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Abstract

While the merits of outsourcing remain a hot topic in the age of globalisation, the beginning of the new decade has witnessed the rise of a widely used translation technique – crowdsourcing. Translation crowdsourcing is the process of pitching a translation task to a crowd of volunteers who, if interested, can contribute to the completion of the task by translating a share of it for a financial reward or, as is often the case, free of charge.

Taking the case of Facebook translation and focusing particularly on the communities of Danish and Dutch user-translators, this study aims to understand the motivation underpinning translation contributions, and how these are executed. It poses the following research questions:

Why do crowds engage in online volunteer translation for Facebook, what motivates individuals to participate, and how do they process the translation tasks?

A mixed-methods research design involving netnography and triangulation of data from three empirical sources was incorporated to produce data on the community of user-translators, their translation activities and performance within the Facebook collaborative translation platform. The three sources were: (1) an online questionnaire survey distributed to Danish and Dutch user-translators, (2) a set of textual data in the shape of Danish and Dutch user-translators’ discussions of source-texts, and (3) two online interviews with user-translators. Notable analytical tools included volunteer motivation theory, concepts of human desires and translation strategies.

The analysis of the collected data suggests that the Danish and Dutch Facebook user-translators are motivated to participate in translation by a number of factors which primarily contribute to the satisfaction of their needs of ambition, competence, entertainment, social contact and status. The studied user-translators perceive the Facebook initiative as an opportunity to practice skills, collaborate with peers, building a positive personal image online, exercising the freedom to contribute, enjoying translation as an entertainment and pastime activity, and benefitting the people wishing to use Facebook in their own language. For some user-translators, these elements have a positive effect on their self-confidence. Others recognise the ambition to succeed in activities that interest them and the competition with peers to produce translations as motives for participation.

Based on these results, the study characterises the engagement of crowds in online volunteer translation for Facebook. It explains individuals’ motivation to participate and their performance with translation tasks. In this regard, the findings offer an account of how Danish and Dutch user-translators approach translation tasks and attempt to overcome obstacles in the translation process.
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Glossary of Terms Specific to Facebook Translation Crowdsourcing

The following section lists and defines the key terms associated with Facebook’s translation crowdsourcing platform and used in the thesis. The definitions have been provided by the researcher.

**Facebook Messenger**
an instant messaging service and software application integrated as a chat feature on Facebook.

**Glossary**
a list of words and phrases recognised as terminology, fixed terms or expressions which must be used, where applicable, in the target language. The glossary is managed by Facebook and is provided as tool to the user-translators.

**Input module**
a module within the translation app displaying the source phrases which need to be translated into the target language. It also receives translations from Facebook user-translators.

**Leaderboard**
a ranking chart within the translation app displaying users who translate for Facebook. They are listed either in terms of (1) the value and amount of their contributions to the translation of Facebook during a specified period of time or (2) on the overall impact of their contribution with translations in their particular language.

**Style guide**
a set of stylistic guidelines belonging to a particular target language. The style guide cannot be edited by the user-translators.

**Translations**
a Facebook application (app) in which the whole Facebook translation module is embedded. The user must install it on Facebook to facilitate participation in the translation activity on Facebook. The app grants access to the translation platform, leaderboards, glossary and style guide, and contains statistical information about users’ contribution with translations. The interface of **Translations** is translated into each target language and user-translators must choose the language in which they wish to translate during the installation of the app.

**Translator Community**
a Facebook group page for user-translators functioning as a communication channel for the Facebook user-translators. There are separate group pages for all of the languages in which Facebook is being translated. User-translators are free to join the group belonging to the language they translate into. They will obtain group membership once their request has been approved by Facebook.

**Translator Community for Dansk** and **Translator Community for Nederlands** are the names of the translator community group pages referred to in this thesis.
User-translator: someone who has created a profile on Facebook, installed *Translations* and is active with translation on the app.

Voting module: a module presenting the user-translators with the source phrases and their translations, enables them to vote the translations up or down and stores these votes. It can be accessed from within *Translations*.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In recent years, the phenomenon of crowdsourcing has rapidly gained ground in the world’s international business markets and it has become a popular tool for companies and organisations seeking new ways of completing tasks in the most effective and least costly way. In this thesis, I will explore the phenomenon of crowdsourcing in the translation industry and attempt to uncover the motivations and work processes for Danish and Dutch speaking users of Facebook – hereinafter referred to as user-translators – who volunteer to carry out crowdsourced translation tasks being outsourced to them as a crowd on the internet.

The term ‘crowdsourcing’ was first coined by Jeff Howe in 2006 in an article in the online magazine *WIRED* (Howe, 2006). Crowdsourcing, according to Howe, consists of companies outsourcing specific tasks to an online community rather than exploiting the talent of a fixed workforce. In the article, Howe presented the term to define an emerging phenomenon that was beginning to transform various commercial sectors, especially in the US, and change the way the actors within these markets were doing business. According to Howe, technological advances in software programs and other digital tools within the commercial sectors are continually breaking down the cost barriers that previously separated professionals from amateurs (ibid.) which in turn has encouraged companies to take advantage of the range of talents among amateurs.

I am particularly interested in translation crowdsourcing due to its rising popularity and use within the translation industry and its success among project managers and crowdsourcers alike. Particularly, I have premised my research on the above understanding of crowdsourcing, and how it is influencing the work of translation professionals.

1.2 Research questions

To study translation crowdsourcing within an authentic environment, I have examined the social network, Facebook, and its attempt to crowdsource translation tasks on an online app. The main objective of this thesis is thus to elucidate how user-translators on Facebook operate and provide an understanding of what motivates them to participate in translation crowdsourcing. I am interested in discovering who these crowdsourcers are, why they engage in translation crowdsourcing, and how they work with the translation tasks. Through netnography and a carefully selected set of analytical research questions, this paper will investigate the effects of personal interest and motivation on behavioural patterns in a group of translation crowdsourcers.
Therefore, the central questions in this thesis are:

*Why do crowds engage in online volunteer translation for Facebook, what motivates individuals to participate, and how do they process the translation tasks?*

The answers to these questions will be based on a study of Danish and Dutch speaking user-translators on Facebook. When exploring the different elements that constitute the work with translation for Facebook, I will employ a mix of product, process and participant-oriented research approaches to examine the situation of working with the translation tasks on Facebook. To explain user motivation for participating in translation crowdsourcing, I will include an examination of their backgrounds, their approach to the translation tasks and the areas of the tasks on which they focus. This leads me to further reflect on the research area of this thesis and produce the following four sub-questions:

1. *What makes crowdsourced translation tasks attractive to Facebook users?*
2. *What motivates individuals to engage in volunteer translation crowdsourcing on Facebook?*
3. *What skills and experiences do Facebook users bring into their translation work, and how is their performance influenced by their personal background?*
4. *How do Facebook users work with translation, and how do they handle potential obstacles in the process?*

These questions constitute the research frame that will guide the work of this thesis. They will function as supporting pillars of the main research question posed above, and I will employ them to answer the main research question.

### 1.3 Research methods

In this thesis, the motivation of volunteer translation crowdsourcers and their performance and involvement with translation tasks are studied. The study consists of a questionnaire with two groups of crowdsourcers, a selection of authentic textual data and two online interviews with a couple of translation crowdsourcers. These three different approaches involve different methods of data collection and should thus allow for a versatile pool of empirical observations.

The aim of this thesis is to produce a comprehensive overview of worker motivation in translation crowdsourcing on Facebook. As we shall see in the following section, the research questions put forward in this thesis further revolve around unanswered or scientifically intriguing questions in the relevant research articles I have read.
1.4 Literature review

In the following sections, I will provide an extensive literature review within the sphere of translation crowdsourcing in order to define the position of the current research within the field. This part of chapter 1 will thus provide the foundation on which I am constructing my research. It will adopt the approach advocated by Saldanha & O’Brien (2014) who argue that the literature review as a method should be able to identify, evaluate and synthesise the existing body of completed and recorded work produced by researchers, scholars, and practitioners (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2014: 19).

In section 1.4.1, I will account for my motivation for examining translation crowdsourcing. In section 1.4.2, I will present the current perceptions of crowdsourced translation. In section 1.4.3, I will introduce previous studies conducted on translation crowdsourcing. In section 1.4.4, I will define three concepts of motivation in different settings. These three concepts will be employed in later analyses. In section 1.4.5, I will perform a literature evaluation accounting for my method of incorporating arguments and concepts from previous research in the examination of data in this thesis.

1.4.1 Motivation

As stated above, I have premised my research on an initial understanding of translation crowdsourcing, and how it is influencing the work of translation professionals. This understanding emanates from an EC publication entitled ‘Studies on translation and multilingualism – Crowdsourcing translation’ (2012), issued by the European Commission, which assesses, in general, the opportunities of working with translation through crowds. I first became acquainted with this paper as a trainee in DG Translation in autumn 2012, where its content was a hot topic among my translator colleagues. Especially, the paper’s discussion of translation crowdsourcing’s impact on the translation profession raised concern. The paper introduces the concept of crowdsourcing, examines examples of crowdsourced translation and assesses the impacts of the phenomenon on the translation profession as well as its applications to institutions. I find that it has provided me with a decent understanding of the crowdsourcing phenomenon illustrating how different stakeholders, including academic scholars and large international organisations are interested in the topic and crowdsourcing’s growing significance for the entire translation industry.

My main motivation for examining this particular means of translation has thus been encouraged by translation crowdsourcing’s presence as an impending field of research within translation studies. I therefore hope to add to the literature regarding motivations of translation crowdsourcers by examining

---

1 DG Translation, Directorate-General for Translation, is the European Commission’s internal translation department.
the performance of two groups of crowdsourcers who have managed to translate the world’s most popular social media platform into other languages. My study will extend the line of previously conducted research within the field while adding new observations, especially as regards motivation of translation crowdsourcers, by focusing specifically on how two different online crowd communities work; i.e. a group of Danish speaking user-translators and a group of Dutch speaking user-translators on Facebook. In the subsequent chapters, I will attempt to evaluate details not previously investigated as well as support and counter arguments that have been presented by other researchers in the same or related fields.

The practical purpose of this section is to provide a comprehensive overview of the research. In order to conduct a proper literature review, I will attempt to characterise the key parts of available literature that relate to my investigation, an exercise recommended by Jørgensen et al. (2011), prior to embarking on primary research (2011: 156). The literature review will thus be able to demonstrate the position of this thesis and its contributions to the field of translation studies.

1.4.2 Current perceptions of crowdsourced translation

I find it important to include a general outline of research on crowdsourced translation to understand its growing importance among translation scholars. Dr Minako O’Hagan, Senior Lecturer at School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies at Dublin University, discusses this extensively in the 2010/2011 special edition of ‘Linguistica Antverpiensia New Series – Themes in Translation Studies’ which she compiled and edited. This edition entitled ‘Translation as a Social Activity – Community Translation 2.0’ comprises a range of contributions from different academic scholars within the area of collaborative translation and includes a specific focus on the translation crowdsourcing phenomenon.

In her introduction, O’Hagan suggests some of the directions for future research within community translation and argues that this field is far more than a dilettante, anti-professional movement (2011: 11). Instead, she claims that community translators are often passionate, knowledgeable people devoted to a cause or matter they know a lot about (ibid: 15). She then discusses the term crowdsourcing, and accounts for the contributors’ analyses and results which have made new knowledge available to translation stakeholders. O’Hagan presents a great deal of analysis relevant to this thesis: an emergent collaborative translation model (as shown through the online crowdsourcing initiatives discussed by Kelly et al. (p. 75ff)), an introduction of the ethics of crowdsourcing by Dolmaya (p. 97ff), and Desjardin’s account of how social media networking can be used to train translators through the app launched by Facebook to translate its web content (p. 175ff).
As mentioned above, O’Hagan concludes by explaining the need for future research on community translation able to shed light on the work and interaction between user-translators in online communities, and the interesting possibilities and implications that arise from the recent online technological trends (2011: 20). The research of this thesis is therefore grateful to and inspired by the points put forward by O’Hagan as well as her encouragement to investigate the field of translation crowdsourcing in further detail.

1.4.3 Studies conducted on translation crowdsourcing

In this section, I will present and summarise the key points of related studies conducted within the field of translation crowdsourcing and account for their methods and results. This will establish an understanding of the foundation of the present research and justify a niche for this thesis as well as the contributions it will make.

Numerous studies have compared samples of crowdsourced translation with machine translation (MT) and investigated the advantages, disadvantages and opportunities of both practices (see e.g. Ambati, Vogel & Carbonell (2010), Anastasiou & Gupta (2011), Austermühl (2011), Kunchukuttan et al. (2012) and Muntés-Molero et al. (2012)). In this regard, Ambati, Vogel and Carbonell note that “translation is a complex cognitive task that requires specific language skills like reading, understanding and writing in multiple languages.” (2012: 1192). Some of these studies have examined the possibilities of active-learning practices in crowdsourcing as well as the future developments of the Internet regarding user-generated content. For example, Kunchukuttan et al. (2012) have examined how crowdsourcing provides a tool for exploring the large-scale bundle of resources for MT and the importance to understand how factors such as task design, crowd motivation and quality control can influence the success of a crowdsourcing venture. All of these studies have been carried out as online experiments: by creating and observing tasks on crowdsourcing platforms (Ambati, Vogel & Carbonell (2010)), through direct analyses of MT output (Austermühl (2011)) or with online surveys of crowdsourcers (Anastasiou & Gupta (2011)). Regarding the research of Anastasiou & Gupta, their discussion of challenges to motivation of crowdsourcers constitutes a key point of view: “if it ([motivation]) is missing, crowdsourcing is not feasible. Gaining the attention of people and making them emotionally attached is a difficult achievement. The motivation of the crowd can vary: seeking knowledge, recognition and reputation, charity work, money, emotional attachment, and fun.” (2011: 641).

Further, some scholars have focused on the impact of volunteer translation on the translation profession (e.g. Garcia (2010) and Flanagan (2013)) while others have examined the practical challenges involved in crowdsourcing translation via the web (Ambati, Vogel & Carbonell (2012)), the kinds of mechanisms able to
increase the quality of crowdsourced translation to near professional levels (Callison & Burch (2011)) and the questions surrounding translation competence, problems and errors (Melis & Albir (2001)). The final study has classified the translation problems presented by Nord in order to propose a set of quality assessment criteria for translations (Melis & Albir, 2001: 281). Their research is unpacking the kinds of translation obstacles that user-translators are encountering on Facebook. Additionally, they encourage further research to provide “empirical data on the problems encountered by the translator and the mechanisms the translator uses solving them, as well as on problem-solving in the translation competence acquisition process” (ibid.). Part of my research and analysis will attempt to uncover the mechanisms employed by Facebook user-translators to complete translation assignments.

Another point of interest to my study is the Master’s thesis by Geerts entitled “Discovering Crowdsourcing – Theory, Classification and Directions for use” (2009). Here Geerts has adopted a design-oriented objective by developing a protocol that can support practitioners in the application of crowdsourcing. In this way, she provides a characterisation of crowdsourcing types by collecting and analysing examples from around the web. Although she focuses primarily on organisation and management research, she also accounts for the emerging nature and broad range of crowdsourcing as a topic, and explains how her study forms “a scientific basis for the subject to mature from further studies and experiences” (2009: vi).

1.4.4 Concepts of motivation in different settings

Studies into the motivation and reasons for businesses to take advantage of the opportunities presented by crowdsourcing have also been conducted. For instance, Mesipuu (2010) has investigated the “hows” and “whys” of translation crowdsourcing by examining two cases of volunteer translation in two different online communities – the open community of Facebook and the closed community of Skype (ibid: 4). Her two case studies consisted of issuing surveys to 10 Estonian speaking translators from the two online communities. This enabled her to suggest a number of improvements that would allow the two companies to optimise work conditions for user-translators on their platforms. Regarding the Facebook study, she concludes that ambition is not a significant motivational factor for the user-translators; more important is the desire to do things because they matter (e.g. making communication available in other languages, contributing to the development of the language) or to realise one’s individual potential (ibid: 39).

Moreover, Kaufmann et al. (2011) have conducted a study on worker motivation in crowdsourcing that adopts different models from classic motivation theory, work motivation theory and open source software development to crowdsourcing markets by analysing the survey responses of 431 workers on Amazon’s
Mechanical Turk. In doing so, Kaufmann et al. prepare and present a model that accounts for seven different constructs of intrinsic motivation: skill variety, task identity, task autonomy, direct feedback from the job, pastime, community identification and social contact (2011: 4). These categorisations state that people participate in crowdsourcing activities for different reasons:

(1) Skill variety entails practising personal skills needed to solve a specific task.

(2) Task identity entails the ability to see how the result of one’s work is used.

(3) Task autonomy refers to the degree of freedom that is allowed to the worker during task execution. If decision-making and creativity are permitted, the worker’s motivation will be enhanced.

(4) Direct feedback from a job covers to which extent a sense of achievement can be perceived during or after task execution.

(5) The pastime category covers acting just to “kill time”. It appears if a worker acts in order to avoid boredom.

(6) Community identification entails a subconscious adoption of norms and values from the crowdsourcing platform community guiding crowdsourcer motivation.

(7) Social contact covers the motivation caused by the sheer existence of the community, and thus the crowdsourcer’s ability to be socially involved with other people.

It should be noted here that Kaufmann et al. adopt a general approach to worker motivation in crowdsourcing and thus do not focus on translation in particular. I will thus add an angle to the results produced by Kaufmann et al., as well as the other scholars and researchers examined here, by generating knowledge of worker motivation in translation crowdsourcing.

Moreover, the recently published PhD dissertation by Dombek (2014) studies the motivations of internet users in translation crowdsourcing. Dombek has carried out a case study of Polish user-translators on Facebook in order to understand the motivations behind their engagement in their translation work. She employs a mixed-methods research design that links netnography with online surveys and an observational study to collect the data on the user-translators, their activities and use of the Facebook app for translation. As her methodological approach, she primarily opts for the self-determination theory (SDT), a motivation theory concerned with motivation in social contexts. SDT holds that “the motivation to pursue and attain one’s valued outcomes depends on the degree to which the needs of autonomy, relatedness and competence can be satisfied in these processes” (2014: 76). On these grounds, she presents a set of factors

2 Amazon’s Mechanical Turk is an online crowdsourcing marketplace that musters human intelligence in order to solve tasks that are currently impossible for computers to perform.
which can positively and negatively affect the motivation of participants engaging in various types of translation crowdsourcing (Dombek, 2014: 265ff). Positive motivation factors include benefitting others, putting one’s skills into practice, collaborating with others, building a positive personal image online, having the freedom to contribute and enjoying translation as an entertainment activity. Negative factors include technical problems with the translation app, lack of communication and support from Facebook staff, and insufficient recognition and acknowledgement for their completed work. By analysing user-translators’ actions through participant observation, Dombek argues that they mostly focus on the positive factors and perceive the translation crowdsourcing activity as “an opportunity to practice skills and effect change for the better while collaborating with others and experiencing fun” (2014: xvi). Dombek’s results show that user motivation to contribute is affected by the translation platform provided, and she uses this evidence to propose a set of guidelines for the design of such platforms.

Dombek concludes her study by providing several different recommendations for future research. She calls for more research within the emerging field of translation crowdsourcing which is needed in order to assess current observations and generate additional knowledge about the motivations of translation crowdsourcers as well as collaborative translation practices online (ibid: 271ff). The research conducted in this thesis will fulfil her request by attempting to explore her perspectives within a related research frame and add new perspectives by observing and interacting with the Danish and Dutch speaking translator communities on Facebook.

