TTR
Traduction, terminologie, rédaction

The *Newcomer's Guide to Edmonton* and Community Translation: Materially and Culturally Situated Practices

Odile Cisneros and Ann De Léon

Volume 33, Number 2, 2e semestre 2020

Matérialités de la traduction : le livre, la ville, le corps
Materialities of Translation: The Book, the City, the Body

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1077713ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1077713ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Association canadienne de traductologie

ISSN

0835-8443 (print)
1708-2188 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Cisneros, O. & De Léon, A. (2020). The *Newcomer's Guide to Edmonton* and Community Translation: Materially and Culturally Situated Practices. *TTR*, *33*(2), 95–123. https://doi.org/10.7202/1077713ar

Article abstract

In line with the current turn towards the study of material culture in Translation Studies, this paper explores community translation in Edmonton through the case study of the *Newcomer's Guide to Edmonton* (*NGE*). A 63-page handbook of essential information for new residents published by the City of Edmonton (2016), the *NGE* was translated into 7 languages in a project that employed community translators. This research examines community translation as both a materially and a culturally situated practice. We discuss how the materialities of communication and translation (Littau, 2016) can be addressed through this case study on community translation (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016). We also look at the process of community translation, specifically, the material conditions under which community translators work, often as volunteers with limited training who serve newcomers. We explore the case of the translation of the *NGE* as a culturally situated practice where community translators faced the particularities not only of the material translated, but also of the local context and target communities. Our research suggests that the process of the *NGE*'s translation not only empowered translators to make appropriate choices for their local communities, but also developed strategies for elevating the quality of the final product.

The *Newcomer's Guide to Edmonton* and Community Translation: Materially and Culturally Situated Practices

Odile Cisneros
University of Alberta

Ann De León
University of Alberta

Abstract
In line with the current turn towards the study of material culture in Translation Studies, this paper explores community translation in Edmonton through the case study of the *Newcomer's Guide to Edmonton* (*NGE*). A 63-page handbook of essential information for new residents published by the City of Edmonton (2016), the *NGE* was translated into 7 languages in a project that employed community translators. This research examines community translation as both a materially and a culturally situated practice. We discuss how the materialities of communication and translation (Littau, 2016) can be addressed through this case study on community translation (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016). We also look at the process of community translation, specifically, the material conditions under which community translators work, often as volunteers with limited training who serve newcomers. We explore the case of the translation of the *NGE* as a culturally situated practice where community translators faced the particularities not only of the material translated, but also of the local context and target communities. Our research suggests that the process of the *NGE*'s translation not only empowered translators to make appropriate choices for their local communities, but also developed strategies for elevating the quality of the final product.
Keywords: community translation, material turn, cultural practices, newcomers, Edmonton

Résumé
Dans le sillage du tournant actuel vers l'étude de la culture matérielle dans le domaine de la traductologie, nous explorons dans cet article la situation de la traduction communautaire à Edmonton à travers l'étude de cas du *Newcomer's*

Guide to Edmonton (*NGE*). Le *NGE* est un document de 63 pages publié par la ville d'Edmonton en 2016 regroupant des informations essentielles pour les nouveaux résidents. Traduit en 7 langues, le *NGE* a été réalisé par des traducteurs communautaires. Cette recherche examine la traduction communautaire en tant que pratique située du point de vue matériel et culturel. Nous discutons la manière dont les matérialités de la communication et de la traduction (Littau, 2016) peuvent être abordées à travers cette étude de cas sur la traduction communautaire (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016). Nous examinons également le processus de traduction communautaire, en particulier, les conditions matérielles dans lesquelles les traducteurs communautaires travaillent, souvent en tant que bénévoles avec une formation limitée au service des nouveaux résidents. Nous explorons le cas de la traduction du *NGE* en tant que pratique culturellement située où les traducteurs communautaires ont été confrontés aux particularités non seulement du matériel traduit, mais aussi du contexte local et des communautés cibles. Notre recherche suggère que le processus de traduction du *NGE* a permis aux traducteurs de faire des choix appropriés pour leurs communautés locales, mais a également développé des stratégies pour améliorer la qualité du produit final.

Mots-clés : traduction communautaire, tournant matériel, pratiques culturelles, nouveaux arrivants, Edmonton

Introduction

In the last decades, Edmonton, a mid-sized Canadian city, has witnessed a rapid increase and diversification of its newcomer[1] population. In 2011, 27% of Edmontonians reported having a mother tongue other than English or French, Canada's official languages at the federal level. The most commonly reported non-official languages were Chinese, Tagalog (Filipino), Punjabi, and Spanish. In the five years prior to 2011, Edmonton received 49,930 immigrants, roughly half of whom came from the Philippines, India, China, Pakistan, and the United States. Ethnic groups from Africa, and Latin America experienced the greatest growth from 2006 to 2011, and, more recently, the numbers of Iraqi and Syrian refugees have increased significantly (ECF/ESPC, 2016). The 2016 census showed a similar trend, as almost a quarter of Edmontonians stated their native language was different from the official languages (French or

1. In this paper we use "newcomer" as defined by the Edmonton Community Foundation (ECF) and Edmonton Social Planning Council (ESPC): "a person who has arrived in Canada, whether as an immigrant or refugee." "Immigrant" is defined as "a person who migrates to another country, usually to live permanently. In Canada immigrants are given the legal status of permanent residents" and refugee is defined as "a person who is forced to flee from persecution and who is located outside of their home country" (2016, p. 1).

English) (Government of Canada). Over half of these speakers used this non-official language in the home.

Many newcomers face language barriers in accessing programs and services and their successful settlement often depends on support offered by institutions and government (Mahmoudi, 1992; Derwing *et al.*, 2005-2006; Vineberg, 2012). Among the initiatives that the City of Edmonton (COE) undertook in recent years to make basic information more widely available to newcomers was the creation of the *Newcomer's Guide to Edmonton* (*NGE*) and its translation into 7 languages in 2016. The *NGE*, designed to help newcomers settle in Edmonton, includes basic information under the following headings: About Edmonton, Working Together for You, Finding Information, Settling in Edmonton, Moving Around Edmonton, Living in Edmonton, Learning in Edmonton, Working in Edmonton, Staying Healthy in Edmonton, Staying Safe in Edmonton, Enjoying Edmonton, and Municipal Government. The development of the original English-language version[2] involved multiple stakeholders, including settlement workers, English language instructors, cultural brokers,[3] and newcomers themselves. Acknowledging the diverse linguistic backgrounds of newcomers, a one-year initiative was launched in 2016 to translate the guide into Amharic, Arabic, French,[4] Mandarin, Punjabi, Somali, and Spanish.[5]

2. A new English-language version of the guide was published in 2016, specifically developed with translation in mind. The latest version on the City of Edmonton website was updated in 2018.

3. Cultural brokers are individuals working in a variety of organizations and act as mediators between groups or people with different cultural backgrounds to increase mutual understanding. They aim to enhance the health and well-being of newcomer families so that they can build communities, thrive, and contribute to their new society. Many cultural brokers are themselves from immigrant communities and thus know first-hand the social, economic, and linguistic challenges that many newcomers may face when trying to integrate into Canadian society.

4. While including French in a case study on newcomers to Canada may seem problematic given its status as an official language of Canada (federal level), at the municipal level (Edmonton), it does not enjoy any special status despite provincial efforts (Alberta) to provide materials in French to its growing Francophone community. As noted by the project organizer: "there was a consultation with the Franco-Albertan Association and they were not really happy with us doing the French translation based on Parisian French. They felt we were excluding the Franco-Albertan African community […] and so with the *Newcomer's Guide*, we wanted to include them" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a).

