

## **Defining ‘Community’ for Community Translation**

Daniel Tomozeiu

University of Westminster

### ABSTRACT

Unlike community interpreting, community translation engages with the members of the community both at individual and group levels. This duality of the process makes the identification of the community as a socio-cultural entity and of its individual members all the more important. There have been several attempts to define the concept of ‘community’ in different professional and academic contexts. Mindful of the difficulty of defining community, the paper proposes three methods that can help community translators in visualizing the characteristics of the intended audience and in making informed translation decisions. The three methods, derived from user-centred translation, are scrutinized using a case study based on a real-life National Health Service (NHS) text.

KEYWORDS: community translation, defining community, inclusion/exclusion

### **1. Introduction**

Community translation, also known as public service translation, is currently developing as an independent research area within translation studies. After a period in which community translation research was addressed mainly together with public service interpreting, the difference between them is being acknowledged. For a more in-depth look at the development of community translation research, see, for example, Taibi (2011). This paper identifies one of the roles of community translation, namely enhancing inclusion, as being the main aim of the process. Based on this key role, the paper looks at best translation approaches in order to fulfil it, focusing on the pre-translation phase. Three models of community (intended readership) visualization are proposed and discussed in the context of community translation. The study relies on initial observation and analysis, supported by examples drawn mainly from a British community translation context. The method is consistent with the work done, for example, by Kelly (2006) on a similar topic.

As acknowledged by several authors, for example, Goepferich (2007:29) over the last fifty years, the discipline of translation studies has widened its scope to incorporate different directions and foci. This widening has led to the development of several complex debates that are taking place within the discipline, debates that have a direct or indirect impact on the practical work of the translators. These debates, for example the relation between the ST and the TT and the translation process which have been impacted by functionalist approaches (e.g., Reiss and Vermeer 1991; Nord 1997), are addressed in this article in the theoretical background section only from the perspective of community translation.

In this paper, the term ‘community translation’ is understood in the sense defined by Niska (2002:135): “written translation of mainly informative texts, addressed by the authorities or institutions to people who do not understand texts in the language of the text producer”. Based on this definition, the readership of the TT can be considered to be a diverse and heterogeneous community, their unifying aspect being their limited ability to comprehend texts in the dominant language. It is the need to better identify and functionally define the characteristics of the community (target readership) that is the basis for this article. The importance of clearly defining the audience right at the outset of the translation process has been discussed, for example, by Paul Robertson (2006). A series of methods aimed at helping the translator better define the community, each with its advantages and disadvantages, are discussed in the subsequent sections.

It should be mentioned that community translation as a concept routinely incorporates not only the translation of texts directed from authorities to a community that does not (fully) understand the dominant language, but also the other way around, translations from the community to the authorities. Typical examples in this sense would be the translation of official documents such as birth and marriage certificates. This type of translation, discussed at length by Mayoral (2003), has a different type of readership. This readership tends to be made up of civil servants and professionals (e.g., doctors). While acknowledging the different institutional cultures that, for example, the police and the health service will have, it is considered that the civil servants and the professionals will share similar linguistic abilities in the dominant language (Mayoral 2003:23-66). Therefore, this article focuses on the translation of documents from the dominant language into other languages, and the relevance

attached to defining the readership in the context of the translation of texts directed from authorities to a community.

In order to enable the analysis of readership, the role of community translation needs to be defined. This will help not only to locate community translation within the wider translation landscape, but also to analyse the different audience visualization techniques mentioned below. In simple terms, community translation is meant to “ensure communication with all citizens and permit their participation and, therefore, empowerment” (Taibi 2011:215). This definition encapsulates, in a succinct manner, the main purpose of community translation. However, the use of the term ‘citizens’ is open to discussion, particularly when so much of the work in community translation revolves around immigrant communities. For the purpose of this paper, community translation is seen as a means to empower not only the citizens but also long term (and sometimes short term) residents who need to or would benefit from having access to specific information.