1.4.5 Literature evaluation

Presenting the above sources, I have noted that they primarily follow a research method focused on product, process or participants. These three concepts will be further explained in chapter 2. For instance, none of the above studies have examined translation crowdsourcing from a view that integrates product, process and participants as interrelated and coherent elements. Therefore, I intend to adopt a mixed research approach by examining factors that will generate knowledge on the translation situation as constituted by all three components. This has led me to develop a research frame able to generate results by mixing different data collection methods. These mixed methods, presented and explained in chapter 2, will produce both quantitative and qualitative data through a questionnaire, set of textual data and two personal interviews with translation crowdsourcers. I will further account for my selected research method in chapter 2.
1.5 Delimitation

In the following section, I will delimit this thesis by providing a fixed scope for the research and investigation taking place.

First, I have adopted a primarily qualitative approach to data collection which will focus on exploring specific details and practices related to the work with Facebook-based translation. This will allow me to produce arguments and statements that relate to this particular situation; however, this method will not be useful for producing results on translation crowdsourcing in general or for providing general claims about the phenomenon on a broader level. Such a method could otherwise be employed to produce general statements, hypotheses or even theories about translation crowdsourcing by means of broader reaching quantitative data.

Second, regarding the selected theories for examining potential translation problems in chapter 3, I will only focus on and explain in detail those strategies that relate to the examples that I will present. Furthermore, in the presentation of motivation theories in chapter 3, I will adapt and include only the parts of those theories that will relate and be applicable to the observations in the current study.

Third, the general selection of examined people as well as written material in this thesis are based on an interest in three of the languages in which I am proficient; Danish, Dutch and English. I have developed a proficiency in these three languages by living in countries where they are spoken, and so this thesis will focus on user-translators working with these three languages.

Fourth, I have chosen to include a selection of six textual examples of discussions on source-texts in the examination and analysis of the empirical data in chapter 4. These six examples have been carefully selected among hundreds of posts written by users in both the Danish and Dutch translator community groups on Facebook, and it is clear that including more textual examples would have provided a more diverse account of the many interesting discussions taking place in the two groups. However, due to the scope of this thesis, I have opted for a qualitative approach to examination of data and thus confine myself to making conclusions based on particular empirical observations.

Finally, the decision to conduct merely two personal interviews was made in accordance with the premise and purpose of this thesis as explained above. They will focus on qualitative aspects of user-translation on Facebook and allow for a snapshot of particular user motivations and considerations in translation. The collected data will thus not be able to generate knowledge on general circumstances or conditions for user-translators on Facebook.
1.6 The rise of crowdsourcing

In the following sections, I will review the development of crowdsourcing in order to understand its position within today’s global translation industry. This will illustrate the setting in which the research of this thesis has taken place. Section 1.6.1 will explore the emerging trend of translation crowdsourcing. Section 1.6.2 will identify the elements of a typical crowdsourcing process. Section 1.6.3 will examine crowdsourcing in the translation industry, and section 1.6.4 will explain the method of translating on Translations which is the name given to Facebook’s translation app.

1.6.1 What is translation crowdsourcing?

Corresponding to the emerging crowdsourcing trend, Jiménez-Crespo (2013: 193ff) argues that over the past decade, numerous online communities have used social networking technologies to foster a common implementation procedure of crowdsourced tasks. In the translation industry, this phenomenon has grown through two different mechanisms: (1) the introduction of crowdsourcing activities and platforms and (2) the development of open translation tools. Jiménez-Crespo defines translation crowdsourcing as “volunteer translation produced in some form of collaboration by a group of Internet users forming an online community, often using specific platforms” (ibid.). This kind of translation practice was founded in web localisation and has developed into new and different types. Open translation tools, in contrast, include computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools, translation memories (TMs), terminology databanks, crowdsourcing web platforms, and open-source translation software, among others. He further goes on to point out that scholars and researchers have yet to adopt a commonly agreed term for the concept of collaborative translation, as it is currently found as ‘user-generated’, ‘open’, ‘community’, ‘volunteer’, ‘hive’ and ‘collaborative’ translation (ibid.). However, the most favoured term among scholars and in the industry is ‘crowdsourced translation’ which is the definition I will adopt for this thesis as well.

1.6.2 The crowdsourcing process

The process of outsourcing an activity to a crowd can be explained in various ways depending on different factors, including the purpose and contents of the activity, the person, company or organisation in charge of the activity, the industry in which the project is being launched and the goal and prospects of the activity (Ambati et al. (2012), Anastasiou & Gupta (2011)). Nonetheless, a crowdsourcing activity is generally characterised by the fact that it can be outsourced from the company or organisation itself where it used to be performed by a designated agent or employee. In fact, more and more companies are opting to
externalise various business practices to crowds with the right prerequisites for handling them. Because of the massive online presence of people from all over the world, many companies are interested in crowdsourcing internal activities related to e.g. innovation, design, development, marketing, sales, support and translation (ibid.). In the following paragraph, I will examine how translation crowdsourcing works.

In response to developments in online infrastructure, translation can now be performed in entire virtual and cloud-based environments set up by businesses interested in translating their activities (Kelly et al., 2011 in O’Hagan, 2011: 77). According to Kelly et al. (ibid.), a typical crowdsourced translation project is launched by a project manager in a given community prior to running the source-text document through a translation memory; a database that stores textual segments, e.g. sentences or paragraphs, which have previously been translated, in order to aid human translators. Also, the text will sometimes be pre-translated by employing machine translation. Subsequently, the project manager will perform a search in relevant databases in order to find crowdsourcers to complete the translation. Once launched, the project manager will continue to monitor the project and the crowdsourcers’ performance to ensure a smooth preparation, implementation and completion of the task. Facebook, however, will upload multiple tasks to a crowd of user-translators who may choose whichever tasks they prefer and complete them at their own convenience. There are no Facebook project managers directly involved with this crowd, and the completion of tasks is completely voluntary.

1.6.3 Crowdsourcing in the translation industry

The crowdsourcing trend has made companies aware of the benefits of outsourcing translation to the users of their services, and they have begun using this tactic to launch new products in different countries or expand their businesses in other linguistic markets. Due to the aim of such actions, the translation efforts can be divided into different types, depending on the kind of underlying motivation: cause-driven, product-driven and outsourced crowdsourcing (Kelly et al., 2011 in O’Hagan, 2011: 89, Jiménez-Crespo, 2013: 194).

Cause-driven crowdsourcing efforts encourage a particular community to produce crowdsourced translation for a common goal, such as having a localised version of Facebook in Danish and Dutch. The volunteer translators provide their services without compensation and in return translate at their own convenience. Yet, in some cause-driven projects crowdsourcers are recognised for their work, e.g. on the translation initiator’s website but this differs from case to case (Kelly et al., 2011 in O’Hagan 2011: 89).

Product-driven efforts are generally contingent on user demand for a certain product to be translated into the language(s) of their choice. The translation is provided by a company recruiting and managing a crowd
of people who often match a specific profile in order to be chosen as translators (ibid.). The translators are often motivated to carry out the tasks by promises of free products or services from the company.

Finally, outsourced crowdsourcing activities typically relate to entire websites and web portals specialised in offering crowdsourced translation. These services are mostly concerned with web localisation and will often be paired with professional translation (Jiménez-Crespo, 2013). The crowdsourcers will often be compensated monetarily in order to encourage their participation in the project, although most often it pays very little (Dolmaya, 2011 in O’Hagan, 2011: 99).

### 1.6.4 Translation on Translations

At the current time of writing (August 2014), Facebook users interested in translating Facebook into other languages are first required to download the built-in app that can be found by searching for the translation app on Facebook. Following installation, a small blue globe logo will appear at the bottom of the user’s screen every time Facebook is accessed within an Internet browser. Clicking on the logo will take the user directly to Translations main interface where the choice of language to translate into must be made. The source language will always be English, but the target language can be any of the 113 languages currently available to users of the social media network. In this particular case of interest, whether Danish or Dutch is chosen as target language is of secondary importance when explaining the translation app’s function, as it is constructed in the exact same way for all languages. By selecting the desired target language of translation, the user is redirected to the main working page of the app where an overview of content to be translated will appear as an extensive list of sentences, typically one sentence for each string, with an accompanying explanation of the context in some of the cases (cf. Table 1 below).

Practically, translation takes place within the translation app in an input module that displays source phrases which need to be translated into a given target language. Following translation, all translated material is stored within the app. This makes it possible for user-translators to track translations and alter their contents, e.g. in cases where they notice an error on a translated page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>String</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Danish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Their birthday is in [days] days</td>
<td>User birthday is in [days] days</td>
<td>Der fødselsdag er om [dage] dage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De har fødselsdag om [dage] dage</td>
<td>De har fødselsdag om [dage] dage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har fødselsdag og om [dage] dage</td>
<td>Har fødselsdag og om [dage] dage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Overview of source-text string to be translated into Danish*
2. METHODOLOGY AND EMPIRICAL DATA

Within academic research, empirical knowledge will arise from collected data which is subject to examination and to which references can be made, based on conducted and collected observations, data, statements, texts and sources (Jørgensen et al., 2011: 107).

In this chapter, I will present and explain the methods employed in order to collect data based on the above understanding. Section 2.1 will briefly define the interrelated concepts of methodology and research methods in order to understand their applications here. Section 2.2 will account for the overall methodology that has directed the methods of data collection in this thesis. Section 2.3 will account for the applied research methods. Section 2.4 will briefly explain the composition of Facebook’s Danish and Dutch translator communities. Finally, section 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 will explain those methods in detail that have been employed to generate the empirical material examined and analysed in chapter 4.

2.1 Methodology vs. method

Methodology is the overall frame that will characterise the way any research is carried out. It is an approach for the researcher to adopt before beginning the collection of data and deciding on a method of how to carry out the research (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013: 13).

On the one hand, the Oxford Dictionary of English (3rd ed., 2010) defines ‘methodology’ as “a system of methods used in a particular area of study or activity” which provides an understanding of interrelatedness between the two concepts methodology and method. Overall, methodology can be defined as a general approach to studying a phenomenon – it is the science of method and a kind of comprehensive toolkit that come with a particular way of carrying out research.

On the other hand, the Oxford Dictionary of English (3rd ed., 2010) defines ‘method’ as “a particular procedure for accomplishing or approaching something, especially a systematic or established one”. In scientific research, the term ‘method’ can thus be defined as a specific research technique (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013: 13). Hence, methods are the practical tools available to researchers in order to make sense of empirical data, and they can be used to apply and test theories in order to understand the collected data. This is therefore what I have set out to do in this thesis.
2.2 Netnography

The primary methodology in this thesis is netnography. Netnography is a recently established research technique that allows researchers to conduct ethnographic research online, and it has been devised specifically to examine the behaviour of cultures and communities present on the Internet (Kozinets, 1998). Netnography can be defined as “an adaptation of the qualitative methods utilized in consumer research [...], cultural anthropology [...], and cultural studies [...], with the express aim of enabling a contextually-situated study of the consumer behavior of virtual communities and cybertulture” (ibid.).

In general, netnography collects and analyses: (1) stored data, i.e. a record of the communication held in the community which is unaffected by the actions of the researcher, (2) elicited data co-created by the researcher through interactions with members of the online community, and (3) field-note data illustrating the researcher’s own reflections concerning observation, interaction and participation in the community. Furthermore, netnography shifts from traditional ethnographic observation of individuals to interpretation of computer-mediated conversational acts which constitute the textual discourse held by the members of the studied community in their online space (Kozinets 2002: 64).

My reason for applying netnography in this thesis is that it practically enabled me to gain access to the Danish and Dutch groups of user-translators that consist of people who are physically situated in far apart cities and countries. Netnography functioned as a tool with which to collect the acquired data, and it has enabled me to study how and why translation takes place on Facebook. Therefore, I will argue that netnography was an ideal methodology for this study as it can integrate different methods of data collection and coordinate these data in analyses. Also, it allows both the researcher and the participants to come together and engage in exploratory studies in a fast and effective way (Kozinets, 2010: 44). This is a very convenient feature when conducting netnographic research; it may, however, entail some sensitive issues which are important to consider prior to initiating the research activities.

For instance, since netnography provides the possibility for the researcher to remain observant and hence entirely anonymous in the online community, it is important to be aware of any ethical issues that could arise in the process of collecting data. To avoid ethical dilemma, researchers should ensure that participants know that they are being observed so they can take their precautions. Kozinets stresses that there must be no confusion about why the researcher is in the online community and that it is important to avoid identifying individual observed members’ real names or other identifying details (Kozinets, 2010: 146ff). For this reason, I made known my presence and aim to the two translator groups prior to initiating the research activities and, in line with the recommendations by Kozinets, I provided a guarantee that I
would treat all personal references confidentially. This should have ensured that potential conflicting issues have been mitigated before the launch of my research activities.

2.3 Selected research methods

In this section, I will account for my method of collecting empirical material applied in this thesis. This method consisted of three different elements:

(1) an online questionnaire survey consisting of 17 questions to provide a general understanding of who the two groups of crowdsourcers are, what motivates them to participate in translation crowdsourcing for Facebook, and what kinds of considerations and strategies they employ in the translation process,

(2) textual data in the shape of six examples of source-texts that have been translated by Facebook users on the translation app to illustrate the ways in which crowdsourcers are discussing their ideas and solutions, and

(3) two interviews with Facebook users who are part of the Danish and Dutch translation communities to provide examples of users’ reasons for engaging in translation work and to provide qualitative support to the analytical part of the questionnaire data.

Together, these three methods present the evidence for this thesis’ conclusions about crowdsourcing translation within the particular case of Facebook and its Danish and Dutch speaking translator groups.

I have thus employed a mixed-method approach collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data enable the provision of broad conclusions on conditions related to crowdsourced translation practices whereas the qualitative data focus on particular instances and thus enable comprehensive discussions on particular statements and points of view obtained from the. The mixed-methods approach is a combination of three different approaches: (1) a product-oriented, (2) a process-oriented and (3) a participant-oriented. The first seeks to investigate the textual product, i.e. the outcome of the translation process (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013: 50). The second is concerned with understanding translator behaviour, competence, expertise, and the relations between cognition and the translated product (ibid: 109). The third studies the various participants in a translation situation and how they relate to their surrounding environment (ibid: 150).

In order to generate results, I have therefore made use of the triangulation method in which two or more methods are used to collect and analyse data on the same research question(s) (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013: 23). This entails cross-checking the results from one set of data with those from another in order to
compare and assess the results in relation to each other. I will thus be able to make the three analytical parts of this thesis relate to each other. Notably, the interview data will be employed to cross-check the results produced by the questionnaire survey and obtained from the textual data.

2.4 The composition of Facebook’s Danish and Dutch translator communities

In order to view the results of this thesis in the perspective of its authentic context, I will briefly describe the translation environment on Facebook. This environment consists of the translation app Translations as well as a Facebook group dedicated to the users who translate each of the languages in which Facebook is available. In this thesis, I am focused on the two Facebook groups ‘Translator Community for Dansk’ (the Danish user group) and ‘Translator Community for Nederlands’ (the Dutch user group).

The Danish translator group contains 118 members as of the time of writing, plus one member of the Facebook Translations team who merely plays the role of group admin. Of the 118 members, 72 (60%) are men and 46 (40%) are women.

The Dutch translator group consists of 135 members not including the Facebook Translation member of which 92 (68%) users are men and 43 (32%) are women.

Overall, the two groups hold 253 members of which 164 (65%) are men and 89 (35%) are women.

2.5 Questionnaire survey

In this section, I will discuss the data collection method of the questionnaire survey. I will further account for the contents and scope of the questionnaire as well as explain the performance of a pilot study conducted prior to the launch of the survey.

2.5.1 Method

Prior to commencing the examination of user motives for participation in translation, I decided to investigate user-translators’ backgrounds. I therefore designed the first part of the questionnaire as a demographic survey which would provide information about their backgrounds. The second part of the questionnaire would provide an initial understanding of their motives for being involved with translation for Facebook which would be further examined by means of later interviews.

3 The numbers of members in the two translation groups were retrieved 29 July, 2014.
I decided to distribute an online questionnaire across the two Facebook groups to obtain knowledge about as many participants as possible. The data obtained would be useful for providing an initial overview of the research area and for producing information about people’s activities in an online community (Kozinets, 2010: 43) – in this case Facebook.

In order to collect the data, I made use of an online tool called SurveyXact\(^4\) by which it is possible to create questionnaires. According to Kozinets (2010), the survey method is applicable when attempting to discover the correlations between various factors, such as demographics, attitudes and online community behaviour as well as to learn about people’s self-reported representations of how they (intend to) act in regards to their online community activities (Kozinets, 2010: 45). The questionnaire survey was therefore designed to provide answers to questions about user backgrounds and usage of the translation app, and I consider it a suitable tool for establishing a ‘big picture’ view of the crowdsourced translation activities taking place among Danish and Dutch speakers on Facebook.

I chose to construct and distribute the questionnaire in the two languages Danish and Dutch with the exact same questions for both groups, and I drafted and translated all 17 questions myself. I had two main reasons for creating a bilingual questionnaire:

(1) It would induce more people to complete the survey as receiving a questionnaire in one’s native language is more appealing and requires less time and effort to complete. In this regard, Saldanha & O’Brien advocate for the importance of avoiding ambiguity which is “especially problematic if non-native speakers of the questionnaire language are included in the sample” (2013: 155). I have therefore attempted to avoid ambiguity and encourage participation by making the questionnaire available in the respondents’ native languages.

(2) Through this division, I have been able to tell the two language groups apart in my analysis of the accumulated data. In essence, all the information has been collected in one single survey which I have divided into smaller fractions corresponding to the language in which the survey was completed. This has enabled me to distinguish between collected data in my analysis.

In order to obtain answers to all questions, 15 questions required an answer while only two, numbers 8 and 13 which concern knowledge of additional languages and translation into other languages, were left optional, since they required only a yes/no answer.

\(^{4}\) www.survey-xact.dk.
2.5.2 Questionnaire contents

As already mentioned, the questionnaire distributed to Danish and Dutch user-translators consisted of 17 questions (cf. appendix 1). Questions 1-8 were demographic, and questions 9-17 were concerned with user attitudes and behaviour in relation to their activities on the translation app. The survey included both open and closed (or ‘structured’) questions allowing participants to write some of their responses in text boxes while providing short and clear answers to other questions. This mixed approach is considered ideal when designing a questionnaire, as it will yield a diverse range of differently structured answers and observations (Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013: 157). The content of the questions was based on my own initial investigation of the translation app as well as questions I had posed myself when reviewing literature of relevance to this thesis. The questions further took take point of departure in the research questions guiding the work of this thesis. They were thus practically oriented and stemmed from a personal curiosity about the group of user-translators, their backgrounds, abilities and motivations.

By examining the data obtained from the demographic part of the survey, I should be able to illustrate user backgrounds, including sex, age, nationality, level and type of education, occupation, residence, mother tongue and knowledge of additional languages. These questions thus took a quantitative approach to gather information about the user-translators. The analysis of these data will complement the second part of the questionnaire analysis which employs a qualitative research approach and aims to provide an in-depth view of the crowdsourcing activities on Facebook.

The qualitative approach is illustrated by questions 9-17 concerning users’ occupation with the translation app. These questions offered both a range of open answer options as well as a selection of positions and attitudes towards presented claims presented as multiple-choice questions. This composition of differently phrased questions should be able to generate a varied set of data about user-translators’ attitudes and behaviour which is a method encouraged by Saldanha & O’Brien (2013).

