

Department of Modern Languages  
University of Helsinki

# **THE CLIENT FACTOR**

## **A STUDY OF CLIENTS' EXPECTATIONS REGARDING NON-LITERARY TRANSLATORS AND THE QUALITY OF NON-LITERARY TRANSLATIONS**

**Nina Havumetsä**

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Arts of  
the University of Helsinki, for public examination in lecture room XV,  
University main building, on 23 November 2012, at 12 noon.

Helsinki 2012

ISBN 978-952-10-8391-4 (nid.)  
ISBN 978-952-10-8392-1 (PDF)

Unigrafia  
Helsinki 2012

# ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on non-literary translation and on the client as a party in the translation event. Clients' norms concerning non-literary translation in the language pair Finnish and Russian, their expectations concerning non-literary translators as manifested by their expectations of good translations and the competence of translators, as well as the clients' role in the translation event are considered on the basis of norm theory. These expectations may influence the requirements that translators feel that they are expected to satisfy. The norm concept refers to such expectations of what one must, may or must not do, and to the accompanying rewards of satisfying the community's expectations and the negative repercussions of not fulfilling them. The quality of translation can be seen as the degree to which a translation satisfies the evaluator's expectations of what a translation should be like. Literature on translation service quality, translation quality and norms in general is reviewed. The emphasis is on translation norms (preliminary, operational, initial, expectation, accountability, relation, and communication norms) which are discussed in detail from the client's viewpoint.

Clients' views on the quality of non-literary translation, their expectations regarding translators as well as their role in the translation event, and thereby in the formation of translation norms, are investigated in a survey conducted among Finnish companies that are likely to place orders for translations in the language pair Finnish-Russian. In addition, real translations provided by some respondents of the survey are analysed in order to see whether they correspond with the respondents' responses to the survey.

The findings suggest that clients value accuracy, completeness, functionality, correct interpretation of the original author's intention and an easy-to-read quality of translations. Translators are expected to be experienced, master the terminology of a special field and to have language and translation skills. Formal qualifications were not regarded as important. Clients' role in the translation event appeared to be somewhat smaller than it could be and some respondents seemed to be unwilling and/or unable to assess the quality of translations. This directs attention to the translators' ethical responsibility for the quality of translation as experts and as the creators of the translation tradition. It also suggests that it would be beneficial for both translators and their clients if the clients' knowledge of what competence means in translation and the general visibility of the translation profession were increased.

*Keywords:* non-literary translation, norm, translation quality, translation quality assessment

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I discovered translation studies almost ten years after getting a Master's degree at the Helsinki School of Economics. I knew that I had found my true academic love, and when the opportunity arose to enrol as a post-graduate student in the University of Helsinki, I took it enthusiastically. I had set a firm goal of graduating in four years. Things did not go quite as planned: it has taken me twice as long to complete my thesis and finish my studies. There were some extenuating circumstances, though, such as the birth of our third child, and the fact that I turned from a full-time student into a part-time one during the final stages of my Ph.D. project. Still, I am not sorry that it took so long because I have enjoyed every moment of it.

I wish every doctoral student would be as lucky as I have been in finding inspiring supervisors. I am grateful to my supervisors Timo Suni, Ph.D., Professor Andrew Chesterman and Professor Inkeri Vehmas-Lehto. Without their advice and encouragement I could never have written this thesis. I feel especially fortunate to have been supervised by Professor Chesterman whose book *Memes of Translation* was a great source of inspiration for me. I am also indebted to Professor Liisa Tiittula for guiding me through the final phase of this academic journey, and to my pre-examiners Professor Kaisa Koskinen and Professor Christina Schäffner for their meticulous examination of my work as well as for their invaluable critique.

Most of all I wish to thank my husband Marko for financing my research by supporting our family alone while I had the luxury of pursuing my dream, for believing in me even in difficult moments and for always being there for me. To our dear daughters Viivi, Ellen and Heidi I would like say thank you for letting me have the peace and quiet that I needed even though I know it often took tremendous effort from you.

I would also like to thank my mother Asta for her love and support. Father, I wish you were here to see this day. I know you would be proud.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to the Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters whose grant allowed me to conduct my survey. My goal was always very pragmatic: to produce information that would be useful for both translation students and for practising translators. If any of them find my thesis interesting, I will consider my mission accomplished.

# CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1	<i>Sociological research on translation .....</i>	1
1.2	<i>Sociological research on the working life of non-literary translators ...</i>	2
1.3	<i>Clients as factors in the translation event .....</i>	2
1.4	<i>The connection between expectations, norms and quality .....</i>	3
1.5	<i>The purpose and structure of the present study .....</i>	5
2	QUALITY OF TRANSLATION SERVICES .....	8
2.1	<i>Characteristics of services .....</i>	8
2.2	<i>Customer satisfaction, perceived quality of services, and customers' expectations.....</i>	9
2.3	<i>Price as an element in consumer satisfaction .....</i>	14
2.4	<i>Customer expertise .....</i>	15
2.5	<i>Some implications for the quality of translation services .....</i>	16
2.6	<i>Defining and measuring service quality .....</i>	17
3	TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT .....	21
3.1	<i>Methods of translation quality assessment.....</i>	23
3.2	<i>Criticism of translation quality assessment methods.....</i>	28
3.3	<i>Subjectivity of translation quality assessment .....</i>	29
3.4	<i>Translation quality and norms.....</i>	30
4	NORMS .....	32
4.1	<i>Social norms.....</i>	32
4.2	<i>Norms of communication.....</i>	34
4.3	<i>Attitudes toward norms .....</i>	37
4.4	<i>Norm-related roles .....</i>	39
4.5	<i>How norms work.....</i>	39
4.6	<i>Changes of norms .....</i>	41
5	NORMS IN TRANSLATION STUDIES .....	43
5.1	<i>The preliminary, the initial and the operational norms of translation</i>	43
5.2	<i>Translational conventions and laws .....</i>	48
5.3	<i>Translational product norms: the expectancy norms and clarity.....</i>	49

5.3.1	The expectancy norms and the client.....	51
5.3.2	Clients as norm authorities .....	52
5.3.3	Ways to make clients' expectations known to translators.....	54
5.3.4	Clients as evaluators of compliance with the expectancy norms .....	55
6	PROFESSIONAL TRANSLATION NORMS .....	58
6.1	<i>The relation norm and truth</i> .....	58
6.1.1	Approaches to the relation norm .....	59
6.1.2	The relation norm and the client.....	63
6.1.3	The value of truth .....	65
6.2	<i>The accountability norm and trust</i> .....	67
6.2.1	Definitions of trust.....	68
6.2.2	Ways to evaluate trustworthiness .....	71
6.2.3	Accountability and loyalty .....	73
6.2.4	Trust and quality.....	76
6.3	<i>The communication norm and understanding</i> .....	78
6.3.1	Definitions of misunderstanding .....	78
6.3.2	Reasons for misunderstanding .....	79
6.3.3	Understanding and quality, or ways to prevent misunderstanding.....	81
6.3.4	Evaluation of the degree of compliance with the communication norm .	83
7	BREAKING THE NORMS: TRANSLATION ERROR .....	85
7.1	<i>Classifications of translation errors</i> .....	85
7.2	<i>Clients and errors</i> .....	88
7.3	<i>Causes of translation errors</i> .....	89
7.4	<i>Consequences of translation errors</i> .....	93
8	METHODS AND RESEARCH MATERIAL .....	95
8.1	<i>The target population and the respondents</i> .....	96
8.2	<i>The questionnaire and the sample translations</i> .....	98
9	ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH MATERIAL .....	100
9.1	<i>General characteristics of the respondents and their companies</i> .....	100
9.2	<i>The choosers, the checkers and the orderers</i> .....	100
9.3	<i>The types of translation service provider used</i> .....	101
9.4	<i>The text types translated</i> .....	102
9.5	<i>What is good quality?</i> .....	104
9.6	<i>Analysis of translations provided by respondents</i> .....	114

9.7	<i>How translations are checked.....</i>	<i>122</i>
9.8	<i>The reasons for choosing a translation service provider .....</i>	<i>125</i>
9.9	<i>The client's role in the process of translation .....</i>	<i>131</i>
9.10	<i>Reactions to good or bad quality .....</i>	<i>133</i>
10	DISCUSSION .....	134
10.1	<i>Clients' norms concerning non-literary translations .....</i>	<i>134</i>
10.2	<i>Clients' norms concerning non-literary translators.....</i>	<i>136</i>
10.3	<i>Clients' role in the translation event .....</i>	<i>137</i>
10.4	<i>Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.....</i>	<i>138</i>
	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	142
	APPENDIX .....	149

# LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: Critical incidents in a relationship between a client and a service provider
- Table 2:* Comparison in translation quality assessment
- Table 3:* Relation between the questionnaire and the topics of this study
- Table 4:* The organisational status of the respondents
- Table 5:* The types of TSPs used by the respondent companies to produce Finnish-to-Russian or Russian-to-Finnish translations
- Table 6:* Types of translation service provider used
- Table 7:* Use of Finnish and foreign external TSPs by the respondent companies
- Table 8:* The share of respondents who have mostly the following text types translated
- Table 9:* Translation of different text types by company size and type of activity
- Table 10:* Severity of suggested deficiencies of translations
- Table 11:* Suggested deficiencies of translations regarded as harmless or not errors, % of respondents
- Table 12:* Deficiencies of translations according to the share (%) of respondents who rated them as very serious errors
- Table 13:* Agreement and disagreement with statements about translation
- Table 14:* Agreement with statements about translation by respondents with different roles
- Table 15:* List of actual translations provided by respondents
- Table 16:* The most important methods of checking translations
- Table 17:* Selection criteria used in hiring a TSP
- Table 18:* The most important qualities of translators, respondents who chose the quality in question among the four most important qualities



# ABBREVIATIONS

FRCC	the Finnish-Russian Chamber of Commerce
L1	native language
L2	second language
SL	source language
ST	source text
TQA	translation quality assessment
TSP	translation service provider
TL	target language
TT	target text



# 1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of the present study is to investigate the quality of non-literary translations as it is seen from the client's viewpoint. The quality of services is measured by the degree to which the client's expectations match his/her experience of the service. Expectations are also an essential factor in norms, and therefore norms form the core of this study. The application of norm theory and the investigation into the clients' role in the translation process mean that this study can be regarded as translation sociological research and, more specifically, as research into the working life of translators in which clients play an important part. Since translation is a service and as such it is produced at least partly in cooperation with the client, considerations regarding the role the client plays in the translation process therefore form part of this study.

## 1.1 SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH ON TRANSLATION

The concept of norms was introduced to the study of translation by Gideon Toury some thirty years ago. Since then norms have inspired a large amount of research and secured a place as an important concept in the attempt to find out the factors that affect the decisions made by different actors in translation. The norm concept belongs to two major disciplines: it originates in philosophy and has been applied widely in sociology. Because translation is an activity that is performed by members of a community for the needs of a community, it is natural to turn to the theories and research methods of sociology in the study of translation. Social aspects have, according to Wolf (2007: 6–7), always been a part of translation studies in various forms. Roots of the sociology of translation can be traced back to Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, which led to questions regarding the forces that make a system function and the nature of the relationships between the groups of people involved in it (*ibid.*, p. 7). It is, however, only fairly recently that a research orientation with a clear object of studying the sociology of translation has emerged (see, e.g., works edited by Inghilleri 2005 and by Wolf and Fukari 2007). In this orientation translators and other parties are seen as belonging to a social system which "greatly determines the selection, production and distribution of translation and as a result, the strategies adopted in the translation itself" (Wolf 2007: 1). Clients, or requesters or commissioners of translation, are members of this social system, actors in the event of translation, and they play a part in translators' working life. As such, they can influence the way translations turn out to be.

## **1.2 SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH ON THE WORKING LIFE OF NON-LITERARY TRANSLATORS**

Wolf identifies three overlapping “sociologies” of translation, each with a different emphasis. There is one which focuses on the agents, mainly, it seems, on literary translators and members of the publishing world active in translation production and investigates them from different aspects (see, e.g. Simeoni 1998, Sela-Sheffy 2005, Wolf 2006 and Buzelin 2007), often turning to Pierre Bourdieu’s notions of capital, field and habitus. Another line of study emerges from descriptive approaches. Referring to Robyns (1992), Wolf explains that this line of study concentrates on the translation process and on questions such as the discourse on translation and on the mechanisms governing the importation of texts and textual elements through translation, and thus on the concept of norms (e.g., which texts a culture chooses to translate). A third approach, “sociology of the cultural product”, looks at translation “by highlighting its contribution to the construction of social identity, image, social rules, or ideology” (Wolf 2007: 17).

It is important to note that the division of translation sociology into approaches that focus on the agent, the process and the product is, as Wolf says, a matter of emphasis only. In non-literary translation, there have been studies on translator status and accreditation (Dam and Korning Zethsen 2008 and 2010; Chan 2010), the influence of the translator’s individual history, the working of human cognition and effect of the specific situation and environment on translation (Risku 2002, 2010), and studies on the translator’s agency and networks (Abdallah and Koskinen 2007; Abdallah 2010, see also Abdallah’s 2012 doctoral dissertation in which both these articles are included). Justa Holz-Mänttari should be mentioned here as an early pioneer in describing the production of a translation (or ‘translatorial action’) as cooperation in which expert agents of different fields cooperate (see Schäffner 2011 for an English description of Holz-Mänttari’s main ideas). These reports focus on the agent but deal also with questions regarding the actual process of translation in cooperation and interaction with other experts, businesses, and with clients and readers. The discussion regarding the product in these reports appears to be mostly concerned with factors that affect translators’ ability to produce good-quality translations and the (lack of) appreciation people have for that ability and for the product itself. In other words, sociological research is being done into the working life of translators.

## **1.3 CLIENTS AS FACTORS IN THE TRANSLATION EVENT**

Considering the interest in translation sociology and translators’ working life, clients would appear to be an important object of study. However, there seems to be very little research on non-literary translators’ clients as agents in the translation event. A translation event refers to the process in which a text is se-

lected for translation, translated by a translator in the actual act of translation, and at the end of which feedback may be given on the translation (Toury 1995: 58, 249). The client or the commissioner of translation is mentioned in several studies, especially within the functionalist school, where the client is the party with whom the translator negotiates about the skopos of the translation. Systematic investigations into the clients' role have appeared only fairly recently, mostly, it seems, with emphasis on questions such as the image of and the level of respect for the translation profession among the clients (see, e.g., Dam and Korning Zethsen 2008 and 2010 and Chan 2010).

As to the influence that clients may have on the translation process, opinions differ. Some researchers see clients and their aims for the translation as one of the two most important "sources of tension" in translation, along with the source text and its constraining influence on the target text (Malmkjær 1993: 147). Pym (1998), however, is not so certain. In his account of the purpose of translation as a final cause he remarks that "[t]he problem is that we don't really know who is playing the game. The purpose of a translation might be determined by the client's instructions, the make-up of the potential readership, or the brilliance of the translator. Different theorists accord different weightings to these factors" (Pym 1998: 154). Vehmas-Lehto (1989: 210) suggests that, besides interference from the source text, both the translators' and their employers' translation principles can explain why translations display certain features.

A client may have expectations regarding translations in general or regarding the way a particular translation should look. Pym (1998: 157) sees such expectations as causal elements in the formation of a translation. For clients to have such a causal effect, translators must be somehow aware of them, i.e. they must have knowledge or expectations of clients' expectations. Clients can therefore play a role in determining the formal cause, as Pym puts it (*ibid.*), to the extent that they themselves have expectations about translation – and about translators – and are willing and able to make them known to translators and to see to it that they are fulfilled, i.e. to the extent of their agency (*agency* defined as "willingness and ability to act" as in Kinnunen and Koskinen [2010:6]). And expectations which translators feel that they have to fulfil are a prerequisite for the existence of norms, as will be explained in more detail in chapter 4 below. They are also linked to translation quality assessment since an evaluator can use his/her expectations as a point of comparison in assessing translation quality.

## **1.4 THE CONNECTION BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS, NORMS AND QUALITY**

This study is based on the assumption that people seek the acceptance and respect of other people, especially their peers and those on whom they are dependent, and try to behave accordingly. Based on experience the members of a community either know or assume that if they behave in a certain way, a certain

response from other people is likely to follow. As social beings, most people may be expected to behave in a manner that will lead to positive responses and to avoid behaviour that will invoke negative responses from other members of the community. Expectations of other people's likely reaction are a condition for the existence of norms (see section 4.1 for more details).

In services marketing literature (see below chapter 2), the extent to which the perception of a service matches the expectations concerning that service is commonly used as a measure of quality. 'Perception' refers to a client's subjective experience of a service and 'expectations' are the client's equally subjective ideas of how well the service will solve his or her problem and how well it will benefit him or her. If the service provider is experienced as meeting these expectations, the client will regard the quality of the service as good.

It is possible that a client has had bad experiences with a service or a particular service provider, and that his/her expectations concerning the service are unnecessarily low because of those experiences or for some other reason. Meeting such pessimistic expectations does not mean that the quality is good. From the client's perspective his/her expectations of *good* quality equal to what the translation *should* or *should not* be like. Therefore they can also be regarded as the client's norms for translation. From a translator's perspective, a norm (see chapter 4 for more details) may be said to exist if the knowledge or feeling that a client will be pleased if a translation displays a certain feature serves as a motive to make sure that such a feature will be present in the translation. An expectation may also be more like a requirement in which case not meeting that expectation is likely to lead to negative repercussions for the translator perhaps influencing him/her to aim actively at meeting that requirement in the future. Translators who meet their clients' expectations may be assumed to succeed in their profession and their conduct, and the products or services that they produce are likely to form an example, something to be imitated by other translators.

To summarise, a client can be seen as a party in the translation event who has expectations regarding the acceptable conduct of the translator and the characteristics of a good translation. The knowledge or assumption of the existence of such expectations of people such as clients whose good opinion is important to a translator, may thus make him/her try to meet them in order to avoid the negative consequences connected with not meeting them and to pursue the positive consequences of meeting them. A client can put his/her expectation into words, e.g. 'translation must display feature X', which would be an expression of what he or she thinks is or should be a norm. A translation that meets the client's expectations is regarded as a good-quality translation by that client. A single client's expectations cannot be considered a norm, but if such expectations are common and if translators are commonly aware of them and aim to meet them, possibly in anticipation of sanctions connected to compliance or non-compliance, translations meeting such expectations could also be called norm-following.

In the present study, an expectation-fulfilling translation is taken to mean from the client's perspective the same as a norm-following or a good-quality translation.

## 1.5 THE PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The purpose of this study is to focus on clients and their interplay with translators and to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the clients' norms concerning non-literary translation in the language pair Finnish and Russian in present-day Finland as manifested by clients' expectations of good translations?
2. What are the clients' norms regarding the selection and competence of non-literary translators in the language pair Finnish and Russian in present-day Finland as manifested by clients' expectations of good translators?
3. What is the clients' role in the translation event and thereby possibly in the emergence and development of translation norms?

It is important to note that I do not intend to claim that quality of non-literary translation in this or any other language pair is or should be determined solely by the degree to which a translation meets clients' expectations. Other studies will be required to determine the sources of expectations that translators aim to fulfil and the relative weight of clients' expectations among them. The idea here is to try to find out and describe clients' expectations about what translations *should* be like and how translators *should* behave, i.e. their normative expectations, as opposed to 'expectations' in the more everyday sense meaning the anticipated outcome of a future encounter with a particular service provider, as described above. (The degree to which *clients* think translation quality is dependent on their expectations being fulfilled is another matter.)

The present study has points of contact with some of the research presented very briefly above and it also reflects the three dimensions of research in translation sociology identified by Wolf. The process of translation appears in my study as something that is initiated by the client because he or she needs a translation for a business purpose. The client choosing a translator to do the job is an important stage in this process, which is why I will look into the selection criteria, such as a translator's education or accreditation, and the feelings of uncertainty and trust connected with choosing and cooperating with a service provider. Furthermore, clients have an opportunity to interact with translators during the translation process and also at its end when they can evaluate the product and use it for the intended purpose. I hope to be able to further our under-

standing not only of what the relevant norms are from the clients' viewpoint, but also what influence clients have, if any, on how norms emerge and develop.

In Abdallah (2010: 16) and Chan (2010) the clients are translation agencies and translators are either in-house translators or freelancers working as subcontractors. Korning Zethsen and Dam (2008 and 2010) approach the subject by investigating in-house clients, i.e. the opinions that employees who order translations have regarding the in-house translators of their company. In the present study, the viewpoint is that of the party who approaches a translation service provider in order to get a translation for his/her own needs. More specifically, 'client' (or 'customer') refers in this particular case to a Finnish company that uses the services of a translation service provider in order to acquire translations from Finnish into Russian or the other way around, to be used for a specific purpose. To get a picture that is as comprehensive as possible I have tried to include all kinds of client–translator relationships in my study. There can be in-house translators or other employees producing translations in a client's company, a client can hire a translation agency that employs either in-house or freelance translators, or he or she can use the services of a freelance translator working alone. A translation agency that has freelancers as subcontractors is not a client in this study. Such an agency may have many of the same requirements for translations and translators as the clients in the present study, but the focus here is on the party who actually uses the translations that they order and who are not necessarily experts on translation.

The present study is limited to non-literary translation. Non-literary translation is an important object of research because it employs a large number of translators and because people read a lot of non-literary translations, sometimes even more than they do literary translations. Non-literary texts, such as newspaper articles, can be significant texts, and new expressions, words, terms and ideas can be introduced to different cultures through non-literary translations. Studying their production process and the social settings in which they come into being is therefore important and may, for instance, help the students of translation prepare for their future profession, and give practising translators a hopefully useful outsider's view on some aspects of their work.

Providers of non-literary translation services are in many cases businesses and can benefit from some of the results of research on the marketing of services. This study will only touch upon a small part of this vast area of marketing research in chapter 2 with the aim of placing non-literary translation services in the general framework of other service businesses and making use of some of the findings regarding service quality that appear relevant to this study. Not all translation service providers included in the present study are business: some are in-house translators or other internal service providers. However, the basic ideas of service quality assessment can be applied to them, too. In chapter 2, I also explain in more detail the relation between expectations and the perception of quality, and the quality distinction between the technical dimension and the



process dimension. In chapter 3, I concentrate on the technical dimension of quality and review literature on translation quality assessment.

Exploring the norm concept is a major part of the present study. I decided to work with norm theory because it can be used to describe how decisions to act are made at least partly on the basis of other people's expectations and also how the quality of those actions is evaluated on the basis of one's expectations. It also suits my purpose to study the link between normative expectations and real translations. Chapter 4 will concentrate on the social norm and related concepts and also on the norms of communication. Norms of translation receive most of my attention. I present an overview of the literature on translation norms and focus in particular on product and professional norms (Chesterman 2000) in chapters 5 and 6. They seem to provide an adequate framework for analysing the expectations that clients have, not only concerning translations (the product norms) but also translators (through the relation between the product and the professional norms) and the role which clients (could) have in the process of translation. I introduce my empirical research material and methods in chapter 8, move on to the analysis of the material in chapter 9 and conclude my study by discussing the findings in chapter 10.

## 2 QUALITY OF TRANSLATION SERVICES

The quality of a service can be measured as the degree to which the experience of the service matches one's expectation of it. In the following, I will take a look at the specific characteristics of services and the quality of services as they are seen in services marketing literature. I will also discuss the different kinds of expectations as well as the varying degrees of expertise that clients may have as buyers of services.

### 2.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF SERVICES

Translation is a service. Grönroos (2001: 81–84) states that most services share three main characteristics: they are, first, processes which are, second, at least partly produced and consumed simultaneously, and, third, the customers participate in their production process to a varying degree. Edvardsson et al. (1994: 13) use the term 'co-service' "to highlight the unique nature of creating, rather than 'producing' service, in a process with the service receiver as an active participant". Moreover, since customers have different needs, expectations and personalities, services are heterogeneous, i.e. every service encounter is somehow unique both for the service provider and for the customer (Grönroos 2001: 81–84).

The statement that services are at least partly produced and consumed simultaneously seems at first difficult to apply to translation, but if we think about another service, for instance, enjoying a meal at a restaurant, it becomes clear that a service is more than just the food on your plate or the translation that you read. Services include the whole process from the first contact with the service provider to the receipt and use of the actual core of the service that you buy. According to Grönroos (2001: 86), consuming a service has more in common with consuming a process than with consuming an end-product. A satisfactory end-product is what the consumer expects to have at the end of the service process, but the experience s/he gets from the process affects considerably his/her perception of the overall quality. A service provider is often unable to differentiate his/her end-products from those of the competitors. That is why service providers frequently try to make their service production (and consumption) process stand out from competition.

Intangibility is another aspect of services. Some services, however, are more intangible than others, e.g. a restaurant has many tangible components but teaching has only few (Zeithaml and Bitner 2000: 4–5). The translation industry would appear to be somewhere in between: at the end of the process the customer gets a tangible product which s/he can read, analyse, distribute to other people, file, or throw away.

Translation can be characterised as a professional service. In the context of this study, it is also a business-to-business service. Based on extensive literature, Ojasalo (1999: 23–28) lists several criteria for professional services, all of which are applicable to the translation profession. First, professional services are provided by educated and experienced persons with a substantial fund of specialised knowledge often in a narrow area. Second, they are oriented toward recognising the problem that the customer needs to have solved, designing a solution and implementing it. Third, professional service providers typically work on the basis of the customers' assignments. Fourth, a high degree of customer uncertainty is involved in purchasing and evaluating professional services, i.e. customers may find it difficult to decide what the actual problem to be solved is, whom to hire, and whether the outcome is of satisfactory quality. Fifth, many professional services deal with sensitive problems of the customers and therefore require confidentiality and trust between the parties. Sixth, professional services are regulated by a code of ethics, which can be official or based on tradition. Seventh, professionals often form a professional association, e.g., to set codes of conduct and certify practitioners. Eighth, the status of the occupation is recognised by society. Ninth, the marketing of professional services is based more on referrals and social contacts than on advertising. The tenth and final characteristic of professional services is that they often deal with information and are affected by its special features, such as its ability to be shared, transported and leaked.

## **2.2 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION, PERCEIVED QUALITY OF SERVICES, AND CUSTOMERS' EXPECTATIONS**

Services marketing researches distinguish between service quality and customer satisfaction. According to Zeithaml and Bitner (2000: 74–75), customer satisfaction consists of five components (not too different from Grönroos's seven criteria, see below): perceived service and product quality, situational factors, personal factors and price. Grönroos points out (2001:123) that the (overall) service quality is experienced first, after which the customer feels satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the service.

The quality of service perceived by a customer has two dimensions: *the technical dimension* or the quality of the end-product, and the functional or *process dimension*. The technical quality is the *what* of quality: what the consumer gets as a result of the production process and interaction with the service provider. The quality of the process refers to *how* the consumer experiences the simultaneous production and consumption process and the instances of interaction, 'the moments of truth', with the service provider's personnel. The relative importance of the *what* and the *how* may vary from service to service and from customer to customer (Grönroos 2001: 100–103).

From the customer's point of view, quality of service is equal to his/her subjective perception of the service. Quality is therefore relative. According to Grönroos (2001: 105) quality is good if the perceived quality matches the level of quality expected by the customer. This seems to make good sense at least if the customer does not expect poor quality but a level of quality that is close to what s/he requires from that service. Expected quality is affected by, among other things, the service provider's marketing communications and image, and the customers' needs and values. In Grönroos's (2001: 100–102) model, the service provider's image is an important element through which the perceived process and technical quality are filtered, leading to the conception of perceived quality. If the service provider has a good image, customers are more likely to forgive minor mistakes and faults. If the image is bad and a customer still for some reason decides to hire the service provider, errors are likely to be regarded as confirmation of what the customer already knew and have a relatively more serious negative effect on perceived quality. A company's image is thus the result of expected and perceived quality (Grönroos 2001: 387). It is important to note that in this model also the perceived quality of the outcome, or the technical quality, is seen through the service provider's image.

Grönroos (2001: 123–124) lists seven criteria for good perceived service quality (mostly as referred to in Edvardsson et al. [1994: 86–87], partially my translation from Finnish):

1. Professionalism and skills (outcome-related criterion)
2. The customers realise that the service provider and his/her personnel have the knowledge and skills as well as operational systems and physical resources needed to solve their problems in a professional way.
3. Attitudes and behaviour (process-related criterion)
4. The customers feel that the service personnel (contact staff) are concerned about them and want to solve their problems in a friendly and spontaneous way.
5. Accessibility and flexibility (process-related criterion)
6. The customers feel that the service provider, his/her location, operating hours, staff and operational systems are designed and operate in a way that ensures easy access to the service and preparedness to adjust to the demands and wishes of the customer.
7. Trustworthiness (process-related criterion)
8. The customers know that whatever happens or is agreed upon they can rely on the service provider and his/her staff to keep their promises and to act in the best interests of the customers.
9. Recovery (process-related criterion)
10. The customers realise that whenever something goes wrong or something unexpected happens, the service provider will immediately take action to keep the situation under control and to find a new acceptable solution.
11. Servicescape (process-related criterion)

12. The customers feel that the physical environment and other factors in the surroundings of the service encounter help to create a positive experience.
13. Reputation and credibility (image-related criterion)
14. The customers believe that the operations of the service provider can be trusted, that s/he gives value for money and that s/he represents a level of performance and values which can be accepted by the customers.

As seen from the list, most of the criteria are process-related and therefore represent the process dimension of the overall service quality with, surprisingly, only one criterion (professionalism and skills) having to do with the outcome, which is, after all, the reason the customer engages in the transaction in the first place. Grönroos (2001: 100; 123) does point out that the relative importance of these factors varies and that the technical quality is very important when customers evaluate the overall quality. He argues also that a business strategy based on technical quality can be successful only if the quality of the technical solution offered by the service provider is so high that it cannot be matched by competitors. In many industries that is not the case, which is why improving the process dimensions in order to gain a competitive advantage in the market would be a better strategy (Grönroos 2001: 103–104). This seems to be the reason why the process dimensions get so much attention in services marketing literature.

It should be noted that these criteria are not considered only after the service has been performed. Customers also have expectations concerning these criteria and make a decision to hire a service provider based on how well they expect him/her to fulfil them.

Specifically, and very suitably, for professional services, Edvardsson et al. (1994: 2) propose the term 'right quality' which means that "the service provider has met the specifications or requirements which were laid down for the service on the basis of the customers' demands and needs, and that the customers' expectations have been fulfilled". Quality is fulfilling expectations and needs of the customer, the staff and the owners of the company that provides the services, and quality is right when every one of them is satisfied. Edvardsson and his co-authors' definition is applicable to services with a high professional component, but it looks at quality from the service provider's perspective. If a client does not know that his/her expectations do not match what s/he actually needs in the service provider's professional opinion, s/he cannot expect the service provider to satisfy those needs or include them in his/her requirements for the service. However, if those needs were pointed out to the client, s/he might change his/her expectations regarding the outcome of the service process accordingly and possibly perceive the service process as a whole as having exceeded his/her expectations (in that particular instance – next time s/he will have changed his/her expectations to match his/her needs). So in accordance with the concept

of right quality it is the professional service provider's job to adjust the client's expectations where necessary.

In a way that is similar to this definition of right quality, Ovretveit (2000: 3; see also Edvardsson et al. 1994: 79) sees three dimensions of quality in health-care and also in other services with a high professional component: first, *customer quality* refers to the customer (patient) getting what s/he wants from the service; second, *professional quality* has to do with the customer getting what s/he needs and whether his/her needs are satisfied in a way that is assessed as correct and necessary by the professional service provider (outcome is one measure); and third, *management quality*, which is whether the service is provided economically, without errors and in accordance with the law. Professional quality directs attention to the possibility that the customer does not always know what s/he needs (Edvardsson et al. 1994: 79). Additionally, what the customer wants (customer quality) is not necessarily what s/he needs in the professional's opinion or what can be achieved in a way that would satisfy the requirements of professional quality. Along the same lines as Ovretveit (2000), Thomson-Wohlgemuth and Thomson (2004: 282) state that their ACTS (Acquired Capabilities in Translation Systems) model aims to define quality in the translation business based on a principle according to which "[c]onsistent quality is: producing a translation that the translator can be proud of, while minimising waste within the organisation, yet maximally meeting the customer's stated requirements".

Abdallah (2007: 283–285) takes a bird's eye view on the translation business and brings into discussion yet another aspect of quality, the ethical one. She sees quality as consisting of three dimensions. The quality of translation (product quality) is influenced not only by how it is produced (process quality) but also by whom and in what conditions (social quality). Social quality includes ethically important aspects such as translators' work conditions, fees and the mutual relationships between the actors involved in translation. The conditions in which translation is carried out are, of course, likely to have an effect on its quality and, in the long run, on the supply of the service. Social quality may also be regarded as part of a translation service provider's management quality, if the translation service provider is an agency that employs translators or hires freelancers.

Just as clients may sometimes not be fully aware of what they actually need from a professional viewpoint, they can have expectations that are not completely clear. In a study by Ojasalo (2001; see also Ojasalo 1999: 81–85, Grönroos 2001: 135–137), the different kinds of expectations that customers may have are described in more detail. Like Grönroos (see above), Ojasalo (2001: 1–2<sup>1</sup>), too, bases his research on the theory of disconfirmation according to which "service quality and satisfaction result from how well the actual service perform-

---

<sup>1</sup> The page numbers referred to in Ojasalo (2001) are according to the printout of the unpaginated article that is available online. They may not correspond with the page numbering of the original publication.

ance [...] matches the customer's expectations". Expectations fall into three groups:

(1) A customer has *fuzzy expectations* when s/he expects the service provider to improve his/her situation somehow but does not have a clear idea about what it is exactly that should be corrected, what should be done about it and how. Fuzzy expectations are very real for the customer and affect the perceived quality. It is in the service provider's interests to define these unclear problems and needs and make them explicit through dialogue with the customer, because when fuzzy expectations are not met by the service provider, the customer will feel disappointed but unable to understand why. S/he may then decide to try another service provider. Specifying fuzzy expectations requires some time and effort also from the customer.

(2) *Implicit expectations* about some elements of the service are so self-evident to the customer that s/he does not actively or consciously think about them or the possibility that they will not be met. S/he will, however, notice when the service provider does not live up to them. In other words, implicit expectations can cause dissatisfaction in the service but not positive surprises. They are therefore communicated to the translator in the form of negative feedback (if at all). Disappointing a customer is one way of making implicit expectations explicit (to the customer), but a better way would be to reveal them in discussions with the customer before the service is performed.

(3) *Explicit expectations* refer to "conscious assumptions or wishes about the service in the customer's mind. The customer pays explicit attention to whether these expectations are met and knows clearly what went wrong if they are not met. However, they are not necessarily expressed openly, at least not all of them" (Ojasalo 2001: 4).

All kinds of expectations can be realistic, unrealistically low or unrealistically high. The customer may also have a set of expectations which includes various degrees of each of the three kinds of expectations. There may be, for instance, implicit expectations about one element of the service and explicit expectations about another. Furthermore, expectations of one and the same customer may vary during the relationship, e.g., explicit expectations may become implicit (Ojasalo 2001: 4–5).

In addition, Ojasalo (2001: 10) notes that, in contrast to consumer services such as restaurants, professional service providers have more responsibility for "mak[ing] sure that the defined problem and the designed solution serve the best interests of the client, not only in the short term, but also and especially in the long term." A similar point is made by Thomson-Wohlgemuth and Thomson (2004: 269). This is in line with the concept of 'right quality' and Ovretveit's three dimensions of quality discussed above, emphasising the importance of providing a service which is of good quality from the professional point of view even if the perceived quality might not seem ideal to the customer right away.

What is said above about different expectations also highlights the fact that the problem of quality in a service like the translation business, is that of ensur-

ing the consistency of quality to ensure that the customers get the quality they have learned to expect (Grönroos 2001: 84).

## **2.3 PRICE AS AN ELEMENT IN CONSUMER SATISFACTION**

The price of a service is not an actual component of service quality, but it plays a role in consumer satisfaction. Zeithaml and Bitner (2000: 30–31; 435–436) describe price as a factor which may be used as an implicit indicator of quality e.g. when other information such as advertising or brand names are not available, when quality is hard to detect, when the price of a service varies widely, or in high-risk situations where the consumers use credence qualities (as opposed to search qualities which can be determined before purchasing a product or experience qualities discernable after purchase or during consumption) to assess difficult-to-evaluate services like management consulting or legal services.

Many services thus appear to be cases where there is asymmetrical information (Akerlof 1970) about the quality (in translation, asymmetrical information means that the translator knows more about the quality of the translation s/he can produce than the client; see below section 6.2.4). However, there seems to be a contradiction between price used as an indication of quality (the higher the price the better the quality) and the fact that when customers cannot evaluate the quality of a product, low-quality products will eventually take over the market. Grönroos (2001: 124) notes that the meaning of price is unclear when it comes to quality but that “customers may equate a higher price with better quality especially if the service is very intangible” (my translation from Finnish). Maybe there are differences among customers in the level of risk associated with purchasing a particular service and perceptions about the level of competence needed to perform it well. If the service is regarded as high-risk, requiring a highly competent professional to produce it, the customer might not opt for the cheapest service provider (because s/he would equate price with quality), nor the most expensive one either due to fear of paying too much if the risk is realised. But if the service is associated with a low level of risk so that practically anyone could provide it, even if its quality is difficult to evaluate, then perhaps the service providers with the lowest fees might enjoy more demand.

Price is not the only cost the consumer has to pay for a service. There are also non-monetary costs, including time costs and search costs, i.e. effort invested to find the service needed, waiting for access to it and consuming it, convenience costs like arranging one’s schedule to correspond to the service provider’s opening hours, and psychological costs such as fear of uncertainty or high costs (Zeithaml and Bitner 2000: 434–435). These seem closely related to the process dimension of the service.



## 2.4 CUSTOMER EXPERTISE

Customers' experiences and skills as buyers may have an effect on their quality perceptions. Ojasalo (1999: 210) defines customer expertise as their "general ability to use the service as a means of generating benefits." Customer expertise is, according to Ojasalo (*ibid.*), influenced by three phenomena, namely, the number of former assignments the customer has given, his/her ability to evaluate and understand the benefits of the service, and general knowledge and experience in business administration. These phenomena are connected to each other. For instance, the customer's level of expertise is likely to rise together with the number of assignments s/he has given and evaluated. However, even a novice customer can be an expert in evaluating service quality if s/he is able to see the concrete consequences of good or bad service quality to his/her company, which is usually easier in small companies and for those customers who have much general knowledge of business administration and wide experience in purchasing and assessing different kinds of services (Ojasalo 1999: 211–212).

Ojasalo (1999: 215ff.) defines the differences between novice and expert customers in terms of their expectations, the value they give to service characteristics that generate short- or long-term quality, the extent of their tolerance zones and the different sacrifices they have to make for acquiring the service. Novice customers have more fuzzy and unrealistic expectations, think more in terms of short-term quality, have narrower tolerance zones (the distance between minimally acceptable and desired service quality levels) for service failures, are more reluctant to share confidential information with the service provider, and, finally, emphasise price more as a component of customer satisfaction owing to the fact that monetary matters are easy to understand. Experts are better at evaluating and understanding the benefits of the service and have had time to develop trust in the service provider. Therefore they are not as likely to evaluate different service providers solely on the basis of price and are not as reluctant to share confidential information with the service provider as novices are. Instead, experts consider time as an important sacrifice. Experts' expectations are likely to be implicit and quite demanding. They have longer time horizons and pay more attention to the relevance of the benefits that the service can offer than to how fast the benefits will appear. Furthermore, experts have wider tolerance zones, i.e. they tolerate a wider variation in service quality without terminating the relationship, which suggests that experts, on average, understand the nature and the difficulty of the service better than novices. On the basis of some of these points it could also be concluded that novices are more demanding clients. Ojasalo's main point seems to be, however, that expert clients value trust and long-term relationships highly and are prepared to overlook an occasional failure by the service provider rather than start building a new relationship with a new one.

The benefits of good-quality translations and the negative consequences of bad-quality translations can vary a great deal depending on what the translation

is used for. To evaluate translation services from this viewpoint the customer needs language skills. Otherwise even frequent assignments may not lead to genuine expertise because these customers cannot evaluate all sides of the technical quality of translations. It is difficult to say anything about the tolerance zone of such customers, which may be related to their being unable to compare their expectations with perceptions even if they probably have the same kinds of expectations as anyone else. It seems likely that for them trusting the service provider despite these difficulties is a big step to take emotionally. In addition, this group of customers, even if they are experts in terms of the number of translation assignments they have given, may act like novices in the sense that they concentrate on service attributes that they can understand, like the price.