As mentioned above, for a long time research in community translation and community interpreting were considered jointly. This has led to a limited amount of research focused on community translation and its characteristics. There are two important differences between the two practices, differences which impact both on the research agenda and on the importance attached to the analysis of audience visualization techniques. Unlike community interpreting, community translation is proactive rather than reactive, and it has a much longer ‘reaction loop’. While interpreting is a “problem-solving tool in situations in which help or intervention is needed” (Taibi 2011:217), public service translation is a proactive tool meant to help in making information available to different communities and their members. This proactive dimension raises the first challenge in defining the readership. Without having a clear sense of the socio-economic, cultural or even linguistic abilities of the readership, defining it becomes problematic. The challenge of defining the audience increases considering the much longer or non-existent ‘reaction loop’. In the case of public service interpreting, the professional interpreter is in a position to collect information regarding the comprehension ability of the receiver and to adapt the discourse accordingly. This is not the case with community translation. In some cases, there is a reaction loop if, for example, several members of the community ask for clarifications or seem to be repeating a certain erroneous line of action (or inaction). This might indicate difficulties in comprehending the

message of the translation and may require emendation. However, this process can be long and expensive. Understanding the translation audience is important for all translation activities. However, in community translation, with its emphasis on inclusion and accessibility, better identification and mapping of the audience becomes even more imperative.

## **2. Theoretical background**

Before looking in detail at the various ways of visualizing the readership in community translation, it is useful to locate community translation research in the wider discipline of translation studies, based on its characteristics. By doing this, certain characteristics and priorities of the community translation process will become clearer, pointing to the importance attached to readership in this particular translation context. This in turn will help analyse the various methods of readership visualization discussed below. There are a number of models that attempt to categorize translation approaches and to identify the priorities or characteristics of each category. Most of these approaches focus on different types of equivalence between the ST and TT. For example, Nida (1964:331) distinguishes between what he terms “formal equivalence” which focuses on format and context, and “dynamic equivalence” where the focus is on getting an equivalent response (reaction) from the TT audience when reading TT as from the ST audience when reading the ST. This distinction is particularly relevant, and the emphasis on the reaction of the audience is extremely important as it reflects the main preoccupation of community translation. Therefore, it can be argued that using Nida’s categorization, community translation rests clearly within the remit of “dynamic equivalence” where “correspondence in meaning must have priority over correspondence in style” (Nida 1964:134).

In order further to position community translation within the context of translation, Peter Newmark’s (1991:10) model is also of use. Newmark differentiates between semantic translation (which resembles formal equivalence as defined by Nida) and communicative translation (which resembles dynamic equivalence). However, Newmark distances himself from Nida’s more specific categorization, providing a number of reasons for this, including the rhetorical question: are readers “to be handed everything on a plate?” (Newmark 1991:51). In the case of community translation, the answer to the question might be “as much as possible” if the aim of the translation is to provide access to information for the speakers

of the non-dominant language, given that they have to overcome a number of significant cultural hurdles in order to engage with the text. Based on Newmark's model (1991:39) and given that community translation texts are very much subjective and rooted in their own contemporary context, a communicative translation approach that is "reader focused" and "oriented towards a specific language and culture" (ibid.) is the preferred method of translation.

Although, as Newmark argues, most texts benefit from a translation approach that combines semantic and communicative features, the purpose of community translation—ensuring communication with the reader and enhancing inclusion—puts the reader at the heart of the translation process. As concerns about loyalty to the ST (which is a specific feature of semantic translation) become secondary to the need to inform the reader (user), the translation approach for community transition becomes fixated within the area of "communicative translation", as defined by Newmark, and it could be argued that it moves even beyond that in order to achieve its purpose. Approaches for community translation, with their over-arching focus on the user's need for communication, can be considered within the context of "user-centred translation" as defined by Otava (2013) and elaborated by Suojanen et al. (2015).

As the authors explain, "User-centred translation (UCT) is a neologism coined to bring the user to the fore in translation processes" (Suojanen et al. 2015:152). User-centred approaches and usability testing have been used in a number of areas ranging from design to software. These approaches have also come close to the area of translation, in the context of technical writing, where instruction manuals have to take into account the needs of the users. Translation has actually been drawn into the academic debate in some of these areas; see, for example, Singh (2004:83) who explores "translation issues in user-centred design". Suojanen et al. (2015) have brought some of the approaches used in these other areas to the realm of translation. The advantages of a user-centred approach in the case of community translation are obvious, as it enables the translator to prioritize the needs of the TT reader. In analysing this approach, Suojanen et al (2015) discuss a number of procedures through which user-centredness and usability can be achieved. The procedures can be divided into two main categories: pre-translation and post-translation. The post-translation procedures involve series

of heuristics tests adapted from technical writing, for example. They range from an intuitive check to an evaluation using focus groups.

