Frank Austermühl and Christine Mirwald (Auckland)

Images of Translators in Localization Discourse

Frank Austermühl and Christine Mirwald (Auckland)

Images of Translators in Localization Discourse

Abstract:

This article aims to determine the image of professional translators in the localization industry. Based on a corpus consisting of white papers published by leading industry representatives and applying mainly quantitative analysis methods, we identify an increasing degree of industrialization within the language services market. The consequence of this development is a marginalization of the translator within professional translation processes. This image of the translator projected in industry discourses of localization is in stark contrast to the one that has been established by Translation Studies.

Keywords:

localization industry; localization discourse; translator images; corpus analysis.

Contents:

1   Introduction

With the establishment of the localization industry as the prime sector for global professional translation services and the primary market place for graduates of translator training programs, the notion of localization, and with it translation-technology solutions in general, has started to play a more dominant role in Translation Studies curricula worldwide. In Europe, many universities have used the curricular modification prompted by the Bologna process to update their study programs and now offer courses on computer-assisted translation, more precisely on terminology management and translation memory systems, as well as software and Web site localization as part of their BA and, most frequently, MA programs in translation. Some centers have gone a step further, offering entire programs on translation technology and/or localization. These include for example Heidelberg University's BA in Translation Studies for Information Technologies, the MA in Computer Assisted Translation (Translation and New Technologies) offered by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, the Masters in Translation and Localization offered by Tarragona's Universitat Rovira I Virgili, as well as the Graduate Diploma in Localisation Technology and the Master of Science in Global Computing and Localisation offered by the Department of Computer

Science and Information Systems at the University of Limerick. In the United States, the Monterey Institute of International Studies has established a Master in Translation and Localization Management, and Chico State University, also located in California, offers a Localization Certificate Program.

From a curricular and didactic point of view, developing and integrating courses or even entire programs on translation technology and localization represents a plethora of challenges that include the selection, structuring, and sequencing of courses and contents, the availability of teaching facilities equipped with adequate hardware and software resources, finding qualified instructors, establishing students' basic ICT (information and communication technology) skills, balancing theory and practice, integrating translation practice and technology training, etc. Another challenge, as Ahmann points out in his contribution to this volume, is posed by student expectations and images of the profession that are removed from the realities of modern translators.

The curricular changes mentioned above have been long overdue and will play an important role in preparing future graduates for a career in an international communicative environment that is almost entirely based on electronic texts and network-based exchanges. The more practice-oriented approaches to integrating translation and localization technologies and procedures into the translation classroom will make the transition from university to industry easier for future graduates.

Looking at typical industry publications, one does wonder, though, what kind of welcome our graduates will get from the corporate world of translation, or, more precisely, from language service providers.

2   On the Notion of Industry

It has become commonplace in academic and professional discourse alike to refer to professional translation services as being part of a larger language services or localization industry. Given that even Wikipedia refers to translation as an "art [that] is as old as written

literature" (Wikipedia Contributors 2008), the industrial turn in referring to translation means that at least a brief look at the connotations of the industry concept is merited.

Examples of definitions of the term "industry" include the following: Industry refers to "1. the business of producing goods; all branches of manufacturing and trade; 2. a branch of manufacturing and trade which produces a particular product [...]" (Chambers 2001); and "1. organized economic activity concerned with manufacture, processing of raw materials, or construction. 2. a branch of commercial enterprise concerned with the output of a specified product: the steel industry [...]" (Collins 2000).

Despite the fact that these definitions also include the notion of "industry" as a general term for trade and business, it seems to be very much associated with manufacturing and production. It also carries the notions of mass-production, smoking chimneys and piecework. Thus, using this term in the context of translation might contribute to establishing an image of interlingual and intercultural mediators as some kind of human processing devices, with the source text representing the input and the target text representing the output, or product.

The fact that translation is seen by many as replacing words of one language by words or strings of a different language further reinforces this view. But since there is so much more to translation, this kind of definition represents a slippery slope. Reducing translators to means of translation production diminishes their creative and individual efforts, their diverse skills and high qualifications. Moreover, it ignores the fact that translation is about communicative mediation between cultures and not about replacing words. It also contributes to the perception that in the long term, as soon as the technology is refined enough, translation will become a fully automated process, just as almost all other industries became more and more automated in the past century. If the goal is to establish an image of translation as a highly diverse and intricate profession that requires an extensive range of skills and excellent training, then an image of translators as true cultural mediators and even artists, a counter-image to translators as linguistic robots, needs to be developed. With this aim in mind, the term "industry" may not prove useful.

The term "industry" does, however, have a range of positive connotations. It thus can be used as a collective term for "[a] particular form or branch of productive labour, a trade, a manufacture" (Little, Fowler, and Coulson 1993: 1356). It also carries the notion of adding value to a product, of refining it, and doing so in a clear, well-structured and streamlined process or workflow. As we will see, these are features that leading localization companies are rather eager to stress. Thus, from the point of view of a service provider, using the term "industry" might be regarded as well justified.

2.1   Marginalization

In a 2007 article entitled "Translators in the Language Industry – From Localization to Marginalization" (Austermühl 2007), we have pointed out that a discussion of the industrialization of the translation profession and its potentially negative impacts on translation professionals usually does not form part of the above-mentioned new courses and programs on translation technology and localization. We described some of the points worthy of discussion as follows:

> (1) Outsourcing leads to isolation, cutting the translator off from the larger communicative context of his or her work, thus leading to an exclusion of much of the socio-economic environment of the given project (see e.g. Pym 2003a). (2) The chunking of large translation projects among numerous translators by project managers and the additional segmentation of source and target texts that comes with the ubiquitous use of Translation Memory Systems (TMs) leads to lack of co-text, i.e. to a disappearance of the immediate *textual* environment of the segments being translated (see Austermühl 2006). (3) Furthermore, time-to-market demands and the resulting mass production of words lead to minimalist decision processes by translators who (quite understandably) often reduce their research and documentation efforts to screening pre-fabricated TM and term solutions (see Enríquez and Austermühl 2003). As a consequence of these and other related developments, professional translator portals hotly debate the idea that translation has become a mere "commodity." Scholars like Anthony Pym warn that "translators [are] becoming separated from the process of communication" (Pym 2003), or argue that the industry itself is in need of "re-humanizing" (Clark 2003). (Austermühl 2007: 42-43)

If we assume that localization is more than the mantra-like recited "process during which a general (internationalized) product is adapted to the needs of a locale, which is associated with a specific culture and specific linguistic characteristics" (Charalampidou 2006), that it

can, and probably should, also be defined as the standardization or homogenization of the translation process and of translational decision-making, then we will need to focus on whether localization leads to a disempowerment of translators and to a lowering of their professional status.