## **2.5 SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR THE QUALITY OF TRANSLATION SERVICES**

It seems likely that for customers who are unable, unwilling or too busy to assess the technical quality of translations, the process dimension of the translation service, along with the price of translation, are what they base their translation quality assessment on. If this is the case, what we are discussing here is not the traditional text-based way of analysing translation quality, and not even what House (2001: 254) calls social evaluation, but something that marketing researchers might be interested in. However, the process dimension, as well as the image of the service provider includes things like trustworthiness, reputation, level of performance and values, and it forms a part of this study. In addition, studying the process dimension would seem important for the customers and translation service providers. The process dimension is also related to questions such as deadlines and fees which are of interest to any practising translator.

Ovretveit's (2000) division (above) of service quality into customer quality, professional quality and management quality offers interesting points of view on discussions about the quality of translation and factors that affect it. In the service production process, for instance, the customer's need for speed and the translator's requirement of enough time to achieve a level of quality which s/he deems desirable for the customer as well as to himself/herself, based on his/her own professional norms, may often be at odds. There may be other differences between the service provider and the customer regarding the level of quality to be pursued and the conditions which are deemed appropriate for reaching that level. Abdallah (2010: 22–23) sees serious consequences of such differences: "If the actors do not share a common goal, such as a mutually agreed level of quality, it is neither possible to have efficient cooperation nor to produce good quality."

One possible consequence is that the resulting total quality (professional, customer and management quality put together) could actually be lower than

the quality perceived by the customer if the professional quality is not high enough in the translator's opinion. It may also be that the professional quality is perceived as high but the customer as a layperson is unable to appreciate the quality in the same way. The professional, customer and management quality, with the addition of social considerations, as suggested by Abdallah (2007), appear therefore to be suitable analytical tools for the managers of the service company and also for someone who studies both the production and the consumption side of a field.

Ojasalo's (2001) fuzzy, implicit and explicit expectations are *the customer's* expectations. Even the customer's explicit expectations are "in the customer's mind" and may not be expressed openly to the service provider. Moreover, the service provider may have unrealistic expectations of a particular customer's expectations. Thorough discussions with the client would seem to be a prerequisite to trying to match perceived quality with expected quality. The service provider has a certain responsibility here since, as Byrne (2007: 12) points out with regard to translation, what a client may reasonably expect is in proportion to what the translator claims to be able to do, i.e. whether s/he claims to be a generalist or a specialist translator. Open discussions with the client are crucial also because, as Ojasalo (2001) argues, expectations can change during the customer-service provider relationship. Expectations, then, are likely to be quite customer-specific, but there may still be expectations about some aspect of the translation service that are more or less common to the whole market at a given time.

## **2.6 DEFINING AND MEASURING SERVICE QUALITY**

Edvardsson et al. (1994: 182) state that "defining quality is the starting point for measuring it." One must first establish what the key quality factors are (e.g. reliability and trust) and then get the customers to specify them, in their own words, in terms of variables and to indicate the importance of different variables. After quality has been defined in this way, one can proceed with rating the service. The authors also recommend using both quantitative methods (for objective and precise facts) and qualitative measurements (to better understand customers' expectations and requirements) (Edvardsson et al. 1994: 181).

To find out what in the customers' mind constitutes quality is an important step in closing what Zeithaml and Bitner (2000: 26; 104) call the provider gap, or the possible difference between customer expectations and the service provider's perceptions of customer expectations. To study quality, Zeithaml and Bitner (2000: 111) recommend using both qualitative and quantitative research. Qualitative methods, e.g. critical incidents research (which will be discussed shortly), can be used to make sure that the service provider has defined quality in a way that is meaningful to the customers, and quantitative methods to en-

able the service provider, e.g., to quantify customer satisfaction and to see where service provider's performance does not meet the expectations.

According to Grönroos (2001: 120–123) expectations clearly influence perceived quality, but measuring quality by comparing expectations and perceptions of quality is problematic. Grönroos suggests making an extensive list of the different service dimensions and measure the customers' perceptions of these dimensions.

Another way described by Grönroos (ibid.) would be to use *the critical incident method* in which the customers are asked to describe in detail instances when they thought an element of the service process or the outcome differed from the usual either in a negative or a positive way, and to explain why they thought that way. According to Holmlund and Strandvik (1999: 10), critical incidents "are significant actions or episodes, which deviate from a comparison standard. An incident is significant when it triggers perceptual attention or behavioural attention or both. Compared to the comparison standard the firm can experience the incident as negative or positive."

The different comparison standards that are used by the customer may be placed on a scale ranging, according to Liljander (1995: 52, 82–85), from the minimum tolerable quality to the ideal level of service quality. Between these ends there are standards that can be based, for instance, on product norms, i.e. typical performance expected from competing service providers, brand norms (meaning the usual level of performance provided by a particular service provider), or even on alternative ways of fulfilling a need, which in the translation business might be producing original texts in the languages needed instead of translation. The customer may compare his/her experience of the service against several standards and change the standards over time. The standards used may depend on his/her demographic background, knowledge, and on the perceived complexity and importance of the service to be evaluated (Holmlund 1997: 89–90).

The fact that there is often no single acceptable way of performing a service is reflected in the *zone of tolerance* concept, (which was mentioned above in connection with customer expertise). It refers to the extent to which the customer is willing to accept variation in the performance of the service, i.e. to the zone between the minimally acceptable (adequate) level and the desired level. Each customer has an individual zone of tolerance and they may have different zones of tolerance for different service dimensions (Zeithaml and Bitner 2000: 51–53). The concept seems therefore to be very similar to expectations in general, the difference being that it brings out the fact that "[c]ustomers' service expectations are characterized by a range of levels [...] rather than a single level" (Zeithaml and Bitner 2000: 53). It is also related to image in the sense that if the service provider's image is good, the customer's zone of tolerance would appear to be wider than when the image is poor.

Holmlund (1997: 85–87; see also Holmlund and Strandvik 1999: 14–15) uses the zone of tolerance to describe incidents according to degrees of behavioural

criticality, i.e. the perceived influence on the relationship, between the service provider and the customer, and perceived criticality. In Table 1, cells C and D are real critical incidents that fall outside the customer's zone of tolerance.

**Table 1:** *Critical incidents in a relationship between a client and a service provider (Holmlund 1997: 86)*

		Perceived influence on relationship	
		Minor	Significant
Perception of criticality	Minor	A Routine incident, which is not perceived as deviating from comparison standards. Falls within the tolerance zone.	B Incident, which affects the relationship but is not remembered as deviating from comparison standards. Falls within the perceptual but not behavioural tolerance zone.
	Significant	C Conspicuous critical incident, which does not have a significant effect on the relationship. The perceptual tolerance zone is exceeded.	D Critical incident, which has a significant effect on the relationship. The perceptual and behavioural tolerance zones are exceeded.

It is interesting to see that a critical incident does not need to have an effect in the relationship between the service provider and the customer (Cell C), i.e. it does not necessarily lead to the customer giving positive or negative feedback to the service provider, feeling increased or decreased loyalty toward him/her, or, for instance, switching to another service company. In addition, it means that the service provider and the customer may have different opinions of the quality of a service dimension (see Holmlund and Strandvik 1999: 13 for unilateral and bilateral perceptions of criticality).

Cell A appears to be closest to a case where expectations of what the service should be like are met and quality therefore regarded as at least acceptable. The significance of cell B seems less obvious, and I do not see, how an incident that is not perceived as critical could have a significant influence on the relationship between the service provider and the customer.

The trigger, or the source, of a critical incident can lie in unplanned variation in the service, or it can result from planned and repetitive aspects like changes either in the seller's or the buyer's organisation, production, product or procedures. Also the network, e.g., the customer's customer or the service provider's subcontractor, can serve as triggers, as can authorities and competitors (Holmlund and Strandvik 1999: 17).

To summarise, the critical incident method can offer insights into the most important phases of the relationship between the customer and the service provider where "the parties' attention level and sensitivity are raised" (Holmlund

and Strandvik 1999: 1; 25). It can help to reveal what is considered normal indirectly by shedding light on what is unexpected. It can be used to study the quality of both the process and the outcome.

In the following chapter I turn more specifically to translation quality and take a look at translation quality assessment methods suggested in translation studies literature.

### 3 TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT

This chapter deals with what was above called the technical quality of translations, i.e. the quality of the end-product which the client gets at the end of the service process, although the process of translation will not be completely forgotten. The emphasis is on translation quality assessment which in itself reflects evaluators' expectations regarding translations. Translation quality will be discussed further in several places in chapters 5 and 6, especially in connection with the relation norm.

The quality of translation has been a central topic in both ordinary people's conversations regarding translation and in translation research. Quality can be viewed from many angles. One can look at it from the viewpoints of the translator, the reader, the client or other parties involved in the translation process, it can be studied as a certain kind of relation between the original and the translation, a certain kind of effect caused by the translation on its reader, or as a likely result of a certain kind of process.

One may also investigate the change of the idea of translation quality in time. Chesterman (2000: 20ff.) describes the broad outlines of how thinking about translation has evolved and definitions of the translator's task varied since Antiquity in the history of predominantly literary translation, echoing an increase of text types translated and the development of linguistics and understanding of cross-cultural communication. In the current stage of this evolution of norms (Chesterman 2000: 33ff.), the "cluster of ideas" enjoying wide popularity appears to consist of seeing the translator as an independent but loyal mediator, an expert whose job is to facilitate communication taking into account several contextual factors, including the anticipated response of the target text readers. Much of translation research is directed at finding out more about the actual act of translating and why translations are the way they are, how they shape their new home culture and how they portray their culture of origin.

It would be interesting to know whether the evolution of western norms of translation would look the same if more research had been done on non-literary translation. Still, the history of translation shows the conception of translation, sometimes widening and sometimes narrowing, depending on what people thought translation can be and what it should be (Toury 1995: 15).

Examples of current informal characterizations of translation quality are listed in Hansen (2008: 260). The list reflects the difficulties involved in defining good quality. It includes statements of different kinds, such as the following reference to what is thought to be a prerequisite of quality:

- Quality depends on the quality of the translation process.

The idea behind a standard which focuses on a process is that if a process which includes the elements defined in the standard is carried out, the result is likely to be desirable. The 2006 European Standard (ES) for translation services (SFS-EN 15038) covers the process of translation service production. The emphasis of the standard is on defining the conditions which will ensure meeting clients' requirements and producing correct and complete translation services (ES 5.2). It includes requirements concerning the professional competences of the translators, revisers and reviewers. According to the standard (ES 5.4.3; 5.4.4), translations must be revised, i.e. a reviser must check it for its suitability for agreed purpose and compare the source and target texts (ES 2.10). If agreed with the client, a translation must also be reviewed, i.e. checked for "suitability for the agreed purpose and respect for the conventions of the domain to which it belongs" (ES 2.8). A reviewer must be a specialist of the domain in question, but translators and revisers must have the following skills through either a recognised degree in translation, any other higher education plus at least two years of documented experience in translating, or simply through at least five years of professional experience (ES 3.2.2):

- Translating competence consists of the ability to assess the level of difficulty of the assignment, to "transfer the meaning in the source language into the target language" (ES 5.4.1) without errors or omissions, in correct language and in accordance with the agreement with the client.
- Linguistic competence means the ability to understand the source language and proficiency in the target language, and textual competence the knowledge and practical mastery of a wide range of text type conventions.
- Research competence includes the ability to efficiently find and use additional information when it is needed to understand the source text and to produce the target text.
- Cultural competence covers the use of information about the source and target cultures.
- Technical competence refers to availability and use of the equipment utilised for the production of translations, research, document management, and communication.

According to the standard, the translation service provider must also have a documented quality management system (ES 3.4) including at least a statement of its own objectives, a process for quality monitoring and, if needed, for correcting delivered translation services, as well as a process for handling all information received from the client.

Although the standard's aim is not to define 'translation quality', it is clear that the desired end-product of the process is a translation which conveys the meaning of the source text without errors or omissions, is written using correct language, respects the conventions specific for text type and domain, takes into account cultural differences between the source and the target cultures, is terminologically consistent and complies with the instructions of the client.



The second set of statements in Hansen's list are about the relation between the original and the translation and about what one should aim at while translating. They are thus also about how quality should be assessed:

- Quality depends on the fulfilment of the function/skopos set for the translation.
- Quality is the degree of equivalence between the source and the target text.
- Quality does not equal absence of errors.

There are also statements that refer to who should decide what quality is, who should determine the factors that affect people when they assess the quality of a translation.

- Quality is culture-dependent and a question of social and political appropriateness.
- Quality depends on individual perception and idiosyncratic criteria.
- Quality is whatever the client is satisfied with.
- Quality is just what the client needs, nothing more, nothing less.

I will touch upon these viewpoints later in connection with the relation norm (see section 6.1) and translation quality assessment below.

### **3.1 METHODS OF TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

Translations can be evaluated in a number of ways for different purposes. Brunette (2000: 170–173) distinguishes between five types of assessment procedures for 'general texts' (which do not include specific text types such as business letters or financial reports [ibid., p. 180]):

1. *Didactic revision* is used in translator training to improve students' skills. Criticism must be justified.
2. *Pragmatic revision* is "careful comparison of the translated text with the original in order to improve the translation" (ibid., p. 173).
3. *Quality assessment* is done by comparing the final translation or a sample thereof to the source text in order to determine the quality of the translation or to measure the translator's productivity. The assessment is done by using criteria that are considered objective and by calculating a rating according to the number and gravity of errors found. The motivation is to get information on which to base, for instance, decisions to hire translators or admit them to professional organizations.

4. *Quality control* is based on a sample of a final translation. It can be anything from reading samples of the translation to partial comparative revision. The aim is to make sure that the translation complies with established criteria.
5. *Fresh look* means “[r]eading of the target text as an independent text to ensure it complies with current writing standards and the explicit or implicit requirements of the initiator” (ibid.). The aim is to see how readers in the target culture would receive it.

Brunette’s (2000) focus appears to be on TQA (translation quality assessment) and related procedures that are performed in translation training and in translation agencies big enough to employ revisers. If Brunette’s classification is considered from the viewpoint of the present study, the most relevant procedures are quality assessment, quality control, and fresh look, since all of them seem applicable to the needs and possibilities that a client has for translation quality assessment. The term ‘fresh look’ refers to the fact that in Brunette’s classification it can, as a means of quality assurance, offer the translator a chance to make some final adjustments. However, a client who understands the target language may also read the target text without referring back to the source text (which s/he might not understand) in the way defined by Brunette, but for that procedure ‘fresh look’ might not be the best possible term.

House (2001: 244–247; see also House 1997: 1ff. for an extensive review and critique of different approaches to translation quality) divides translation evaluation in different schools of thought into three main groups. First, *mentalist views* include subjective and intuitive assessments of translations which are either superficial expressions of opinions, or regard translation as an individual creative act. Second, some *response-based approaches* require that the readers of the source text and those of the translation should have an equal response which means that both groups of readers should experience the texts as equally intelligible and informative (House, *ibid.*, referring to Nida 1964). Although Nida’s approach is source-text based, which functionalist approaches are not, House regards purpose-based evaluation of the latter as another group of response-based approaches. The third main group are the *text and discourse based approaches*, which, according to House, consist of literature-oriented approaches such as descriptive translation studies, post-modernist and deconstructionist thinking, and linguistically oriented methods.

The aim of House’s (1997) own model is to provide objective linguistic tools for a detailed analysis of the original and the translation so that the grounds of the ultimate evaluation would be transparent and the evaluation itself as little subjective as possible (House 1997: 103). House (1997: 4–6) rejects reader response as a criterion of translation quality assessment. She emphasises semantic, pragmatic and textual equivalence as the fundamental criterion of translation quality (House 1997: 31), and she maintains that translation quality must be based on a linguistic analysis and comparison of the source and the target text. Her functional-pragmatic model of translation evaluation (House 1997: 107–109) indicates what a good-quality translation is like, in her view. In the model,

a textual profile or an individual textual function of both the source text and the translation is determined using the concepts of *register* and *genre* (following Halliday). Register consists of *field* (the subject matter of the text), *tenor* (the characteristics of the participants, the relationship between them, their personal viewpoints and attitude toward the communicative task), and *mode* (the channel and the degree to which the parties may participate). Register realises genre, which House (1997: 107) defines as “a socially established category characterized in terms of occurrence of use, source and a communicative purpose or any combination of these”. The profiles are compared to see whether there are any mismatches. The type of translation needed (overt or covert) determines whether the textual function of the original can be maintained.

House’s model concentrates on textual analysis and the prerequisites which a covert translation should meet in order to function in the intended way in a new culture. It could therefore be regarded as a textual and discourse based model. The model is quite complex and it therefore seems unpractical but also very useful for translation teaching purposes to highlight the many aspects of a text to be considered during translation.

Brunette (2000: 174–180) includes *logic*, i.e. “checking whether the translation is sufficiently well linked on a semantic (coherence) and formal language (cohesion) level to constitute an effective text (communication act) for the target language community” (Brunette 2000: 174), in her suggestion for the general guidelines for assessment criteria. There are three more criteria. *Purpose* consists of intention (what the initiator or the author of the original aims to do with the text, e.g. inform or recommend, and of effect (how the initiator of the translation wants the target audience to react to the translation). *Context* covers the non-linguistic circumstances of the production of the translation which the evaluator needs to consider while assessing whether the target text is appropriate for the intended audience. It includes the target audience of the translation, the author, the time and place in which the translation will be used, etc. *Language norms* refer mostly to absence of interference which would jeopardise the success of communication.

Within the functionalist school, the function of the translation also defines the perspective from which the quality of translation is to be assessed (Hönig 1998: 21). For instance, the necessary degree of precision in translation is determined by the intended function of the translation and the context of its use. A translator first decides on a function which the translation should achieve among its intended readers and then, instead of following rules developed through contrastive analysis of the languages involved, applies translational strategies toward that end. TQA can therefore cover two areas: the choice of the function to be aimed at and whether the translation is able to produce that function in the intended audience. Hönig (ibid., 12, 31–32) argues, however, that in practice TQA is “a speculative enterprise” because in the absence of rules “there is no correct translation for any one word, only an acceptable one”, because translators often do not know the end-users of their translations, because clients

may have strict rules for translations regardless of their functions and end-users, and because there is no scientific data on typical readers' responses. Regarding the choice of a skopos or a purpose for a translation Hönl (ibid., p. 12–13) refers to Nord's concept of loyalty which, according to him, seems to mean "acting in the best interests of one's client which is more a matter of expediency than of ethical standards".

Nord (2005) is concerned mainly with translation teaching. For that purpose, translation criticism should be a combination of (a) an analysis of the similarities and differences between the source text and the target text, of translation strategies and methods, and of the translation skopos and brief, and (b) an evaluation of the translation and its ability to function as planned (Nord 2005: 180). I will come back to Nord's loyalty concept in section 6.2.3.

In Colina (2009: 237–239), TQA methods are classified into *experiential methods*, which are "ad hoc, anecdotal marking scales developed for the use of a particular professional organization or industry" (p. 237), and *theoretical methods*, which include reader-response approaches (Nida) and textual and pragmatic approaches, such as skopos theory and House's model. Colina (2009: 244) suggests a componential, functional, textual TQA tool for professional and educational purposes. In the beginning, the function of the target text and its intended audience are specified, and each component of quality is given a number indicating their priority. There are four components of quality (Colina 2009: 259–260): (1) *target language* refers to the grammaticality, idiomaticity, interference and their effect on comprehension; (2) *functional and textual adequacy* means the degree to which the translation is seen to fulfil its function and take into account the target audience; (3) *non-specialised content meaning* describes how accurately the translation reflects the meaning of the original; and (4) *specialised content and terminology* refers to the correctness of terms used in the translation and to how it reflects the translator's competence in the domain in question. Each component is divided into four levels, or descriptors, and each level/descriptor has a preset numerical value. The evaluator chooses the descriptor that best describes the translation as to the component in question. For instance, the lowest level descriptor of component no. 2 reads as follows:

Disregard for the goals, purpose, function and audience of the text. The text was translated without considering textual units, textual purpose, genre, need of the audience, (cultural, linguistic, etc.) Can not [sic] be repaired with revisions. (Colina 2009: 260)

The highest level descriptor for the same component states that

The translated text accurately accomplishes the goals, purpose (function: informative, expressive, persuasive) set for the translation and intended audience (including level of formality). It also attends to cultural needs and characteristics of the audience. Minor or no edits needed. (ibid.).

To allow for assignment-specific considerations, the weights given to each component of a given translation commission, or the priorities given to each component may be adjusted. Finally, the evaluator has to decide whether the translation can be used for its designed purpose as it is, whether it has to be corrected, or redone completely, possibly in a way other than translation. Colina's model is flexible in the sense that it can be used as a checklist to quickly but systematically assess a translation or it can be used to evaluate each quality component in great detail. For laypersons it is also important that the quality components can be described without using special linguistic terminology.

Whatever the method used to evaluate quality, it involves some kind of comparison on which the judgment is then based. Chesterman (2000: 123–136) divides translation assessment into three main groups in accordance with the direction in which the evaluator looks from the target text, back to the source text or forward to the reader response. In *retrospective assessment* the source text and its translation are compared in order to find out what kind the relation between the source text and its translation is and whether it fulfils the evaluator's expectations. The relation is described in terms of some kind of equivalence, the degree of freeness or literalness, closeness in respect to style, etc. *Prospective assessment* concentrates on the effect the translation has on its readers. *Lateral assessment* involves comparison of the translation with "the appropriate set of texts in the receiving language" (Chesterman 2000: 133), i.e. other translations of the same text type or texts of the same text type that have been originally written in the target language. Comparison may also consist of a combination of the above methods. In Table 2, which is based on Chesterman (2000: 65, 123–136), and the approaches to translation quality discussed in this chapter, some of the different forms comparison could take in TQA (or translation research in general) are listed and grouped under the three headings.

For instance, the row in the table which reads "effect of TT (target text) on evaluator" compared with "effect evaluator expects TT to have on designed audience" is meant to capture evaluation of the translation and its ability to function as planned (Nord 2005: 180 and above). The word 'effect' may be interpreted broadly as function, readability, comprehensibility, interpretation, use, etc.

A TQA method can involve more than one type of comparison. A combination could be, for instance, retrospective assessment of the source text and the translation, prospective assessment of the expected effect of the translation and a lateral assessment of the correctness of the language used in the translation. Comparing a TT with what one considers to be an ideal translation for the ST (see Lauscher [2000: 162–163] and 3.5. below) would seem to be a combination of retrospective assessment and lateral comparisons with other similar texts, translated or not.

**Table 2:** *Comparison in translation quality assessment*

Assessment:	Comparison of:	With:
Retrospective	Form, meaning, style, function, readability, etc. of TT – analysed formally, or – based on evaluator’s subjective impression	Form, meaning, style, function, readability, etc. of ST; – analysed formally, or – based on evaluator’s subjective impression
Prospective	Effect of ST on readers – measured or – assumed by evaluator	Effect of TT on readers – measured or – assessed by evaluator
	Effect of ST on evaluator	Effect of TT on evaluator
	Measured effect of TT <sub>1</sub> on readers	Measured effect of TT <sub>2</sub> of same ST on readers
	Effect of TT on evaluator	Effect evaluator expects TT to have on designed audience
	Effect evaluator expects TT to have on designed audience	Measured effect of TT on designed audience
Lateral	Language used in TT – analysed formally, or – based on evaluator’s subjective impression	Native use of TL based on – formal analysis, or – evaluator’s impression
	TT – analysed formally, or – based on evaluator’s subjective impression	Non-translated TL texts of same type based on – formal analysis, or – evaluator’s impression
	TT – analysed formally, or – based on evaluator’s subjective impression	Translated TL texts of same type based on – formal analysis, or – evaluator’s impression
Combination		

Furthermore, the boundaries between the assessment methods are not completely clear. The first two cases of prospective assessment might be labelled retrospective/prospective because the evaluator looks both back to the source text and the situation in which it was or is used, and forward to the effects of the translation.

In addition, the effect may be expected to depend on the correctness of language of the translation and on the results of lateral assessment, i.e. how well it is seen to fit in with comparable texts already existing in the target culture.

### **3.2 CRITICISM OF TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT METHODS**

Presently available scholarly methods of TQA have received serious criticism. House (2001) criticises functionalist theories for paying too little attention to the source text and for not providing explicit definitions of central concepts

(such as *function*), descriptive translation studies for not providing any criteria for quality assessment, mentalist approaches for relativism, and response-based approaches for lack of measurable criteria for TQA.

House's criticism seems harsh considering, for instance, that Nord (2005) pays a great deal of attention to the source text, and descriptive translation studies do not aim at providing criteria for quality assessment. However, House is not the only critic of TQA methods. According to Lauscher (2000: 151–158) the equivalence-based methods, including House's own model, offer imprecise definitions of criteria and terms like 'optimum equivalence' or 'as closely as possible', and focus on function as it is expressed in the source text instead of taking the communicative preferences of the target culture as a starting point. The problem with functional models of TQA is, in Lauscher's (2000: 158) view, that they propose to measure quality in terms of "general assumptions which are not examined in the light of the actual functions assigned to texts nor the means chosen to realize them". Lauscher concludes that scholarly approaches to TQA are not helpful for practical quality assessment because they neglect the actual conditions of translating. Also Colina (2009: 238–239) remarks on the poor applicability of both reader-response and some textual and pragmatic approaches. In addition, she maintains that the fact that quality in translation has many aspects is sometimes ignored.

Based on the above arguments, TQA appears to suffer most from subjectivity, imprecision, and from restricted focus and applicability.

### **3.3 SUBJECTIVITY OF TRANSLATION QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

The discussion about translation quality assessment seems understandably to evolve around translator training and certification, where the subjectivity of evaluation is an obvious problem. Subjectivity is involved in every TQA method discussed above in how concepts are defined and measured, aspects of texts chosen for evaluation, and also in what kinds of weights are assigned to each aspect under evaluation and to the different conditions (translator's level of expertise, time available, fees, technical aids used, etc.) potentially affecting translation quality. The question is then how to minimise subjectivity and how to deal with its effects when it can lead to people being treated unfairly.

Attempts to minimise subjectivity can lead to increased complexity of evaluation methods, like in House's model, requiring a high level of linguistic expertise and a considerable amount of time. Consequently, such methods in practice assign the task of TQA to those who have the necessary language skills, knowledge of the relevant cultures, an understanding of the effect of cultural differences on translation, familiarity with the intended readers and their likely responses, access to the source texts, etc. These are big requirements which seem to radically limit the number of people considered competent enough to engage in TQA.

Hönig (1998: 16–17) puts it very clearly: “in order to objectively and professionally assess the quality of translations one needs to have acquired a certain amount of expertise and knowledge [...]”.

Another way to approach the problem is to accept that quality assessment is subjective and to leave it to the reader or to the client. It seems unlikely that clients would see their own subjectivity as a problem in TQA. Instead of worrying about not being objective, many clients' problem would rather seem to be an inability to evaluate translations at all due to lack of language skills. On the one hand this makes statements like *Quality depends on individual perception* or *Quality is whatever the client is satisfied with* seem problematic. The latter statement is also at odds with the idea that quality has three dimensions: the quality experienced by the client, the service provider as a professional and the service provider as a business (see above section 2.2). On the other hand, inability to evaluate translations does not mean the client cannot have expectations concerning translations which the translator should find out and take into account to ensure customer quality.

Lauscher (2000: 162–163) fully acknowledges the subjectivity of TQA. She describes translation evaluation as a process in which the evaluator compares the translation or rather, his/her interpretation of it, with an ‘ideal’ target text that s/he has in his/her mind for the source text. Evaluation is influenced by the context in which it takes place and by its purpose (e.g. translation teaching). Lauscher (ibid.) argues that translation quality is a matter of agreement. She is in favour of prescriptive assessment of translations because this would benefit translation in general by making it more visible and therefore more respected. She calls for a model of prescriptive evaluation which would be based on a better understanding of, and agreement on, what is subjective in TQA, and one which would take into account the circumstances in which the translation was produced. Furthermore, for evaluation to be prescriptive the parties must, according to Lauscher, either agree with each other or one of them must be influential enough for others to consent to his/her evaluation.

### **3.4 TRANSLATION QUALITY AND NORMS**

The evaluation process outlined by Lauscher fits in with what was said in the previous chapter about the quality of services, how quality is perceived by the client and compared with his/her expectations (Lauscher's ‘ideal’ target text) regarding the service. It is similar to the idea of looking at the quality of a translation as the degree to which it abides to the translation norms prevalent in the community in which translation takes place.

In the present study, quality will be discussed in terms of translation norms, i.e. shared ideas of what translators must, may not or can do. As will be described in more detail in the next chapter, by expressing the nature of the expected behaviour, norms regulate behaviour and serve as yardsticks for its



evaluation. Norms both constrain and ease behaviour by limiting the set of alternative courses of action. According to Hermans (1996: 2), norms “mediate between the individual and the collective sphere, between an individual’s intentions, choices and actions, and collectively held beliefs, values and preferences”. Norms are thus shared notions of how members of a community should act, but they are open to subjective evaluations and decisions. Situations vary and people differ in how aware they are of the different norms, how many possible courses of action they can think of before deciding on one of them, how sensitive they are to the possibility of sanctions in case they break norms, and they have different values. Ultimately, a person can decide to comply with norms or break them.

From the point of view of an evaluator, the quality of a translation is seen as the degree to which the evaluator thinks the translation meets his/her expectations and requirements regarding it. An evaluator may reward a translator’s norm-complying and expectation-fulfilling behaviour or punish him/her for breaking norms and dissatisfying expectations. S/he may also approve of a breach of norms and thus facilitate a change of norms. In turn, this translation forms a part of the evaluator’s experience of translation as well as the experience of anyone who reads it and is likely to affect their future expectations and also the translator’s beliefs of what is expected of him/her. This might be a way quality is “agreed” (Lauscher 2000: 163), i.e. through “offers” (translations) that are accepted or rejected.

In the following chapter, I discuss in more detail the relation between quality and norms, looking in particular at the functioning of social norms and, because translations are means of communication, also the norms of language and communication.

## 4 NORMS

Different areas of life are governed by unwritten rules of behaviour, or norms, with different, sometimes conflicting contents. A non-literary translator can be an entrepreneur or an employee and s/he is therefore governed by norms that cover the behaviour of people as service providers or employees. He or she is also governed by specifically translational norms and, in addition, by norms that concern communication in general. In order to understand clients' position in all this I will, in the following, take a closer look at the norm concept and describe what norms are, how they work and what kind of norm-related roles people can have. I start from social norms whose definition by Bicchieri (2006) seems to offer a useful starting point and tool for analysis of other related concepts such as conventions. I also review some literature on the norms of communication, because within communities of readers and clients there are likely to exist expectations regarding translations as linguistic products to be used for specific communicative purposes.

Although I discuss 'social norms', 'communication norms' and 'translation norms' in this study, they all share the basic components of the norm concept, but cover different areas of life and therefore differ in some aspects, like the nature of sanctions attached to them.

### 4.1 SOCIAL NORMS

Bicchieri (2006) suggests a clear definition of a social norm based on conditional preferences which may be used to distinguish between social norms, descriptive norms, conventions and habits. *Social norms*, according to Bicchieri (2006: 3), play a role in situations in which there is a conflict of interest but also a possibility to gain something by joint decisions. It is noteworthy that Bicchieri does not regard the expectation of a sanction as necessary for a social norm to exist. A social norm exists when:

1. A person knows that a certain behavioural rule exists and applies to the situation.
2. S/he prefers to conform to the rule in situations of that type on the condition that:
  - 2 (a) S/he has empirical expectations, i.e., having repeatedly observed conforming behaviour or its consequences, s/he believes that a sufficiently large subset (which may be small but influential) of the population which s/he belongs to conforms to the rule in situations of that type,

*and either*

2 (b) S/he has normative expectations, i.e. s/he believes that a sufficiently large subset of the population expects him/her to conform to the rule in situations of that type

or

2 (b') S/he has normative expectations and s/he expects sanctions, i.e. s/he believes that a sufficiently large subset of the population expects him/her to conform, prefers him/her to conform and may sanction behaviour that does not conform (Bicchieri 2006: 11, 13).

Social norms motivate behaviour only indirectly, the real motives being the expectations and preferences behind the norms. A person may, however, be so convinced of the norm's justification and inherent value that other people's expectations are irrelevant to his/her decision to comply with the norm. Bicchieri (2006: 20–22) calls such norms *personal norms*.

In fear of other people's disapproval a person who complies with a social norm may often have to act against his/her own interest (especially if interest is understood as material gain) (Bicchieri 2006: 2–3). Conforming to a *descriptive norm*, however, is, according to Bicchieri (2006: 29–34), never against the person's own interest. Descriptive norms differ from social norms in that there is no social pressure to conform to a descriptive norm. A person may simply imitate others' behaviour because s/he is uncertain about what one is supposed to do in the situation or finds it difficult to assess the consequences of alternative courses of action. In such situations imitation seems like a safe option. Only clauses 1, 2 and 2 (a) of the above definition of a social norm apply to descriptive norms. Fashions and fads are examples of descriptive norms<sup>2</sup>.

A descriptive norm may become a *convention* (Bicchieri 2006: 34). A convention exists if enough people regularly perform the act in question, prefer the outcome of all choosing to perform the same act, feel that they are expected to perform the act, could not do better by choosing to perform another act, but are not punished if they do. In other words, conventions coordinate expectations but bring the benefits of coordination<sup>3</sup> only to those who comply. Whereas complying with a descriptive norm is basically imitation motivated simply by a person's unilateral desire to do as the others do, expectations are mutual when it comes to conventions. These expectations are, however, not a sufficient reason to follow a convention. One must want to coordinate in order to avoid the cost of not following a convention, which equals to the consequences of non-coordination but does not involve sanctions or feelings of guilt as breaking a social norm does. A convention exists as long as it is followed whereas a norm may exist even if it is not followed (e.g., there is a norm that prohibits lying, but people still lie). Unlike social norms, conventions do not go against a person's self

---

<sup>2</sup> Bicchieri (2006: 2–3) argues that descriptive norms are solutions to coordination games. Social norms, however, do not solve coordination problems but transform mixed-motive games into coordination games.

<sup>3</sup> In game theory, coordination games are defined as "complete agreement among the players about the order of preference of the possible outcomes" (Colman 1982: 31–32).

interest. On the contrary, it is in a person's interests to follow the convention because coordinating with others is beneficial (Bicchieri 2006: 34–35, 38).

*Habits* are not norms because they are not in any way dependent on other people's behaviour or expectations, nor are there any sanctions to be expected for breaking a habit (Bicchieri 2006: 20).

Bicchieri (2006: 38–39) points out that in real life the lines between social norms, descriptive norms and conventions are fuzzy. A convention may become a social norm, and what is a descriptive norm for one may be a social norm for another. In addition, since norm breaking is possible and happens in real life, a person may find himself/herself in a situation in which the descriptive norm (what people commonly do and think they should do) implies behaviour which is different from the applicable social norm (what is approved or disapproved of) (Bicchieri 2006: 64). For instance, there was an article by Pääkkönen (2004) in the leading Finnish newspaper about a reader who had found a large number of errors in a translation of a novel. Most of the errors were punctuation errors. The translator explained that she had seen many different fashions and tendencies during her long career as a translator: "Sometimes commas have been favoured more, sometimes less." (*ibid.*, my translation from Finnish). This might be an instance of the translator following a descriptive norm. The reader, however, regarded correct punctuation (i.e. one that is in accordance with official guidelines) as a valid norm which, if not followed, the translator and the publisher must be reminded of and possibly punished for in the form of public criticism.

Some of the terms Bicchieri uses such as personal norm and descriptive norm may raise questions as to their applicability to norm theory. For instance, if norms refer to a community's common behavioural rules, how can there be personal norms that are not dependent on other people's opinions and actions? Bicchieri approaches norms, as her definition of a social norm indicates, from an individual person's viewpoint. A person may feel social pressure where there actually might be none or s/he may not care whether or not there is any, because his/her personal convictions are so strong that they play the role of normative expectations for him/her (personal norm). Bicchieri's approach serves as a reminder that common behaviour consists of the actions and attitudes of individual persons and that there can be different assumptions and motives behind uniform behaviour.

## 4.2 NORMS OF COMMUNICATION

In this section, the norms of linguistic communication are discussed. The result of a translation process is a product of linguistic communication, often to be used on its own without any reference to the fact that it has been derived from a text written in a different language. A client can be the end-user of a translation or the party who sends it further to the actual end-users. As a receiver or a

sender of a message s/he is subject to the norms that cover communication and, in addition, as an evaluator of translation s/he may have yet other norm-related roles. Norms of communication may be applied, e.g., in evaluating the language and the functional and textual adequacy of a translation (see Colina 2009 and section 3.1 above).

In her book *Norms of Language*, Bartsch (1987) concentrates on linguistic norms as correctness notions which regulate verbal communication in more or less the whole community and which are learned in socialisation. According to Bartsch (1987: 166), norms imply an expectation of a regularity of behaviour. The expected regularity is expressed in the *norm content*. Norms provide regular ways of perceiving and acting in socially relevant situations, and common solutions to coordination problems. Norms also offer a point of orientation: a person justifiably believes s/he knows what to expect from others and what others expect from him/her. In addition to norm content, a norm has a *character*, i.e. it is either an obligatory or an optional norm (Bartsch 1987: 173–176).

An important feature of norms is *normative force*, which may take the form of corrections, criticism, neglect, ridicule, exclusion from interaction, loss of education and job opportunities (Bartsch 1987: 176) when the norms are broken. Positive sanctions, or rewards, for complying with a norm would be the opposite, for example, praise, increased educational and job opportunities, perhaps also absence of criticism and other unpleasant consequences of breaking norms.

In Bartsch's view, norms are "accepted by the whole community and are internalized by at least the relevant part of a community" (Bartsch 1987: 169). In this respect, her position is somewhat different from that of Bicchieri (2006), whose definition of a social norm only refers to the expectations of a sufficiently large subset of the population.

Internalisation implies compliance without the feeling of external pressure and identification with the norm (Bartsch 1987: 170). According to Bicchieri (2006: 194), "[a]n internalized norm is a norm that one is prepared to defend and rationalize as having positive value".

Like Bicchieri (2006), Bartsch considers normative force an important distinctive feature between norms and some other related concepts. Usage and custom do not have normative force. Bartsch (1987: 167, 174) defines a convention as a solution to a recurring coordination problem which has to be followed to stay alive, but which can easily be replaced by another convention. A convention may become a norm. Prescription, regulations and orders have normative force, but are usually given to those who are supposed to follow them (i.e. the subjects) by authorities, and followed only because compliance is monitored and non-compliance punished. Also a prescription can turn into a norm.

There are different kinds of rules which regulate interaction between people but only the rules that govern informal interaction, i.e. social rules, are norms. Another set of rules are technical rules, some of which, as long as they relate to a task that concerns the whole community and are accepted and internalised as

guidelines by its members, can be called technical norms (Bartsch 1987: 168–169). Bartsch holds that communication is governed by two kinds of norms whose ultimate goal is to reach understanding:

1. Norms of communicative products are technical product norms which guarantee that the communicational means used can be recognised. They regulate the appearance of the means that people use to communicate. For written communication they cover the social reality of graphemic, morphemic, and syntactic correctness notions.
2. Norms of use of communicative means guarantee the interpretability of communicative means by regulating the way acts are performed and aims pursued by using the semantic (linguistic means used to represent real and possible states of affairs), pragmatic (linguistic means used to perform actions), and stylistic (pragmatic means regulating the constitution of texts and use of different registers) resources available (Bartsch 1987: 171).

Bartsch (1987: 212) argues that by conforming to these norms of communication the speaker and the hearer comply with *the highest norm of communication*, which requires the speaker to express himself/herself so that the hearer can understand his/her intention, and the hearer to try to understand the speaker's intention. The highest norm of communication is a *principle*. A principle is defined by Bartsch (1987: 193) as an unchanging, necessary norm that has no alternatives<sup>4</sup>.

The highest norm of communication is, in turn, based on *the principle of rationality* according to which one must aim at a communicative goal in a manner that is proportionate to and purposeful in view of that goal (ibid.).