The pre-translation procedures focus mainly on helping the translator ‘visualize’ the audience, the community that is to benefit from the message of the text in the case of community translation. These pre-translation procedures represent the core of this article. Three different audience visualization methods are analysed in detail and their suitability for community translation is evaluated. A number of examples are offered in order to support the arguments. Given the breadth of community translation, these examples are chosen as representative, but they are not an exhaustive representation of the different situations relating to community translation.

### **3. Research method**

The research method chosen for this article is influenced by a number of factors. Given the very limited amount of academic research that has been undertaken on this topic, and since community translation “as a specific form of the translation process is wholly neglected in the literature” (Fraser 1993:326), there is limited guidance as to the suitability of research methods for an investigation in this area. As Fraser mentions, among the few studies that have engaged this topic, there seems to be little agreement as to what the appropriate research methods are. Given the focus on visualizing the target audience, reflective methods would appear to be appropriate. In her study, Fraser (1993) asked twelve community translators to provide a verbal protocol of the translation process of a specific local-authority leaflet. Such an approach provides useful information on the current state of practice, highlighting different strategies adopted by the translators in order to address the (cultural) challenges of the text.

This paper is forward-looking and identifies the advantages and disadvantages of specific user-centred translation methods in a community translation process. As the three audience visualization methods have not been tested yet, a reflective approach would not be appropriate. Instead, a theoretical approach relying on initial observation and analysis is used, and it is exemplified using a leaflet produced by the Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust. This approach supports well the research at this stage, where the three methods of audience visualization are introduced to the area of community translation, and

their potential is evaluated. Once the uptake of these methods grows, their influence in improving (or not) the quality of community translation will have to be evaluated.

In order to exemplify the three audience visualization methods presented below, the opening paragraphs of the award-winning leaflet titled ‘Anxiety. A Self Help Guide’ (Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust 2013) is used. The opening paragraphs were chosen for the analysis carried out in the paper due to their value in the way they frame engagement with the community.

#### **4. A heterogeneous community**

As mentioned above, the key purpose of community translation is enhancing inclusion. Most community translations are undertaken in order to allow community members with limited comprehension skills in the dominant language to partake in community life and activities. The challenges community translators are facing can be divided into two broad categories: one has to do with linguistic and cultural non-equivalence and another has to do with the linguistic characteristics and abilities of the TT audience. The first type of challenges is not necessarily specific to community translation and has been discussed by a number of authors, for example, Catford (1965). The second type is of interest for this paper, namely finding ways to address the audience by better understanding its characteristics. Before considering different ways of visualizing the audience/community, its diversity needs to be appreciated. For community translation, the translation of a text is as good as its level of inclusivity. Most non-dominant communities, like all communities, tend to be highly diverse. The level of comprehension of the TT for non-dominant language communities is impacted by a number of factors, increasing the heterogeneity of the community. Di Biase (1987:62) identifies three of these factors, which are highly relevant when trying to visualize the community. Di Biase discusses these factors in the context of a migrant community, but they are relevant also for other non-dominant language communities.

- Impact of the migration process in terms of impoverishing competence on the community language or the impact of the dominant language and other non-dominant languages that coexist or coexisted in the same cultural and geographical space
- The “pool of language resources the community draws from” (Di Biase 1987:62), for example, the difference between the standard language and language dialects that might be more familiar to some members of the community

- The community's language attitudes; how willing the community is to use or borrow words, phrases or structures from the dominant language and other languages.

These and other unique characteristics of the target audience need to be taken into account by the translator. They are important features that impact on community translation and the applicability of user-centred translation in this context. They should be considered both for pre-translation processes, as discussed below, as well as for post translation ones.

## **5. Methods of audience visualization**

The next section discusses the three most common audience visualization methods used in a user-centred approach. They are presented analytically in this section, with reference to their applicability, and potential advantages and disadvantages in a community translation setting.

