Kääntä, L., M. Enell-Nilsson & N. Keng (toim.) 2018. Työelämän viestintä, Arbetslivskommunikation, Workplace Communication, Kommunikation im Berufsleben. VAKKI-symposium XXXVIII 8.–9.2.2018. VAKKI Publications 9. Vaasa, (35–47)

Revisiting the Concept of Cooperation in Translation Work

Raphael Sannholm
The Department of Swedish Language and Multilingualism
Stockholm University

Syftet med den här artikeln är att problematisera begreppet samarbete i översättningssammanhang. Begreppet har lyfts fram i den översättningsvetenskapliga litteraturen som en central komponent i professionellt översättningsarbete, men definitionerna av begreppet skiljer sig åt. I artikeln redogör jag för olika perspektiv på begreppet samarbete, dels från en allmän tolkning av begreppet, dels från ett översättningsvetenskapligt perspektiv. Begreppet samarbete diskuteras också utifrån ett antal empiriska exempel från min pågående forskning, som syftar till att utforska professionellt översättningsarbete som social och kollektiv praktik. Sammanfattningsvis mynnar diskussionen ut i ett förslag till nyansering av begreppet samarbete, där typiska antaganden om t.ex. delade målsättningar som en komponent i interaktion mellan aktörer visar sig otillräckliga. Istället föreslås en initial uppdelning i samarbetsorienterade praktiker och proaktiva praktiker.

Keywords: cooperation, ethnography, translation workplace

1 Introduction

The fact that translated texts often are the result of a more or less coordinated effort of several actors has been acknowledged across different strands of Translation Studies (henceforth TS), from research on literary translation (e.g. Lindqvist 2002, Buzelin 2007, Solum 2017) to technical translation (e.g. Chesterman 2006, Abdallah 2007, Risku 2010, Risku & Windhager 2013). Recognition of the collective nature of translation work has even led some scholars to argue that the "individualistic concept of 'the translator'" is misleading, as it ignores the input from other actors (and factors) involved to different degrees in shaping a translated text (Risku & Windhager 2013: 42). This statement echoes Toury's (2012) argument about the nature of the concept of 'the translator': "Very often, hypotheses […] formulated with respect to the translator and his/her actions are […] related to a *hypothetical construct*; i.e. a functional entity mediating between […] two texts rather than a person" (2012 p. 215, italics in original). Similarly, in reference to translation work in a Language Service Provider (henceforth LSP), Karamanis et al. (2011: 48) point out that while translation is often considered to be "an individual activity" in translation research,

> [s]olving translation problems in this context is an activity that relies not only on an individual translator's memory and cognitive abilities, but on the interactions between teams [sic!] members and with resources […] in the LSP setting.

A lens through which the involvement of different actors in translation work can be viewed is the concept of *cooperation*. This concept takes centre stage in my ongoing research, which aims to explore the nature of professional translation work as a collective and socially situated practice. In other words, I share the assumptions put forward above that professional translation work often can be understood as a collective practice, and that cooperation constitutes a central feature of this practice. I also subscribe to the assumption put forward by Argyle (1991: 16), namely that "[no] cooperation over work and relationships could occur at all without communication and social interaction", which provides a rationale for the choice of the methodological framework of ethnography (see section 3).

The purpose of this article is to review and problematize some applications of the concept of *cooperation* in TS. This discussion, in turn, will be framed within a more general examination of this concept. I will then explore the borders of the concept in question using a few empirical examples from my ongoing research on the social and collective character of professional translation work.

