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**1. Introduction**

With Edmonton seeing a steady increase in immigration in the last few years (Statistics Canada), immigrant support and integration services are more important than ever to ensure that newcomers are able to fully participate within Edmonton’s community. In order to successfully integrate into the Edmonton community and Canadian society in general, documents pertaining to identity and qualifications must be translated so that they may be evaluated and accepted by authorities such as government agencies, employers, and educational institutions. However, certified translation services may be expensive, and so there are a handful of organizations in Edmonton that provide community translation services as a more affordable alternative. The Edmonton Immigrant Services Association (EISA), is one of these organizations. Through a collaboration between their Language Bank Program and their Supporting Newcomer Integration Project, they translate official documents such as driver’s licenses, birth certificates, police record checks, and education documents like diplomas and transcripts into English from a variety of languages, including Spanish. The final translations are accompanied by a signed affidavit, making the translation useable in a majority of situations.

I was put in contact with Amanda Yang, a coordinator at EISA, by my thesis supervisor, Dr. Ann De León, who made me aware of EISA’s particular need to create an in-house searchable glossary of terms. I worked with Amanda and the Spanish translation team at EISA to collect information that I needed in order to create a glossary that would respond to the particular needs and the specific difficulties faced by EISA’s Spanish translators. The creation of this glossary is part of EISA’s current plan to update their translation practices in order to better reflect current practices within the language and translation industries (see “Glossary thesis questions”). The plan to transition into the updated set of practices includes two stages: 1) the creation of a searchable in-house glossary of terms where members of the team can add information and new terms, which I created, and 2) the implementation of a collaborative workspace on the Trello platform in order to facilitate inter-group communication. These changes are currently being tested out with the Spanish translation team, and if shown to be successful, will be expanded to the rest of EISA’s translation teams.

My approach in creating the glossary was community service-oriented, as I strove to create a translation resource that would aid community translator volunteers working with EISA and ultimately benefit members of the Edmonton community by ensuring a smooth social, professional, and educational integration for newcomers. In this paper, I will reflect on EISA’s current and planned translation practices by examining them in relation to other community translation practices in Edmonton and more broadly to community translation practices worldwide. I will also reflect on my method and experience with creating a searchable and collaborative in-house Spanish to English glossary in relation to terminological practices worldwide and more specifically within Canada. I will begin by providing an overview of community translation, official document translation, community translation within Edmonton, and EISA in order to establish a strong contextual base. I will then describe the process and methodology that I used to create the glossary. Finally, I will discuss my experience and findings in relation to community service-learning, the particular role of proofreaders within EISA’s translation team, and the particular difficulties and possible solutions to these difficulties within community translation and official document translation.

1. **Community translation**

The concept of community translation, the practice of creating written translations in order to make public information accessible to immigrant population who may not have a high competency in the official language of a given country or region, is strongly associated with community interpreting (O’Hagan 12; Taibi and Ozolins 8). However, the concept of community translation includes a much larger variety of situations, texts, organizational structures, and people involved in the process. Notably, community translation differs from other forms of translation due to the fact that non-professional translators are often involved in the process. Community translation projects can include both non-professional translators as well as professional translators who get involved in community translation projects due to the fact that they see a particular value in them (O’Hagan 13; Cisneros and De León 100).

Community translation may also be referred to using the following terms: *collaborative translation*, which is an umbrella term that also includes professional translation projects that utilize a collaborative model; *volunteer translation*, which is typically used to refer to translation that is performed by Internet users who are already part of an online community, and *crowdsourcing*, which describes large-scale participation in an open and collaborative online project that recruits participants via an open-call process (O’Hagan 13-14; Désilets and van der Meer 29). Additionally, Kelly et al. identify three distinct “community translation environments”: *cause-driven*, in which translators choose to translate content they are interested in and work on their own schedule (this type includes fansubbing and fandubbing); *product-driven*, in which for-profit companies recruit translators, typically from their consumer community, and may provide renumeration in the form of free products, discounts, etc.; and *outsourcing portals*, which function based on a traditional form of payment and provide crowdsourced translations to paying clients (89). In this way, community translation can vary greatly between projects, however the connecting aspect between all these different formats is the influential role of “community.”

The idea of “community” has many ambiguities and can be defined in a large variety of ways. In the context of community translation, “community” can refer to an already-existing online community created by a fanbase for a particular piece of media or a consumer base for a particular product, a “project community” that is formed by the translators involved in a collaborative project, or a community that is defined by geographical, cultural, or linguistic similarity or proximity: for example, an immigrant population living in a particular city (O’Hagan 13-14; Kelly et al. 77; Taibi and Ozolins 1). In the context of EISA’s translation services, this last definition of community is the most relevant.

Due to the large amount of population shift in the last couple of decades, primarily due to immigration, travel, and population displacement as a result of humanitarian crises, the need for translation services has greatly increased (Taibi and Ozolins 1). In particular, there has been an increased need to translate texts that are intended to communicate information between public services and the general population, as there has been an increase in newcomer populations with a limited knowledge of the mainstream or official language (Taibi and Ozolins 7-8). The translation of public information content is necessary to ensure the social inclusion of newcomers, as having access to needed information is essential to individual improvement of socioeconomic status and meaningful participation within the immediate local community as well as the general social organization of the country as a whole (Taibi and Ozolins 10-11). This perspective reveals the presence of a focus on community engagement, social action, and social change, which Harold M. Lesch describes in his definition of community translation as a translational approach in which translation of public information is used to create a more even power dynamic (92-93). According to Lesch, providing access to necessary information empowers underprivileged communities to be able to meaningfully participate within society and advocate for themselves and their needs. (93-95) In this way, unbalanced power relationships that are caused by a divide between a mainstream linguistic community and a linguistic minority are able achieve a more equal balance due to a facilitation of inter-group communication, which ensures that the minority group is able to equally participate in society, which ensures an increased social cohesion (Taibi and Ozolins 10-11; Lesch 93-95). Community translation as a response to this need for translated materials is often carried out by government agencies or other community or non-profit organizations involved in the public sector, and within this genre of important public information, there is often significant overlap with other types of translation, particularly medical, legal, and official translation (Taibi and Ozolins 8).

There has been some concern that community translation and other forms of collaborative translation are going to overrun and replace more traditional models of professional translation, which Kelly et al. refer to as the “TEP (translate-edit-proofread)” model (75). In this model, a first draft of the translation is typically created by a single translator, who then hands it off to a senior translator who makes needed edits, and the final product is proofread by an assigned proofreader who ensures that the information and formatting in the document are correct. New collaborative community models that allow for real-time collaborative interaction have several benefits as opposed to the TEP model, as they often result in a focus on preventing errors instead of recognizing and fixing them later, and often have significantly faster turn-around times (Kelly et al. 77-80). Kelly et al. suggest that these new and innovative translation models are not simple replacements of the traditional model; rather, they are a natural progression of translation processes and are a natural consequence to current online environments, existing limitations of the TEP model, and an increase in market demand for translations that traditional entities are unable to keep up with (84-92). In this last instance, community translation is not “taking over” the jobs of professional translators, but rather fills an underserviced niche. Additionally, professional translators may be assigned key roles within collaborative crowdsourced environments as editors or coordinators, particularly in projects spearheaded by large for-profit high-tech companies, which demonstrates that professional translators are certainly not undervalued, but rather that their roles within specific niches of the translation industry may be evolving (Kelly et al. 89-91). In the non-profit sector, community translation responds to the needs of underserved populations by allowing organizations to limit costs when there is limited funding, provide accessible translation services at a low cost to community members, and giving community members who have a strong connection with the local context, and who are often newcomers themselves, a chance to give back and contribute to their communities (Cisneros and De León 100-101).