### *Personas*

The use of 'personas' is a deductive process through which the translator creates several user models. They are based on the experience of the translator with the target audience. Tina Calabria (2004) defines the use of 'personas' as "the development of archetypal users to direct the vision and design". She adds, "[p]ersonas identify the user motivations, expectations and goals...and bring users to life by giving them names, personalities and often a photo" (Calabria 2004). When building personas, the translator would actually write a short profile for this representative of the readership. The personas could be more or less detailed, but should always contain enough details in order to allow the translator to make informed decisions when in doubt. The crucial point is the information on which the personas draw upon. Ideally the translator would create several personas in order to guide the process (Calabria 2004). Elaine Brechin (2008) defines personas as "a set of fictional, representative user archetypes based on the behaviours, attitudes, and goals of the people we interview in our research phase". The implication here is clear that there is a detailed research phase that precedes the creation of the personas. While this might be the case when translating, for example, a set of public documents for a major national awareness campaign, for most community translation jobs the research is very limited (or non-existent). Therefore, the creation of the personas must rely on the translator's view and understanding of the community members.



Calabria (2004) discusses the use of personas primarily to guide the development of websites and online content. Suojanen et al (2015) have applied the methodology to the area of translation. Calabria lists a range of advantages that recommend the use of personas. Some of them are specific to web-design, while others are more general. The most striking advantage, which is carried over into translation, is that “they are relatively quick to develop and replace the need to canvass the whole user community” (Calabria 2004). Indeed, the use of personas can be a relatively fast and cheap way to help the translator visualize the readership. Moreover, the method can be implemented by the translator alone. The translator might require support from the translation commissioner on designing the personas, but in many cases, given their knowledge of the community for which they are translating, they are probably better placed to undertake the personas creation. Given the limited resources with which the translators operate, this is an important advantage.

However, the use of personas can also carry significant challenges. The creation of the personas relies on the characteristics identified during the research phase. If the research phase is not very long or detailed, the personas will inevitably be based on a number of characteristics shared by the translator’s circle of acquaintances in the potential readership. For several reasons, as mentioned above, these characteristics will not be shared by all the members of the community. Therefore the use of personas risks focusing on the characteristics of some (most) of the community members. By doing so, the use of personas risks excluding (or not addressing the needs of) a number of community members that do not share the identified characteristics. This goes against the main purpose of community translation, that of inclusion, and might create artificial barriers to information within the community.

The use of personas can also be highly dependent on the translator’s understanding of the community and its individual members. The translator will always have a personal view of the community. For translators that are somewhat removed from the potential readership, there is the risk of drawing on stereotypes and generalizations when designing the personas. The use of stereotypes is not desirable not only due to theoretical considerations (for more on this see for example, Stangor, 2000), but also on practical grounds. The use of stereotypes will invariably over-accentuate some characteristics and ignore others, leading to the exclusion of some community members and therefore limiting the success of the translation.

### *Implied Readers*

‘Implied readers’ is a second procedure proposed by Suojanen et al (2015) in order to better understand the target audience and to improve the accuracy of user-centred translation. This approach is similar with the personas method presented above, the main difference being that it starts from the opposite end of the process. If in the case of personas, the translator created a ‘portrait’ of the reader based on their image of different community members, in this case the translator starts by identifying “the reader image a researcher might build from the text through analysis” (Suojanen et al 2015:57). To put it differently, “an implied reader is an abstract collection of characteristics the text requires from the recipients so that they can fully understand it” (Otava 2013:15). By identifying the characteristics of the ST readership in detail the translator can compare and contrast them with those of the TT readership and make informed translation decisions. The method relies heavily on the ability of the translator to distil the characteristics of the audience based on the analysis of the text. This is a skill that translators in general possess, even if the process is sometimes done in an implicit manner, rather than in an explicit way.

The use of implied readers can offer significant advantages to the community translator. One of the most obvious ones is the ability to undertake this mental model without recurring to complex analysis tools. The analysis carried out in this context is text analysis. Given that in most cases the translator will have a good knowledge of the dominant community for which the ST was written in the first place, identifying its characteristics based on the source text should be a relatively straight-forward process. Obviously the creation of the implied reader requires time and an analytical approach, however it does not entail the use of external resources in the way the creation of personas would.