We think that a discussion of the role of translators, especially of individual, freelance translators, needs to be part of any translator training and should not be restricted to brief discussion during theory courses but become an integral part of any translation and localization practice course as well.

To provide teachers and students alike with a point of departure for this kind of critical reflection, we will in the following try to identify and describe the major images of translators prevalent in discourses of localization as produced by localization industry representatives. More specifically, we aim to investigate, by means of a corpus analysis of white papers published by leading companies and institutions, how translators are portrayed in the localization industry.

Localization is the most important and influential business segment of the language services market, and the term is being increasingly used instead of translation. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the image of the translator conveyed by this industry will "translate" into how translators are seen, not only within the language services market in general, but also by clients. This image will thus influence translators' roles in business procedures, their responsibilities, tasks, and working conditions, as well as their remuneration. In other words, the images projected in the discourse of the industry will to a large extent define the public status of translators.

Based on our earlier findings (see Austermühl 2007), we expect to identify images of translation and of translators that are far removed from those of translation scholars, teachers, and students. From a theoretical perspective, this does bear a certain irony, as Pym points out:

> [A]nd now, precisely when some translation theorists are on the point of affirming that all cross-cultural relations are translational, that translators should be experts in the management of cultural differences

and the like […] translation theory is being outflanked by the discourse of localization, and translation itself has been returned to the narrow linguistic exercise it was in the 1960s (Pym 2004: 52).

This view becomes evident, for example, when Cadieux and Esselink (2002) define translation as

> the specifically linguistic operations, performed by human or machine, that actually replaces [sic] the expressions in one natural language into those of another. That has the effect of making translation just one task—possibly the most time consuming, costly and vital, but as we have seen not the only one—in adapting something to the needs of a given locale.

It is interesting to see that in this definition translation is not only reduced to "linguistic operations"—which can, of course, also be done by a machine—but also primarily associated with the negative adjectives "time-consuming" and "costly." Although it is also referred to as the most "vital" task, one cannot deny the impression that translation is portrayed as a necessary evil in the localization process.

The marginalization of translation to linguistics, and translators to linguists, that can be observed in the localization industry (Austermühl 2007: 44), is also illustrated by the following example: "XLIFF allows translation vendors to concentrate on their core competency: translation of words" (Esselink 2006: 28; emphasis ours). Although the localization industry celebrates the fact that "today's new, emerging publishing standards, such as content management systems and XML, place a new focus on the art of translation" (Cadieux and Esselink 2002), the authors go on to say that therefore "translators in localization can finally start to focus on what they should really be focusing on—changing one natural language into another" (ibid.). Examples like these demonstrate how large parts of the industry still conceive of translation: a solely linguistic operation that is based on equivalence at the word level.

2.2 Recent Developments in the Localization Industry

Compared to thirty years ago, the translation market has changed substantially (see van der Meer 2003 for a detailed history of the localization industry). In fact, one could even say that a whole new sector has developed, since today's localization industry does not have much in

common anymore with the "cottage industry" (Pym 2004: xv) that translation used to be. Not only have the demands of the clients changed—and as a result the concepts, tools, and processes—but the service providers have changed as well. Today, there are only a few dominant global multi-language vendors (MLVs) in the global market. This is a result of a number of mergers and acquisitions, which have reshaped the market throughout the last fifteen years. This wave of consolidation peaked, but certainly did not stop, in the year 2005 when the then "main players [...] Bowne Global Solutions, Lionbridge and SDL International" (Esselink 2006: 26) were all involved in major acquisitions. On June 27, 2005, U.S.-based Lionbridge Technologies Inc. announced the acquisition of their competitor Bowne Global Solutions for US$ 180 million (DePalma and Beninatto 2005), thus becoming the industry leader (see DePalma and Beninatto 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008). Only one week earlier, on June 20, 2005, U.K.-based SDL International had announced that it would buy TRADOS, "the maker of the leading desktop translation memory (TM) tool" (Yunker 2005), for US$ 60 million (DePalma 2005: 3).

According to the Globalization and Localization Association (GALA), one of the professional associations representing the interests of language service providers, "the Lionbridge purchase was a quantitative change for the industry, while SDL's plans qualitatively changed the industry" (DePalma 2005: 3). SDL had developed and sold its own translation suite, SDLX, before, but buying one of its fiercest competitors was a move that caused a great deal of both excitement and concern in the industry. Not only did SDL become one of the leading two MLVs, but it also became "by far the largest supplier of translation memory, terminology management, and translation workflow management products" (DePalma 2005: 3). This acquisition reflected a "growing interdependence of translation providers and tool providers" (Austermühl 2007: 41), a trend that was confirmed by and reflected in SDL's subsequent acquisitions of Tridion (a provider of Web content management solutions), and PASS Engineering (developer of Passolo, a leading visual localization tool) in 2007, as well as Idiom (a leading provider of globalization management solutions) in February 2008.

Since 2005, Common Sense Advisory, an independent research and consulting company in the field of globalization, has published annual rankings of the leading language service

providers (LSPs) in terms of revenue. The ranking provides an overview of the language market as a whole, but does not make a distinction between individual service categories, such as "translation, localization, interpretation, internationalization, supporting technologies, engineering, [or] [...] language learning" (DePalma and Beninatto 2008: 5).

The most recent ranking was published in May 2008 and reported a combined market revenue of US $12.1 billion for 2007. Common Sense Advisory predicts an annual growth rate for the language services market of 14.6 per cent annually over the next five years, and expects the market to reach a volume of US $24 billion by the year 2012. The report also shows that the market is becoming more global, and, for the first time, "Europe now represents more translation revenue than the United States" (DePalma and Beninatto 2008: 1). Another observation is that the leading 25 LSPs only accounted for 23.7 percent of the total market revenue, which indicates a highly fragmented market (ibid.: 4).

In the 2007 ranking the authors remark on how consolidation is constantly reshaping the market:

> The five largest LSPs in 2000 were Berlitz, Bowne Global, Lernout & Hauspie (L&H), Lionbridge, and Alpnet. In 2006 they [sic] were Lionbridge, L-3, SDL, TransPerfect, and RWS. Bowne absorbed some of L&H, Lionbridge swallowed some bits of L&H on its own and then Bowne in its entirety. SDL acquired Alpnet (DePalma and Beninatto 2007: 2).