2.5.3 Pilot study

Prior to initiating the primary data collection process launched by the questionnaire survey, I conducted a small pilot study in order to test and assess the questions in the survey. The results of pilot studies will often provide valuable guidance as regards the usefulness and applicability of the drafted questions (Jørgensen et al., 2011: 112, and Saldanha & O’Brien, 2013: 22), and I therefore decided to test the questionnaire on these parameters prior to issuing the actual call for participants. In practice, I contacted two user-translators, one in the Danish and one in the Dutch group, and asked them to test the
questionnaire. Both of them consented, answered all 17 questions and subsequently provided feedback consisting of small corrections and improvements which I implemented. Particularly, the feedback was concerned with technical barriers to the completion of the survey and a request for the exchange of multiple-choice questions with open comment boxes as regards one question. A link to the revised questionnaire was subsequently posted on the walls of both translator groups along with a call for participants.

2.5.4 Scope and reach of the questionnaire survey

The duration of the questionnaire survey ran from 5 May, 2014 until 10 June, 2014. In this period, I received a total of 49 responses. Table 1 below, cropped and pasted from the survey’s interface on SurveyXact, illustrates the completed (‘gennemført’) number of questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overblik over besvarelser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Samlet status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribueret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nogen svar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gennemført</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frafuldet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Overview of questionnaire responses

Of these 49 responses, 26 were completed in Danish and 23 in Dutch providing an almost equal number of responses from both language groups. Prior to launching the survey, I decided to allocate a minimum of one month to the collection of questionnaire data in order to retrieve as many responses as possible. Ultimately, 17 of the responses came from female user-translators (35%) and 32 from male user-translators (65%), as appears from the replies to question 1 (cf. appendix 1). A closer look at these numbers within a broader perspective reveals that they are equally proportionate with the total percentages of male and female members counted in both translator groups, as stated in section 2.4.
2.6 Textual data

In this section, I will present the method of collecting a set of textual data consisting of six examples of discussions on source-texts that have taken place among user-translators in the Danish and Dutch speaking translator communities on Facebook the past two years (cf. appendixes 2-7). In these forums, the users can share issues or thoughts about translation tasks encountered while working on the translation app. The idea is that sharing opinions on the content with fellow user-translators will make the users able to find common solutions to the translation problems they encounter.

2.6.1 Method

In section 2.3 above, I initiated the present research by opting for the method of collecting empirical data on Danish and Dutch speaking user-translators on Facebook by means of an online questionnaire survey. The collected data will provide a frame for understanding who the Facebook translation crowdsourcers are and reveal some of their motives to translate for Facebook.

On this background, I find it interesting to examine the above-mentioned examples of discussions on source-texts that will illustrate how they approach and solve translation tasks. This will enable me to account for the cognitive processes that guide the users in their translation work and provide answers to my research questions regarding Facebook users’ work with translations, the kind of strategies that can be deduced from their methods and how the users handle potential obstacles or translation problems. The purpose with this part of my study is thus to complement the knowledge and observations obtained from the questionnaire survey by presenting and analysing the Facebook users’ comments within the translator community groups. Since I am examining both the Danish and Dutch speaking communities, I will include examples found in both groups.

The textual data was collected within the two translator community groups, Translator Community for Dansk and Translator Community for Nederlands, and illustrate different perspectives concerning translation work on the app. On the walls of these two groups, the users are free to post ideas, comments and problems with the purpose of discussing them with each other prior to submitting the translations to which their issues are related.

The two groups were both created on 13 October 2011, and they have seen an immense number of discussions being initiated covering a variety of subjects, ideas and issues. I was therefore careful in the selection of examples, and I only chose the ones I found representative of a general trend of topics and
ideas being exchanged. In chapter 4, I will present and analyse these examples through references to their content in an incorporated interpretation of both results and analysis.

As noted in section 2.2, which introduced netnography and discussed the importance of user privacy, I will not disclose any personal information about the user-translators, such as their real names. This will enable me to discuss and analyse their actions freely and eliminate the possibility of online tracking which would otherwise link them as private individuals to this research. In order to protect user privacy, I thus made use of a free tool available for generating random names; the Facebook browser plugin called ‘Social Fixer’.

In the following paragraph, I will explain the process of selecting and storing each post in my collection of material. First, I selected the posts within the two groups that I found interesting to examine and ensured that all comments were expanded when I displayed the whole discussion. Since I am equally interested in examining the Danish and Dutch groups of user-translators, I attempted to select an equal number of posts from both groups. I finally chose four discussions in the Danish translator group and three in the Dutch group, yet two of the discussion revolve around the same issue and will be treated and analysed as one example in chapter 4. Afterwards, I accessed SocialFixer and selected the action ‘Anonymize Screen’ which converted the real names of the users in the selected posts into fictitious names. In cases where the same user had made one or more comments in the same post, his/her pseudonym remained the same in all instances. Once the names were generated, I employed a browser plugin called ‘Awesome Screenshot: Capture & Annotate’ to create a screenshot of the full body of all six discussions. In these screenshots, all the comments in the posts, no matter the length of them, were included. Finally, I cropped out each of the selected examples from the screenshots. By employing both tools, I have guaranteed the respect for privacy which I set out to do, and I have practically been able to retrieve the chosen examples. The results of this method will be presented and analysed in chapter 4.

2.7 Interviews

In the following, I will account for my method of conducting two separate interviews with Facebook user-translators. These interviews were concerned with how and why they translate and their approaches to translation.

5 ‘Social Fixer’ is available at www.socialfixer.com.
2.7.1 Method

I chose to conduct two interviews with user-translators as I wished to use the personal interviews as a tool to explore the questionnaire survey, the arguments posed by motivation theorists and researchers as well as the concepts of translation strategies in analyses of these arguments. This would allow for well-founded statements about user motivation and approaches to translation which were explored in the questionnaire survey. The two interviewed parties, a Danish male Facebook user and a Dutch female Facebook user, were both involved with translation for Facebook at the time of the interviews, and they had provided their contact details in the questionnaire survey where I had called for interview participants. Both of them thus belong to the Danish and the Dutch translator community groups, and their comments will illustrate examples of how and why user-translators carry out translation tasks. It is therefore my aim that the results obtained from this part of my empirical investigation will complement and further explore some of the observations and arguments made in the analysis of the questionnaire survey as well as parts of the textual data.

The two interviews were carried out as written, semi-structured and synchronous interviews on Facebook Messenger and thus took place in surroundings familiar to the participants. Generally, computer-assisted interviews are encouraged by netnography (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009), and I therefore found it an appropriate method for conducting the interviews. I proceeded by accessing Facebook from an internet browser and searched for the two users’ names within the translator groups. I began both conversations by writing a personal message to each of the respondents asking them whether they wished to participate. They both accepted, and the interviews took place in separate conversations with each respondent. Following completion, I copy-pasted the whole body of both conversations into two separate Word documents where I altered the names of the respondents and removed the profile pictures of them and me which were attached to every response. These were the only alterations I made to the interviews, and some of the responses are therefore divided into short fractions because this was how they were submitted by the respondents.

During both interviews, I allowed for a free-flowing question/answer process which was structured by a pre-prepared interview template containing a series of guiding questions to elicit the required information. According to Saldanha & O’Brien (2013: 172), this approach allows the researcher to improvise during the interview and still carry a structured conversation with each participant about their actions and motivations.

One of the advantages of a written interview is that it facilitates instant transcription which leaves room to concentrate fully on the body of the interview (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009: 169, Kozinets, 2010: 111). Another advantage is that chat conversations are able to provide “a refreshing forum for a type of...”
interactive expression that [is] freer and more flowing” (Kozinets, 2010: 112). As with any chosen method, there are also disadvantages which could comprise the forum itself in this case. Not being face-to-face with the participants created a physical distance between us, and I could not pay attention to features such as their gestures and body language. I will argue, however, that for the purpose of these two interviews, the validity of my chosen method is granted. The two respondents were familiar with the setting, and my questions were focused on obtaining information rather than observing their actions. Also, due to logistic challenges (the researcher is located in Belgium and the participants in the Netherlands and Denmark) the possibility to meet in person proved difficult.

During both interviews, which took place on the same day, I made sure that the respondents were given enough time to write their comments and elaborate their arguments before I proceeded with new questions. Additionally, I made sure to remain open towards potential deviations from the topic in order to explore their contents, and I aimed at posing open, non-leading questions in both conversations.

Also, I deliberately adopted an informal interview style in order to make respondents feel at ease and encourage direct and spontaneous speech. For instance, by employing smileys in my responses, I aimed to adopt an approach which, according to Gamble & Gamble (2013: 181), signals openness, recognition, relaxation, familiarity and kindness. The interview data will be examined and analysed in section 4.4.
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter introduces the theoretical framework to be employed in later analyses of the collected empirical data in order to generate knowledge of crowdsourced translation on Facebook. The theories examined here are selected on the basis of their suitability to illustrate the collected data and their ability to produce answers to the research questions posed in this thesis.

In the following sections, I will introduce and examine theories of motivation, translation strategies and translation problems. Section 3.1 will outline the premise of the theoretical concepts applied. Section 3.2 will introduce those motivation theoretical concepts that will be applied in analyses of the collected empirical data. Section 3.3 will present the terminology of translation strategies. Finally, section 3.4 will account for the complete selection of theoretical concepts and explain their relevance to this research project.

3.1 Integrating theories

Scientific theory is a system of principles, propositions and doctrines (or assumptions) within a certain professional discipline which can be used to describe, explain and predict phenomena within the discipline, thus serving as a framework for understanding the overall subject of research (Jørgensen et al., 2011: 107). This definition provides the preconception required to make use of the collected empirical material that I will explore and analyse in this thesis in order to discuss the relevant areas of translation crowdsourcing.

In order to assess the reasons and motivations for Facebook user-translators’ involvement with translation crowdsourcing, I will take point of departure in motivation theory specifically aimed at explaining the motivation of people occupied with volunteer work. I thus argue that translation on Facebook – due to its optional and unpaid commitment proposal – is a voluntary activity compatible with the general perceptions of volunteering for specific purposes or causes.

As regards examining the work with Facebook-based translations, I will apply the notions of macro and microstrategies as well as translation problems in analyses of relevant examples. These elements will enable a discussion on the translation work itself as it takes place on the translation app.

Overall, I will examine the collected empirical data by means of relevant statements, arguments and concepts presented by scholars and researchers who have previously studied the field of crowdsourced translation. Their contributions were introduced in section 1.4.
3.2 Motivation theory

In the following section, I will introduce and account for a range of concepts in motivation theory with which I intend to illustrate and analyse angles of the collected empirical data in chapter 4. More specifically, I will apply the theoretical concepts introduced below to account for motivation of user-translators on Facebook. These concepts will form a frame for understanding the collected data and ultimately the research questions concerned with motivation. I will introduce them in chronological order below.

In their research on formal and informal volunteer work, Wilson & Musick (1997) defined volunteer work as “unpaid work provided to parties to whom the worker owes no contractual, familial, or friendship obligations” (Wilson & Musick, 1997: 694). Due to the fact that their research project was carried out years before the emergence of social media platforms such as Facebook, they did not refer to online volunteer work, such as crowdsourcing initiatives, when they presented their examples. I therefore find it relevant to analyse how people in online environments engage in volunteer translation work by means of the theoretical arguments posed by Wilson and Musick (1997).

Wilson and Musick (1997) argued that volunteering can be defined as a productive activity that requires certain ‘inputs’ needed to do it (ibid.). First of all, it will often involve some kind of collective action related to feelings of ‘working together’ and second of all, it sometimes also entails a range of moral incentives, such as personal belief in the importance of helping others as well as doing something for a cause that is important to the individual. These inputs are often present in so-called ‘formal’ volunteering which, according to Wilson & Musick, takes place in the context of companies and organisations (1997: 700). ‘Informal’ volunteering is mainly a private activity and not organised within any particular context. Most formal volunteers are convinced by their personal relations to engage in volunteer work, and they typically accept on the grounds of wishing to contribute to a collective good (ibid.). It is important, however, to realise that volunteers are motivated by different factors and that their actions may serve different psychological functions for each of them.

In a paper entitled “Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach”, Clary et al. (1998) examined the motivations underlying volunteerism. They investigated the role of motivational processes in volunteerism and presented a six-motive conceptualisation by building on previous functional theorising. In this way, they identified motivations of generic relevance to volunteerism. The six functions served by volunteerism comprise (1) values, (2) understanding, (3) social, (4) career, (5) protective and (6) enhancement functions (Clary et al., 1998: 1518).
The ‘values’ function explains why people enjoy helping others as it centres on the opportunities that volunteerism provides for individuals to express values related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others.

The ‘understanding’ function explains why people strive for opportunities to learn, understand, practise, and apply skills and abilities that might otherwise go unpractised.

The ‘social’ function suggests social (or peer) pressure as motive to volunteer, and it generally reflects motivations regarding relationships with others. It states that volunteering offers opportunities to be with one’s friends or to engage in an activity viewed favourably by important others.

The ‘career’ function asserts that people volunteer because they believe it is able to increase their job prospects or enhance their career, but it might also be perceived as a means of maintaining career-relevant skills. It is concerned with career-related benefits that may be obtained from participation in volunteer work.

The ‘protective’ function explains motivation on grounds of personal responsibility for others but it also accounts for processes associated with the functioning of the ego.

The ‘enhancement’ function is focused on enhancing self-esteem, confidence and self-improvement as well as fostering personal development. It thus argues that people volunteer for reasons of personal development or to experience satisfaction related to personal growth and self-esteem. The enhancement function comprises a motivational process that focuses on the ego’s growth and development and involves positive strivings of the ego.

In connection with the development of the six-motive conceptualisation, Clary et al. emphasised that volunteerism may serve more than one motive for an individual and that a group of volunteers performing the same activity may be motivated by different functions (1998: 1529). They further explored whether individuals prefer tasks with benefits aligned with their own preferred volunteer motives. Their argument has been supported by Widjaja (2010) who, in a descriptive paper, reviewed existing literature on volunteer motivation. She stated that people will be occupied with volunteer work of all kinds provided that “the activity matches and fulfils the individual’s motivational concerns” (2010: 10). Widjaja also found that volunteers are primarily motivated by the desire to help those less fortunate than themselves and to express altruistic values.
Based on studies involving more than 6,000 people, Professor of Psychology, Steven Reiss, developed a theory that presents 16 basic desires that guide nearly all human behaviour (2000: 17ff). Due to the fact that these desires are able to account for behaviour in all kinds of situations, I will argue that not all of these 16 desires are applicable in this research exploring motivation for engaging in translation crowdsourcing. I will therefore only include and account for the ones I wish to examine here and which will thus be included in an analysis of the Facebook user-translators’ motivation and behaviour. These include the following desires: acceptance, curiosity, idealism, order, power, social contact and status.

Reiss defined the desires by means of two functional factors; the associated emotion and the actual act of behaviour. There is no hierarchy or order in between the different desires – their assigned importance solely depends on each individual person (Reiss, 2000: 22). Below, I have adapted the desires into a table that will fit the objective of this study. I have selected each of the seven categories from the premise that these should be able to account for user-translators’ actions in crowdsourced translation work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic desire</th>
<th>Associated emotion</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>Assertive behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>Wonderment</td>
<td>Truth-seeking, problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>Compassion, sense of justice</td>
<td>Social causes, fair play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Security, stability</td>
<td>Makes many rules, clean, ‘perfect’, compulsive, organisation(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Competence, influence</td>
<td>Leadership, achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contact</td>
<td>Happiness, belonging</td>
<td>Party, join clubs/groups, fun(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Self-importance, superiority</td>
<td>Concern with reputation, showing off, awards(*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: the seven basic desires that motivate human action (adapted from Reiss, 2000)

Reiss developed this categorisation of basic human desires with the purpose of accounting for human motivation, and the desires are all based on needs that motivate people’s actions. The following desires are linked with their need: ‘acceptance’ and the need for approval, ‘curiosity’ and the need to learn, ‘idealism’ and the need for social justice, ‘order’ and the need for organised, stable, predictable environments, ‘power’ and the need for influence of will, ‘social contact’ and the need for friends and relationships, and

---

7 The basic desires include power, independence, curiosity, acceptance, order, saving, honour, idealism, social contact, family, status, vengeance, romance, eating, physical exercise and tranquility (see Reiss, 2000, pp. 20-21).

(*) Reiss describes these functions as ‘end goals’ more than acts of behaviour.
'social status’ and the need for social standing and personal recognition. In chapter 4, I will examine and analyse these desires in connection with the empirical data I have collected.

In the book “Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us” from 2009, author and former White House chief speech writer, Daniel Pink argue that human motivation is largely intrinsic and that motivational factors revolve around three elements: autonomy (the urge to direct our own lives), mastery (the desire to get better at something that matters) and purpose (the yearning to do what we do in service of something larger than ourselves) (2009: 83ff). Although Pink discusses motivation in the perspective of how to motivate employees, I will attempt to assess whether the elements of autonomy, mastery and purpose can be applied in a crowdsourcing setting as well. At least, part of this assertion is supported by Mesipuu (2010), who claims that the opportunity of contributing with translations on Facebook into one’s native language can be seen as something that matters to the users (2010: 29). She further adds how there may need to be a “valuable something” present to motivate the crowd and foster people’s interest in volunteering which in turn will make it possible to find incentives to keep the crowdsourcers committed to their work (ibid: 31).

In a recent study on religion, education and volunteering, Son & Wilson (2012) investigated how social norms are able to explain why people decide to volunteer. They argued how people’s educational background is “the most consistent, and often strongest, predictor of volunteering” (2012: 474) and further emphasised how personal resources, such as skills, free time and social connections enable people to engage themselves as volunteers. Furthermore, they stated that people engage in volunteer work simply because they want to make a difference for other people. Sometimes, there is even no direct motive or well-considered cause behind people’s actions; they volunteer because they want to volunteer (ibid.). Additionally, Son & Wilson called for future research to investigate how norms and other predictors of volunteer work interact with each other. For example, it is possible that a sense of obligation to help others affects how people calculate the value of their free time – those who feel strongly that working on behalf of others is important are therefore more likely to “find time” to do volunteer work (Son & Wilson, 2012: 496).

In this thesis, I will link my choice of Clary et al.’s (1998) six functions of volunteerism to Reiss’ (2000) basic desires through an incorporated approach of the two theories with the purpose of analysing user-translator’s motivations for carrying out translation work at their own request. I will equally employ the arguments and concepts presented by Wilson & Musick (1997), Pink (2009), Mesipuu (2010), Widjaja (2010), and Son & Wilson (2012) in this analysis which is commenced in chapter 4.
3.3 Translation strategies

In the following sections, I will present the terminology of translation strategies defined by Schjoldager (2008) from which I intend to illustrate and analyse the selected set of six textual examples in section 4.3. I have chosen to apply Schjoldager’s definitions of translation strategies as a tool for examining this part of the empirical data as it will allow me to depict the intuitive actions performed by user-translators in both the Danish and Dutch translator community groups on Facebook. I will begin with presenting and defining Schjoldager’s ideas of macro and microstrategies followed by a definition of translation problems in different textual contexts. Subsequently, I will account for my selection of translation strategies when assessing their suitability in this research, including a definition of translation problems which will enable a discussion on the actual challenges encountered by user-translators in their work.