At the same time, the use of implied readers for community translation can have a number of drawbacks as it relies heavily on the skills of one person, the translator. The procedure requires the translator to be able to accurately understand the characteristics of the source text implied reader and then compare them with the target text implied reader (the community). This is a significant analytical task which, if undertaken by one person only, has potential weak points. First, in some cases, analysing the source text and creating the implied reader of the source text can be challenging. Second, and particularly relevant for community translation, when identifying differences with the target audience, the translator must be as

inclusive as possible and this requires a good understanding of the target audience. This is a similar challenge to the one posed by the use of personas above.

In the words of Christine Sousa, “[T]he implied reader [is] the person the author addresses in his work, explicit [sic] or implicitly, and who shares in some assumed measure the author’s knowledge.” (Sousa 2002:17). The same is true for the translator; the implied reader (target audience) will share to a certain extent the translator’s knowledge. Being able to visualize the target audience in an inclusive manner and ensuring that the target text addresses this audience as comprehensively as possible is an important challenge for the community translator. Indeed the use of a comparative approach between the source audience and target audience might facilitate identifying some of the less obvious characteristics of the target audience, hence strengthen the process.

### *Audience Design*

‘Audience design’ is the third and final mental model discussed in this paper. It shares a lot of characteristics with the implied readers, however, it relies on a more detailed process that aims at identifying and categorizing the target audience. The categorization used by Suojanen et al (2015) was first developed by Allan Bell (1984) for analysing speech patterns of radio journalists. It was then taken up by Hatim and Mason in their reference work *The Translator as Communicator* (1997) and analysed in the context of translation.

The classification provided by Bell (1984:159-161) and later referred to, in the context of user-centred translation, by Otava (2013:18) identifies the following five audience groups:

- *addressees*, whose presence is known, who are ratified participants in an exchange, and who are directly addressed
- *auditors*, who are known, ratified but not directly addressed
- *overhearers*, who are known but not ratified participants, and not addressed
- *eavesdroppers*, whose presence is not even known
- *referees*, with whom the speaker identifies, appreciates, and aims to please

By deconstructing and categorizing the target audience, the community translator is able to ensure that the translation addresses all (or the majority) of the identified categories. This type of deconstruction can have the advantage of clearly identifying (and helping prioritize)

different parts of the audience. Some of the categories mentioned above (for example, eavesdroppers) might alert the translator to the importance of certain audience categories that would otherwise not be necessarily considered in the translation process.

As a method, using audience design has only limited drawbacks. It requires additional time from the translator, before starting the actual translation process. Also, the above five categories might not be always easy to identify in the case of community translation. This is again a process in which the contribution of the translation commissioner can play a very important role. Most commissioners would probably identify the addressees (and maybe the auditors) when commissioning the transition. However, they might not always be very specific about the overhearers or eavesdroppers. In reality, given that the commissioners will know more about the channels through which the translated information is to be distributed (location of posters, leaflets, etc.), it can be argued that they are in a better position to identify the last three categories. The audience design would benefit from the involvement of the translator and commissioner.

## **6. Discussion**

In this section the three methods presented above are discussed with the help of a case-study. The aim of the case-study is to exemplify how these methods could be used in practice, in a community translation context, and to discuss their advantages and disadvantages.

### *The case study*

The Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust produces a large number of self help guides which address a number of issues, from abuse to bereavement to depression and stress. These leaflets have been developed and made available to care providers who can download them and rebrand them with their logos, if necessary. The excerpt presented in the appendix represents the opening lines of the anxiety brochure, which in 2013 received a British Medical Association (BMA) Patient Information award. The brochure has 24 pages in total, looking at a number of aspects such as symptoms, causes, treatment, and support organizations for those suffering from anxiety. It was designed in 2013 and is meant to be reviewed in 2016.

The following sections show how the three audience visualization models presented in this paper work in practice, and what some of the challenges are when using them.

### *Personas*

The creation of the personas will be very much dependent of the target language and therefore the community for which the translation is being made. As discussed above, one of the main challenges of the personas is that of avoiding stereotyping. Obviously, the personas method relies on considering a ‘typical’ member of the community and their needs, but at the same time ‘typical’ should not become ‘stereotypical’.