2 Theoretical Points of Departure

In this section, I account for a few takes on the concept of cooperation, both from a general theoretical perspective and the perspective of TS. I start with a discussion of a couple of basic definitions, followed by a brief reflection on the kind of concept cooperation can be claimed to be. First, a general, descriptive, and explicit definition of 'cooperation' from the Oxford English Dictionary is given, then follows a somewhat elaborated alternative:

> Cooperation: "The action of co-operating, *i.e.* of working together towards the same end, purpose, or effect; joint operation" (OED)

The next definition comes from social psychology, where Argyle (1991) gives the following definition, also descriptive in kind:

> "Cooperation: acting together, in a coordinated way at work, leisure, or in social relationships, in the pursuit of shared goals, the enjoyment of the joint activity, or simply furthering the relationship" (Argyle 1991: 4)

Common to both definitions seems to be that cooperation entails 1) action; 2) involvement of more than one actor; 3) commonality of purpose or goal. Put differently, these points constitute the necessary conditions, which – taken together – would be sufficient to constitute a case of cooperation (cf. Carlshamre, forthcoming). However, Argyle (1991: 4) also introduces the criterion that the action should be carried out "in a coordinated way", which is not explicit (but perhaps somehow implicit) in the OED definition. Moreover, to Argyle (1991: 4), commonality of purpose seems to be but one of several motivations; while conditions 1) and 2) remain unchanged, condition 3) could be exchanged for “enjoyment of the joint activity” or “furthering the relationship”.

An optional way of approaching the concept of cooperation that seems more productive considering the purpose of this article, is to think of it as comprising degrees of typicality, as is posited by ‘prototype theory’ (e.g. Rosch 1975). From this perspective, as is pointed out by Sarangi (2016: 157), “the key question is not whether an entity belongs to a category but whether it retains a prototypical status”. In a similar vein, Cartwright and Runhardt (2014) uses the term *Ballung concept* (2014: 268), to denote “concepts that are characterized by family resemblance rather than by a definite property”. From such a perspective, instances of cooperation in general, and in translation work, would be classified as such based on similarity between cases rather than a shared essence. This is also the basic premise for the discussion in section 4.

2.1 Cooperation in Translation Work

As pointed out in the introduction, when it comes to cooperation in translation work, there seems to be quite some agreement in the TS literature that cooperation constitutes a central feature of translation work. Next, a few different takes on the concept are presented. Because of the limited scope of this article, the account is by no means exhaustive; the aim here is rather to point to differing perspectives on the topic in order to set the scene for a review of some empirical examples[1].

The concept of cooperation in professional translation work forms part of Holz-Mänttäri’s (1984) theory of translatorial action (see Nord 1997). This theory posits that professional translation work by default is cooperative as it comprises the shared effort of different ‘experts’, where translators occupy the role of experts of inter-lingual communication. This take on cooperation also posits the existence of a shared end of some sort, thus bearing resemblance to the definitions given above.

Pym (2000), in contrast, addresses cooperation in translation contexts from the perspective of inter-cultural communication. In his own attempt to pin down the intensional, i.e. the theoretical, dimension of cooperation in translation contexts, he revisits Grice’s (1975) principle of cooperation in conversation, but finds it unsatisfactory for his purposes as it “appears to condone a view of language as a social pastime, as a socially creative rather than informationally communicative activity” (Pym 2000: 184). In contrast to this purported view, Pym (2000) argues that the concept of cooperation should encompass both these aspects. Now, the form of cooperation in translation contexts addressed by Pym (2000: 181) refers to “long-term cooperation between cultures”, something that – according to him – is to be *promoted* by translators. In other words, to Pym

[1] See, however, also e.g. Abdallah (2007), Karamanis et al. (2011), O’Brien (2011), LeBlanc (2013), Cordingley & Manning (2017).

(2000), cooperation rather seems to refer to some sort of *result* of translation work than to certain characteristics of social interaction in the production of translations, which is what is at heart in this paper.

A proposal of characteristics of cooperation that appears more productive for the aim of this article, is made by Risku (2010). She argues that "[t]he role of cooperation should not be underestimated in translation work […]", and goes on to point out that "[translators] regularly need to call on each other's expertise or contact other experts for extra input to assist them and speed things along" (Risku 2010: 106). Risku (2010) also proposes a distinction between different forms of cooperation in translation work, which perhaps can best be understood as extensions, i.e. cases of classification, of the concept: 1) continuous cooperative work in contexts where actors are present in the same location or distributed geographically, 2) cooperation as part of the process of forwarding a translated or revised product to the next actor in the translation workflow, and 3) *ad hoc* cooperation with experts of different sorts.