1. **Official document translation**

Official document translation refers to the translation of documents that serve either a legal or administrative purpose and are considered to be legally valid in the target country (Asensio 1). Documents involved in official translation usually describe facts relating to the legal status, identity, qualifications of one or more individuals (Asensio 9; Taibi and Ozolins 77). Official translation may significantly overlap with other types of translation, such as legal translation or court translation, as the documents involved in official translation often include details relating to legal subject matter (Asensio 1). Examples of documents that are common within official translation include birth, death, and marriage certificates, diplomas, transcripts, driver’s licences, and passports. Medical documents, including insurance documents or hospital transcripts, may also require official translation. Typically, documents requiring official translation are brought over from a newcomer’s country of origin and are often needed in order to obtain or maintain legal residency; however, documents which Canadian nationals bring back from countries they were visiting may also require official translation (Lambert-Tierrafría 216; Taibi and Ozolins 77). These documents may include marriage certificates from Canadians who chose to get married abroad, or medical documents that describe illness or injury experienced abroad.

Specific linguistic features of documents involved in official translation may include rigid grammatical structures, use of the passive voice, a highly formal register, and highly conventionalized and formulaic structures which may be unusual or archaic, and which are not found in other kinds of texts (Asensio 98; Lambert-Tierrafría 217; Taibi and Ozolins 89). These particular features are common in both Spanish and English official documents. Official documents also usually have a particular visual format that includes blank spaces, which are provided in order for the document user to fill in required information (Taibi and Ozolins 89).

Official translation is an extremely varied field. Required levels of professional certification and methods of validation for translators performing official translation vary greatly from country to country (Asensio 4-5; Taibi and Ozolins 79). Legal and administrative regulations about official translation are also often extremely different, and in some cases, may not exist at all. Based on their country’s particular regulations, official translators may be authorized to perform different translation activities (for example written translation, oral court translation, potentially both, etc.), may be required to adhere to different translation directions (from second language to mother tongue, etc.), or may be required to belong to and adhere to the regulations of different governing bodies, including national or regional judicial governing bodies or professional associations (Asensio 4-5).

As a further complication, different authorities within the same country may have different guidelines as to what makes an official translation valid. For example, the Canadian government accepts translations done in Canada by a certified translator in good standing with a provincial or territorial translation association, translations done outside of Canada by a translator accredited in that country, and translations by a non-certified translator which are accompanied by an affidavit (*Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada*). EISA’s translation service fall into this last category, and therefore are acceptable by federal government standards. The University of Alberta’s Undergraduate Admissions & Programs website simply states that “documents issued in a language other than English or French must be accompanied by an official English translation” with no additional information. Meanwhile, the University of British Columbia’s Graduate School website specifies that translations must be literal and that non-literal translations will not be accepted, and that if the translation is not obtained from the student’s home institution’s translation service, they must obtain a “complete, word-by-word, literal English translation” from a certified English translator and instruct them to endorse the sealed envelope containing the translation and the original photocopy by signing across the seal.

Official documents themselves also vary greatly from country to country, and may even vary based on region, municipality, or even the date created (Lambert-Tierrafría 223). Variation can occur in the formatting of the document, as well as the amount and type of information that is provided. Additionally, differences in education systems, academic degrees, grading scales, legal and judicial systems, and other qualification requirements that vary by country add to the heterogeneity of official translation (Asensio 95; Taibi and Ozolins 82-84).

Official translation is characterized by its high legal or administrative value, as officially translated documents represent an individual’s legal status and identity and may result in changes to status or recognition of particular rights or privileges (Taibi and Ozolins 78). Official translators are expected to have a working knowledge of legal and administrative systems, both in the target country and the country of origin, an understanding of the particularities of different official documents, and overall cultural competency in order to successfully translate the document and additionally be able to report information about legal systems or concepts from a foreign country or culture when asked or required to do so (Asensio 37). The recipient of an official translation is usually either a legal or administrative authority that has the ability to ascertain whether or not a translated document is considered valid, and may then use the translated document to certify identity or status, recognize and validate qualifications, or use the document as evidence to confirm allegations (Asensio 3, 9-10; Taibi and Ozolins 81).

As a result of the high stakes involved in official translation, as well as the particular use of translated documents by the recipients, official translation most often uses a literal and conservative translation style (Asensio 51). Official translators often exist in two simultaneous but opposing roles: that of a public authenticator from the perspective of an administrative or legal authority, and that of their client’s payee, who wants the final translation to present them in the best way possible (Asensio 11). Overall, a literal translation is preferred, as authorities often expect a high level of literalism due to the fact that literalism is commonly ideologically linked to objective translation (Asensio 12). In this way, a literal translation is also considered to be in the client’s best interest, as it is more likely to be accepted and approved by authorities, who expect the translation to visually resemble the source document very closely. As well, official translators may be liable to legal or professional repercussions if their translations are deemed to lack objectivity, and so translation using adaption or cultural equivalents is discouraged (Asensio 16). According to Fletcher, the official translator’s job is to create a direct translation of the original document that will allow an evaluating authority to then analyze the document (32). Analysis is not part of an official translator’s assigned task, and therefore, they must refrain from translation practices that may alter the meaning of the original document. That being said, the final translation must also be understandable, and so some alterations may be necessary in order to create an idiomatic translation. In this way, an official translator works between multiple opposing requirements, including literalism, linguistic correctness, and a specific formal legal style to strike a balance between them and fulfill needed expectations (Asensio 13).

This high level of literalism results in official translation being a form of “overt translation,” a translation that is clearly identifiable as being a translation, as it usually includes additional information, explanations, and translator’s notes (Taibi and Ozolins 109). Official translations also often include visual descriptions of the original document, including descriptions of stamps and seals, and commentary of illegible sections (Asensio 64-65, 72). In addition, the translated document also usually includes the translator’s statements, certification, seal, or signature to prove that the translation is trustworthy and fulfills all needed requirements (Asensio 65-67; Taibi and Ozolins 90-91). This visible presence is often necessary for an accurate evaluation of a document, as the translator’s additional explanations and clarifications may assist an evaluating authority in ascertaining equivalences or analyzing information (Taibi and Ozolins 92).

1. **Community translation in Edmonton**

According to the 2016 census carried out by Statistics Canada, around 23.8% of Edmonton’s population consists of immigrants. Of the total immigrant population, about 25.4% arrived most recently between the years of 2011 and 2016, demonstrating a recent significant increase in new arrivals in Edmonton. Additionally, an estimated 1.5% of Edmonton residents (19, 875 individuals) had no knowledge of either French or English at the time of the 2016 census. The arrival of a significant number of recent immigrants as well as the small minority of individuals with no knowledge of English or French indicates a particular need for language and translation service within Edmonton, as newcomers must be able to access important information, communicate with government authorities and with other people in their new place of residence, and be able to provide proof of identity and qualifications when needed.

The two major organizations that are involved in community translation in Edmonton are the Edmonton Immigrant Services Association (EISA) and The Family Centre (TFC). Both of these organizations provide non-certified translation and interpretation services. Along with completed translations, these organizations provide a signed affidavit attesting to the accuracy of the translation. In this way, documents translated by community translators working with these organizations fulfill governmental requirements for official translations.

The translation services offered by The Family Centre are carried out by non-professional translators who are often members of immigrant communities themselves (Rao 82). In this way, the translation services they offer fit into the paradigm of community translation in two complementary ways: the services, notably for official document translation, are provided to the Edmonton community in order to enable a smooth integration, and the translators providing the services are members of a pre-existing geographic, social, and cultural communities that are able to use their localized knowledge to the benefit of their clients. Additionally, The Family Centre’s translation services have been used by the City of Edmonton on 16 occasions between 2007 and 2018, most notably for the largest translation project carried out to date, that of *The Newcomer’s Guide to Edmonton* (Rao 82). These translations fit within the main community translation paradigm described by Taibi and Ozolins, in which texts intended to communicate essential information from government or other public services to community residents are translated in order to enable residents with a limited knowledge of the mainstream language to access important information (7-8; Cisneros and De León 100).