The text below could represent one of the personas texts developed by the translator for the Romanian translation:

Ion, is a 34 year old Romanian construction worker who has been living in Newcastle for the past 18 months. He works on a new office tower development, working long hours most days. He finished the first two years of university in Romania, but started working on construction sites since he was 23. He is married and has one child. His wife, Maria, lives with him in Newcastle and earns a living by looking after an elderly couple. Their child is five, and lives in Romania with Maria’s parents. Ion is a hard worker, and has been with this construction company for four months now; his boss seems to trust him. For a while now he has been feeling rather nervous and uncertain about his life and life choices. He doesn’t have many friends here, but he enjoys the company of some of his colleagues and sometimes they go together for a drink after work. He is just generally unhappy with his lifestyle: the rented accommodation, not seeing his son more than once a year. For a while he did cash-in-hand odd jobs, but that made him more nervous and uneasy so he stopped. The money he makes now is just about enough to rent a small room for the two of them and to send some money back to Romania every few months. This whole situation makes him uneasy. He doesn’t go to the doctor often and doesn’t like hospitals; but he wishes they could prescribe him something to make the uneasiness go away. He feels he can’t really talk to his work colleagues about his uneasiness—they would probably mock him. He mentioned his feelings to his wife once or twice, but they are not used to sitting down and discussing about how they feel.

If the translator was trying to make a decision about the general format of the translation and the length of the text, the persona created above might help in deciding the length of the document. Romanian, being a romance language, tends to be more verbose than English and usually Romanian translations are longer than the original English texts. The original brochure in English already has 24 pages and for Ion, who is uncomfortable with doctors, an extended version might put him off. If the translator was wondering about replicating or not the register of the English version, the persona above would also help him make an informed decision in this sense.

At the same time when in doubt over the most appropriate translation from a user-centred perspective, the persona would also play a role in the decision making process. For example, the expression “coping with it” in the phrase “Overcome your anxiety by learning better ways of coping with it” can be translated in Romanian in a number of ways, from *a se descurca* (to manage) to *a face fata* (to deal with; to address something). Based on the created persona, and Ion’s desire to address this in a swift manner, the translator might, for example, decide to opt for the latter in this given context.

This short example shows the range of questions that the use of personas could support the translator in addressing. Personas do not provide the ultimate answer for the translation, but they can guide the questioning and reflective translator when making certain translation decisions. By constructing several personas, with different relevant profiles, the translator would be in a position to make these decisions in a better informed manner.

### *Implied Reader*

When reading the NHS source text, the translator might identify, among others, the following audience characteristics:

- adult audience
- used to being addressed in a direct manner
- used to having medical topics introduced through attention-grabbing identifiers such as “bad with your nerves”, “stressed out”
- expects a medical brochure to be informative but not authoritative
- wants to know early on what the brochure aims to help them achieve

- used to having medical conditions explained through the use of everyday examples (operation, driving test, examination)

Once the translator has sketched out the characteristics of the ST audience in this manner, she can then compare this audience with the expected audience of the TT (the community) trying to ascertain from the beginning which of these characteristics are shared by the two audiences and which are not. That analysis would help her make the translation decisions throughout the text.

For example, if she was translating this text into Brazilian Portuguese, she might conclude that Brazilians would not expect a medical document to address the readers in such a direct manner, and therefore the use of impersonal constructions or passive voice would be more appropriate. She might also decide that having medical topics introduced through attention-grabbing identifiers is an aspect that a Brazilian audience would be comfortable with, and therefore would maintain the original formatting and style. At the same time, if she decides that a Brazilian audience would expect a more authoritative tone in a medical brochure, she might decide to adapt it.

It is important to note that the audience visualization methods described here support the translator in acknowledging the particularities of the TT audience. They enable her to identify similarities and differences in the audience's expectations. The methods do not prescribe the solution in addressing these needs and expectations, but they provide the translator with the tools to identify, acknowledge and categorize them.