Companies that dominate the industry one year can slip down the list or become a victim of consolidation the next year. Yet despite a considerable amount of reshuffling within the lower positions, the top three positions in all of the Common Sense Advisory rankings from 2005 on have always been held by the same three service providers: Lionbridge, SDL, and L-3 (formerly Titan).

L-3's core business is providing translation and interpreting services to the U.S. military, and the U.S. involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan can be considered as the main reason for L-3 holding the top position in the last two rankings (see DePalma and Beninatto 2007, 2008). Lionbridge and SDL, however, are both designated localization service providers, and considering the volumes of their revenues in comparison with their next closest competitors,

we can see that the mergers and acquisitions in the localization industry over the past 15 years have made Lionbridge and SDL the leading localization companies.

Their dominance is the reason why these two companies were chosen for the analysis. It is assumed that due to their economic power, size (both in terms of revenue and employees), global distribution, and client quantities, Lionbridge and SDL are having a substantial influence on the industry, an assumption that is further supported by SDL's position as the world's leading provider of computer-assisted translation (CAT) applications.

The way in which highly visible companies like Lionbridge and SDL perceive of concepts such as translation and localization will have an effect on both clients and translators. The way in which they portray language services will shape how the clients see services like translation and localization, and what they expect from the industry. In addition, since the MLVs are at the top end of the supply chain, they will also set the general working conditions for all professionals involved in the lower ranks of the chain.

3   Translator Images: A Corpus Analysis

In the following, a corpus consisting of publications by Lionbridge and SDL and by the Localization Industry Standards Association (LISA), one of the major independent industry associations, will be analyzed to determine industry images of translators.

3.1   Sources

Lionbridge Technologies Inc. is a public company (Nasdaq: LIOX) that provides translation and localization services. Founded in 1996 and based in Waltham, Massachusetts, it has 45 offices in 26 countries and employs 4,600 staff (Lionbridge 2008a). In addition to translation and localization, Lionbridge offers the following services: "Interpretation; Development and Maintenance; Testing; Product Certification; eLearning and Content Development; Product Engineering" (ibid.). The company's 2007 revenue was US $ 452 million. Since the above-mentioned acquisition of competitor Bowne Global Solutions in 2005, Lionbridge was able to sustain its leading position in the localization industry against SDL International.

SDL International is a public limited company (LSE: SDL) with a 2007 revenue of US $235 million (see <u>DePalma and Beninatto 2008: 4</u>). The company is based in Maidenhead, UK, and was founded in 1992. Currently, it employs 1,700 staff in more than 50 offices in 30 countries. SDL offers language services as well as business consultation services, and claims to be "the world leader in Global Information Management" (<u>SDL 2008c</u>). For the last few years, SDL has focused strongly on the acquisition and development of technology for translation/localization leverage as well as workflow and content management. This strategy is reflected in the above-mentioned recent acquisitions of leading tool providers, including Trados. According to the SDL Web site, "Trados is now used by more than 80 percent of the world's professional translators" (<u>SDL 2008a</u>). Due to this position as the leading tool provider, SDL can be considered one of the most influential forces in the language services market, even if it cannot rival Lionbridge's position in terms of revenue.

The Localization Industry Standards Association (LISA) is a private, non-profit organization "founded in 1990 […] to standardise computer terminology in multiple languages" (<u>van der Meer 2003: 184</u>). Consisting of more than 400 member companies from all kinds of industries involved in globalization, LISA promotes itself as the leading institution in the GILT industry (see <u>Lommel 2007: 53-55</u>), and, in fact, as the "mother" of the localization industry:

> By working together in LISA, LISA members successfully created a new industry—the localization industry—and have raised the profile of their activities to the point that increasing numbers of corporations are treating product globalization as an area of strategic importance. (<u>LISA 2008e</u>)

LISA's mission is "[t]o lead business globalization in all industry sectors operating in the international environment" (<u>LISA n/d</u>) by developing standards for globalization and localization processes and tools. LISA's group of members consists in equal parts of vendors and clients of localization and globalization services. In addition to best practice guides, industry primers and survey reports, LISA publishes the newsletter "Globalization Insider" as an information source on the industry. Fora, workshops, conferences, special interest groups, as well as the organization's Web site aim to facilitate an exchange of ideas among all partners involved in globalization activities (<u>LISA 2008b</u>).

3.2 Text Types

The corpus consists mainly of white papers, with the exception of the materials published by LISA. As Stelzner (2008) points out, "white papers are powerful marketing tools used to help key decision-makers and influencers justify implementing solutions." The term can also refer to documents and reports produced by a government, in which a particular issue is discussed and certain policies are recommended, "yet today, the corporate or marketing white paper report is much more common" (Ellis-Christensen 2008).

The typical structure of a white paper is to first outline a certain problem in all its details and intricacies, and then to present particular tools or processes to solve the problem. By employing a scientific register and tone, and extensively using bibliographical references, white papers often try to appear as objective research reports. However, more often than not, they come to the conclusion that the solution offered by a certain company—usually the company publishing the white paper—is best suited for that particular problem. That is why white papers are often seen as mere "sales pitch[es] in disguise" (Graham 2007). Although it is true that white papers are, first and foremost, being written for the purpose of "generat[ing] interest in a product or [...] promot[ing] investment or sales of a product" (Ellis-Christensen 2008), they do provide an "industry-specific and consumer focused" (Pedersen 2008) insight into a problem or business field.

White papers are, on the one hand, based on scientific research conventions, at least to some extent; on the other hand, they represent a company's point of view and perspective on a certain issue. Thus, we can make inferences from a company's white papers about its business and industry philosophy in general, and the challenges it is focusing on in particular. Moreover, since language service providers' white papers clearly address potential customers and clients, they give an insight into how these service providers portray the language service market to those influential decision makers. In other words, they reflect how the service providers are marketing both themselves and the industry, and ultimately, how they perceive of and convey the concept of translation, and how the role of the

translator is presented. These types of documents are therefore considered a valuable and revealing source for assessing the image of the translator in the localization industry.[1]

3.3   Selection of Corpus Documents

The corpus consists of white papers that were available from designated resource or knowledge sections of the respective company or institution Web sites on September 30 and October 1, 2008. The Lionbridge Knowledge Center (Lionbridge 2008b) comprises "a collection of whitepapers, webinars and podcasts" (ibid.), of which only white papers (42 documents) were selected. Twenty-nine documents were downloaded from the white paper section of the SDL Knowledge Center (SDL 2008b). LISA's Publications Catalogue (LISA 2008c) includes different categories of documents (e.g. best practice guides, primers, survey reports, etc) of which 15 documents are included in the corpus.