Based on the above outline, three different conceptualizations of cooperation can be discerned: 1) inter-professional cooperation as *an inherent feature* of translation work due to the distribution of different kinds of expertise across different actors (Holz-Mänttäri 1984, see Nord 1997), 2) inter-cultural cooperation as the desired *outcome* of translation work (Pym 2000), and 3) cooperation as *collectively coordinated action* at different levels aimed at producing translations (Risku 2010). These different takes on cooperation are not mutually exclusive, of course: presumably, inter-cultural cooperation could be achieved through cooperation in the inherent sense between actors with different expertise, who, in turn, cooperate in concrete ways with other actors in the very process of formulating translations. Nevertheless, it is the latter conceptualization that seems the most productive for the purposes of this article, as it offers a background against which the empirical examples discussed in section 4 below may be fruitfully problematized. Before turning to the discussion of empirical examples, however, an account of the setting – the translation workplace in question –, the methods used, and the nature of the material considered in this article is given.

3 Setting, Method, and Material

This section starts with a short overview of the setting in which the data collection has taken place. Then follows a brief account of the methodology, the data collection methods used, the research participants, and the nature of the material in my research.

3.1 Setting and Participants

The setting in which the material for this study has been collected is the Swedish translation office of a global LSP, a private sector company with offices and staff in several different countries. Its clients are also mainly found within the private sector, and range from manufacturers of heavy machinery to market research companies and travel websites. In the Swedish translation office, several different roles can be identified, such as line managers, who are in charge of coordinating the work of the translation teams, project managers, who function as the main link between clients and translators, and of course translators, who are in charge of both linguistic (translation and revision) and administrative (allocation of work to freelancers, resource maintenance, etc.) tasks. The translators are divided into three teams which are dedicated to different subject matters: medical technology, general technology, and information technology.

The participants in this study are 13 translators and 1 line manager (information technology team). The translators all form part of the general technology and information technology teams. All of them have Swedish as their primary target language, and source languages include English, German, French, and Norwegian. Their participation in the study consisted in agreeing to being observed throughout their working day, and later interviewed about certain aspects of their work (see below).

3.2 Methodology

The material for this study has thus been collected through ethnographic fieldwork, which in this case involves participant observation[2], interviews, and collection of documentary data (see e.g. Hammersley & Atkinson 2007 for an overview of ethnographic methods). Ethnographic approaches are becoming increasingly popular in TS, where researchers have turned to ethnography for investigating different aspects of translation work in authentic settings (e.g. Flynn 2004; Buzelin 2007; Koskinen 2008; Karamanis et al. 2011; LeBlanc 2013; Tesseur 2014; Asare 2015; Risku 2014; 2017; Olohan 2017; Olohan & Davitti 2017).

The study reported in this article complies with many of the characteristics considered central to ethnography, such as the long-term[3], first-hand engagement with people in their everyday environment, the interaction between researcher and (other) participants, the employment of different methods, the iterative-inductive approach, and the dual role of participants as both subjects and objects in the research (see e.g. Savage 2000; O’Reilly 2005, Hammersley & Atkinson 2007).

The observations were carried out during a consecutive period of four months (March 2017 to July 2017) in the Swedish translation office of the LSP, and mainly documented by means of field notes (Emerson et al. 2011), but I have also made occasional record-

[2] I subscribe to the conceptualization of ‘participant observation’ put forward by the sociologist Katrine Fangen (2005: 31), namely that it entails “general social interaction with your research subjects, not that you perform the same actions as them” (my translation).
[3] The material was collected at different points in time between March 2017 and February 2018.

ings of planned interaction among participants, taken photographs of the office premises, and asked participants for examples of electronic communication that concerns collective efforts to address translation-related issues. In other words, the material consists of fieldnotes, interview transcripts, logs from electronic interaction, and different sorts of documents, such as guidelines for client accounts, lists of allocation of clients among translators. In this article, I will illustrate and problematize the notion of cooperation with some extracts from the interaction data (Skype and email logs), the fieldnotes, and the interviews (see 3.4).