In “The Newcomer’s Guide to Edmonton and Community Translation: Materially and Culturally Situated Practices,” Cisneros and De León describe their ethnographic exploration of the process that the City of Edmonton (in collaboration with The Family Centre) used to translate *The Newcomer’s Guide to Edmonton* into Amharic, Arabic, French, Mandarin, Punjabi, Somali, and Spanish. This project is extremely significant, as it is the largest public-service document translated by the City of Edmonton to date and which included translation into seven different languages, involved a team of twenty-three people, and was allocated a budget of almost CAN$50,000 (Cisneros and De León 119). This demonstrates that within the City of Edmonton, community translation is perceived to be a valid and valuable practice. As noted by Cisneros and De León, the team members involved in the NGE project all agreed that community translation is necessary in order to ensure access to essential information and services (110-111). Additionally, the project organizer described the particular value of sourcing translations from within the target community, as translators who are part of that community will have extensive specific and relevant cultural knowledge and experience, which would allow them to create a more accessible and relevant translation. As well, community translation offers the benefit of community consultation which allows translators to receive feedback and improve their translations in order to create a final product that is best suited for use by their community (Cisneros and De León 118). The project utilized a collaborative model in which the translators and proofreaders worked together and directly with the third-party reviewer, something which was new to many of the team members. There was also a final meeting with all team members to review and celebrate the project’s completion, and team member interviews indicate a strong sense of community and collectivity (109, 113).

1. **Edmonton Immigrant Services Association**

Edmonton Immigrant Services Association (EISA) is a non-profit organization that was established in 1976. As stated on their website, EISA works to assist newcomers in “adapting to and fully integrating into Canadian society.” As well, the organization facilitates programs that center on multiculturalism and anti-racism in order to develop cross-cultural understanding and establish strong community bonds. As part of their Settlement and Integration Support Services, EISA provides official document translation services through a joint effort between their previous Language Bank Program and their Supporting Newcomer Integration Project, which was establishes in 2018. Due to the fact that their translators are primarily non-professional volunteers, they do not provide certified translations; however, they do provide signed affidavits for each translation which fulfills the requirements of most organizations requesting translated documents, including the federal government.

Among the languages that EISA translates is Spanish. Although there are dozens of Spanish to English volunteer translators working for EISA, only about ten translate documents regularly (“Honors thesis”). As well, there are five proofreaders who are part of the translation team, who review the final translations and check them for errors. Thus, EISA employs a modified version of the traditional TEP model, in which the translation is completed by a single translator, and then is sent to another individual who makes needed changes. However, it seems that like many organizations and even translators, EISA mixes up the distinction between “revising” and “proofreading” (Taibi and Ozolins 128-129). Whereas proofreading usually refers to looking only at the final monolingual text and checking for grammatical or informational errors, revising (also called editing in Kelly at al.’s description of the TEP model) refers to looking at both the final draft translation submitted by the primary translator as well as the source document in order to correct translation errors. EISA’s proofreaders do not in fact proofread; they revise the translations and correct translation errors committed by the primary translator. This particular use of the term “proofreader” is also utilized by The Family Centre (Cisneros and De León 104).

In addition to the modified TEP model, EISA also employs what Taibi and Ozolins refer to as a “letterbox” model (116). In this organizational model, source documents needing translation are passed on to translators from the clients through the agency, without having the agency coordinators themselves read the documents. Considering the fact that EISA provides translation services for a large variety of languages, this model is necessary, as it would not be feasible for the coordinators to read all of the documents, as they are not fluent in all of the source languages.

Within the current modified TEP model that EISA uses, training sessions and social events are organized in order for translators and proofreaders to meet and get to know one another. (“Glossary thesis questions”) This strategy for creating a sense of community among volunteers is similar to the final debrief held by The Family Centre after the completion of the *The Newcomer’s Guide to Edmonton* project, although EISA currently does not use a collaborative model like The Family Centre did. However, EISA is moving towards implementing a collaborative model in which translators and proofreaders will be able to contribute to the collection of knowledge by adding to a searchable in-house glossary and will be able to ask questions, discuss solutions, and share additional resources on the Trello platform. This will align EISA’s translation practices with the collaborative practices used by The Family Centre and other community translation models discussed previously.

My involvement in the creation of a searchable Spanish to English glossary of terms was facilitated by Dr. Ann De León, my Honors supervisor, who had a previous working relationship with Amanda Zhang, EISA’s Language Bank coordinator, and was aware of an existing translation need within the organization (“Honours project”). A glossary of terms had previously been created by Dr. De León with her students in December 2012 as part of her SPAN 405 translation CSL component where students volunteered to provide document translations for EISA. Dr. De León shared this glossary with her EISA Language Bank community partner at the time, but it appears that it was not used by EISA. From feedback obtained from EISA, the indication was that it was not used because it was limited in scope and not easily searchable, and therefore was not shared with other volunteers. This glossary though was used later by Dr. Cisneros and her SPAN 405 students in 2015 when they partnered to translate documents for EISA’s Language Bank. In any case, the need to create a glossary of terms for EISA’s volunteer translators came up again in November 2020 when an ex-student of Dr. De León and EISA volunteer translator emailed her. She expressed interest in having Dr. De León and her SPAN 405 students help EISA and their volunteer translators by having them create a glossary of terms and communication platform for in-house use.

Additional goals of creating an in-house searchable glossary, other than for the implementation of a collaborative translation model, was to improve the quality of translations by ensuring the standardization of terms and improving translator productivity and turnaround times by eliminating unnecessary vocabulary research. Depending on a translator’s expertise in a given subject area, 20-60% of their translation time may be spent on researching terminology (Bowker 311). A searchable glossary of key terms would decrease needed research time, which would ensure that clients have a reduced waiting period to receive completed translations and would allow translators to complete more translations in a shorter period of time.

2. **Methods and process**

1. **Survey and findings**

In order to assess the specific needs of the EISA Spanish translation team and to determine the needed specifications of the glossary, I created a short-answer survey directed at the coordinators, translators, and proofreaders that are involved in the process of translating Spanish documents into English. I created the survey with Google Forms so that participants were able to fill it out online on their own time, and included three variations of questions, depending on if the survey participants identified themselves as being in an administrative role, being translators, or being proofreaders. The survey was distributed to the team by Amanda Zhang and all responses collected were anonymous. The survey questions focused on determining which document types were most commonly translated and which were the most difficult and time-consuming to complete, determining any specific challenges or errors that translators and proofreaders commonly experience, and identifying preferred information to be included in the completed glossary. In total, I received seven responses to my survey. Five of those were from proofreaders (therefore, all current Spanish to English proofreaders answered the survey) and two were from translators. Unfortunately, I did not receive any responses from administrative staff. Complete lists of all the survey responses I received can be found in Appendices 1 and 2.

The majority of respondents (5 out of 7) reported that they most often worked with birth certificates and education documents, such as transcripts and diplomas. A majority (6 out of 7) also identified education documents, transcripts in particular, as being the most difficult and time-consuming to translate, the most time-consuming to proofread, and as being the type of document that generally needs the most correction. When it came to specific sources of difficulty and common translation issues, one translator and one proofreader mentioned course names, three proofreaders mentioned overly literal translations, one translator and one proofreader mentioned specific formulaic phrasing found on legal documents and diplomas, and two proofreaders mentioned language differences between countries.

As to suggestions of what information to include in the glossary entries, 6 out of 7 respondents suggested country of use, one translator and one proofreader suggested information about different uses or variations of a term, one proofreader suggested that contextual information be included, and one proofreader highlighted the importance that commonly seen words be standardized. Additionally, this last respondent suggested that additional information about academic programs and titles that do not have a direct Canadian equivalent or that vary among Latin American countries be provided.

1. **Glossary creation**
   1. **Preliminary organization**

Before beginning the creation of the glossary, I first considered the preliminary questions posed by Jakic and Andelkovic (6): 1. What is the purpose of this resource? 2. Who are the target users of this resource? 3. What data categories should each entry include? 4. How extensive and detailed should the resource as a whole and the individual entries be? and 5. What software or other format should be used? I identified the purpose of the glossary as being a resource for the translation of Spanish official documents into English with the goal of creating standardised translations and improving translation quality and turnaround time. I identified the target users as being community translators and proofreaders working for EISA’s translation services.