The criteria according to which the documents were selected were availability and processability. The first refers to the fact that the publications had to be available at the chosen dates from the aforementioned Web site sections free of charge; however, some of the content required either membership or registration. The latter refers to the fact that the materials downloaded from the Web sites were all in PDF format. In order to be processable by the chosen electronic corpus analysis tool, they had to be converted into text files. Unfortunately, this was not possible for all the documents. Where this was the case, convertible PDF files were requested from the respective publishers. However, some documents could not be obtained in the required format. A list of all of the sources included in the corpus can be found in Section 8.

---

[1] The authors would like to thank Ross DaVonne at Lionbridge, and Anna Abgarian at LISA for providing the requested resources in alternative file formats, so that they were processable by the analysis software.

3.4 Corpus Analysis

The field of corpus linguistics is traditionally associated with research fields such as semantics, morphology, diachronic linguistics, discourse analysis, and socio-linguistics, to name but a few. These fields commonly use very large corpora.

However, corpora can also be analyzed in order to investigate the "ideology" of a distinctive group of speakers. This approach incorporates smaller and specialized corpora. "Since language is the key vehicle for the expression of ideology, the analysis of corpus data lends itself to this area of research" (Adolphs 2006: 80). In our context, the group of speakers consists of the three chosen representatives of the localization industry, and ideology refers to their views on the role of the translator.

In using corpora to analyze ideology, there are two different approaches. The first is to statistically determine keywords of the corpus and then interpret whether those keywords reflect a certain ideology (the corpus-driven approach). The second approach is to first define keywords of interest intuitively and then analyze the corpus for those words (the corpus-based approach) (see Adolphs 2006: 83f.). Our analysis design is a combination of these two approaches since both intuitively and statistically determined keywords are analyzed.

3.4.1 Tools

There are a variety of tools available for the electronic analysis of corpora. Since most of them incorporate all the basic functions necessary for the intended analysis in this project, the main criteria for choosing a tool were availability and user-friendliness. The tool we used in our analysis is *AntConc 3.2.1w* for Windows, which was developed by Laurence Anthony (2007). The decisive factors in favor of this particular software were its intuitive user

interface and the fact that it is available as freeware. Its features include, among others, keyword, frequency, collocation and concordance lists, as well as cluster analysis.[2]

3.4.2 Methods

Using *AntConc*, we looked at the following phenomena:

Lemma. The first step in preparation of the analysis is to create a list of lemmata. A lemma is defined as a "set of lexical forms having the same stem and belonging to the same major word class, differing only in inflection and/or spelling" (Francis and Kučera, in Baker, Hardie, and McEnery 2006: 104). For example the lemma TRANSLATE covers all of the following forms: *translate*, *translates*, *translated*, and *translating*. For the following analysis a previously created lemma-list was downloaded from the AntConc Web site (Someya 2008) and integrated into the tool.

Frequency. A frequency list is a quantitative measure that lists "all the words that occur in a corpus, with the total number of occurrences given for each word" (Olohan 2004: 77). The frequency word lists in this analysis show the frequencies for the lemmata that were defined by integrating the above-mentioned lemma list.

Keyword. A keyword is (Baker, Hardie, and McEnery 2006: 97; emphasis in original):

> 1. A word that appears in a text or corpus statistically significantly more frequently than would be expected by chance when compared to a corpus which is larger or of equal size. […]
>
> 2. Any word that is considered 'focal' in a text, but not through statistical measures […].
>
> 3. A word which is made the subject of a **concordance** […].

For this research, keywords will be analyzed in all of the above-stated ways. As for the first definition, the Brown corpus (Hammond 2003) will be used as the reference corpus.

Concordance. "A concordance lists the occurrences of a particular search item in a corpus in the context of the surrounding text that occurs alongside the item" (Adolphs 2006: 136).

---

[2] The authors would like to thank Michael Barlow and Tim Michie from the University of Auckland for their advice on and suggestions for corpus analysis tools.

Therefore, this method allows for a further investigation into a keyword's collocations or semantic prosody. However, since a concordance does not analyze the vicinity of the KWIC quantitatively, it will only be considered a method to obtain a general idea about the usage of the word.

Collocation. Collocation refers to the fact that "certain words are more likely to occur in combination with other words in certain contexts. A collocate is therefore a word which occurs within the neighbourhood of another word" (Baker, Hardie, and McEnery 2006: 36). This method can thus help to determine whether a certain term carries particular connotations or expresses a biased view (ibid.: 38).

Cluster analysis. To facilitate the analysis of both concordance and collocates lists, a cluster analysis can be carried out. A cluster analysis "generate[s] an ordered list of clusters that appear around a search term […]" (Anthony 2007).

4 Results

As a starting point for the white paper corpus analysis, the occurrence of the lemma TRANSLATOR was analyzed in terms of frequency, keyword, concordance, collocation and cluster.

4.1 Frequency

Rank	Rank in wordlist	Frequency	Lemma
1	11	3291	translation
2	14	2812	content
3	17	2533	language
4	20	2494	support
5	22	2116	global
6	24	1839	product
7	26	1719	process
8	30	1603	site
9	32	1569	customer
10	34	1454	system
11	35	1385	test
12	36	1380	information
13	37	1379	localization

14	40	1304	company
15	41	1299	service
16	43	1284	market
17	44	1280	management
18	46	1248	time
19	50	1151	cost
20	52	1125	quality
21	54	1041	web
22	57	949	business
23	58	945	tool
24	60	925	organization
25	62	850	project
26	63	817	technology
27	67	800	terminology
28	71	772	translate
29	72	762	standard
30	74	755	client
…	…	…	…
…	**116**	**545**	**translator**

Table 1: Frequency List of Non-Functional Lemmata

To obtain an overview of which terms are frequently used in the corpus texts, a frequency wordlist was created. The list is a "filtered" version, i.e. it shows the 30 most frequently used "proper words." Mere functional words, like prepositions, pronouns or functional verbs, are excluded. These terms provide a rather profound perspective on what the dominant issues in the white papers are. The dominant topics seem to be processes (*test*, *time*, *cost*, *project*, etc.), technology (*site*, *tool*, *terminology*, etc.) and the industry in general (*global*, *customer*, *localization*, *customer*, etc.). Although this frequency list already provides a good overview of the topics, the following analyses will allow us to determine the terms of interest on a broader and thus more profound basis.