After the main observation period, from March 2017 to July 2017, I carried out individual interviews with the participants. The interviews revolved around four main topics: 1) workplace procedures, 2) cooperation in the office, 3) cooperation within the company, 4) cooperation with 3rd party actors. At the end of each interview, demographic information was collected on the participants' age, educational background, and professional experience. The structure of the interviews has largely been guided by what the participants have emphasized, and a lot of leeway has been given to the participants to take the conversation in directions that have seemed relevant to them. The interviews are transcribed in a naturalized fashion (cf. Bucholtz 2000), as the focus is on the content rather than particular features of speech.

In the analysis, I employed an iterative-inductive approach (O'Reilly 2005) where I take the empirical material as the main point of departure rather than existing theory. In concrete terms, the material is analyzed by means of qualitative coding, which means that I delimited chunks of data and labeled them with codes that reflect their content in different ways (see Saldaña 2009). I used the qualitative analysis software MAXQDA (www.maxqda.com) where fieldnotes, photos, and documents were stored, and recordings were transcribed.

3.3 Material

The empirical material used in this article to illustrate and discuss the notion of cooperation constitute a rather limited part of the total data. As mentioned above, it is retrieved from logs of electronic communication, fieldnote data, and interviews. The criteria for identifying instances – and accounts – of actions and interaction on part of the participants that are relevant for the present discussion are that they should involve two or more actors, and that the interaction should revolve around some sort of issue related to ongoing translation tasks. The extracts from the data are analyzed contrastively in order to identify similarities and dissimilarities across cases, which, in turn, underlies the argument of a division of cases into *cooperative* and *proactive* practices.

4 Analysis and Discussion

In this section, preliminary observations are presented and discussed. As previously mentioned, the concept of cooperation will be problematized in the light of empirical examples, and I will argue that while the classification of certain cases of interaction as cooperative seems uncontroversial, others can be more adequately labelled as constitutive of *proactive practices*, rather than *cooperative* ones.

In example 1, a translator (Elsa) is revising a translation delivered by a freelancer (referred to as NN), and contacts a colleague (Liam) in the office via Skype to ask about his interpretation of a phrase in French. When Liam replies to the initial question, it becomes clear that this was not the information Elsa was seeking. She then modifies the context by providing the Swedish translation, and gets a reply that she appears satisfied with[4].

(1) **[2017-04-28 10:21] [Elsa]:**
har du någonsin hört talas om någonting som heter såhär [*have you heard about anything like this?*]
Par prosorité?
i sammanhanget [*in this context*]
lorsque l'humidité ambiante est très importante, elle s'infiltre par porosité au niveau des conduits flexibles du circuit de réfrigération
[2017-04-28 10:23] [Liam]:
Ja det är "porositet“ [*Yes it's "porositet*"]
[2017-04-28 10:23] [Elsa]:
ja men jag förstår inte riktigt hur det hör ihop med resten [*yes but I don't get how it connects to the rest*]
[NN] har skrivit [*has written*]
När det är mycket fukt i den omgivande luften filtreras den genom porositet vid AC-systemets luftkanaler [*When there is a lot of humidity in the surrounding air, it gets filtered through porosity by the AC system's air channels*]
ok?
[2017-04-28 10:25] [Liam]:
det ska vara "tränger in" inte filtreras [*it should be "tränger in"/gets in, not gets filtered*]
[2017-04-28 10:25] [Elsa]:
(y) [👍] tack! [*thanks!]*
[2017-04-28 10:26] [Liam]:
(highfive) (Example 1: Skype conversation, April 28)

To begin with, this kind of interaction appears to quite easily classify as a prototypical case of cooperation in translation work: two actors interact with each other to reach a solution to a translation-related issue. However, if one would try to apply criteria such as the existence of a shared goal among these actors in order to classify the interaction as cooperation, the conclusion would probably be quite different, which points to the usefulness of the "Ballung concept" approach (Cartwright & Runhardt 2014: 268). This interactional sequence also corresponds closely to Risku's (2010) first case in the outline of types of cooperation: "co-located or distributed collaborative work which re-

[4] All translations into English are mine.

quires continuity and a common context" (2010: 106) which shows that Elsa and Liam work closely together and even share the responsibility for certain clients. The next example, where an initial request for proof-reading assistance evolves into a negotiation of terminology, also seems to constitute a rather clear-cut case of cooperation.