5. As noted by the project organizer, a network of stakeholders, including the TFC (The Family Center), were consulted to determine which language groups were the

With the recent publication of the *NGE* and the stakeholders and participants still around, the opportunity to research this translation project was undertaken in order to generate recommendations on translation for stakeholders in government, the nonprofit sector, and communities at large. Through this research project,[6] we were able to delve into the material and cultural challenges that a team of community translators and reviewers faced in the task of translating material for use by their own local communities. Based on Gabriel González Núñez's translation policy categories (2016) exploring "management, beliefs, and practices," we conducted online surveys and individual interviews[7] to examine the material challenges that the *NGE* community translators faced and the techniques and knowledge employed to cope with challenges in translating. Through this process, we learned about the strategies and know-how that translators, project managers, and other stakeholders involved developed in response to those challenges. Their praxis provides an interesting case study of culturally and materially situated community translation in Canada at the municipal level.

1. The Material Turn in Translation Studies and Community Translation

As the guest editors of this special issue of *TTR* suggest in their Introduction, in response to the material turn in many other fields, Translation Studies has increasingly focused its attention on the study of material cultures. A similar focus on materiality can be readily perceived in the case of the *NGE* we examined, perhaps most significantly in the conceptualization of community translation as a materially, socially, and culturally situated, not product, but

most linguistically vulnerable rather than only relying on demolinguistic data. For example, Tagalog was not included by the project organizer given that members of that community were deemed highly proficient in English (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a).

6. The research project "Empowering Communities through Translation: The Case of the *Newcomer's Guide to Edmonton,*" led by Odile Cisneros, Ann De León, and Sathya Rao (University of Alberta) in collaboration with *NGE* project organizer, Charlene Ball (City of Edmonton), was awarded a Partnership Engage Grant from Canada's Social Science and Humanities Research Council in 2018. The authors would like to thank their graduate and undergraduate research assistants (Bashair Alibrahim, Wangtaolue "Gary" Guo, and Hyunjin "Amy" Kim) for their help with various aspects of this study.

7. This study received approval from the Research Ethics Office at the University of Alberta (RES0039507) to conduct all surveys and interviews. Our questionnaires were also approved by the COE: *NGE* project organizer.

rather *practice*. The key term here is "situated," which points to how translation practice is anchored to concrete material and local conditions.[8] "Situated," to our mind, suggests more strongly a sense of material conditions as well as embeddedness within specific linguistic and geographical communities (of newcomers), both of which are relevant to our discussion of community translation below. In other words, the material, social, and cultural situatedness may include things such as the translators' degree of training and the local contexts (communities) in which they operate. It is in that sense that both the material turn and community translation can productively interact. In this discussion, the concept of community translation must be examined.

Minako O'Hagan (2011) notes that the term "community translation" has been fraught with ambiguity. Because of its association with the well-established field of community interpreting in Translation Studies, "community translation" has been used by some authors to refer to "the written translation of public information for an immigrant population" (*ibid*., p. 11).[9] While community interpreting has become more professionalized in some countries like Australia, Canada, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (Taibi, 2014, p. 53), it still often employs (like many community translation practices do), "untrained individuals" or non-professionals[10] (Antonini *et al*., 2017; Wadensjö, 2009). The involvement of non-professionals is also

8. Other discussions might rightly use the terms "context" or Bourdieu's "habitus" in the sense of embodied cultural practices.

9. O'Hagan also notes that community translation has been used more or less synonymously in the context of Web 2.0 using terms such as "translation crowdsourcing," "user-generated translation and community," "crowdsourced," "collaborative," and "participatory translation" (2011, p. 13).

10. Research on non-professional interpreters and translators (NPIT) has also been fraught with a diversity of terms referring to them in different contexts as: "natural translators" (bilingual competence), "intercultural mediators," "lay interpreters," "public service interpreters," "volunteers," "amateurs," "ad hoc translators," or "unprofessional translators" (Blasco Mayor and Jiménez Ivars, 2011; Antonini *et al*., 2017). While focusing more on the role of non-professional interpreters, Antonini *et al*. propose that "non-professional" is the most unbiased term to use given that its opposite is a "professional translator," which implies someone who is recruited, receives payment, is held to high standards and receives prestige (2017). In contrast the work of non-professional interpreters or translators is seen as voluntary and unpaid and is not necessarily held to the same standards as that of a professional translator. In our study, this term is further complicated in that the community translators of the *NGE* were in fact recruited and paid, and their translation backgrounds (professional and non-professional) varied.

prominent in a wide range of collaborative "translation practices […] unfolding on the Internet," a phenomenon that O'Hagan notes is also known as "community translation," with "community" understood as being online and tied to the specific context of Web 2.0 (2011, p. 12). These practices, this scholar points out, do not always involve untrained volunteers given that professional translators may also volunteer to undertake this type of online work (*ibid.*, p. 13). In this paper we take the position that any translator, professional or not, can act as a community translator when she or he translates for a community setting, whether online or not.

Beyond questions of professional or online status, community translation is also seen by some as a practice that seeks to address material and power imbalances in society by ensuring the rights of all individuals and communities to public information and services (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016). In that vein, scholars probe how community translation deals with issues that are specific to the local context, namely, diversity of readerships (Burke, 2018), linguistic disparity, and cultural differences between newcomers and host community (Gawn, 1988; Snell-Hornby, 1995; Campbell, 2005). On the basis of such discussions, in this study we see *community translation* as a locally inflected practice[11] performed by local community translators whose aim is to facilitate communication between the City of Edmonton (regarding access to public services) and newcomers who may lack proficiency in one of the official languages, namely, English[12] (Taibi and Ozolins, 2016, pp. 7-8).

Returning to the issue of the material turn, Karin Littau's article "Translation and the Materiality of Communication" (2016) sparked a lively discussion in the 'Forum' section of the journal *Translation Studies* over the year 2016-2017. Though Littau does not discuss community translation per se, some parts of her argument can clearly

11. As our case study did not focus on community translation practices online, we looked at how the "cultural situatedness" of community translators shaped their practices. That is, we considered how community translators operated within their own physical communities and if this allowed them to become more intimately aware of the diversity of readerships, linguistic disparities, and cultural differences between the newcomer and host communities they were translating for.

12. As mentioned earlier, while English and French are both official languages of Canada (federal level), at the provincial level, federalism grants provinces control over their own language policy. In Edmonton (at the municipal level), French does not enjoy any special status, which is why it was one of the translation languages given the need of the growing newcomer French-speaking African community.

relate to the local and material aspects that emerge in community translation. For instance, Littau notes that "there is something deeply skewed about the discursivization of culture, if it leads to the abandonment of asking questions about its material, physical or physiological substrata" (2016, p. 84). Community translation is closely connected to its physical context, as community translators are embedded within specific cultural and material conditions. Furthermore, Littau remarks that translators form "part of a material, medial and technologized ecology that shapes every aspect of mind" (*ibid*., p. 84) and that paying attention to "the role of 'material agency' in translation [also involves considering] 'how translations are carried through societies over time by particular groups'" (*ibid*., p. 88). These aspects clearly stand out in the case of the community translators in our study as well. Community translators, many of them newcomers themselves, have experienced similar material circumstances to the ones their target audiences face, and this shapes their perception and approach to translation. With this in mind, we explored to what extent community translators paid special attention to specific details (register, for instance) when translating for particular cultural and linguistic communities that they themselves may have been or are members of.

