative à l'aide d'une plateforme collaborative en ligne. Les données obtenues à partir d'une analyse quantitative et qualitative suggèrent que les tâches de traduction collaborative en ligne ont renforcé la motivation des étudiants à l'égard de la traduction collaborative et les ont aidés à consolider leurs connaissances techniques sur des outils et des fichiers de localisation spécifiques.

Mots-clés: traduction collaborative, localisation, technologie de la traduction, formation de traducteur

Address for correspondence

María del Mar Sánchez Ramos
University of Alcalá
Department of Modern Philology
C/Trinidad, 3
28801 Alcalá de Henares, Madrid
Spain
mar.sanchezr@uah.es