4.2 Keywords

Rank	Frequency	Ref, Corpus	Keyword				
1	13779	13,166,736	be	3	2812	6,425,618	content
2	3291	7,912,264	translation	4	2533	5,392,756	language
				5	2116	5,155,012	global

6	2494	4,946,477	support	26	1454	1,871,512	system
7	1703	4,193,457	wc	27	1304	1,819,999	company
8	1839	3,846,835	product	28	758	1,819,280	lisa
9	1569	3,593,514	customer	29	1299	1,799,718	service
10	1603	3,442,815	site	30	1337	1,786,845	need
11	1379	3,366,875	localization	31	772	1,762,807	translate
12	1719	3,099,596	process	32	714	1,743,696	localize
13	1127	2,724,737	user	33	696	1,713,826	xml
14	1385	2,651,770	test	34	817	1,700,019	technology
15	2029	2,602,205	use	35	1151	1,698,147	cost
16	1041	2,493,586	web	36	755	1,667,698	client
17	1280	2,485,315	management	37	674	1,659,653	software
18	1284	2,270,325	market	38	662	1,574,661	mt
19	1380	2,116,813	information	39	925	1,565,935	organization
20	1125	2,067,545	quality	40	850	1,549,874	project
21	1271	2,046,428	provide	41	811	1,458,273	base
22	945	2,002,986	tool	42	575	1,415,876	lionbridge
23	813	2,001,926	Sdl	43	718	1,352,157	application
Rank	Frequency	Ref, Corpus	Keyword	44	545	1,328,092	translator
24	808	1,989,614	conjurer	45	583	1,319,380	document
25	800	1,903,299	terminology				

Table 2: List of Keywords

The first of the additional methods to back up our preliminary findings is a keyword analysis. This method compares the frequency wordlist created from the white paper corpus to a frequency wordlist created from the reference corpus. The resulting keyword list shows which words are significantly more frequent in the white paper corpus than in the reference corpus. Again, a focus on processes and technology can be observed.

4.3 Concordances

With more than 500 occurrences of the keyword *translator*, the concordance list is too exhaustive and will thus only be used to obtain a general impression for the context in which the term is used. Moreover, such an analysis is often less objective. Therefore, our analysis will focus on quantitative collocations and clusters.

4.3.1 Collocates

Table 3 shows the most frequent, non-functional collocates of TRANSLATOR. The window span for this analysis was defined as 2L and 2R, i.e. the two collocates to either side of the keyword are analyzed. Although it is possible to define a greater span, this value was considered adequate, because it will deliver informative, but still comprehensible, data. The table shows only collocates with a frequency higher than 2.

Just as in Austermühl's (2007) initial analysis, the most frequent collocate to TRANSLATOR is HUMAN. Since allocating the adjective *human* with TRANSLATOR is only necessary in order to distinguish it from machine translation (MT), and considering the fact that MT is the fourth most frequent collocate, this reveals a strong focus on the topic of automation. As Austermühl suggests, this indicates that "after the web-based renaissance of machine translation, language industry representatives are again seriously talking (and thinking) about fully-automated translation" (Austermühl 2007: 43). Other collocates worthy of noting are FREELANCE, INTERPRETERS, AUTHORS, TERMINOLOGISTS, SPECIALIST, ACCESS, REVIEWERS, REPLACE, PRODUCTIVITY, MANAGERS, QUALIFIED, PROFESSSIONAL, LINGUISTS, COSTS, CONTEXT, and TOOLS. A cluster analysis will help determine if and how they occur in the context of the term TRANSLATOR.

Rank	Frq	FrqL	FrqR	Collocate					
6	75	75	0	HUMAN	35	9	8	1	SPECIALIST
9	40	1	39	INTERPRETERS	39	9	3	6	ACCESS
15	25	25	0	FREELANCE	44	7	0	7	TRANSLATE
21	17	0	17	MT	47	7	0	7	REVIEWERS
24	12	2	10	WORK	48	7	3	4	PROJECT
26	12	10	2	AUTHORS	52	7	6	1	HELP
28	11	4	7	TRANSLATION	53	7	5	2	CONTENT
29	11	2	9	TERMINOLOGIST	54	7	6	1	CONTACT
34	10	4	6	DIFFERENT	55	6	2	4	WRITERS
					56	6	1	5	WORKING

Rank	Frq	FrqL	FrqR	Collocate	Rank	Frq	FrqL	FrqR	Collocate
59	6	6	0	REPLACE	104	4	3	1	COUNTRY
60	6	2	4	PRODUCTIVITY	105	4	1	3	COSTS
61	6	3	3	MANAGERS	106	4	4	0	CONTEXT
62	6	3	3	ENSURE	107	4	3	1	CERTIFIED
64	6	1	5	ASSOCIATION	111	4	4	0	AUTHOR
68	5	2	3	TERMINOLOGY	117	3	3	0	WRITER
69	5	3	2	SYSTEM	124	3	2	1	TOOLS
70	5	5	0	QUALIFIED	125	3	0	3	TIME
71	5	5	0	PROFESSIONAL	129	3	1	2	TECHNICAL
					132	3	1	2	REVIEWER
Rank	Frq	FrqL	FrqR	Collocate	133	3	0	3	REVIEW
73	5	1	4	NETWORKS	134	3	0	3	PUBLISHERS
83	4	1	3	TRAINING	141	3	0	3	MACHINE
94	4	3	1	LINGUISTS	142	3	0	3	LOCALIZATION
95	4	0	4	LANGUAGE	150	3	0	3	FOCUS
96	4	1	3	KNOWLEDGE	151	3	3	0	FEEDBACK
97	4	1	3	INTERPRETER	153	3	0	3	EDITOR
101	4	2	2	DIFFICULTY	154	3	3	0	CREATORS
102	4	3	1	DEVELOPERS	155	3	3	0	CLIENTS
103	4	4	0	DEPLOYMENTS					

Table 3: List of Collocates of the Lemma TRANSLATOR by Frequency

4.4 Cluster

A cluster analysis of the key terms shows again a high frequency of the topic of MACHINE TRANSLATION. The second most frequent cluster after HUMAN TRANSLATOR is FREELANCE TRANSLATOR, with 22 occurrences. The term IN-HOUSE TRANSLATOR, in contrast, is only referred to three times. One possible explanation for this could be that localization companies do not refer to their in-house translators as translators, but use more general terms like "staff" or the term "linguist." By doing so, they stress the fact that they are offering more than "just translation" and that translation is the part of localization that can easily be outsourced.