3.3.1 Macrostrategies

According to Schjoldager (2008), translators will be faced with the decision of deciding on a macrostrategy guiding the production of a target-text when working with the translation of any given source-text. A macrostrategy is thus an overall method for carrying out a translation task in the most appropriate manner (Schjoldager, 2008: 67). The choice of macrostrategy is often made intuitively, especially by experienced translators, when deciding how the target-text should relate to its source-text. On this conceptual basis, Schjoldager proposes a model of macrostrategies in order to account for the decisions made on ‘macro-level’ by people involved with translation work. She further explains how, in order to produce translations of high quality, it is important for the translator to consider each translation situation and the focus that s/he is expected to project onto the task. With this in mind, Schjoldager’s model of macrostrategies will provide a suitable angle in the attempt to understand how the Danish and Dutch user-translators on Facebook complete the tasks they are assigned. Below, Figure 1 provides an overview of the two different macrostrategies in translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source-text oriented macrostrategy</th>
<th>Target-text oriented macrostrategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on source-text form and content</td>
<td>Focus on target-text effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of somebody else’s communication</td>
<td>Mediation between primary parties in a communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt translation</td>
<td>Covert translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**: A model of macrostrategies (from Schjoldager, 2008: 72)
As it appears from Figure 1, each of the two macrostrategies comprises three different perspectives in translation. A source-text oriented approach premises that (1) the focus is on the form and content of the source-text, (2) the translator is conveying somebody else’s communication, and (3) the translation is overt, meaning that the receiver(s) will either care or be aware that the target-text is a translation and not an original text. Contrarily, a target-text oriented approach assumes that (1) there is an overall focus on the target-text effect, the communication is mediated between different parties, and (3) that the translation is covert, meaning the receiver(s) will not care or even be aware that the target-text is a translation.

As we shall see in chapter 4, the translator’s choice between macrostrategies is important to pre-establish in order to produce accurate translations. Further, these decisions are equally – and especially – related to the kinds of microstrategies that play a role when working on translations. The interrelation between macro and microstrategies will thus provide a focal point in my analysis of the set of textual data, including users’ discussions of source-texts.

### 3.3.2 Microstrategies

Where macrostrategies are the decisions the translator makes at the macro-level of translation, microstrategies are the choices s/he should consider at the micro-level when transferring a message from one text to another (Schjoldager, 2008: 89). Microstrategies are especially important to integrate in the approach to translation when experiencing translation problems at word, phrase or sentence level. As with macrostrategies, such decisions will most often be made intuitively in the course of translation, but paying attention to the different possibilities in terms of translation strategies will enhance the quality of translation work (ibid.). On this basis, Schjoldager presents a taxonomy of microstrategies by which she explains the different functions of possible translation strategies at the micro-level. Below, Figure 2 outlines the different microstrategies in translation.
### Microstrategies in translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct transfer</td>
<td>Transfers something unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calque</td>
<td>Transfers the structure or makes a very close translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct translation</td>
<td>Translates in a word-for-word procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>Translates in a sense-for-sense procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitation</td>
<td>Makes implicit information explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>Translates rather freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condensation</td>
<td>Translates in a shorter way, which may involve implicitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Recreates the effect, entirely or partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>Adds a unit of meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>Changes the meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion</td>
<td>Leaves out a unit of meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permutation</td>
<td>Translates in a different place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: A taxonomy of microstrategies (from Schjoldager, 2008: 92)**

In chapter 4, we shall see some of these microstrategies in play when I will analyse the set of textual data. I have included them all here in order to illustrate the diverse choice of translation strategies at the micro-level. The ones that are applicable in the analysis of the textual data will therefore be further explained when exemplified in relation to actual examples. The selected examples will differ in nature and touch upon different aspects in translation work – and hence involve different translation strategies – thus providing an understanding of Facebook user’s translation ideas and considerations. It will further allow for an insight into some of the translation issues that have emerged through the work with the translation tasks and puzzled the user-translators. In this connection, I will also examine users’ translation work from an understanding of translation problems as explained by Schjoldager (2008).

#### 3.3.3 Translation problems

When perceiving translation problems from a theoretical point of view, Schjoldager (2008) presents them as part of the skopos theory – a conceptual framework set up to help students improve their practical translation skills (Schjoldager, 2008: 151). In this regard, Schjoldager claims that there may be different ways of translating a given text and argues how “the designated skopos will determine which one is more appropriate in a given situation” (ibid: 152). The definition of translation problems thus visualises the
obstacles that can arise in a translation process which disrupt the translator in the translation process. These obstacles are due to items found in the source-text. Constituting an analytical model in the skopos theory, Schjoldager (2008) accounts for four different translation problems able to explain the difficulties that may arise in specific contexts of translation work. As the definitions of these problems will enable me to examine some of the issues that appear from the textual data collected in the Danish and Dutch translator communities on Facebook, I will therefore employ the model of translation problems as presented by Schjoldager (2008: 175). She presents the four problems in the following order of generalisability: (1) pragmatic, (2) cultural, (3) linguistic and (4) text-specific problems. Prior understanding of these problems will help me explain and analyse the translation obstacles that the user-translators on Facebook have come across in their work. Below, the translation problems and their defining criteria are listed in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation problem</th>
<th>Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>There are differences between the text-external profile of the source and target situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>There are differences related to conventions and/or norms and habits between the source and target cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>There are structural differences between the source and target language, i.e. linguistic features expressed otherwise in the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text-specific</td>
<td>There are features in the specific source-text that cannot be directly translated, e.g. neologisms or idiosyncratic terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3:** A model of translation problems (adapted from Schjoldager, 2008: 175)

In this connection, it is important to note that there is a difference to be made between translation **difficulties** and translation **problems** (Schjoldager, 2008: 174). The former are subjective obstacles and may arise in cases where the translator lacks the required skills or knowledge required to do the job. The latter are objective or inter-subjective obstacles related to the particular job in question. In the analysis of the empirical data in chapter 4, I shall have a look at the issues discussed among the user-translators and, when appropriate, account for them belonging to the category of translation problems.
3.4 Selection of theories and concepts

In the following, I will briefly account for the complete selection of theories and concepts applied in this thesis and explain their relevance to this particular research project.

3.4.1 Motivation

As explained above, I have chosen to illustrate and analyse the collected empirical data by applying a range of different perspectives provided by scholars and researchers who have investigated different aspects of motivation. In particular, these perspectives have been introduced and examined in section 3.2 and partly in section 1.4.4. I have opted for a focus on volunteer motivation in particular in order to examine motivation in translation crowdsourcing by means of related theoretical and conceptual tools not previously employed in the studies of this phenomenon. I will support these tools with selected motivation theories able to account for human behaviour. This will make the tools and theories complement each other in an analysis of Facebook users who engage in volunteer work when they take part in crowdsourced translation on their own accord. These elements will thus make me able to explain why people engage in crowdsourced translation work on Facebook.

3.4.2 Translation strategies and translation problems

I have chosen to apply Schjoldager’s (2008) framework of macro and microstrategies in translation as well as her definitions of translation problems due to their functional approaches to translation. Since I have decided to examine actual examples of discussions on source-texts among Facebook user-translators with the aim of exploring the considerations they make in their work, I find the notions of translation strategies and translation problems applicable in my analyses of some of these examples. For this purpose, it seems ideal to illustrate the collected data by means of Schjoldager’s functional method to examining translation work, including macro and microstrategies. Applying these strategies will help generate answers to the research questions posed in this thesis concerned with translator strategies and translation obstacles.
4. RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I will present the results of the empirical data collected from three different sources: (1) a questionnaire survey, (2) a set of textual data comprised of six translator discussions and (3) two interviews with a Danish and a Dutch user-translator. The results will be analysed in order to appropriately answer the research questions posed in this thesis and add to the knowledge of motivation and translation strategies in translation crowdsourcing.

Section 4.1 will present the results of the questionnaire in two different sections. This division will illustrate its quantitative and qualitative elements which will allow for a discussion of results by focus area. Section 4.2 will analyse the results obtained from the questionnaire survey. Section 4.3 will present and analyse the selected textual, and section 4.4 will present and analyse the interview data.

4.1 Questionnaire results

This section will present the results obtained from the questionnaire survey (cf. appendix 1). Section 4.1.1 will present the results from the responses to questions 1-8 while section 4.1.2 will present the results from the responses to questions 9-17.

4.1.1 Presentation of quantitative questionnaire results

In the following section I will, unless otherwise stated, present and examine the results based on the total set of collected data, i.e. the responses from both Danish and Dutch speaking user-translators. The reason is that a pre-examination of the data collected in both groups showed that there are no outstanding differences in the way the Danish and Dutch users have replied. The informative details both groups have provided for each question are similar, and this presents an opportunity for examining and analysing the results across language groups. As explained in chapter 2, one of the reasons for creating a bilingual questionnaire was to enable a distinction between the two language groups when I present and analyse the accumulated data. However, due to the comparable results obtained from both language groups, it appears appropriate to present the results as a whole and thus distinguish between the two language groups only in case of discrepancies or particular interest. In order to do so, the answers from the Danish and Dutch speaking user-translators can be told apart simply by looking at the language in which they have replied. The questionnaire results will be examined in the following paragraphs:
The acquired demographic data from both language groups reveal an average age of 32 (cf. question 2) and thus a group composed of primarily young people of which the majority are men (65% as stated above). When examining their level and type of education in question 4, the vast majority of user-translators (89%) are either attending or have graduated from secondary school\(^8\) or have a long-cycle higher education diploma\(^9\), i.e. 3-4 years or >4 years of higher education. The remaining 11% have specified a level of primary school (7-10 years of school attendance), vocational training or short-cycle higher education (less than three years). More specifically, 24% have indicated a level of secondary education while 65% are or have been enrolled in >3 years of higher education. Examining the specific details provided by the latter group of respondents shows that their specific field of education varies greatly with people being educated in such different fields as marketing, economics, engineering, history, social sciences and nursing. Nonetheless, it is possible to detect a common tendency among the replies from both Danish and Dutch speakers, since many respondents are educated in languages. For instance, some of the specifications include ‘Prof. bach. i erhvervssprog og IT-baseret markeds Kommunikation’, ‘cand. ling. merc.’, ‘cand. mag.’ and ‘Cand. mag. Nordisk’ as regards the Danish respondents, and ‘Engelse taal en cultuur’, ‘Germaanse’ and ‘Communicatie-en Informatiewetenschappen’ concerning the Dutch respondents. These replies illustrate how the two groups hold a number of well-educated user-translators whereof several have a degree in languages and communication. A couple of them have even indicated ‘cand. ling. merc.’ which is the Master’s degree programme in international business communication in which I am enrolled.

When turning to examine the replies provided in question 5, a diverse picture of respondents’ current occupations emerges in accordance with the different educational backgrounds as stated above. Also, some respondents claim to be students or unemployed/seeking work.

Question 6 is concerned with the geographic location of user-translators. In order to learn more about them and explore the possibilities for generalising a common trend among these users, I asked where they are physically located – in which countries they come from, and whether they live in small or big cities. I received answers covering a wide range of cities in Belgium, Denmark and the Netherlands, although the majority of them proved to cover metropolitan areas such as Copenhagen and Aarhus in Denmark, Brussels, Antwerp and Gent in Belgium, and Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Utrecht in the Netherlands.

I also decided to include questions about nationality (question 3) and mother tongue (cf. question 7). I wondered, for instance, whether a number of user-translators might be bilingually raised, and whether this

---

\(^8\) I have decided to make use of the common term ‘secondary school’ which according to relevant dictionaries is a suitable equivalent for the Danish ‘gymnasium’ and the Dutch ‘secundair onderwijs’, respectively.

\(^9\) The term ‘long-cycle higher education’ refers to ‘mellemlang videregående uddannelse’ and ‘lang videregående uddannelse’ in Danish. In Dutch, I have defined the term accordingly as ‘hoger onderwijs’.


could explain their interest in languages. Yet, in question 3 only one respondent indicated a different nationality than Danish, Belgian or Dutch. When examining the answers to question 7, it appeared that the vast majority has either Danish or Dutch/Flemish as his/her mother tongue. I chose to include French as an answer option as well, since Dutch (Flemish) and French are the two primary official languages in Belgium. The main objective with question 7 was to explore whether some of the user-translators grew up bilingual; yet, none of the respondents indicated a native language combination including French. A total of 10% however indicated a mother tongue of either English or another language. These languages were specified as German, Spanish and Swedish. With this in mind, I will draw attention to question 8 where I asked the respondents about their knowledge of other languages than their native language and English.

Question 8 required the respondents to list the additional languages known to them, requiring at least the ability to conduct an everyday conversation as well as to write and spell correctly. Of the total 49 respondents, 35 claimed such ability. This question generated an extensive list of languages covering knowledge of eight additional languages, including German, French and Spanish in the top three with eighteen, thirteen and nine occurrences in total. The remaining languages include Italian and Swedish, both listed four times, and Mandarin, Turkish and Russian, where each language occurs one time. When investigating these data in further detail by looking at the language in which the questions were answered, it appears that eleven of the German speakers are Danish whereas the remaining seven are Dutch. Regarding the number of French speakers, only three of them belong to the Danish speaking group while ten are found in the Dutch speaking group. Moreover, the same trend appears when examining the number of Spanish speakers; here, two of the replies came from the Danish group seeing the remaining seven found among the Dutch speakers. Swedish, however, was only stated as an answer by Danish speakers. In this context, it should be noted that the numbers cannot be regarded as proportionally valid, since the number of respondents is not identical for each group. It does however provide a good impression of the versatile linguistic competences to be found in the two translator groups.

4.1.2 Presentation of qualitative questionnaire results

In the following section, I will present and examine the results from the responses to questions 9-17 (cf. appendix 1).

On average, the Danish and Dutch speaking user-translators have been registered members of Facebook since 2008, and the vast majority have been using Translations for more than six months. Most respondents claimed to have been active between one and two years (cf. question 10). When addressing user-translators’ attraction to the app (cf. question 11), the respondents provided numerous motives for
their involvement. By inspecting the 49 responses I have received, it is possible to detect four common tendencies accounting for the users’ involvement. These tendencies can be summarised in terms of the following reasons:

1. To satisfy one’s curiosity about the app and its possibilities
2. To be part of building Facebook in one’s own language
3. To correct spelling mistakes and/or bad wordings found around the translated versions of Facebook
4. Due to a general interest in use of language, communication and/or translation

When drafting the questionnaire survey, I also focused on exploring the respondents’ considerations in the process of working with translations on the app. Particularly, I drafted question 12 with Schjoldager’s definitions of translation strategies in mind in order to gain an understanding of the choices the user-translators make when they translate. I therefore provided the five different answer options in a multiple-choice question enabling respondents to select one or more of the possible answers depending on which of them they mostly agree with. Furthermore, as some respondents might have other considerations than the ones I proposed, I facilitated optional comments as well. When examining the results from question 12, one response in particular excels by having received a total of 35 out of 49 votes. It reveals how user-translators are primarily concerned with rendering the source-text as a whole in an attempt to recreate the overall meaning in a similar way in the target language. Moreover, with 28 out of 49 votes, respondents also favoured the option of considering what kind of wording would be most appropriate in the target language, even if it entails not translating everything in a direct word-for-word manner. It should also be noted here that I received a couple of interesting comments as regards reflections on translation strategies. I will present and analyse these comments in chapter 4.

Question 14 aimed to uncover the extent to which the user-translators employ the translation tools made available to them by Facebook as well as other aids such as dictionaries and tools for machine translation. The user-translators have direct access within Translations to a set of remedies produced by Facebook, including a style guide, a glossary and a link to frequently asked questions (FAQ). When investigating their answers in question 14, less than half of all 49 respondents claimed to make use of the glossary (41%) and the style guide (29%). Furthermore, merely two respondents claimed to visit the FAQs for assistance. Some user-translators (33%) claimed to opt for non-Facebook translation tools such as Google Translate while others (37%) claimed to make use of no tools at all.

A way of revealing the actual usage of Translations is by looking at the user visit frequency (cf. question 15) and average time spent on the app (cf. question 16). The majority of respondents claimed to visit the app regularly, most of them on a weekly (37%) or almost weekly (35%) basis. Some respondents (10%) claimed
to pay a daily visit to the app while others (18%) stated that they rarely use it. Question 16, aiming to shed light on the user-translators’ commitment to work with the translations, saw most respondents spending between 5-15 minutes (33%) or 15-30 minutes (29%) per visit. Further, 26% of all respondents claimed to spend between 30 minutes and 2 hours. The least active group (10%) claimed to spend between 1-5 minutes.

The final question posed in the questionnaire survey, question 17, focused on respondents’ attitudes towards a range of different motives to use Translations. It included 10 statements as answer options that built on the motivation concepts and theories presented in chapter 2, in particular the six functions of volunteerism presented by Clary et al. (1998) and Reiss’ basic human desires (2000).

Practically, question 17 was structured as a comprehensive multiple-choice table in the form of a Likert scale. The table went into detail with possible motives to use Translations, and it facilitated the choice between six different degrees of agreement for each statement. Respondents were thus required to rate all 10 statements in terms of their agreement with each of them. In the following paragraphs, I will present the 10 statements and account for the accumulated responses I received from both Danish and Dutch respondents. In chapter 4, I will analyse their significance in terms of relevant motivation theory.

Statement 1 suggested that the translator uses Translations because s/he wishes to assist Facebook in their work. To this question, 68% confirmed that they either agree or strongly agree with the statement, 22% answered neither/nor, 6% disagreed and 4% remained undecided.

Statement 2 suggested that the translator uses the app in order to practise translation. Here, 50% agreed while 16% responded neither/nor. The remaining 34% either disagreed or remained undecided.

Statement 3 suggested improvement of one’s linguistic competences as an argument for using the app. Here, respondents provided widespread answers with 44% agreeing, 36% disagreeing, 18% saying neither/nor and 2% claiming to be undecided.

Statement 4 proposed the app as a nice pastime. In this case, a majority of 72% agreeing respondents exceeded both the group of disagreeing respondents (12%) and the group of undecided respondents (16%).

Statement 5 suggested that translators use the app because their translation work is part of making a difference for the people using Facebook in their mother tongue, i.e. Danish or Dutch. Most respondents (74%) claimed that they agree with the statement, with 12% of them replying neither/nor, 8% disagreeing and 6% remaining undecided.

The Likert scale was developed by psychologist Dr. Rensis Likert (1903-81) and is a method of measuring attitudes by asking people to respond to a series of statements about a topic, in terms of the extent to which they agree with them, and so tapping into the cognitive and affective components of attitudes (www.simplypsychology.org).
Statement 6 focused on the competition between the user-translators in translating the most strings. Whoever translates the most on a weekly, monthly and even yearly basis will have his/her name displayed on the leaderboard within *Translations* for all translators to see, and the users translating the most will have the chance to win virtual awards. Statement 6 therefore explored the competition element of translation. The results showed that 43% agree that this as an incentive for them to translate while 24% disagreed with the statement. 33% remained undecided.

Statement 7 suggested that the app is an entertaining activity. The results showed a large majority of 80% agreeing with the statement, making it the most convincing manifestation of agreement on the entire scale of statements in question 17.

Statement 8 suggested that translators participate because they enjoy being part of their respective translator communities on Facebook. 41% agreed with this statement while 33% disagreed. 22% were neither for nor against, seeing only 4% undecided.

Statement 9 proposed that the translation experience gained by using the app might prove beneficial for career and/or job opportunities. This statement generated the most attitudes of disagreement (47%) on the entire scale of statements in question 17. 38% claimed to be undecided whereas 14% agreed with the statement.