Regarding these matters, the literature on community translation is still scant, because it has typically been envisioned either as a result-oriented practice addressing urgent social needs (e.g., medical and legal) or as a "subordinate" or non-professional practice lacking the rigor and quality of its professional counterpart.[13] Nonetheless, the way the *NGE* was translated afforded us the potential to explore alternative conceptions of community translation. For example, community translation can be conceived as a constructive intercultural *praxis* (Habermas, 1984; 1989; Venuti, 1996) with the potential to empower linguistic minorities to participate in the broader social conversation by being entrusted to translate material for their own consumption. Ultimately, our goal is to show that translation can play a significant social, political, and even economic role in how multicultural cities like Edmonton can be managed as part of well-conceived translation

13. Taibi and Ozolins note that "community translation is closely concerned with migrants, refugees and local language minorities. As these groups usually fall into low socio-economic strata and lack social, economic and political power, community translation itself has been perceived as a non-priority service and a non-prestigious area of study" (2016, p. 19).

practices or a language policy (Telles de Vasconcelos Souza, 2018). A case in point is the work of Reine Meylaerts (2018) on the translation policy implemented in the highly diverse City of Antwerp, Belgium. Here Meylaerts highlights the essential role that translation plays in overcoming language barriers which may prevent the full participation of linguistic minorities in their host society.[14] "[T]ranslation policy," she argues, "can act as an instrument for social justice in its inclusion of minorities" (Meylaerts, 2011b).

2. Theoretical and Methodological Approaches

Hélène Buzelin (2007a, 2007b) developed an inquiry-based method inspired by Bruno Latour's anthropology (1989, 1991, 2002), which she used to investigate translation practices in publishing houses in Montreal. This method focused on the translation production *process* as opposed to the end result or the target audience. Janet Fraser (1993, 1999) has also noted that translation studies research has tended to take a product-based approach, arguing that research on community translation might benefit from a focus on process and empirical data gathered through oral interviews of the practitioners. Our study was designed with such principles in mind. Consequently, an ethnographic approach was employed that paid particular attention to the community translators' and other agents' experiences, practices, or know-how (de Certeau, 1990, 1994).

Our choice of an ethnographic or process-based approach led us to consider if pre-existing formalized translation policies or practices may have influenced translators and other agents in the case of the translation of the *NGE*.[15] Translation policy, as defined by Meylaerts, involves "a set of legal rules that regulate translation in the public domain: in education, in legal affairs, in political institutions, in administration, in the media" (2011a, p. 165). Meylaerts focuses on the European context, where more explicit and developed translation policies and management exist (2011a, 2011b, 2018). Through our research, we were able to determine that no written formalized translation policy exists in Edmonton. As mentioned, we delved into a set

14. Meylaerts' work on translation policies here showcases how translation practices and beliefs pioneered by community interpreting and translation social workers and civil servants in Antwerp in the 1990s preceded translation management (i.e., its legal implementation and recognition by Flemish authorities) by over a decade (2018, p. 465).

15. See the essay on translation policy and practices in Edmonton by our research collaborator Sathya Rao in this volume.

of translation policy categories, based on Bernard Spolsky's (2009) linguistic typology and developed by González Núñez (2016) in his work on cases in the United Kingdom, where explicit or overt translation policies are uncommon. These categories, which include "management, beliefs, and practices" (*ibid*., p. 92), enabled us to more thoughtfully design surveys and interviews, taking into account the reality of translation practices in Edmonton.

González Núñez defines translation *management* as "decisions regarding translation made by people who have the authority to decide the use or non-use of translation within a domain" and they may include "attempts to influence not just the choices of the people who actually do the translating but also those of individuals who engage translators and interpreters"; *beliefs* as ideas "that members of a community hold about issues such as what the value is, or is not, of offering translation in certain contexts for certain groups or to achieve certain ends" and, while often unspoken, can be inferred from practice; and *practice* as "actual translation practices of a given community," involving "questions such as what texts get translated, what mode of interpreting is used, into and out of what languages, [and] where it takes place" (2016, p. 92). These three categories interact in complex ways. Such complexity was evident in the responses we obtained to survey questions. In exploring translation practice, we became aware of the material challenges that the *NGE* community translators and project managers confronted accessing resources. Looking at the practice also allowed us to explore the strategies or know-how they developed to cope with these translation challenges. We organized the discussion of practice into the challenges faced and the strategies developed to cope with those strategies. This methodology also afforded us insight into the working conditions of these translators and reviewers, who at times act as volunteers, have different degrees of training, and serve newcomer communities who may face uncertainty.

The project organizer, project manager, translators, and reviewers were surveyed using specifically designed questionnaires as well as open-ended interviews to investigate translation management, beliefs, and practices. The results of the surveys and interviews were tabulated to compare and contrast answers as well as identify common and recurrent themes. Our study took into consideration the way the translation project of the *NGE* was organized as teamwork. The team included a project organizer, responsible for the overall management,

and a project manager, who hired translators and proofreaders.[16] The project organizer hired third-party reviewers.[17] For each of the 7 target languages, there was a translator, a proofreader, and a third-party reviewer, though some translators changed mid-way through the project. In all, at least 23 team members collaborated on the project. Communication and coordination among the 7-language specific sub-teams were facilitated by the project organizer and project manager. The project organizer liaised between team members and was responsible for the coordination of the entire project.

We began our study with a call for participants to all team members of the project. We successfully recruited 12 participants[18]

16. While translators, proofreaders, and third-party reviewers chose to remain anonymous, both the project organizer, Charlene Ball, Multicultural Liaison at the City of Edmonton, and the project manager, Taryn McDonald, Social Enterprise Centre (SEC) Supervisor at The Family Centre (TFC), gave consent for their names to appear here.

17. In this paper the terms "proofreader" and "third-party reviewer" were those used by the *NGE* project organizer and manager. According to the project organizer (email exchange) the "proofreaders" were expected to check the translation for spelling and grammar accuracy, etc. and were hired in-house by the project manager from TFC (as were the translators). The "third-party reviewers" were hired as an added level of quality control by the project organizer through the Multicultural Health Brokers Co-op (MCHB) and were external to TFC. Their tasks included reviewing the translation for spelling, grammar accuracy etc. but they also had to ensure the translations reflected the local and target culture context and thus also acted as community readers (Mossop, 2019, pp. 115-135). What the project organizer observed, though, was that these roles were more fluid depending on how each team interpreted them: "In some cases the individuals took on their roles as proofreaders and in others the translator and proofreaders seemed to work more as a translation team, consulting with each other over the proper interpretation of the original text and the accuracy of the translation. In a couple of cases, it seemed like the third-party reviewers took no initiative regarding the context and just reviewed the translation checking for spelling, grammar accuracy, etc." In turn, the project manager explained that: "Both the proofreader and third-party reviewer made suggestions to the translator. All suggestions were taken into consideration and discussed. Ultimately our translator made the final decision as to what the end product would be" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2020).