I began the construction of the glossary by choosing an appropriate software. According to Jakic and Adelkovic, the software chosen should be user-friendly and allow for continuous easy updating of entries (7). Blaise Nkwenti-Azeh further stipulates that user-friendliness is determined by ease of use, the presence of additional system guidance, and “intelligent” or approximated responses or suggestions when searching a term (601). Additionally, the search function should be able to utilize different data categories, retrieve all related entries, and allow for the neutralization of upper- and lower-case letters and diacritics in order to allow for easier searching (Nkwenti-Azeh 602-603). Nkwenti-Azeh further states that users should be able to access terms through a direct search, selection from an index, or through an expansion of the search string to access similar or related terms and entries (604).

I decided that a spreadsheet created on Google Sheets would be the most appropriate software for the particular purpose and target users of the resource. It is highly user-friendly due to the fact that it is an easily-accessible application and does not require any additional software to be bought or downloaded, and most people are familiar with the organization and use of a spreadsheet. Additionally, it will be easy for translators and proofreaders to continue expanding the resource, as there will be little to no learning curve, as is the case with many software that is specifically designed for terminology management (Wright and Wright 159; Lambert-Tierrafría 222). As well, the “Comment” feature that is a part of Google Sheets allows for constant feedback from the users that can be used to continually improve the resource and that will encourage collaboration. The feedback will ensure increased accuracy through the growth of the project, as it will allow for individual translators to share the knowledge that they acquire through working on particular texts or accessing particular outside resources (Wright and Wright 155-156).

However, a spreadsheet does have certain limitations. For one, the amount of data categories and detail that can be included is quite limited due to the organization of rows and columns (“Entry Structures” 576). As such, large amounts of text or a large amount of data categories may be awkward to view due to the need to scroll horizontally. As well, all the text within a single cell may not be visible due to size limit of the column the cell is part of, and so users may be required to click on a particular cell in order to see all the text is contains in the text bar located above the spreadsheet. Additionally, there is a strong directionality from the source language to the target language due to the organization of columns (“Entry Structures” 587). Contributing to this directionality is the fact that the search bar that I was able to create is only capable of searching within one column. However, considering the fact that the translations being done by EISA have a strong sense of directionality, as all documents are translated into English, I did not consider the strong directionality of the spreadsheet as a hindrance. Additionally, the limitations of the search bar result in users not being able to search entries using other data categories, such as country of use or type of document, and I was also unable to neutralize diacritics, which might result in difficulty retrieving relevant entries, although I was able to neutralize upper- and lower-case letters. In an attempt to combat the issue of the diacritics, I added a note beside the search bar alerting users to the fact that the use of accents will affect search results. As well, the search bar I created is not capable of providing approximate suggestions or related terms, although it is capable of providing a list of multiple results that all contain the searched term. All that being said, I considered accessibility and ease of use and updating of the glossary to be most essential to the success of this project, and so accepted all these limitations as being part of the software which is most appropriate for the intended purpose and target users.

As Jakic and Andelkovic suggest, I tailored the data categories included in the glossary to the needs of my identified purpose and target users (7), according to the responses I received in the survey. The data categories I chose to include were: Spanish Term, English Equivalent, Context of Use, Country of Use, and Notes. The Notes category is a space to include any additional needed definitions, contextual explanations, additional resource recommendations, or examples of use, depending on the particular term. For example, I included additional contextual and usage information for entries that were formulaic set phrases, and added sources and additional resource suggestions for entries relating to levels of education that may differ between countries. While many sources suggest additional data categories such as word class, source, definition, example of use, and date of entry creation (Crabbe and Heath 154; Nkwenti-Azeh 605; Wright and Wright 151), I limited the amount of data categories to just five in order to accommodate the limited space within Google Sheets and limit the need to scroll horizontally.

* 1. **Entry creation**

I used an ad hoc approach in order to select the terms to be included in the glossary. This approach is a text-driven form of terminology management and is commonly used by translators (Wright and Wright 148). Typically in ad hoc work, a corpus is used to identify key vocabulary, often through term mining or statistical analysis (Wright and Wright 148; Popiolek 347). This approach differs from a systemic terminology management approach, as it is not meant to fully document concept systems within a particular subject field, but rather focuses on a limited number of specific terms that are found within a corpus (Karsch 293). It is a practical approach meant to create a resource that will be used for a limited time span, audience, or purpose (Karsch 294). In this case, the glossary has the specific audience of EISA’s Spanish community translators, and the specific purpose of translating official documents from Spanish to English.

I was provided with the glossary compiled by Dr. De León and her SPAN 405 student in December 2012 and a selection of 17 of the most recent translations done by the EISA team, which made up the corpus that I worked with for this project. I included all the terms used in Dr. De León’s glossary as a starting base and then added additional key terms found in the corpus of recently translated documents. I also added additional contextual information to the entries of terms sourced from Dr. De León’s glossary whenever that was possible; for example, when a term was clearly related to an education context. Typically, a concordancer can be used to analyze a corpus of text and extract key terms to be included in a glossary, such as what is described by Crabbe and Heath in the creation of their Japanese-English glossary. However, due to the fact that the source texts that were part of the corpus I was working with were in a PDF format, as they were all photocopies of original documents, they were unable to be analyzed by a concordancer. Therefore, I selected key terms to be included in the glossary manually by reading through the corpus and identifying key terms to include based on repetition, presence in titles or headings, and suggestions from the survey.

As stated by Rogers, terms do not only include single words; terms can contain multiple words, or they can even be full phrases (590). According to Wright, this latter form of terminological units can include set phrases, whose equivalents are often not direct literal translations, and standard text (also called boilerplate in the USA), which refers to extended chunks of text which are identical or nearly identical and which are found in specific textual contexts such as contracts or other legal documents. (“Term Selection” 15-16) Additionally, abbreviated forms of lengthier phrases or words may be considered to be distinct terminological units. I included all of these different types of terminological units in the glossary, including full phrases, as formulaic phrases and structures are commonly used in official documents and were identified in the survey as being a cause of translation difficulty.

Although in their own construction of a glossary, Crabbe and Heath suggest excluding vocabulary that could be literally translated and vocabulary that is considered “subtechnical” due to its use in a variety of domains (154), Wright acknowledges that translators often work with texts that are interdisciplinary and may not possess required technical or even “subtechnical” knowledge, which results in a need for information about a variety of vocabulary that is both general and subject-specific (“Term Selection” 19-20). Based on the information I obtained from the survey, which highlighted overly literal translation, a need for standardization, and difficulty with formulaic phrases, I chose to include a large variety of types of terms, ranging from single commonly-used words such as “curso” and “acta” which may be mistranslated due to the presence of false cognates to multi-word technical terms such as “infraestructura de datos espaciales” to formulaic phrases such as “en uso de las facultades que la ley le confiere.” I included this large variety of terms in order to ensure a high level of standardization, consistency, and quality in the translation of various types of official documents.

When choosing what to include as the English equivalent in an entry, I considered the need for standardization as well as the need for the translated text to be tailored to the target audience. The need for standardizing commonly-seen terms was highlighted by one survey respondent, and the need for translators to use a uniform set of terminology in order to ensure accuracy and consistency is regularly described in literature that deals with translation terminology management. (Crabbe and Heath 151; Jakic and Andelkovic 5; Karsch 293; Nkwenti-Azeh 605; Wright and Wright 149) Therefore, I made sure to provide only one ideal equivalent, as opposed to presenting multiple options, as was the case in the previous glossary provided to me by EISA, in order to ensure that the community translators will translate common terms in a consistent manner and therefore ensure a high translation quality and consistency. In selecting the ideal equivalent, I considered the target readership of the translated documents, which due to the nature of official documents, would be government or institutional authorities. Therefore, I consulted resources created by the government and other institutions, including TermiumPlus, the Government of Alberta’s web pages on the IQAS International Education Guides, and the University of Toronto’s web page dedicated to international credential equivalencies in order to select equivalent terms that are currently used by the target readership.