Finally, statement 10 suggested that completing the translation tasks boosts the translator’s self-confidence. In total, 39% agreed with the statement, 16% responded neither/nor, 41% disagreed and 4% remained undecided.

### 4.2 Analysis of questionnaire results

In the following sections, I will analyse the results obtained from the questionnaire survey and examined in section 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 in order to illustrate that the respondents’ backgrounds, capabilities, performances and motivations are all interrelated elements. The following sections are divided into paragraphs which structure the analysis in terms of general themes that have appeared from the results. The analysis will provide answers to the questions why some Danish and Dutch Facebook users are motivated to participate in translation of the site and how they work with translations. The analysis will incorporate relevant concepts, theories, arguments and discussions put forward by scholars and researchers whose work was presented in section 1.4’s literature review and chapter 3’s presentation of theories. The analysis will discuss and assess these elements in relation to this thesis’ research questions on translation
crowdsourcing. In sections 4.3. and 4.4, I will go into further detail with how users work with translations and what motivates them to participate.

4.2.1 User backgrounds and motivation

As it appeared from the presentation of questionnaire results in section 4.1.1, the majority of both Danish and Dutch speaking user-translators either have a minimum educational level of secondary school or are/have been pursuing a university degree. Furthermore, when taking a glance at their present occupation, many respondents claim to be students or currently unemployed. I will argue that this provides evidence to suggest that some of the many respondents enrolled in secondary or higher education programmes have not yet finished their studies – an argument which is further supported by the respondents’ low average age of 32. Moreover, most respondents state that they often visit the app and most users spend up to 30 minutes on translation each time. These facts provide a means for explaining why a majority of users can find the incentive and time to spend on translating for Facebook. One explanation is that the students and the jobseekers, in particular, are in a position that allows them to devote extra time to spare time activities. User dedication can also be examined from the view that most translators are young, and they are therefore part of a group of consumers who love to explore new ICT technologies and who are very curious about new modern technological products (see e.g. Sjøberg & Schreiner, 2008). From a motivation theoretical point of view, curiosity is in fact one of the basic human desires presented by Reiss (2000) which is able to account for people’s actions and involvement in everything they do. Reiss explains curiosity as a reason for participation in cases where it adds to the pool of knowledge in a person’s life – in this regard it presents an argument for explaining why users of Facebook decide to translate for the company. A reason is that they acquire new knowledge while satisfying their own curiosity, and their actions are guided by a personal wish to translate interest into action.

Another argument accounting for participation is the fact that the majority of respondents belong to a group of well-educated people who have the necessary skills and ‘cognitive surplus’ to be involved with this type of extracurricular or off-work activity. Many of them have an educational background in languages and communication which suggests that there is a pool of potential to be exploited within the groups. Some users could thus possess the qualifications and skills required to produce good translations. Further, they are willing to devote their spare time to translate for free for Facebook. In this respect, Son & Wilson (2012) argue that the most consistent, and often strongest, predictor of volunteering is a person’s educational background and that the role of enabling resources, such as civic skills, free time, and social connections is
able to explain why people volunteer (Son & Wilson, 2012: 474ff). Although their research examines conditions in the US alone, they make an interesting observation when arguing how people with a higher education degree are much more likely to engage in volunteer activities than people with a high school diploma or less. Their research assesses examples of more standard types of volunteer work, such as for instance unpaid political campaign work or organising social activities in one’s neighbourhood. However, it seems valid to apply their arguments in an assessment of user motivation here, as the majority of the Facebook users also have an extensive educational background. Therefore, I will argue that users’ educational backgrounds count as a motivational factor when deciding to translate for Facebook.

4.2.2 User competence and motivation

Furthermore, the four common tendencies accounting for users’ active participation with translation, presented in section 4.1.2, reveal that people have difficulties with accepting e.g. spelling mistakes on the translated versions of Facebook. The four points further illustrate an interest in the app due to disruptions in the Facebook users’ presence on the social media network, and they explain user involvement on grounds of a general interest in languages as well as a personal desire to use Facebook in one’s preferred language. Especially the latter point seems valid in the following perspective; in 2007, when Facebook was still only available in English, there were around 9,000 Danish Facebook users. Eight months later, following the site’s translation into Danish, the social media platform had seen 460,000 Danes creating a user profile (Sørensen, 2014) – an increase of more than 5000 percent. In this connection, I will argue that my results are supported by Son & Wilson’s theoretical arguments that “[p]eople volunteer not only because they can, or because they have wider social networks, or because they have an “interest” in the output of the unpaid labor […] but also because they think it is the right thing to do.” (Son & Wilson, 2012: 475)

It can therefore be argued that the many well-educated user-translators on Facebook qua their professional backgrounds feel encouraged to combine their knowledge about communicative strategies with their language skills when deciding to participate in translation for Facebook. There appears to be further support for this argument when examining the study on community translation initiated by O’Hagan (2011). Along similar lines, she argues that “participants in community translation settings are not all untrained volunteers; professional translators also respond to a particular call which they consider worthwhile” (O’Hagan, 2011: 13). What becomes evident is thus that some of the translation crowdsourcers in the Danish and Dutch translator communities, who are actually capable individuals trained in a field relating to languages, appear to be interested in applying their language skills and spare time to assist with work related to their professions. Even when looking beyond the respondents’
educational backgrounds, results showed that both the Danish and Dutch speakers generally have highly advanced language skills; seven out of ten thus claim to know one or more languages in addition to English and their mother tongue. I find this an interesting observation as it is also supported by the arguments of Son & Wilson (2012), who explain how people enjoy putting skills into practice – even for free and in their spare time.

Furthermore, the vast majority of user-translators have been active with translation on the app for months and, for some, even years. There are thus several reasons to argue that the two groups contain experienced Facebook translators who know their way around the app and are familiar with its work procedures. They know its features and tools and have had the opportunity to build a routine in working with the translation tasks. These elements combined with users’ language skills and interest in translation are supported by the results presented by Dombek (2014) who claims that translation crowdsourcers strive to satisfy needs of competence and thus perceive the translation app as an opportunity to practise their skills and effect change for the better (2014: 265). The elements also support the argument that the Facebook translation system is quite successful in bringing together a unique combination of people, processes and technology (Kelly et al. in O’Hagan, 2011: 87). Certainly, in order to employ crowdsourcing as a means for generating linguistic content for free, Facebook needs translators with language skills and subject-matter expertise – a niche that can be found within Facebook’s own crowds of users. Having their own ‘expert’ users localise the network’s content in their respective languages provides an opportunity to produce clear and unambiguous translations – a point which is also stressed by Kelly et al. (2011). The situation is thus favourable to both Facebook and its users, as both parties have something to gain from the work with translations.

The questionnaire results also showed that the majority of the user-translators do not use the translation tools supplied by Facebook, such as the style guide and the FAQs. Some of them claimed that they consult the glossary when in doubt about specific Facebook terminology, but overall they do not favour the use of tools. Some users did, however, account for other tools they make use of when translating. The following comment came from a Danish respondent: “Søgefeltet i selve appen så man kan se hvad andre tidligere har oversat”. It reveals that some users also apply more creative ‘tools’ such as conducting a search in already translated material which is stored within the app itself, in order to examine similar content that has already been translated. Furthermore, their knowledge of other and more professional tools available to language professionals is also apparent. For instance, a Dutch respondent claimed to make use of “De

---

11 [The search engine within the app in order to see what others have previously translated.]
leidraad van de nederlandse taalunie\textsuperscript{12}\textsuperscript{,} which is a set of guidelines published by the Dutch Language Union about the correct usage of Dutch in all the countries where it is spoken\textsuperscript{13}.

The above points and quotes provide an incentive to argue that the ‘expert’ group of content creators – which Facebook is strongly committed to attract through its crowd of users – do in fact exist. Therefore, many users might simply not have the need for basic translation tools as they translate by means of their own competences and convictions of what is correct. Due to their proficiency in both the source and target languages, they might thus possess the means to work on the translation tasks.

\textbf{4.2.3 Functions of volunteerism and human desires}

Another part of my research examined user motives for becoming active on the translation app and saw the development of four different tendencies explaining these motives (cf. section 4.1.2). All four of them are proactive initiatives that exist because the user wishes to employ his/her own competences to make a change in some specific way. I therefore find that the functions of volunteerism proposed by Clary \textit{et al.} (1998) can explain volunteer participation on grounds of motivation to localise Facebook because user-translators value helping others by providing Danish and Dutch versions of Facebook. They also claim to enjoy acquiring new knowledge through the opportunity to learn, practise and apply skills and abilities, and I will therefore argue that Clary \textit{et al.}’s functions of values and understanding, in particular, play a part in explaining participation in translation work. People value the difference their work with translation makes, and they are involved because it is an opportunity to gain new knowledge in an area that interests them.

Overall, the results showed that user-translators are motivated to participate in order to provide a service to all Danish or Dutch speaking users of Facebook. Compared with Reiss’ (2000) concepts of human desires, these results are supported by the definition of the ‘idealism’ desire. In this case, users-translators’ sense of consideration for other users wishing to use Facebook in the language of their choice makes up an incentive for some of them to carry out the translation tasks. The concepts of Clary \textit{et al.} (1998) help provide a valid account for why the user-translators exercise such volunteer behaviour as it can be explained by an altruist wish to make a change for other people. It is furthermore in keeping with the argument posed by Widjaja (2010) that people are motivated to volunteer by a desire to express altruistic values and feel good about themselves. Also, Clary \textit{et al.} (1998) included this aspect in their ‘values’ function which contains a focus of concern for others.

\textsuperscript{12} [The guidelines from the Dutch Language Union.]
\textsuperscript{13} Information about the Dutch Language Union is available at www.taalunie.org.
The questionnaire results also showed that user-translators are considering personal gains when they translate which is illustrated by their wish to compete with others on the number of completed translation assignments. It can thus be argued that working with the translation tasks makes users able to satisfy one of their basic human desires which, according to Reiss (2000), is the quest for status. This desire explains behaviour related to the individual’s concern with own reputation, and by translating for Facebook the users are able to fulfil their own needs of status through capability practising.

Therefore, I will argue that factors of personal ambition also play a role in explaining user motivation. In this regard, the results suggested that people generally enjoy the elements of competition in translation work; an argument making sense as the top-translators – those translating the most source-text strings – will have their efforts displayed on a leaderboard inside the translation app for everyone else to see. Therefore, if aspiring to claim a spot on the list, users must compete in producing the most translations and thus be quite active on the app. The importance of ambition equally appeared in the results by Mesipuu (2010); she argued, however, that ambition was not a significant motivation factor for the user-translators in her study. Instead, she claimed that in order to stay committed to the translator community in which the user takes part, there is a personal psychological, social or emotional requirement that needs to be met (2010: 10). In the case of my study, the need to gain recognition and respect should be perceived as a factor in explaining participant motivation as the results have showed. Furthermore, Mesipuu (2010) explained that people not only appreciate having products in their own language but claimed that they are also motivated by the fact that they can make their contributions visible to other people, and that they are part of making these products available to themselves and others (2010: 29). This supports my previous argument that user-translators are driven by personal ambition which, when fulfilled, adds to the needs of competence.

Moreover, it appears that a sense of social belonging constitute an important incentive to participate in translation as well. The explanation is to be found in the users’ claim that they enjoy being part of their translator community on Facebook which can also be seen through their active participation in discussions within the translator community groups. This is an interesting point as it shows how features other than what is directly connected with the pleasure of carrying out the translation tasks can be perceived as motivating factors. In this regard, support for the claim can also be found in view of Clary et al.’s social function of volunteering which reflects motivation on grounds of forging or strengthening relationships with others as well as personal satisfaction of belonging to a social community (Clary et al., 1998: 1518), since my results have indicated that these are factors that matter to some users. Additionally, Wilson & Musick (1997) argue that the fact that people enjoy working together and believe in helping others make up a strong incentive for volunteering and offering one’s commitment and spare time to unpaid activities.
(1997: 695). These were also elements that appeared from my results. Furthermore, Reiss’ perception that social contact constitutes a human desire seems plausible in this respect since it accounts for people’s decision to join groups and become active in social communities such as the translator groups on Facebook. It is therefore not surprising to note that many of the Danish and Dutch user-translators claim to enjoy being part of their respective translator communities where many of them regularly discuss the source-texts and related issues with each other. Therefore, there seems to be no compelling reason to argue that user participation is in some cases encouraged by users’ desire to be part of a social community. This is also presented as an argument by Dolmaya who claims that “what unites all successful crowdsourcing efforts is a deep commitment to the community” (in O’Hagan, 2011: 101). Human beings are social beings, and a strong sense of commitment and team spirit within the translator communities will thus be able to further encourage participation and motivation for users to remain translators. This statement is therefore not to be underestimated by companies such as Facebook who have chosen to be fully dependent on users’ contributions with content for their websites and online platforms. In order to take advantage of these voluntary contributions, Facebook should maintain a pleasant online environment for all participants since the factors of contribution and online well-being are mutually reinforcing.

4.2.4 Translation as a fun activity

The questionnaire results revealed that most users consider the translation work on Facebook a nice pastime activity. This corresponds with the findings of Dombek (2014) who claimed that Facebook user-translators carry out the translation tasks in order to experience fun, enjoyment and satisfaction. These factors can be argued support the individual’s desire to enhance personal skills and competences which creates a sort of win-win scenario where both users and Facebook benefit from their involvement with the translations. Despite the fact that many of Facebook’s user-translators are trained in languages, as stated above, and looking for a way to release their ‘cognitive surplus’, a majority of them still participate because of the mere fun of it. In this respect, Kaufmann et al.’s (2011) categorisation of crowdsourcers’ intrinsic motivations can be discussed. Their research, which studied crowdsourcers in different online crowdsourcing projects, finds that people participate in crowdsourcing activities mainly because of the pastime element. The crowdsourced tasks are usually small and do not require much effort or research to complete. Kaufmann et al.’s (2011) results are important to assess here because they support my argument that users are particularly motivated to participate in translation work to ‘kill time’ while having the opportunity to employ own skills in order to make their efforts worthwhile. Kaufmann et al. (2011) also claimed that the concepts of skill variety and task identity play important roles in explaining participation in
crowdsourcing projects. In this regard, my results showed support for those concepts claiming that people are involved in order to practise personal skills, and because they are able to see how the result of their work will be used afterwards and take pride in that. Additionally, motivation to take part in Facebook-based translation is also found in the importance of social contact which, according to Kaufmann et al. (2011), is also a construct of intrinsic motivation. As the examples examined thus far shown, it can therefore be argued that the motive to be socially active with others around a given fun activity constitutes a factor in explaining why people choose to translate voluntarily in their spare time.

4.2.5 Translation, personal opportunities and self-esteem

Part of my research has focused on whether Facebook translation activity is connected to personal development. For instance, I considered the ‘career’ function presented by Clary et al. (1998) when drafting question 17 of the questionnaire survey which addressed user-translators’ motives to translate on grounds of personal development and enhancement of career opportunities. Results showed that there is little support for arguments claiming that users translate because they feel it improves their linguistic competences. Enhancement of career and job opportunities makes up even less of an incentive. This can be explained by the fact that the translation work on Facebook is a voluntary activity taking place in a setting that is unlike other situations of volunteer or paid work. People do not become user-translators because of potential prospects in the non-virtual world – the translation for Facebook remains a spare time activity and personal development thus means little in this regard. Therefore, not all of Clary et al.’s (1998) functions are applicable when analysing the motivation of translation crowdsourcers as these functions also apply to different settings. Along the same lines, gaining experience with and practising translation are also not major reasons for participating in translation. However, users seemed more divided on the question of whether carrying out the translation tasks enhances their self-confidence. My results show some support for the question which can be further sustained if considering Clary et al.’s (1998) functions of volunteerism, specifically the ‘enhancement’ function, and how it explains participation on grounds of one’s own wish to improve self-esteem, confidence and self-improvement. In this way, the individual’s sense of satisfaction when completing the tasks submitted for translation can appear to play a role in explaining why people choose to do it. This claim corresponds with Clary et al.’s (1998) observation that the enhancement function involves a motivational process that centres on the growth and development of the ego and a range of positive strivings of the ego (Clary et al., 1998: 1518). In this case, where I will argue that the enhancement function plays a role in motivating some user-translators, their participation is based on feelings of the success they experience when they carry out the translation tasks.
Additionally, when examining the results in terms of Reiss’ (2000) basic desires accounting for human motivation, the desire for acceptance can be discussed as an influential factor, as it is able to explain how user-translators experience a sense of self-confidence when completing translation tasks. In the course of it, they experience the need for approval by other users, and it can be argued that the desire for acceptance is able to explain the feeling that the completion of tasks improves self-confidence because it is a way to showcase skills.

Furthermore, the results showed that users enjoy the competition element in translation work, as the desire for acceptance is then part of constructing a positive self-image which is enhanced when competing and succeeding in translating the most on the translation app. It can be argued that this desire is connected with the desire for power which Reiss (2000) explains is accountable for people’s quest to demonstrate competence and exercise influence. Claiming the position as top-translator on the Facebook leaderboard will have a positive impact on the individual who will strive for maintaining his/her spot if motivated to translate by the desire for power and acceptance. The leaderboard is thus an important part of the translation app on Facebook, since it is able to retain some of the user-translators.

4.2.6 Exploring translation strategies

Introducing the following section, I will dedicate this last paragraph to the analysis of the kinds of considerations that users find most important when translating on Facebook. This is a question that I included in the questionnaire in order to gain an initial understanding of what is at stake when attempting to define the practical approach to translation on the app.

Overall, the results suggested that the user-translators are primarily concerned with translation in a sense-for-sense manner. They perceive the source-text as a whole and try to render its overall meaning similarly in the target-text. They translate on phrase-level more than word-level which shows understanding for the fact that translation cannot alone be carried out by means of a ‘direct translation’ default strategy (Schjoldager, 2008). I will therefore argue that they are aware that macrostrategies are part of a translation process and that they thus explore different methods of translation when approaching a new translation task.

As stated in section 4.1.2, I have received a couple of interesting comments regarding reflections on translation strategies (cf. question 12) which will allow me to assess the respondents’ choices of translation strategies. I will thus proceed with examining these comments which directly reveal that there are some experienced individuals proficient in languages among the Facebook user-translators.
For instance, a Danish respondent (R1) stated that “Jeg føler ikke at jeg er perfekt - nogle oversættelser overlader jeg til andre, men stemmer så i stedet”\(^\text{14}\)” revealing an honest and considerate self-perception and awareness of personal competences. Meanwhile, another Danish respondent (R2) assessed the five answer options that were provided in question 12 and reached the following conclusion; “Punkterne 2, 3 og 4 er alle særdeles vigtige, men det giver ikke mening at prioritere dem, da en vellykket oversættelse altid består i at afbalancere disse hensyn i forhold til hinanden i hvert enkelt tilfælde. [...] I øvrigt forgår tegnsætning hos trænede sprogbrugere sjældent ’efter’ skrivningen, men løbende, som en integreret del afskriveprocessen”\(^\text{15}\)”. Furthermore, several respondents have added comments on how they assign the context of the target-text great importance when deciding on how to translate. For instance, a Dutch respondent (R3) explained his/her perception of translation strategies when claiming that “het is heel afhankelijk van de tekst context hoe ik ervoor kies om het te benaderen”\(^\text{16}\)”.

The application of translation strategies will be discussed and analysed further from section 4.3.