18. One participant withdrew from the study after signing the consent form and did not fill out the online survey, so is not counted in the 12 cited above. Three participants who filled out the online survey did not agree to or were not available to carry out a follow-up in-person interview. Although we did not receive any response from any third-party reviewers, we were able to indirectly get a sense of their role from interviews with other participants (i.e., that some may have not done much [returned their review in 20 minutes]; some did not want to confront the translator regarding their concerns that the translation was poor [thus suggesting that they might not have been professional translators—in the sense that a professional translator would

from a total of 23 team members. The study consisted of two phases: an online survey and a follow-up in-person taped interview. The online surveys were tailored to the specific role of the participant, namely, translator, proofreader, third-party reviewer, project organizer, or project manager. We obtained 12 responses to online surveys (10 from translators and proofreaders, 2 from the project organizer and project manager). We did follow-up in-person interviews with 9 participants: 2 project managers; 3 proofreaders (French, Punjabi, and Spanish); and 4 translators (Chinese, Punjabi, Somali, and Spanish). We were not successful at recruiting any third-party reviewers.

The translator/proofreader online survey was divided into 4 sections and was conducted in English, the common language of the research team and participants. The first section aimed at getting a general profile of each translator/proofreader regarding origin, linguistic expertise, educational background and training, role in the project, and general experience as a translator/interpreter. Section 2 looked to assess working philosophy and beliefs vis-à-vis (socio-political) commitment and ideology as "community" translators/reviewers, and whether this commitment was reflected (or not) in their translation and proofreading practices. Section 3 asked questions about the translation and proofreading process, namely, the collective nature (or not) of the *NGE* translation process as a distinctive feature, the organization of work, and the proofreading/reviewing procedure adopted. The fourth and final section asked translators and proofreaders to reflect on their translation/proofreading choices and how they mirrored their (socio-political) commitment as well as opinions about the final translation product and its role.

As opposed to the very specific questions in the translator/proofreader online survey, the one tailored to the project organizer and project manager had more open-ended questions in three general areas of inquiry (background, translation process, and personal philosophy). Under "background," we queried the project organizer and manager (none of whom were translators[19]) about their professional and linguistic experience, their involvement with other

have had a code of ethics to guide them]; and some did a lot in the sense that they replaced a translator).

19. The project organizer and project manager are not translators and they are monolingual speakers of English, but they were familiar with some translation issues and terminology they developed over their 10+ years of experience as frontline workers and cultural brokers for NGOs serving immigrants and refugees, as we discuss below.

translation projects, and their knowledge of any language policies in the context of their work. Regarding the process, managers were asked to: describe the translation process (including recruitment of team members, quality control, visual design); comment on other translation projects as opposed to this one; and discuss target audience, cost, level of usage, and satisfaction with the end-product. Finally, under "personal philosophy," organizer and manager were invited to self-reflect on their role as organizer or manager of this project, and on the role that they play in Edmonton's multicultural community.

3. Findings and Discussion

To outline the results of both the online survey and the in-person interviews, we begin with a snapshot of the personal, educational, and professional background of the translators and proofreaders, followed by a brief discussion of similar background details of the project organizer and manager. We go on to discuss the material and cultural challenges that all participants faced as well as the culturally situated responses they developed. Our discussion follows González Núñez's (2016) categories of "management, beliefs, and practices" which, as mentioned, also guided survey design.

The diversity of languages that the *NGE* was translated into parallels the diversity of the translators' countries of origin. In our survey sample of 10 translators and proofreaders,[20] they hailed from: Canada (20%); India (20%); Eritrea (20%); and China, Colombia, Somalia, Sudan (each 10%). Their time in Edmonton varied: less than 5 years (10%); between 5-15 years (30%); more than 15 years (60%). These numbers show that the vast majority had been living for a considerable period in Edmonton, suggesting perhaps being established in their communities. Their languages of expertise included not only the languages that they were commissioned to translate into, but also, in some cases, languages from neighbouring linguistic communities, for instance, Amharic/Tigrinya, Bilen, and Tigre for Amharic translators/proofreaders, and Punjabi, Hindi, Urdu, for the Punjabi translators/proofreaders. The Spanish proofreader also had native fluency in Portuguese. The educational background of all translators was fairly high: 20% reported college or technical training; 50%, university degrees; and 30%, a graduate degree. In contrast,

20. The figure 10 refers only to translators and proofreaders. The figure 12 for participants cited above also includes the project organizer and project manager, who filled out separate surveys not discussed in this section.

formal training in translation was relatively limited: only 10% reported having professional certification; 30% reported some training as part of a degree; 40%, only short-term training (2 weeks to 12 hours); and 10% reported no training, just practical experience, while 10% gave no answer. Their practical experience ranged from 0-5 years (60%) to 5 or more years (40%).[21] This number, in tandem with the time in Edmonton figure, shows that some experienced translators have also been longstanding members of their local community and also suggests that some may have been translating right from their arrival in Edmonton or even before. A notable facet of the translators and proofreaders is that most of their work involved primarily translating *into* English,[22] rather than into their mother tongue, another possible handicap due to relative unavailability of qualified translators from their mother tongue into English. 70% of respondents translated between 60-100% of the time into English, in contrast to 30% of respondents who translated primarily into other languages.

In terms of training, both the project organizer and project manager were university-educated, with one holding an MA degree. The project manager had 10 years of experience in various roles as a frontline worker, supervisor, and manager, and, although not fluent in any language other than English, she was supervisor at The Family Centre (TFC), an organization providing translation and interpretation services to the community through contractors. The project organizer on the part of the City of Edmonton (COE), had worked for 20 years in international educational exchanges and in the not-for-profit sector serving immigrants and refugees. She worked as Multicultural Liaison, connecting ethnocultural community groups with COE programs. She had some knowledge of Spanish and through her international work was somewhat aware of translation issues.[23] Neither had ever undertaken a project of this size or complexity in terms of the number of languages involved.

21. The question asked to report in months and years the length of practical experience. The longest period reported in the survey was 45 years.

22. Surveys revealed that translation into English was carried out for a variety of organizations including personal document translation for non-for-profits, but also materials for government, education, healthcare, legal and commercial organizations.

23. In her online survey, the project organizer mentioned, "difficulties of literal translation, lack of language, experiential or conceptual equivalence between languages, degrees of formality, effect of relationship and context on language used, etc." (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018a).

4. Management

By looking at aspects of management, we were able to find out not only the details of the translation process, but also the rationale behind them. The project organizer and project manager worked collaboratively to develop a translation process that would include local community translators, more monitoring, and quality control: i.e., "translation and proofreading by TFC, third-party reviewers selected by the COE, and design and correction chapter by chapter" online survey with project manager (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018b). This decision stemmed from second-hand knowledge they had about the previous 2008 *NGE* translation, which had been outsourced to a professional translation agency in Toronto and which had, in some cases, "missed the mark regarding the target audience."[24] For this reason, they felt it was important to hire community translators more familiar with the local context. The project organizer first conducted focus groups with key stakeholders (cultural brokers, teachers of English as an Additional Language, and settlement workers, many of whom had been newcomers themselves) and asked them about the *NGE* "content relevance, gaps, sequencing, design etc.", which meant revising and simplifying the English version (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a).