Another principle of language is *the minimal principle of correctness*: if one wants to communicate, one has to conform to the norms of communication (Bartsch 1987: 60). This is, as defined by Bartsch (1987: 61), a 'prudential norm', meaning that it is not wise to stretch the limits of *the principle of charity* (the assumption by the hearer that the speaker acts rationally [Bartsch 1987: 52]).

Although the norms of communication are defined by Bartsch as technical norms, she points out that "[a]lso social and ethical norms play a role in communication because it is always embedded in social interaction" (Bartsch 1987: 170). *The norm of honesty* is an ethical norm. It requires that if one wants to break the norms of communication, one must be certain that the breach will be recognised by the hearer (Bartsch 1987: 61).

The author of the original text is responsible for complying with these norms when s/he writes the ST and the translator is in turn responsible for making sure that the TT complies with them. How exactly one is to reach compliance with, for instance, the principle of rationality differs from culture to culture, which is where we cross over to the translational norms.

---

<sup>4</sup> Bartsch's definition of *principle* is narrower and more precise than the every-day sense in which it appears to be used by Koller (1995: 196–197 and 6.1.2 below).

### 4.3 ATTITUDES TOWARD NORMS

Norms, according to Bartsch (1987: 177–178), exist in a population in five different ways which, essentially, describe the various kinds of relationships and attitudes that members of a community can have toward norms:

- A norm exists in a population as a norm if it regulates behaviour. If the population complies with the norm only under pressure, it is not a real norm but a prescription. A norm must be internalised, i.e. a person must identify with it and conform to it out of internal motives. A norm can exist naturally as a result of primary socialisation, or it can be adopted later in life.
- A norm is accepted as a norm if correction or criticism of non-conforming behaviour is welcome or at least accepted by the population. Members of the population want to comply with an accepted norm.
- A norm is adopted as a norm if it is both accepted and exists as a practice.
- A norm is valid, if it is an acceptable reason for behaviour in accordance with the norm content, and a basis for criticism of non-conforming behaviour. Norm authorities and norm enforcers support and strengthen it.
- A norm is justified in relation to a higher norm or value if its compliance with it is rational (purposeful and proportionate) with regard to the higher norm or value. Justification may be partial in case of conflicting norms.

A *domain* refers to the group of people within a community for whom the norm exists (the existence domain), is accepted (the acceptance domain), adopted (the adoption domain), valid (the validity domain) or justified (the justification domain). Norm conflicts arise if these domains do not include the same group of people. In such cases a norm may, according to Bartsch's theory, exist but not be accepted, valid or justified; be valid but not accepted, adopted or justified; be accepted but not justified or adopted; or be adopted but not justified; and the other way around for each case (Bartsch 1987: 302). For instance, a norm content may exist but not be valid which would appear to correspond roughly to Bicchieri's concept of descriptive norm, i.e. to be a case of imitation. Bicchieri's personal norm might be understood as a norm which a person has adopted and regards justified but which is not valid to all or even a sufficient number of community members. An example of a norm which is justified and valid but not adopted might be a level of performance that competent professionals can achieve and novices would like to but are not yet quite able to.

Acceptance is essential for the survival of norms. Bartsch points out that "[o]nly if the population accepts the prescription as something which guides its behaviour, even where there is no threat of sanctions, will it become a norm" (Bartsch 1987: 135) and also that "[w]ithout acceptance and adoption the result of a valid act of norm issuing is not more than a valid prescription" (Bartsch 1987: 134).

Justification is an important dimension of existence when it comes to norm conflicts. A norm conflict or a dilemma involves comparison and choice between different norms and actions which they require (see Savory's [1968: 50] well-known list for an example of conflicting norms). A norm conflict may arise, as described above, because (a) members of a community have differing attitudes (belong to different domains of the dimensions of existence) toward a norm; or (b) when there are two or more norms which apply to a situation but cannot be complied with at the same time or one right after the other (Bartsch 1987: 294–295, 301), possibly because two or more independent norm authorities have issued conflicting norms (Bartsch 1987: 135). Norm conflict may also occur (c) when people have different opinions as to which norm among several possibilities is the one valid in the given situation, or (d) when people agree on the applicability of a norm but disagree on which form of action serves the norm best (Bicchieri 2006: 76). In some cases, competition or overlap of norms may describe the situation better.

A norm conflict may in some cases be solved by comparing the higher norms and values that the conflicting norms are meant to serve, in other words, by looking for guidance from the hierarchy of norms and values. In any case, a person facing a norm conflict appears to be in a situation that in game theory would be called a mixed-motive game (see also Bicchieri 2006: 3 and above) in which the parties partly cooperate and partly compete with each other and everyone has to weigh the different outcomes that abiding by one norm and breaking another will have on them personally and on other people (Colman 1982: 93). A translator might have to decide whether to, say, make a source-oriented translation with cultural references explained in detail which, s/he believes, would be the best way to express the author's intention and contribute to understanding between the two cultures involved, or to consent to the client's demand and make an easy-to-read, target-oriented translation to promote cross-cultural understanding by offering an effortless reading experience and thereby a smooth intake of information and a wider readership. After all, is not any service provider supposed to please the client to ensure future business? This example shows how one jointly accepted higher norm (or value or purpose) could be served in two conflicting ways (point d above). A norm from an "adjacent field" (Simeoni 1998: 24), such as business (which often is not actually "adjacent" because many non-literary translators are entrepreneurs and directly involved in business), complicates the matter further by representing a requirement which appears to be widely applicable, and high in the hierarchy of norms (in this particular case, an instance of point b above).

In addition to being resolved via reference to the hierarchy of norms and values which the norms support, a norm conflict may be resolved by a party higher up in the social hierarchy, such as a norm authority. A norm authority is a norm-related role that allows a person to set norms and decide which norms apply in a given situation. Norm-related roles are discussed next.



## 4.4 NORM-RELATED ROLES

Hermans (1996: 10) argues that norms are connected to the power structures and relations of a community and that the hierarchy of these relations explains the hierarchy of norms and differences in their binding force. The dominant groups of the community determine proper and correct behaviour by, for instance, recognising certain products as embodying their norms and values. Bartsch (1987: 4, 70) explains that the social reality of linguistic correctness notions, in other words, norms, is created in a community by its members, who determine "what the models or standards which have to be followed are, who has to follow which models, who provides models, and who enforces, if necessary, adherence to the models". She lists the different, possibly overlapping roles people play in "establishing the social reality of norms": *norm authorities* (those who exert normative force, have the authority to issue a norm [p. 133], or decide which norms are valid [p. 315]), *norm subjects* (those who are supposed to follow the norm), *norm promulgators* (those who introduce norms as valid for the population), *norm promoters*, *norm enforcers* (for instance, teachers, or anyone who corrects and criticises others' behaviour), *norm beneficiaries* (everyone is supposed to be one) and *norm victims* (those who suffer because they are unable to comply with a norm (Bartsch 1987: 176)).

Clients' norm-related roles are discussed in section 5.5.

## 4.5 HOW NORMS WORK

Bicchieri's (2006) description of norm-following diversifies the usually sanction-centred view of people's motivation to comply (or not). Bicchieri (2006: 231, 234) believes that norms have originally come to exist in repeated situations involving social dilemmas when it has been necessary for the survival of the community to defend the common good even at a cost to individual interests. She notes (Bicchieri 2006: 216) that people have a natural tendency to look for an existing behavioural regularity before acting and to conform to the actions and opinions of others in ambiguous or uncertain situations (i.e. to display herd behaviour), and that they are sensitive to other people's expectations, as expressed in her definition of a social norm.

According to Bicchieri (2006: 23, 43), possible motives to comply with a norm include a wish to gain a reward as a result of pleasing other people by acting in accordance with their expectations, desire to avoid a negative sanction for non-compliance, regarding other people's expectations as reasonable and, to use Bartsch's (1987) terms, considering the norm justified because it is seen to serve a good purpose. The possibility of being rewarded for norm-compliance or punished for non-compliance is dependent on there being a party which monitors conformity to norms. One may conclude that norm subjects' knowledge of the

(non-)existence of such a party would be likely to influence the effect that normative expectations with sanctions (Bicchieri 2006: 11) have on their behaviour.

This picture is made more complex by the situation in which action takes place. Norms are, in Bicchieri's (2006: 93–94) account, embedded in scripts, which are schemata for events. A script is activated by individually perceived situational cues. Referring to works by several researchers, Bicchieri (2006: 85–86) explains that when a person enters a situation, s/he will first pay attention to the features or cues of the situation, judging their relevance on the basis of his/her background knowledge, the decision context, and his/her goal regarding the situation. Such cues may include "a direct statement or reminder of the norm, observing others' behavior, similarity of the present situation to others in which the norm was used, as well as how often or how recently one has used the norm" (Bicchieri 2006: 112 footnote). There are also other, more constant factors which guide a person's attention, such as personally relevant information and things that s/he thinks about frequently such as values and attitudes. The person will then compare what s/he has paid attention to with his/her experience of similar cues and interpret the situation as belonging to a certain category of situations (Bicchieri 2006: 98). After the category has been identified, a script is activated.

In addition to being dependent on individual perception, scripts are culture-specific. A script describes what usually happens in a situation of a given type, defines the actors involved and their roles. The beliefs, preferences and norms which are relevant for the script are activated (Bicchieri 2006: 57, 94). To be followed, a norm has to be focused upon. This means that there must be a sufficient number of clear enough situational cues to make a person aware of the relevant norm (Bicchieri 2006: 46). Information that the client gives to the translator about the intended use and target audience of the translation would be such cues.

According to Bicchieri (2006: 45, 77), also deciding what the norm requires one to do is context-dependent (i.e. subject to a person's interpretation of the cues detected in each particular situation [pp. 56–57]). Therefore the same norm may lead people to behave differently in different situations. Moreover, in ambiguous situations, or with cues pointing to several, possibly conflicting norms, a person may not be able to form the beliefs and expectations that apply to the situation (Bicchieri 2006: 79). (See also the discussion of norm conflicts in 4.3 above.) Nevertheless, Bicchieri (2006: 68–69, 80) maintains that social norms are more often followed automatically than complied with as a result of conscious deliberation, and that those who think that obeying a norm is always an intentional choice overestimate dispositional factors, such as abilities and preferences, and underestimate the effect of the situation on behaviour. She writes (Bicchieri 2006: 97–98) that "[n]orm following is similar [...] to bicycling, or the ability to recognize a piece of music: Once a schema is activated, we tend to follow the norm by default, without being able to tell what prompted it or which features of the situations acquired particular relevance" – but even in

those cases “the beliefs that guide our actions may become apparent when they are called into question or when we are asked to justify our choices”. They may also become apparent when the norm has been violated (Bicchieri 2006: 48; see also Toury 1999: 21). This seems to be connected to implicit and explicit expectations (see section 2.2 above) as well: not meeting implicit expectations will make them explicit.

Bicchieri’s thinking appears to fit in with the way Jänis (2009: 30) describes her own experience as a translator. She writes about the traditionally quite literal translations of Russian texts into Finnish and remarks that it is difficult to explain why such a tradition had evolved and to pinpoint the areas of language use it covered. She also mentions that when she began her career as a translator about 40 years ago she had “internalised the norm according to which the specific features of Russian discourse must be conveyed as precisely as possible in Finnish” (ibid., my translation from Finnish), finding her own translations from back then as typical representatives of Russian-to-Finnish translations of that time but not in compliance with present-day norms.

Additionally, people differ as to how much the perceived social norm influences their behaviour, i.e. how willing they are to enforce conformity to the norm, by their willingness to conform to the norm measured as the amount of remorse they will feel if they break what they believe to be the norm, and, in accordance with condition 2(a) in Bicchieri’s definition of a social norm, by what they consider to be a sufficiently large subset of the population to convince them to follow a norm (Bicchieri 2006: 222–223).

## 4.6 CHANGES OF NORMS

The norm concept has sometimes been said to be too static and to emphasise constraints on behaviour and translators as norm subjects only. Change and non-compliance are, however, basic features of the concept. A decision to act is preceded by an interpretation of the situation and an evaluation of the expectations of the people considered influential enough, who may observe the act or its consequences. People are bound to interpret these matters differently, to have different sets of skills and resources for meeting these expectations and to be influenced by their own previous experiences when they come across a similar situation next time.

Norms may change or disappear, for instance, when the circumstances (other goals, values and norms) change so that a norm no longer serves the purpose for which it emerged in the first place, in other words, if a norm ceases to be justified, or if the purpose or goal itself loses its appeal (Bartsch 1987: 198–202). In such a case, norm breaking is no longer criticised and norm breakers stop feeling guilty for non-compliance. Along the same lines, a norm content which is not valid but is nevertheless justified suggests that if it were to acquire normative force it could easily be accepted and become a new valid norm. Someone

who performs the regularity expressed in a norm content which is accepted but not valid could, if s/he is influential enough, turn out to be a trendsetter whose behaviour is first imitated (as a descriptive norm) and later becomes a valid social norm. It seems that 'influence' does not have to be defined in terms of 'power' or 'authority' (as in some sort of control over other people). It could also be based on admiration, respect, or on convincing argumentation.

Bicchieri offers an explanation for why unpopular norms may exist, and also a suggestion as to how norms could be changed, in terms of the notion of pluralistic ignorance. Pluralistic ignorance is a term used in social psychology to describe a situation in which people privately disapprove of a norm but think that everybody else accepts it – and everybody else thinks the same way. The result is that even though no one or almost no one likes the norm everyone still complies with it. Pluralistic ignorance occurs when there is no open communication between members of the community and therefore no way of knowing others' real attitudes and motives. The only way to draw inferences of people's beliefs and expectations is look at their observable behaviour (Bicchieri 2006: 186–187). To use Bartsch's terms, pluralistic ignorance appears to be a case of a norm being valid but not justified or accepted in people's minds. In accordance with her definition of norms, Bicchieri (2006: 196, 206) suggests that unpopular norms could be made inactive by changing people's beliefs and expectations and that this could happen by a sufficiently authoritative party providing information about the real attitudes in the community, or as a result of observable non-compliance by influential members of the community.

## 5 NORMS IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

In this chapter, I first go over the norms of translation focusing on Toury's (1995) classification of them into the preliminary norms, the initial norms, and the operational norms. I then continue with Chesterman's (2000) product norms, or the expectancy norms, of translation and with the three general professional norms of translation – the accountancy norm, the communication norm and the relation norm – in chapter 6. Toury's and Chesterman's norms are partly overlapping but they also complement each other and together provide a comprehensive framework for this study. For instance, Toury's preliminary norms can be understood to concern access to the translation profession, which is not covered explicitly by Chesterman's norms and in which clients may play a role. Chesterman's norms, on the other hand, direct perhaps more detailed attention to the act of translating and its different aspects through the professional norms. Especially the accountability norm and the communication norm seem to give an opportunity for analysing translator-related issues and therefore also questions that have to do with the interaction between translators and clients. In addition, they are linked to values which justify them. That is why Chesterman's norms get most of my attention.

### 5.1 THE PRELIMINARY, THE INITIAL AND THE OPERATIONAL NORMS OF TRANSLATION

In *Descriptive Translation Studies*, as represented by Toury (1995), translations are seen to bring into the receiving target culture (or section of the target culture) something that is missing from and needed in it. The approach is thus target-oriented, meaning that research begins from a text which is accepted as a translation in the target culture, or designed to fulfil its assumed needs, and proceeds to study the circumstances of its coming into being (Toury 1995: 36, 166). The target culture determines the process by which the translator produces the translation (the process), the characteristics of the translation (the product), and its position within it (the function) (Toury 1995: 11–12; 26–29). More specifically, the activity of translation aims at a product of translation that will occupy a certain position in the target culture. To reach this objective translators seek to meet the expectations of the target culture regarding the textual-linguistic features of the translation by using corresponding translational strategies. The position which the translation actually gets in the target culture is, in turn, affected by how the translation turns out (Toury 1995: 13–14).

Translators must be able to “play a social role”, which includes complying with the norms that govern their behaviour and the products of their work in a given community at a given time (Toury 1995: 53). Norms are, according to

Toury (1995: 54–55), socio-cultural constraints, performance instructions, which motivate translators to choose non-randomly between alternative kinds of behaviour. Norms reflect each particular culture's general values and tell the members of the community what one has to do or must not do, does not have to do or may do in a particular situation. Norms are learned in socialisation. They are more binding than idiosyncrasies but not as strong as rules: one has to obey a rule but one may choose not to comply with a norm.

According to Toury, "strictly translational norms can only be applied at the *receiving end*" (1995: 53, original emphasis). Because non-literary translations are often translated into the target language in the source culture, they are also initially accepted as translations and evaluated in the source culture where their source text is available, even though their aim is to be accepted as translations and to achieve a certain function in the target culture. However, it would be difficult to imagine these translators not being subject to the norms of the source culture where they have been educated and where they must be accepted as translators and the products of their work as translations.

Norms change over time, and because letting go of the old and learning to do things in new ways is not always easy, norms which the majority of the society complies with may coexist with norms that used to be mainstream but are now fading away, and with new norms that have been adopted by trendsetters (Toury 1995: 62–63).

Unlike Bicchieri (2006: 11), Toury (1995: 55) observes that norms always come with actual or potential sanctions. Norms serve as criteria for evaluating behaviour. They are specific to the type of situation, and may be revealed in situations in which people may select between different kinds of behaviour and in which they repeatedly choose to behave in a certain way (Toury, *ibid.*).

Although his main focus appears to be on literary translation, all kinds of translation are, according to Toury (1995: 57–58), governed by norms, although under varying conditions. In addition, norms appear to operate not only in the actual act of translation, but throughout the journey that a text makes from being selected as a source text to being received by target-culture readers. i.e. in the translation event (Toury 1995: 249). The *initial norm* refers to the basic choice which the translator makes between subjecting himself/herself to the requirements of the norms of the source text (and thereby to the norms of the source culture and language), or to the norms of the section of the target culture in which the translation is intended to secure a given position. This choice may show as a tendency on the macro level of the text, or as regularities in micro-level decisions (Toury 1995: 56–57).

Translational norms are divided into preliminary norms and operational norms (Toury 1995: 58–59). *Preliminary norms* are involved in forming the translation policy which covers the non-random choice of texts and text types to be imported as translations into the receiving culture. Translation policies may differ depending on text type and the (groups of) people who make the decisions. Another set of preliminary norms concerns the directness of translation,

i.e. questions like whether or not and under which circumstances mediated translation is permitted.

In many cases the preliminary norms of non-literary translation seem to be determined in the source culture. In international trade texts are likely to be chosen for translation on the basis of communicative or commercial considerations to support the export or import of, not the translated text as in literary translation, but some other product or service. Furthermore, non-literary translations produced in international trade are frequently translated in the source culture and only then sent to the receivers in the target culture. In other words, they are exported from the source culture rather than imported into the target culture. Whether or not they are supposed to fill any gaps in the target culture would then depend not only on target-side factors but also on factors originating in the source culture. One way in which non-literary translations, imported or exported, might be seen to fill a gap in the target culture is in the sense that if members of a target culture read, for instance, promotional texts originating from another culture and translated into their own language, they might feel that their culture lacks the product or service described in the translations. Such translations could lead to exporting the terminology regarding a certain technology or product groups into the target culture (see Toury's [1995: 206ff.] account of translation-specific lexical items). Another way could be importing a new form of communication, such as TV commercials, into a culture where they did not exist before, or affecting the way the new function of an existing form of communication is pursued (see Jettmarová [1998], who analyses the factors affecting the strategies used in the translation of advertisements in the Czech Republic in the beginning of the 1990's, when advertisements acquired a function which was different compared to the previous era).

Another way in which translations fill a gap is when texts are translated for non-source-language speakers living in the source culture or visiting it. A large number of texts are translated for tourists and people working or studying in foreign countries. In Finland, as in many other countries, the target language of such texts is often English which is used as a lingua franca. To define the target culture in such cases is an interesting question.

Preliminary norms can be taken to govern all kinds of decisions regarding translation excluding the decisions which translators make in the actual act of translation. They not only govern what gets translated but, as a result, who is offered the possibility to understand what it says in the source text. Along these lines, in the export of non-literary translations, the preliminary norms might be extended to include translation policy regarding the target languages chosen for translations and offered to the target culture. This choice determines the potential readership of the translation. For instance, a company may decide to translate texts into a lingua franca such as English, into a selection of major world languages or into the customer's language, whatever that may be. Factors such as the relative power and prestige of the exporting source culture and the importing target culture would be likely to influence such choices. Furthermore,

translation policy could include decisions as to who gets to translate the source texts, i.e. what qualifications one must have to be allowed to work as a translator. This would be an instance where the preliminary norms, the operational norms (see below) and the initial norm intersect (Toury 1995:59–60). For instance, Inghilleri (2003: 254) suggests with regard to interpreted asylum interviews that “the operational norms or performance instructions will be evident in the professional differentiation of status of interpreters in the marketplace”. The status of the translation profession, conditions of work, fees, etc. are related to this aspect of the preliminary norms.

If preliminary norms are, basically, gatekeepers’ norms about what is translated, from and into which languages, and by whom, the *operational norms* (together with the initial norm) are about how they are to be translated. The first set of operational norms, the *matricial norms*, governs “omissions, additions, changes of location and manipulations of segmentation” (Toury 1995: 59). The second set consists of textual-linguistic norms which “govern the selection of material to [...] replace the original textual and linguistic material with” (ibid.). They may be general for all translation, or specific to text-type or mode of translation. They are not necessarily the same as the norms which are involved in writing original target-language texts.

Norms can, according to Toury (1995: 67–69) be further divided into three main groups depending on their intensity, i.e. how strongly approved or disapproved the behaviour expressed in the norm is: (a) basic norms are “more or less mandatory for *all* instances of a certain behaviour” (Toury 1995: 67, original emphasis); (b) secondary norms or tendencies indicate recommended rather than obligatory action and cover a wider range of behaviour; and (c) tolerated or permitted behaviour is just barely approved of. Toury does not comment on the range of behaviour this group might cover, but it seems that behaviour that is just barely approved of is closer to basic norms in intensity than to secondary norms. Compared with Bicchieri’s (2006; see also 4.1 above) definition of norms, basic norms would appear to be equal to a situation in which a translator has normative expectations and expects sanctions. Secondary norms might be comparable to having normative expectation without expecting sanctions for non-compliance.

Indifference toward a type of behaviour is also possible. Different groups within a community may have the same norm but vary with regard to its intensity. Norm-followers differ, additionally, in the degree of conformity that they show with regard to a norm (Toury 1995: 69). For instance, some member of a community may conform to the norm almost always while another member may comply with it only occasionally.

“Permitted” and “tolerated” behaviours deserve more attention than they have received so far. If for a norm to exist there must be corresponding beliefs, expectations and possibly sanctions, one may ask whether permission to do something (which is also permission not to do something because otherwise it would be an obligation to do it) is a norm at all. Also, what use as a criterion for



evaluating behaviour (which norms are supposed to be) could something be that one may do, or equally well leave undone? Investigating the permitted seems meaningful if the aim is to see how it changes in time and varies from one (section of a) culture to another, but this could more easily be done by studying what is not permitted. Von Wright's (1963) analysis appears to be useful in considering this in more detail. According to him (von Wright 1963: 6–9, 71), norms are issued and promulgated by a norm-authority to norm-subjects and made effective by attaching sanctions to them. He divides norms into *obligation norms* (what one ought to do or must not do) and *permissive norms* (what one may do). Permission may be understood in two ways from the viewpoint of the norm authority. An act may be permitted in a weak sense if it is not forbidden, and in a strong sense "if the authority has considered its normative status and decided to permit it" (von Wright 1963: 86) or if it is a logical consequence of other norms issued by the authority, in which case the authority may not be aware of permitting it. Von Wright (*ibid.*) does not regard weak permissions as normative at all. A strong permission may only amount to the norm authority declaring that s/he will tolerate the act in question should the norm subjects decide to do it. A stronger permission would be, for instance, a prohibition against preventing the norm subjects from performing an act (von Wright 1963: 88–89).

According to Chesterman (1993: 14), "normative laws have prescriptive force for members of a given translating community", being prescriptive from the point of view of an individual's development into a professional, with normative laws describing "observed regularity in the behaviour of competent professionals who are accepted as embodying translation norms" (*ibid.*). In other words, a young translator may see other translators' work as prescriptive. Similarly, when a client accepts and uses a translation, s/he may be regarded as at least having tolerated it. That is the way a translator might see it even if there was no actual declaration of toleration. From the translator's viewpoint previous translations accepted by the same client and translations in general (the translation tradition) are norm-setting in the sense that they can be taken to give a strong permission to imitate them and to use them as models. However, it may very well be that the client has not considered at all the translation's status in this respect and may be unaware of having set any norms or models for translators to follow. This seems possible as to the initial and the operational norms. As to preliminary norms in literary translation, the norm authorities may be expected to be more aware of the implications of their choices for the question of what may be translated. In any case, translations, it seems, can be seen as norm-setting from the norm subject's side even though they are not consciously norm-setting from the norm authority's side.

The effect of permission-giving provided by existing translations (the translation tradition), and even one's own previous accepted translations is, it seems, quite strong. Pym (2010: 133), for instance, remarks that, in localisation, "[w]here text reuse technologies present an 'authorized' solution (since it comes with the job), the translator is likely to opt for it, even when alternative solutions

are readily available or even clearly necessary, if the translator has the time and the disposition to think about it". A similar account is given in Pym (2008: 323–324).

## 5.2 TRANSLATIONAL CONVENTIONS AND LAWS

Toury (1995) does not discuss conventions (although he mentions them in Toury [1999: 14]). Hermans (1996: 5) writes about conventions which "grow out of precedent and social habit and [...] presuppose common knowledge and acceptance" as a helpful concept in order to explain norms more fully. Even though conventions, according to Hermans (*ibid.*), are not norms because they do not imply sanctions, they are still accepted social constraints on behaviour (see also von Wright's [1963: 8] similar definition of customs). Norms may emerge if expectations which are connected to conventions become binding. For Hermans (1996: 5–6), norms are rules which indicate what is considered proper and correct behaviour. Norms too are constraints on behaviour, but more forceful than conventions since they are backed up by sanctions, strong attitudes and beliefs.

Nord (1991) regards conventions as readers' expectations of translations. She argues for distinguishing between regulative and constitutive translational conventions (Nord 1991: 99). Constitutive conventions determine a community's concept of and expectations from translations and, as hierarchically higher concept, also the regulative conventions of translation. Regulative conventions concern "the generally accepted forms of handling certain translation problems below the text rank (e.g., proper names, [...] realia, quotations, etc.)" (Nord 1991: 100). Norms which might exist, e.g., for legal translations are, according to Nord (*ibid.*) of an even higher rank. Chesterman (1993: 6) has argued that Nord's conventions are actually norms. This appears to be a valid point in the sense that, like norms, Nord's constitutive conventions determine the expected relation between the original and the translation. In addition, Nord (1991: 94, 96) argues that concealed non-conformance to conventions would be equal to deceiving the readers of the translation and breaking the indispensable moral principle of loyalty (see also section 6.2.3 below). One would expect such behaviour to be sanctioned, but Nord's translational conventions are not binding nor are they enforced by sanctions. Nord's definition of the regulative conventions, however, seems to be close to Hermans's and Bicchieri's conception of conventions.

If Toury's continuum of idiosyncrasies, norms and rules is related to Hermans' conventions, norms, rules and decrees, and Bicchieri's habits, descriptive norms, conventions, and social norms, a succession of motivations emerges which could be described as having a binding force and an attention to other people's expectations which gradually increase from almost zero to maximum: idiosyncrasy/habit – descriptive norm – convention – norm – rule – decree. For

the translation to fall inside the boundaries formed by the constitutive conventions or norms, i.e. to qualify as a translation, habits and idiosyncrasies also depend to some degree on the society's expectations. The problem in norms research is to distinguish between the different motives and to find a plausible explanatory hypothesis for a regularity detected in a translation. In addition, there appear to be more or less regular features that are common to any translation, in other words, universals or recurrent features of translation (see e.g. Mauranen and Kujamäki eds. 2004). According to Toury (2004: 18), the regularities of behaviour that norms imply are not general enough to be regarded as universals. Toury (1995, 2004) prefers to speak of laws instead of universals because the notion of law accepts the possibility of exceptions to the law. He has suggested two tentative translational laws, the first of which, the law of growing standardisation, he formulates as follows: "in translation, textual relations obtaining in the original are often modified, sometimes to the point of being totally ignored, on favour of (more) habitual options offered by a target repertoire" (p. 268). The other law, the law of interference, reads: "in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text" (p. 275). Interference can be negative (deviation from normal practices of the target system) or positive (greater likelihood of selecting existing features) (ibid.). It is difficult to distinguish these regularities from norm-governed behaviour, which is text-type and culture or group specific, and changes over time – unless there are fundamental universal norms that guide all translational behaviour at all times and that might explain such universal features.

### **5.3 TRANSLATIONAL PRODUCT NORMS: THE EXPECTANCY NORMS AND CLARITY**

Translational norms are, according to Chesterman (2000: 64) divided into *process norms* and *product norms*. The product norms of translation govern what completed translations should look like in a given community at a given time. They are called *expectancy norms* and they cover roughly Toury's operational and initial norms. The expectancy norms are based on the prevalent translation tradition, parallel non-translated texts and readers' expectations about "text-type and discourse conventions, about style and register, about the appropriate degree of grammaticality, about the statistical distribution of text features of all kinds, about collocations, lexical choice, and so on" (Chesterman 2000: 64). Also Hickey (2003: 72ff.) provides a list of items perceptible to a reader as a translation assessor. It concentrates on deficiencies that can be found in translations such as overt factual errors, inaccurate or unacceptable use of language or terminology, foreign-sounding expressions, and obvious inconsistency in the meaning of the text.

Expectancy norms are also used to evaluate translations: there is a range of possible translations, a sort of tolerance zone (see also section 2.6), in which

some translations comply with the expectancy norms better, some worse than others (Chesterman 2000: 65). Texts that are seen to satisfy the readers' expectations well serve as models. Other texts are still accepted as translations but "not norm-embodiment ones" (ibid.).

The expectancy norms are the primary focus of lateral assessment, in which translations are compared to similar texts originally written in the target language (Chesterman 2000: 133–134). An evaluator may thus notice not only grammatical errors, odd meanings, neologisms, unusual style and collocations, non-conformity to discourse conventions, but also qualities that are harder to specify such as non-typical distributions of items (Chesterman 2000: 134; Chesterman 2007: 58). In addition, a translation may be assessed against other translations, i.e. against the prevailing tradition of translation (Chesterman 2000: 65).

The way compliance with the expectancy norms is, in Chesterman's view, assessed primarily laterally may lead to the conclusion that the evaluator, who is the client in the present study, is only interested in the end product of the translation process and its grammaticality, functionality and readability. But evaluators, Lauscher (2000: 163) suggests, compare translations against a model target text which is based on a general concept of translating. If a text to be evaluated is presented as a translation, the very concept of translation already refers to certain things, such as there being a source text from which certain features have been transferred to the target text, and are now shared between the two texts, and to which the target text is tied by accountable relationships (Toury 1995: 33–35), or constitutive conventions, norms or rules (Nord 1991: 100; Chesterman 1993: 6–7; Hermans 1996: 15). An evaluator who reads only the target text appears to trust (because s/he has to due to lack of language skills or time or because s/he chooses to) that the relation between the source text and the target text corresponds to the expectations s/he has for them. In other words, the evaluator's expectations seem to extend beyond the appearance of the target text to the area covered by the professional norms (see chapter 6 below), but in any assessment method which does not rely on comparison of the source text and the translation, compliance with the professional norms is, or has to be, taken for granted. Some clients are able to compare the target text with the source text. For those who are not able to do that, the comparison of the target text with non-translated target-language texts might be used as an indicator of the translator's general competence.

Chesterman (2000: 175) suggests that the value governing the expectancy norms is clarity, which is a universal linguistic value (see Bartsch's [1987: 212] definition of the highest norm of communication). Clarity does not equal directness or complete absence of grammatical errors. Chesterman (2000: 176) defines clarity as follows: "a message has clarity to the extent that the receiver can, within an appropriate time, perceive the speaker's intended meaning, the speaker's intention to say something about the world and/or to produce some effect in the hearer". It appears therefore to be a value which supports under-

standing, another value of translation according to Chesterman (2000: 183). An obvious way in which a client can help a translator achieve clarity is providing him/her with clear source texts whenever possible.

### **5.3.1 THE EXPECTANCY NORMS AND THE CLIENT**

In the marketing of services, the quality of the service is determined by how well the client's experience of the service performed matches his/her expectations. A similar notion is expressed by the expectancy norm (Chesterman 2000: 64). Clients' influence over the expectancy norms seems to depend on their ability to make their expectations known to translators, convince them to meet them, check whether the expectations have been met, reward those who comply, punish those who do not, and sometimes even accept a breach of norms and participate in changing the norms. This requires that clients act as norm enforcers and possibly also as norm authorities.

To enforce a norm, a person should know, or at least think that s/he knows, what the norm is, and there should be something in the situation or in the object of evaluation which makes the norm spring to mind. Bicchieri's (2006: 80 and above) account of situational cues is applied below in order to consider the way a client's expectations are formed. Because the situational cues seem to be more easily applied to norm subjects, I will look at them first from a translator's viewpoint.

For an experienced translator the situational cues might include a long list of factors, much like the one in Malmkjær's (1993: 145) model of translation (the model is discussed in more detail in section 6.3.1), such as the source text, its text type or genre and subject area, the position the genre is to have in the target culture, the source and target cultures and their mutual relation, source text author, target text readers, the client personally and the company s/he represents, the guidelines given by this and other clients presently and previously, experiences with other similar cases, etc. These factors allow the translator to identify the situation as belonging to a certain category of translation commissions, say, a translation of instructions of use (text type) for a durable consumer product (readership) for the Russian market (target language and culture), with situation-specific factors. Some relevant norms might now be activated, such as, say, *Instructions for use must be translated so that they are instantly recognised as such in the target culture*, or *Instructions for use for a consumer product should be translated extra carefully because non-experts cannot spot errors in technical information*. Non-translated Russian texts of the same type as well as other instructions for use translated into Russian would be instances of "observing others' behavior, [and assessing] similarity of the present situation to others in which the norm was used" (Bicchieri 2006: 112 and as quoted above). The models provided by parallel translated and non-translated texts serve as models of behaviour which indicate the expected results of behaviour, i.e. are experi-

enced as prescriptive (Chesterman 2000: 74), and at the same time give permission to imitate them. This is how a norm subject might think.

The client's point of view is different. As a non-expert, his/her expectations may be based on a variety of sources and models: translation exercises done at school for language learning purposes, translated literature and other (translated) texts, translations s/he has made himself/herself, comparisons of source texts and their translations between any pair of languages, previous dealings with translators (and other service providers), discussions with others who have purchased translation services, newspaper articles about translation or translators, translation agencies' advertisements, etc., in other words, the public discourse of translation s/he has been exposed to. S/he may share with the translator some of the situational cues, like the source text type or the target audience. While the situational cues invoke in the translator expectations of what is expected of him/her, the client is surrounded by situational cues and models which are partly similar to those of the translator, and which, in turn, activate the expectations that s/he has toward the translation and the translator. These expectations would direct his/her attention toward certain features of the translation and s/he would probably notice especially the things that are unexpected and which imply that the translator has somehow failed to meet the expectations (Toury 1999: 21) or exceeded them.

Naturally, the client is not the only party who has expectations regarding translations, or the only one whose expectations translators aim to fulfil. Furthermore, expectations are subjective and not always clear, as Bicchieri (2006: 48, 98 and above) and others (see section 2.2) have pointed out.

### **5.3.2 CLIENTS AS NORM AUTHORITIES**

An evaluation of a translation may lead to the client criticising or praising it to the translator, which would make the client a norm enforcer. Since clients, as members of the society, are (parts of) the sufficiently large, or influential enough, subset of the population expecting translators to conform to a behavioural rule (Bicchieri 2006: 11), could clients also be regarded as norm authorities who issue norms and decide which norms are valid in a given situation?

Because norm authorities are the ones who issue norms, Bartsch's (1987: 133–134) definition of a correct act of issuing a norm helps to answer the question of clients' authority over norms. According to Bartsch, an utterance of a norm sentence can be a correct act of issuing a norm if, among other conditions, the norm subject accepts its utterer as a norm authority and the addressees are possible norm subjects with respect to the norm authority in the given area. If the utterer is not authorised to issue a norm, the utterance is just an attempt to issue a norm. If, in addition, the utterance of a norm sentence contains a norm content which already exists as a valid norm, the utterance is a norm explication, which, in turn, may be the utterer's attempt to establish himself/herself as

a norm authority, or an act of telling someone about, or reminding them of the norm, or correcting their behaviour (i.e. enforcing the norm).

Since translation can be regarded as an expert service (see section 2.1), it is difficult to imagine the client as a norm authority regarding translation. Even skopos theory, which places particular emphasis on listening to the client's needs and cooperation between the client and the translator, leaves the final say to the translator. A client may in some speciality areas, for instance, in terminological questions, be more knowledgeable than a translator, but to be a norm authority would require him/her or clients in general to regard themselves as authorities and translators to consider themselves as obligated to follow clients' requirements. But perhaps it does not matter whether a norm sentence uttered by the client is a genuine act of issuing a norm or just an attempt to do so, because any norm sentence is still an expression of expectation and can in practice have the same effect on the norm subject as an issue of a norm. The question is then whether clients are as a group influential enough to make translators meet their expectations. Taking into account the central place that customer service has in any business, a client could be seen by the translator, and s/he could see himself/herself, perhaps not as a norm authority on translation in general, but as an authority regarding the specific translation which his/her company has commissioned. Clients would be norm authorities to the extent that their requirements are taken into account and have an effect on how translations turn out on the basis of their status as clients.

As service providers non-literary translators are members of a business community and subject to its rules. There are other influences as well. Hermans (1996: 13) argues that translation is connected to several unique, complex and constantly changing cultural systems, which may be expected to lead to "competing, conflicting and overlapping norms and models which pertain to a whole array of other social domains". Simeoni (1998: 19–20) goes further by suggesting that the products of translation appear to be governed by the rules of the literary, scientific, technical, legal or other specific field in which translation takes place. This would mean that strong influence or even authority over translation norms might come from sections of society other than translation itself. An important channel for these influences would seem to be the client and the translation brief. However, as a business, non-literary translation is also subject to factors such as fluctuations in the supply of and demand for translators of different language pairs over time. Such fluctuations could in turn affect the relative power of each source of influence over the norms of translation. Therefore it seems that the relationship between translators and other parties, groups and institutions in a society can be described as one of a changing degree of mutual dependency.

### 5.3.3 WAYS TO MAKE CLIENTS' EXPECTATIONS KNOWN TO TRANSLATORS

As mentioned in section 2.2, expectations can be fuzzy, implicit, or explicit (Ojasalo 2001: 4). A client with explicit expectations is likely to monitor their fulfilment and be prepared to make them explicit also to the translation service provider. There are many occasions to do this during the translation brief, through advice possibly given to the translator during translation, and through feedback after the translation has been submitted. Feedback may be given also by clients with implicit expectations. Feedback, according to Toury (1995: 249–250), is normative and concerns the appropriateness of a translation as a target-language utterance and as a translation into the target culture, of the relationships between source texts and target texts, and therefore of the methods used in the process of translation. In the process of socialisation, feedback is, at first, “an external monitoring device” (ibid.), a sanction which makes the novice translator revise his/her translation. In time, the translator learns to anticipate potential feedback and take it into account even before submitting the translation to the client. Feedback is eventually assimilated and becomes part of the translator’s basic competence, turning into an internal monitoring device (Toury 1995: 252). Also Englund Dimitrova (2005: 235) points out the important role that feedback received or sought from clients and colleagues plays in building translator competence.

Normative pronouncements (Toury 1995: 65), or normative formulations (Toury 1999: 15), are what one might call feedback from society. They are

prescriptive ‘theories’ of translation, statements made by translators, editors, publishers, and other persons involved in or connected with the activity, critical appraisals of individual translations, or the activity of a translator or ‘school’ of translators, and so forth (Toury 1995: 65).