In example 2, a translator (Wilma) asks if anyone wants to proofread the translation of a term. The translators in the excerpt are seated together in a corner of the office, and Wilma speaks out loud to the group, without any specific addressee. Her colleague, Stella, responds to the call, steps over to Wilma's desk and confirms the translation, but hedges, saying she does not know what the term refers to. At this point, a third translator, Hugo, overhears the conversation and breaks in, saying that 'now he gets curious'. Wilma explains the context of the term, and Hugo offers an alternative solution. Wilma does a google search on the competing alternative solutions and concludes that the one suggested by Hugo is much more common. At this point, a fourth translator enters the conversation, making a positive comment on the outcome of the interaction.

> (2) Wilma opens and translates a task consisting of two words directly in the edit section of the translation management system. When finished, she asks out loud if 'anyone wants to proof-read a word' with no specific addressee. Stella, who sits directly to the left of Wilma replies that she can do it and steps over to Wilma's desk. The source text at hand is "hydrogen station", and Wilma has translated it as "vätestation". Stella says that she doesn't know what it is, but that it sounds good. Hugo, who sits in front of Wilma with his desk facing hers, says that 'he gets curious now'. Wilma explains that the term concerns fuel for cars that don't run on gasoline or diesel. Hugo replies that this concerns "vätgas" and suggest that the translation should be "vätgasstation". Stella says that 'vätgasstation sounds like something that would blow up any second'. Wilma googles 'vätestation' and 'vätgaststation' and concludes that the latter option gives "many more" tokens in the search results. "Great input", says Elsa, whose desk is placed diagonally to the left from Wilma's, and Wilma says "yes, thanks for that". Elsa adds: "This is why you ask your colleagues". (Example 2: Fieldnotes May 15)

Again, like example 1, the interaction in this example corresponds closely to the idea of cooperation taking place in a context where actors operate together in a continuous manner (cf. Risku 2010). It also corresponds well to the observation made by Karamanis et al. (2011), cited in the introduction. This example also resembles the preceding one in other respects: a solution to a translation-related issue is reached through interaction among different actors, and context is provided by one of the actors to allow for an adequate understanding of the issue at hand in the other actors. The interaction in example 3, however, is not as easily characterized as purely cooperative.

In example 3, a translator (Alice) has been working for a while on a translation for her main client. When she finishes the translation, she prepares for the delivery to the project manager. Initially, this thus appears to qualify as a case of the kind of cooperation Risku (2010: 106) refers to as "punctuated forms of production where a completed translation is passed on to others". At this point, however, Alice realizes that there are certain instructions for the job, which, if followed, would introduce mismatches in the translation memory. This causes her to contact the project manager via email, asking how to handle the instructions, given the risk of contaminating the translation memory.

(3) When the delivery of the translation is due, Alice realizes that there are instructions for the job saying that certain terms are to be used in the translation regardless of what the source text says. Alice says that "then there will be a mismatch in the translation memory, I don't like that". She writes to the project manager […] asking how to deal with this. She repeats that there will be a mismatch in the memory if she follows the instructions, and adds "and **they understand this as well, but I'm making a kind of disclaimer**". She adds that the project manager will answer that she is aware of this but that they should go ahead and translate anyway". After a little while, Alice gets a reply from the project manager who writes that she can ignore the instructions and translate in accordance with the source text. (Example 4: Fieldnotes April 18)

A number of observations can be made here. Firstly, it appears to be the case that the translator not only tries to prevent the translation memory from being contaminated with mismatches, but also tries to anticipate any criticism that could be directed towards her for a decision taken with regard to the instructions. Interestingly, she also anticipates the reply from the project manager, which, however, turns out to be different to what she expects. The action of asking a question to which one anticipates the reply can arguably be thought of as a proactive action rather than a cooperative one. The anticipation of the nature of the reply also suggests that the action forms part of a routinized way of handling similar issues, that is, a proactive practice. Lastly, two additional observations that connect to examples 4 and 5 below, merits mentioning: Firstly, asking questions about how to handle a given issue may not only be understood as a solicitation for information, but also as a way of shifting the responsibility for any consequences of the decision to another actor. Secondly, using a means of communication which makes it possible to trace when, and by whom, the decision was made, may be thought of as a proactive action in itself.