The above quotes reveal that some user-translators carefully consider their approaches when deciding on a translation strategy. Overall, I will argue that R1’s open and reflective self-evaluation exceeds what can be expected from non-professional translators, and it supports the many arguments put forward thus far in the this analysis that describe the user-translators as capable and skilled language proficient individuals. Additionally, R2 stated how s/he does not deem it appropriate to prioritise between the different strategies, as s/he believes a good translation will always be the product of balancing these considerations in relation to each other. Furthermore, R2 and R3 showed a similar understanding for the target text product and the entire text environment when explaining how they take account of the writing process and proceed methodically with the work. Presumably, these are all considerations known to professional translators; yet, I will argue that they cannot be expected from non-professionals. Nonetheless, some user-translators within the Danish and Dutch translator communities are evidently bearing translation strategies in mind when they carry out the translation tasks. I will therefore argue that they are well aware of the significance of their function as translator as they show an understanding for the features and elements that constitute a good translation. They have an express wish to produce quality translations, and in doing so they put their time and effort into the work despite the fact that the service they provide remains completely voluntary and unpaid.

\(^{14}\) [I do not consider myself perfect – I leave some translations to others and then I vote instead]

\(^{15}\) [Statement 2, 3 and 4 are all very important, but it makes no sense to prioritise them, since a successful translation always involves balancing these concerns in relation to each other in each case. [...] In addition, for trained language users, the punctuation procedure rarely occurs ‘after’ writing, but continuously, as an integral part of the writing process]

\(^{16}\) [It mainly depends on the context of the text how I choose to approach it]
I will conclude this part of the analysis with a comment received from a Danish user-translator. It illustrates a clear and deliberate approach to translation and once more exemplifies the profile for translation that many of the users have; “Når jeg oversætter, så skal det være "sjovt". Så jeg springer konsekvent over alle oversættelser, som kræver kendskab til styleguide eller terminologi, hvis jeg er det mindste i tvivl. Egentlig kan jeg endnu bedre lide at forbedre andres oversættelser, da mange af de andre oversætteres forslag er af ret tvivlsom karakter. Jeg bruger også en del af min tid derinde til at stemme forkerte forslag ned, så de ikke ved et uheld "går live".” This comment further stresses two of the arguments which were repeatedly put forward in the above sections of analysis: that users perceive translation as a fun activity and that they are motivated to participate because they wish to improve Facebook in their own language.

4.3 Presentation and analysis of textual data

In previous sections, motivation to translate for Facebook has been explained by means of a variety of theoretical arguments and concepts. It is illustrated by the facts that user-translators pay reoccurring visits to the app, they often use it and for long periods of time.

As we shall see in the following sections, the Danish and Dutch user-translators are not working solo in their occupation with the translation tasks – in fact, they use their designated translator communities on Facebook to discuss translation issues with each other which sometimes involves an open exchange of a wide range of ideas and solutions to translation problems. As my results have shown, one of the reasons for Danish and Dutch user-translators’ motivation to translate is that it is a fun activity. Also, most of them claim that they enjoy being part of working for Facebook, and they are motivated to make a difference for people wishing to use Facebook in Danish and Dutch.

Based on an understanding of motivation, I wish to explore how user motives are translated into the actual practice of working with translations. I will therefore examine how user-translators have addressed authentic translation tasks by assessing the considerations they have made in order to complete them. Also, I will analyse important elements contained in the translation tasks. This analysis is possible since the users often discuss translation issues or questions in the translator groups, and I can therefore employ their written conversations as empirical material in analyses of their applied translation methods.
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17 [When I translate, it has to be “fun”. So I consistently skip all translations that require knowledge of the style guide or terminology, if I am the least in doubt. Actually, I prefer to improve the translations made by others, as many of the other translators' proposals are rather dubious. I also spend part of my time in there to vote incorrect suggestions down, so they won't accidentally “go live”]
In the following sections, I will present and analyse six examples of discussions on source-texts that I have retrieved within the Danish and Dutch Facebook groups. The discussions have evolved from wall posts being made by users within the groups, and I have specifically selected the six discussions by means of the following criteria: (1) they are concerned with translation work on Facebook’s app, (2) they represent a type of issue, e.g. involving grammar or language use, that the users have often discussed and (3) they excel from the large volume of wall posts made in both groups since they have generated some of the most comments from users. I will examine these particular examples because they have fostered a debate among users regarding the issue in question, and there will thus be many details to analyse from the conversations.

The primary aim with this part of the thesis is to illustrate how translation work is carried out on Facebook. In order to analyse the examples, I will primarily apply Schjoldager’s (2008) definitions of microstrategies, as I wish to explore how translation strategies can explain user-translators’ working processes. Where applicable, I will further employ Schjoldager’s (2008) definitions of macrostrategies and translation problems in relation to the textual examples.

In the following sub-sections, I will first present and analyse three examples taken from ‘Translator Community for Dansk’. Second, I will present and analyse two examples taken from ‘Translator Community for Nederlands’. The sixth example includes an analysis of a translation issue posted and discussed in both the Danish and Dutch translator communities. The examples all differ in nature and illustrate discussions concerning different translation strategies and, in some cases, translation problems.

All examples include a screenshot of the post made by the discussion initiator. The entire discussion, including all user comments, for each of the examples can be found in full length in appendixes 2-7.
4.3.1 Example 1

The first example which I will present and analyse is introduced below and is taken from the Facebook group ‘Translator Community for Dansk’. The entire discussion can be found in appendix 2.

The user, PA, initiating this discussion is concerned with the fact that a new dictionary of spelling is about to be published in Danish. PA therefore wishes to inform his fellow translators that the correct Danish spelling of ‘e-mail address’ will be changed. This is an example of a discussion that has often taken place within the two translator groups; one related to grammar and orthography.

PA’s post received 33 comments from several different users who all expressed their opinion about the change of accepted spelling. It evolved into a discussion of the development of written language in general as well as different opinions on language use and translation.

The main focal point of the discussion revolves around the question of how English terms such as ‘e-mail address’ enter the Danish language without being translated into a Danish equivalent, and how these terms that become loan words in Danish change the structures of the Danish language. It is interesting to note how some users are more in favour of this development than others by examining the respective pro and con arguments the discussion. For instance, PA claims that a part of the natural development of any language causes some words to lose their meanings or gain new ones, and he expects that the Danish language in the future will allow retracted nouns to be written in two words – as is currently the case in English for instance – since this trend is slowly gaining grounds in written Danish, yet not being grammatically correct. Another user, IN, on the other hand, does not favour this trend and maintains that freedom of choice with respect to writing in one word will distort the meaning and cause unnecessary confusion, and it should never be accepted as a valid way of spelling. This point is shared by PW who is

Example 1

The user, PA, initiating this discussion is concerned with the fact that a new dictionary of spelling is about to be published in Danish. PA therefore wishes to inform his fellow translators that the correct Danish spelling of ‘e-mail address’ will be changed. This is an example of a discussion that has often taken place within the two translator groups; one related to grammar and orthography.

PA’s post received 33 comments from several different users who all expressed their opinion about the change of accepted spelling. It evolved into a discussion of the development of written language in general as well as different opinions on language use and translation.

The main focal point of the discussion revolves around the question of how English terms such as ‘e-mail address’ enter the Danish language without being translated into a Danish equivalent, and how these terms that become loan words in Danish change the structures of the Danish language. It is interesting to note how some users are more in favour of this development than others by examining the respective pro and con arguments the discussion. For instance, PA claims that a part of the natural development of any language causes some words to lose their meanings or gain new ones, and he expects that the Danish language in the future will allow retracted nouns to be written in two words – as is currently the case in English for instance – since this trend is slowly gaining grounds in written Danish, yet not being grammatically correct. Another user, IN, on the other hand, does not favour this trend and maintains that freedom of choice with respect to writing in one word will distort the meaning and cause unnecessary confusion, and it should never be accepted as a valid way of spelling. This point is shared by PW who is
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18 [With reference to a previous discussion here on the site, we need to be aware that when the new spelling dictionary is published November 9, we should no longer write “e-mail-adresse” Now we MUST write “e-mailadresse”.]
afraid that a free choice will result in poor literacy skills in the long run, especially among young people.

Other users also comment on the word ‘e-mail’ itself, and its different translations in Danish which is the focal point in last part of the discussion.

On this basis, the example illustrates a discussion which is primarily concerned with translation strategies and how they influence languages. The users engaging in this discussion are generally concerned with reaching some sort of agreement on the right translation strategy for the term ‘e-mail’ and whether the Danish term should imitate the English one or not – and they employ rules of grammar and their own linguistic preferences to argue in their own favour. The discussion involves the meanings of the Danish terms ‘e-post’ and ‘e-mail’ which I will argue are translations produced by two different microstrategies, calque and direct transfer. The former is focused on transferring the structure or making a close translation of a source-text item while the latter is focused on transferring a source-text item unchanged to the target-text. In this regard, users agree that, as a starting point, there is no correct translation of the term since it depends on the context and the judgement of the translator in each situation.

In this regard, I will include a point made by IN that “Vi oversætter ikke ord, men betydninger”19. This echoes the argument promoted in the analysis of the questionnaire survey that the translator groups contain a number of skilled people who are bringing their professional backgrounds, expertise and/or interest in languages with them into the work with translation for Facebook. IN’s point further exemplifies users’ knowledge of translation strategies and the notion that there are more approaches to translation than translation by means of a word-for-word procedure. This argument is supported by the fact that most users have been active on the translation app for a long period of time and thus have established a sense of how to approach the assignments. Example 1 is therefore interesting from several different points of view by virtue of its ability to illustrate the apt approach to translation that many user-translators have.

19 [We are not translating words, but meanings]
4.3.2 Example 2

The second example which I will present and analyse is introduced below and taken from the Facebook group ‘Translator Community for Dansk’. The entire discussion can be found in appendix 3.

Example 2 illustrates how a Danish user-translator, TO, questions the fact that the English word ‘leaderboard’ has been rendered in English on the Danish version of Facebook when a Danish equivalent exists. By further adding that ‘leaderboard’ does not exist in the online dictionary ‘ordnet.dk’, he supports his argument of favouring the Danish term ‘rangliste’. This is an example of a discussion that has often taken place within the two translator groups; one concerned with terminology.

The example reveals that some user-translators are interested in ensuring that the commonly produced translation output is of decent quality. Many of the discussions taking place within the two communities are concerned with quality assurance and often call for other users’ opinions in terms of the best translation – as the discussion and analysis of example 1 also revealed.

Example 2 has prompted 11 comments from various users who all highlight different points in their agreement with the translation ‘rangliste’. For instance, FF points out how an entry in an English-English dictionary presents two meanings of ‘leaderboard’, and he thus wishes to ensure that the right one is selected for this particular translation. Another point is made by DO who claims that Google suggests ‘rangliste’ and thus advocates for the choice of this term for the translation.

When examining the discussion in example 2 with translation strategies in mind, the users are discussing whether the microstrategy direct transfer is the right choice in this case. It directly transfers the source-text word into the target-text, but this strategy is found to be inappropriate by the users engaging in the discussion. In order to track all the instances where ‘leaderboard’ has been directly transferred, they

[How can it be, that the word “Leaderboard” has been accepted as a translation of “Leaderboard”, when we have the excellent Danish word “Rangliste”? Besides, “Leaderboard” is not entered in the dictionary (cf.: ordnet.dk)]
encourage each other to search for the term on the app and alter the translation. Instead, the direct translation ‘rangliste’ should be merged into the existing translations. I find that the users’ considerations are particularly interesting to assess here, as they are able to illustrate how translation strategies are considered and discussed actively among the users. My aim in this regard is thus to examine them from a theoretical point of view. Their discussion in example 2 demonstrates that users are deliberately considering practical approaches to translation at the micro-level which makes an analysis in terms of applied translation strategies possible. It can further be seen that they are keen to review and investigate in depth the options related to different translation strategies in order to produce the best translations.

Example 2 further illustrates that some, but far from all, users often employ dictionaries and other translation tools when arguing their cases in a discussion with fellow user-translators. It also supports the findings of section 4.2 where I argued that the groups of Danish and Dutch user-translators contains many capable and skilled individuals who are trained in languages, communication and/or translation. In particular, it showcases their will to practise skills while satisfying their needs of competence and autonomy over the translation tasks – an argument equally promoted by Pink (2009) and Dombek (2014) which was presented in previous sections.

4.3.3 Example 3

The third example which I will present and analyse is introduced below. It stems from the Facebook group ‘Translator Community for Dansk’. The entire discussion can be found in appendix 4.

Example 3

[What is the attitude towards the translation of the family relations “stepsister”, “stepbrother”, “stepmother” and “stepfather”? Regarding father and mother I believe it should be “stedmor” and “stedfar” – “papmor” and “papfar”]
In this post, HB calls for opinions about how to translate the family relations “stepsister”, “stepbrother”, “stepmother” and stepfather”. I will not go into detail with describing either connotations or denotations of these four terms as discussed by the user-translators, but I will instead focus on the challenges that their translations entail. I will argue that HB addresses this issue as a translation problem, as he makes it clear that there are no instructions made available in terms of how they should be translated – and there are different terms available in Danish to choose from. In this case, there appears to be a need for more information about the context which would allow for an accurate translation to be made. Therefore, I will argue that due to differences in the source and target-text contexts, example 3 illustrates a cultural translation problem. The source-text items have different equivalents in Danish which HB discusses in his post and they provide an example of how cultures have their own norms and conventions that can pose obstacles in a translation process. The fact that Danes use different terms to describe the same family relation, depending on personal inclinations, is the main point of this discussion. For instance, is a stepbrother someone who is married into the family, or is he perhaps a half-sibling? Equivalent terms suggested in the discussion are ‘stedbror’, ‘papbror’, ‘bonusbror’ and ‘halvbror’, and it can thus be argued that different perceptions of the microstrategy adaptation are in play in attempting to recreate the effect of the source-text terms in the Danish target-text. In this regard, the most suitable terms will depend on the context and purpose of the translation. Adaptation as a strategy can also be employed to handle a cultural reference in a source-text which is related to the discussion of a cultural translation problem as mentioned above. These considerations reveal the attention to different available options in translation that the user-translators propose, and the discussion shows that the users are eager to share and comment on each other’s ideas. In this connection, WM emphasises his personal attitude: “Jeg mener også at det er vigtigt at forholde os nøgternt til oversættelserne og undlade at blande vore egne personlige holdninger, med der til hørende personlige begrunder, ind i oversættelsesarbejdet”. I find the comment illustrative of the users’ awareness about their role in the translation process and once again their professional approach to translation. WM shows that he approaches the translation tasks professionally as he will not let his own opinion affect his translation strategies, and he believes this is the approach that all users should adopt. Thus, a parallel can be drawn to example 2 where a similar comment was made by another user regarding the importance of translating meanings rather than words. I will argue that this example reveals that some users are more than amateurs as they show understanding for translation and its complexities. The discussion shows that many user-translators agree that translation can be approached seem a little too artificial to me, but regarding siblings I am not so sure. “Stedbror” sounds a little strange to me and “Papbror” as well. Therefore I will suggest “Halvbror” and “halvsøster” for siblings.

22 [I also find it important that we handle the translations objectively and avoid dragging our own personal attitudes, including any related personal justifications, into the translation work.]
from different angles depending on the context and that there is often more than one ‘default’ translation strategy for carrying out a translation assignment.

4.3.4 Example 4

The fourth example which I will present and analyse is introduced below. It is taken from the Facebook group ‘Translator Community for Nederlands. The entire discussion can be found in appendix 5.

This example, presented by the user FS, brings about a discussion of poor translations. In this case, FS has found two linguistic errors on the Facebook app ‘Runtastic’ and calls for the group’s attention to the problem. He suggests that other users should access the task, which is available in the translation database, and vote down the currently accepted translation. This can be done by making a search for the sentence that has been translated within the translation app. A link to the error-prone translation in example 4 has been added by FS to the post, and the issue itself can be seen in the screenshot that FS has attached to the post. Here, it reads: “[FS] hebben 5,51 kilometers gewandeld met Runtastic.com”.

23 [Good afternoon everyone!! Could you just reject the string below? Thanks in advance!]
24 [[FS] has walked 5.51 kilometres with Runtastic.com]
The error is found in the verb ‘hebben’. In this case, it is either conjugated in its 3rd person plural form in the present tense (meaning ‘[they] have’) or rendered in its infinitive form (meaning ‘[to] have’) – in both cases, the verb will be written ‘hebben’. Either way, the translation is incorrect as the verb refers back to its noun, FS, which is 3rd person singular. The correct conjugation of the verb ‘hebben’ should have been the 3rd person present ‘heet’, and the correct sentence is thus “[FS] heeft 5,51 kilometer gewandeld met Runtastic.com”. In this improved translation, the second linguistic mistake can be noticed as there should be no plural ‘s’ added to ‘kilometer’ in Dutch when it follows a cardinal number. Only in cases where there is a wish to stress or emphasise a certain amount or when referring to entities such as dozens, hundreds or thousands should the plural ‘s’ be added in Dutch. FS has thus spotted a genuine error, and the example has provoked other users to comment on it. BD, for instance, expresses his frustration when claiming that “er gewoon wordt doorgegeven in de plaats van vertaald”. He is not satisfied that English source-text items sometimes are transferred instead of translated into Dutch, and the example shows that users are paying attention to detail and deem it important that the Facebook interface is correctly translated. The example can be argued to illustrate users’ desire for order as it shows how they are preoccupied with reviewing and correcting already translated material. In Reiss’ (2000) words, it is a projection of the need for organisation. It further shows how many users, when coming across errors of grammar and wording, choose to address the issue. They are keen to improve Facebook, and they rely on each other’s work to reach the goal.

Example 4 can also be illustrated by means of the concepts of translation problems. Parts of the source-text consist of programming code, i.e. code-like items functioning as substitutes for e.g. user name and number of kilometres. These items are marked in bold in the example. Accessing the source-text via the link reveals that it reads “[user] walked [kilometer(s)] with [Runtastic.com]”. It makes it possible to see that the verb ‘walked’ in past tense has been changed into the present perfect tense ‘have walked’ (hebben gewandeld’) in Dutch. It thus appears that the Dutch translators have found the past tense inappropriate to convey the meaning of having been out on a walk with Runtastic. This action indicates that it was completed at some point in the past and that it extends to the present, and I will therefore also argue that the present perfect tense is the most appropriate choice for this translation. Directly translating the source-text including the verb in past tense creates a target-text that sounds unidiomatic in Dutch. I therefore find the present perfect ‘heeft gewandeld’ to be more appropriate than the past tense ‘wandelde’ would have been in this particular case.

---

25 See for instance ‘De Taaltelefoon’ which is a language advice service provided by the Flemish government in Belgium: http://taaltelefoon.vlaanderen.be/nlapps/docs/default.asp?id=4420.

26 [It is simply being transferred instead of translated]
Thus, it can be argued that a linguistic translation problem has arisen due to the fact that the past tense should not be used to convey the meaning in Dutch. However, there is a structural difference between the source and target languages which make it impossible to directly process the task, as the source-text needs to be expressed differently in the target-language. This problem has complicated the translation process and created a faulty translation because the programming codes do not make room for changing the tense. The user-translators are therefore very restricted when working on translations that consist of codes, and they should be careful in rendering the message correctly in the target-text.

4.3.5 Example 5

The fifth example which I will present and analyse is introduced below. It is taken from the Facebook group ‘Translator Community for Nederlands. The entire discussion can be found in appendix 6.