Through TFC, the project manager recruited translators and proofreaders corresponding to the languages the *NGE* was to be translated into. Individuals from TFC who were interested in becoming translators for this project were asked to submit a resume. According to the project manager, selection was based on "competency in their mother tongue and English, experience in translation and/or interpretation, and related professional experience and/or educational background in a related field" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018b). Individuals were also chosen based on their availability and who the project manager thought would work well as a team, thus adding a subjective layer to the selection process. Once selected, TFC composed teams of two people, a translator and a proofreader. As an extra measure to ensure

24. For example, as noted by the project organizer in an interview, the previous *NGE* Punjabi translation outsourced to professional translators "used a register that was so high to the point of not being understandable to the general population" and therefore was not "effective" for the Edmonton context. In fact, it had to be re-done a couple of times, given that some idiomatic expressions were translated literally, such as translating "Edmonton is a powerhouse" as "Edmonton is a city of electricity." In some cases, the linguistic variant chosen did not match the one used by the specific newcomer or immigrant community based in Edmonton (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a).

quality, the project organizer asked each of the teams to do a test chapter. The chapter was then sent to a third-party reviewer selected by the project organizer through Multicultural Health Brokers Co-op (MCHB) to decide whether they would proceed with that team. The project manager felt that having an additional reviewer helped to raise the level of translation for the project, yet this extra layer was also a new experience for them, as they were not always clear on the expectations and where the final say resided. Together with the project organizer, they ultimately decided it was with their in-house (TFC) translators.

Participants were also surveyed on how the *NGE* translation project was managed. According to them, TFC functioned as an intermediary as well as the managing organization for the *NGE* translation project. The translators and proofreaders involved were first contacted by the project manager or other representatives from TFC. While individual in-person meetings were first held to explain the project, it was noted that most of the correspondence was carried out through email. A collective debriefing session/celebration with all participants (managers, translators, proofreaders, reviewers) was held by TFC upon project completion. This celebration and acknowledgement was very meaningful to the participants. The Spanish translator noted in her interview: "It just became a community project […] we translated this thing. Now we can all relate […] having the celebration in the end. That was huge for us… so rewarding" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018c).

Generally speaking, the participants were very positive about the organization and management of the *NGE* translation project: (1) Communications were convenient; (2) There were clear deadlines and expectations; (3) There was a strong sense of collectivity. Interestingly, the participants' responses disagreed regarding general guidelines they had received. For example, the Amharic translator reported that the requirement was for the document to be translated word by word, yet the meaning should be clear.[25] In contrast, according to the French proofreader, literal translation was not what the client was

25. The participant brought to his interview a printed email of the general recommendations. These included: "translate word for word, as long as the meaning was clear" and to "keep the same spacing as the original" which he felt was not achievable, given that Amharic is more gender specific often requiring them to write two different pronouns (masculine and feminine) and hence having a longer text than the English original (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018d).

expecting. The Amharic translator also said that the format (spacing, in particular) of the original text should be kept in the translation. Yet, the Spanish translator stated that she was told that format was not a big concern and that The City of Edmonton would take care of the format when they sent the translation off for printing.[26]

5. Beliefs

Answers to surveys and interview questions revealed specific beliefs about the importance of translating community materials as well as perceptions around the role and value of community translators. As Multicultural Liaison for the COE, the project organizer (online survey) envisioned her role as helping to reduce "barriers to equitable access to City of Edmonton policies, programs, services, and information for vulnerable populations" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018a). The project organizer's approach to this translation was "very much based on an ideal of inclusive collaboration with stakeholders," where "true empowerment and community development is not something that can be done 'for' communities, but must be done 'by' and/or 'with those communities'" (*ibid.*). In turn, the project manager saw her role "as being a bridge between the customers and the translators" in order to "ensure that people for whom English is their second language, still have access to everyday services" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018b). Furthermore, representing TFC, she felt that "customers should trust that the work commissioned is done in a timely and accurate way" given that "translation services are a luxury" (*ibid.*).[27] While the project manager noted that translation work can easily be contracted out to professional agencies, she felt it was important to have "an agency who understands the work and has built positive and strong relationships with their translators to ensure a higher quality of work" (*ibid.*). This raised important questions regarding what assumptions organizations or individuals have regarding the quality of translation work outsourced to professionals, i.e., that the work will be professional

26. The project organizer found these inconsistencies in conveying translation expectations enlightening, given that in their earliest discussions with the project manager "they had agreed to convey to the translators the importance of sacrificing literal translation for more 'meaningful' translation to the target language communities." The project organizer explained that these inconsistencies might have been the result of not having provided these instructions (i.e., policy or guidelines) in writing to be shared with the translation teams (Cisneros *et al.*, 2020).

27. Luxury here is meant in the sense that translation may be seen as expensive for some members of the community.

and accurate, and the need to assess if these assumptions are correct. As noted by the project organizer (interview): "you're paying for a professional service so you get that back and it's natural to assume that the final product you get is a professional and accurate product," but at times they realized "that wasn't the case and that we spent a lot of money on [a] translation that ultimately couldn't be used" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a). This experience led the project organizer to develop this new translation process from a "culturally sensitive and relevant perspective," taking into account the "language level and education level" of the target community (*ibid.*).

Participants were asked questions about their connection and investment in their communities. All 7 translators and proofreaders who participated in the post-survey interview felt that being involved in the translation of community materials into languages other than English was very important to them. For example, participants felt that community translations were "indispensable" (Amharic translator), "very important" (Punjabi translator, Spanish proofreader), and "a great idea" (Spanish translator) (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018-2019a). Their rationale[28] for the need to translate community materials into languages other than English included: (1) Canadian society is a multicultural one and newcomers speak different languages and were raised in different cultures (Punjabi translator, Spanish proofreader); (2) Language barriers exist and newcomers may not have fluency in English (Chinese translator, Punjabi proofreader, project manager); (3) Newcomers need government/welfare/community materials translated (or explained to them) in order to successfully integrate into their new society (Amharic translator, Spanish translator) (*ibid.*).

The participants were queried about their perception of their role as a community translator. The consensus among the interviewees was that a community translator functions as a mediator that connects communities with government and not-for-profit organizations. In one case, the relationship was characterized as a "bridge" (Chinese translator). Still, there were some differences in their characterization of the community translator's agency and work ethic. Their responses fell into 3 groups regarding the role of community translators. (1) They function as an independent and objective party or "communicator" acting between communities and organizations (Chinese and

28. These rationales were stated during the in-person interviews, and while these ideas were expressed slightly differently by the participants, they have been grouped here together by the authors.

Amharic translators). (2) They represent both the community and the organization they are working with (project organizer, and Punjabi and Spanish translators) and have a strong connection to the community they represent (the Spanish translator noted, "it is hard to detach yourself"), but also felt the need to demonstrate a translator's reliability. (3) The translator should be loyal to the documents they are translating (Spanish proofreader and project manager), and yet they admitted they ultimately represented their employer, TFC (*ibid.)*.

Queried about the distinctiveness of community translators compared with professional "non-community" translators,[29] participants' responses fell into three groups. (1) Community translators embody a stronger sense of centripetal collectivity than non-community or non-local translators do (project manager, Chinese translator, Spanish translator): "it was more beneficial to have someone who was from the community; you need that local experience" (Spanish translator). While they noted that non-community or non-local translators are very good, they felt that community translators "just kind of have an extra commitment."[30] (2) Two interviewees saw very little difference between a non-community or non-local translator and a community translator (Punjabi and Amharic translator), yet both noted that community translators have more affinity with the neighbourhood or the language community they form a part of.[31] (3) Some participants perceived that community translators might have received less formal training than their non-community professional translator counterparts.[32] For example, participants felt that non-

29. By "non-community translator" we mean translators who do not have a direct connection with the local communities who are the target audience of the *NGE*. This project, as mentioned earlier, hired translators through TFC, a local NGO that provides both interpreting and translation services through local contractors who are members of the communities they serve locally.