The cluster analysis also shows that TRANSLATOR is often just one occupation in a list of roles, e.g. "This ensures that no one is working with outdated data, and that everyone—from engineers, linguists and translators, to writers, sales people and marketing staff—shares the same language data knowledge" (Fidura 2007: 7). This explains the high frequency of collocates like INTERPRETER, REVIEWER, AUTHOR, TERMINOLOGIST, etc.

5   Images of Self and Others in the Localization Industry

As a result of the corpus-driven approach, we can establish the following hypotheses to be tested in further, corpus-based analyses.

Special focus on efficiency, processes, and technology: The localization industry seems to focus essentially on efficiency, processes and technology. Indicators that led to this conclusion are the frequent use of terms like CONTENT, MANAGEMENT, PROCESS, TOOLS, SERVICE, as well as dominant collocates of TRANSLATOR such as PRODUCTIVITY, COST and TIME.

Marginalized image of the translator: Translators are present in the industry discourse, but the way in which the profession is portrayed reveals a tendency to marginalization. Translators are often only mentioned as one of many agents within a certain process work-flow or as operators of translation tools. The frequent use of the collocation *human translator* (66 times), which is merely used as a differentiator for *machine translation*, also contributes to the impression of a marginalized translator image. Another observation from the study is the lack of a notion of translators as "intercultural communicators and experts, [and] authors and interpreters of meaning" (Austermühl 2007: 44). This, together with the focus on technology and processes, leads to the assumption that translation is reduced to being "just a language problem" (Brooks, in Pym 2004: 52). This assumed reduction also becomes apparent in Austermühl's remark concerning translators becoming linguists (Austermühl 2007: 44).

To find out if translators are really marginalized in the localization industry, and if so, in which way and to which degree, terms used as an alternative to *translator* are analyzed. In addition, terms referring to translator skills and qualifications are also looked at more closely.

5.1   A Self Portrait of the Industry

In order to test the above hypotheses, we will, in the following, determine the lexical fields of the terms in question, using various corpus analysis tools.

5.1.1 Efficiency

Table 4 shows the lemmata determined for the lexical field EFFICIENCY along with their respective frequencies in the corpus and with their four most frequent collocates.

Key Lemma	Frequency	Most Frequent Collocates
TIME	1248	MARKET REAL COST (also MONEY) CONSUMING
COST	1151	TRANSLATION SAVINGS TIME REDUCE
QUALITY	1124	HIGH ASSURANCE TRANSLATION LOCALIZATION
EFFICIENCY	204	MORE PROCESS COST GLOBAL
PRODUCTIVITY	148	QUALITY INCREASE (also IMPROVE, GAIN, etc.) EFFICIENCY SOFTWARE

Table 4: Collocation and Frequency Analysis for the Lexical Field EFFICIENCY

Their high frequencies show that TIME and COST are important topics in the localization industry. Since "time is money," the aim is to avoid time-consuming tasks and thus reduce translation costs, which might affect translation or localization quality. Therefore, quality assurance procedures are essential to guarantee high translation quality. However, the main criterion for translation and localization quality seems to be CONSISTENCY (41 collocations with quality), especially in the context of terminology, content, brands, and style. Another criterion is the USABILITY (25 collocations) of the localized product.

To sum up, the ultimate goal in the localization industry is to reduce translation time, cut costs and thus increase productivity; a particular focus on efficiency can indeed be identified.

Considering the nature of the analyzed publications, this finding is not a real surprise, since white papers are, by nature, addressing clients, and clients are always interested in efficiency and low costs. An interesting fact, however, is that this efficiency is promised at the same time as high quality. As the collocations for PRODUCTIVITY and EFFICIENCY show, the means to achieve this ambitious goal are considered to be PROCESSES and technology (SOFTWARE).

5.1.2 Processes

As we have seen earlier, the localization industry is characterized by a substantial degree of outsourcing. This also entails a great deal of management. To ensure a smooth and efficient workflow throughout all the different stages of the cascaded supply chain, standardized workflow procedures and processes are necessary.

Table 5 shows that the term PROCESS is used rather frequently and, because it is also listed in 12th position in the keyword list (see above), it has to be considered an important topic. Although a great portion of the occurrences can be attributed to collocations like TRANS-LATION/LOCALIZATION PROCESS or CONTENT CREATION PROCESS, it reflects nevertheless the industry's desire to present localization as a sophisticated business process (see Austermühl 2007: 42), i.e. a systematic series of interdependent tasks and actions that leads to a desired end or product. The aim of stressing this is to distinguish localization from mere translation, as this might "elicit a negative, unprofessional image" (ibid.).

Due to the high number of agents involved in a localization project, efficient management of the individual procedures and outsourcing steps is essential in order to ensure a smooth workflow. As the collocates of the term WORKFLOW suggest, the aim is to standardize processes to such a degree that fully automatic management of the workflow by means of workflow management systems is possible. However, it has to be noted that we expected to find more references to the respective procedures involved in the localization process, but only translation and testing seemed to be of particular significance.

Key Lemma	Frequency	Most Frequent Collocates
PROCESS	1138	TRANSLATION & LOCALIZATION

		CONTENT
		BUSINESS
		MANAGEMENT
TESTING	749	PERFORMANCE
		GLOBALIZATION
		SERVICES
		MAINTENANCE
PROJECT	612	MANAGEMENT (ALSO MANAGER)
		LOCALIZATION & TRANSLATION
		SPECIFIC
		DEVELOPMENT
MANAGER	305	PROJECT
		SUPPORT
		CONTENT
		PRODUCT
WORKFLOW	165	TRANSLATION
		MANAGEMENT
		AUTOMATION
		SYSTEM

Table 5: Collocation and Frequency Analysis for Lexical Field PROCESS

5.1.3 Technology

The methods applied in this research may not be best suited to document the extent to which the industry focuses on technology, because it does not reflect the brand names of individual technological solutions developed and/or used by the companies (like "Translator's Workbench" or "SDLX"), but only the usage of the generic terms (like TRANSLATION MEMORY).