**3. Discussion**

1. **Connections with social change and community service-learning**

Community translation as described by Taibi and Ozolins has a strong relationship with social justice, as it involves direct community engagement and results in creating social change (11). The main focus of this social change involves facilitating inter-group communication between a minority linguistic or cultural community and the mainstream linguistic or cultural population in a given area (Taibi and Ozolins 10-11). Allowing a minority group to access important information and resources through community translation allows for improved social inclusion and individual empowerment, as individuals are able to communicate with authorities and other community members who are part of the mainstream linguistic or cultural group. By accessing needed resources and communicating with key authorities and community members, linguistic minority individuals have an increased ability to effectively participate within society and potentially improve their socio-economic position, which allows them to feel a stronger sense of inclusion and empowerment. The connection to social justice is also supported by Lesch, whose definition of community translation highlights a focus on addressing the needs of language-impoverished communities (92). Lesch further describes community translation as being a response to issues of linguistic rights or rights to the access of information which are not being fully met, as community translation allows for minority linguistic communities to access information that was previously unavailable to them (93-95). In this way, community translation plays a direct role in balancing uneven power relationships, as it gives minority groups the chance to have more meaningful participation within general society, and also to participate in governmental debates or decision-making and advocate for their particular needs. This connection to social change is also present in official document translation, as the translation of needed documents allows for immigrants, refugees, and other newcomers to participate in and integrate into the society of a particular country (Asensio 2). Additionally, translation of education documents and other credentials may allow for individuals to improve their socio-economic status and feelings of inclusion by allowing them to participate in their industry of expertise.

I strongly considered this connection to social change in my work with the glossary, as the particular project goals that I identified and the decisions that I made on both an overall glossary organization and individual word choice level were based on the fact that the translations produced would allow newcomers to better participate within Edmonton society and potentially improve their socio-economic position. In particular, I prioritized producing high quality translations with a short turnaround time, thus streamlining the translation process, in order to ensure that immigrants, refugees, and other newcomers would receive the completed translations in a shorter period of time and therefore be able to access needed resources and complete needed government processes quicker. This would ideally result in an increased ability to integrate into the Edmonton community, as well as their particular local or work communities, and thus limit feelings of social exclusion or isolation.

From my past community service-learning experience, I based my methodology of creating the glossary by drawing from information obtained from the survey I conducted on Tania Mitchell’s description of a critical community service-learning approach, and particularly the aspect of working to redistribute power (56-58). In creating a resource designed to be used by the translators and proofreaders, I looked to them to determine how the glossary should be structured and what kinds of terms should be included. EISA’s translators and proofreaders can be conceptualized as forming a community that me and my work was designed to serve, and so by allowing them to identify their particular needs, there was a reversal of the traditional service-learning paradigm, in which community need is not identified by community members themselves, but rather by an outside authority. My hope in formulating the glossary based on the needs identified by the community of EISA’s Spanish translators and proofreaders is that they will find the glossary to be useful and relevant to their work, instead of finding it to be irrelevant or unhelpful due to it not responding effectively to needed requirements and specific translation difficulties. I also looked to the translators and proofreaders for specific knowledge about certain terms or translations. Although I occasionally disagreed with their suggestions due to information I found in other sources, looking to use knowledge from the community members themselves allowed for a shared role in creating knowledge, which will hopefully encourage the team to continue expanding and updating the glossary on their own.

Community translation practices and other collaborative translation practices worldwide also look to community members to collect knowledge and thus disrupt the traditional hierarchical structure of knowledge collection. For example, crowdsourcing models such as those used by Facebook and LinkedIn, and translation done within cause-driven and product-driven environments, and with potentially already-existing communities, allows for non-professional translators to implement their particular knowledge as a consumer to create translations that are better tailored to the target audience (Désilets and van der Meer 27-28; Kelly et al. 89, 92). As well, this allows for individuals who may have subject-level expertise to use and share their relevant knowledge (Kelly et al. 84). In this way, there is a validation and appreciation for knowledge held by non-professionals, which disrupts traditional ideas of expertise and ability and empowers non-professionals to utilize their particular experiences to participate in this kind of work and use their particular experiences to inform their translation choices.

EISA’s translation services, as well as those of The Family Centre, work to redistribute power by involving volunteer translators who are members of the Edmonton community, and who may even be immigrants, refugees, or other newcomers themselves. These volunteers, who are part of the community that they are providing services to, are able to implement their own personal linguistic and cultural experiences and knowledge into their work in order to better respond to community needs. Thus, there is a disruption of traditional power structures typically found in specialized fields, as community knowledge and experience are valued, and community members who are immigrants themselves are able to participate in providing a needed service to other members of their communities. Translation tasks are not relegated only to professional translators who have a high level of technical skill but may not have an intimate knowledge of a particular community, as a lack of needed relevant cultural context may result in an unusable translation (Cisneros and De León 108, 110-111).

The disruption of hierarchical structures can also be present in professional translation spaces and the implementation of collaborative models that disrupt traditional hierarchical structures can provide many benefits, including earlier error correction, increased knowledge circulation and training, and faster turnaround times (Kelly et al. 77-78). This organization of what Kelly et al. term a “project community” can be viewed through the lens of Etienne Wenger and Jean Lave’s conceptualization of “communities of practice.” A “community of practice” or “CoP” refers to a group of people engaged in a process of collective learning and dealing with a particular set of problems or a particular interest (Edmonton Regional Learning Consortium; Wenger-Trayner). CoPs allow professionals working in the same field to take collective responsibility for sharing best practices and collecting new and needed knowledge that can work to advance professional practice within a given domain. CoPs can function in direct physical environments, such as shared work spaces, or be organized through online forums, such as those that Noriko Hara describes in the chapter “Online Communities of Practice: Beyond Organizational Boundaries” of her book *Communities of Practice: Fostering Peer-to-Peer Learning and Informal Knowledge Sharing in the Work Place*. Overall, CoPs disrupt traditional models of learning and knowledge collection by being practitioner-oriented and prioritizing autonomy and informality, traits that are also commonly found in collaborative translation spaces (Wenger-Trayner).

Although EISA does not currently utilize a collaborative translation model or have a space for translators and proofreaders to collectively share knowledge, their two-phased plan to transition into a collaborative model will create a space where translators and proofreaders will be able to share information that they have learned through working on their particular documents and learn from other members who have worked on documents that use either similar or different formatting or vocabulary. This will be done through being able to suggest edits to already-existing entries and add new terms to the glossary, and being able to directly communicate with one another on the Trello platform. In this way, the team members will be able to ask questions, discuss possible solutions, and share information and resources, thus creating an online community of practice. This would result in an overall increase in community-based and individual knowledge that would work to further improve translation quality and turnaround times, as translators and proofreaders would be better able to draw from their own experience and that of others in order to make appropriate translation decisions. The implementation of an online community of practice will also ensure that EISA’s practices align with the most up-to-date practices within community translation, as many community translation projects utilize online platforms in order to facilitate communication, knowledge sharing, and access to needed clarification or advice (Désilets and van der Meer 29; Kelly et al. 77-78).

1. **Role of proofreaders in community translation**

I will begin this section by clarifying the terminology that I am going to be using, as there is some terminological confusion that is often present when referring to revising, proofreading, or editing. Taibi and Ozolins describe this confusion as occurring most often between the idea of “reviewing” (comparing the source document to the draft translation and fixing errors of translation) and “proofreading” (a monolingual process where grammatical errors in the target language are corrected in the final translation without any comparison to the source document), and as being a mistake that even professional agencies and translators often make (128-129). Kelly et al. differentiate between the processes of “editing” and “proofreading” within the context of the TEP model, in which editing is carried out by a senior translator who corrects translation errors through a bilingual process, similar to the “reviewing” described by Taibi and Ozolins, and in which proofreading is defined as a monolingual process that is used to verify that the information presented in the final translation is factually correct and that none of it is missing (75). Koponen et al., on the other hand, define “proofreading” and “editing” as being monolingual processes, and define “revision” as being a bilingual process involving a comparison of the source document and draft translation (2). Giovanni Scocchera analyzes these terminological issues in his paper and explains that this lack of terminological cohesion may be present due to a relative lack of information and research about translation revision, noting that the concept of translation revision is missing from several influential translation resources, including the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* and the *Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (143-144.) By comparing a variety of definitions, Scocchera identifies key components of the concept of “revision,” including a “comparative examination” of the source document and the draft translation, improvement and correction of the draft translation, and common involvement of a senior-level or otherwise experienced translator (145-146). This definition of revision is in line with what the EN 15038 and the ISO 17100 standards identify as being revision (Koponen et al. 1). However, EISA is among the group of organizations that mislabels revision as proofreading, and identifies its translation revisers as being proofreaders. This particular terminology is also used by The Family Centre, as is explained by Cisneros and De León (104). In order to maintain EISA’s intra-organizational language, I will use the term “proofreader” or “proofreading” when referring to specific EISA-related activities. However, when speaking about general practices worldwide, I will use the term “revising” or “revisor,” as that is considered to be the current and most accurate terminology. Both of these terms within the context of this paper refer to a bilingual process in which the source document and the draft translation are compared in order to make translation corrections.