The discussion is initiated by MG who addresses a challenging issue; the fact that there are dialectical differences between written and spoken Dutch in the Netherlands and Belgium. Dutch is the official language of the Netherlands and is equally recognised as such in the region of Flanders in Belgium, and there are different variants of spoken and written Dutch in each of these countries as well as several other countries around the world. Example 5 illustrates how it can pose a challenge to produce a translation that can be appropriately used by Dutch speakers with different dialects.

27 [Hello fellow Belgian translators. Unfortunately, I still often encounter U and Uw when translating. I completely understand that this is Belgian for je/jou/jouw, but I have read somewhere in the guidelines that You should be translated with je/jou/jouw. I (we) would be very grateful if you would keep this in mind. With love...]
MG claims that he often comes across the polite forms of ‘you’ and ‘yours’ – ‘U’ and ‘Uw’ in Dutch – on the Dutch version of Facebook. For a Dutch speaker from the Netherlands, these forms appear overly formal when used on Facebook – yet, they are widely used by Belgian Dutch speakers as informal, colloquial variants of ‘you’ and ‘yours’ in the Flemish dialect28. MG knows that this is the case in Belgium but calls for the user-translators’ attention in an attempt to respect Facebook’s guidelines that require translations to be performed in standard Dutch. All participants in the discussion agree that the guidelines should be respected and that the corrections must be made.

By means of translation strategies, I will argue that the discussion is able to illustrate the way that adaptation is being used by some translators to render Facebook in the variant of Dutch they speak and write. The user-translators, who have worked on the translation in example 5, may thus have attempted to create a target-text that adapts the source-text in a way that works in their own language. The Flemish terms ‘U’ and ‘Uw’ are commonly found in all kinds of texts, fields and subjects, since this is simply how ‘you’ and ‘yours’ are colloquially expressed in Flemish. This translation, however, does not fit the brief stipulated by Facebook in their guidelines requiring translation into standard Dutch, and the users agree that these guidelines should be respected.

In this regard, I will argue that example 5 contains a pragmatic translation problem because of the differences in the source and target situations, and the issue of dialects is thus the catalyst. Furthermore, the discussion taking place in example 5 is able to shed light on some of the differences and challenges that occur when translating languages that are spoken in different countries and regions.

---

28 Flemish is the variant of Dutch officially recognised as a spoken and written language in Belgium. For tips on language use: http://taaltelefoon.vlaanderen.be/nlapps/docs/default.asp?fid=504.
4.3.6 Example 6

In the following section, I will present and analyse two discussions that have taken place within the Danish and Dutch translator groups on Facebook. Both discussions are concerned with the same source-text term, and I will analyse them coherently for the purpose of illustrating all arguments in one coherent presentation. The entire body of both discussions can be found in appendix 7.

Example 6.1

Example 6.2

Example 6.1 and 6.2 both illustrate discussions of how to translate ‘Faceversary’ – a term invented by Facebook prior to its 10 year anniversary in February 2014. It forges the terms ‘Face(book)’ and ‘(anni)versary’, and I am curious to examine how these translation tasks have been discussed among the users.

29 [How would you translate “Faceversary”? I sometimes come across it among the pending translations.]
30 [Hi translators. I am translating the sentence “Tomorrow is their Faceversary”. The constructed term “Faceversary” will probably appear in more texts, so I think we should agree on a fixed translation. The suggestions I am able to come up with sound rather silly – but so does “Faceversary” in my honest opinion. Do you have any good ideas? - faceilæum? - facebookilæum? - facebilæum?]
Both examples show that the translation of ‘Faceversary’ caused much interest among user-translators who extensively commented on the posts and discussed how to produce the best translation. The discussions have prompted a variety of suggestions regarding how to translate the Facebook neologism ‘Faceversary’. Overall, the Danish and Dutch users have discussed two different approaches which I will analyse by means of translation strategies. Some of them opt for a target-text oriented macrostrategy by inventing a term that would be appropriate in the target language while others wish to maintain the original construct by means of a source-text oriented strategy.

The users advocating a target-text oriented approach have invented a range of terms in both Danish and Dutch by means of a focus on the target-text effect. In the Danish group, I will argue that the terms ‘faceilæum’, ‘facebookilæum’, ‘facebilæum’, ‘Facebook-årsgård’ and ‘facelsdag’ all are constructs of a target-text oriented macrostrategy as they have been created in an attempt to capture and reproduce the source-text creativity. They all contain, partially or entirely, the word ‘Facebook’ and a suffix that refers to the Danish word for anniversary, ‘jubilæum’ or ‘årsgård’. In the Dutch group, I find that the terms ‘Facejaardag’, ‘Facetje’, ‘Facedag’, ‘Facejaar’, ‘Facebookverjaardag’ and ‘Face-ileum’ have been constructed by means of a target-text oriented macrostrategy. These terms also attempt to create expressions that function well in Dutch by merging ‘Face’ or ‘Facebook’ with the Dutch word for anniversary, ‘verjaardag’ or ‘jubileum’.

The users advocating a source-text oriented approach have focused on the source-text form and content when deciding to keep the term ‘Faceversary’ in both Danish and Dutch. This is illustrated by the comments in which users wish to transfer the term ‘Faceversary’ to the Danish and Dutch target-texts. This decision makes the English neologism become a loan word in the two target-languages and opting for this approach will require the target audience to understand the connotations of the English term.

In this situation, I will argue that it is a question of assessing the relation between source and target-text and which microstrategies to employ when carrying out translations.

The direct transfer strategy keeps the term ‘Faceversary’ untranslated in the target-text whereas a calque translation opts for a translation that transfers the structures of the source-text item to the target-text, such as ‘faceilæum’, ‘facebookilæum’ and ‘facebilæum’ in Danish and ‘Face-ileum’ in Dutch. A calque construct is a translation that is very close to its original and often results in a target-text item that seems unidiomatic in the target language. I will argue that this is the case of these four examples that seem odd and unidiomatic in both Danish and Dutch.

Oblique translation focuses on rendering the source-text in a sense-for-sense manner, and I will argue that ‘Facebook-årsgård, as a Danish example, and ‘Facejaardag’, ‘Facedag’ and ‘Facejaar’, as Dutch examples, are
constructs of this strategy. In their own ways, they attempt to cover the contextual meaning of the source-text item. Both the calque and oblique translations attempt to merge the words ‘Facebook’ and ‘anniversary’ in similar ways in Danish and Dutch compared to the English construct. The user-translators inventing these terms are therefore operating in a more target-text oriented manner when trying to produce an appropriate translation, yet still taking into account the contextual meaning of the source-text. The results are examples of neologisms created in Danish and Dutch that attempt to render a functional equivalence in relation to the original source-text item ‘Faceversary’. In the following sub-section, I will examine some of the microstrategies at play in the construction of target-text terms.

4.3.6.1 Microstrategies at play

Of the terms discussed above, I find it interesting to further analyse the term ‘Facebook-årsdag’ in Danish and ‘Facejaardag’ in Dutch. I have categorised these as oblique translations, since they have been translated in a sense-for-sense procedure that imitates the English source-item. I will argue that ‘Facebook-årsdag’ which means ‘Facebook-anniversary’ is a neologism attempting to convey the sense included in the source-text term, and I find that it works well in Danish as the literal meaning of the invented term is clear and unambiguous. When pronounced, ‘Facejaardag’ resembles ‘verjaardag’ which in Dutch means ‘birthday’ or ‘anniversary’. The connotations of ‘Faceversary’ are therefore maintained. I find that the construct ‘Facejaardag’ corresponds well with the meaning of ‘Faceversary’, and it is further an idiomatic expression in the target language.

Moreover, I will analyse the terms ‘facelsdag’ in Danish and ‘Facetje’ in Dutch. When pronounced, ‘facelsdag’ resembles ‘fødselsdag’ which means ‘birthday’, and it conveys the meaning of the source-text term because it maintains references to ‘Facebook’ and ‘anniversary’. I will therefore argue that ‘facelsdag’ is a well-designed construct of the microstrategy adaptation as it attempts to recreate the source-text effect.

The term ‘Facetje’ in Dutch is also a production of the microstrategy adaptation, and it involves a linguistic feature which is common in the Dutch language; the diminutive endings. These small suffixes, frequently added to nouns, are used to convey a slight degree of the root meaning, miniaturisation of the item or quality in question, encapsulation, intimacy, or endearment\(^\text{31}\). The suggestion ‘Facetje’, composed of ‘Face’ as in ‘Facebook’ and the diminutive suffix ‘-tje’, is thus a creative solution that attempts to construct a target-text item that functions in the target culture as this way of inventing new nouns is very common in

\(^{31}\) See e.g. https://onzetaal.nl/taaladvies/advies/verkleinvormen-algemene-regels.
Dutch. It does, however, not express the same meaning as the original source-text term because the reference to ‘anniversary’ is lost. A ‘Facetje’ – if not explained by its context – could refer to anything and would require more explanation in order for Facebook users to understand its meaning.

I will further illustrate example 6 from the perspective of translation problems. Since the users have decided to discuss the difficulties in translating the term ‘Faceversary’, it can be argued that it constitutes a translation problem. There is no direct translation strategy for such term, and the translator has to think of other ways to produce a target term. Due to the fact that the term ‘Faceversary’ is specifically connected to the source-text on the Facebook platform, I will analyse it as a text-specific translation problem that clearly illustrates the complexity of translating neologisms and idiosyncratic language. Furthermore, since this term cannot be generalised and no parallels exist in any of the target languages, it must be solved in a text-specific way that includes an equal focus on target-text effect and thus an understanding of the structures of the Danish and Dutch languages.

Example 6 thus illustrates users’ approach to translation as well as the considerations they share with each other in order to find solutions to translation problems. The invented Danish and Dutch terms examined above depict translations produced by means of clever choices of microstrategies and a flair for understanding the cultural and linguistic environments of both the source and target-texts.

4.4 Presentation and analysis of interviews

In the following section, I will present, compare and analyse the data collected via two interviews conducted in order to directly explore user-translators’ own considerations, approaches and attitudes to translation for Facebook. The interviews took point of departure in the motivation theories and concepts presented earlier in this thesis as well as an understanding of translation strategies. They were further conducted following a pre-examination of data collected in the questionnaire survey which provided points to further investigate. The full length of both transcribed interviews can be found in appendices 8 and 9.

The two respondents both claim that they have been interested in languages for many years, and they are involved with translation for Facebook because of their own desire to put personal skills into practice. This corresponds with the results obtained via the questionnaire in which most users have stated that they enjoy practising translation because it allows them to translate their interest into action. Furthermore, the two respondents both state that they perceive the translation app as a great tool on which to spend some spare time. In this regard, the Dutch respondent, MvH, explains that “ik vind deze kleine taken leuk, ze zijn
The Danish respondent, DK, expresses a similar view in that “[...] hvor andre måske spiller et spil, så hygger jeg mig med oversættelser, det er et ret fint tidsfordriv” (appendix 8, l. 312). An analysis of these points is supported by the observations of Dombek (2014) who argues that participation in crowdsourcing is rooted in the desire to have fun and satisfy needs of competence. Her points have been explored in detail in connection with the examination and analysis of the questionnaire survey in chapter 4. In equal terms, DK states that “jeg kan li’ alt der bringer ny viden og kundskaber... det er sjovt.” (appendix 8, l. 177). I will therefore argue that one of the main motives for users to be involved with translation on Facebook is that it enables them to creatively release their abilities and to be entertained in a constructive way. This is a point that was also supported in the analysis of the questionnaire data.

In this connection, DK explains that it is important for him to contribute to the Danish Facebook community and the people who are benefitting from the work he carries out: “Ja, jeg synes det er sjovt at deltage - og rart at man kan bidrage - bidrage til et fællesskab, for selvom FB drager økonomisk fordel af det, i stedet for at skulle hyre oversætningsfolk, så er det jo mine landsmænd jeg føler jeg giver tilbage til... til alles gode” (l. 192). In a similar manner, MVH explains that she is motivated by the fact that she can see her work making a difference: “Ik hou van de kleine uitdagingen, ik vind het leuk om te doen. maar bovendien is het heel bevrengend om uiteindelijk de vertalingen op de Nederlandse facebook terug te zien. Het werk maakt verschil, dat is een fijne gedachte. Dat is vooral waarom ik het doe denk ik ☺” (appendix 9, l. 216). These two statements illustrate a motive for carrying out translation due to the selflessness of the effort and because users can see that it makes a difference. With these statements in mind, I find it reasonable to claim that Kaufmann et al.’s (2011) constructs of intrinsic motivation are present here as they explain why some people participate in crowdsourcing activities. They become involved in order to practise personal skills, and because they will be able to take pride in their work once they see how the result of it is being used. In this connection, I also find the two quotes representative of the argument by Wilson & Musick (1997) who claim that people volunteer due to a personal belief in helping others and a wish to contribute with something to a collective goal. The user-translators are therefore attempting to apply personal competences in a spare time activity in order to feel good about their accomplishments. I will argue that it is a visual way in which one’s own productive efforts create a sense of pride about the difference made for

---

32 [I like these small tasks, they are fun pastimes]  
33 [I like everything that brings about new knowledge and skills... it is fun]  
34 [Yes, I think it is fun to participate – and nice that you can contribute – contribute to a community, because even if Facebook is capitalising on it, instead of having to hire translators, then it is my countrymen that I feel I am benefitting... for the good of all]  
35 [I love the little challenges, I like to do this. but it is also very satisfying to finally see the translations again on the Dutch Facebook. The work makes a difference, which is a nice thought. This is mainly why I do it I think]
others than oneself. There is surely a degree of selflessness and generosity present in users’ motivations, but it is complimented by a degree of complacency as users also strive for personal goals such as feeling successful and accomplished in the environment in which the work takes place.

Furthermore, I find that there is ample support for the claim posed by several scholars, including Dombek (2014) and Kaufmann et al. (2011) that the pastime element in solving the small translation tasks plays a main role in explaining user motivation to translate. In this regard, my research has not produced any results able to advocate for Kaufmann et al.’s (2011) point of view that motivation is also enhanced through the reception of direct feedback for a job done. In the words of MvH: “Je krijgt nooit feedback van Facebook mbt je werk dus je bent eigenlijk vrij om te doen wat je zelf wilt, te vertalen, en dan zijn je medevertalers gewoon je grootste critici”36 (appendix 9, l. 111). There is thus evidence to suggest the opposite; that Facebook crowdsourcers are motivated to translate despite the fact that they do not receive feedback from Facebook for the tasks they carry out. Instead, there are other factors that play a role in accounting for their motivation, as the results from both the questionnaire survey and the interviews show.

One of these factors appears to be the possibility to participate in a creative writing process. This has been extensively argued in chapter 4 which has examined the translation process through six textual examples of discussions of source-texts in the two translator groups – especially as regards the translation of the term ‘Faceversary’. In this connection, MvH emphasises the significance of the creativity factor: “Ja.. soms is de context niet eenduidig, dat is lastig, dan is het begrip heel vaag en op verschillende manieren te interpreteren. of een woord wat we in het Nederlands niet of nauwelijks gebruiken. Dan moet ik mijn creativiteit gebruiken, maar dat zijn voor mij de leuke uitdagingen”37 (appendix 9, l. 204). In this case, the question is concerned with how to overcome translation problems to which MvH replies that this challenge is in fact what plays a part in motivating her. I therefore find that the motivation constructs by Kaufmann et al. (2011) enabling personal creativity through task autonomy also plays a role in explaining motivation to participate in translation for Facebook.

I have further explored how users perceive the possibilities of their work with translations. In this regard, DK touches upon the advantages and disadvantages of outsourcing translation of the entire Facebook site to its user crowd: “Jeg vil mene, at fordelene er at man kan være heldig at oversættelsen bliver udført af kompetente personer, der både forstår at formulere sig, at være præcise nok til at der ikke opstår uvetydigheder og som også forstår sammenhængen/sammenhængene, som de oversatte tekster vil

---

36 [you never receive any feedback from Facebook regarding your work so you are basically free to do what you want, to translate, and then your fellow translators are just your biggest critics]
37 [Yes.. sometimes the context is not clear, that is difficult, then the concept is quite vague and can be interpreted in different ways. or a word that we never or rarely use in Dutch. Then I have to use my creativity, but to me those are the fun challenges!]
optræde i - og at det er nogenlunde omkostningsfrit *). Ulempen må være at man får garbage in and out - og ikke ved det.38”) (appendix 8, l. 249). His opinion illustrates the importance many Danish and Dutch user-translators assign translator competence. By investigating the results of both the questionnaire survey and the textual data, there appears to be a clear consensus that user-translators have to possess good language skills and be meticulous in their work with translation. This view seems supported by MvH who claims that “Ik vind het niveau van de vertalers vaak hoog, ze denken er goed over na”39”) (appendix 9, l. 144). She believes that the translators are carefully considering the translation output and that the quality of translations produced by the Dutch translators is good and suitable for its purpose.

DK and MvH have addressed many of the same aspects when accounting for each of their motives for being involved with translation for Facebook. Yet, DK adds a motive when emphasising that he enjoys pleasing others and accounts for it as a reason for why he participates: “Ja, det er for mig altid en personlig tilfredsstillelse, at vide at man gør andre glade for noget - også hvis de ikke ved det kommer fra mig… er det ikke en altruists grundsubstans?”40”) (appendix 8, l. 331). DK enjoys the role of the altruist, and he claims that it is the impelling cause for his participation. I have previously supported the motive of altruism when assessing Reiss’ (2000) and Widjaja’s (2010) accounts of idealism explaining motivation. Furthermore, I will argue that DK’s statement could be representative of user motives as it finds support with Son & Wilson (2012) who claim that “people volunteer because they believe it is the right thing to do” (2012: 474ff). My results thus add a perspective to Son & Wilson’s request for future research able to investigate how a sense of obligation to help others affects how people calculate the value of free time. Also, the results support Mesipuu’s (2010) argument that people are motivated to realise their individual potential and Pink’s (2009) motivational factor of purpose which stresses that people are motivated to serve something larger than themselves.

Finally, on the basis of all my presented analytical claims, I will argue that translation researchers such as Mesipuu (2010), Kaufmann et al. (2011) and Dombek (2014) as well as motivation theorists such as Wilson & Musick (1997), Clary et al. (1998), Reiss (2000), Pink (2009), and Son & Wilson (2012) have raised important and relevant points of view, observations and arguments well suited for employment in the present study on Danish and Dutch translation crowdsourcers on Facebook. I find that DK and MvH both have added important points in terms of outlining the factors that can explain translator motivation and

---

38 [I think the advantage is that you can be lucky that the translation is being carried out by competent people, who both know how to express themselves, to be precise enough to avoid ambiguities, and who also understand the context CONTEXTS in which the translated texts will appear – and that it is more or less cost-free *)] The disadvantage must be that you will get garbage in and out – without knowing it.)

39 [I think the level of the translators is often high, they carefully think about it]

40 [Yes, to me it is always about personal satisfaction, knowing that you make others happy about something – even if they do not know that it is coming from me... is that not the basic substance of an altruist?]
behaviour in a particular crowdsourcing setting. Their points are well vested in both the entirety of the collected empirical material and the literature and theories employed in order to explore these arguments in detail – and I will argue that they have been able to support many of the arguments made in previous sections from different perspectives.
5. DISCUSSION

In previous chapters, I have examined people’s motivation to participate in translation for Facebook and their behaviour when carrying out such tasks. In this chapter, I will discuss the views and arguments produced in my analyses and relate them to each other in order to provide a more nuanced view of Facebook translation. I will include relevant views put forward by Wilson & Musick (1997), Clary et al. (1998), Reiss (2000), Pink (2009), Mesipuu (2010), Kaufmann et al. (2011), Son & Wilson (2012), and Dombek (2014) in order to connect my arguments to the existing discussion about crowdsourced translation. I will also include a discussion of Schjoldager’s (2008) translation strategies as they relate to the approach to translation of user-translators. I will compare results obtained from different aspects of my research: the questionnaire survey, the textual data and the two interviews to create a coherent discussion in which the points raised in each section will complement each other. In section 5.1, I will discuss and assess the validity of my sources as a means for exploring the collected data.