### *Audience design*

Understanding the needs of the different segments of the audience is taken one step further by the audience design method, which enables the translator to consider the different types of audiences a document might have beyond the very obvious ones. Using Allan Bell's method described above, the audience break-down for the NHS medical leaflet would look like this:

- *addressees*: all members of the public who can read the language of the text and think they might suffer from anxiety
- *auditors*: all members of the public who can read the language of the text and have an interest in the topic of the leaflet

- *overhearers*: all members of the public who can read the language of the text and visit an NHS clinic
- *eavesdroppers*: readers whose knowledge of the language of the text is unknown, for example, speakers of another language that might be learning the language of the text
- *referees*: all members of the public who can read the language of the text and would benefit from reading the information

By breaking down the audience in this way, the translator can consider her translation decisions in light of the different audience requirements. For example, by acknowledging both the addressees and auditors, the translator might choose to address both the potential readers who think they might suffer from anxiety, and members of the public who might know someone that would benefit from the information. In this sense, she might decide to amend the direct tone of the text which tries to foster a sense of self-analysis (“anxiety is something we all experience from time to time”) to a more inclusive tone that addresses also other potential audience segments, such as the auditors or referees. Again, this method does not provide the translation solution, but it offers a useful tool to address translation problems so as to make informed decisions by considering the interests of the various audience segments.

## **7. Conclusion**

This paper has set out to address an under-researched area, namely community translation. Starting from the main aim of community translation—enhancing inclusion for speakers of the non-dominant language—the paper has taken advantage of user-centred approaches in translation in order to put forward and test three different audience visualization methods. The paper has demonstrated the importance of prioritizing the readership (the community) above all other translation concerns in community translation. It has also reflected on the challenges of properly defining the audience, using existing models that prove high audience heterogeneity in the less-established communities (Di Biase 1987:62).

The three audience visualization methods proposed by Suojanen et al (2015) were applied in this paper to a community translation context. The analysis section identified their potential advantages and disadvantages from a theoretical perspective while the discussion section used a case study to identify their appropriateness. The case study has proven the complexity



associated with using these methods borrowed from other disciplines in community translation. While the methods will help the translator (and the translation commissioner) to have a better understanding of the translation audience, they require extra preparatory work from the translator either by analysing the text or by imagining a ‘typical’ audience member. Furthermore, this work is undertaken by the translator in the knowledge that it will not provide clear cut answers to translation dilemmas, but might provide useful guidance. Suojanen et al (2015) mention that these pre-translation techniques work best if accompanied by post-translation techniques such as heuristics tests. These pre- and post-translation activities require the translator to invest extra time and energy in the translation process, in the hope that the quality of the final product will be improved.

The current paper has engaged with the three audience visualization methods from a mainly theoretical perspective, using one case study. The case study has demonstrated, on a one-off basis, that the three audience visualization techniques can be applied to community translation. Far from providing a clear answer to the best translation option, the case study has proven that each of the three methods, on its own or combined, can provide additional insightful information in better understanding the target audience. How this information is used in order to make translation decisions is up to the translator. In order to fully test the level of appropriateness of these methods in the context of community translation, further case studies need to be carried out. As a future research agenda, interviews with translators that have used the methods will be carried out, and their findings presented in a future paper.

## **References**

- Bell, Allan (1984) ‘Language Style as Audience Design’, *Language in Society*, 13(2): 145–204.
- Brechin, Elaine (2008) ‘Reconciling Market Segments and Personas’, *Cooper–Journal*. Available online at [\[http://www.cooper.com/journal/2002/03/reconciling\\_market\\_segments\\_an.html\]](http://www.cooper.com/journal/2002/03/reconciling_market_segments_an.html) (accessed 06 October 2014).
- Calabria, Tina (2004) ‘An Introduction to Personas and How to Create Them’, *Step Two Designs–Articles*. Available online at [\[http://www.steptwo.com.au/papers/kmc\\_personas/index.html\]](http://www.steptwo.com.au/papers/kmc_personas/index.html) (accessed 06 October 2014).