The acknowledgement of the importance of translation revision is relatively recent, as it was first institutionalized on a large scale with the European standard for Translation Services EN 15038 created by the European Committee for Standardization in 2006, being succeeded in 2015 by the ISO 17100 created by the International Organization for Standardization (Koponen et al. 1). These standards indicate that revision is mandatory for all translation work, and must be done by someone other than the translator, a process also referred to as other-revision, in order to ensure an objective revision process (Schnierer 110). Translation revisors must possess the same competencies as translators, including linguistic and cultural competence; however, additional required competencies include an ability to identify and justify needed changes without going overboard and “hyperrevising” (making unnecessary changes) and interpersonal skills such as judgement, an open mind, respect for others, and a sense of responsibility, which aid in maintaining the important relationship between translators and revisors and sometimes acting as mentors, making judgements about necessary changes, and anticipating target audience needs, preferences, and reactions (“Conceptualizing translation revision competence” 5; “Towards a model” 11; Taibi and Ozolins 131-133). Translation revision is an important part of the translation process, as it ensures a consistent and high level of translation quality by allowing errors to be identified and corrected. As well, it can be used as an educational and training tool in order to improve individual translator competence (Scocchera 168). Revision is a commonly-used quality assurance tool within community translation as well as in the professional sphere: Désilets and van der Meer describe the process of “Peer Review” in their suggestions of best practices (39) and Taibi and Ozolins discuss post-draft quality assurance (115).

EISA promotes its proofreaders from within its ranks of translators, making selections based on a strong background in the language industry, a strong linguistic and translation skill set, or continued demonstration of high-quality work and reliability (“Glossary thesis questions”). When conducting my survey, the majority of the responses I received (5 out of 7) were from the proofreaders. I suspect that this strong involvement of proofreaders is a demonstration of their previously evident high level of dedication, which would have likely been a key factor in their promotion to the proofreader role. Their relevant background in the language industry and proven reliability, which would inspire a strong dedication to a community translation project like EISA’s, is therefore likely linked to a stronger motivation to participate in this project than other volunteer translators.

The responses I obtained from the proofreaders provided me with the most detailed insight into what the glossary needed, as they were able to identify common translation issues and difficulties due to their experience and skill with translation themselves, as well as due to their experience with seeing the errors that other translators were often committing. While the translators primarily indicated formatting issues and difficulties with formulaic language and course names, the proofreaders additionally identified issues of overly literal translation, use of anglicisms or false cognates, and issues of equivalence of certain diplomas, degrees or certificates due to variation of education systems. This information was extremely valuable, as I was able to identify more terms that should be added to the glossary in order to meet these identified needs and respond to particular difficulties. For example, I added terms such as “acta,” which is often mistranslated as “act” instead of “certificate” due to issues of false cognates, and “consejo de la facultad,” which could be literally mistranslated to “faculty advice” instead of “faculty board.”

Scocchera suggests promoting translation, and revision as part of the translation process, as a collaborative activity (170-171), similar to the collaborative models of community translation described by Désilets and van der Meer and Kelly et al., in which translators are able to share information, ask questions, and as a result, improve overall translation quality by preventing errors from occurring instead of waiting until the revision phase to detect and correct them. (29; 77-80). Within this collaborative space, there is increased knowledge exchange between participants that results in increased opportunities for learning and training and an overall increase in translation quality. (Kelly et al. 78; Scocchera 168, 170-171) Within the context of EISA’s translation teams, the proofreaders have a strong ability to act as leaders in this knowledge exchange due to their higher levels of experience and skill in the translation field, as well as a strong dedication to the work, which during the process of the glossary’s creation was demonstrated by the fact that every proofreader currently part of the Spanish team took the time to fill out the survey with detailed responses. Due to their particular skills, experience, and role within EISA, the proofreaders were a great asset during the creation of the glossary, as they were able to clearly identify specific needs that dictated the required overall organization, as well as specific terms to be included. In considering their experience, skill, and dedication, they will likely continue to add more comments, information, and new terms to the glossary in order to expand and update it and ensure a high quality of translation and a high level of collaboration moving forward. With the implementation of the Trello platform, I suspect that the proofreaders will have a strong leadership role on there as well, as they will be uniquely qualified to answer questions that translators have in the same way that they were able to identify specific translation issues and needs in the process of creating the glossary. Thus, through the creation of the glossary and implementation of the Trello platform, both new and current translators will be able to access a body of knowledge in part collected by and with the help of the proofreaders, which will be specific to the particular needs and difficulties faced by the translators at EISA. In this way, the proofreaders will lead the collective generation and distribution of important knowledge that will ensure a high quality of translation and will help translators improve their individual competencies and expand their individual understandings and knowledge of document translation. This collective practice will hopefully become a strong basis for the development of a community of practice in which EISA proofreaders and translators will be able to continue to create and collect new knowledge and share information about best practices in order to continue to advance their individual and collective translation practice and continue to produce high quality translations that will meet the needs of their clients.

1. **Difficulties encountered in community translation and official document translation**

One of the main difficulties encountered with official document translation, as explained by Taibi and Ozolins, is a lack of any overarching policy or regulation that outlines specific expectations or characteristics of translated documents (87). This is true in the case of Canada as a whole, and in the case of Alberta and Edmonton specifically. Sathya Rao’s explanation of linguistic policy in Canada reveals that the minimal legislation about linguistic diversity that exists, focuses primarily on the promotion and maintenance of minority languages and lacks information about translation, while the legislation in Alberta focuses primarily on minority language rights within education and again lacks mention of translation (74, 76). Furthermore, the City of Edmonton does not have an overarching translation policy, including for the translation of its own documents (78). Neither the Canada nor Alberta government websites provide any clear expectations of document translation, only stating that translations are necessary (*Alberta.ca*; *Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada*). This relative lack of policy is corroborated by Nelida Chan, who explains that Canada also has no existing significant federal nor provincial/territorial terminology-related policies (492, 502). As well, neither the Association of Translators and Interpreters of Alberta (ATIA) nor the Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council (CTTIC) provides any specific guidelines as to how official document translation should be carried out.

While professional translators are likely aware of best practices and common expectations and are thus able to make informed translation choices, community translators may not be aware of these practices and expectations due to a lack of experience or education, and may therefore struggle to create an acceptable translation. In either case, a lack of clear regulation makes the work of a translator difficult, as they are left to infer the particular expectations of the recipient, and making wrong choices may result in negative consequence for the client (in EISA’s case, the immigrant), as applications which require translations may be rejected due to submitted translations being deemed as unacceptable. Although I am unaware of any instances of rejections of translations provided by EISA, Asensio does highlight rejection of translations as being a potential occurrence in the overall domain of document translation which requires consideration (40-42).

On the other hand, as explained by Asensio, the authorities and organizations that are the final recipients of the translation may expect the translation to fulfill incompatible demands, such as both a high level of literalism and good linguistic style, which may create a difficult tension in the translator’s work (13). Again, a failure to completely fulfill these expectations on the part of the translator may result in the client’s application being rejected. A rejection of an application may have disastrous effects for the client, as it may impede their ability to gain legal recognition of their status, successfully immigrate into the country, or have qualifications recognized, which could impact their ability to find good employment.