30. The Chinese translator also noted in an interview that people often put "community translators in a lower status" with respect to non-community professional translators and that that is a mistake: "I myself have been working with community volunteer translators for many, many years, and my experience is that they can do very good work" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019b).

31. In his interview, the Amharic translator felt that "community translation is a social activity in which you are constantly connected to the community" while non-community professional translation "is done in isolation" and for personal reasons such as "getting paid" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018d).

32. Project manager: "I hate to use the word lack of education because I think so many of our community translators are so very educated in their own way [but] I think any formal training or any training courses you can take to enhance your skills

community professional translators might be more experienced and much more skilled in translating technical documents (project manager, Chinese translator, Punjabi proofreader) (*ibid.*).

6. Practice: Material and Cultural Challenges

When examining the individual practice of translators and managers, a number of material and cultural challenges became evident. These included: the size of the project, doing group work, an underestimation of the completion time and cost, a lack of a written policy document or guidelines, different degrees of linguistic competence (of project organizer, project manager, translators and reviewers), specific terminology and cultural difference, and linguistic variation. These challenges, however, presented an opportunity for creative solutions.

Regarding size, the project manager noted in her online survey that the *NGE* was the largest translation project they had undertaken: "Having multiple teams of translators working on the project at different rates, levels and with various languages was challenging" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018b). Monitoring the work posed challenges but using a tracking program helped. Monitoring also revealed communication issues between translators and reviewers. At times translators and project managers had difficulty getting reliable responses from third-party reviewers.[33]

Reflecting on their experience working in groups, all the participants, with the exception of two translators (Amharic and Chinese), revealed that they had not worked collaboratively before. The majority were used to working alone as independent (freelance) translators or reviewers. Working in this more collaborative fashion forced many to rethink their notions about translation as a solitary profession. This experience also encouraged them to work together and bring up doubts or disagreements. The project organizer noted an initial need for facilitation to ensure translators and proofreaders worked comfortably with outside third-party reviewers (something new to them), instead of contacting the project manager, who didn't

are important, but I think so much importance comes from actually being in the community" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018b).

33. For example, the project organizer noted in her interview, "there was one reviewer who came later who we weren't sure if [they] actually did anything because [they] would receive something and twenty minutes later would send it back and say it's all good. So maybe we had outstanding translators and proofreaders, which in fact they were, but I think in any translation, there's always going to be room for some improvements, right?" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a).

know any of the target translation languages. The translators and proofreaders, however, could contact the project organizer if they had questions regarding the original intent or meaning of the English text.

In the course of the translation, some translators or proofreaders had to be replaced due to translation issues[34] or family emergencies. Consequently, some final versions ended up with an inconsistent style. One translator commented that the final Table of Contents did not sound like it was translated by a native speaker and was inconsistent with the contents in the rest of the guide. The translator doubted whether the entire final version had been reviewed, a task they would have been happy to take on for purposes of consistency.[35]

In retrospect, the project organizer felt they might have tried to initially "coordinate a bigger meeting with all the teams at the start of the project" to clarify expectations and build relationships between teams, as most communications for the project occurred mainly through email and/or phone: "I think more face-to-face meetings may have helped people to work more cohesively in some cases" (*ibid.*). The Chinese translator also suggested that group meetings could have taken place after each chapter so team members could share the challenges they encountered and solutions/strategies employed. These strategies or "things to look out for," they noted, could then be used in each subsequent chapter (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019b).

At the end of the project, the project organizer, project manager, and most of the translators and proofreaders remarked that, had they known the real amount of time it would take to complete the project, they would have charged more, as this work was something they completed on top of their regular work. The Spanish proofreader noted that busy schedules resulted in email being the main form of communication with the translator (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018e). Some teams also did not use the same proofreading/correction platforms to track changes, which created extra work. Translators also had to do extra proofreading/corrections after the final translation was

34. These issues are explained further ahead but included (for some languages) disagreement between the third-party reviewer and the translator (i.e., the third-party reviewer did not perceive the translator to have the same level of bilingual competence or the translator used a variant that missed the mark regarding the target audience. Two teams were dismantled based on this process).

35. This was interesting to note because, according to the project manager, the final say was supposed to rest with the translator. This might have been the result of having multiple translators/proofreaders due to family emergencies.

completed because the design program inadvertently eliminated important elements in the text.[36]

The lack of a written translation policy or guidelines had a varying impact on the practice of translators and managers. None of the interviewees knew if the City of Edmonton had any kind of written translation policy, but, interestingly, 2 participants (the Spanish and Chinese translators) assumed there was a written "policy" or "guidelines," which had just not been made available to them.[37] The project organizer noted that while there was no formalized written translation policy, they felt it was advantageous to have "the flexibility to manage the project in a way we thought would be most effective as well as more affordable" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a). The project organizer observed that "hiring a professional translator[38] doesn't necessarily guarantee you the results you want for material that is for local use," (*ibid.*) which highlights the importance of using local community translators in this process. This flexible approach was also praised by the project manager:

> We had to develop our own practices and figure out what was going to work best and change things if we needed to […] so I think in some ways it was maybe a little bit more freedom […] and we could use it as a learning opportunity, which I definitely think it was. (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018b)

Linguistic competence also raised issues, as the project organizer and project manager were not translators themselves or had fluency in languages other than English, and yet were tasked with developing a translation process that would ensure quality control. For some

36. As noted by the project organizer, software issues ended up making changes especially to non-Roman scripts. For example, since the designer was not familiar with Asian character vertical text arrangement, when formatting they had arranged the characters using an English reading direction. This was corrected when the Chinese translator provided her with "two articles on Wikipedia about how to do vertical layout for Asian characters" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a). The Spanish translator noted certain diacritic marks, such as the "ñ" had been changed to an "n" after going through the design software. This extra work was not calculated in the initial cost (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018c).

37. The Spanish translator noted: "I was told that the City had a policy and that it was not enough for us to have a translator and a proofreader internal to TFC, [because] it also needed to be reviewed by a third-party, which is a new thing, because for other organizations we actually just do the translation and then have the internal proofreader" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018c).

38. Translation companies also have no licensing and may not require recognized certification of translators and so proficiency can vary.

languages (particularly Chinese and Amharic), there were more instances of disagreement between the translator and the third-party reviewer because one of the two parties did not perceive the other as having the same level of bilingual competence, or because the target language itself has variations. There was no consensus among participants if all parties had the same level of bilingual competence. Among the 7 translators and proofreaders interviewed, 3 (Amharic translator, Spanish proofreader, Punjabi proofreader) were quite positive, believing that each member in the group had the same level of bilingual competence. The rest held the opposite view.[39]

The translators and proofreaders were also not always in agreement about word choices and terminology. Translators and proofreaders spoke about the difficulty in translating terms or expressions which did not have an exact equivalent in the target language or a corresponding concept in the target culture. Examples include: "spring forward"/"fall back", "daylight saving time," and "bus transfer" (Punjabi); "senior," "snow," and "orchestra" (Amharic); "neighbourhood watch" and "windchill" (Chinese). Some translators struggled with translating Canadian First Nations terminology, while the Spanish translator noted the term "college" varies across Spanish-speaking countries with different educational systems. Similarly, LRT (Light Rail Transit) is called "tubo" in Argentina, "metro" in Mexico, while in other places it doesn't exist. Likewise, what regional variant to use in Spanish was debated: for example, "canales de bicicleta" was changed to "carriles de bicicleta," as it was deemed more accessible to the target audience. All of these examples point not only to the cultural specificity of the source text, but also to the challenges of transferring such cultural specificity effectively to the different target linguistic communities.