In example 4, the translator addresses the occasional need to force other actors to make a decision on issues that potentially involve risk:

(4) something that's important to do [is] to force the project managers to take a stand and make [a] decision, we can make [a] decision, sure, but when we have asked questions and the project managers try not to have to answer because they don't want to have the responsibility for the decision … that … sometimes it's quite useful to force them to make the decision, because it's theirs to make, in quite a lot of cases, […] (Example 5: Interview, Wilma, November 16)

By asking directed questions to the project managers, the translator strives to elicit a reply that she can later refer to if the need arises. This can easily be understood as a proactive action on part of the translator.

In example 5, the manner in which certain communication technology – email – is used, is interpreted as a way of exploiting the electronic means of communication used in the company as a means of preparing for countering possible future criticism and repercussions from other actors. This could be seen as a continuation of the action of shifting the responsibility for decisions shown in examples 3 and 4. In example 5, the translator addresses the purpose and importance of creating traceability of decisions.

> (5) you should be able to follow, there should be a trace, that's why I don't […] talk on the phone and so on, because it's somewhat of a culture in [the company] to put the blame on you and tell you off, […] and that's why you always want to document stuff, so [you can say] "yes but we asked about this" or "we did bring this up" just to have something to counter with in case […] there are complaints [then] you can actually [say] "yes but you know what? Look here, here's the email I sent you, you see the date, you see" […], that's really important. (Example 6: Interview, Alice, October 23)

As is suggested by the examples above, the Swedish translators actively anticipate and take measures to counter criticism and repercussions on part of actors in other offices. On the one hand, this is done by forcing other actors to make decisions on issues that involve risk for different reasons. On the other hand, this is done by consciously bringing about a written record of decisions in order to be able to tie any given decision to a specific actor. This connects to Risku's (2007: 91) observation that electronic communication creates "an ongoing shared history with each communication partner". However, the examples above also suggest that this is done not only as a measure for conveying information from one actor to the next, but also as a means of preparing to counter criticism and corrective actions from other actors.

In sum, based on the above examples it seems obvious that the constellation of actors within which interaction on translation-related issues takes place seem to influence the nature of the interaction, in particular the degree to which the interaction may be characterized as cooperative. Secondly, these examples suggest that it is misleading to assume the existence of some generic form of cooperation in translation work by default, based on the observation that different actors are interacting with regard to the overarching purpose of the activity – delivering translations to a client. Instead, actions and interaction in the vein of what Risku (2010: 106) refers to as "punctuated forms of production where a completed translation is passed on to others" (the second form of cooperation mentioned in section 2.1), can, based on the examples above, more readily be conceived of as proactive rather than cooperative.

5 Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this article is to review and problematize the concept of cooperation in translation work, and discuss some assumptions connected to it in light of empirical data from ethnographic fieldwork in an LSP. As a preamble to the discussion, a review of intensional and extensional aspects of cooperation is provided, both from a general point of view and from a TS perspective.

The analysis of a few empirical examples suggests that interaction among translators in the Swedish office often seems to correspond quite closely to common conceptualizations of cooperation; that is, to a joint effort to resolve problematic instances in translation tasks, much in line with the observations of e.g. Karamanis et al. (2011). Interaction between the Swedish translators and their colleagues overseas, on the other hand, is not as easily categorized as cooperative. Rather, it often seems to involve proactive actions on part of the Swedish translators aiming to prepare for a possible need of countering future criticism from other actors. In sum, I tentatively propose that actions that, according to assumptions in previous TS literature, would amount to cooperative practices, can be divided into at least two different types of practices: *cooperative* and *proactive* ones.