Toury calls such statements by-products of norms and regards them as possible attempts to formulate norms and control behaviour. He warns against taking them at face value, saying that the persons who give out such formulations are interested parties who are subjective, naïve, and possibly insufficiently informed, and that there may well be differences and contradictions between what is said and what is done (Toury 1995: 65–66). Still, normative formulations, just like pseudotranslations, “testify to what a society has become *conscious of* in its conception of translation” (Toury 1995: 46, original emphasis). In addition, (compared with feedback received by trainees from teachers) non-professional criticism “is likely to be more representative of society at large, and hence of the norms which actually govern translational behaviour” (Toury 1995: 256). Clients’ normative formulations are an important object of analysis in the present study.

Apart from feedback and other ways of making expectations regarding the translated text known to the translator, a client may exert normative force by



firing a translator whom s/he considers incompetent, or by providing employment opportunities to certain kinds of translators. This way, clients select those whom they regard suitable among the supply of translators and let them know what skills and qualities they are expected to have. As Englund Dimitrova (2005: 229) puts it, “[t]he fact that a person has been able to make a living from translation can be seen as an (indirect) evaluation of his/her work”. This means that clients participate in establishing the professional requirements for translators, which seems comparable to issuing a norm (specifically, preliminary norms) and to competent professional translators establishing the product norms of translation, which they do, according to Chesterman (2000: 67), by their translations. Clients may thus be seen to have at least indirect power over who gets to translate and how they should translate.

#### **5.3.4 CLIENTS AS EVALUATORS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE EXPECTANCY NORMS**

The method a client uses to check whether his/her expectations for a translation have been met gives a clue as to what s/he thinks is important in translation. A client may also choose not to monitor a translator’s performance in any way. The possibilities and limitations of clients as lay evaluators depend very much on their language skills. Other requirements for evaluation are considering it necessary or interesting and to be within one’s competence, as well as having an opportunity (time) to do it. These requirements restrict the conclusions which may be drawn on the basis of a given assessment method alone. They also appear to weaken clients’ ability to influence translators’ behaviour by positive or negative sanctions, and add weight to the idea that clients’ non-norm-setting behaviour may be taken as norm-setting by translators.

Lateral assessment performed by clients to evaluate compliance with the expectancy norms has its problems. For the purpose of analysing lay readers – which many clients may be expected to be – as translation assessors, Hickey (2003: 67–69) proposes to divide all features of translations into perceptible and imperceptible ones. The features of translations that are perceptible in lateral assessment, such as inaccurate use of language or terminology or foreign-sounding expressions (see Hickey 2003: 72ff.; Chesterman 2000: 134; Chesterman 2007: 58), serve as a reminder that evaluation is not only about knowledge of a foreign language but also about being a skilful reader in one’s own native tongue and about being sensitive to cultural differences. A lot of variation between different evaluators may therefore be expected, and some features, although perceptible in theory, will be imperceptible for those who are not, as Hickey (2003: 69) puts it, “alert and knowledgeable”. Another problem seems to be that the result of a lateral assessment is not necessarily a reliable indicator of quality, should a client have expectations regarding the relation between the source and the target texts. Hickey (2003: 67–69) argues that while it is possible that an assessment of the quality of a translation matches its actual quality,

lay readers may not notice either a translator's exceptional skill, or errors in the translation. In other words, a lay reader may not notice if his/her expectations have in fact been exceeded, or if they have not been fulfilled, and s/he may erroneously regard a bad translation as a good one, or a correct translation as an incorrect one (if, for instance, factual errors of the source text have been passed on to the translation).

In addition, compared with experts on translation, one may expect from lay evaluators a less detailed and systematic approach as well as inability to use the linguistic terminology of scholarly TQA. That may make expressing one's opinion about a translation more difficult and also make one's assessment seem superficial. For instance, an expert might say that a text is not cohesive while a lay person might try to express the same thing by saying that a text is difficult to read or understand, clumsy, or somehow weird. In other words, there could be a problem matching lay description with expert terms.

Still, there seems to be no reason to decide beforehand that lay evaluators cannot compare intelligibility and informativeness of the two texts (dynamic equivalence; Gutt's [2000] relevance-theoretical approach), consider the function in which the source text and the translation are supposed to be used (functional equivalence), the ability of the translation to fulfil its purpose in the hands of its receiver (skopos theory), grammatical correctness, orthography, cohesion, readability etc. They also have first-hand knowledge of the translation brief and the conditions of the commission.

The significance of lay evaluation to translation research has been questioned. House (2001: 254–255) underlines the importance of appreciating the difference between linguistic analysis, i.e. "describing and explaining linguistic features of the original text and comparing them with the relevant linguistic features of the translation text" (ibid.), and (social) judgement, which means judging how good a translation is. Translation quality evaluation should be based on linguistic analysis, not on "translation receptors' intuitions, feelings, beliefs or the (equally vague) effect of the translation" (ibid.) which House regards as being of secondary importance to translation studies as a scientific discipline. Translation evaluation is, according to House, influenced by a number of factors, just like any other social activity. A translator makes choices partly based on non-linguistic considerations such as the reason for translation, the intended readership, publishing and marketing policies, social, cultural, political and ideological constraints. House suggests that in translation quality assessment these considerations may in practice weigh more than linguistic factors or the translator's competence.

House appears basically to be concerned about mixing professional quality with customer quality (Ovretveit 2000 and section 2.2) and blurring the line between them. Her remark about the different influences under which translation and its evaluation take place implies, however, that there is in practice a lot of interaction between customer quality and professional quality. The effect which other translations (models) have on a translator's expectation of what is ex-

pected from him/her seems to be an example of such interaction. Customer quality and lay evaluation are therefore not completely irrelevant to professional assessment, and they are also an important part of the concept of right quality.

## 6 PROFESSIONAL TRANSLATION NORMS

The process of producing a translation which is supposed to conform to the expectancy norms is, according to Chesterman (2000), regulated by the process norms of translation. Process norms are called *professional norms*. Chesterman (2000: 68–69) suggests that all professional norms can be grouped under three higher-order norms: *the accountability norm*, *the communication norm*, and *the relation norm*. In the following, all these norms, and the values they support, are discussed, starting from the relation norms which appear to me to be close to clients' expectancy norms and also to Toury's (1995) initial and operational norms. My goal is to look at each set of norms mainly from a client's point of view.

### 6.1 THE RELATION NORM AND TRUTH

The process norm that governs the relation between the source text and the translation is the relation norm: "a translator should act in such a way that an appropriate relation of relevant similarity is established and maintained between the source text and the target text" (Chesterman 2000: 69). Although this is a linguistic norm which specifically concerns translation, it is clearly people-oriented: it allows the translator to choose an appropriate relation between the source and the target text in the given situation with the given parties involved. The client's wishes are one factor to consider. The relation could be one which emphasises formal, stylistic or semantic similarity, similarity of effect, or a combination of various degrees of different kinds of similarity. The relation norm also concerns the appropriate degree of target-culture adaptation and addition and omission of information (Chesterman 2000: 69–70).

There can be many reasons why a certain relation exists between a source text and its translation. Probirskaja (2009: 174) remarks aptly that motivations behind choosing a translation strategy can be complex, contradictory and very difficult, if not impossible, to disclose. For instance, a foreignising translation can, according to her, be an indication of "[1] benevolence in presenting a foreign culture, [2] resisting the conventions of mainstream culture, [3] keeping up stereotypes, otherness and exoticism, [4] making a distinction between a foreign culture and one's own, [5] keeping up one's identity with respect to the foreign, [6] faithful translation, [7] influence of foreign mainstream culture and its ideology, or [8] ordinary interference" (*ibid.*, my translation from Finnish). The last two seem to be reasons that are not subject to conscious decision making, but the first six of these can be a choice made by the translator or someone else who is able to have influence over the translator.

Equivalence has often been used to describe the relation between the source text and the target text. Its usefulness as a concept has been under much debate mostly because it has been seen to entail an excessive and unpractical demand for sameness and an idealistic belief in the identity of a text and its translation<sup>5</sup>. For the functionalist approaches, equivalence is only one possible relation between the ST and the TT to be aimed at. I next take a brief glance at the relation between the source text and the target text starting from equivalence-based approaches. I emphasise approaches which discuss the role of the client in more or less detail and which appear applicable to non-literary translation.

### **6.1.1 APPROACHES TO THE RELATION NORM**

According to Nida (1964: 136), any translation “must clearly reflect the meaning and intent of the source”. Nida (1964: 126–139) sees two basic, polar types of translation, between which there are other standards of translation representing the two basic orientations to a varying degree. At one end, formally equivalent translations (equivalence meaning correspondence, not identity, which Nida regards as impossible) emphasise the form and the content of the source text. At the other end are translations aiming at dynamic equivalence, which means that “the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message” (Nida 1964: 129). ‘Response’ appears to refer to the way the translated message and the original are understood by their respective audiences (Nida 1969: 95). A dynamically equivalent translation is defined as “the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message” (Nida 1964: 136). ‘Natural’ means that the translation adapts to the grammar and lexicon of the target language in order to be stylistically acceptable, fits into its new context and culture, maintains the spirit of the original, accurately reflects the emotional tone of the original author, and takes into account the level of experience and understanding of the receptor-language audience. The term ‘natural’ thus covers the language of the target text as well as some aspects of the relation between the source and the target texts. Nida (1964: 139) acknowledges the uncertainty in determining the way the readers of the source text “responded or were supposed to respond”. Still, he argues that reader response is an important factor for all translating and therefore also for any evaluation of translation. Description of the different types of translation should be kept separate from the assessment of their appropriateness for different types of audiences.

House (2001) regards equivalence as “a concept constitutive of translation” (House 2001: 247). House’s notion of equivalence recognises the ambiguity of linguistic items and the fact that languages relate differently to reality. Equiva-

---

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance, Pym (1995), and Halverson’s (1997) analysis of how different views on the philosophy of science are behind the ways in which equivalence is regarded, on the one hand, in the linguistically oriented school and, on the other hand, in the historical-descriptive approach.

lence is a relative concept and related to the preservation of meaning on the semantic, pragmatic and textual level. Translation is defined as “the recontextualization of a text in L1 by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in L2” (ibid.). There are two main types of translation: an *overt* translation does not attempt to have the same function as the original but allows its readers to understand the original text and its impact in its original culture. The aim of a *covert* translation, however, is to have the same individual textual function and genre as the original. To achieve this, the translator applies a cultural filter, which means that the differences in conventions, rhetorical styles and expectation norms have to be analysed and, when necessary, taken into account in translation at the levels of language/text and register to create a functionally equivalent translation (House 2001: 250–251). Furthermore, translations should be theoretically separated from versions which, as House remarks, are the results of client satisfaction and consumer service taking priority over the pursuit for equivalence.

Gutt (2000), in turn, excludes covert translations from the domain of translation theory. In his account of translation, which is based on the relevance theory developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986), equivalence of message or function is not enough to distinguish translation from other interlingual communication. That distinction has to be made on the basis of the way the target text is intended to achieve relevance (i.e. to have large contextual effects with small processing effort needed to retrieve them) (Gutt 2000: 31 citing Sperber and Wilson 1986: 125), which is “in virtue of its resemblance with the other utterance” (the source text) (Gutt 2000: 210). A proper relation between a source and a target text would thus include the knowledge or implication that the target text is in fact a translation. Translation proper is interlingual interpretive use of language, and a translated utterance is presumed to interpretively resemble (i.e. share explicatures and/or implicatures with) the original in a way which is consistent with the presumption of optimal relevance (pp. 46, 105–106).

Gutt sees covert translations as something that general translation theory does not need to concern itself with because:

- covert translations are instances of descriptive use of language (i.e. use of language in which “a mental representation or thought [is entertained] in virtue of its being true of some state of affairs” [Gutt 2000: 39]), intended to achieve relevance not as translations (i.e. as cases of interpretive use) but through descriptive accuracy, and therefore they can be written independently of the source text (p. 59)
- the client who commissions a covert translation is interested in the resulting text being an accurate description or an effective text, not in its interpretive resemblance with the original (p. 217)
- the reader does not care whether the text s/he is reading is a translation or not (ibid.), but, since s/he is not aware of reading a translation, s/he might not read it against correct contextual knowledge (p. 222).

In such cases Gutt advises clients against translation and recommends production of original texts in the languages in question. A focal point in Gutt's (2000: 64) critique appears to be "a tendency to use the word 'translation' rather loosely to refer to almost any instance of communication that involves the transfer of information from one language to another".

In other approaches, e.g. Pym (1995) and Koller (1995), equivalence is regarded as something that defines translation and separates it from non-translation. According to Pym (2010: 6–7), equivalence is based on the idea that there can be "a relation of 'equal value' between a source-text segment and a target-text segment" which can be established on any linguistic level. There are two ways of thinking about equivalence: *natural equivalence* means that a translation reflects a correspondence which exists between languages and which can be verified by back-translation. *Directional equivalence* (Pym 2010: 25–30) assumes that a translator chooses between alternative translation strategies, and that translating a completed translation into its source language may not lead back to the point of departure. Pym (1995: 167) sees the translator as "an equivalence producer, a professional communicator working for people who pay to believe that, on whatever level is pertinent, A is equivalent to B".

Other approaches are not so concerned about classifying different types of translation and defining translation. The focus shifts toward the factors that lead a translator to choosing a relation between a source text and its translation. In descriptive translation studies a text may be studied as a translation based only on the assumption that it is a translation (Toury 1995: 33–35). Equivalence is taken to mean "any relation which is found to have characterized translation under a specified set of circumstances" (Toury 1995: 61). This makes clients – the initiators, buyers, receivers and senders – key figures in defining equivalence.

Also the interaction between the translator and the client gets more attention. Malmkjær (1993) refers to Davidson (1986) and bases her model of translation on the meeting of the participants' prior and passing theories in interaction through translation. The translator's knowledge of the requester's aims is described as an important factor affecting the translator's translational choices and thereby the relation which the translator creates between the source text and the target text. Malmkjær (1993: 146–147) mentions, first, "the requester-factor" and the requester's aims for the translation together with the source text, and, second, the constraining influence of the source text on the target text as "the two most powerful causes of tension in the process of performing a translation" (Malmkjær 1993: 147). Other factors include the translator's assumptions and knowledge of the writer of the source text, the reader of the translation, (intended) uses of the two texts and their contexts and the discourse surrounding them (Malmkjær 1993: 145).

Skopos theory assigns an important role to the client. The relation between the original and its translation (translatum) is the result of the translator's decisions that s/he makes guided by the purpose, or skopos, of the translation as set

by the client together with the translator (Vermeer 1996: 7). If the client's opinion about the way in which the source text should be translated differs from that of the translator's, the translator should be able to negotiate with him/her in order to convince him/her of the superiority of his/her expert opinion (Vermeer 1996: 35).

According to Vermeer (1996), the author of the original and people who read and interpret his text, among them his translator, all interpret the world, including the text, differently. A translation does not have to be retrospectively "equivalent" to, or automatically tied to, a particular source-text interpretation, only prospectively "adequate" to the target-text skopos. "Equivalence" is always partial (Vermeer 1996: 77–78). Equivalence of any kind, fidelity to the source text, imitation of the source text structure, etc. are legitimate and possible relations which a translator may try to establish between the original and the translation, if that is what the skopos expects him/her to do.

Although there is no pre-determined relation between a source text and its translation, "translation" is a specific type of translational action, namely, source-text based translational action. Depending on the relation between the source text and the target culture, or on the skopos, translation may not be possible or purposeful, in which case the source text may have to be "rewritten", "paraphrased" or completely "re-edited", requiring "translational action" other than translation (Vermeer 1989: 184–185).

Vermeer's (1989) idea of quality is based on the skopos (purpose) of the translation. The translator's task is not tied to equivalence of responses or to the preservation of a communicative intention. Vermeer writes that "[w]hat the skopos states is that one must translate, consciously and consistently, in accordance with some principle respecting the target text" (Vermeer 1989: 182), and further that "[a] translation must function in such a way that the given goal is attained" (Vermeer 1989: 186). The skopos must be defined separately for each translation commission in negotiations with the client or, if necessary, based solely on the translator's expert judgement. Skopos theory appears to have a prescriptive undertone: on the one hand it states that translation is action and therefore automatically has an aim, but on the other hand, demands that the aim be consciously and systematically pursued. In translation quality assessment the question is then not whether a translation has a skopos but whether it is a suitable skopos and how well the translation fulfils it. Martín de León (2008: 14–15) observes, however, that the assessment of the purposes of translation is not included in Vermeer's theoretical thinking, but that Nord has tried to address that issue by her ethical principle of loyalty.

Also in Nord's (2005: 32) functional approach to translation the intended or demanded function of the target text determines the relationship between the target text and its source text. The translation process begins when the initiator decides that s/he needs the target text for a certain purpose. The initiator may have more than one role in the process: s/he may also be the source text producer, the source text receiver, the target text receiver, the target text sender,



etc. (Nord 2005: 6–7). To serve the chosen purpose the target text must meet certain requirements, which the initiator defines in the translation assignment. If the initiator cannot specify the requirements, the translator who is an expert in intercultural communication and the target culture, uses the information that s/he gets from the initiator about the target text situation and the purpose of the communication to set the skopos for the target text himself/herself (Nord 2005: 9–10).

The translator must also apply the loyalty principle in choosing a function for the target text, i.e. respect the wishes and expectations of the parties involved (for more on loyalty see section 6.2). The loyalty principle requires the translator to consider the expectations and wishes of the initiator, the target text receiver and the original author who want a particular kind of relationship between the original and the translation, or between originals and translations in general. While skopos theory allows the translator considerable freedom as long as the skopos is served, “[I]oyalty limits the range of justifiable target-text functions for one particular source text and raises the need for a negotiation of the translation assignment between translators and their clients” (Nord 1997: 126). Considerations regarding loyalty can thus be used to assess the suitability of a skopos for a particular situation.

### **6.1.2 THE RELATION NORM AND THE CLIENT**

Based on the short review above, the client can be seen as: (a) the initiator who plays an active role and decides the purpose of the translation (together with the translator) and the source text/target text relation that should be aimed at (Vermeer, Nord); (b) a more passive party who expects equivalence on a relevant level (Pym); (c) the party who has regarded the target text as equivalent to its source text (since the translation exists and has been accepted as a translation) (Toury); (d) a party through whom the demands of the target audience of the translation and economic constraints are channelled to the translator (House); (e) a party whose interests and wishes have to be taken into account (Nord); (f) a party whose (expected) interpretation of the source and/or target text needs to be considered (Malmkjær; also Koller – see below) and, finally, as (g) someone who in certain cases orders translations (which should not be considered as such theoretically) because it is convenient but who could do better by requesting original texts (Gutt). This list, which is not meant to be an exhaustive description of each scholars’ view on the client, shows the many faces with which the client appears in translation research.

The relation norm is a linguistic norm, and therefore the actual forming of the relation between the original and its translation is in the translator’s hands and largely beyond the client’s direct control. Still, the relation norm is affected by social conditions such as the persons involved and the situation in which communication takes place. The client can influence it through his/her individual abilities and preferences. This can be seen in the following list, which is

adapted from Koller (1995) and which shows factors that are connected to the client:

**Client-related factors and conditions which influence the relation between a text and its translation (adapted from Koller [1995: 196–197]):**

The client:

- the client's guidelines and the declared purpose of the translation
- the client's translation principles
- the interpretation of the original text by its author or by its source-language reader (if s/he is the client)
- preconditions for comprehension on the part of the target-language reader (if s/he is the client).

The text:

- the source text (if written by or under the influence of the client).

The translator (chosen by the client):

- the translator's explicit and/or implicit theory of translation, creative inclinations and understanding of the work
- the practical conditions under which the translator chooses or is obliged to work.

Many of the items on the above list involve things that a client can do before the translator even begins to translate and are about creating favourable conditions for the actual translation. An ideal client would thus be someone who understands both the source and the target languages, produces clear source texts, knows what s/he wants and expresses it clearly to the translator who has been hired based on carefully thought-out selection criteria in line with the client's translation principles and guidelines, to whom the client offers reasonable work conditions and whose translation s/he checks and comments afterwards. Such a client would have made good use of the opportunities that are available for him/her to affect the relation between the source text and its translation. However, as was discussed above in more detail (see sections 2.2 and 2.4), clients' level of expertise as buyers of services may vary, as may their understanding of their own expectations of such services. Some clients may not be able to be the active and involved party. They may be unwilling or unable to specify and communicate to the translator their translation principles and guidelines, they may produce unclear source texts and lack language skills. Even these clients can influence the relation norm and quality through the choice of the translator, but such influence would be without clear direction because they would have limited possibilities of assessing the translator's work and determining what *kind* of a relation norm they are supporting by choosing a certain translation service provider.

The text, if written by or under the influence of the client, is mentioned in the above list as a client-related factor affecting the relation between the original

and the translation because clear, well-written texts contain little, if any, writer-related or structural triggers of misunderstanding (see 6.3.2) and therefore make the translator's job easier. Texts that are difficult to read and understand also raise the question of whether the translator should correct such flaws and make the translation better than the source text in that respect. This point overlaps with the client's translation principles in the above list.

The client can influence the conditions in which translations are produced. Abdallah (2007: 283–285; see also 2.2 above) would like to include those conditions as part of the social quality of translation, in the concept of translation quality. The conditions in which a product or a service is produced undoubtedly affect the outcome, and translation is no exception.

A client who speaks the source and the target languages can assess whether the translation conforms to the relation norm retrospectively by comparing the original text and the translation. Comparison of the translation with the original (or with other texts such as parallel non-translated target-language texts or other translations) is done by looking for similarities and differences between the texts (Chesterman 2000: 123; 2007: 57–58). Comparison reveals different things to different people since everyone has their individual abilities, preferences, points of view and circumstances, which all affect the way in which comparisons and also quality assessments are made (Chesterman 2007: 60). For instance, if translation is regarded as interlingual interpretive use of language (Gutt 2000: 107), a comparison would focus on the contextual effects offered by the original and the translation and on the processing effort required to yield them. If it is correct to say that a client who requests a covert translation does not care about interpretive resemblance between the original and the translation (Gutt 2000: 217), s/he cannot be assumed to be interested in comparison of the target text with the source text. S/he may also not be interested in the translator's competence as a *translator* (in Gutt's sense) but on his/her ability to understand the source text and produce appropriate texts in the target language perhaps using the original as a source of facts and ideas only.

Although it has been argued, according to Chesterman (2000: 128), that retrospective assessment is artificial because normal readers of translations do not have the original texts, comparison of translations with their source texts would seem to be a viable option for those who commission translations and are familiar with both the source and the target languages.

### 6.1.3 THE VALUE OF TRUTH

Chesterman (2000: 179) argues that the value governing the relation norm is truth, which means that "the state of affairs to which a translation should be 'true' is [...] the source text" (ibid.). Observing or disregarding this value appears to separate translation from non-translation: depending on the situation, the parties involved and the texts, the relation between the original and the translation may vary but it must still be possible to characterise it as a relation of truth

in accordance with the notion of translation prevailing in the target culture (Chesterman 2000: 178–180). If, however, the relation norm is broken, a translation may be criticised as being too free or too literal, or distorting the meaning of the original causing an error of comprehension (Chesterman 2000: 139). That way truth is connected to the two other professional values, understanding and trust: a truthful translation enables understanding and is likely to create trust toward the translator.

Truth is an important concept for Newmark's (1991) source-text oriented approach to translation. He maintains that translation is a truth-seeking activity (Newmark 1999: 72) and that the purpose and end of translation is that the reader understands the truth (Newmark 1991: 1). Translators have a responsibility to the truth as well as to the client (*ibid.*, p. 40). The truth is in the meaning of the original, but all the different varieties of meaning found in the text to be translated have to be put into an order of importance based on the aims of the translated text and those of the translator. Only functionally relevant meaning needs to be transferred to the reader of the translation (*ibid.*, pp. 1, 27–28). Furthermore, Newmark (1991: 1–2) argues that closeness or accuracy of translation should depend on how important the language of (a part of) a text is, importance being determined by the occasion, the values of the text, the client's criteria or by the status of the writer of the original or the person quoted therein. However, "[t]here seems no good reason not to reproduce the truth, even when the truth is not particularly important" (Newmark 1991: 2).

Truths not worth preserving include, according to Newmark (1991: 46), slips and typos, bad writing such as illogical structure and ambiguity, factual errors, and statements which go against accepted human rights. In such cases the translator might have to consult with the client to agree on what should be done about those flaws. Possible courses of action regarding statements against human rights include making the client aware of misleading or untrue statements of the source text, reducing sexism in language, and writing separate comments or introductions (Newmark 1991: 160). The idea seems to be not to delete "truths" that are not pretty but to make sure that the client and readers are conscious of them or, in other words, fully understand them. Adopting Newmark's somewhat idealistic position would mean an increase of translator's responsibilities which would make him/her considerably more visible in his/her relationship with the client and not completely neutral in relation to the content of the text. On the same subject Baker (2006: 105) argues that with every assignment translators have to choose whether to reproduce the ideologies that a text represents or to distance themselves from them, if necessary, by refusing to translate. So on the one hand translators need to consider not only the relation between the source text and the translation but also whether the truth deserves to be conveyed and whether they want to be the ones who make it possible. On the other hand, translators can be active in translating texts that they think should be translated in order to allow access to information that would otherwise not be made available.

## 6.2 THE ACCOUNTABILITY NORM AND TRUST

According to Chesterman (2000: 68–69), the accountability norm sets the standard for the translator's integrity and thoroughness. It requires the translator to "act in such a way that the demands of loyalty are appropriately met with regard to the original writer, the client, the translator himself or herself, the prospective readership and any other relevant parties". In cases of conflict, the translator can decide which party should be given primary loyalty.

From the translator's point of view this norm is subordinate to the expectancy norm by which it is determined (Chesterman 2000: 67). It is governed by the value of trust which is a relation between people: trust that the translator has in the parties involved, and trust that the parties involved have in the translator. To survive translators must be trusted as individuals and as a profession. Because trust exists unless it is lost, translators should act so that they do not betray it (Chesterman 2000: 180–181). The translator breaks the accountability norm if s/he falsely represents the message and is careless with terms, names, numbers, etc. (Chesterman 2000: 141).

In Pym's (2004b: 5, 10–11) view, cross-cultural communication might be characterised, among other things, by relatively low trust. He sees situations in which a client does not know the TL (target language) as mediated cross-cultural communication characterised by a high degree of potential mistrust. This is because the client is unable to check the translator's work, which, in addition, is often purported to be in another person's name. Trust has value because it reduces complexity. Its function is to facilitate cooperation by enabling a beneficial communication act to take place.

If the translator is trusted by default, it probably means that the client sees no risk or only a very small risk of being disappointed in his/her expectations regarding the translator and the translation. If, however, translation is characterised by low trust, the client seems to think there is a clear risk involved in commissioning a translation. The former view stresses the importance of preventing trust from being lost, the latter that of creating trust and basing trust more on experience than on any initial expectations of the actions of the (potentially) trusted.

So trust is what clients feel to various degrees toward translators and translations. The translators are expected to be loyal to the parties involved. Loyalty means, as defined by Oxford English Dictionary (2010, online), "true to obligations of duty, love, etc." and "faithful adherence to one's promise, oath, word of honour, etc.". You can be a loyal friend or, say, a loyal (i.e. regular) customer. Loyalty has also been defined as "the obligation to refrain from breaching the trust that others have bestowed upon us and to fulfil duties taken upon ourselves by accepting somebody's trust" (Sztompka 1999: 5) or, in other words, being worth someone's trust. Trust and loyalty are therefore closely connected concepts.

Recently, trust has interested sociologists and political scientists (for a review see e.g. Ilmonen and Jokinen 2002, Sztompka 1999, and Jalava 2006 for a detailed analysis of Niklas Luhmann's thinking on trust and how Anthony Giddens and Piotr Sztompka have been affected by it). In the following, I will look at some definitions of trust borrowed from sociologists and political scientists, and see how they can be applied to translation. My aim is to take the point of view of a client to see how translators could be perceived and their trustworthiness assessed.

### 6.2.1 DEFINITIONS OF TRUST

In Hardin's (1999) view, people cannot and should not be expected to trust government because they cannot know enough of it to trust it. Trust is connected to knowledge. If I trust you, "I know or think I know relevant things about you, especially about your motivations toward me" (Hardin 1999: 24–26). Trust is not to be confused with inductive trust which is a mere expectation of regularity in behaviour or events like the seasons changing. "To say that I trust you with respect to some matter means that I have reason to expect *you to act in my interest* with respect to that matter because you have good reasons to do so, *reasons that are grounded in my interest*" (ibid., original emphasis).

Hardin (ibid.) sees that in addition to trust and distrust (i.e. not trusting) there is a neutral position where there is lack of either trust or distrust because of absence of relevant knowledge on which to base a judgment of trust or distrust. It is close to Sztompka's (1999: 26–27) notion of *mistrust* which is a neutral, temporary phase, a situation with a lack of clear expectations and hesitation about committing oneself but which, in contrast to Hardin's position, is the result of destroyed trust or healed distrust and thus based on prior knowledge about the trusted. According to Sztompka, betrayed trust seems to lead more readily to distrust than unjustified distrust can turn into trust. *Distrust* is defined as negative expectations about the actions of others which also involve negative commitment i.e. avoiding those who are distrusted. Sztompka (1999: 25) defines trust as "a bet about the future contingent actions of others". Trust, first, refers to a belief about other people's actions and, second, the trustor's commitment to action the outcome of which is at least partly uncertain and uncontrollable (Sztompka 1999: 26).

Harré (1999: 255–257) argues that to trust is to have confidence in the reliability of the trusted thing or person to "continue to behave as it has always behaved, as things very like it have behaved, or as things of that sort should behave" (p. 257). When we say "A trusts B in respect of X", in ordinary language, A is a person, B can be a person, an animal or a material thing, and X is what is determined by boundaries of trust which are context-specific. A relationship of trust between people can be based on perceived features or characteristics of the trusted. In this case trust is ascribed *a priori* (ascribed or role-based trust). Trust that is based on experience of the performance of the trusted is given a

*posteriori* (earned or experience-based trust). In either case, trust, according to Harré, has to do with the role of the trusted relative to the trustor.

Patterson (1999: 153) sees trust as “the condition in which someone, the trustor, commits without security something to the care of another, the trustee, solely on the basis of the trustor’s confidence or faith in the trustee’s likelihood of fulfilling his obligation”. This confidence is largely based on how well the trustor knows the trusted. Patterson (1999: 154–157) makes a distinction between *direct trust*, which is trust between two persons or a group of persons and one person (the trusted), and *indirect trust* where the trust relationship depends on a third party. Referring to Shapiro (1987), he also distinguishes between *personal trust*, where the personal qualities of the persons involved are critical, and *impersonal trust* where emphasis is not on personal qualities, but on an institutional arrangement (e.g. not a particular teacher but the school system), i.e. there is no direct contact between the principal (the trustor) and the agent (the trusted), and “faceless and readily interchangeable individual or organizational agents” (Shapiro 1987: 634) act on behalf of the principals but out of their direct control. From these distinctions, Patterson makes a framework of trust relations, consisting of *affective trust* (direct and personal trust), which is a relation between usually two persons who know each other and rely on personal criteria in weighing the costs and benefits of trust. *Intermediary trust* (indirect and personal trust) relies on what a known intermediary assesses the personal characteristics of the trusted to be. That is, A and C do not know each other, but they both trust B who can act as a trust-creating intermediary between A and C. The third type of trust relation is *collective trust* (direct and impersonal trust). It is formed in situations where we trust people with whom we are in frequent direct contact but whom we do not learn to know personally. Here humanistic trust, i.e. trust in people as fellow human beings, plays an important role. The fourth system of trust is *delegated trust* (indirect and impersonal trust). In this case a usually personally unknown intermediary acts as a guarantor of trust relationship. According to Patterson, delegated trust is what Shapiro refers to by impersonal trust (see above) and also what we mean when we speak of confidence in business or in institutions.

Trust can thus be seen as a belief in people acting in the future as agreed or expected in which case it is assumed that there is always a risk, perceived or unperceived by the trustor, in relying on other people’s future actions (Sztompka, Harré, Patterson). Or the feeling of trust or distrust can be considered an issue only if the trustor has or thinks s/he has relevant knowledge of the trusted to assess whether it makes sense to trust him/her (Hardin). But if the trustor decides to become somehow dependent on another person’s future actions anyway, it could be regarded as a relationship of trust. After all, a person can have very little trust i.e. may regard relying on another person as very risky, complete trust (very small risk) or something in between. These different levels of trust can be measured and observed: quoting Levi (1996<sup>6</sup>: 7), Offe (1999: 46–47) argues that

---

<sup>6</sup> Levi, M. (1996) *A state of trust*. Unpubl. ms.

trust can be measured partly by observing what trusting persons do *not* do in terms of gathering information, monitoring and sanctioning when failure to perform by the trusted would lead to high costs to the trustor. He adds that trust can also be measured as “the preparedness to enter into relations where monitoring etc. is not feasible or prohibitively costly”.

To apply Patterson’s and Harré’s concepts to the field of translation let us consider the situation of a client who is in the market for a translation for the very first time. S/he could get involved in a relationship of intermediary trust by hiring a translator recommended to him/her by a business associate s/he trusts. S/he could use the services of a translator s/he knows personally (affective trust). Patterson’s concept of collective trust seems to be not so readily applicable to translation, but if we concentrate on the fact that it is impersonal and direct, it could describe a situation where the client hires a translation service provider mostly based on role-based trust s/he extends toward any translator (the translation profession) and deals with him/her directly. Finally, the client could, for instance, use a translation agency previously unknown to him/her which would in turn find a subcontractor whom s/he will probably never learn to know personally (delegated trust).

The client can form experience-based trust for a specific translator only after actually having seen and evaluated a translator’s performance (if s/he regards it as necessary and is capable of doing it). Role-based trust, however, seems to be a factor in all of the above cases: there must be either some initial trust in the profession of translation if a client decides to hire a translator. Chesterman (1997: 154) puts it this way: “[Translators] will be trusted (a) if the profession is trusted, (b) if they are deemed to be *bona fide* members of the profession, and (c) if they have done nothing to forfeit this trust”. What if a client has a disappointing experience with a translator? It could mean that the trust s/he initially had in the particular translator or the profession in general is diminished, turned into mistrust or even into distrust, i.e. a decision to actively avoid using this or any translator’s services. If this client at a later time is forced to commission a translation anyway, it would be a high-risk situation for him/her in which the translator would have to not prevent trust from being lost but to create trust. The translator, however, might be completely unaware that this was the case and from his/her point of view, acting as if preventing trust from being lost seems like a sensible thing to do in all circumstances.

It is also reasonable to assume that because translation is a business and a means of earning a living, Hardin’s interests-based notion of trust plays a role in any relationship between the client and the translator.

From the disappointed client example above, it can be seen that previous experiences with other translators are likely to influence the role-based trust the client has in the translation profession. Sztompka (1999: 48) notes that trust attached to a social role (position) may extend to everyone in that role and also that personal trust or distrust felt for a person who holds a certain position can enhance or diminish the trust that people have for anyone in that same position.



This transfer of trust is a factor in Patterson's framework as well, in which trust for an intermediary or delegated trust for an organisation or institution is extended to the person actually performing the task in question. As pointed out by Harré (1999: 259–261), the trust relation between a person and an institution is a special case of trust in persons: as people, an institution is subject to moral demands and constituted by rules and customs that constrain its personnel.

To summarise, trust is related to the future actions of the trusted. To trust is to take a risk that the trusted will not act as expected or agreed. Trust can be based on experience of dealing with the trusted, on expectations concerning the role the trusted is acting in (as a representative of an institution) or on a third, (trusted) person acting as an intermediary between the trustor and the trusted.

### **6.2.2 WAYS TO EVALUATE TRUSTWORTHINESS**

There are many factors which can be considered in order to assess the degree of risk involved in trusting someone.

As pointed out by Warren (1999: 330–332), Hardin (1999; see above 6.2.1) stresses the trustor's judgement of the trusted person's interests and not of his/her information, knowledge or skills relevant for the particular situation. The reason, according to Warren, seems to be that it is more difficult to assess people's competencies than the interests that motivate them (or institutions). Offe (1999: 61, footnote) makes a similar remark, stating that even in repeated interactions, such as when clients interact with professionals, it can be impossible to assess the competence and commitment of the persons involved.

It seems self-evident that it is in any entrepreneur's interests to get and keep as many paying clients as possible and to act accordingly. To base trust on that motivation alone, i.e. on trust in business in general (delegated trust) does not get us below the surface. Sztompka (1999: 70–86) offers a more comprehensive analysis of the clues of trustworthiness. He lists three grounds on which one can base estimates of *primary trustworthiness*, i.e. the features that the trusted may be said to have. The list appears to be a mixture of various degrees of experience- and role-based expectations. First, the trustor may have first-hand knowledge of the trusted's *reputation*, or record of past deeds. Second-hand testimonies referring to reputation, e.g. stories about the trusted, his/her profession or his/her membership in exclusive groups are also used to estimate trustworthiness.

Certification could be proof of belonging to such group. Translation certification could, according to Chan (2010), work as a signal which would reduce clients' (who are translation agencies, i.e. translators' clients in Chan's study) uncertainty about translators' linguistic proficiency and thereby make recruitment easier. In addition to translator certification, the translator's education in general, membership in, say, the national organisation of translators or translation entrepreneurs, list of references published on the translator's web site and com-

pliance with industrial standards could also be regarded as testimonies of competence and therefore of trustworthiness.

The second item on Sztompka's list is *performance* or actual deeds, present conduct and current results of the trusted which are closely related with Harré's experience-based trust. The client might for example ask the translator to give a sample of his/her work. And third, *appearance* (external features like dress, body language, etc.) as an indication of a person's social and economic status, power and thereby also implied trustworthiness is also considered in assessing whether someone can be trusted.

According to Sztompka, these three grounds of trustworthiness require that the trustor has or can acquire information about the object of trust. Familiarity with the trusted makes his/her conduct more visible and allows for easier access to such information whereas anonymity and distance prevent access to relevant information. The notion of familiarity can be extended to include well-known products and companies. Akerlof (1970: 499-500) notes that the brand-name good is one of the institutions which counteract the effects of quality uncertainty. The brand-name good "not only indicate[s] quality but also give[s] the consumer a means of retaliation if the quality does not meet expectations". The consumer can then not only stop buying the product based on its poor performance but also let other people know about the bad experience with it, thereby ruining its reputation.

In addition to primary trustworthiness, Sztompka (1999: 87–95) analyses secondary or *derived trustworthiness*. This has to do with "contextual conditions that make the actions of persons or institutions more trustworthy, independent of any other characteristics they might have" (p. 87). More specifically, *accountability* is such a contextual condition. Accountability means "the presence of agencies monitoring and sanctioning the conduct of the trustee, or at least potentially available for such monitoring and sanctioning if the breach of trust occurs" (ibid.). Such an agency can be informal, like a group of friends. Accountability makes trusting easier because being trustworthy is in the interests of the trusted and therefore a further incentive not to breach trust. To actually increase trustworthiness the agencies of accountability must be able to act effectively if trust is breached. This can be achieved if the trusted has a clear identity (non-anonymity), if s/he is dependent on the jurisdiction of the agency of accountability, and has something to lose as a punishment for breaching trust (a job or reputation, for instance). Sztompka (1999: 90–91) adds that accountability can be raised also by structural arrangements such as legally binding contracts, the principle of confidentiality, malpractice suits, consumer protection organisations, guarantees extended to consumer products, etc. (not to mention publicity).

In translation the amount of influence different agencies of accountability have varies. The client has more effective ways to sanction the translator than the readers of the translation. Because translation is a free profession open to anyone, the power of the professional organisations of translators over unethical

translators is limited compared to what can be done to lawyers and medical doctors who do not act according to their official codes of conduct.

*Situational features* (Sztompka 1999: 95) can raise or lower the derived trustworthiness of the trusted. Visibility is such a feature: it allows the trusted to be supervised and thereby the decision to trust or not to trust more informed. Quality of the setting in which the trust relationship is supposed to take place has an effect: a well-designed web site and a nicely furnished office will probably help communicate that the translator is committed to his/her profession and has therefore a motive to be trustworthy.

Sztompka (1999: 83–86) notes that people use different criteria and attach various degrees of importance to them when they judge a person's trustworthiness. The emphasis attached to various clues of trustworthiness varies according to the task the trusted is supposed to perform, in time, from culture to culture (e.g. attention to diplomas and titles) and from trustor to trustor.