Additionally, there is a large variation in official documents, as their structure varies from country to country, and may also vary depending on the region they originate from or the year they were created (Lambert-Tierrafría 223; Taibi and Ozolins 40-41). As explained by Asensio, documents from different countries may also include additional information which may or may not be considered relevant in the recipient country (30-31). Alternatively, documents coming from a different country may lack information that the recipient country deems essential (Asensio 20-21). Cultural practices and social structures that differ between countries, such as naming conventions, particular occupations, or administrative organization and nomenclature also contribute to translation difficulty. The corpus that I used to create the glossary corroborated these difficulties, as each document I looked at was formatted differently, and exemplars of the same type of document often included different types of information. For example, a driver’s license from Puebla, Mexico provided information about the holder’s organ donor status but did not provide any other medical information, while a driver’s license from Venezuela provided information about the holder’s allergies, blood type, and RH factor, but did not provide information about organ donor status.

Official documents also contain many different linguistic challenges, as they often use linguistic forms and features not found in other text types, including incomplete or fragmented phrases, unusual, highly formal, or archaic expressions, or highly formulaic and technical phrasing, which cannot be translated literally, but must be translated using a functional equivalent (Asensio 98; Lambert-Tierrafría 217; Taibi and Ozolins 89). These difficulties were corroborated by the survey answers I received, with one proofreader specifically noting difficulty with the “prose-like structures” used in diplomas, and one translator noting difficulty “with long Spanish sentences… [particularly in] legal or academic documents.” These linguistic elements may be particularly difficult for community translators who do not have formal training or relevant experience, as they may be unfamiliar with the particular verbiage used in these documents, and so may struggle to identify appropriate equivalents. Taibi and Ozolins explain that there is typically a lack of training available for community translators, and so work done by untrained freelance or other non-professional translators may be lacking in quality (23). This may be detrimental to the clients requiring document translation, as inadequate translations may result in applications being denied, and may even cause the reputation of the community organization providing the translation service to suffer. Additionally, a lack of training may result in community translators not knowing where or how to properly search for appropriate equivalents, as formal training usually includes information relating to research and translation resources. Although there are many resources available that focus on specialized language, including a variety of Spanish-English law dictionaries, community translators may not be aware of their existence or may not have access to them, limiting their ability to search for appropriate translation equivalents, which may result in increased turnover times due to longer terminological research times or an overall lower translation quality. That being said, the results from the survey demonstrated that EISA’s Spanish translators and proofreaders have a good knowledge of a variety of available translation resources. However, I did only have two translator respondents out of a much larger number of translators, and therefore this may not be accurately representative of the whole group.

1. **Possible solutions to current difficulties**

Although creating new federal, provincial, or municipal policies may not be the most feasible option due to the time and resources required for legislation to be drafted and passed, the implementation of federal or provincial regulations would ensure clear expectations and a high level of standardization, which would make the translation of official documents and the processing of applications containing translated documents more efficient. Alternatively, the detailed enumeration of recommended best practices by translation associations such as ATIA and CTTIC, similar to the document that has been published by the Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators (AUSIT), could also serve to fulfill this purpose.

There are also a variety of other solutions that can be implemented in order to respond to the specific difficulties described in the section above. The creation of new terminological resources such as EISA’s searchable in-house glossary can provide community translators with needed information specifically tailored to their needs that will ensure lexical congruency and a high quality of translation (Crabbe and Heath 151). Additionally, a continued expansion of already-existing resources such as TERMIUM Plus would be beneficial, as it would ensure that provided information is up-to-date, and the resource is adequately responding to terminological needs. Although TERMIUM Plus began as, and is still mostly an English-French resource, it has been expanded to include Spanish and Portuguese translations (Chan 493). There were many terms relating to official documents that did not have entries when I looked them up, which demonstrates a need to continue expanding TERMIUM Plus’ repertoire of Spanish terms. This expansion would work towards increasing a standardization of terms used within government agencies, which would be beneficial to translators engaging in official document translation, as they would have access to a relevant and accurate resource, which would shorten research times, and thus turnaround times, and would increase lexical congruency among translations. As a result of an increased lexical congruency, the translations included in applications for immigration or citizenship would become increasingly standardized and predictable, which would make them easier to assess, and would ultimately shorten waiting periods and allow for an increased number of applications to be processed.

Another strategy that would make official document translation more efficient is what Lambert-Tierrafría refers to as “selective translation,” which has reportedly begun to be implemented by the Translation Bureau of the Government of Canada (223). Taibi and Ozolins refer to this strategy as an “extract translation” (87-88) and Asensio refers to the final product as a “virtual document.” (30-36) Selective translation involves creating a non-verbatim translation which only includes necessary information. Additional unnecessary information, including additional validations, instructions within the source document that inform the user on how to fill it out, and internal references to other parts of the document are omitted. The use of selective translation would result in a standardized document with a predictable format that would make processing easier and more efficient (Taibi and Ozolins 88).

However, in order for selective translation to be a viable solution, new policies would have to be implemented which would validate and standardize their use in a variety of government institutions. Although the Translation Bureau is reportedly making use of selective translation (Lambert-Tierrafría 223), I was unable to find any information relating to this practice on their website or any other Government of Canada page. As well, governmental authorities are not the only ones requiring official document translations, as there is a significant need for the translation of education documents. As I discussed earlier, educational institutions each have their own distinct policies when it comes to translated documents, but hopefully with an implementation of selective translation within government services, selective translation would become an accepted norm within other institutions as well. This would allow for shorter turnaround times and more efficient processing, as translators would not be required to replicate the exact format of each translated document, but would instead be able to use a pre-existing selective translation template.

Templating is another option suggested by Lambert-Tierrafría, which involves creating a template for a particular document type so that the translator does not have to replicate the formatting every single time they work on a new translation (222-223). However, there are many difficulties associated with this strategy, including an extensive amount of time needed to create the template, as well as the high volume of templates that need to be created due to the large variety among document formats, which vary from country to country, region to region, and even according to the time period in which the document was issued (Lambert-Tierrafría 223-224).

A possible solution to the issue of a lack of training or experience among community translators is the establishment of communities of practice in order to promote collaborative learning. Collaborative practice is already fairly common among community translation, as described by Désilets and van der Meer, O’Hagan, and Kelly et al, and EISA is currently working to integrate collaborative practice within their translation teams with the implementation of the glossary and the Trello workspace (“Glossary thesis questions”). As previously explained, this two-phased plan to establish a collaborative environment will create a space in which translators and proofreaders can form an online community of practice, which will provide a space for asking for feedback or suggestions from peers and will also serve as a learning resource due to the presence of information from previous comments or suggestions that will continue to inform translation choices (Hara 96). The future implementation of a “global community of practice,” defined by Wenger as a network of multiple different communities of practice (qtd. in Martin 148), would be even more beneficial to community translation organizations involved in official document translation or other similar types of translation. It would facilitate standardization and knowledge sharing across several different community translation organizations, which would lead to a larger and more generalized improvement of translation quality, as community translators would have an increased reservoir of knowledge, experience, and resources to draw from when translating.

4. **Conclusion**

Official document translation is necessary for newcomer integration, as it is required in order for newcomers’ identity documents and additional credentials and qualifications to be accepted by national, provincial, and local authorities. Translation of credentials and qualifications is often required for immigrants to successfully find work in their area of expertise and thus be able to improve their socioeconomic position. Additionally, translation of both foreign documents and local information is necessary in order for newcomers to avoid experiencing social isolation or exclusion. In this way, translation has an important social role and can be used to ensure that rights and needs relating to language and access to information are properly met. In particular, community translation is directly tied to community engagement and social action, as it often employs volunteer or non-professional translators, who are often part of the target minority community or the surrounding mainstream linguistic community, in order to produce functional translations that are relevant to the particular social or geographic context. While EISA’s community translation practices are not focused on providing translations of necessary public information, which is the primary paradigm associated with community translation, they do work towards an improved integration of immigrants, which certainly has a social engagement orientation. In this way, EISA’s practices are similar to that of another organization in Edmonton, The Family Centre, which also provides community translation services for official document translation; although, The Family Centre has also worked on translations for the City of Edmonton, including translating *The Newcomer’s Guide to Edmonton* into several languages, which fit within the primary community service paradigm.