Nevertheless, Table 6 clearly shows that translation tools as well as machine translation systems play a major role in the discourse. Whereas full automation of certain workflow and testing procedures seems to be favorable, this does not quite seem to be the case for translation and localization tasks as such. Translation tools are referred to as *terminology* or *content management* systems. This term still implies that the technology merely *supports* the translator in his or her task but does not aim to replace him or her entirely. And even publications on the topic of machine translation seem eager to stress the fact that machine translation cannot yield high-quality output without human pre- or post-editing.

Key Lemma	Frequency	Most Frequent Collocates
SYSTEM	1454	MANAGEMENT
		TRANSLATION
		CONTENT
		TERMINOLOGY
TOOL	945	TRANSLATION
		TM
		TEST
		AUTOMATION
MACHINE TRANSLATION/MT	893	IMPLEMENT
		SYSTEM
		HUMAN
		OUTPUT
TECHNOLOGY	817	LANGUAGE
		STANDARDS
		PROCESS
		TOOL
TERMINOLOGY	800	MANAGEMENT
		TRANSLATION
		EXTRACTION
		WORK
TRANSLATION MEMORY/TM	779	USE
		TOOL
		SYSTEM
		TECHNOLOGY
AUTOMATION	376	TRANSLATION
		TEST
		TOOL
		WORKFLOW

Table 6: Collocation and Frequency Analysis for the Lexical Field TECHNOLOGY

5.2 Translator Roles

In order to establish whether the localization industry does in fact marginalize the translator in this way and to help us appreciate what it understands as translator competence, some indicative lexical fields will be determined and the observations will be analyzed.

5.2.1   Culture

The frequency analysis shows that, compared to LANGUAGE, the concept of CULTURE does not play a distinctive role in localization discourse. The collocation analysis indicates that if culture is mentioned at all, it is often accompanied by the term language, but does not often stand on its own. From an academic point of view this is rather disappointing, given the impact Cultural Studies has had in recent academic discourse in Translation Studies.

Key Lemma	Frequency	Most Common Collocates
CULTURE	107	LANGUAGE
		CORPORATE
		GLOBAL
		LOCAL
CULTURAL	94	DIFFERENCES
		LANGUAGE
		LINGUISTIC
		MANAGING
LANGUAGE	2533	LOCAL
		MULTIPLE
		TARGET
		SOURCE
LINGUAL	24	MULTI-
		BI-
		SEARCH
		SUPPORT

Table 7: Collocation and Frequency Analysis for the Lexical Field CULTURE

5.2.2   Linguist

As mentioned earlier, the localization industry is said to have a preference for the use of LINGUIST instead of TRANSLATOR. A frequency analysis for this term, however, does not seem to support this assumption.

Out of the 14 instances where LINGUIST is used in the corpus, only two have been identified as possibly being intended to refer to translators instead. The fact that TRANSLATOR appears as a collocation to LINGUIST also suggests that the latter is not used synonymously but additionally to the former, and that there seems to be a distinction between the two professions.

Nevertheless, the adjective LINGUISTIC is used twice as often as CULTURAL and is even included in the keyword list.

Key Lemma	Frequency	Most Common Collocates
LINGUIST	14	COMPUTATIONAL TRANSLATORS SKILLED LEAD
LINGUISTIC	209	RESOURCES REVIEW TOOLS KNOWLEDGE
LINGUISTICALLY	18	BASED CORRECT TET (TERM EXTRACTION TOOL) POWERFUL

Table 8: Collocation and Frequency Analysis for the Lexical Field LINGUIST

Based on a brief concordance analysis of LINGUISTIC, it is assumed that the term is sometimes used as an intended adjective to TRANSLATION, as in the following example: "Translation and localization activities include all linguistic tasks related to the actual rendering of source words into target languages" (SDL 2007: 9). Yet, as stated before, the concept of translation entails not only linguistic (i.e. relating to language, not to linguistics) aspects but also cultural and communicative notions. By using the term *linguistic* as an adjective to describe *translation*, these other two notions are ignored completely. The natural adjective to refer to *translation* would be *translational*, but this term is not used at all within the texts of our corpus. It can be assumed that the term is avoided due to the desire of localization service providers to distinguish themselves from "mere" translation service providers.

5.3   Professional Profile

Given the tendency in the localization industry to focus on the linguistic aspects of translation, it might be interesting to find out if this is also the focus when it comes to defining translator competence.

Looking at the collocations of the various terms associated with the role of the translator as a highly skilled and qualified expert, we find confirmation of previously observed patterns. The focus on technology is reflected in collocations like TECHNOLOGICAL COMPETENCE or TECHNOLOGICAL SKILLS. Also, the aforementioned focus on the linguistic aspect of translation is substantiated by the fact that *linguistic* skills, *language* professionals and *language* competence are commonly mentioned, while notions of culture or communication are again missing. And although the term TRAINING is used rather frequently, it only refers to *translator* training in one instance. Furthermore, the analysis did not reveal much about which particular qualifications or competences are expected from translators, the only exception being the role of the translator as subject matter expert.

Key Lemma	Frequency	Most Common Collocates
PROFESSIONAL	311	SUPPORT
		SERVICE
		LANGUAGE
		TRANSLATION
QUALIFICATION	46	TRANSLATORS
		ADDITIONAL
		PROCESS
		HIGHLY
EXPERT	88	SUBJECT
		MATTER
		TESTING
		KNOWLEDGE
SKILL	170	HUMAN
		HIGHLY
		TECHNOLOGY
		LINGUISTIC
TRAINING	392	PROGRAM
		SIMULATION
		GLOBAL
		PHASE
COMPETENCE	8	LANGUAGE
		TRANSLATORS
		TECHNOLOGY
		SKILL

Table 9: Collocation and Frequency Analysis for the Lexical Field PROFESSIONAL PROFILE

From these findings we conclude that translators' qualifications, skills and competence—unlike technical, technological and linguistic ones—do not play an essential role in the publications analyzed. Since the target readership for these publications is potential clients, the strategy seems to be to use assertive terms like *professional*, *skilled* and *qualified* without bothering the readers too much with details of the nature of these skills and qualifications.

6   Conclusion

The marginalized image of translators and translation in the localization industry is in stark contrast to the academic image of translators and translation in Translation Studies. The discipline of Translation Studies portrays translators as highly competent experts in intercultural communication whose ample skill sets qualify them for a broad array of services. For the localization industry, however, the most important attributes of the ideal translator seem to be efficiency and great technological skills, and the translator's tasks are limited to linguistic aspects of translation.