Linguistic variation produced issues that the Chinese, Punjabi, and Spanish translators were particularly aware of. In the case of Spanish, the translator suggested the project organizer hire a third-party reviewer from a Spanish American country in order to ensure a Spanish that would be more accessible to the local target audience. This introduces the important question of who the intended target

39. The Spanish proofreader noted that while some "organizations want certified translations, so no community translators work for them, the COE was okay with it though, they just wanted some checks and balances. That's why there was a translator, two proofreaders [sic] and reviewers, so there was a lot of checking each other's work" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018e).

audience was and, in this case, what Spanish variant would be most appropriate to the Edmonton context. Assumptions were also made by the translator, proofreader, third-party reviewer, and project manager (who did not speak the language) regarding what variant of Spanish would be best to use (e.g., debating the problematic distinction between Peninsular vs. Latin American Spanish) and what "formal" Spanish meant to them. While the Spanish translator noted that historically the Spanish-speaking community in Edmonton was Chilean, recent Spanish-speaking newcomers are not, so she appreciated that the third-party reviewer had a Venezuelan[40] background.[41]

7. Practice: Culturally Situated Strategies

The many challenges managers, translators, and proofreaders faced in their practice were met with surprisingly creative culturally situated strategies. These included creating a process for quality control and employing a number of tools and techniques to cope with the difficulties. A test chapter, external third-party reviewers, and a tracking tool enabled the project organizer and manager to make informed decisions as to what teams might work best together and produce a higher quality product in a timely fashion. Two teams were dismantled based on this process. The project manager noted that: "there was one situation where the third-party reviewer was uncomfortable with the translation and tried to be diplomatic without saying outright that the translation was poor, but they were not prepared to speak directly to the translator as the whole thing needed to be redone"[42] (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018b). In this case the project manager replaced that translator with positive results.

Translators and proofreaders, according to our online survey, also made use of both online and print resources such as: parallel

40. The project organizer found this comment interesting given that the Spanish third-party reviewer was in fact from Chile (Cisneros *et al.*, 2020).

41. Other issues included choosing the correct register for the target audience. For example, the Punjabi proofreader suggested that the translator use a more accessible register: "I thought it was better in plain simple Punjabi language. Because if you write in book language, sometimes people don't understand […] because a lot of people from our community come from villages and have never [even] been to a city [before coming to Edmonton]" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019c).

42. While the role of third-party reviewers was not directly assessed in this study, such a comment might indicate that the third-party reviewer here might have not been a professional translator who, guided by a code of ethics, would have had to express such concerns directly.

texts or research on Wikipedia (Spanish); print (Punjabi-English) and online bilingual dictionaries (French-English); online resources, databases, and concordances (e.g., Wordfast.com, Linguee.com, Proz.com, WordReference.com, Termium Plus, Google Translate); spellcheck in Microsoft Word (only used by the Spanish team because traditional spelling check programs were not compatible with a lot of the other languages) (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018-2019b). Translators and proofreaders also consulted with members from their target community. The Spanish translator noted in an interview: "I asked a couple of family members and friends from other Latin American countries about specific terms/challenging expressions. I also asked one of my relatives to read my work to see if it was easy to understand" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2018c). The Punjabi proofreader noted that "because a lot of people are reading this, I involved some of the community members from our side because I work at the radio station, I do talk shows" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019c). She also consulted with the Punjabi Writers' Association, a journalist from India, and a Punjabi professor from the community. The Chinese translator discussed the challenge of translating "windchill" and, after consulting with a family member, re-wrote the entire relevant section (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019b). This strategy of consulting local community members for their input on materials ultimately destined for their own use highlights community translation as a culturally situated strategy.

The project organizer, the project manager, and some translators/proofreaders also had the opportunity to take a 12-hour Community Translation course at the University of Alberta's Faculty of Extension with Odile Cisneros (project's Principal Investigator). The course empowered them by making explicit the tacit beliefs embedded in their own translation practice. It also reconfirmed the project organizer's decision to work with community translators: "My confidence was boosted in hearing [the community translators] in that course, that they knew what they were talking about [in technical terms] in regards to translation" and that "they were members of the communities as well" (Cisneros *et al.*, 2019a). That is, they were familiar with the diversity of readerships, linguistic disparities, and cultural differences within their own newcomer and host communities.

Conclusion

The translation of the *NGE* presents an interesting case study on the use of community translation by a Canadian municipality with no

formalized or written translation policy.[43] The project was unprecedented for Edmonton, not only because the *NGE* was the largest public-service document translated by the city, but also because of the number of languages it was translated into, the resources deployed, and the people involved (i.e., more than 23). The guide was translated into 7 languages; the team included a project organizer, a project manager, translators, proofreaders, and reviewers; and had a budget of almost CAN$50,000. While no formalized (or written) translation policy or guidelines were available to aid in the translation of the *NGE,* the project organizer and the project manager showcased their flexibility and know-how in organizing a materially and culturally situated framework for carrying out a community translation practice that also expressed concerns for the quality of the final product. Among these practices were the use of professional-like quality control checks, such as doing a first test chapter and employing an extra level of review through third-party reviewers (external to TFC) alongside proofreaders (who acted as translation reviewers) (internal to TFC). These choices were aimed at raising the level of translation and targeting it specifically to the local communities, all practices which ultimately benefit newcomers.[44]

Vis-à-vis the role of translation in language policy, the authors of this study would like to suggest that in order to enhance the practice of community translation, there is a need to continue to educate municipal administrators and community translators on best translation practices: i.e., to continue to develop workshops and create practical resources for their use, and to acknowledge the importance of the work that they do (their role as cultural brokers and the value of first-hand knowledge of the local context and communities they are translating for).

The translation of the *NGE* can also help to counter notions of translation as an activity that can only be performed by professionals, regardless of their knowledge of the local context or target audience. It highlights the social worth of community translation, understood as a valuable intercultural process designed to help communities incorporate their own knowledge while initiating a fruitful dialogue with the host community. Involving the local community in the

43. To our knowledge the only city in Canada with an officially formalized policy is Toronto.

44. Newcomers are the ultimate beneficiaries of promoting best translation practices, as these will address their needs and empower them to fully participate in society.

translation process[45] might also encourage the City to engage with other community translation participatory or collaborative practices (such as crowdsourcing) already used in the field of translation (Désilets and van der Meer, 2011; Jiménez-Crespo, 2017).[46] As noted by Meylaerts (2011b, 2018), there is an intimate connection between translation practices and issues pertaining to language rights, linguistic justice, and social inclusion in democratic societies. Pérez-González and Susam-Saraeva (2012) also note that non-professional translators (and interpreters) should no longer be seen as a less desirable or less expensive alternative to their professional counterparts, in that this group of people encompasses a wide range of participants who should be allowed to contribute to new forms of civic engagement. By employing and empowering local community translators (with varying degrees of professionalization) to make appropriate choices when translating material for local use, the translation of the *NGE* is an example of translation as a materially and culturally situated practice that can inspire similar initiatives in other Canadian cities or other multilingual contexts.