To be more specific, it is not just the task (e.g. translation of a document) but its *complexity* as perceived by the trustor (the client) that probably affects not only the criteria used to assess the trusted's (the translator's) trustworthiness but also whether risk and therefore some degree of trust are seen as an issue in hiring a translator. This is another reason why role-based expectations regarding the translation profession are important. Furthermore, the clues of primary and derived trustworthiness are connected to each other. Situational features are close to appearance, and the presence of an effective agency of accountability may affect the weight the aspects of primary trustworthiness are given.

As seen from the above discussion on trust and the clues of trustworthiness, trust is in many cases built not on how the trusted actually performs the required task (experience-based trust) but on thinking that the threat of losing something valuable will force the trusted to be trustworthy, and on images of people. Thus visibility plays an important part in establishing a relationship of trust (see e.g. Chesterman 1997: 154). In non-literary translation, the obvious way of increasing translators' visibility in the eyes of the public, i.e. mentioning their names, translators' prefaces, etc. are usually unfeasible. For a client a translator becomes quite visible already when s/he is trusted with a confidential document to translate, returns it with the translation which is possibly into a language the client does not know, and sends an invoice. The visibility of the translation profession is perhaps a more effective way to help clients assess the trustworthiness of a translator (or any other professional) and get a realistic picture of what it takes to be a good translator.

### **6.2.3 ACCOUNTABILITY AND LOYALTY**

Sztompka's notion of accountability, i.e. there being an agency or structural arrangements to make sure that there are sanctions for breaching trust, is only implied in Chesterman's (2000: 68, 181) accountability norm, which stresses the importance of maintaining trust in translators. This norm requires the transla-

tor to be loyal to the original writer, the client, himself/herself, to the readers and other relevant parties (Chesterman 2000: 68–69). They could then be regarded as more or less powerful agencies of accountability who at least have a right to question or praise the translator's decisions if not to actually impose sanctions. On the one hand, since the accountability norm is determined by expectancy norms, the target language readership is in key position here. On the other hand, because expectancy norms are governed by the prevalent translation tradition and parallel translated texts of a similar text-type, they are strongly influenced by the professional translators who "are largely responsible for the original establishment of the expectancy norms" (Chesterman 2000: 67).

Also Nord's loyalty principle (1991; 2001: 194–196; 2005: 32) stresses the TT readers' interests. She argues that the translator is responsible to both the ST sender for not falsifying the sender's intention and the TT recipient for producing a functional target text and for considering his/her expectations about the translation. If the translator disagrees with other parties' expectations and therefore cannot meet them s/he must explain his/her translation purposes and methods to them (just like people must observe the norm of honesty, see Bartsch [1987:61] and section 4.2 above). For that s/he needs to be able to recognise and make explicit his/her own subjective theory regarding translation (Nord 2001: 191). Adhering to the principle of loyalty means that the translator must be capable of considering alternative courses of action, choosing one that is in the best interests of the parties involved and taking responsibility for that choice. According to Nord, the translator may, for example, choose to adapt translation units when their literal translation would not be received by target readers in the way the original author would wish. The loyalty principle thus seems to emphasise the value of creating understanding between the communicating parties.

In emphasising a certain neutrality, the idea of standing for one's principles despite external pressure, Nord's position is not that far from Pym's (2004a: 179) view that translators should be loyal to the translator's profession (with the higher aim of promoting long-term cooperation between cultures), even though Pym sees that there is no primary neutrality. Pym's and Chesterman's notions are not far apart either: since the accountability norm is one of the basic professional norms of translating, having to do with "an awareness of the ethical responsibility of a translator" (Chesterman 2000: 154) and strongly influenced by the professional translators through the expectancy norm, then acting in accordance with it is being loyal to the profession.

On the whole, Sztompka's view on accountability is that of an outsider, the trustor, while translation scholars referred to above take the translator's viewpoint and are more interested in translators' loyalty, professional integrity and their ability to make justifiable translation decisions independently.

The different parties involved in translation may think of a translator's accountability differently. To see whom the translator might be accountable to in the client's opinion we can look at nursing ethics for an analogy. Tadd (1994:

91–93) notes there are different ideologies about nursing. On the one hand, nurses can be seen as subordinates in the hierarchical doctor-nurse relationship and accountable for fulfilling their duties in compliance with institutional policies. This ideology reflects *task responsibility*, which requires from the agent basically only avoidance of negligence and very little critical reflection and judgement (Tadd 1994: 89–90, citing Agich 1982: 65–67). On the other hand, nurses can be seen as independent agents whose duty is to provide a specialist service to patients, drawing their authority from their knowledge and competence and being accountable to patients, to society as a group, and to the profession of nursing for supporting its standards. This ideology reflects *role responsibility*, which is attached to social roles.

The client can see the translator either way: as a performer of a task which is not demanding and for which s/he is accountable only to the client, or as a professional, a provider of a complex service who is accountable not only to the client but to the society for performing a role and to the translator's profession for complying with its ethical standards.

It is easy to see a possible source of conflict in the client regarding the translator being responsible only to him/her for the simple task of translating a document, and the translator seeing himself/herself as acting in a professional role. (Role responsibility is not to be confused with role-based expectations or trust: role-based expectations may be based on the translator having either task responsibility or role responsibility.) If the parties involved have different ideas about what it is that translators do it means that they may have different expectations as to what translators are supposed to do and how they should act. It is actually a question of different definitions of the profession and, ultimately, a question of who can make those definitions. Again, good visibility of the profession would be beneficial in making discussions about translation accessible to interested parties and also in ensuring that the users of translations can have a realistic picture of translators' work.

Role responsibility seems to be more clearly connected to accountability, as understood by Agich (1982: 55, quoted by Tadd 1994: 89), than task responsibility. According to Agich, for an agent to be considered accountable, s/he must understand the required actions in particular situations, have the ability and autonomy to decide on alternative actions, and to be able to explain why s/he chose to act in a particular way. Similarly, Ilmonen (Ilmonen and Jokinen 2002: 32) notes that "the fewer alternatives the agent has to choose from the lesser his/her responsibility is. And *vice versa*: the freer from external pressures the agent is to act according to his/her will, the more responsible s/he is for his/her own choices" (my translation from Finnish). To return to translation, what if a translator who is not fully competent does not completely understand the required actions, does not see alternatives which a competent professional would see and is unable to explain the reasons for his/her choices? S/he may also be under pressure from the client to produce the translation in a very short time or to translate, say, a part of the text in a way which would suit the client's specific

needs but which would be against the translator's ethical standards. Still, it does not seem fair to say that s/he would not be accountable for his/her actions. Anyone can claim to be a translator and accept translation commissions, but to say 'I am a translator' to a potential client is practically a promise, a commissive act just as saying 'This is a translation' is (see Chesterman 2002: 28). It gives the client the right to expect what is usually expected from translators and translations in a given culture at a given time, even if the client is not aware of the translator's particular level of competence, and it creates a duty for the translator to act according to legitimate, reasonable expectations. A translator can therefore be held accountable for claiming to be a translator and everything that follows from it.

On the other hand, clients are also accountable for their actions. It is not unreasonable to expect clients, who are also businessmen and -women and make decisions to hire service providers all the time, not to trust naively just anyone who claims to be a translator, especially when there is no shortage of competent translators. Also, since it is no secret that very tight schedules, having more than one translator translate large documents and hiring outside translators who, in contrast to in-house translators, may lack subject-matter and contextual knowledge, can have negative effects on the quality of translation (Marcelli 2003: 71–74), clients can be seen to be partly morally responsible for how the translation turns out to be. They are often regarded as responsible for it in the eyes of the receiver of the text. Readers of the translation are the informal agency of accountability for clients when it comes to the quality of translations. Legally the quality of the translation is the translator's responsibility and shortage of time is no excuse for carelessness (Susiluoto 1997: 137).

#### **6.2.4 TRUST AND QUALITY**

Chesterman (1997: 152) and Nord (2001:185) point out that trust and loyalty refer to an interpersonal relationship between the translator and the other parties involved. This view emphasises the fact that translation is a service performed by people for people, that different parties have a right to have their opinion about translation taken into account, and that there can be more than one good way to translate a text. However, a translator is not only accountable *to* someone, s/he is also accountable *for* something, not just trusted but trusted to do something. This is what Harré means by context-specific boundaries of trust (see 5.3.2.1 above). It would seem then that right below the surface formed by the interpersonal relationship of accountability or loyalty is in fact an intertextual relationship between the way the ST sender's intention appears in the ST, the way in which an ST has been transformed into a functional TT, or any other textual relationship. In other words, to trust a translator is actually to trust that s/he will produce a translation which has a required textual relationship with the source text and that s/he will do it by the agreed deadline and in accordance with the other terms of the assignment.

The difficulty of distinguishing good quality from bad is an important source of uncertainty in many markets. Quality differences and uncertainty make trust a highly relevant issue also in the translation business. This is because of asymmetrical information (Akerlof 1970; see also Varian 1996: 630ff. and, for a recent application of the concept of asymmetrical information to translation, Chan 2010): the buyers of translations cannot know beforehand the quality of the translations. According to the Lemons Principle formulated by Akerlof, the sellers of products such as used cars have information of the quality of the cars which the buyers do not have. The demand for used cars depends mostly on average quality and price. Because the buyers are uncertain about the quality, they are unwilling to pay high prices for these cars. Eventually, good-quality used cars will be driven out of the market because their owners do not want to sell them at the low prices the buyers would like to buy them, but bad-quality cars ('lemons') will sell for higher prices than what would be reasonable considering their bad shape.

This principle can be applied to the translation business. Translation is a service the quality of which even the translator cannot know beforehand with absolute certainty. Even after the translation has been completed, it will take special skills, time and effort to find it out: after all, translators are human and mistakes are always possible. To deal with the possibility of errors there are computer programs that are used to check the spelling, consistency of terminology, etc., not to mention the profession of the reviser, which could be called the functional equivalent of mistrust in the same way as customs officials and prosecutors (Ilmonen and Jokinen 2002: 93 footnote). This means that the sellers of good-quality products would benefit from quality being assessable or at least quality questions being openly discussed, and from the buyers finding effective ways to evaluate the trustworthiness of the sellers when it comes to their ability to produce good-quality translations.

Abdallah (2010: 20–23) discusses the effects of asymmetric information from the translator's viewpoint and remarks that "[u]nfortunately, inadequate or substandard source materials and lack of relevant information are not uncommon in the translation industry" (p. 20) and that withholding relevant information from translators may even be intentional due to mistrust. Serious problems may also be caused by the translators having insufficient information about the desired translation quality and the fact that the level of quality is not agreed upon mutually by the parties involved. These problems may make translators frustrated and lead to poor quality, especially since the client (a translation company in Abdallah's study) may be unable to monitor quality properly. Abdallah (*ibid.*, pp. 23, 26) observes that lack of trust is widespread and sees indications that quality is deteriorating in the translation industry. As a partial solution she suggests that a classification of quality should be developed which would help the parties coordinate quality definitions and agree on the level of quality needed for each assignment. Although Abdallah explores the translation profession and the translation market from a viewpoint that is different from

mine, her conclusion appears to be similar: both clients and translators need open information about each other, the expectations regarding the assignment and the conditions required to produce good-quality translations.

### 6.3 THE COMMUNICATION NORM AND UNDERSTANDING

The communication norm is a social norm having to do with the translator's role as a mediator of the intentions of others. A translator who acts in accordance with this norm, "[optimises] communication, as required by the situation, between all the parties involved" (Chesterman 2000: 69). This is not a norm specific to translation, it is the general communication norm applied to translation (ibid.). The key words are 'situation' and 'people': this norm requires the translator to make choices which help the parties understand each other. In order to act according to this norm translators have to consider the parts or features of the source text that the intended readers of the target text might not understand sufficiently or in the right way and try to find translation solutions to prevent such undesired effects (Chesterman 2000: 185). They also need to avoid grammatical errors which may irritate the reader or make the text more difficult to understand in some other way (p. 140).

According to Chesterman (2000: 183–186), the value that governs the communication norm is understanding. Similarly, Newmark (1991: 62, 74) writes, with perhaps more of a bird's-eye view, that translation helps people and nations to communicate and understand each other and that that is also translators' main goal. Closer to a concrete task and situation, a translator's aim can be seen as either producing understanding, or, rather, as "minimising misunderstanding of the text among included readers, and [...] minimising the number of potential readers who are excluded from understanding" (Chesterman 2000: 186) by, for example, unnecessarily complex language. Explication (making something that is implicit in the source text clearer in the translation) can, according to Englund Dimitrova (2005: 58) be seen as an instance of complying with the communication norm.

In an attempt to consider ways to minimise misunderstanding I first take a brief look at how pragmatics researchers view misunderstanding, where and why it occurs, and then discuss how it could be prevented.

#### 6.3.1 DEFINITIONS OF MISUNDERSTANDING

Misunderstanding, in its standard form, occurs when the hearer reaches "understanding which is *partially or totally deviant* from what the speaker intended to communicate" (Weigand 1999: 769, original emphasis). One is not aware of misunderstanding, as opposed to difficulty in understanding or non-understanding which the interlocutor is aware of, although s/he may want to conceal it (Weigand 1999: 769–770). Misunderstandings may remain unnoticed



and uncorrected and thus result in miscommunication between the speaker and the hearer, which is defined by Weigand (1999: 771) as “communication not achieving its purpose of coming to an understanding”.

Misunderstandings vary in scope and, depending on the situation, seriousness of consequences. Blum-Kulka and Weizman (2003: 111) and Weizman (1999: 844) see misunderstanding happening on two levels, which both have three dimensions. First, the we-level is the level of all participants of a conversation. It emphasises the shared intentionality of conversation as collective action and refers to the (a) general topic, (b) purpose and (c) tone of conversation. Second, the I-level is the level of an individual participant and refers to the (a) propositional content of an utterance, (b) its illocutionary point and (c) how that point is achieved. A misunderstanding may occur at any level, dimension or in any combination. Furthermore, a misunderstanding on I-level does not necessarily mean misunderstanding on the level of the whole conversation (Blum-Kulka and Weizman, *ibid.*).

Additionally, Blum-Kulka and Weizman (2003: 110–111) distinguish between negotiated and non-negotiated misunderstandings. A non-negotiated misunderstanding is noticed or suspected by the speaker on the basis of the hearer’s response, but the speaker chooses not to direct attention at it and not to correct it. A negotiated misunderstanding, however, is noticed and pointed out or hinted at by the first speaker.

Separation of the I-level and the we-level seems to be more easily applicable to interpretation or translation of dialogues in literary translation than to non-literary translation. The closest one can get to a conversation in non-literary translation is translation of business correspondence where each letter could be seen as the I-level and the whole sequence of letters regarding, say, an order starting from the first inquiry and ending with a contract would be the we-level. It is difficult, however, to find a we-level in advertisements, instructions for use, official documents and other communication directed at the general public or public officials. There is perhaps a shared intentionality in the sense that a member of the intended audience can be expected to understand the topic and purpose of ads, instructions for use or an extract from the trade registry at a glance. But there is no gradually proceeding collective action like in an ordinary conversation. Apparently, this is the reason why with these text types, if there is no feedback from readers, misunderstandings could easily remain unnoticed and uncorrected. The consequences could vary from minor difficulties experienced by the reader to him/her forming undesired opinions about the sender of the message, the company s/he represents, the products s/he is trying to sell, etc. and to taking misguided actions.

### **6.3.2 REASONS FOR MISUNDERSTANDING**

From the point of view of prevention of misunderstanding and of translation quality it is useful to consider factors which may lead to misunderstandings. In

Malmkjær's (1993: 142–147; see also 6.1.1 above) model of translation understanding is reached when the reader interprets an utterance in the way the writer intended it to be interpreted, i.e. when the passing theories of the reader and the writer converge. Malmkjær's model consists of a writer of the original, the original reader(ship), the translator as a reader and a writer, and the reader(ship) of the translation. The model has up to twenty factors on which such convergence (which, in Malmkjær's opinion, should be considered gradable) depends, including the parties' knowledge of each other, the uses of the original and the translated utterances, co-text and context. In order for understanding to be reached in translation, there can be as many as five passing theories which have to converge in different stages of the process of having something translated. There is, first, the passing theory which the writer of the original wants the reader(ship) to use for the utterance; second, the theory which the reader of the original actually uses to interpret the utterance; third, the theory that the translator uses as a translator/reader of the utterance; fourth, the theory the translator/writer wants the reader of the translation to use for the interpretation of the translated utterance, and, finally, the theory which the reader of the translation actually uses. In practice, texts may be written in the source language only to be translated, i.e., for no particular source-language audience in mind. The writer might then think of the theory which s/he wants either the translator or the translation reader (or possibly both) to use for interpretation. Even in cases with only four passing theories, this model suggests that deficient knowledge and mistaken assumptions about the parties involved, the use of the utterances and other factors, could make it more difficult for passing theories to coincide and understanding to be reached.

Misconceptions and false beliefs are factors also in Bazzanella and Damiano's (1999: 818, 820–821) account of misunderstanding. The authors call factors which could lead to misunderstanding "triggers", wishing to stress that they do not necessarily cause misunderstanding. They can also just make understanding more difficult but not lead to an actual misunderstanding. The following list by Bazzanella and Damiano (1999: 821) shows that the setting in which communication in general takes place and the individual characteristics of the persons involved influence the process of coming to an understanding:

**Triggers of misunderstanding:**

a) Structural triggers

- (1) Disturbances along the communicative channel
- (2) Similarities between elements of the linguistic code
- (3) Troubles caused by the use of a foreign language
- (4) Structural ambiguities (e.g. lexical or syntactic [ambiguities])

b) Triggers related to the speaker

- (1) 'Local' factors, such as speaker's slips of the tongue, misconceptions, use of ambiguous forms
- (2) 'Global' factors concerning the structuring of information both on the pragmatic and on the syntactic levels [...]

c) Triggers related to the interlocutor

- (1) Knowledge problems, such as false beliefs, lexical incompetence, gaps in encyclopaedic knowledge
- (2) Cognitive processes, such as wrong inferences, and the cognitive load and its effects on the interlocutor's production

d) Triggers related to the interaction between the participants

- (1) Non-shared knowledge
- (2) Topic organisation
- (3) Focusing problems

Since this list is not specifically about translation, a couple of things could be added to make it better suited to the purposes of the present study. Structural triggers could include the author/speaker and the reader/interlocutor being separated in time and space, being members of different cultures and language communities, and communication being dependent on a third party. These new triggers are proposed here because they would seem to complicate the participants' task of finding the right passing theories, or expected and actually used ways of interpreting a text, and slow down correction of misunderstandings. Also, the translator could be placed between (b) and (c) as an interlocutor/reader/mediator and a speaker/writer/mediator, representing a new source of misunderstanding with a set of triggers similar to the ones in (b) and (c), with the addition of possible areas of professional incompetence or inexperience. The fact that the translator may be a complete outsider to the interaction could add to "non-shared knowledge" in point (d), which, in turn, might include the translator as a participant, together with those involved in the translation process from the client's as well as from the translation service provider's side (such as revisers; see Brunette et al. [2005] who question the usefulness of monolingual revision, and Künzli [2005:35] whose study indicates that about 10% of all changes made by revisers, with great variation between different revisers, were errors introduced to the draft translation).

### **6.3.3 UNDERSTANDING AND QUALITY, OR WAYS TO PREVENT MISUNDERSTANDING**

What could be done to prevent all these factors and difficulties from triggering a misunderstanding? Misunderstanding is, after all, something one is not aware of as a reader and something one as a writer is normally not aware of enabling (al-

though a text can be designed to allow for multiple interpretations or to be unclear). Dascal (1985: 453–454) suggests preventing misunderstandings, or managing them in a conversation, by scanning possible misunderstanding that could happen because of unfortunate choice of words (not *any* misunderstanding but *likely* misunderstanding in the given context), monitoring for signs of misunderstanding which the hearer shows and, finally, correcting them. This view places the responsibility for managing misunderstandings on the speaker or, in our case, the writer of the original and the translator. Scanning likely misunderstandings is definitely something that a translator, who is complying with the communication norm, should do both as a reader of the source text and as the writer of the target text. Still, with the writer and the reader separated in time and place and by a language barrier, managing misunderstandings can be a challenge. Misunderstandings can be detected by the author of the message after s/he has received the reader's response, or the reader may suspect that s/he has misunderstood something, and then turn to the writer for clarification, but either way the repair process takes much more time than in normal face-to-face talk. It seems more effective, then, to use time to prevent misunderstanding from occurring at all. In this sense, time appears as an advantage that written communication has over conversation: there is usually more time to think about what one wants to say and how one wants to say it in written communication than in conversation. This can be exploited to the full by the client allowing, and the translator reserving, a reasonable amount of time for the translation. In fact, if it was found that most translators experience deadlines as too tight, shortness of time could be called a structural trigger of misunderstanding – and adequate time a structural trigger of understanding.

Furthermore, one can aim to minimise misunderstanding by weakening the triggers of misunderstanding. From the point of view of the present study, the client can reduce the triggers related to himself/herself by producing clear source texts whenever s/he is the sender of a message to be translated. As the one who chooses many of the people who participate in the process of having a text translated, including the translator, the client can influence the triggers which the translator brings into the process by making sure that s/he fulfils certain professional requirements. To the extent that the hiring criteria for all translators are similar across the market, these criteria could be called structural triggers of (mis)understanding. Additionally, the triggers related to the translator and to the interaction between the participants can be made weaker by the client providing the translator with lists of terms and other material, and being available to answer questions, in other words, by helping the translator understand the source text and by lessening the amount of non-shared knowledge.

Since we do not live in a perfect world it must be acknowledged that avoiding misunderstanding and helping parties reach mutual understanding through communication is not always the goal. According to Baker (2006: 105) translators may knowingly aim at a particular interpretation of the source text in pursuing the interests of one party of a conflict.

To conclude, a translator can be seen as a mediator whose responsibility is limited to not adding to the threats to successful communication. Chesterman's (2000) communication norm, however, views translators as taking a more active role by finding out what parts of the original are difficult to understand and why, where possible sources of misunderstanding are and figuring out ways to avoid them. Furthermore, even if the communication norm is a professional norm for translators, there are ways in which a client can help a translator to comply with it, and things that clients can do, as a group which forms the demand side of the translation market, to contribute to smooth communication through translation.

#### **6.3.4 EVALUATION OF THE DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMMUNICATION NORM**

The model of assessment which concentrates on evaluating compliance with the communicative norm is, according to Chesterman (2000: 128), prospective assessment (see section 3.1 above). In prospective assessment one examines a translation in order to consider its ability to produce a desired effect on its readers.

Prospective assessment is influenced strongly by each evaluator's subjective tastes and abilities (Chesterman 2000: 128, 133). As to assessing how serious a misunderstanding detected in the translation is, an objective evaluation might include, first, measuring the size of the unit of a text which is misunderstood and other part(s) of the text whose interpretation suffers from that misunderstanding, and, second, the consequences of the misunderstanding measured as action taken and attitudes formed as compared to actions and attitudes which would have taken place, had there not been a misunderstanding. Needless to say, such estimation would be very difficult, if not impossible, and probably pointless.

The client is, naturally, dependent on his/her language skills, but supposing that s/he knows the target language well, s/he can judge the translation's readability and intelligibility. S/he could also use the dimensions in Blum-Kulka and Weizman's (2003) model (topic, purpose and tone of the we-level, and 'what', 'why' and 'how' of the I-level, to put it very roughly) as a sort of check-list. Even if there does not appear to be a we-level in some forms of business communication, we-level concepts such as purpose (intended function) and tone seem useful in evaluating the effect which the translation is designed to have and in checking for possibility of misunderstanding. They cannot really be considered without looking ahead at the intended reader of the translation and are therefore not so much about the relation between a source text and its translation but communication in general, as is Chesterman's communication norm. This allows the translator and the evaluator to see the possibility of, for instance, expressing a request to do something (the illocutionary point) not by means of the imperative mood used in the source text (a mode of achievement of that point),

but, say, through more subtle and indirect ways in accordance with the conventions of the target culture in order to ensure that the translation is interpreted correctly and appropriately acted upon. The dimension of the propositional content could serve as a reminder to also look back at the source text to assess how well the translation enables its readers to understand the original's informational content.

## 7 BREAKING THE NORMS: TRANSLATION ERROR

Acting against people's expectations can lead in two directions: one can either not fulfil them or one can exceed them. If expectations regarding a translation are exceeded, the translation is seen as exceptionally good, different from other translations but in a way that is pleasing. The translator has then moved successfully in the area covered by what one *may* do in translation. Therefore it does not seem suitable to refer to exceeding expectations as norm-breaking. In the following, norm-breaking refers only to unfulfilled expectations about translations, i.e. to translation errors.

The Oxford English Dictionary (2010, online) explains the meaning of the word *error* as "something incorrectly done through ignorance or inadvertence; a mistake, e.g. in calculation, judgement, speech, writing, action, etc." The word *incorrect* is defined as "not in accordance with fact; erroneous, inaccurate" or "not in conformity with a recognized standard; improper, faulty". These definitions suggest that, first, the reasons for errors are lack of knowledge or attention, and, second, that regarding something as erroneous involves comparing an action to what is considered to be proper, and in accordance with reality and agreed criteria. An error might therefore be considered as something which goes against the expectations that people have of action in a given situation, i.e. unwanted deviations from norms (Chesterman 2000: 138). Since norms exist to promote values, a translation error can also be seen not only as failure to promote them but also as an act against the ethical principles of translation. If a translation contains an error, then, there is something in the target text which *should not* be there or something is missing from the target text which *should* be there.

Deciding whether something is proper or adheres to a standard may depend on subjective and situation-specific considerations. This makes it difficult to give a precise definition of a translation error. Besides errors that originate in the analysis of the source text and production of the target text, translation errors can be taken to include all other mistakes translators make (typos, punctuation errors etc.) and leave in the target text (non-correction of, e.g., logical errors made by other people). In the following, I will first look at some classifications of translation errors and then discuss their causes and effects.

### 7.1 CLASSIFICATIONS OF TRANSLATION ERRORS

House's (1997: 45–46) model is applied to a TT with a function equivalent to that of the ST and achieved by equivalent pragmatic means. There are two kinds of errors. *Overtly erroneous errors* are, first, mismatches between the denota-

tive meanings of ST and TT elements, namely, omissions, additions, and substitutions which consist of “wrong selections or wrong combinations of elements” (House 1997: 45). The second group of overtly erroneous errors are breaches of the target language system, such as grammatical errors and odd use of language. *Covertly erroneous errors* are mismatches between the situational dimensions of the ST and the TT in cases where the cultural distance between the respective communities and the differences between the SL and the TL are not too big, and where no secondary function has been added to the TT (i.e. it is a translation and not a version).

The terms used by Vehmas-Lehto (1989, 2005) are close to those of House’s but the error types are defined differently. Vehmas-Lehto (2005: 53) defines as errors any changes of the informational content as well as instances where any other important aspect of the meaning of the source text (such as feelings or artistic value) is prevented from being conveyed to the target text reader. Vehmas-Lehto (1989: 27–31; 2005: 64–65) divides translation errors into overt and covert ones. *Overt errors* are, first, deviations from the semantic content of the source text caused by misinterpretation or, second, violations of the target language system or grammatical norms originating in the production of the target text. Overt errors of the first kind distort the message whereas overt errors of the second kind irritate and distract the reader. *Covert errors* refer to violations of the target language stylistic norms and conventions (or *usus*), and recommendable norms, which cover well-written texts. They are mostly quantitative, having to do with non-typical frequencies of linguistic phenomena, e.g. sentence length. These errors are not easy to pinpoint but still they make the translation seem somehow wrong, difficult to understand, and less readable. Qualitative errors are due to differences in textual conventions between the languages involved, such as collocation (which is qualitative according to Vehmas-Lehto [1999: 107], quantitative according to Chesterman [2000: 84]), punctuation, or choice of grammatical form (Vehmas-Lehto, *ibid.*).

Similarly, Pym (1992: 282–284) classifies errors found in translations into binary and non-binary errors for teaching purposes. In a *binary error* a wrong answer is selected instead of the right one. In contrast, in a *non-binary error*, “the target text actually selected [is] opposed to at least one further target text<sub>2</sub> which could also have been selected, and then to possible wrong answers” (*ibid.*, p. 282). All truly translational errors are non-binary. They are subject to the form “It’s correct but...” (*ibid.*, p. 284) or “No, it’s wrong but...” (Pym 2004b: 14), because from one point of view they are correct (or incorrect) but from another they may not be good (or bad) solutions.

In Pym (2004b) translational errors are discussed from the point of view of their consequences. A *high-risk mistake* is one which has a high probability of leading to the success conditions of the communication act not being obtained (*ibid.*, pp. 11–12). Success conditions are “failure-avoidance conditions”. If they are fulfilled, the communication act is regarded as beneficial to all parties, or at least the benefits are considered greater than the material (time, money) or



other kinds of transaction costs, or efforts, put into the given act. (ibid., p. 4) In solving a *low-risk translation problem* the translator is relatively free to choose from more than one target option. Target options for high-risk messages, however, are limited by the success conditions of the communication act (ibid., p. 14). The distinction between high-risk mistakes and low-risk translation problems offers a very different way of looking at errors compared with the classification of errors into translational (non-binary) and not truly translational (binary) errors. A binary error might very well be a high-risk mistake. One might also ask, why would an instance of a translator choosing, for instance, a clearly incorrect TL term not be a translational error.

From the practical point of view of a reviser, Mossop (2001) presents four groups of errors that a reviser looks for in a (draft) translation. The first group concerns *problems of accuracy and completeness* of transfer of the source text message. A translation may be too accurate or not accurate enough, depending on the needs of the reader. The most important requirement is that there are no major mistranslations. Inaccuracy is usually caused by incorrect understanding of the source text but it can also arise in the production of the target text. Problems of incompleteness refer to the No Additions No Subtractions principle which translators are expected to follow in rendering the message of the source text, unless they are explicitly requested to act otherwise. The principle applies to relevant meaning and leaves room for case-specific considerations. For instance, reproduction of the source text's repetitiveness or other undesired feature is not necessary, and for some texts, adding cultural or technical explanations may be required (Mossop 2001: 99–103).

The second group refers to *problems in logic and facts*. The translation may lack logic because "the source text itself is illogical, and the translator has not done anything about it" (Mossop 2001: 104) or because the translator has introduced nonsense where there was none before. Factual errors are usually present in the source text but they can also be introduced by the translator. The reasons for the errors of this type can be blind copying of the source text, lack of source language knowledge, or the translator being rushed or tired. As a result, they make the reader question the competence of either the source-text author or the translator (p. 106).

The third group of problems concerns *language and style*. The translation should be easy to read, its language should be suited to its users and its style to the genre. The terminology, as well as grammar, should be correct, and the word combinations idiomatic. The fourth group has to do with *problems of physical presentation* (layout, typography, organisation of the document as a whole) (Mossop 2001: 99).

Also Brunette et al. (2005) concentrate on the way revisers look for errors in translations. Errors occur in respect to the following four criteria: (1) *linguistic coding* (non-compliance of the TT with the rules and conventions of the TL), (2) *accuracy*, i.e. complete transmission of the original message, and compliance with the translation brief (nonsense, false sense, mistranslation, omission), (3)

*appropriateness* (ignoring the audience, the medium and the purpose of the text), and (4) *readability* (passages that are difficult to understand, ambiguities). Attention is paid to the fact that revisers, especially monolingual ones, can not only correct (some of) the mistakes made by translators but also introduce a large number of errors into the TT themselves.

The functionalist view represented by Nord (2005) has no preset definition of a translation error. A translation error is defined broadly as “a failure to carry out any of the translating instructions”. From the translator’s point of view, it is “a deviation from the selected (or rather, prescribed model) of action”, whereas the recipient sees it as “a frustration of expectations” (Nord 2005: 187). Whether or not an element of a translation is considered an error depends, therefore, on the translation skopos, or the function which the translation is intended to fulfil, which is fixed by the initiator (Nord 2005: 10, 187). This approach highlights the suitability of the translator’s choices for the intended purpose of the target text, placing emphasis on equivalence of any kind or other relation between the ST and the TT only if it is required by the translating instructions. An element of the target text defined as an error in one translation may not be an error at all in another. Errors are linked to the factors of Nord’s analytical model according to which the translator should analyse the extratextual and intratextual factors of the ST in detail to decide, which elements of it, if any, are to be adapted in order to produce a TT which is suitable for its intended function and in accordance with the translation assignment. In that sense, a translation error could be seen as the result of the translator’s insufficient language skills, inability to find out and understand the intended function of the TT and the target situation, or failure to analyse the ST and adapt it where necessary. Nord’s model emphasises the way in which a translator should work and thus the source of errors.

These accounts of translation errors represent the viewpoints of a translation scholar, teacher and reviser who are experts in their field, who know the languages involved and can therefore compare the TT with the ST. In the following, I consider how clients, who are usually laymen in translation, see translation errors.

## **7.2 CLIENTS AND ERRORS**

Since clients evaluate translations on the basis of expectancy norms (see section 5.3.1), a translation error can be defined as any disappointment of their expectations concerning a TT. Defining something as an error is therefore situation specific. Furthermore, the client’s definition of an error may not coincide with that of the translator. What the client sees as an error may not be one in the translator’s opinion. Conversely, the client may think an element of the TT is not wrong even if the translator would correct it if s/he had the chance.

A client’s ability to detect a translation error naturally depends very much on his/her knowledge of the foreign language in question or L2 which is usually

Russian in the present study. Let us first assume that the client doesn't know Russian well enough to compare the Russian TT with the Finnish ST. In that case all s/he can do is to trust the translator s/he has chosen.

If the translation is from L2 (Russian) to L1 (Finnish), most clients of this study have a possibility to assess the TT laterally by comparing it with the image they have of other texts of the same type they have read before in Finnish to decide whether the Finnish TT conforms to their expectancy norms. They can also pay attention to grammatical errors, ambiguous passages, typos, logical and factual errors, to what appears to be the overall translation strategy (too free/too literal), readability, etc. Some semantic errors that are overt or binary to a scholar/teacher remain covert – imperceptible, to use Hickey's (2003) expression – to the client. A difficult-to-read, or covertly erroneous, TT can be overtly awkward in the client's eyes. Moreover, clients can assess the TT prospectively in terms of its ability to cause a desired effect in the target audience and notice errors in that respect.

The same assessment methods are available to clients who know Russian. They can additionally analyse the TT retrospectively to see what choices the translator has made and, for instance, to check for accuracy, completeness, and terminological correctness. In fact, a client who understands both SL and TL can look for the same problems in the TT as a reviser in Mossop (2001) and Brunette et al. (2005), see above.

Error gravity depends on the situation. A serious, or high-risk, error, which is one that makes the TT unfit for its intended use, can be as small as a typo in a crucial place. It is also possible that the TT contains errors but can still be used as planned. To save time and money, a client ordering a translation of a business letter written in a foreign language may well tolerate e.g. covert translation errors so long as they do not cause any misunderstandings. The same client might not accept them in a translation of his/her own letter into a foreign language. This suggests that there is a set of norms that any translation should in principle adhere to, but on some conditions it is acceptable to break these norms if there are no serious consequences of the breaking or if the benefits of the breaking (saving time, money, effort) outweigh the costs (less than ideal readability or style, not conveying the whole content of the ST, etc.).

### **7.3 CAUSES OF TRANSLATION ERRORS**

Translations are evaluated on the basis of the expectancy norms (see section 5.3.1). They concern translations in general and the specific translation at hand in particular. When an error is detected or suspected in a translation, the translator has broken the expectancy norms or the professional norms and the result of that breaking is somehow evident in the translation. There can be many reasons for errors. According to Vehmas-Lehto (2005: 56–57), insufficient source language skills may result in errors caused by misunderstanding and deficient

target language skills can cause problems in formulating the target-language message. Apart from language skills, translators need what Vehmas-Lehto (ibid.) calls contrastive competence to produce good-quality translations. Contrastive competence is divided into two sub-competencies. Lacking *cultural contrastive competence* prevents the translator from noticing the differences in the source and target cultures which would need to be addressed in order to produce an understandable translation. For instance, something which is implicit in the source text might have to be made explicit to ensure understanding. Problems with *linguistic contrastive competence*, i.e. "the ability to detect in which cases the languages use different linguistic means to express the same content" (Vehmas-Lehto 2005: 56, my translation from Finnish), result in interference.

Many errors may be due to the translator not being thorough enough (thereby breaking the accountability norm), carelessness and disturbing external factors (as in any other profession): the translator may be tired, rushed, upset about something, his/her computer may be acting up, or dictionaries outdated. Or perhaps s/he does not know enough about the subject matter of the ST and receives no help from the client. Accepting a commission which is beyond the translator's competence can be seen as breaking the accountability norm and making the client take a bigger risk in hiring the translator than s/he is aware of.

It is safe to assume that most translation errors are indeed accidental and unintentional. There is, however, such a thing as intentional error. According to Bartsch (1987: 70), incorrect use of linguistic means in general can be looked at from semantic and pragmatic points of view, taking into account what the language user's intentions are and how s/he judges the situation. Unintended semantic or pragmatic incorrectness is usually caused by insufficient understanding of the situation spoken in and the situation spoken about, which leads to wrong information in communication and to misunderstandings. Differences between the communicational partners' semantic and pragmatic notions of correctness can also result in misunderstandings. Hidden (intentional) semantic incorrectness results in lies, whereas hidden pragmatic incorrectness means that the speaker's use of language is dishonest.

Functionally justified deviations from the content of the ST are usually not considered errors. Intentional errors go beyond that: the translator knows that s/he is making a translation decision which at least in some respect is not justified. Such situations could be called instances of manipulation or censorship. Censorship refers to situations where the meaning of the source text has been altered, something has been added to the target text for which there is no counterpart in the source text, or some part(s) of the source text have been omitted, and where the reason for doing so is to do the correct thing from political, social, religious, or moral motivations which are considered more valuable than conveying the content of the ST truthfully (see e.g. Malmkjær 2004). The reason is to prevent a message from being sent in order to somehow protect the assumed interests of the sender, the receiver or the subject matter of the message (e.g.

government policy). In other words, the source text is considered to be pragmatically inappropriate or damaging, and by censorship it is made pragmatically appropriate even if the result is a semantic translation error. The person(s) who decide whether or not to make these alterations can be the translator, the editor (publisher), and/or the client.

In non-literary translation, omissions, additions, substitutions, etc. can be expected to be mostly functionally or commercially motivated (if they are not errors) and not censorship as it is the sender/author or the receiver of the message himself/herself who decides what does not need to be translated. Nevertheless, an interesting and well-known example of censorship comes to mind from the field of interpreting. On 11 November, 2002 at a press-conference in Brussels Russian President Vladimir Putin was asked about the use of heavy weapons against Chechen civilians by the Russian troops. He replied as follows:

Если вы хотите совсем уж стать исламским радикалом или готовы пойти на то, чтобы сделать себе обрезание, то я вас приглашаю в Москву. У нас многоконфессиональная страна, у нас есть специалисты и по этому вопросу. И я порекомендую ему сделать эту операцию таким образом, чтобы у вас уже больше ничего не выросло. (Federal Post Info 2002)

(My) English translation: If you want to become an Islamic radical and are prepared to undergo circumcision, I invite you to Moscow. We are a multi-denominational country, we have specialists even for that. And I will recommend that they do the operation in such a way that you will never have anything growing there again.

President Putin's interpreter, however, translated as follows:

If you want to become an Islamic radical and if you'd like to get your circumcision, please come to Moscow. We are a multiconfessional, multi-ethnic nation. Please come. You are welcome and everything and everyone is tolerated in Moscow. (Sciolino 2002)

Here, the interpreter served his client by saving him from having to face the reactions of the international press right there and then. As President Putin had used strong language before, it is possible that the interpreter had received instructions to soften his client's statements when necessary. If the translation was in accordance with the client's instructions, he was probably pleased with it. Even if the client's expectancy norms were, it seems, satisfied, could it be said that therefore this was a good translation? Assigning the status of a translation error to a feature of the target text depending only on the translation's compliance with the initiator's instructions and expectations is problematic. In this case the interpreter (and the client) considered loyalty to the client the most important value, placing it above the listeners' justified expectations concerning a truthful interpretation. The moral principle of loyalty, which means that the translator "is responsible to both the ST sender (or the initiator if s/he is also the sender) and the TT receiver" (Nord 2005: 32), directs attention to the sender's

right to communicate his/her message and also to the receiver's right to receive the intended message. Loyalty refers to the obligation of being trustworthy (Sztompka 1999: 5). The above is an extreme example of breaking the accountability norm where the trust the listeners had in the interpretation was betrayed and, perhaps, as a result, the trust that people (those who were present at the press-conference and knew Russian, saw the story about what happened on TV or read about it in the newspaper) have in translators in general was lessened a little. It can also be regarded as an instance of breaking the communication norm because it prevented people from understanding what was actually said and therefore caused the act of communication to continue on false premises. Afterwards an uncensored translation was made available.