To conclude, it should once again be emphasized that these observations are preliminary; they will be (re-)considered in light of subsequent readings of the material as the analysis progresses. Moreover, the division into *cooperative* and *proactive* practices needs further nuancing to shed light on the particularities of the actions which constitute each type of practice. Nonetheless, the observations presented in this article point to the complexity of the notion of cooperation in professional translation work, which will be further explored and problematized in my ongoing research on translation as a socially situated and collective practice.

Works Cited

Argyle, Michael (1991). *Cooperation. The Basis of Sociability*. London & New York: Routledge.

Asare, Edmund K. (2011). *An Ethnographic Study of the Use of Translation Tools in a Translation Agency: Implications for Translation Tool Design*. Doctoral Dissertation. Kent State University.

Bucholtz, Mary (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(10), 1439−1465.

Buzelin, Hélène (2007). Translations "in the making". In: *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, 135−169. (Eds.) Helena Wolf, & Alexandra Fukari. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Carlshamre, Staffan. [Forthcoming]. Concepts and relativism.

Cartwright, Nancy, & Rosa Runhardt (2014). Measurement. In: *Philosophy of Social Science: A New Introduction*, 265−287. (Eds.) Nancy Cartwright & Eleonora Montuschi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chesterman, Andrew (2006). Questions in the sociology of translation. In: *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*, 9−27. (Eds.) João Ferreira Duarte, Alexandra Assis Rosa, & Teresa Seruya. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cordingley Anthony & Céline Frigau Manning (Eds.) (2017). *Collaborative Translation. From the Renaissance to the Digital Age*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, & Linda L. Shaw (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Flynn, Peter (2004). Skopos theory: An ethnographic enquiry. *Perspectives* 12(4), 270−285.

Grice, H. Paul (1975). Logic and Conversation. In: *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 41−58. (Eds.) Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.

Hammersley, Martin & Paul Atkinson (2007). *Ethnography. Principles in Practice*. 3rd edition. London: Routledge.

Holz-Mänttäri, Justa, (1984). *Translatorisches Handeln. Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki: Suomalainen

Karamanis, Nikiforos, Saturnino Luz, & Gavin Doherty (2011). Translation practice in the workplace: contextual analysis and implications for machine translation. *Machine Translation* 25, 35−52.

Koskinen, Kaisa (2008). *Translating institutions: an ethnographic study of EU translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
LeBlanc, Matthieu (2013). Translators on translation memory (TM). Results of an ethnographic study in three translation services and agencies. *Translation & Interpreting* 5(2), 1−13.
Lindqvist, Yvonne (2002). *Översättning som social praktik. Toni Morrison och Harlequinserien Passion på svenska*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology. New series. No. 26. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
Nord, Christiane (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
Olohan, Maeve (2017). Knowing in translation practice. A practice-theoretical perspective. *Translation Spaces* 6(1), 159−180.
Olohan, Maeve, & Elena Davitti (2017). Dynamics of Trusting in Translation Project Management: Leaps of Faith and Balancing Acts. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 46(4), 391−416.
O'Reilly, Karen (2005). *Ethnographic Methods*. London & New York: Routledge.
Oxford English Dictionary Online [cited: 3.5.2018] Available at: http://www.oed.com/
Pym, Anthony (2000). On Cooperation. In *Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies I. Textual and Cognitive Aspects*, 181−192. (Ed.) Maeve Olohan. Manchester. St. Jerome Publishing.
Rosch, Eleanor (1975). Cognitive Representations of Semantic Categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 104(3), 192−233.
Risku, Hanna (2007). The role of technology in translation management. In: *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies*, 85−98. (Eds.) Yves Gambier, Miriam Shlesinger & Radegundis Stolze. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Risku, Hanna (2010). A cognitive scientific view on technical communication and translation. Do embodiment and situatedness really make a difference? *Target* 22(1), 94−111.
Risku, Hanna, & Florian Windhager (2013). Extended Translation. A Socio-cognitive Research Agenda. In: *Interdisciplinarity in Translation and Interpreting Process Research*, 35−47. (Eds.) Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, Susanne Göpferich, & Sharon O'Brien. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Saldaña, Johnny (2009). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. London: Sage.
Sarangi, Srikant (2016). Activity types, discourse types and role types: interactional hybridity in professional-client encounters. In: *Hybridity in Systemic Functional Linguistics: Grammar, Text and Discursive Context*, 154−177. (Eds.) Donna Miller & Paul Bayley. Sheffield: Equinox.
Savage, Jan (2000). Ethnography and health care. *British Medical Journal* 321, 1400−1402.
Solum, Kristina (2017). Translators, editors, publishers, and critics: Multiple translatorship in the public sphere. In *Textual and Contextual Voices of Translation*, 39−60. (Eds.) Cecilia Alvstad, Annjo K. Greenall, Hanne Jensen, & Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Tesseur, Wine (2014). *Transformation Through Translation: Translation Policies at Amnesty International.* Doctoral Dissertation. Aston University.
Toury, Gideon (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. 2nd edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Appendix