References

Antonini, Rachele *et al.* (2017). *Non-professional Interpreting and Translation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Blasco Mayor, María Jesús and María Amparo Jiménez Ivars, eds. (2011). *Interpreting Naturally: A Tribute to Brian Harris*. Bern, Peter Lang.

Burke, Jean (2018). "Linguistic Diversity Amongst Swahili-Speakers: A Challenge for Translation in Australia." In M. Taibi, ed. *Translation for the Community*. Bristol/Blue Ridge Summit, Multilingual Matters, pp. 156-173.

Buzelin, Hélène (2007a). "Translation Studies, Ethnography and the Production of Knowledge." Trans. Paul St-Pierre. In P. St-Pierre and P. C. Kar, eds. *In Translation – Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 39-56.

Buzelin, Hélène (2007b). "Translations 'in the Making'." Trans. Peter Vranckx. In M. Wolf and A. Fukari, eds. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 135-169.

45. It would be interesting to carry out a follow-up study involving the reaction of readers from the target language communities in the form of focus groups or feedback concerning the translations of the *NGE*.

46. The webpage hosting the *NGE* includes a link allowing users to suggest "corrections" for future updates. A future study might look at what type of feedback was received.

Campbell, Stuart (2005). "English Translation and Linguistic Hegemony in the Global Era." In G. Anderman and M. Rogers, eds. *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?* Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto, Multilingual Matters Ltd, pp. 27-38.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya, and Ann De León (2020). *Email exchange with Charlene Ball, November 9*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya, and Ann De León (2019a). *Interview with Charlene Ball, November 12*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya, De León, Ann and Gary Guo (2019b). *Interview with Chinese translator, February 27*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya and Ann De León (2019c). *Interview with Punjabi proofreader, July 24*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya, De León, Ann, Guo, Gary and Bashair Alibrahim (2018-2019a). *Interviews with translators and proof-readers, December 2018-February 2019*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya and Ann De León (2018-2019b). *Online survey with translators and proof-readers, October 2018-January 2019*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya and Ann De León (2018a). *Online survey with Charlene Ball, answers obtained July 16*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya and Ann De León (2018b). *Online survey with Taryn Mc Donald, July 17*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya and Ann De León (2018c). *Interview with Spanish translator, December 11*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya, De León, Ann and Bashair Alibrahim (2018d). *Interview with Amharic translator, December 12*.

Cisneros, Odile, Rao, Sathya, De León, Ann and Bashair Alibrahim (2018e). *Interview with Spanish proofreader, December 20*.

City of Edmonton (2016). *Newcomer's Guide to Edmonton: An Introductory Guide to Help New Residents Settle in Edmonton*. Edmonton, City of Edmonton.

de Certeau, Michel (1990). *L'invention du quotidien 1. Arts de faire*. L. Giard, ed. Paris, Gallimard.

de Certeau, Michel *et al*. (1994). *L'invention du quotidien 2. Habiter, cuisiner*. Paris, Gallimard.

Derwing, Tracey *et al*. (2005-2006). "The Attraction and Retention of Immigrants to Edmonton: A Case Study of a Medium Sized Canadian City." In *2005-2006 PCERII Working Paper Series*. Edmonton, Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration.

Désilets, Alain and Jaap van der Meer (2011). "Co-creating a Repository of Best-Practices for Collaborative Translation." *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, 10, pp. 27-44.

Edmonton Community Foundation (ECF) and Edmonton Social Planning

Council (ESPC) (2016). *Vital Signs Report on Newcomers*. [https://www.ecfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016-Vital-Signs-Final.pdf].

Fraser, Janet (1993). "Public Accounts: Using Verbal Protocols to Investigate Community Translation." *Applied Linguistics*, 14, 4, pp. 325-343.

Fraser, Janet (1999). "The Discourse of Official Texts and How it Can Impede Public Service Translators." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20, 3, pp. 194-208.

Gawn, Peter (1988). "Authenticity and Quality of Translation." *Meta*, 33, 3, pp. 456-460.

González Núñez, Gabriel (2016). "On Translation Policy." *Target*, 28, 1, pp. 87-109.

Government of Canada (2016). *2016 Census, Province of Alberta.* [https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E&TABID=1].

Habermas, Jürgen (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston, Beacon Press.

Habermas, Jürgen (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, The MIT Press.

Jiménez-Crespo, Miguel A. (2017). *Crowdsourcing and Online Collaborative Translations: Expanding the Limits of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Latour, Bruno (1989). *La science en action: Introduction à la sociologie des sciences*. Trans. Michel Biezunski. Paris, La Découverte.

Latour, Bruno (1991). *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes*. Paris, La Découverte.

Latour, Bruno (2002). *La fabrique du droit: Une ethnographie du Conseil d'État*. Paris, La Découverte.

Littau, Karin (2016). "Translation and the Materialities of Communication." *Translation Studies*, 9, 1, pp. 82-96.

Mahmoudi, Kooros M. (1992). "Refugee Cross-Cultural Adjustment: Tibetans in India." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16, 1, pp. 17-32.

Meylaerts, Reine (2011a). "Translation Policy." In L. van Doorslaer and Y. Gambier, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 163-168.

Meylaerts, Reine (2011b). "Translational Justice in a Multilingual World. An Overview of Translational Regimes." *Meta*, 56, 4, pp. 743-757.

Meylaerts, Reine (2018). "Language and Translation Policies in Context of Urban Super-Diversity." In M. Gazzola *et al*., eds. *Language Policy and Linguistic Justice,* Springer International Publishing AG, pp. 455-475.

Mossop, Brian (2019). *Revising and Editing for Translators*. London, Routledge.

O'Hagan, Minako (2011). "Community Translation: Translation as a Social Activity and Its Possible Consequences in the Advent of Web 2.0 and Beyond." *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, 10, pp. 11-23.

Pérez-González, Luis and Şebnem Susam-Saraeva (2012). "Non-Professionals Translating and Interpreting: Participatory and Engaged Perspectives." *The Translator,* 18, 2, pp. 149-165.

Snell-Hornby, Mary (1995). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Revised Edition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Spolsky, Bernard (2009). *Language Management.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Taibi, Mustapha (2014). "Community Interpreting and Translation in the Arab World: Status Quo and Strategies for Change." *Babel,* 60, 1, pp. 52-69.

Taibi, Mustapha and Uldis Ozolins (2016). *Community Translation*. London/New York, Bloomsbury Academic.

Telles de Vasconcelos Souza, Izabel Emilia (2018). "The Interpreter as a Cultural Agent: The Cultural Role of Interpreters Over Time." In O. I. Seel, ed. *Redefining Translation and Interpretation in Cultural Evolution*. Hershey, IGI Global, pp. 220-237

Venuti, Lawrence (1996). "Translation as Social Practice: Or, the Violence of Translation." In M. G. Rose, ed. *Translation Horizons: Beyond the Boundaries of Translation Spectrum*. Binghamton, Center for Research in Translation, State University of New York at Binghamton, pp. 195-214.

Vineberg, Robert (2012). *Responding to Immigrants' Settlement Needs: The Canadian Experience*. New York, Springer.

Wadensjö, Cecilia (2009). "Community Interpreting." In M. Baker and G. Saldanha, eds. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.* London, Routledge, pp. 43-48.

Odile Cisneros
Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Canada
cisneros@ualberta.ca

Ann De León
Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Canada
adeleon1@ualberta.ca