The difference between the interpretation example and a translator correcting an obvious pragmatic error in the ST may not appear that big. After all, in translation as opposed to interpretation the author can correct his/her language or statement before even commissioning a translation. But interpretation is a form of oral communication. The point of a press-conference is to have a chance to communicate spontaneously, to have a discussion with a person, to see a person eye to eye, to get a glimpse of his/her personality. If a mediator is assigned to censor what is said, people might as well exchange written questions and answers.

It has been suggested that calques may be used to convey an intentionally false image of the referent. English phrases like *science park* or *business park* have often been translated into Finnish by loan translations (*tiedepuisto* and *yrittäjäpuisto*, respectively). The Finnish word *puisto* does not refer to "an area of land [...] devoted to a particular activity", which is one of the meanings of the English word *park* (as in, e.g. *industrial park* or *technology park*) (Oxford English Dictionary Online 2010). *Puisto* refers only to a nature reserve or an area with trees, and often with flowers, where people go to relax and enjoy themselves. According to Kolehmainen (2005), in a small Finnish town called Virrat, a plan to establish a recycling park advanced nicely until people realised that *kierrätyspuisto*, a loan translation of *recycling park*, had nothing in common with *puisto* and instead, is used to gather, process, and recycle waste. Kolehmainen (ibid.) suggests that the positive connotation of *puisto* may have been used to go ahead with a plan which was bound to raise people's objections. If that were true, it would be a case of an intentional translation error, motivated by a desire to manipulate people into doing something against their will. Based on this example, manipulation in non-literary translation could be defined as allowing misunderstanding to happen (i.e. breaking the communication norm) by exploiting subtle differences in denotative or connotative meanings in order to steer the reader toward interpreting the text in a way which is in the interest of the client/translator but not necessarily in the reader's interest. It could also be defined as framing by labelling, i.e. picking a lexical item, term or phrase to refer to an object in order to "provide an interpretive frame that guides and constrains our response to the narrative in question" (Baker 2006: 122). In such

cases intention, if there is any, would be difficult to prove. In the above case it is quite possible that the parties involved do not regard *kierrätyspuisto* as an error and did not choose it in order to manipulate the public.

## 7.4 CONSEQUENCES OF TRANSLATION ERRORS

Translation errors may be defined and categorised in different ways, but they can all have undesired consequences. Following Pym's (2004b) notion of high- and low-risk mistakes, an error is a realisation of the risk which is connected to translating. A translation in which these risks have been realised puts obstacles of different sizes in the way of meeting the success conditions of communication.

This thinking is also visible in Marcelli (2003: 79–81), who represents a language consultant's point of view and points out that "in technical translations, errors count only insofar as they affect either the product's performance or the product's sales". According to her, the seriousness of errors found in technical translations is evaluated on the basis of three extralinguistic variables. First, the more technically knowledgeable the users of the translation are, the more easily they can cope with ambiguities and mistakes. An error in a technical document used by members of the general public could have unwanted consequences such as injuries and decreased sales of the product, and would therefore be regarded as more serious. Second, the gravity of an error depends on the text type. The more extensively accessed the translated document is the more important it is that there are no mistakes in it. Third, errors in highly visible sections of the target text are more serious than those found in less prominent parts of the text. Further, Marcelli notes that only legal texts are such that any error would be considered very serious because of the risk of litigation.

Curiously, there may be cases where breaking norms may do the reader of the translation the favour of making him/her aware that what s/he is reading is actually someone else's interpretation of the original author's text. When one knows one is dealing with a translation, breaches of cultural norms can protect the reader from misunderstanding (and the sender of the message from being misunderstood) since pragmatic mistakes are assumed to be made by the translator (Weizman and Blum-Kulka 1987: 72). These mistakes would then be covert, non-binary, and low-risk. Another service that errors might do in some cases is that when one detects an error, one is reminded of the existence of a norm, one may start thinking about the norm's justification and perhaps looking for new ways to comply with the norm or serve the value behind it.

To conclude, a target text which contains errors can give a (sometimes knowingly) false impression of the text, its writer or sender and even of the source culture to the readers of the target text, or they can lead to target readers making decisions based on wrong information. Erroneous texts can harm the sender's reputation and cause additional costs to the client, the readers and to the trans-

lator. They may lack important information present in the source text. They can be difficult to understand or unable to produce the wanted effect on the reader. Errors can also harm the translator's reputation by eroding the trust that clients have in him/her and, consequently, in the translation profession in general.



## 8 METHODS AND RESEARCH MATERIAL

Based on the literature on the marketing of services as reviewed in chapter 2 and on the expectancy norm, it is assumed in this study that:

- Clients have expectations regarding acceptable translations and they evaluate the quality of translations by assessing the degree to which these expectations have been fulfilled.
- Clients have expectations regarding the acceptable behaviour of translators which are reflected in their decisions to hire translators and connected to their expectations regarding translations.
- Clients play a role in the translation event.

I also assume that clients are rational and use the resources (knowledge, skills, time, etc.) that they have to act in the way they deem best in a given situation.

Since my goal was to explore and describe clients' norms for translation and translators and their role in the translation event, I did not consider it necessary to formulate my research questions as hypotheses. Hypotheses are typical in explanatory and predictive research and, in addition, they are often based on prior research which is scarce in my topic (Hirsjärvi et al. 1997: 148).

Expectations regarding the desirable characteristics of translations or translators can also be thought of as norms that clients think should govern translation. To search for evidence of the existence of a norm which would govern an observed regularity in behaviour, one can, according to Chesterman (2006: 17–18) study belief statements (how people say they should act), explicit criticism against non-conforming behaviour, and norm statements, which are official statements by a norm authority about how people should act. Toury (1995: 65) suggests that norms be researched by studying both textual sources, i.e. translations themselves, as well as extratextual sources such as statements of people who are connected with translation, although such statements should not be taken at face value. To follow these advice, and to answer the questions asked in the introductory chapter, I conducted a survey in 2006 among the member companies of the Finnish-Russian Chamber of Commerce (the FRCC). A survey was chosen as it provides a structured manner of describing, comparing and explaining a phenomenon (Hirsjärvi et al. 1997: 122), and because it suited the goals of this study which were to explore and describe an object which had not been researched before. In addition, a survey may be conducted at a reasonable cost, and it can be conveniently repeated at a later time or with a comparable target population to investigate changes of expectations or to compare them. In order to see whether the respondents' answers to the questions in the questionnaire matched with their actions and whether their opinions and wishes regard-

ing quality expressed in the responses are reflected in actual translations, the respondents were asked to provide an example of a translation which they thought was either good or poor. These translations would also be regarded as critical incidents.

## **8.1 THE TARGET POPULATION AND THE RESPONDENTS**

The member companies of the FRCC were chosen as the target population because they could be expected to have ordered translations between Finnish and Russian and thus form a suitable target population for this survey. Another important reason for choosing these companies was that a register containing their contact information was available for purchase and especially that I could find no other database or register from which a sample suitable for my purposes could have been picked randomly.

The survey questionnaire was mailed in May 2006 to 533 companies, i.e. all companies listed in the membership records of the FRCC at that time and active in Finland. Translation agencies listed as members of the FRCC were left out in order to focus on the clients of translators and translation agencies. The target population that emerged this way was sent a letter requesting them to answer questions regarding the quality of non-literary Russian-to-Finnish or Finnish-to-Russian translation. The companies were reminded that the survey was not about interpretation or literary translation. They were asked to fill in the questionnaire and mail it back with an example of a translation, either from Finnish into Russian or the other way around, which they considered good or bad and to explain why that was. They were also requested to mail back an empty questionnaire in case their company did not have a need for translations between Finnish and Russian. The companies that did not respond to the letter were sent e-mails, with the questionnaire attached, reminding them of the survey and allowing the respondents to answer either by mail or by e-mail, in June 2006 and again in September/October 2006. As a result, of the 533 companies, 104 returned an appropriately filled in questionnaire. Another 92 sent back an empty questionnaire, making the total response rate 36.8%. Apart from the reasons that affect generally low response rates of any survey, the relatively low response rate of the present survey may be due to it being sent out in the summer season. As in any survey, the respondents of this survey may be expected to be somewhat biased toward the persons who are interested in translation and have sometimes thought about translation quality at the expense of those who are not interested in the subject matter of the study and do not regard it important.

Since the target companies of the survey were not chosen randomly they form a convenience sample (Tashakkori and Teddlie 1998: 76) which may not adequately represent the whole target population (companies that use translations in the language pair Finnish–Russian). On the one hand, the generalisability of the results of this study is thus limited. On the other hand, the representa-

tiveness of a sample is highly dependent on how well it reflects the target population. To evaluate this, the respondent structure of this survey may be compared as to company size and exporter/importer status with the findings of a study by Simola and Ollus (2008: 6) which used the VIRKE database for official use compiled by the Finnish Customs and the Finnish Tax Administration. According to that study, in 2006 a total of 4,020 Finnish companies exported their goods to Russia and 1,393 companies were importers of Russian goods. Roughly 84% of Finnish companies that exported to Russia and about 74% of the companies that imported from Russia were small or mid-sized<sup>7</sup>. Approximately 62% of the respondents of the present study are involved in trade with Russia, and of those companies the share of small and mid-sized companies (based only on the number of employees being less than 250) is 64%. About 45% (47) of the firms that trade with Russia are exporters, 5% are importers and 12% are both exporters and importers. The rest are companies that offer services related to trade with Russia such as legal services. The structure of the respondent companies is therefore somewhat biased toward large companies (i.e. companies that have 250 or more employees) but corresponds roughly to the proportions that existed some time after the present survey. The number of importers (17) compared to the number of exporters (59) is in this study somewhat smaller than in Simola and Ollus's (2008) report (1,393 and 4,020, respectively).

In general, there appear to be no characteristics which would make the present group of respondents or the member companies of the FRCC stand out as so different from other companies as to seriously reduce the generalisability of the results of this study to other Finnish companies in need of translations between Finnish and Russian.

The approach of this study is more quantitative than qualitative. The scale of measurement is mostly nominal, which limits the set of available scientific tests. The analysis was mostly done on the basis of contingency tables and comparisons of the replies of different respondent groups with focus on the differences and similarities found to be the clearest. The respondents were grouped, for instance, according to the size of the company they represented, the type of activity they were involved in (e.g. export and import or other), the types of texts they most often have had translated and their role in the translation process, i.e. whether they are the ones who decide which translation service provider to use ('the choosers'), the ones who check translations ('the checkers') or the ones who place orders to translation service providers ('the orderers'). The groupings were done in order to find out whether the respondents' attitudes were dependent on, for instance, the text-types they most commonly have translated.

---

<sup>7</sup> Small and mid-sized companies are companies that have less than 250 employees and a turnover of less than 50 million euros or, if these figures are unavailable, companies whose exports amount to less than 50 million euros (Simola and Ollus 2006: 16).

## 8.2 THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE SAMPLE TRANSLATIONS

The questionnaire (see Appendix 1 for a translation from Finnish) was drafted with the aim that it be as clear and understandable as possible for laypersons. Terms such as 'register' and 'function' were therefore avoided. The questionnaire was tested by sending it to the directors of two small companies known to me personally (not included in the survey) as well as presented to the MonAKO<sup>8</sup> research seminar group for comments.

In the formulation of the questionnaire, the goal was to get a picture of the criteria the respondents have used to select a translation service provider, whether they check the translations they order, how they interact with the TSP during the translation process, and what responsibilities they have regarding translation quality. These questions were complemented by questions about what they thought would be the best way to check translations, how they rated the severity of different kinds of assumed deficiencies that translations could have, what qualities as well as service characteristics they required from their TSP. They were also asked to agree or disagree with a number of normative statements regarding literalness, functionality, interference, understandability, additions and omissions, and fluency of text using modal verbs 'may', 'must' and other expressions to the same affect. Attention was paid to features of translations which were thought to be recognisable by the respondents. An attempt was made to ask about the same concept in different ways to make sure that the results would be reliable. The respondents were also encouraged to comment freely on any question on the margins of the questionnaire or a separate piece of paper.

The first seven questions of the questionnaire concern the respondents' backgrounds, for instance, as to the size and nature of their business, the role they have in relation to translations, what kind of TSPs they use and what kinds of texts they have translated. Other questions relate to the different themes of this study according to the following summary:

---

<sup>8</sup> The multilingual communication programme of the Department of General Linguistics at the University of Helsinki

**Table 3:** *Relation between the questionnaire and the topics of this study*

Theme	Question no.
Quality of translation service	20
Expectations for translators and TSP selection	8, 13, 18, 19, 20
Expectations for translations (the expectancy and relation norms)	11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23
The accountability norm and trust	9, 10, 14, 18
Client's role and client expertise	9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22
The communication norm and understanding	12, 13, 18
Translation quality assessment	9, 10, 11, 17

Some questions are related to more than one theme, and some themes have been divided into subthemes in the table for the sake of giving a detailed picture.

The questions asked are mostly multiple-choice questions. Some open-ended questions are asked at the end of the questionnaire to give the respondents a chance to express their thoughts in their own words. The reason for placing the open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire was that the respondents would have time to get focused and organise their thoughts on the topic while answering the multiple-choice questions, after which their answers to the open-ended questions would reflect their thinking as clearly as possible.

Twenty-four examples of translations (mostly those considered good by the respondents who provided them) were received from twenty-two respondents. Of the samples, 17 were from Finnish into Russian, two from Russian into Finnish, one from Swedish into Russian, and four from English into Russian. The samples represent a wide variety of different text-types. They include contracts, brochures for products, a project and a company, an offer, extracts from the Trade Register, a letter to Russian officials, a product list, an economic review, instructions for use, an article in a company news letter, an annual report as well as excerpts of what appear to be the articles of association, as well as a page of a publication concerning Finland's trade with Russia.

In the analysis of the translations sent to me by the respondents, in order to be as objective as I can, I have concentrated on what seemed to me to be clearly correct or clearly wrong, or what could have clearly been done better. By 'clear' I mean that I believe most people would agree with me on my assessment.

I wish to make clear that I have no personal or financial ties either to the companies that have provided me with a translation for analysis, or, as far as I know, to the translators of these texts (the translator was identifiable in three cases). I am a native speaker of Finnish.

## **9 ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH MATERIAL**

In this chapter, I present the findings of the survey which I conducted among the company members of the Finnish-Russian Chamber of Commerce. They were thought to be likely to commission translations in the language pair Finnish-Russian.

### **9.1 GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR COMPANIES**

According to a study by Simola and Ollus (2008: 6), roughly 84% of Finnish companies that export to Russia and about 74% of the companies that import from Russia are small or mid-sized (based on the number of employees and turnover). In 2006, a total of 4,020 Finnish companies exported their goods to Russia and 1,393 companies were importers of Russian goods.

In the present study, roughly 25% of the respondents are not exporting or importing companies but firms that offer legal, logistics and other services to businesses that are involved in trade with Russia. There is also a group of 14 respondents representing "other" fields. They are, for example, companies that produce goods or services in Russia, or construction companies. Some of them, such as a communications consultant, could also be classified as services related to trade with Russia.

To avoid problems related with small numbers of cases, exporters and importers have been combined into one group of respondents consisting of 64 cases (62% of all respondents), and services related to trade with Russia and other businesses into another group of 40 cases (38% of all respondents).

### **9.2 THE CHOOSERS, THE CHECKERS AND THE ORDERERS**

Of the respondents who filled in the questionnaire 67% are involved in choosing a translation service provider for their company. This group will be called the choosers. About one third of the respondents, the orderers, order services from translation service providers (TSPs), and 28% of the respondents check translations from Finnish into Russian or the other way around (the checkers). The duties are somewhat overlapping. For instance, about 28% of the choosers also check translations or, in other words, 70% of those who check translations also choose TSPs. Only 16% of the orderers are also choosers or involved in checking translations.

The respondents' organizational status is as follows:

**Table 4:** *The organisational status of the respondents, % of all respondents*

Clerical worker	32
Top management	28
Middle management	22
Professional	18

Choosers of TSPs are most likely to be top management: 40% of those who make decisions about which TSP to hire are top management and about two thirds are at least middle management. At the same time, more than half of the orderers are clerical workers.

Translations are checked mostly by clerical workers but about one fourth of the checkers are professionals and another fourth are middle management. Top management is very rarely involved in this activity.

### **9.3 THE TYPES OF TRANSLATION SERVICE PROVIDER USED**

Two of the most commonly used types of translation service provider are an employee who translates among his/her other duties and a freelance translator working alone. A more detailed account is given in Table 5 (the respondents may use more than one type of TSP, so the percentages do not add up to 100).

**Table 5:** *The types of TSPs used by the respondent companies to produce Finnish-to-Russian or Russian-to-Finnish translations, % of all respondents*

An employee produces translations as part of his/her job	54
A freelance translator working alone	53
A translation agency with several translators and/or subcontractors (i.e. a big translation agency)	47
An in-house translator	14

To ease analysis, an employee translating as part of his/her job and an in-house translator are hereinafter combined into "internal translation service provider", whose services are used by 62% of all respondents. A more detailed account is given in Table 6:

**Table 6:** *Types of translation service provider used, % of all respondents*

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Freelancer</b>	<b>Big translation agency</b>	<b>Internal TSP</b>
Large company	52	55	63
Mid-sized company	42	42	73
Small company	61	43	55
Exporter/importer	46	37	71
Services and other business connected to trade with Russia	65	63	48

Exporters and importers as well as large and mid-sized companies seem to prefer their translations being done by an internal TSP. Firms that offer services related to trade with Russia and small companies hire freelance translators more often than have internal translation service providers.

About half of all respondents use a combination of an external and an internal TSP.

Those respondent companies that use freelance translators or bigger translation agencies use mostly Finnish TSPs. Hiring the services of foreign, usually Russian or Estonian TSPs is not that uncommon as can be seen in Table 7:

**Table 7:** *Use of Finnish and foreign external TSPs by the respondent companies, % of all respondents*

Finnish TSPs for Finnish-to-Russian translations	74
Foreign TSPs for Finnish-to-Russian translations	23
Finnish TSPs for Russian-to-Finnish translations	48
Foreign TSPs for Russian-to-Finnish translations	17

## **9.4 THE TEXT TYPES TRANSLATED**

Most commonly translated text types are documents for officials, more often from Finnish into Russian than the other way around, and contracts. For more details, see Table 8:



**Table 8:** *The share of respondents who have mostly the following text types translated, % of all respondents*

Documents for officials from Finnish into Russian	57
Contracts from Finnish into Russian	55
Advertisements from Finnish into Russian	40
Correspondence from Finnish into Russian	39
Instructions for use from Finnish into Russian	29
Contracts from Russian into Finnish	49
Documents for officials from Russian into Finnish	41
Correspondence from Russian into Finnish	36
Advertisements from Russian into Finnish	20
Instructions for use from Russian into Finnish	14

In addition, 21% of the respondents reported having other text types, such as planning materials, technical documents, brochures, reports, training materials, press releases, company newsletters, etc. translated.

Fourteen per cent of all respondents, most of them from exporting companies, reported having no need at all for translations from Russian into Finnish.

For analytical purposes different respondent groups were formed based on whether or not the respondents reported having the above mentioned text types translated. This classification does not take into account the language into which texts are translated since the results indicate that most respondents have translations made into both directions.

Table 9 shows that company size and the type of activity they are involved in has some effect on the translation requirements for different text types.

**Table 9:** *Translation of different text types by company size and type of activity, % of respondents by respondent type*

<b>Company size</b>	<b>Documents</b>	<b>Contracts</b>	<b>Correspondence</b>	<b>Ads</b>	<b>Instructions</b>	<b>Other</b>
Large n=33	64	61	30	39	30	36
Mid-sized n=26	54	50	27	35	42	15
Small n=44	59	59	55	43	23	14
<b>Type of activity</b>						
Exporter/ importer n=63	51	56	35	52	40	22
Services and other n=40	73	60	48	20	15	20
<b>All respondents</b>	59	57	40	40	30	21

Thus, exporters and importers have advertisements and instructions for use translated much more often than companies that are not involved in trade.

Companies that offer services related to trade with Russia have documents and also correspondence translated more often than exporters and importers do.

## 9.5 WHAT IS GOOD QUALITY?

In the present study, translation service provider's ability to produce good-quality translations, i.e. the technical or product quality, was found to be the most important service feature (see 9.8 below). This section will concentrate on the respondents' expectancy norms (the technical or product norms). I will present the responses to the questionnaire regarding quality issues to show what it is that the respondents expect from translations in general, what the desired features of translations are and what is not allowed. The translations that were provided by some respondents for the needs of this study will be used mainly to assess whether the responses to the questionnaire reliably reflect the reality.

To see what is forbidden in translation the respondents were asked to rate a list of deficiencies a translation may have. Table 10 shows these suggested flaws in the order of their perceived severity.

**Table 10:** *Severity of suggested deficiencies of translations, % of all respondents*

<b>Deficiency</b>	<b>Rated as a very serious error</b>
The translator has forgotten to translate a part of the original.	90
The translator has been careless with numbers.	89
In the client's opinion, the translator has misinterpreted the author's intention.	85
The translator has mistranslated a term.	69
An otherwise correct Finnish-to-Russian translation of an ad is not such as an ad should be in Russia.	47
Grammatical error.	38
The original is difficult to read and so is the translation.	29
The translation follows closely the word order of the original.	25
The translation is otherwise good but its use of language is somehow weird.	21
Spelling error.	15
The translation is typographically unsuitable for intended purpose.	11

Responses to another question showed that leaving something untranslated by a conscious decision is almost as unwanted as not translating a part of the source text because of carelessness: 80% of all respondents, 50% of them strongly, disagree with the statement *The translator may leave out those parts of the original s/he considers unnecessary for the readers*. A clear majority of respondents, 64%, did not favour translations that are word-for-word and sentence-for-

sentence, and almost as many did not think that a translation into Finnish may reveal the language of its Russian original. This appears to be in line with the respondents' assessment of the severity of related translational errors and flaws (weird language of the TT and ST and TT having the same word order).

Some of the suggested deficiencies were rated as harmless or not as errors more often than others:

**Table 11:** *Suggested deficiencies of translations regarded as harmless or not errors, % of respondents*

Deficiency	Rated as harmless	Rated as not an error
The original is difficult to read and so is the translation.	9	19
The translation is typographically unsuitable for intended purpose.	23	13
The translation follows closely the word order of the original.	11	9
The translation is otherwise good but its use of language is somehow weird.	10	7
Spelling error.	29	1
Grammatical error.	12	0

However, the odds that a client will not mind, for instance, spelling errors are still quite small and a safer bet would seem to be to deliver spelling error-free translations. Similarly, transfer of the difficult-to-read quality of an original to the translation may not be an error at all for 19% of the respondents but is a serious mistake for 29%.

Overt errors that have to do with the transfer of the meaning of the source text were generally regarded as more serious than covert errors such as inadequacies regarding readability and style. Attitudes toward spelling errors and, to an extent, toward grammatical mistakes, which are overt errors, are somewhat less critical than attitudes toward other overt errors. In general, overt errors appear to be associated with a higher risk (at least to translators as service providers – the risk that the different kinds of errors may have for the success of communication cannot be evaluated here) than covert errors.

The perceived severity of some errors seemed to be somewhat dependent on the role the respondent plays in the translation process:

- 96% of the checkers and 94% of the choosers regarded mistakes in copying numbers as very serious compared to 81% of the orderers.
- 60% of the checkers considered grammatical errors as very serious compared to 40% of the choosers and 26% of the orderers.
- 19% of the orderers said that letting the translation stay as difficult-to-read as the original is a very serious error while 34% of the choosers and 35% of the checkers were of that opinion.

- 20% of the checkers thought that somehow weird use of language in an otherwise good translation is harmless compared to 3% of the orderers and 12% of the choosers.

In general, the checkers (and the choosers but to a lesser degree) appeared to be less tolerant of errors than the orderers, as can be seen in Table 12.

**Table 12:** *Deficiencies of translations according to the share (%) of respondents who rated them as very serious errors*

Deficiency	The choosers	The checkers	The orderers
1. The translator has been careless with numbers.	94	96	81
2. In the client's opinion, the translator has misinterpreted the author's intention.	87	81	81
3. The translator has forgotten to translate part of the original.	86	92	94
4. The translator has mistranslated a term.	64	73	72
5. An otherwise correct Finnish-to-Russian translation of an ad is not such as an ad should be in Russia.	49	58	41
6. Grammatical error.	40	60	26
7. The original is difficult to read and so is the translation.	34	35	19
8. The translation follows closely the word order of the original.	25	39	29
9. The translation is otherwise good but its use of language is somehow weird.	20	28	19
10. Spelling error.	17	20	10
11. The translation is typographically unsuitable for intended purpose.	8	12	19

Regardless of what types of text the respondents had translated the top four of the most serious errors were the same with everyone. The respondents who have correspondence and contracts translated appeared to perceive deficiencies in a very similar way and so did the respondents who had ads and instructions for use translated. Those who have documents for officials translated seemed to have yet another way of looking at the severity of different errors. The big picture is quite uniform but different aspects are emphasised for different text types. For instance, 21% of the respondents who have correspondence translated regarded grammatical errors as very serious whereas 44% of the respondents who have instructions of use translated thought so. Thirteen per cent of the respondents who have correspondence translated regarded the original and the translation having the same word order as a very serious error, while 33% of the respondents who have documents translated for officials shared that opinion. Also, 74% of the respondents who have correspondence or contracts translated

considered the translator having misinterpreted the author's intention as a very serious error while 90% of those who have ads translated (and 100% of the respondents who do *not* have contracts translated) thought so.

To widen the perspective to include what the respondents thought translations should or may be like, they were also asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements about translations in general and about the roles and duties of the client and the translator. Table 13 shows how the respondents of this survey responded to statements about translations.

**Table 13:** *Agreement and disagreement with statements about translation, % of all respondents*

<b>Statement (over 50% of respondents agreed)</b>	<b>Agree somewhat</b>	<b>Agree strongly</b>	<b>Agree, total</b>
1. The translator must mould a difficult-to-read original into a translation with fluent and natural language.	47	46	92
2. A translation does not have to be word-for-word. The most important thing is that it can function as intended, for instance, as instructions for use.	42	36	78
3. The translator must translate as the client wants him/her to translate.	57	21	78
4. The translator must check with the client and correct errors that are in the original text.	37	40	76
5. The most important thing is that a translation is understandable. A couple of grammatical or spelling errors do not matter.	54	17	71
6. A Finnish translator must have his/her Finnish-to-Russian translation checked by a native speaker of Russian.	39	28	68
7. The translator may add to the translation clarifications which s/he considers necessary for the readers.	32	20	52
<b>Statement (over 50% of respondents disagreed)</b>	<b>Disagree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree strongly</b>	<b>Disagree total</b>
8. A translation has to be word-for-word and sentence-for-sentence.	44	20	64
9. A translation from Russian into Finnish may give the impression that it is a translation from Russian.	36	33	69
10. The translator may leave out those parts of the original s/he considers unnecessary for the readers.	30	50	80

Here, too, there were differences depending on the respondents' business and role in the translation process, as well as the text types translated. Exporters and importers, on the one hand, and the companies that offer services related to trade with Russia, on the other hand, differed from each other most clearly on the statement about translations having to be literal: 27% of the exporters and importers and 51% of the providers of services to trade were for literal translations. Companies of different size, however, did not differ from each other much in that respect. The clearest differences between them were found regarding the

statement about whether the translator is allowed to add clarifications to the translation: 60% of the small companies and almost as many of the mid-sized companies agreed with this statement, while only 35% of the big companies agreed with it. Small companies agreed more often than the others with the statement that the translator must check with the client and correct mistakes that were in the source text.

The biggest differences in the responses of the respondents grouped according to the text types that they reported having translated most commonly were:

- 44% of the respondents who have correspondence translated agreed with the statement that a translation has to be word-for-word and sentence-for-sentence, while only 22% of the respondents who have ads translated were of the same opinion.
- When literalness was set against functional suitability, the respondents softened their stand slightly: 65% of the respondents who have correspondence translated agreed with the statement that a translation does not have to be word-for-word and that the most important thing is that it can function as intended. Of the respondents who have ads translated, 88% shared that opinion.
- 77% of the respondents who have correspondence translated and 75% of those who have contracts translated agreed with the statement that the most important thing is that a translation is understandable and that a couple of grammatical or spelling errors do not matter. However, 63% of the respondents who have instructions for use translated and 68% of those who have ads translated were of the same opinion.
- 46% of the respondents who have correspondence translated were of the opinion that a translation from Russian into Finnish may give the impression that it is just that, while only 23% of those who have ads translated agreed with that statement.
- 85% of the respondents who have advertisements translated agreed with the statement that a Finnish translator's translation into Russian must be checked by a native speaker of Russian, whereas, for instance, only 62% of the respondents who have correspondence translated considered it necessary.
- 33% of the respondents who have correspondence translated agreed that the translator may leave out parts of the original that s/he deems unnecessary for the reader, while only about 20% of the respondents who have contracts or instructions translated thought so.
- 61% of the respondents who have correspondence translated agreed with the statement that a translator may add to the translation clarifications which s/he considers necessary for the readers. Of the respondents who have contracts translated, 45% agreed with that.

The respondents appeared to have different requirements for different text types. Overall, translators of correspondence seemed to be allowed to use their own judgment the most as to adding something to the translation that was not in the original or leaving out something that was in the original. At the same time, errors in grammar, typos or being word-for-word were not regarded so seriously as in other texts. A related issue seems to be that, as was said above, a translator misinterpreting the intention of the original author was considered to

be less serious an error by the respondents who have correspondence (and contracts) translated than by those who have other text types translated. In correspondence the number of people that could be exposed to these errors is limited: misunderstandings and translator's errors can be corrected easily and quickly before they do any serious harm. In fact, correspondence resembles conversation in this respect.

The views of the respondents differed on several points depending on which role they play in the translation process, as shown in the table below:

**Table 14:** *Agreement with statements about translation by respondents with different roles, % of respondents by respondent type*

<b>Statement</b>	<b>The choosers agree</b>	<b>The checkers agree</b>	<b>The orderers agree</b>
1. The translator must mould a difficult-to-read original into a translation with fluent and natural language.	91	85	91
2. A translation does not have to be word-for-word. The most important thing is that it can function as intended, for instance, as instructions for use.	73	81	90
3. The translator must translate in a way the client wants him/her to translate.	74	64	78
4. The translator must check with the client and correct errors of the original text.	75	67	80
5. The most important thing is that a translation is understandable. A couple of grammatical or spelling errors do not matter.	70	56	75
6. A Finnish translator must have his/her Finnish-to-Russian translation checked by a native speaker of Russian.	63	79	71
7. The translator may add to the translation clarifications which s/he considers necessary for the readers.	55	56	45
8. A translation has to be word-for-word and sentence-for-sentence.	40	26	28
9. A translation from Russian into Finnish may give the impression that it is a translation from Russian.	36	30	29
10. The translator may leave out those parts of the original s/he considers unnecessary for the readers.	22	32	16

Table 14 shows that the choosers seemed to value literalness and tolerate unnaturalness (Finnish text tasting like Russian) somewhat more than the others, but they still wanted translations to be easy-to-read as much as the others did. They were less eager than the others to have translations checked by a native speaker of the target language. The orderers were the least willing to allow the translator to add clarifications to the translation or to leave out unnecessary meanings, and the strongest advocates of translations functioning as intended, even at the expense of losing word-for-word accuracy. The checkers had the lowest tolerance for errors in spelling and grammar. They agreed more often than the others with the idea of having a native speaker of Russian check Finnish-to-Russian translations of Finnish translators (and in general with the idea of having another translator check translations). They were more than the others in favour of a translator leaving out unnecessary parts of the original.

There were also clear differences between the advocates of functional suitability (of whom there were approximately six out of ten respondents) and the much smaller group of those who were for word-for-word and sentence-for-sentence accuracy (about one fifth of the respondents). The former tolerated less the influence of Russian language on Russian-to-Finnish translations, and were more willing to let the translator add to the translation clarifications that s/he considers necessary than the latter were. However, both groups agreed almost as much with the statement that the translator must mould a difficult-to-read original into an easy-to-read translation and that the most important thing about translations is that they are understandable, not that they are completely free of typos or errors in grammar.

Although functional suitability is what the majority of the respondents valued it does not mean that it may be pursued by any means. Seventy-six percent of the proponents of functional suitability disagreed with the statement allowing the translator to leave out unnecessary parts of the source text, and 42% of them were against the translator adding clarifications which s/he thought necessary for the reader.

These two views on translation were not mutually exclusive: 22% of those who were for functional translations also agreed with the statement that translations must be word-for-word and sentence-for-sentence, and 47% of the advocates of literal translations were also for functional suitability. On the other hand, 95% of those who disagreed with the statement that translations must be word-for-word and sentence-for-sentence agreed with the idea that translations do *not* have to be literal but suited to the purpose. Also, 86% of those (n=22) who did *not* think that functional suitability is primary were for word-for-word and sentence-to-sentence accuracy.

Almost half of the respondents who were for literal translations stated that the best way to check a translation is to compare it with the original to see if it is accurate. At the same time, 18% of them chose reading the translation to see if it is suitable for the intended purpose as the best checking method. Correspondingly, while 40% of the respondents, who thought that a translation does not



have to be word-for-word but stylistically suited to the intended purpose, considered going through the translation with that particular point of view in mind as the best way to check a translation, one fifth of them picked comparison of the translation with the original to see if it is accurate as the best checking method.

All this suggests that not all respondents have clear expectations regarding translations. It is likely that the group of clients who do not have a clear idea what they want from a translation (i.e. those who have fuzzy expectations) is small in a country like Finland, where everyone studies at least two foreign languages at school, translated literature attracts a wide audience, and foreign pictures and TV programmes are subtitled. It is also unlikely that a client would not have a purpose in mind for a translation. Most clients would appear to have either implicit or explicit expectations. On the one hand, it is possible that the conflicting responses to the questionnaire were given by respondents who have implicit expectations and who can express them explicitly only when they discover deficiencies in a service that has already been performed. On the other hand, expressing one's opinion on a clear statement or a question is not necessarily comparable with buying a professional service and evaluating it. Conflicting responses may simply indicate that some clients do not really know much about translation – and they do not need to if their translator is a professional who can explain things to them.

Accurate transfer of the factual content and natural language were what the respondents most often mentioned as the determinants of good quality in the open-ended questions of the questionnaire:

- The words fluent or fluently (*sujuva, sujuvasti*) were used 25 times
- The words clear or clearly (*selkeä, selkeästi*) were used 18 times
- The word understandable (*ymmärrettävä*) was used 16 times
- The words accurate or accurately (*tarkka, tarkasti*) were used 10 times
- The word easy-to-read (*helppolukuinen*) was used 5 times
- The words precise or precisely (*täsmällinen, täsmällisesti*) were used 4 times

Determinants of good quality as reported in the open-end questions:

- The language of the translation is good / natural / fluent / easy-to-read / does not reveal that it is a translation (mentioned 60 times in different ways).
- The informational content of the original is conveyed correctly / accurately / precisely / completely / so that the translation corresponds to the original (mentioned in different ways 46 times).
- The translation is understandable / clear / unambiguous (mentioned 34 times).

- The translation has no errors in general or in grammar, numbers or facts (mentioned 14 times).
- Correct terms are used (mentioned 14 times).
- The language of the translation is stylistically correct / appropriate (mentioned in different ways 13 times).

In most comments more than one characteristic was mentioned:

"A good translation corresponds to the original, is easy-to-read and cannot be recognised as a translation."

"Such that the client understands the technical words and the translation is grammatically correct."

"Written in fluent language, conveys familiarity with the culture, correct factual content."

"Clear, understandable, target language is natural, facts are correct."

"No errors, fluent."

"Clear, in translation content is more important than form. Contemporary terms are used."

"The subject matter is made clear."

"Translated as accurately as possible, so that the reader understands it in the same way as the author."

"Written in fluent and faultless language, factual content conserved."

"Informative, clear, conveys expertise, correct terminology, clear syntactic structure."

"Written in fluent, natural language. Does not have to be word-for-word. Correctly conveys the meaning."

"Accurate content, readable and understandable."

"Precise in content and emphasis, no errors in facts (names, places, numbers, etc.)."

(My translations from Finnish.)

It may be concluded that although translations with grammatical and spelling errors and awkward language may be tolerated – if the facts and the meaning are conveyed correctly – a translation has to be written in fluent, natural, stylistically appropriate language to be considered good.

To complement the analysis of actual translations, which I hoped to receive from the respondents, the questionnaire included a task in which the respondents were asked to pick a Russian translation for the name *Sibelius Academy*. It

is Finland's only music university, located in Helsinki and commonly known in Finland. It had no official Russian version of its name, and it was unlikely to be a place where the respondents of this survey had received their education. The respondents were also asked to choose a Finnish translation for the Moscow P. I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory, which I considered to be a Russian counterpart of the Sibelius Academy. Out of several possible translations four alternatives (my translations) were given in both cases and it was also possible to answer *I do not know* – which was the answer of about one third of those who choose the TSPs as well as of those who mostly order translations. None of those who check translations chose this alternative.

This question turned out to be unproductive. However, it is interesting that out of the alternatives given, 13% of respondents chose a word-for-word Russian translation (*Сибелиус-Академия* / 'the Sibelius Academy') but 21% picked a corresponding word-for-word Finnish translation (*Moskovan valtiollinen P. I. Tšaikovskille nimetty konservatorio* / 'the Moscow State Conservatory named after P. I. Tchaikovsky'). This suggests that there might be different expectations for translations depending on the direction of translation, but this requires further research.

As mentioned before, about one third of all respondents – among them about one third of both the choosers and the orderers and 40% of, for example, exporters and importers – answered *I do not know* to these questions. This suggests that a large proportion of these clients is unwilling or unable to assess translations even when the task is simple, carries no risk, and alternative translations are provided for them. This also makes one wonder whether the popularity of the source-oriented alternatives such as *Сибелиус-Академия* ('the Sibelius-Academy') is simply an indication of difficulties experienced in evaluating to what extent translations meet one's expectations.

In sum, on the basis of the responses it can be inferred that there appear to be three sets of norms that the respondents of this survey think should govern translation. The first set consists of the strongest norms, which seem to concern completeness of the translation, the intention of the author of the original remaining intact in the process of translation, undistorted transfer of meanings such as numbers or terms, as well as the translator taking as much responsibility as s/he can for the semantic correctness of communication by checking potential errors found in the source text. This is hardly surprising for texts which basically exist to convey information and which business decisions are based on. These norms require the translator to be careful and suggest that the relation between the ST and the TT should be such that the TT can be described as a precise translation.

A second set of norms would seem to be about being able to produce stylistically suitable and grammatically correct translations. These requirements concern qualities that can be evaluated without comparing the translation with the source text. The high percentages of respondents who rated deficiencies connected to these two groups of norms as very serious breaches suggests that they

are basic norms which should be followed in all circumstances, although the norm-breaking of the second kind may in general not be subject to as severe sanctions as breaching the norms of the first kind.

A third set, or pair, of norms might be formulated as *Translations must have correct spelling* and as *Translations must be typographically suited for intended purpose*. They would govern tolerated behaviour which is common enough in non-translated written communication (spelling errors) or perhaps not regarded as something all translators should be able to do well (layout).

In some cases there appear to be discrepancies in the responses which makes it difficult to assess the intensity of a potential norm. The respondents of this survey were almost unanimous about the importance of a translation being easy to read: 92% thought that the translator has to mould a difficult-to-read original into an easy-to-read translation. Still, 9% of the respondents thought it was harmless, and another 19% regarded it as not an error at all, to let a difficult-to-read original be transferred into a difficult-to-read translation. It was only the seventh most serious error (rated as very serious by 29% of the respondents) but topped the list of statements which the respondents of this study agreed with, 46% of them strongly. It is possible, then, that the respondents very much want translations to be written in fluent language, but if they are not, it may not be regarded as an actual error. It is also possible that this reflects differences in people's eagerness to monitor compliance with a norm and punish for non-compliance, or is an reflection of there being a higher norm, such as the one that the meaning of the source text must be transferred precisely and completely, and that in case of a norm conflict the translator should choose precision over fluency. Yet another possibility is that the respondents who strongly agreed with this statement but still regarded non-compliance with it as not an error or only a harmless one, as 20% of them did, are individuals with a large tolerance zone, which could be a sign of client expertise.