My creation of an in-house searchable glossary will undoubtedly help address many difficulties found within the intersection of community and official document translation, including trouble finding equivalents for formulaic or archaic linguistic terms and a lack of translation knowledge, skill, or experience that is common within community translation; however it certainly will not respond to the needs of other community translation organizations or to the overarching lack of terminology and translation policy within Canada. As a result, I would recommend that further translation resources be created in collaboration with organizations practicing community translation in order to respond to specific needs, and that already-existing resources such as TERMIUM Plus be expanded in order to include more languages and individual terms. As well, communication between various organizations would be beneficial, as translators and administrators would be able to exchange information within a global community of practice in order to develop a system of best practices that would work to ensure a high quality of translation and an efficient turnaround. Both official document translation and community translation are essential to the functioning of our current globalized society and have a direct impact on the lives of immigrants. Overall, I want to highlight the fact that official document translation and community translation play a vital role in the social integration and inclusion of newcomers, and therefore additional resources and policies working to ensure a high translation quality and a shorter turnaround time will be essential to ensuring that newcomers to Edmonton specifically, or Alberta or Canada in general, are able to successfully participate within society and thus feel welcomed and accepted.

**Appendix 1: Translator survey responses**

**Q1. What types of documents do you most commonly translate from Spanish to English?** (i.e., birth, marriage, death certificates, driver's licences, school or university transcripts, university or technical institution diplomas, etc.)

1. School transcripts
2. Birth Certificates, Academic Certificates and transcripts

**Q2.Which documents do you find the most challenging to translate**? (i.e., types of documents, countries of origin, etc.) **Why?** (i.e., formatting, specific terminology, etc.)

1. School transcripts, because of the formatting
2. Very long Spanish sentences are hard to translate when you have to follow specific formats for legal or academic documents.

**Q3. Are there any specific terms or expressions that you remember having issues with translating?**

1. Certain subject names

**Q4.Which documents take the most time to translate? Why?**

1. School transcripts
2. Transcripts

**Q4.What resources do you use while translating?** (i.e., dictionaries, online glossaries, translation forums, automatic translators, etc.) **Which of these resources do you use the most often? Which do you find most helpful? Why?** (i.e., easy navigation, has specific terminology, etc.)

1. Google translate because it is easy to use, it’s not always correct, but it gives me a general idea.
2. Linguee (it gives you lots of examples of other translations), proz.com (it's my favorite because I learn a lot from the debates), and I use other online dictionaries.

**Q5.What kinds of information would you find the most helpful to include in a translation glossary dedicated for the use of translating documents from Spanish to English at EISA's Language Bank?** (i.e., country of use, specific context information, etc.) **Why?**

1. Country of use because each country has different words.
2. Country of use would be nice to know. Latin America is formed by so many countries in which specific Spanish terms are used in different ways. It would be of great help also if glossary specified different uses of terms.

**Appendix 2: Proofreader survey responses**

**Q1.What types of documents do you most commonly proofread that are translated from Spanish to English?** (i.e., birth, marriage, death certificates, driver's licences, school or university transcripts, university or technical institution diplomas, etc.)

1. It is a mix of all of the above with driver's licenses probably being the most recurrent one or the one I recall seeing the most.
2. birth, marriage, death, divorce certificates, driver's licenses, high school and university transcripts, high school and university diplomas.
3. all the ones you mention, although there does seem to be a certain tendency to work on university credentials (diplomas, transcripts, etc.)
4. University Transcripts and birth certificates (I get a bit of everything actually)
5. Birth certificates, university transcripts and diplomas

**Q2. Which documents do you find need the most correction?** (i.e., types of documents, countries of origin, etc.) **What kinds of corrections do you most commonly have to make?** (i.e., false cognates, anglicisms, etc.)

1. With Spanish being such a complex language that varies from country to country, one of the most recurrent corrections is related to a word or phrase being translated without taking into account the region or country the actual document is originating from. It is a well-known fact that the exact same Spanish word can have different meaning and the meaning is deeply embedded in that particular region or country.
2. diplomas, transcripts. Anglicism or when the translator makes literal translations that do not make sense, also because of the country of use
3. Names of courses and names of degrees
4. Transcripts have Misunderstanding errors (list of courses with no context Venezuela/Colombia) or literalness and with birth certificates the main problem is Illegibility of source text (handwritten and faded documents-mostly old docs)
5. A1. Diplomas, particularly when they contain paragraph style introductions and prose-like structures not used in English diplomas.

A2. Overly literal translations, where individual words are translated correctly, but the writing is not comprehensible or natural for the corresponding English document.

**Q3. Are there any specific terms or expressions that you can think of, that you have to correct often?**

1. I can't think of any at this moment but a few of them are related to university or college diplomas and birth certificates.
2. Not in particular, but some terms can be formal or informal and the use depends on the context of the sentence
3. Programs that are called "Engineering" in Latin America, but that are either "technologist" programs in Canada or that don't exist here at all (a good example is the *Ingeniería Comercial* degree from Chile)
4. not of the top of my head, sorry
5. No.

**Q4. Which documents take the most time to proofread? Why?**

1. Most documents requiring translation have some form of legal terms in them. I find that the most difficult to translate as I don't have a legal background. The forces me to find resources on line such as glossaries of legal terms, case studies, etc.
2. transcripts
3. Lengthy transcripts from engineering or post graduate medical programs, due to the complex nature of the course titles
4. University transcripts. I have to check the courses names (also the marks have to match)
5. Transcripts are longer documents generally, so they take longer. It depends more on the country of origin though. If key information is missing (e.g., unexplained abbreviations, unexplained grading systems, etc.) it can take some time doing internet research to find that information.

**Q6. What resources do you use while proofreading?** (i.e., dictionaries, online glossaries, translation forums, automatic translators, etc.) **Which of these resources do you use the most often? Which do you find most helpful? Why?** (i.e., easy navigation, has specific terminology, etc.)

1. Translation forums is probably the resource I use the most and find most helpful. These forums are open to anyone so it is not unusual to find people from many different countries who can provide valuable feedback.
2. dictionaries, word reference online, an academic family member help quick and make it easy to navigate
3. Word Reference, Proz, and dictionaries. Sometimes I might also search for specific online glossaries
4. ProZ term search is good
5. WordReference, Linguee, Real Academia Espanola, various online dictionaries for translations.

WordReference and proz.com for translation forums.

Wikipedia for official names and context information of countries, territories, etc. Official university websites often to find program specific content.

Google searching for key terms is my primary approach.

Sometimes I will ask contacts from specific disciplines or countries for an opinion.

WordReference is my go to for terms because they have the dictionary definitions, their definitions list specific countries and regions where usage varies, and because their forums are easy to navigate. I usually go to proz.com if I couldn't find what I needed at WordReference.

**Q7. What kinds of information would you find the most helpful to include in a translation glossary dedicated for the use of translating documents from Spanish to English at EISA's Language Bank?** (i.e., country of use, specific context information, etc.) **Why?**

1. I would say country of use and a bit of context information. You don't find that information easily available and I think it would be valuable when trying to fully understand the definition of a word.
2. Country of use is big! Spain uses different Castellano than from Mexico or Colombia
3. I think it would be good to standardize certain words that come up very often. For example, CURP, CRIP, Cedula de identidad, Cedula de Ciudadano, Registro Civil, etc. It would also be good to provide some information on these tricky non-engineering programs. Finally, it would be good to agree whether the Mexican "Licenciado" or the term "Ciudadano" should be translated or not (I don't translate them).
4. Country of use for sure, it would make searching faster
5. Country of use, source documents (e.g., "typically found in marriage certificates"), example sentences. The example sentences are helpful because they let me check to see if the context for the glossary translation is the same as my sentence.

Variations on a term could be useful as well. Often, official documents use certain words in unusual ways (say, by making an adverb out of a word that is typically used only as a noun). If we have a root word, appending variations used for that word would be helpful. This would be tricky to compile though.
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