- Catford, J.C. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Di Biase, B. (1987) 'Translating for the Community', *Australian Review of Applied Linguistic Series S*, 4: 52-65.
- Fraser J. E. (1993) 'Public Accounts: Using Verbal Protocols to Investigate Community Translation', *Applied Linguistics*, 14(4): 325-343.
- Goepferich, Susanne (2007) 'Translation Studies and Transfer Studies: A Plea for Widening the Scope of Translation Studies', in Yves Gambier, Miriam Shlesinger, Radegundis Stolze (eds) *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies. Selected Contributions from the EST Congress, Lisbon 2004*, London: John Benjamins Publishing, 27-39.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason (1997) *The Translator as Communicator*, London: Routledge.
- Kelly, Debra (2006) 'Enhancement of the International Visitor Experience to London Museums and Galleries', University of Westminster. Available online at [<https://www.westminster.ac.uk/file/12616/download?token=hP9xzQLP>] (accessed 10 October 2014).
- Mayoral, Asensio Roberto (2003) *Translating Official Documents*, London: Routledge.
- Newmark, Peter (1991) *About Translation*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Maunder, Lesley and Lorna Cameron (2013) 'Anxiety. A Self Help Guide', Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust. Available online at [<http://www.ntw.nhs.uk/pic/selfhelp/>] (accessed 06 October 2014).
- Nida, Eugene A. (1964) *Toward a Science of Translating*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Niska, Helge (2002) 'Community Interpreter Training: Past, Present, Future', in Giuliana Garzone and Maurizio Viezzi (eds) *Interpreting in the 21st Century. Challenges and Opportunities*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 133-214.
- Nord, Christiane (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Otava, Anni (2013) *Focus on the Audience: Three Cases of User-Centered Translation*, Master's Thesis. University of Tampere, Finland. Available online at [<https://tampub.uta.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/94589/GRADU-1384510886.pdf?sequence=1>] (accessed 06 October 2014).
- Reiss, Katharina and Hans J. Vermeer (1991) *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, [Foundation of a Translation Theory], 2nd edition, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Robertson, Paul (2006) 'Communication for Intercultural Navigation (CIN) Model', University of Westminster. Available online at [\[http://www.westminster.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0004/246172/CIN\\_model.pdf\]](http://www.westminster.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/246172/CIN_model.pdf) (accessed 10 October 2014).
- Singh S. et al. (2004) 'A Reflection on Translation Issues in User-Centred Design', in H.M. Khalid, M.G. Helander, and A.W. Yeo (eds) *Work with Computing Systems*, Kuala Lumpur: Damai Sciences, 83-87.
- Sousa, Christine (2002) 'TL versus SL Implied Reader: Assessing Receptivity when Translating Children's Literature', *Meta*, 17(1):16-29.
- Stangor, Charles (2000) *Stereotypes and Prejudice: Key Readings*, New York: Psychology Press.
- Suojanen, Tytti, Kaisa Koskinen and Tiina Tuominen (2015) *User-Centred Translation*, London, Routledge.
- Taibi, Mustapha (2011) 'Public Service Translation', in Kirsten Malmkjær and Kevin Windle (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 214-227.
- Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust (2013) 'Anxiety'. Available online at [\[www.ntw.nhs.uk/pic/leaflets/Anxiety\\_A4\\_2015.pdf\]](http://www.ntw.nhs.uk/pic/leaflets/Anxiety_A4_2015.pdf) (accessed 10 October 2014)

## **Appendix**

**“Bad with your nerves”**

**“A worrier”**

**“Stressed out”**

**“Unable to relax”**

**“Tense and nervous”**

... are all words we might use to describe someone who has a problem with anxiety. If someone has too much stress for too long anxiety is very often the result. This booklet is about anxiety, and aims to help you to:

1. Recognise whether or not you may be suffering from symptoms of anxiety.
2. Understand what anxiety is, what can cause it, and what can keep it going.
3. Overcome your anxiety by learning better ways of coping with it.

### **What is anxiety?**

Anxiety is something we all experience from time to time. It is a normal response to situations that we see as threatening to us. For example, if we had to go into hospital for an operation, or had to sit a driving test, or take an exam, it would be natural to feel anxious. Anxiety at certain levels can even be helpful in some situations such as when we need to perform well, or cope with an emergency.

Source: Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust (2013) ‘Anxiety’  
[[www.ntw.nhs.uk/pic/leaflets/Anxiety\\_A4\\_2015.pdf](http://www.ntw.nhs.uk/pic/leaflets/Anxiety_A4_2015.pdf)] (accessed 10 October 2014)