In any case, together with the popularity of the idea of native Russian speakers checking translations made into non-native Russian and frequent mentions of fluency and clarity in answers to the open-ended questions this suggests that a statement that a translator must produce translations with natural and fluent language even if the source text is difficult to read is at least a secondary norm and that the initial norm of non-literary translations in the language pair Finnish–Russian is target orientation.

## **9.6 ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATIONS PROVIDED BY RESPONDENTS**

In the following, the actual translations that the respondents sent for analysis are described and analysed in order to see whether the responses to the questionnaire correspond with real life. These translations that were sent by re-

spondents as examples of translations that they regarded as good or poor are listed in Table 15.

**Table 15:** *List of actual translations provided by respondents*

Nr	Type of text	Language pair	Evaluation by respondent
1	President's Overview	Swedish–Russian	Translation by an agency “quite poor”. Attached also final publicised version.
2	Product list	Finnish–Russian	Not expressed, but appears accurate and functional.
3	Product brochure	English–Russian	Not expressed, but appears accurate and functional.
4	Letter to Russian officials	Finnish–Russian	“Good translation”.
5	Excerpt from instructions for use	Finnish–Russian	“Good”, “clear”, “easy to understand”, “corresponds well to the original Finnish text”.
6	Excerpt of company presentation	English–Russian	Translation “turned out well”, “stylistically appropriate”, “forceful enough”
7	Excerpt from the articles of association	Finnish–Russian	“Poor”, “deficiencies in terms, syntactic structure, subject matter”.
8	Excerpt from the articles of association	Finnish–Russian	“Good”, “strengths: subject matter, terms”.
9	Excerpt from instructions for use	Finnish–Russian	Not expressed, but appears to have been regarded good enough since it has been published.
10	Contract	Finnish–Russian	“Good”, “relatively accurate”,
11	Document attached to contract	Russian–Finnish	A section of translation “does not correspond to the original Russian text”.
12	Bidding documents	Finnish–Russian	Not expressed, but the date of the document and stricken confidential information suggest that the translation has been used for intended purpose.
13	Extract from Trade Register	Finnish–Russian	“Precise, clear, easy to read”
14	Annual report	Finnish–Russian	“Good”
15	Product brochure	Finnish–Russian	Implied to be of unacceptable quality
16	Excerpt from introduction to book	Finnish–Russian	“Good”
17	Code of conduct	English–Russian	“As appropriate as can be expected since the original is in English written by a French person”, “suitable for purpose as to content”
18	Article in company news letter	English–Russian	“Good”, “a couple of minor comments”.
19	Excerpt from a company's internal news letter	Finnish–Russian	“Good”
20	Term list with definitions	Russian–Finnish	“Easy to read”, “clarifies Russian practice and procedures”, “not the best choices of words but accurate enough”.
21	Product information	Finnish–Russian	“Complies well with commission”, “fulfils its function”.
22	Brochure	Finnish–Russian	“Good”
23	Business barometer	Finnish–Russian	“Good”
24	Articles of association	Finnish–Russian	Not expressed, but appears accurate and functional. Official translation.

There were 17 translations from Finnish into Russian, four translations from English into Russian, one translation from Swedish into Russian and two translations from Russian into Finnish. Two respondents both sent two translations, and one respondent sent a translation that they had found unacceptable and its revised, final version.

The translations were studied in their entirety because of their shortness except for number 14, an annual report, of which four pages were randomly chosen for closer analysis. The aim of the analysis was to find out what the respondents regard as good quality in practice and to see how that relates to what they say they regard as good quality.

In the analysis, I compare the source texts to the target texts and assess whether the target text suits to what appears to be its intended purpose. To lessen the subjectivity of this approach, I also asked an outside specialist<sup>9</sup> for an evaluation. The examples below illustrate my assessment, which is thus open to possible criticism from other scholars.

In general, it appeared that the respondents mostly get the kinds of translations that meet their requirements as they are expressed in the questionnaire. The translations were highly accurate in the sense that in a majority of cases they carefully expressed the meaning of the source text:

Example 1: In addition, there's also that painful period between submitting a bid, and waiting for the final decision, when you don't know whether or not you have been successful. (ST 18)

Кроме этого за подачей тендерной заявки следует болезненный период ожидания решения, когда мучаешься терзаниями и неизвестностью, в чью пользу будет принято решение. (ТТ 18)

Example 2: Vuokraaja sitoutuu maksamaan vuokran [tavarán] käytöstä Vuokranantajalle vuosineljänneksittäin summalla [summa numeroina ja kirjoitettuna] ruplaa + arvonlisävero. Joka vuosineljänneksestä osapuolet laativat pöytäkirjan, jossa voidaan muuttaa vuokrasummien määrää yhteisellä sopimuksella. (ST 10)

Арендатор обязуется вносить арендную плату в пользу Арендодателя за пользование [товаром] ежеквартально в сумме [сумма в цифрах и буквами] рублей, плюс НДС. Ежеквартально стороны составляют Акт по итогам квартала, в котором могут изменить стоимость арендных платежей по взаимному соглашению сторон. (ТТ 10)

There were no missing sentences or larger omissions in the translations. Omissions occurred on the level of words and were more frequent on a couple of translations than in others. Furthermore, there were only about half a dozen cases of splitting one source-text sentence into two target-text sentences, or

---

<sup>9</sup> Elena Titova, M.A. and lecturer in Russian Translation in the Department of Modern Languages at Helsinki University, was kind enough to review the examples and offer her expert opinion.

combining two source-text sentences into one target-text sentence, many of which were found in one extensive translation, although not in the translation from which the following example is taken:

Example 3: Yhtiöllä voi olla hallituksen valitsema toimitusjohtaja, jonka tulee hoitaa yhtiön juoksevaa hallintoa hallituksen antamien ohjeiden ja määräysten mukaisesti. ST (24)

У общества может быть директор-распорядитель, которого избирает правление. Он отвечает за текущую деятельность общества в соответствии с инструкциями и распоряжениями правления. ТТ (24) (An alternative translation without splitting the sentence is quite possible: У общества может быть избранный правлением директор-распорядитель, который отвечает за текущую деятельность общества в соответствии с инструкциями и распоряжениями правления.)

There were several instances in which the translator had explicated the meaning of the source-text, apparently with the aim of making sure the reader of the translation understands it:

Example 4:	[company's] agenda	дальнейшие планы и направления развития компании
Example 5:	den pågående [...] debatten	идушие сейчас в обществе дискуссии о [...]
Example 6:	private labels	собственные торговые марки супермаркетов
Example 7:	ympäristöjohtaminen	управление делами по охране окружающей среды
Example 8:	perehdyttämisaineisto uusia henkilöitä varten	материалы для ознакомления новых сотрудников с работой в концерне
Example 9:	Putinin toimet	меры администрации президента Путина
Example 10:	[yhtiön] laaja verkosto	развитая партнерская сеть [компании]
Example 11:	veroparatiisi	налоговое убежище («налоговый рай»)
Example 12:	[companies] use tendering for their print requirements	используют тендерные торги для выбора поставщиков печатных изданий
Example 13:	after sales services	сервисное обслуживание после сдачи

Example 14: työvoiman määrä

количество занятой на предприятиях  
рабочей силы

There were only a few orthographic or grammatical errors. Attempts had been made to produce functional target texts. For example, in an instruction for use, the imperative mood used in Finnish was replaced in Russian by verbs in the infinitive, which is in accordance with the Russian convention. In another case, the orientation to Finnish readers was removed from the Russian translation of a brochure for a programme designed to encourage cooperation between Finnish and Russian businesspeople. Expressions like *Venäjän-kaupan osaaminen* (ability to conduct business with Russian companies) and *sikäläiset kauppatavat* (their business culture) were translated into *опыт внешнеторговых операций* (experience of foreign trade) and by *культура бизнеса зарубежного партнера* (the business culture of one's foreign partner), making the translation suitable for the Russian target audience.

There were cases where the respondent had noticed a customer gap, i.e. that the translation was not up to his/her requirements. The next example contains terminological errors and does not really make any sense in Russian:

Example 15: tilinpäätös, joka käsittää tuloslaskelman, taseen ja toimintakertomuksen (ST 7)

баланс, содержащий счет прибыли и убытков, управление балансом и отчетом о деятельности (ТТ 7)

Another translation, which the respondent found to be of low quality contained several mistranslations which appeared to be caused by the translator's inability to understand the meaning of the source text:

Example 16: I Finland har diskussioner förts om kommunernas och statens behov av att konkurransutsätta de tjänster som inte hör till deras kärnverksamhet. (ST 1)

В Финляндии в последнее время ведутся разговоры о необходимости подстегнуть конкуренцию между общинами и государством в их основных сферах деятельности. (ТТ 1)

It seems that a likely explanation for the following deficiency which was pointed out by the respondent is difficulty in finding a corresponding Finnish term for the term *взаимозачет*:

Example 17: Итого путем взаимозачета финская фирма [...] оплачивает российской фирме [...] стоимость консалтинговых услуг в размере [...] (ST 11)





Example 24: EU procurement directives for government departments place the environment high on the agenda, and as a result issues like forest certification, **chain of custody** and recycled stock all enter the equation. (ST 18) (my emphasis, indicating what is missing from the translation)

В соответствии с директивами ЕС по госзакупкам [вопросам охраны окружающей среды] уделяется особенное значение, в частности это относится к лесным сертификатам, а также в отношении использования вторичного сырья. (ТТ 18)

In the same translation, a statement is missing quotation marks and is thus not attributed to the person who made it in the source text.

## 2. Problems with terminology, idiomaticity and choice of words:

Example 25: the day-to-day operations                      основная работа

Example 26: takes care of the local                      ведет необходимую отчетность  
bureaucracy

Example 27: For government departments and public bodies, tendering is a necessary evil. (ST 18) (my emphasis)

Для государственных и общественных организаций тендер является жизненной необходимостью. (ТТ 18)                      (my emphasis)

## 3. Tautology (not motivated by the source text):

Example 28: В частности [...] принять участие в реализации части программы [...] (ТТ 6)  
(my emphasis)

Example 29: Консультант консультирует при необходимости дальнейшее проектирование. (ТТ 12) (my emphasis)

## 4. Disregard for text-type specific target-language conventions:

A letter (ST 12) ends with *Kunnioittavasti / С уважением*, but there is no salutation (for instance, *Уважаемые господа!*) in the Russian translation.

## 5. Distortion of the meaning of the source text:

Example 30: Piha-alueelle rakennetaan luonnollisesti myös mm. paikallisten normien ja standardien edellyttämien liikennealueiden lisäksi kaikki tarvittavat [...]. (ST 12)

На территории двора естественно построят также предусмотренные местными нормами и стандартами в дополнение к транспортно-дорожным зонам все необходимые [...]. (ТТ 12)

Example 31: It's a case of making people aware of what is available before it's put down in black and white – because it's difficult to change a tender once it's been drawn up. (ST 18)

Стараемся разъяснить наши возможности, чтобы исключить все недоразумения, так как после подачи тендерного предложения очень сложно внести изменения в принимаемые на себя обязательства. (ТТ 18)

6. Failure, it appears, to ascertain the meaning of an unclear source-text sentence:

Example 32: Konsultti opastaa ja tarvittaessa jatkosuunnitteua [sic]. (ST 12)

Консультант консультирует при необходимости дальнейшее проектирование. (ТТ 12)

This is not to say that all other translations were completely faultless or that the translations which I found to be of lower quality than the respondents who supplied them were poor in all aspects. Many of them appeared to have both strong and weak points. In fact, one of these translations contained errors which I thought were quite serious distortions of the meaning of the source text, but at the same time the language of the translation appeared to be grammatically correct and easy to understand. All this makes it very hard to assess their quality from the point of view of the risks that various less-than-ideal features of translations may present for the success of communication and speaks in favour of a TQA method such as the one developed by Colina (2009) which takes into account situation-specific considerations.

The point of the above description is that some of the respondents appear to experience difficulties in detecting flaws in translations or have some other reason for accepting translations that are below their own requirements, even if they understand both the source and the target languages. This also appears to be a situation where what one does differs from what one says, and we should ask which one is closer to the actual expectation, the doing or the saying. It seems unlikely to me that these clients would accept the less than ideal translations if someone were to point out the deficiencies to them. This is why I would put more weight to the responses to the questionnaire, even though it is possible that some clients have very large tolerance zones, do not mind a couple of mistakes and are perhaps happy to correct them themselves.

Based on this study, we can infer that the most important translation norms that the respondents think should govern translations are the following, in approximate order of importance:

1. The original must be translated completely.
2. The translator must ensure understanding and actively prevent misunderstanding (check and correct errors in original, be careful with numbers and terms, interpret and convey the meaning of the original correctly).
3. The translator must ease understanding by using clear, fluent and natural language even if the original is difficult to read. This requires mostly correct grammar and absence of too many covert errors.
4. Translations must be functionally appropriate.
5. Finnish translators must have their Finnish-to-Russian translations, especially advertisements and instructions for use, checked by native speakers of Russian.
6. The translator should not add meanings to the translation, even if the goal is to facilitate understanding, without the client's permission.
7. The translator should respect the client's wishes as far as possible.

Being word-for-word and sentence-for-sentence may be required by some clients for some texts. In addition, there are features that might fall into Toury's group of tolerated or permitted behaviour (see 5.1 above): translations are allowed in some cases to have covert errors, a few grammatical mistakes or typos, or original and translation may have the same word order, especially if the communication is private (like correspondence and contracts), or has a short life span (correspondence). The more public and impersonal the text is, the less these deficiencies are tolerated.

The results of this study indicate that most respondents have a fairly clear, text-type specific idea of good quality. The type of business they are involved in largely determines the types of texts they need to have translated and therefore affects the requirements that they have for translations in general.

The roles the respondents play in the process of having a text translated were in many cases connected to their expectations regarding translations. This means that there may be several different sets of requirements in one client company and that, as the client's staff changes, the requirements may change, too.

Further, it seems that the expectancy norms are not limited to the appearance of the target text. They concern also the degree of precision to which the translation represents the meaning of the original and, by extension, the principles the translator should adhere to during the translation process.

## **9.7 HOW TRANSLATIONS ARE CHECKED**

Translations into both directions are checked always in one third of the respondent companies and usually in another third of the firms. About 20% check their translations occasionally, and about 8% never check them. There was some variation between different groups of respondents. Mid-sized companies were

more eager to check translations (in 58% of them translations are checked always) than small or large companies. About one fourth of the orderers reported that translations are checked always in their companies, while two out of three checkers said the same. The publicity status of the communication appears to have some effect on the eagerness to check translations: approximately 40% of those who have instructions and advertisements translated reported checking translations always, but only 18% of the respondents who have correspondence translated said that their translations are always checked. This seems not to be explained by assuming that in-house translators or the employees who translate among other duties produce most of translated correspondence, and that their work is not checked so often. On the contrary, the results of this study indicate that in about 40% of the companies that have internal TSPs translations are checked always, which is the case in 24% of the firms that hire freelance translators.

In order to find out how translations are checked in the target companies, the respondents were asked to choose the most important of four alternatives, three of which are shown in Table 16. The fourth alternative was "some other way, which?".

**Table 16:** *The most important methods of checking translations, % of all respondents*

Reading the translation to see if it is such as a text of that type (for instance, an ad, a brochure, a contract, etc.) is supposed to be.	33
Comparing the translation with the original to see if it is accurate.	27
Reading the translation to see if it is written in good and clear Finnish or Russian.	19

Only three respondents suggested some other way, such as asking what the end user of the translation thinks, a combination of the above, or trying to verify the contents in negotiations with clients.

Despite instructions to choose only one alternative as the best way to check translations, 19 respondents marked more than one box. Of these 19 respondents, four (4% of all respondents) preferred a combination of alternatives one and two, six (6%) a combination of the second and the third alternative, and another six (6%) a combination of the first and the third alternative. A combination of all three methods was suggested by three respondents.

A closer look revealed that almost half of the respondents who check translations had marked more than one alternative. This indicates that acting against answering instructions was probably deliberate and in a way a statement against using just one method to assess translations (although the respondents were asked to pick the *best* method, not the *only* method). To suggest a combination of different methods was also quite common among companies that offer services related to trade with Russia and with respondents who included "other

types of texts” in their list of the text types that they have translated most commonly.

The results of this question are therefore unclear in some respects, but reading the translation to make sure it is stylistically suitable for the intended purpose seems to be regarded as the best method. However, checking if the translation is an accurate rendering of the original was mentioned almost as often, whereas merely reading the translation to see if it is well written seems to be not quite enough for the majority of the respondents. The fact that all three alternatives got high response rates and that so many respondents chose more than one alternative contrary to instructions, suggest that all three methods are important and probably used in combination.

There seems to be a connection between the preferred checking method and the text type. Comparing the translation with the original to see if it is accurate was more popular than, or as popular as, method no. 1 in Table 16 (i.e. reading the translation to see if it is such as a text of that type is supposed to be) with respondents who listed correspondence, contracts, official documents and other text types as the ones that they commonly have translated (and with firms that are involved in services related to trade with Russia and small companies). Respondents who reported having advertisements and instructions translated were the least likely to favour comparison with the original as the best way to check a translation (12% and 19% of them, respectively, against 27% of all respondents). Instead, they were even stronger advocates of method no. 1 than the other respondents. Otherwise the responses were quite consistent with the overall result.

As mentioned in the beginning, in about one out of three or four respondent companies translations are checked only occasionally or never. This finding can mean at least two things. It can be an indication that one out of three or four respondent companies trust their translators so much that they do not regard it necessary to monitor their performance. Another explanation might be that these are respondents whose language skills do not allow them to check translations. Let us for now call ‘evaluators’ those respondents who picked a preferred translation alternative for either *Sibelius-Akatemia* or for *Государственная консерватория имени П.И. Чайковского*, and ‘non-evaluators’ those who did not pick an alternative but answered ‘I do not know’ to these questions. The non-evaluators are thus likely to feel insecure about their Russian skills or to not have them at all. About one half of the non-evaluators reported that in their companies translations are never or only occasionally checked, while only approximately one fifth of the evaluators responded in the same way. It seems then that both trust and lacking skills can be reasons for not monitoring translators’ performance. In any case, as many as one third of the respondents do not take the opportunity to give feedback to their translators on their performance and to influence the expectations their translators will have of the requirements of their clients.

## 9.8 THE REASONS FOR CHOOSING A TRANSLATION SERVICE PROVIDER

To find out what requirements there are for translators, the respondents were asked what factors they had used in selecting their TSP and what qualities they consider important for translators.

In Table 17 below, the selection criteria of translation service providers are listed in order of importance according to the percentage of the respondents who chose the criterion from the list given in the questionnaire (question no. 8). The table shows the most popular reasons among all respondents, and among the choosers in particular, for hiring a translation service provider.

**Table 17:** *Selection criteria used in hiring a TSP, % of respondents*

Criterion	% of all respondents	% of the choosers
The TSP's ability to provide fast deliveries and reliability in meeting deadlines	56	54
The translator's language skills	50	53
The TSP's experience	45	52
The TSP's speciality suits the client's needs	35	43
The TSP with the lowest cost	30	29
The TSP is well-known	21	25

The TSP's staff's education was mentioned once. Test translation has been used as a basis to hire a TSP by nine respondents.

The respondents were free to choose as many criteria as they wanted. The average respondent chose 2–3 selection criteria.

The order of importance of the different selection criteria varied somewhat among the different respondent groups. For instance, 64% of those who check translations mentioned the translator's language skills among the selection criteria compared to 41% of the orderers and 53% of the choosers. Also, the choosers and the checkers reported the TSP's experience as well as the TSP's suitable area of expertise having been used as selection criteria more often than the orderers did, while the orderers placed a bit more emphasis than the choosers and the checkers on low costs.

The results seemed to be independent of the respondent company size and type of activity. The order of the top four selection criteria was the same as above with every respondent group except for mid-sized firms and exporters and importers who paid slightly more attention to low costs than others. The companies involved in services related to trade with Russia and in other fields stressed the TSP's suitable speciality, experience and their being well-known more strongly than exporters and importers did. Exporters' and importers'

higher preference for internal TSPs probably explains why they did not consider the TSP being well-known as a more important criterion.

The respondents appeared to search for largely the same qualities from different types of TSP. Those who use the services of freelance translators seemed to value low costs (38% against 21% of those who do not hire freelancers) and the TSP's experience (55% against 33%) more than others, and those who use the services of big translation agencies appeared to appreciate their TSP being well-known more than others (29% against 15% of those who do not hire big translation agencies).

In question no. 20, the respondents were asked to choose five characteristics of services offered by translators or translation agencies and to put those five qualities in order of importance. The responses of fourteen respondents were disqualified, which is clearly the biggest number of disqualified responses. These responses were disqualified because the respondents had not followed the instructions (they, for instance, chose five items but did not indicate their order of importance). However, only one respondent did not answer this question at all.

Among those who replied to this question according to the instructions, a clear top six of the most important service characteristics emerged:

1. Good-quality translations.
2. Ability to meet deadlines.
3. Ability to keep confidentiality.
4. Ability to provide fast deliveries.
5. Good prices.
6. Customer service attitude of the TSP('s staff).

*Good-quality translations* were placed first by clearly the biggest number of respondents, but if the frequencies of all ratings from one to five that each of these aspects of service received, *good-quality translations* and *ability to meet deadlines* were very close to each other in importance, and so were also the *ability to keep confidentiality* and *to provide fast deliveries*, but they followed the first two from a distance.

The rest of the qualities suggested in the questionnaire were the following (in order of importance according to this study):

7. Ability to bid quickly.
8. The TSP's good reputation.
9. The TSP has proper premises, IT equipment and software.
10. The TSP's website is well designed and easy to use.
11. The TSP has been awarded a quality certificate.



These were rated among the top five most important service characteristics only a few times each. The emphasis is clearly on performance. The TSP's reputation (second-hand testimonies of their performance) and quality certificates (membership in an exclusive group) are quite low on the list although they are, according to Sztompka (1999) used to evaluate primary trustworthiness. Quality of the setting (premises and website as sources of derived trustworthiness) seem to have very little effect on the respondents' decision to trust someone with their business.

The order of importance was almost exactly the same as above among the choosers (with slight variation among places nine and eight on the list) and the orderers. Among the checkers the list changed so that the top three were the same as with everyone else, but *a customer service attitude* came fourth and dropped *short delivery times* and *good prices* down one place. The reason for this could be that those who check translations also need to negotiate with the TSPs about the ways the translations have to be changed or corrected, and that way they get to deal with the TSPs more closely.

The analysis of disqualified responses to this question shows that also for these respondents good-quality translations, keeping confidentiality and meeting deadlines were the most valued properties of translators and their work.

An issue possibly related to keeping confidentiality is whether the respondents feel that translators may have their subcontractor's subcontractor produce translations. On the whole, 27% of all respondents strongly disagreed and 36% disagreed somewhat with the statement *a translation agency may have a text translated by a subcontractor who may have his/her subcontractor translate it*. Twenty-eight per cent agreed with it somewhat, and 9% of all respondents strongly agreed. There was no significant difference in how ability to keep confidentiality was rated by those who agreed with this statement and those who did not. However, 71% of the respondents who have contracts translated (against 52% of those who do not have them translated) opposed the idea of a translation commission going through a chain of subcontractors while 55% of the respondents who have advertisements translated were against it. Since contracts are usually highly confidential documents and never made public, this suggests that some respondents may suspect that confidentiality is jeopardised if translation commissions are chained. This is what a respondent seems to have been thinking when s/he wrote on the side of the questionnaire next to this statement with which s/he disagreed: "confidentiality clauses are important". In other words, it could be that the trust which the client feels for a TSP and his/her subcontractor can only be delegated so far.

The different respondent groups viewed this matter somewhat differently: about two thirds of large and mid-sized companies were against chaining, compared to about 51% of the small companies. Similarly, two thirds of the choosers and the checkers were against translation commissions going from subcontractor to subcontractor, whereas 56% of the orderers accepted it.

As to prices, the findings of this study support the Lemons Principle in that inability or unwillingness to evaluate a translation seems to increase the weight that is put on the costs being low: four out of ten 'non-evaluators' reported choosing a TSP at least partly based on them being one with the lowest fees, while about one fourth of the 'evaluators' had done the same.

Table 18 shows what qualities of translators were regarded as the most important (question number 19, the percentages of the respondents who chose the quality in question among the four most important qualities):

**Table 18:** *The most important qualities of translators, % of respondents who chose the quality in question among the four most important qualities*

Knowledge of terminology of a special field	77
Experience in working as a translator	72
Sufficient translation skills regardless of how they were acquired	63
Sufficient language skills regardless of how they were acquired	52
Authorised translator's diploma	38
University degree or equivalent in translation	24
University degree in the language in question	12
Other	7
Ability to use graphic design or layout software	6
Ability to use computer-aided-translation software	5

The top three requirements are also at the top of the criteria used in selection of the TSPs (see above) but their order is different: *knowledge of terminology of a special field* is higher here than *suitability of a TSP's speciality to the client's needs* is on the list describing the TSP selection criteria.

There appeared to be only small differences between respondents from companies of different sizes or types of business activity in the order of the most desirable qualities. Small companies, however, emphasised *experience* (82% of small firms) and *sufficient language skills* (71%) even more strongly than did other firms, dropping *knowledge of terminology of a special field* to third place.

Those who choose the TSPs and those who check their work also agreed almost completely with the above order of the most wanted qualities. The orderers chose *sufficient translation skills* most often (75% against the choosers' 59% and the checkers' 56%), placing *experience* second and *knowledge of terminology of a special field* third.

The respondents who use the services of freelance translators working alone placed *sufficient translation skills* at the top of their list, *experience* second, and *knowledge of terminology of a special field* third. In fact, 69% of this group of respondents mentioned *knowledge of terminology of a special field*, which is quite low compared to 87% of the respondents who have an internal TSP.

The percentages show that most respondents do not require a university degree or equivalent in translation studies. Moreover, a third of even those respondents who regarded such a degree as one of the four most wanted qualities of a translator, also chose *sufficient translation skills regardless of how they were acquired* among the top four qualities. The respondent groups that were most likely to appreciate a degree on translation were the checkers (37%) and those respondents who reported having official documents translated, 30% of whom included a degree in translation or equivalent in their list of the four most wanted qualities, compared to 17% of those who do not have documents translated for officials and 16% of the respondents who need translations of instructions for use.

The fact that more than a third of the respondents included an authorised translator's diploma in their top-four list can be explained by the need to translate documents for officials so often. An authorised translator's diploma was valued most by respondents who are involved in services related to trade with Russia (many of them offer legal and transportation services). However, 25% of the respondents who included an authorised translator's diploma in the four most wanted qualities reported not having much need for translations of official documents, which are the likeliest candidates for translation by an authorised translator. An authorised translator's diploma, it seems, is used as proof of a translator's competence even if there is no actual need for authorised translations.

The low degree of importance that was given by the respondents to the ability to use graphic design or CAT software suggests that many of them may not be familiar with the skills that are required from many translators in their daily work.

The results reveal that what one values or does not value is not always visible from one's actions. Only one respondent reported that their TSP's education or that of the TSP's staff has been used as a criterion in hiring them, but 24% said that they want their TSP to have a university degree or equivalent in translation. One fifth of the respondents reported having chosen their TSP at least partly based on the TSP being well-known, but only 11% included the TSP being reputable and well-known in their list of the five most important aspects of the services offered by a translator or a translation agency. Another example: 70% of the respondents who had *not* chosen their TSP based on the TSP's speciality being suitable to the client's needs nevertheless included *knowledge of terminology of a special field* in their list of the four most important requirements.

As was mentioned above, nine respondents had used test translation to evaluate the competence of the TSP they had hired. This seems to be a low figure if one considers the weight the respondents placed on knowledge of terminology and good translation skills. On the one hand it suggests that translators enjoy a great deal of role-based (*a priori*) trust since there is rarely a need to check their skills beforehand. On the other hand, taking into account the indifference that most respondents seemed to show toward a translator having a degree in trans-

lation, it could mean that the respondents do not regard translation as a very complex act, certainly not complex enough to require university-level training. Choosing a translator would then not be seen as a high-risk situation and the required degree of role-based trust would not be especially high. It may also be that it is simply easier to trust someone on the basis of their having something valuable such as a reputation or business to lose than by testing their competence beforehand.

The respondents were given an opportunity to comment freely on translators. Some added comments on the side of the questionnaire concerning a particular question. Many of the comments below (my translations from Finnish) are direct or indirect descriptions of a good translator:

"Quality of the agency we use varies. An ideal translator translates into his/her mother tongue but understands the source text completely."

"Confidentiality – good all-round education."

"Both the client and the translator must see to it that the translator knows the context, no 'isolated pieces'. The client must provide the translator with special terms."

"Often a professional translator produces a text which is better than the original. Good translators are worth their weight in gold!!"

"Sometimes you meet people who think that every piece of advice or guidance is an insult. Others find it hard to make changes. They are too sensitive about criticism. Nobody knows everything or how to do everything right away."

"The worst situation was when a Finnish translator translated about 20 pages of electrotechnical text from Finnish into Russian and even said that a Russian electrical engineer had checked it. The text was complete nonsense [...]"

"One cannot require a translator to follow slavishly the word order of the original, but s/he cannot make amendments to the original as s/he pleases, especially if it is an authorised translation."

"Many companies assume that e.g. native Russians have a natural ability to 'translate', even if they know very little Finnish and have no knowledge of any specific field."

"There are too many people working as translators who haven't got a clue what translation is all about."

[To the question about chaining] "The client's opinion has to be asked." [The respondent somewhat agreed.]

One thing which emerges from these comments is the importance of good communication skills in dealings with clients. Another is dissatisfaction with some aspects of the translation market.

## 9.9 THE CLIENT'S ROLE IN THE PROCESS OF TRANSLATION

The majority of the respondents reported offering assistance to the translator in more than one way at the moment of assignment by:

- informing the translator about the intended purpose and readers of the translation (62% of all respondents, n=103)
- providing the translator with the name of a person to contact with questions about the subject matter of the original (59%)
- informing the translator about the required level of quality (rough, polished, to be published, etc.) of the translation (49%)
- allowing the translator to use previously made translations or lists of terms concerning the same subject matter (40%).

Fifteen per cent reported offering no assistance at all, at least not in the forms given in the alternatives, to their translators. This can be explained, for instance, by the client having a long-term relationship with the same TSP.

The results of other questions confirm that most respondents are not only willing to do their share in the translation process but also see themselves as partly responsible for the outcome. First, 93% of all respondents agreed with the statement that translation is a cooperation of the translator and the client in which language and culture is the translator's and the subject matter the client's area of expertise. Second, almost as many (87%) agreed that the translator has to know the intended purpose of the translation and, as shown above, 62% *have* informed their translator of it. The difference between these figures suggests, however, that theory and practice do not always meet and that there is room for improving communication between clients and translators in this respect.

Third, more than half (54%) of the respondents thought that they have joint responsibility to the reader with the translator for the quality of the translation. About 29% of the respondents assigned responsibility of the quality to the translator alone and 17% to the client who ordered the translation. The result seems not to be dependent on the size or the nature of the company's activities nor on the role which the respondents play in the translation process. However, those who hire big translation agencies (as opposed to those who do not), mid-sized firms and the checkers were the most willing to accept joint responsibility.

The text type to be translated was connected with how the respondents viewed this matter. Thirty-nine per cent of the respondents who need translations of correspondence and 36% of those who have contracts translated saw the translator as being solely responsible for the quality (compared with 21% and 18%, respectively, of those who do not have these text types translated). Also, 24% of the respondents who have advertisements and 26% of the respondents who have instructions for use translated were willing to accept themselves sole responsibility for the quality of the translation (as opposed to 13% and 14%, re-

spectively, of those who do not have ads or instructions translated). In any case, joint responsibility was clearly the most popular alternative for all text types and all respondent groups.

Finally, 56% of all respondents agreed with the statement that checking a translation is the client's job. This is connected to the respondents' view on who is responsible to the reader for the translation in the sense that those who thought the client is responsible (and also those respondents who have advertisements and instructions for use translated) were slightly more willing than others to also think that it is the client's job to check the translation (and they *did* report checking translations more regularly, see above). (These respondent groups were more often than others for the idea of having a native Russian speaker check Finnish (L1)-to-Russian (L2) translations, or in general having another translator check translations.)

The connection between feeling responsible to the reader for the quality of translations and regarding checking translations as one's job is not clear-cut: about half of those respondents who held the translator responsible for the quality of the translation agreed that checking a translation is the client's job, and half of those who advocated joint responsibility thought that it is *not* the client's job to check the translation. This was also the opinion of about one fourth of the respondents, who regarded the client alone as responsible for the quality. On the whole, the respondents check translations even though many of them think it is not their duty: while 92% of the respondents reported that translations are checked at least occasionally, only 56% thought it was the client's job. This finding can be taken either as a sign of mistrust or as an indication that trust in translation is, in addition to at least some initial role-based (*a priori*) trust, experience-based (*a posteriori*) trust which has to be earned again and again.

Checking may also be a way of keeping an eye on the consistency of the quality and not only a means of establishing whether the quality of each particular text is as it should be.

The respondents of this survey seem to readily accept the position of a norm authority. Three out of four respondents agreed with the statement that the translator must translate in the way the client wants him/her to translate (21% agreed strongly, 57% somewhat). On the whole, agreeing or disagreeing with this statement appeared to have some effect on the way the respondents viewed responsibility for the translation quality, since six (or 29%) of the 21 respondents who agreed strongly with this statement regarded the client solely as responsible for the quality compared with 17% of all respondents. Still, respondents want to determine how their translators translate but mostly leave the responsibility for quality either to the translator or accept joint responsibility with the translator. This interpretation of the findings of the survey is made stronger by the fact that about 75% of those who agreed with the statement that translation is a cooperation between the client and the translator were also of the opinion that the translator must translate in the way the client wants him/her to

translate. It appears then that most respondents are inclined to see translators as having task-responsibility rather than role-responsibility.

## **9.10 REACTIONS TO GOOD OR BAD QUALITY**

The results of this study indicate that a great majority of the respondents somehow express their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the quality of a translation to the translator. A small portion of the respondents, approximately 10%, do not take advantage of the opportunity to support wanted behaviour or to criticise unwanted behaviour.

The most common reaction to a bad-quality translation was giving negative feedback and asking the translator to correct the translation (82% of the respondents). About half of the respondents would change TSPs, and 8% would demand a reduced price. Only one respondent reported that they would not react in any way. Other reactions were, for instance, giving constructive criticism and making an effort to correct the translation together with the translator (6% of the respondents), or revising the translation themselves, that is, without the translator.

The responses of 13% of the respondents show that they would react to bad quality by changing TSPs without giving negative feedback, asking for a reduced price or communicating their dissatisfaction in any other way. In such a case the TSP would have no way of knowing if the quality was poor, or if the client changed TSPs for another reason, or simply did not need translations (from an external TSP) anymore.

Exceptionally good translation quality is likely to be rewarded by the client placing also the next order with the same TSP (75% of the respondents). Sixty per cent indicated giving positive feedback. However, as many as 44% of those who would order the next translation from the same TSP (or 34% of all respondents) would not also give positive feedback. If there is a continuous flow of orders to the same TSP, s/he will know the client is pleased with the quality. If the orders are made very seldom, the TSP may not become aware of the client's opinion. In addition, 6% indicated reacting in no way at all to particularly good quality. On the whole, however, clients appear to make a fairly well-functioning informal agency of accountability which, as defined by Sztompka (1999: 87, see also 6.2.2 above), monitors and sanctions the conduct of the trusted.

## 10 DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to find out what are the norms of non-literary translation in the language pair Finnish and Russian in present-day Finland from the clients' point of view as manifested in their expectations concerning good quality translations. Another purpose was to investigate clients' norms for non-literary translators by studying the selection criteria for translators. The third goal was to determine what the clients' role is in the translation event and thereby in the emergence and development of translation norms. The findings of the present study hopefully increase our understanding of the working life of translators by providing information about clients, who are an important factor in the translation event.

### 10.1 CLIENTS' NORMS CONCERNING NON-LITERARY TRANSLATIONS

According to my review of literature on the marketing of services, the quality of services is regarded as good if a customer's perception of it corresponds to his/her expectations for it. The idea of expectations and experience coinciding is close to, but not quite the same as in the concept of norms. Norm theory holds that translators make decisions and choices according to what they expect is being expected from them: they feel that they *should* do certain things, *avoid* doing some other things or that they *can* or *may* do yet other things in practising their profession. This way they aim at avoiding the negative repercussions of breaking norms and at gaining the rewards of compliance. Readers of translations, who may or may not also be the translators' clients have expectations of what translations should or are allowed to be like. It should be noted that clients' expectations and what they think translations should be like may not coincide: their expectations may be unnecessarily low, for instance, because they have had a bad experience, but they may still have an idea of what translations should be like. The concept of norms appears to suit this line of thinking well. Good quality is not just a service meeting one's expectations, it is a service that meets one's expectations of what one thinks the service *should* be like.

On the basis of this study, most clients seem to have quite clear requirements for translations. Moreover, my findings suggest that their behaviour is consistent with that idea. There are, however, clients who have inconsistent requirements for translations and translators. Also their expertise as buyers of translation services and their ability and willingness to ensure that the quality of translation services meets their requirements varies. That is why it does not seem acceptable to say that quality is good as long as the client is happy. It seems more precise and useful to look at translation quality as consisting of at least two as-



pects in line with Ovetveit's (2000) concept of right quality: first, it must meet professional translators' standards for good quality, and, second, clients must feel that their requirements have been met. Since clients' ability to assess translation quality varies, it appears reasonable to expect that translators, as experts, accept a bigger responsibility here. It would include finding out what the client really wants and needs, being able to justify one's choices and being prepared to deal with clients who are not experts in translation. This requires good communication skills, and, in line with skopos theory, expects translators to be experts (which not every translator is, translation being an open profession). This also suggests that it would be beneficial to cover topics like marketing of professional services in the training of non-literary translators.

The respondents of this survey seemed to have requirements regarding translations that had to do with the relation between source texts and translations. This suggests that the expectation norms cover a wider set of expectations than just those that can be assessed laterally. According to the present study, translations must be accurate renderings of the originals. This requirement is so clear that it speaks for there being a place for the concept of equivalence in translation studies.

The findings also hint at the possibility that the clients' norms of non-literary translation might differ according to the direction of translation. This subject requires, however, more detailed study.

Drawing a line between norms and conventions is difficult. The findings of this study do not appear to be of help in this. The strength of the respondents' opinion expressed as 'strongly agree' or 'strongly disagree' indicates that a negative sanction is to be expected for non-compliance and that a corresponding norm may exist. There seems, however, to be so much variation between respondents that no clear lines can be drawn on the basis of the intensity of the opinions. It is also possible that the topics covered in the questionnaire are not such that would be affected by conventions. For an observer an unconventional feature of a translation would probably fall in cell A of Table 1 above: it would be noticed but no sanction would follow.

Bicchieri's definition of a social norm appears to fit well for describing and analysing translators' attitudes and motives. A client, however, is a source of the expectations that a translator is more or less aware of and possibly aims to fulfil when s/he translates. Toury's classification of norms into basic and secondary norms and tolerated or permitted behaviour appears to offer a good vocabulary for describing and classifying what clients think that should be the norms. A basic norm would be likely to be backed up by sanctions, and translators, for their part, might have normative expectations with sanctions regarding that norm. I would place tolerated or permitted behaviour close to basic norms with a fairly high probability of negative sanctions. Secondary norms could be linked with translators experiencing normative expectations without sanctions.

## 10.2 CLIENTS' NORMS CONCERNING NON-LITERARY TRANSLATORS

There appeared to be no preliminary norms in the form of formal requirements that would restrict access to the translation profession. This is also the position expressed in the 2006 European Standard (ES) for translation services. In hiring decisions the emphasis was on experience, knowledge of terminology of a special field, and on translation and language skills. A university degree in translation was not regarded as important by the respondents. In general, little thought appeared to be given to translators' education. In addition, the respondents had not utilised test translations in order to ascertain the required level of translators' competence. These facts suggest that translation is not considered to be so difficult a skill that it could not be learned without guidance or formal training, and that the level of risk associated with a decision to hire a translator is not very high. Also, the respondents' hiring decisions did not always reflect their requirements for translators.