The questionnaire analysis showed that user-translators are motivated to translate for several different reasons based on a general interest in offering one’s skills and capabilities for the benefit of a common good. People enjoy being part of the social environment within their translator communities as well as working together on the translation tasks. When I examined the arguments of Wilson & Musick (1997), I considered whether their accounts of motivation in formal volunteer work were applicable to my study. I supported their claim that the opportunity to be socially active with others through working on a project important to the individual is an essential element in explaining motivation. On the basis of my results, I will argue that the translation app on Facebook represents a branch of formal volunteer work and that Wilson & Musick’s (1997) concepts of motivation can be employed in an analysis of worker motivation in this setting. Furthermore, the results have shown that people tend to pursue goals in which they can invest their skills in the process of reaching it. This has been illustrated by user-translators’ desire to practise translation skills and simultaneously help the people wishing to use Facebook in their own language. Therefore, I will argue that training of skills and need for social interaction are the primary motivations for individuals to engage in crowdsourcing activities.

My results have verified the findings of Son & Wilson (2012) who stress that personal resources (e.g. skills, free time and social connections) enable people to become involved in volunteer activities (2012: 474). My results are further consistent with Dombek (2014) who claims that motivating factors include benefitting others, putting one’s skills into practice, collaborating with others, building a positive personal image online, having the freedom to contribute and enjoying translation as an entertainment activity (2014: 265ff). I will argue that two motivational factors – contributing translations and a sense of online well-being
– are mutually reinforcing as they are account for people’s interest in the translation work. In other words, users enjoy being part of the Facebook translation environment and they maintain their interest in translation simply because they feel at ease in the environment.

The results show that many students and unemployed are involved with translations. Based on this, I have argued that they are able to find the time for this kind of spare time activity in which they can practise their language interests. Also, the results reveal that many specialists in languages and communication are involved in crowdsourced translation work. The data show that they have well-developed translation skills, and I will argue that they are part of a group of ‘expert’ content creators which Facebook seeks to attract. Facebook motivates them to translate by providing a translation interface in which they can easily translate the source strings and discuss issues with each other in the designated translator groups. The tool which keeps them motivated is the leaderboard inside Translations on which many user-translators strive to appear. They enjoy competing with each other to claim the top positions in order to showcase their skills through the amount and value of their contributions. The results have shown that their motivations can also be explained by personal psychological, social or emotional needs (Mesipuu, 2010: 10). In this case, I will argue that solving the translation tasks means that users’ desire to satisfy psychological elements of competition as well as to engage in social interaction with likeminded people accounts for some users’ motivation to translate for Facebook. This argument is supported by Reiss’ (2000) concepts of basic human desires that motivate people’s actions, specifically the desires of power and acceptance. My argument corresponds with the results showing that carrying out the translation tasks enhances the self-confidence of some users. Possessing the skills to carry out the tasks and seeing one’s contributions displayed on a leaderboard satisfy feelings of self-satisfaction, and users experience a sense of success entailed with completing the work. Users’ self-confidence is thus improved due to feelings of satisfaction when solving the translation tasks, and the recognition they receive from fellow translators. This argument is supported by Clary et al.’s (1998) functions of volunteerism, specifically the ‘enhancement’ function which explains participation as a wish to improve self-esteem, confidence and self-improvement. One way to fulfil this wish is by employing one’s own skills and competences to complete translation tasks on Facebook, a concept that has been presented as another motive to translate.

Parts of both the questionnaire survey and the interview results have emphasised that translation for Facebook is a nice pastime activity by which people experience fun, and this is why they are interested in taking part. These results were obtained by means of concepts developed by Kaufmann et al. (2011) and arguments posed by Dombek (2014). Kaufmann et al.’s (2011) claim that people become involved in order to ‘kill time’ and avoid boredom can thus be compared with Dombek’s view that translation crowdsourcing activities provide an opportunity to practice own skills while collaborating with others and experiencing
fun. Therefore, I will argue that in order to avoid boredom and experience pleasure, people bring their knowledge and skills into activities they find entertaining and worthwhile. Motivation is therefore sustained as people enjoy putting their skills into practice – even if they have to do it for free and in their spare time.

As mentioned above, my results have shown that people’s interest in becoming involved with translation is determined by each individual’s emphasis on a range of different human desires. Taking a glance at the amount of time users spend on Translations suggests a desire and willingness to dedicate much time to the translation tasks. In view of my results, I will therefore argue that user-translators generally have a strong interest in fulfilling their individual needs of competence, entertainment, status, practising skills, and enjoying the social membership of the translation communities. The users perceive it as a worthwhile spare time activity, and it makes them stay involved with the volunteer translation work. On these grounds, I will argue that the translation project creates a win-win scenario in which both parties, Facebook and the user-translators, benefit from the project.

The analysis of six discussions that have taken place within the Danish and Dutch translator communities has shown that user-translators are cooperating with their fellow translators in the designated translator communities on Facebook. They primarily discuss translation tasks, and it often involves a direct exchange of ideas and solutions to translation problems. Examining their conversations by means of knowledge of translation strategies and translation problems (cf. Schjoldager (2008)), I will argue that I have illustrated some of the methods by which they carry out translation tasks. In this research, the methods relate to a particular selection of six examples, and they cannot be argued to be representative of a general approach. I will argue that they do, however, reveal a trend, particularly as regards example 6 where I have analysed the strategies of translating the source-text term ‘Faceversary’.

When translating ‘Faceversary’, users have proceeded in a manner where different translation strategies have been employed to produce the target-texts and invent new terms in the target languages, and the results illustrate how the users relied on each other’s assistance when they experienced translation problems. By assessing the translation strategies applied in the analysis of their approaches, I will argue that many users translate on a basis of intuition. They remain amateurs in the translation setting, regardless of their professional backgrounds, but they are capable amateurs who take the job serious and are determined to ensure a good quality of the localised versions of Facebook. This is what motivates them to be active in the translator fora and discuss the issues they encounter with each other, as my six examples have illustrated. These examples further revealed that many users are skilled individuals who possess an understanding of translation and translation strategies, and they are aware of their roles as
unbiased translators since they assign more importance to rules of grammar and terminology than own tastes and preferences.

Regarding example 6 mentioned above, I find that the term ‘Faceversary’ constitutes a good example of a translation issue that has been competently handled by user-translators in both the Danish and Dutch translator groups. Unfortunately, I have neither found the Danish nor Dutch translation of ‘Faceversary’ on Facebook although I attempted to do so in order to examine those target terms that have ultimately been selected as translations. Nonetheless, I find that the example illustrates the process of translation in situations where there is no immediate translation strategy to opt for.

The ‘Faceversary’ example also illustrates how users are particularly curious and interested in working with a type of translation task that includes some sort of creative process. In this regard, I will argue that they are carefully exploring the range of strategies that can be employed in translation, depending on the context and contents of the source-text. In this particular case, they have addressed the translation problem it posed by handling it in a text-specific way and produced a range of neologisms in the two target languages. I will further argue that the interest in creative translation tasks, such as example 6, is rooted in users’ desire to experience fun, practise skills and take active part in their translator communities where they can discuss their preferences and learn from each other. Employing translation strategies to overcome translation problems thus constitutes their method for carrying out translations. They are free to challenge their imagination when they work and come up with creative solutions in the target language. These elements have proved important in terms of explaining motivation since they appear from both the data on motives to participate in translation and the nature of the favoured tasks on the translation app.

The two personal interviews were aimed at examining the data of the questionnaire survey in order to complement and add arguments to some of the observations and arguments made. In this discussion, the data obtained from these interviews will function as a tool with which to examine previously posed arguments and thus provide a more nuanced view of user motivation.

In both of the interviews, the users explained that the translation app provides a desired possibility to practise skills and capabilities. This echoes the numerous arguments presented in earlier chapters that the training of skills is a motivational factor. Furthermore, both respondents agreed that carrying out translations for Facebook is a nice way to spend some spare time and at the same time satisfy a personal interest in languages. It did not matter to them that they do it without compensation – they enjoy it because the outcome of their efforts makes a difference for other people who cannot or do not wish to use Facebook in English. The interview data are further supported by my presented claims that people translate because they enjoy being creative in a field that interests them which is possible when handling
translations that must be carried out by means of a creative strategy. I will argue that my analysis of motivation in terms of Kaufmann et al.’s (2011) constructs of intrinsic motivation is able to illustrate how people are driven by personal ambition and the desire to practise skills and enable personal creativity. They are motivated to translate because it is entertaining for them, and at the same time, they can feel good about providing a product for free to other people who thus benefit from their work. The fact that there is a demand for their ‘product’ is a motive for them to work, and they remain motivated since there are always new translation tasks to embark on. On this basis, I will argue that the motivation concepts developed by Pink (2009) comprising autonomy, mastery and purpose can be applied to assess a case of crowdsourced translation. As the results of both the questionnaire survey and the interviews have shown, user-translators enjoy the elements of autonomy when working with the translation tasks. They are free to pick the tasks that interest them, and they can carry them out whenever they wish and in their own pace. The concept of mastery is also supported by my results as users wish to improve and practise language skills because it personally matters to them. Further, the desire to offer one’s skills in the work with translations corresponds with the concept of purpose which explains motivation to participate in order to benefit other people. I will therefore argue that the entire selection of results compiled in this thesis illustrate that translation crowdsourcing can be compared with other kinds of volunteer work. The application of different motivation theories, focusing on volunteer work, have shown that user-translators are motivated by many of the same intrinsic values when deciding to become involved in the voluntary translation activities on Facebook. Particularly, I have found that people will offer their time and skills to crowdsourced translation activities because they believe it benefits their own interests. This has been reflected in the arguments of Son & Wilson (2012) who claim that people volunteer not only because they can, but also because they think it is the right thing to do for them. This argument is supported by Reiss’ (2000) accounts of basic desires where idealism and altruism are motives for involvement in volunteer work, also in a case of crowdsourced translation which has been illustrated in earlier chapters. The interview data illustrate that some user-translators have an express wish to ‘give back’ to their Danish or Dutch language community on Facebook and that they strive to make others happy. It can be argued that these results represent core features in theories of volunteer work and thus further verify the selected motivation theories’ applicability in this thesis.

In the analysis of results, I have found that ambition is a motivating factor. Users are driven by their ambitions to produce good translations, to be part of their translation community and to compete with fellow translators. On these grounds, I will counter Mesipuu’s (2010) argument that ambition, in terms of competition with others, is not a significant motivational factor for the user-translators (2010: 39). In the case of Danish and Dutch users, it constitutes a noticeable incentive to participate. Therefore, more
research will need to be conducted in order to assess the factor of ambition, and especially competition, as motivating translation crowdsourcers.

Furthermore, my results have shown that user-translators do not receive any feedback from Facebook for the translation work they carry out – but they are motivated to participate nonetheless. This has been explored by means of Kaufmann et al.’s (2011) factor of direct feedback which constituted a motivating factor in their studies of crowdsourcers on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. My research therefore indicates that direct feedback for a completed job is not a motivating factor in the setting of translation on Facebook. Yet, other aspects proposed by Kaufmann et al. (2011), such as task autonomy and skill variety, have proven prevalent in this setting, and I will argue that their theories of motivation in online crowdsourcing activities can be applied to translation crowdsourcing as well.

5.1 Critique

In the following section, I will discuss and assess the validity of my selected methods and sources in this thesis and provide critique of the choices made.

I will argue that the selection of theories and concepts in motivation of volunteers (cf. Wilson & Musick (1997), Clary et al. (1998), Kaufmann et al. (2011), and Son & Wilson (2012)) have provided me with valuable insights into the motivations of people who decide to work in a setting where they are unpaid and involved because of own interest. By means of arguments and views produced by these researchers, I have been assessed whether Facebook user-translators are motivated by similar elements as people deciding to carry out volunteer work in other settings.

Also, the applications of the psychological theory of basic desires accounting for human motivation (cf. Reiss (2000)), the concepts of motivation in work environments (cf. Pink (2009)), the foundation of understanding volunteer translation in crowdsourcing environments (cf. Mesipuu (2010)), and the motivating factors of participants engaging in various types of translation crowdsourcing (cf. Dombek (2014)) have provided a diverse illustration of people’s actions, when involved with translation work for Facebook. Furthermore, by means of Schjoldager’s (2008) translation strategies and perception of translation problems, I have described and analysed the methods adopted by user-translators in their work.

Yet, regarding the theoretical concepts applied to examine the data, I also considered examining content theories of motivation and human behaviour as these have gained wide recognition in different fields of motivation studies and could be tested on translation crowdsourcers as well. Another possibility considered was the selection of entirely practical applications of motivation theory, e.g. by means of additional work
motivation theories to support the concepts of Pink (2009) and Kaufmann et al. (2011) and thus explore translation crowdsourcers’ motivation to work from this angle. However, such theories include the basic prospect of financial rewards which is not an element in the translation work for Facebook, and I therefore decided to opt for volunteer motivation theories. In order to support the foundation of these theories, I applied them in conjunction with psychological theories which would enable me to analyse user-translators’ actions within the translation communities as well as in relation to carrying out their work. I will argue that these theoretical concepts combined have provided a scope in which the present research has been able to develop and produce valid arguments. Therefore, future research could look into the practices of translation crowdsourcers in online communities by means of practical motivation theories in order to assess the significance of financial rewards and other kinds of compensation.

Furthermore, I chose to conduct my research by means of mixed methods that focused on translation product, process and participants. Inevitably, these methods yielded a large pool of data providing information about different aspects of translation crowdsourcing and motivation which could not be examined in full due to the scope of this thesis. Therefore, I could have chosen to employ either one of these three methods in order to go more into detail with one of the sets of collected data. For instance, it could be interesting to further examine examples of translation strategies and issues being discussed within the translator groups on Facebook as these groups contain abundant data to be explored. For this purpose, the concepts of macro and microstrategies introduced by Schjoldager (2008) could be applied in an extensive analysis of translation crowdsourcers’ methods and translation products. Yet, this thesis aimed to provide a comprehensive overview of translation crowdsourcing by studying Facebook’s translation initiative. Future research could thus adopt one of the following methods: (1) a process-oriented research method in order to examine the workflow of crowdsourced translation in depth or (2) a product-oriented research method assessing the output of translation crowdsourcers’ activities in online communities. By opting solely for one of these angles in this thesis, I could have examined other textual examples by means of Schjoldager’s translation strategies and thus made her theoretical concepts applicable in their entirety.

Moreover, regarding the data collection method for this thesis, I chose to adopt a method consisting of three different elements. One of these was a questionnaire survey which aimed to include all angles of the research questions, and it thus produced a vast amount of data. Aspiring to obtain a varied pool of data, I included 17 questions in the questionnaire – yet, covering the data yielded by the 17 questions proved beyond the scope of this thesis which has primarily focused on the results related to user motivation and translation strategies. Also, I decided to produce the questionnaire in two different languages in order to accommodate receivers; a method proposed by Kozinets (2010). I will argue, however, that the production
of a bilingual questionnaire could have been replaced by a questionnaire in English alone, as I expect that respondents would have been able to answer it satisfactorily in English.
6. CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis was to elucidate the motivating factors of participation in translation crowdsourcing and account for Facebook user-translators’ approach to translation. My interest in discovering who these crowdsourcers are, why they engage in translation crowdsourcing, and how they work with the translation tasks led me to investigate these elements through netnography and a set of analytical research questions. The central question in this thesis was:

- Why do crowds engage in online volunteer translation for Facebook, what motivates individuals to participate, and how do they process the translation tasks?

This question was divided into the following sub-questions:

- What makes crowdsourced translation tasks attractive to Facebook users?
- What motivates individuals to engage in volunteer translation crowdsourcing on Facebook?
- What skills and experiences do Facebook users bring into their translation work, and how is their performance influenced by their personal background?
- How do Facebook users work with translation, and how do they handle potential obstacles in the process?

In this chapter, I will first conclude on the conducted research by means of the four sub-questions that have constituted the research frame of this thesis. Second, I will provide a perspective on future research able to contribute new knowledge to the field of translation studies.

First, regarding crowdsourced translations’ attractiveness to Facebook users, the translation app offers an accessible online space in which Facebook users see an outlet for their language skills, knowledge and capabilities. They are attracted to the app as it provides them the opportunity to be part of a social environment, in which they can share an interest with likeminded people, and engage in an activity they find entertaining and worthwhile. Further, working on the small translation tasks is a way to make good use of skills, free time and to maintain social connections. The translation activities on Facebook thus foster a win-win scenario since both Facebook and the user-translators benefit from the translation projects.

Second, by investigating the motivation for individuals to engage in volunteer translation on Facebook, this thesis suggests that putting one’s skills into practice, collaborating with others, building a positive personal image online, exercising the freedom to contribute, enjoying translation as an entertainment and pastime activity, and benefiting people wishing to use Facebook in their own language constitute motivating factors. For some, these elements also have a positive effect on their self-confidence. Furthermore, some people are motivated by their own ambition to succeed in activities that interest them, and they enjoy
competing with their peers to produce translations in order to showcase their skills through their contributions. In this way, people are motivated by psychological factors such as desires for status, power, acceptance, curiosity, idealism and social contact.

Third, regarding the skills and experiences that people bring into their translation work on Facebook, some users’ personal backgrounds facilitate work with translation. Many Facebook users with language proficiency in English and Danish or English and Dutch volunteer to translate, and they use the app as a pastime tool. They are adept to translate, and their translation performance reveals an awareness of their roles as unbiased translators. They perceive the translation work as “tidsfordriv” and “tijdverdrijf” – to use the Danish and Dutch users’ own words – i.e. a constructive way to pass time.

Fourth, many Danish and Dutch Facebook users translate on a basis of intuition. They are convinced that they possess the right skills to translate, and they enjoy working with tasks that require an exercise of creativity. Also, they seek each other’s advice when in doubt or requiring assistance with a task, and they solve translation problems with respect for the source-text and source context.

Overall, I find that the results obtained by means of the questionnaire survey, the textual data and the two interviews complement each other, and they have constituted useful tools in developing the research. By means of a mixed-methods strategy of examining and analysing the data, I will argue that I have been able to conduct a thorough investigation of a small component of the large and continuously growing crowdsourced translation industry. In the process of examining and analysing the collected data, I have shed light on a translation activity being carried out by volunteers, and in this context, I have presented the motivations of translators of Facebook as well as their strategies and considerations in the process of carrying out the translation tasks.

The findings of this thesis could provide an incentive to investigate crowdsourced translation in other online settings to assess the motives for different kinds of user-based translation. Since Facebook was among the first companies to launch a crowdsourced translation initiative, it could be interesting to examine recently established start-ups specialising in pitching small translation tasks to crowds of contributors who complete the tasks for little or no compensation. Since crowdsourcing continues to emerge as a trend in all parts of the world, I will argue that such research is granted and will benefit the generation of knowledge in this area of translation studies.
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