Examples

(1) Original and translation are presented in the example.

(2) Wilma öppnar och översätter ett projekt som består av två ord direkt i redigeringsvyn i filhanteringssystemet TMS och frågar sedan om det är ’någon som vill korra ett ord’. Stella, som sitter direkt till vänster om henne, svarar att hon kan göra det och tar ett steg över till Wilmas plats. Källtexten är ”hydrogen station” och Wilma har skrivit ”vätestation”. Stella säger att hon inte vet vad det är, men att det låter bra. Hugo, som sitter mittemot Wilma, säger att ’han blir nyfiken nu’. Wilma förklarar att det handlar om drivmedel för bilar som inte drivs av t.ex. bensin eller diesel. Hugo säger att det handlar om vätgas och föreslår att det kanske ska heta vätgasstation. Stella säger att ’vätgasstation låter som nåt som kan sprängas när som helst’. Wilma googlar de båda varianterna och konstaterar att vätgasstation ger ”många fler” träffar. ”Bra input”, säger Elsa, som sitter snett mittemot Wilma till vänster, och Wilma säger ”ja det tackar vi för”. ”This is why you ask your colleagues”, lägger Elsa till.

(3) När projektet ska levereras upptäcker Alice att det finns instruktioner om att vissa termer ska användas i översättningen även om källtexten inte motsvarar dessa. Alice säger att ”då blir det fel i minnet, det gillar jag inte”. Hon skriver till projektledaren igen och frågar hur hon ska hantera detta. Hon säger igen att det blir fel i minnet om hon översätter enligt instruktionerna ”och det förstår ju de också, men jag friskriver mig lite”. Hon lägger till att projektledaren kommer att svara att hon vet men att de ska översätta så ändå. Lite senare får Alice svar från projektledaren som skriver att hon kan ignorera instruktionerna i mejlet och översätta enligt källtexten.

(4) och det är något som är ganska viktigt att göra och det är att tvinga projektledarna att ta ställning och fatta beslutet, för vi kan ju fatta beslut, ja, men när vi har ställt frågor och projektledarna försöker att inte behöva svara för att inte liksom behöva ta ansvar för det beslutet ... det ... ibland är det ganska bra att tvinga dom att ta det beslutet därför att det är deras beslut att fatta, i ganska många fall

(5) man ska kunna följa, det ska finnas en tråd, det är därför jag inte, nu gör vi ju inte det så mycket i alla fall, men pratar i telefon och så vidare, eftersom det finns ju en liten kultur inom [företaget] det här med att man ska ge nån skulden och knäppa folk på näsan[…] och det är lite därför man alltid vill kunna ha dokumenterat att "ja men vi frågade om det här" eller "vi tog upp det här" eller "vi har påpekat det här" just för att man ska ha lite att komma med också […] om det kommer klagomål så kan man faktiskt "ja men vet du vad, titta här, här är mejlet jag skickade till dig, du ser datum, du ser" […], det är jätteviktigt