Still, translators are the ones who create the translation tradition. If hiring decisions are not regarded as risky, and even if the decisions *are* felt to be risky and, because of that, clients transfer the decision-making away from themselves to translation agencies that use subcontractors, it strengthens the translators' role as experts and as norm authorities (i.e. as those who determine what the norms are) and suggests that the clients' role as norm authorities is based on passive acceptance and not on thoroughly thought-out selection criteria. It seems, therefore, that it is the selection of a translator (in accordance with preliminary norms) that precedes the formation of the initial and operational or relation norms, instead of there being awareness of the existing norms and a specific translator being chosen to produce a translation in compliance with those norm. On a more general level, this discussion concerns the relation between the preliminary norms and the initial and operational or relation norms. For instance, in a culture where anyone can work as a translator (i.e. there are no or only very weak preliminary norms covering access to the translation profession), the formation of the initial and operational norms is to some extent left to chance. In addition, weak preliminary norms regarding access to the translation profession emphasise translators' ethical responsibility not to accept translation assignments that are beyond their competence.

Since translation is an open profession, it is fair to ask whether it is an expert professional service. The criteria for professional services listed by Ojasalo (1999; see also section 2.1 above) seem to be applicable to translation, but criterion no. 1 – that professional services are provided by educated and experienced persons with a substantial fund of specialised knowledge often in a narrow area – is not met by all translators. However, the fact that there are less than ideal representatives of a profession should not lower the status of the whole profession. I would rather decide whether an occupation is a profession that provides expert service on the basis of what is required to perform the service well. The

responses to the present study indicate that clients expect translators to have specific skills and experience, often in a special field. Seen from that perspective, translation is a professional service.

### 10.3 CLIENTS' ROLE IN THE TRANSLATION EVENT

Most clients appear to willingly cooperate with translators and see themselves as experts in the subject matter and translators as experts in the languages and cultures in question. However, it seems that not all clients are taking full use of the opportunities that they have to influence who gets to translate and how they should translate. Those opportunities present themselves, for example, in connection with hiring and instructing translators, offering background material, time given for translation, level of translation fees, checking translations and giving feedback. A long working relationship with a TSP can explain some of this. There can nevertheless be at least four other reasons for not making one's requirements clear to the translator. The client may be inexperienced as a requester of translations, s/he may have implicit expectations, s/he may think that translation is not so complicated as to require special attention from the client or, quite the opposite, s/he may regard the translator as the expert who can and should take care of everything independently. The last reason is connected to trust. Trust for the translation profession seems to be a mixture of *a priori* trust, trust that is given beforehand, and *a posteriori* trust, i.e. earned trust. Some findings suggest that trust in translators is role-based (*a priori*), but that translators are seen as having task responsibility. Therefore the level of trust needed would not be very high, which would explain why the respondents seemed not to care about the specifics or the level of translators' education or consider it necessary to check their performance beforehand. At the end of the translation event, however, most respondents seemed quite active in monitoring translators' performance which points to trust having to be earned (*a posteriori* trust). Altogether it is difficult to weigh the plausibility of possible motives: is not checking a translation (absence of monitoring) a sign that it is felt to be unnecessary because the client trusts the translator, or is it a sign of the client's inability or unwillingness to see to it that his/her requirements are fulfilled? There can be different motives for one kind of behaviour, which is a challenge for norms research. An act may be in accordance with a norm but still not motivated by it, because the agent is not acting on the basis of a feeling or knowledge that s/he is expected to act in that way and on the basis of a wish to avoid or gain sanctions.

The findings of the present study do not indicate that lack of trust would be a serious problem in the translation industry, as suggested by Abdallah (her research has covered the relationships between translators and translation agencies which are not included in the present study). Almost all respondents see translation as cooperation between the client and the translator. Around six out

of ten respondents let the translator know the purpose of the translation and provide him/her with the name of a contact person, half of the respondents inform the translator of the required level of quality. There is, however, room for improvement. Further studies would be required to determine whether the situation is changing for the better or for the worse.

Translators have to comply with the norms of their profession, but they, as experts, may also be required to do everything they can to achieve the best possible conditions for observing those norms. One way of doing that could be informing the clients and the public of the translation profession and its requirements. Open public discussion about translation, or about any business where quality is difficult to assess beforehand, could lead to positive changes by decreasing the level of asymmetry of information. Translators themselves as well as translation agencies would I think benefit from using every opportunity to increase the visibility of the translation profession, thus making it easier to assess translators' trustworthiness and strengthening the position of those translators who can prove their competence. Clients might become more aware of their ability to influence translation norms and of ways to do it and start paying more attention to translator selection criteria. This would seem to be in their interest. It would also help if they had a way of making their expectations clearer even to themselves, and a method of evaluating their fulfilment. In other words, clients could find use for a quick and easy method of TQA, which would allow them to evaluate quality in a structured manner while taking into account their situation-specific needs and aiming at objectivity at the same time. I believe that Colina's (2009; see above section 3.1) TQA tool for professional and educational purposes might serve as such a TQA method for clients because it provides a check-list that is short but still addresses the features found important by the respondents of this study: good command of special terminology and the target language, functionality, and accuracy.

#### **10.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

The target group consisted of enterprises that were members of the Finnish-Russian Chamber of Commerce and have translations made in the language pair Finnish–Russian. Their views on translation quality were investigated in a survey using a questionnaire. This target group was selected because of practical reasons in the absence of a database from which a more representative sample could have been taken. However, the companies who received the questionnaire as well as those who responded to it did not seem to be different from any other company in general. Their distribution as to company size of the respondents corresponded quite well with that of all Finnish businesses involved in trade with Russia. Thus the generalisability of the results of the present study seems to be limited only to the presumably small extent that the respondent companies

and their staff members who deal with translations differ from other companies and their personnel.

The choice of the language pair for this study was also dictated by practical reasons such as the author's previous studies. The Russian language is perhaps a fortunate choice in the sense that it is not as commonly known in Finland as, for instance, English or Swedish, but not as rarely spoken as many other languages. This fact may have helped to bring out results that might not have surfaced had the language been more generally known. If the level of knowledge of the language that is foreign in the translation language pair affects the clients' behaviour in the translation event, the generalisability of the results of this study is limited to the extent that such an effect exists. In any case, it was never my intention to aim for results that could only be applicable in translation from Finnish to Russian or from Russian into Finnish. That is why examples of translations from Swedish or English into Russian that were provided by some respondents were included in the analysis. It appears to be common in Finland to have translations made from English into Russian, i.e. between two languages which are non-native for many Finnish translators.

There are risks connected with questionnaires as a method of gathering information. Some of these problems concern also other methods in which information is gathered by asking questions instead of observing behaviour. Multiple-choice questions can steer the respondents' thinking and consequently their responses in directions suggested by the answering alternatives. I tried to minimise this problem by careful choice of words, by allowing more than one alternative answer to be picked and by providing a possibility to answer a question by checking the "other, what?" box and giving a free answer. The respondents were naturally also free not to answer a question, for whatever reason (which turned out to be a rare occasion). Multiple-choice questions have the advantage of providing alternative ways of looking at the subject matter and thus helping respondents analyse their own thoughts, perhaps making implicit thoughts explicit. A disadvantage is that it is likely that some unintentional steering of thinking takes place in a questionnaire through the researcher's choice of questions and their wording and the response alternatives that s/he gives. Answering a questionnaire is also affected by people's wish to give socially acceptable answers even if they answer anonymously, as they did in this case. In addition, some respondents may think about each question carefully before answering while others may fill in a questionnaire quickly without much pondering. As a result the responses cannot be taken as mirror images of the respondents' minds. This problem can be addressed by approaching the object of research from more than one angle, which is what I have tried to do by asking the respondents to provide me with samples of translations in addition to responding to the survey.

The respondents' evaluations of the translations that they sent may be regarded as completely subjective. In an analysis for research purposes, the subjectivity of quality assessment is an evident problem. In order to be as objective

as possible, one tends to pay most attention to the aspects of translations that are clearly wrong (binary errors, to use Pym's term) or clearly correct. Deficiencies such as covert and non-binary errors are more difficult to pinpoint and easily judged according to personal preferences and depending on the evaluator's interpretation of the context. In other words, the degree of subjectivity involved in the assessment of different aspects of quality seems to vary. Furthermore, it is hard to assess the effect of errors and deficiencies on the overall quality and usability of any translation and the size of the risk that they pose on the success of communication. These, I imagine, are the same difficulties that clients face when they evaluate translations, and they make it easy to agree with Lauscher (2000: 162–163) when she says that TQA is inherently subjective.

The generalisability of the results of the present study outside Finland depends at least on the degree to which the discourse of translation is specific to the culture in question and on the influence of other culture-specific factors (history, foreign trade, politics, openness to foreign influences, access and exposure to translated literature and other translated texts, etc.). Finland, for example, is highly dependent on foreign trade<sup>10</sup>. Moreover, Finnish being the language of a small nation and Finland a bilingual country, we are used to translations in culture, politics and everyday life. Countries differ from each other in this respect, so one may also expect the results of similar studies conducted elsewhere to be different.

The norm concept appears to be a fruitful and flexible concept. With its help one can look into the specifics of one case, and investigate the social relations between the parties in detail, or one can take a wider perspective on a section of a society (subculture, field) or a society as a whole. As a basic sociological concept, the norm concept can also be utilised in other approaches to the sociology of translation such as those that rely on Bourdieu's notions of habitus, field and capital. Research into the very concept of norms and the pre-existing expectations that norms entail (as I have tried to do in this study) would also be useful in studying the reception of translations. Bicchieri's (2006) definition of a social norm brings out perhaps more clearly than other definitions that norms exist in the minds of people and that the existence of norms is dependent on the norm subjects having observed corresponding behaviour, and on their feelings and knowledge about possible sanctions connected with that behaviour. Also the expectations can be more or less real and differ in intensity, as the present study hopefully shows.

---

<sup>10</sup> In 2008, the Finnish exports of goods amounted to approx. 18,259 USD/capita while those of Russia were 3,310 USD/capita. For comparison, here are some statistics of other countries' exports of goods per capita in 2008: the USA 4,273 USD, the Netherlands 29,628 USD, Germany 17,713 USD, Great Britain 7,479 USD. These differences perhaps tell something about the general orientation to and dependency on cooperation and trade with foreign countries and hence about the demand for translation. Some economies are more self-sufficient than others. Source: counted from figures available at OECD iLibrary, [www.oecd-ilibrary.org](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org).

The critical incident method appears to be potentially very useful for revealing client expectations. In the present study the method which I expected to use in analysing the translation samples provided by the respondents turned out to be less fruitful than I would have hoped for. Most evaluations that I received from the respondents were positive, or at least not negative, and therefore not necessarily “real” critical incidents as defined by Holmlund (1997; see also 2.6 above). Case studies would probably provide a greater variety of both incidents and evaluations, and also more detailed results.

The present study suffered somewhat from the low response rate to the questionnaire. This is a common problem for surveys involving questionnaires, and solutions to this problem would be very welcome. Questionnaires are, after all, a good method of asking the persons involved directly about the object of research. They can, for instance, reveal things that are *not* done, such as quitting some activity, and the reasons for it. There can, nevertheless, be discrepancies between responses to a questionnaire and how people act in real life, although I would expect the pressure to choose socially acceptable answers to be much smaller in a study on translation than in studies on socially more sensitive topics. In the present study, the combination of a survey and of real translations accepted as such and evaluated by the respondents was designed to increase the validity of the study. However, case studies and in-depth interviews, possibly combined with the critical incident method, could help answer the questions posed in the present study with more certainty and deepen understanding of the client’s role in the translation event. Surveys in other language pairs and larger, randomly chosen samples of target populations would be necessary to verify the results of the present study and the extent to which they are generalisable to the field of non-literary translation in today’s Finland. It would be interesting to conduct similar studies in other countries, for instance, in Russia. Such studies might bring out differences between cultures and shed more light on how cultural, economic, and political factors affect the norms of translation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdallah, K. (2007) Tekstittämisen laatu – mitä se oikein on? [Subtitling quality – what is it?] In Oittinen R. and T. Tuominen (eds.) *Olellaisen äärellä. Johdatus audiovisuaaliseen kääntämiseen*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopistopaino. 272–293.
- Abdallah, K. and K. Koskinen (2007) Managing trust: Translating and the network economy. *META LII* (4), 673–687.
- Abdallah, K. (2010) Translators' agency in production networks. In Kinnunen, T. and K. Koskinen (eds.) *Translators' Agency*. 11–46. Tampere Studies in Language, Translation and Culture. Series B 4. Tampere: Tampere University Press. Retrieved from <http://tampub.uta.fi/> database on 30 Sept 2011.
- Abdallah, K. (2012) *Translators in production networks. Reflections on agency, quality and ethics*. Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology 21. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland. Retrieved from University of Eastern Finland Electronic Publications Database 17 Feb 2012.
- Akerlof, G. (1970) The market for "lemons": quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84 (3), 488–500. Retrieved 30 Nov 2005 from *JSTOR* database.
- Baker, M. (2006) *Translation and conflict. A narrative account*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bartsch, R. (1987) *Norms of language*. London: Longman.
- Bazzanella, C. and R. Damiano (1999) The interactional handling of misunderstanding in everyday conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31 (6), 817–836. Retrieved 24 Mar 2009 from *www.sciencedirect.com* database.
- Bicchieri, C. (2006) *The grammar of society. The nature and dynamics of social norms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. and E. Weizman (2003) Misunderstanding in political interviews. In House, J., G. Kasper and S. Ross (eds.) *Misunderstanding in social life. Discourse approaches to problematic talk*. Harlow: Longman. 107–128.
- Brunette, L. (2000) Towards a terminology for translation quality assessment. A comparison of TQA practices. *The Translator*, 6 (2), 169–182.
- Brunette, L., C. Gagnon and J. Hine (2005) The Grevis Project: revise or court calamity. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 6 (1), 29–45.
- Byrne, J. (2007) *Caveat Translator: Understanding the legal consequences of errors in professional translation*. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, issue 07 January 2007, 2–24. Retrieved 2 Feb 2010 from [www.jostrans.org](http://www.jostrans.org).
- Buzelin, H. (2007) Translations in the making. In Wolf, M. and A. Fukari (eds.). 135–169.
- Chan, A. L. J. (2010) Perceived benefits of translator certification to stakeholders in the translation profession: a survey of vendor managers. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 11 (1), 93–113. Retrieved 18 Aug 2010 from *MetaPress* database.



- Chesterman, A. (ed.) (1989) *Readings in translation theory*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
- Chesterman, A. (1993) From 'Is' to 'Ought': Laws, Norms and Strategies in Translation Studies. *Target* 5 (1), 1–20.
- Chesterman, A. (1997) Ethics of translation. In Snell-Hornby, M., Z. Jettmarová and K. Kaindl (eds.) *Translation as intercultural communication*. Selected papers from the EST congress – Prague 1995. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins. 147–157.
- Chesterman, A. ([1997] 2000) *Memes of translation The spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Chesterman, A. (2002) Pragmatics in Translation Studies. In Helin, I. (ed.) *Essays in translation, pragmatics and semiotics*. Helsinki University Translation Series No. 2. Helsinki: MonAKO. 7–32.
- Chesterman, A. (2006) A note on norms and evidence. In Tommola, J. and Y. Gambier (eds.) *Translation and interpreting – training and research*. Turku: University of Turku (Department of English Translation Studies. 13–19.
- Chesterman, A. (2007) Similarity analysis and the translation profile. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 21 (1), 53–66. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.
- Colina, S. (2009) Further evidence for a functionalist approach to translation quality evaluation. *Target*, 21 (2), 235–264. Retrieved 7 May 2010 from EBSCOhost database.
- Colman, A. M. (1982) *Game theory and experimental games. The study of strategic interaction*. International Series in Experimental Social Psychology Vol. 4. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Dam, H. V. and K. Korning Zethsen (2008) Translator status A study of Danish company translators. *The Translator* 14 (1), 71–96.
- Dam, H. V. and K. Korning Zethsen (2010) Translator status Helpers and opponents in the ongoing battle of an emerging profession. *Target* 22 (2), 194–211. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database on 8 Nov 2011.
- Dascal, M. (1985) The relevance of misunderstanding. In Dascal, M. (ed.) *Dialogue: An interdisciplinary approach*. Pragmatics and Beyond Companion Series; 1. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins. 441–459.
- Edvardsson et al. (1994) = Edvardsson, B., B. Thomasson, and J. Øvretveit (1994) *Quality of service: making it really work*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (2005) *Expertise and explicitation in the translation process*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Federal Post Info (2002) *В Брюсселе постеснялись перевести Путина дословно*. Available on-line: <URL: [http://www.federalpost.ru/out/print\\_4347.html](http://www.federalpost.ru/out/print_4347.html)>. Read 8 Sept 2005.
- Grönroos, C. (2001) *Palveluiden johtaminen ja markkinointi*. (English original *Service management and marketing. A customer relationship management approach* (2000) translated by M. Tillman.) Helsinki: WSOY.
- Gutt, E.-A. (2000) *Translation and relevance*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Halverson, S. (1997) The concept of equivalence in translation studies: much ado about something. *Target*, 9 (2), 207–233.

- Hansen, G. (2008) The speck in your brother's eye – the beam in your own. Quality management in translation and revision. In Hansen, G., A. Chesterman and H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast (eds.) *Efforts and models in interpreting and translation research. A tribute to Daniel Gile*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins. 255–280.
- Hardin, R. (1999) Do we want trust in government? In Warren, M. E. (ed.), 22–41.
- Harré, R. (1999) Trust and its surrogates: psychological foundations of political process. In Warren, M. E. (ed.), 249–272.
- Hermans, T. (1996) *Norms and the determination of translation. A theoretical framework*. URL: [http://eprints.ucl.ac.uk/2005/1/Microsoft\\_Word\\_-\\_96\\_Norms\\_Determination.pdf](http://eprints.ucl.ac.uk/2005/1/Microsoft_Word_-_96_Norms_Determination.pdf). Accessed 3 Feb 2010.
- Hickey, L. D. (2003) The reader as translation assessor. *Studies in Translation*, 1 (1), 59–92. Retrieved 5 Mar 2010 from EBSCOhost database.
- Hirsjärvi, S., P. Remes and P. Sajavaara (eds.) (1997) *Tutki ja kirjoita* [Research and write]. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Holmlund, M. (1997) *Perceived quality in business relationships*. Publications of the Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration Nr 66. Helsinki: Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.
- Holmlund, M. and T. Strandvik (1999) *Critical incidents in business relationships*. Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration Working Papers 396. Helsinki: Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.
- House, J. (1997) *Translation quality assessment. A model revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- House, J. (2001) Translation quality assessment: linguistic description versus social evaluation. *META XLVI* (2), 243–257.
- Hönig, H. (1998) Positions, power and practice: functionalist approaches and translation quality assessment. In Schäffner, C. (ed.) *Translation and quality*. Current issues in language and society. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 6–33.
- Ilmonen, K. and K. Jokinen (2002) *Luottamus modernissa maailmassa*. [Trust in the modern world] SoPhi 60. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Inghilleri, M. (2003) Habitus, field and discourse. Interpreting as a socially situated activity. *Target* 15 (2), 243–268.
- Inghilleri, M. (ed.) (2005) *The Translator. Special issue. Bourdieu and the sociology of translation and interpreting*. 11(2).
- Jalava, J. (2006) *Trust as a decision : The problems and functions of trust in Luhmannian systems theory*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Helsinki, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Policy. The permanent address of the publication is <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:952-10-2855-6>
- Jettmarová, Z. (1998) Influence of translation strategies on target-system norms. Literalness as an overall strategy for translating advertisements in the Czech Republic. In Beylard-Ozeroff, A., J. Králová and B. Moser-Mercer (eds.) *Translators' strategies and creativity. Selected papers from the 9<sup>th</sup> international conference on translation and interpreting, Prague, September 1995. In honor of Jiří Levý and Anton Popovič*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins. 97–105.

- Jänis, M. (2009) Sanatarkasti venäjistä suomeksi. [Literally from Russian into Finnish]. *Idäntutkimus* 2/2009, 27–37.
- Kinnunen, T. and K. Koskinen (eds.) (2010) *Translators' agency*. Tampere Studies in Language, Translation and Culture, Series B 4. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Kolehmainen, T. (2005) Monet uudet puistot ovat käännösvirheitä. [Many new parks are translation errors] *Helsingin Sanomat*, October 18.
- Koller, W. (1995) The concept of equivalence and the object of translation studies. *Target* 7 (2), 191–222.
- Künzli, A. (2005) What principles guide translation revision? A combined product and process study. In Kemble, I. (ed.) *Translation norms. What is 'normal' in the translation profession?* Proceedings of the Conference held on 13th November 2004 in Portsmouth. Portsmouth: School of Languages and Area Studies, University of Portsmouth. 31–44.
- Lauscher, S. (2000) Translation quality assessment. Where can theory and practice meet? *The Translator* 6 (2), 149–168.
- Liljander, V. (1995) *Comparison standards in perceived service quality*. Doctoral Dissertation No. 63. Helsinki: Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.
- Malmkjær, K. (1993) Underpinning translation theory. *Target* 5 (2), 133–148.
- Malmkjær, K. (2004) Censorship or error. Mary Howitt and a problem in descriptive TS. In Hansen, G., K. Malmkjær, and D. Gile (eds.) *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Marcelli, G. G. (2003) The issue of quality in translation and localization: commercial constraints and variables. In Cunico, S. and B. Rodríguez de Céspedes (eds.) *Quality issues in translation*. Portsmouth 16<sup>th</sup> November 2002 Conference Proceedings. University of Portsmouth. 69–83.
- Martín de León, C. (2008) Skopos and beyond. A critical study of functionalism. *Target* 20 (1), 1–28. Retrieved from the EBSCOhost database on 22 Feb 2012.
- Mauranen, A. and P. Kujamäki (eds.) (2004) *Translation universals: Do they exist?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Mossop, B. (2001) *Revising and editing for translators*. Manchester UK and Northampton, MA: St. Jerome.
- Newmark, P. (1991) *About translation*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.
- Newmark, P. (1999) in The second debate in Schäffner, C. (ed.) (1999).
- Nida, E. (1964) Principles of correspondence. In Venuti, L. (ed.) (2000) *The translation studies reader*. London and New York: Routledge. 126–140.
- Nida, E. (1969) Science of translation. In Chesterman, A. (ed.) (1989), 80–98.
- Nord, C. (1991) Scopos, loyalty, and translational conventions. *Target* 3 (1), 91–109.
- Nord, C. (1997) *Translating as a purposeful activity. Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

- Nord, C. (2001) Loyalty revisited. Bible translation as a case in point. *The Translator* 7 (2), 185–202.
- Nord, C. (2005) *Text analysis in translation. Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- OECD iLibrary, [www.oecd-library.org](http://www.oecd-library.org)
- Offe, C. (1999) How can we trust our fellow citizens? In Warren M. E. ed., 42–87.
- Ojasalo, J. (1999) *Quality dynamics in professional services*. Publication of the Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration Nr 76. Helsinki: Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.
- Ojasalo, J. (2001) Managing customer expectations in professional services. *Managing Service Quality*. Vol. 11, Iss. 3, p. 200. Bedford. URL: <[Http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=266749681andsid=3andFmt=4andclientId=23404andRQT=309andVName=PQD](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=266749681andsid=3andFmt=4andclientId=23404andRQT=309andVName=PQD)> Read 2 March 2006.
- Ovretveit, J. (2000) Total quality management in European healthcare. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance* 13 (2), p. 74. Bradford. URL: <[Http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=116350865andsid=9andFmt=3andclientId=23404andRQT=309andVName=PQD](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=116350865andsid=9andFmt=3andclientId=23404andRQT=309andVName=PQD)> Read 2 March 2006.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online. Accessed in Aug 2010.
- Patterson, O. (1999) Liberty against the democratic state: on the historical and contemporary sources of American distrust. In Warren M. E. (ed.), 151–207.
- Probirskaja, S. (2009) *Rajankäyntiä: Suomen ja Venäjän kahdenväliset valtiosopimukset käänntieteellisen avainsana-analyysin valossa*. [Negotiating borders: Bilateral agreements between Finland and Russia in the spotlight of translational keyword analysis.] Doctoral dissertation. Acta Electronica Universitatis Tampereensis, 816. <http://acta.uta.fi/pdf/978-951-44-7629-7.pdf>. Accessed 3 April 2011.
- Pym, A. (1992) Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching. In Dollerup, C. and A. Loddegaard (eds.) *Teaching translation and interpreting. Training, talent and experience*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins. 279–288.
- Pym, A. (1995) European Translation Studies, *Une science qui dérange*, and why equivalence needn't be a dirty word. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 8 (1), 153–176. Retrieved 16 Apr 2009 from [www.erudit.org](http://www.erudit.org) database.
- Pym, A. (1998) *Method in translation history*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Pym, A. (2004a) *The moving text: localization, translation, and distribution*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Pym, A. (2004b) Propositions on cross-cultural communication and translation. *Target* 16 (1), 1–28.
- Pym, A. (2008) On Toury's laws of how translators translate. In Pym, A., M. Shlesinger and D. Simeoni (eds.) (2008) *Beyond descriptive translation studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*. Philadelphia: Benjamins. 311–328.

- Pym, A. (2010) *Exploring translation theories*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Pääkkönen, S. (2004) Ärsyyntynyt lukija löysi romaanista 2500 pilkkuvirhettä [Annoyed reader found 2,500 comma errors in a novel]. *Helsingin Sanomat*, Culture Section, 9 Jan 2004. Retrieved from Helsingin Sanomat Digital Archive on 10 Apr 2012.
- Risku, H. (2002) Situatedness in translation studies. *Cognitive Systems Research* 2 (2002), 523–533. Retrieved from [www.elsevier.com](http://www.elsevier.com) database on 30 Sept 2011.
- Risku, H. (2010) A cognitive scientific view on technical communication and translation. Do embodiment and situatedness really make a difference? *Target* 22 (1), 94–111. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database on 8 Nov 2011.
- Savory, T. (1968) *The art of translation*. Jonathan Cape: London.
- Schäffner, C. (ed.) (1999) *Translation and norms*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto, Sydney, Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters.
- Schäffner, C. (2011) Theory of translational action. In *Handbook of Translation Studies Online 2011*. John Benjamins. Retrieved 18 Apr 2012.
- Sciolino, E. (2002) *Putin offers radical surgery for Chechen rebels*. Available on-line: <URL: <http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2002/11/12/1037080733344.html>>. Read 29 Sept 2005.
- Sela-Sheffy, R. (2005) How to be a (recognized) translator. Rethinking habitus, norms, and the field of translation. *Target* 17 (1), 1–26. Retrieved 29 Nov 2009 from EBSCOhost database.
- SFS-EN 15038 *Käännöspalvelut. Palveluvaatimukset*. [Translation services. Service requirements EN 15038:2006]. Helsinki: Finnish Standards Association SFS.
- Shapiro, S. (1987) The social control of impersonal trust. *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 93, no. 3, 623–658. Retrieved 17 Nov 2010 from JSTOR database.
- Simeoni, D. (1998) The pivotal status of the translator's habitus. *Target* 10 (1), 1–39.
- Simola, H. and S-E. Ollus (2008) *Suomen Venäjän-kaupan yritys rakenne* [Entrepreneurial structure of Finland's trade with Russia]. BOFIT Online 2008 No. 7. Helsinki: Bank of Finland. Available at: <http://www.suomenpankki.fi/NR/rdonlyres/1C90636D-0AC8-4908-A526-CE240C2C2C01/0/bon0708.pdf>
- Susiluoto, T. (1997) *Käännös oikeudellisena kokonaisuutena. Oikeudet ja velvollisuudet*. [Translation as a legal entity. Rights and obligations.] Helsinki: Cubitum.
- Sztompka, P. (1999) *Trust. A sociological theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tadd, W. (1994) Accountability and nursing. In Chadwick R. F. (ed.) *Ethics and the professions*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Tashakkori, A. and C. Teddlie (1998) *Mixed methodology. Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume 46. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.

- Thomson-Wohlgemuth, G. and I. Thomson (2004) Acquiring capabilities in translation. Towards a model of translation business. *Target* 16 (2), 253–287.
- Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Toury, G. (1999) A handful of paragraphs on 'translation' and 'norms'. In Schäffner, C. (ed.) (1999). 9–31.
- Toury, G. (2004) Probabilistic explanations in translation studies: Welcome as they are, would they qualify as universals? In Mauranen, A. and P. Kujamäki (eds.), 15–32.
- Varian, H. R. (1996) *Intermediate microeconomics. A modern approach*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York, London: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Vehmas-Lehto, I. (1989) *Quasi-correctness. A critical study of Finnish translations of Russian journalistic texts*. Neuvostoliittoinstituutin vuosikirja N:o 31. Helsinki: Neuvostoliittoinstituutti.
- Vehmas-Lehto, I. (2005) Rakenneansoja ja piilovirheitä. Kohti selkeämpää käsitystä käännösvirheistä [Structural traps and covert errors. Towards a clearer conception of translation errors]. In Yli-Jokipii, H. (ed.) *Kielen matkassa multimediaan Näkökulmia kääntämisen tutkimiseen ja opiskelemiseen*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, Käännöstieteen laitos. 49–74.
- Vermeer, H. J. (1989) Skopos and commission in translational action. In Chesterman, A. (ed.) (1989), 173–187.
- Vermeer, H. J. (1996) *A skopos theory of translation (Some arguments for and against)*. Heidelberg: TEXTconTEXT.
- Warren, M. E. (ed.) (1999) *Democracy and trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Warren, M. E. (1999) Democratic theory and trust. In Warren, M. E. (ed.) (1999), 310–345.
- Weigand, E. (1999) Misunderstanding: The standard case. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31 (6), 763–785. Retrieved Mar 24, 2009 from [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com) database.
- Weizman, E. and Blum-Kulka, S. (1987) Identifying and interpreting translated texts: on the role of pragmatic adjustment. In Toury, G. (ed.), *Translation across cultures*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications Pvt. Ltd.
- Wolf, M. (2007) Introduction: the emergence of a sociology of translation. In Wolf, M. and A. Fukari (eds.), 1–36.
- Wolf, M. and A. Fukari (eds.) (2007) *Constructing a sociology of translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Wright, G. H. von (1963) *Norm and action. A logical enquiry*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Zeithaml V.A and M. J. Bitner (2000) *Services marketing. Integrating customer focus across the firm*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

# APPENDIX

Questionnaire. Translation of the four-page original from Finnish into English

The quality of translation from the client's point of view

## QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Our company is:
  - 1 large (number of employees 250 or more)
  - 2 mid-size (number of employees 50–249)
  - 3 small (number of employees 10–49)
  - 4 a micro company (less than 10 employees)
  
2. Our company is involved in the trade with Russia as:
  - 1 an exporter, 2 an importer, 3 an exporter and an importer, 4 a company offering services related to trade with Russia, 5 other, what?.....
  
3. Background information of the respondent (please mark all that apply):
  - 1 I am the person who decides which translator or translation agency to hire.
  - 2 I handle the commissions of the translations that we need, but I have not chosen our present translator (s).
  - 3 I am a person who checks translations. I check translations from
    - 1 Finnish into Russian,
    - 2 Russian into Finnish.
  
4. My status in our organisation is:
  - 1 clerical worker, 2 expert, 3 middle management, 4 upper management.
  
5. The translations from Finnish into Russian and Russian into Finnish that we need are done by (please mark all that apply and underline the translation service provider that you use the most):
  - 1 a freelancer or private trader working alone
  - 2 a translation agency with several translators and/or subcontractors
  - 3 a translator employed by our company
  - 4 an employee of our company who translates among other duties
  
6. Our company uses the following external translation service providers:
  - 1 Translators/translation agencies based in Finland for translations from
    - 1 Finnish into Russian,
    - 2 Russian into Finnish.
  - 2 Translators/translation agencies based abroad for translations from
    - 1 Finnish into Russian,
    - 2 Russian into Finnish. Based in which countries?.....
  
7. Please mark three types of texts that you have translated most often. Please strike through unnecessary direction of translation.
  - 1 correspondence: from Finnish into Russian / Russian into Finnish
  - 2 contracts: from Finnish into Russian / Russian into Finnish

- 3 advertisements: from Finnish into Russian / Russian into Finnish
- 4 instructions for use: from Finnish into Russian / Russian into Finnish
- 5 documents for officials: from Finnish into Russian / Russian into Finnish
- 6 other, what?.....

**8.** Our translator / translation agency has been chosen on the following grounds (please mark all that apply):

- 1 they were the one with the lowest cost
- 2 on the basis of a test translation
- 3 on the basis of the translator / translation agency being well-known
- 4 the area of expertise of the translator / translation agency suits our needs
- 5 on the basis of the translator's / translation agency's experience
- 6 on the basis of the education of the translator or the staff of the translation agency
- 7 on the basis of the translator's language skills
- 8 on the basis of the speed and reliability of the delivery of translations
- 9 other grounds, which?.....
- 10 I do not know

**9.** In our company, translations from Finnish into Russian are checked:

1 always, 2 usually, 3 occasionally, 4 never, 5 I do not know 6 we do not need translations from Finnish into Russian.

**10.** In our company, translations from Russian into Finnish are checked:

1 always, 2 usually, 3 occasionally, 4 never, 5 I do not know 6 we do not need translations from Russian into Finnish.

**11.** In practice, the best way to check a translation is (please mark the way that you think is the most important):

- 1 to compare it with the original text to see if the translation corresponds with it accurately
- 2 to read the translation to see if it is such as a text of that type (e.g. an ad, a brochure, a contract etc.) should be
- 3 to read the translation and to assess whether it is written in good and clear Finnish or Russian
- 4 some other way, which?.....

**12.** What instructions and assistance do you offer to the translator in connection with the commission? Please mark all that apply.

- 1 we inform the translator of the intended use and readership of the translation
- 2 we inform the translator of the required level of quality (rough translation, polished translation, translation to be published etc.)
- 3 we give to the translator the name of a person whom s/he may contact regarding the content of the text
- 4 we offer to the translator translations and term lists made previously on the same subject matter



5 other instructions or assistance, what?.....

6 we do not offer instructions, the translator knows what s/he is doing

**13.** What is, or would be, your attitude toward your translator turning to your staff for help, for instance, in questions regarding the translation of the special terminology of your field?

1 positive: the translator is being careful

2 negative: the translator should be competent enough to work things out independently

3 neither positive nor negative

4 our translator has never asked for help

**14.** In your opinion, who is responsible for the quality of the translation toward the reader of the translation?

1 the translator, 2 the company that ordered the translation, 3 the translator and the company that ordered the translation jointly

**15.** What do you do, if a translation does not live up to your expectations? Please mark all that apply.

1 we give negative feedback and ask the translator to correct the translation

2 we demand a reduced fee

3 we change translators/translation agencies

4 other, what?.....

5 we do not react in any way

**16.** What do you do if a translation is exceptionally good? Please mark all that apply.

1 we give positive feedback

2 we order the next translation from the same translator or translation agency

3 other, what?.....

4 we do not react in any way

**17.** Please assess possible deficiencies of translations by marking each item with a number indicating their severity on the scale 1=very serious, 2=not very serious, 3=harmless, 4=not an error.

\_\_\_ Grammatical error

\_\_\_ Typo

\_\_\_ Carelessness in numbers

\_\_\_ Translator has forgotten to translate a part of the text

\_\_\_ The whole translation follows closely the word order of the original.

\_\_\_ The original is difficult to read and complicated and so is the translation

\_\_\_ The translation is good otherwise, but its language seems somehow weird

\_\_\_ The typographic solutions of the translation are not suitable for purpose.

\_\_\_ In your opinion, the translator has misinterpreted the intention of the original author.

\_\_\_ A term of a special field is mistranslated.

\_\_\_ A Finnish-to-Russian translation of an advertisement meant to be published in Russia is clear and error-free but stylistically not the way it should be in Russia.

**18.** Please consider the following statements regarding non-literary translations and their translators.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. A translation must correspond to the source text word-for-word and sentence-for-sentence.	1	2	3	4
2. A translator must mould a difficult-to-read translation into one with easy-to-read and natural language.	1	2	3	4
3. For a translation, the most important thing is that it is understandable. A few grammatical errors or typos do not matter.	1	2	3	4
4. A translator may leave untranslated those parts of the source text which s/he considers unnecessary for the readers.	1	2	3	4
5. A translator may add to the translation clarifications which s/he considers necessary for the readers.	1	2	3	4
6. A translation does not have to be word-for-word. The most important thing is that it works as a text of its own type, e.g. as instructions for use.	1	2	3	4
7. It is the client's job to check the translation.	1	2	3	4
8. A translation is a client's and a translator's joint project in which the translator is the expert of language and culture and the client the expert of the subject matter.	1	2	3	4
9. A Finnish-speaking translator must have his/her Finnish-into-Russian translation checked by a native speaker of Russian.	1	2	3	4

10. A translator must have his/her translation checked by another translator.                    1                    2                    3                    4

11. It is necessary that a translator is aware of the intended purpose of the translation.                    1                    2                    3                    4

12. A translation agency is allowed to have their subcontractor do the translation who, in turn, is allowed to have his/her subcontractor do it.                    1                    2                    3                    4

13. A translator must translate as the client wants him/her to translate.                    1                    2                    3                    4

14. A translator must check with the client and correct errors in the source text.                    1                    2                    3                    4

15. A translation from Russian into Finnish may appear that it is just that.                    1                    2                    3                    4

16. Good quality of the translations used in external communication has a positive effect on a company's image.                    1                    2                    3                    4

**19.** What qualities and capabilities do you require from a translator? Please pick a maximum of four most important qualities.

- 1 a degree in translation from a university or language institute
- 2 a university degree in the language in question
- 3 an authorised translator's diploma (formerly, a sworn translator's diploma)
- 4 sufficient language skills regardless of how they were acquired
- 5 sufficient translation skills regardless of how they were acquired
- 6 knowledge of the terminology of a special field (e.g. technology or the economy)
- 7 experience in working as a translator
- 8 ability to use translation memory software
- 9 ability to use graphic design and layout software, which software?.....
- 10 other qualities, which?.....

**20.** Please place in order of importance five features of service offered by a translator or a translation agency that you consider are most important so that **of the features you chose** 1= the most important and 5= the least important:

- \_\_\_ ability to meet deadlines
- \_\_\_ ability to provide fast delivery times

- good prices
- good-quality translations
- ability to bid fast
- customer service attitude of the translator or the translation agency's staff
- the translator or the translation agency has proper premises, IT equipment and software
- the translator's or the translation agency's website is well designed and easy to use
- the translator or the translation agency has a good reputation
- ability to keep confidentiality
- the translator or the translation agency has been awarded a quality certificate
- other, which?.....

**21.** In your opinion, which of the below alternatives is the most suitable translation for Sibelius-Akatemia [the Sibelius Academy]:

- 1 Академия имени Я. Сибелиуса [Academy named after J. Sibelius]
- 2 Государственная консерватория имени Я. Сибелиуса [State Conservatory named after J. Sibelius]
- 3 Сибелиус-Академия [Sibelius Academy]
- 4 Академия Сибелиуса [Academy of Sibelius]
- 5 I do not know

**22.** In your opinion, which of the below alternatives is the most suitable translation for an institute of higher education called Московская государственная консерватория имени П.И. Чайковского [Moscow P. I. Tchaikovsky Conservatory]:

- 1 Moskovon Tšaikovski-konservatorio [Moscow Tchaikovsky Conservatory]
- 2 Moskovon valtiollinen P. I. Tšaikovskille nimetty konservatorio [Moscow State Conservatory named after P. I. Tchaikovsky]
- 3 Tšaikovski-konservatorio [Tchaikovsky Conservatory]
- 4 Tšaikovski-Akatemia [Tchaikovsky Academy]
- 5 I do not know

**23.** Please describe in your own words what a good-quality translation of a non-literary text is like: .....

.....

Other comments on translations and translators: .....

.....

Thank you for your response. I would like to remind you of my request to send me a translated non-literary text that you regard as a good or a bad translation, together with its source text and your comments, for linguistic analysis. Please see the cover letter for more details.