Two reasons for this gap can be identified: firstly, the changing realities of the language services market. Competition, volumes and time-constraints are ever increasing. Service providers have to find ways to deal with new demands and remain competitive; hence the focus on efficiency and tools. Secondly, it was crucial for the first localization companies to distinguish their services from traditional translation. To prove that they could meet the complex new demands of software localization projects, they had to convincingly establish themselves as highly professional (as opposed to "artsy") and technologically savvy. As a consequence, the role and skills of translators as intercultural mediators faded into the background. Translation theory, and what it entailed, was not considered relevant for the newly emerging industry, because it did not have much to say about the brand new industry. According to Pym (2004: 16), this still seems to be the case and the ignorance seems to be mutual:

> Professionals in localization companies are sure that academics know nothing about the commercial realities of their trade. And, indeed, very few of the academics teaching translation skills do know much

about current language service providers, since we tend to assume translation is simply what it always has been. (It is what it always has been, but not simply so.)

And yet, both parties could benefit from each other: translation theory and practice can learn a great deal from localization, especially in terms of efficiency, teamwork and the use of technology; and the localization industry can learn a great deal from translation theory, especially in terms of translation quality (which is more than just consistency), and seeing the bigger picture and the potential advantages of translators as intercultural mediators (see Pym 2003).

A possible way to change the image of the translator to one that measures up to the realities of both industry and academe is to find a way to cooperate. Translation Studies can no longer ignore the impact of the localization paradigm on its subject field. And indeed, albeit with some delay, this topic seems to be attracting more and more attention among scholars and translator training institutions.

The localization industry has also to open up to academic discourse. This means more than providing academic institutions with discounts on their CAT software. The industry has to understand that language services are not just a product like any other. Language and communication are the most complex skills that humankind possesses. Therefore, the professionals who make intercultural communication possible (and thus our globalized lifestyle) have to be qualified and highly-skilled experts in many respects. More importantly, they want to be recognized as such. After all, "[n]othing upsets people more than making them feel like a commodity" (Clark 2003). According to our analysis, however, the image of the translator conveyed by the localization industry does not reflect this status.

Incorporating a broader concept of translation might lead to a better understanding of the needs of translators. This might in turn result in translation tools and processes that meet the actual requirements of translators; i.e. do not constrain them as much. If professionals feel valued and recognized for their skills and qualifications, they will put more enthusiasm into their work and grow with their responsibilities. In the end, this will increase both quality and efficiency, and thus customer satisfaction. However, professionals who are, constantly and in many respects, marginalized will, in the end, only show marginal performance. What

is even more important, a profession with no or only a marginalized image will not be considered as a career of interest. This would result in a lack of qualified employees, and this cannot be in the interest of the industry.

At this point, however, we also have to admit that this article represents only one approach to determining the image of the translator. Although it provides an insight into the topic, it is far from exhaustive. Nevertheless, the topic and its implications provide material for further research opportunities. One promising approach would be an image analysis in the literal sense of the word, i.e. analyzing advertisements depicting translators in industry journals and magazines. An analysis of job advertisements might also make it possible to draw conclusions regarding the translator's image. It would also be of great interest to examine how, and to which extent, the translator's image affects remuneration and working conditions. A contrast to the industry's perspective would be a study of the self-image of translators.

These suggested research ideas could contribute to obtaining a more complex impression of the image of the translator. This will, in turn, help to define what can be done to improve the occupational image (and hence, the status and situation) of not only one of the oldest but also one of the most important professions.

7 References

Adolphs, Svenja (2006). *Introducing Electronic Text Analysis: A Practical Guide for Language and Literary Studies*. London: Routledge.

Anthony, Laurence (2007). *AntConc3.2.1 Readme*. http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software/README_antconc3.2.1.txt.

Austermühl, Frank (2007). "Translators in the Language Industry – From Localization to Marginalization." Kerstin Brenner and Anja Holderbaum (eds.) *Gebundener Sprachgebrauch in der Übersetzungswissenschaft. Festschrift für Joachim Kornelius zum 60. Geburtstag*. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier. 39-51.

Baker, Paul, Andrew Hardie, and Tony McEnery (2006). *A Glossary of Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cadieux, Pierre, and Bert Esselink (2002). "GILT: Globalization, Internationalization, Localization, Translation." *Globalization Insider* 1.5. http://www.lisa.org/globalizationinsider/2002/03/gilt_globalizat.html.

Chambers 21st Century Dictionary (2001). "Industry." London: Chambers Harrap. http://www.credoreference.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/entry/1209433. [Dec. 8, 2008].

Charalampidou, Parthena (2006). "Website Localization." *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006*. http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/Papers2006/CHARALAMPIDOU.pdf.

Clark, Bob (2003). "Are Translators Getting Their Voice Back?" *Globalization Insider* 2.4. http://www.lisa.org/globalizationinsider/2003/05/are_translators.html. [June 5, 2008].

Collins English Dictionary (2000). "Industry." London: Collins. http://www.credoreference.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/entry/2657745/.

DePalma, Donald A. (2005). *SDL-TRADOS – Language Service Provider Reaction to SDL´s Purchase of TRADOS*. Andover: Globalization and Localization Association. http://www.gala-global.org/en/resources/downloads/2005Q3_GALA-SDL-TradosReport.pdf.

DePalma, Donald A. and Renato Beninatto (2005a). *Lionbridge Buys Bowne Global Solutions*. Lowell: Common Sense Advisory. http://www. commonsenseadvisory.com/gala/050628_QT_liox_bgs.pdf.

DePalma, Donald A. and Renato Beninatto (2005b). *Ranking of Top 20 Translation Companies*. Lowell: Common Sense Advisory. http://www.commonsenseadvisory.com/members/res_cgi.php/050701_QT_top_20.pdf.

DePalma, Donald A. and Renato Beninatto (2006). *Ranking of Top 20 Translation Companies for 2005*). Lowell: Common Sense Advisory. http://www.common senseadvisory.com/members/res_cgi.php/060301_QT_top_20.pdf.

DePalma, Donald A. and Renato Beninatto (2007). *Ranking of Top 20 Translation Companies*. Lowell: Common Sense Advisory. http://www.common senseadvisory.com/members/res_cgi.php/070502_Q_Top_20.pdf.

DePalma, Donald A. and Renato Beninatto (2008). *Ranking of Top 25 Translation Companies*. Lowell: Common Sense Advisory. http://www.commonsenseadvi sory.com/members/res_cgi.php/080528_QT_2008_top_25_lsps.pdf.

Ellis-Christensen, Tricia (2008). *What is a White Paper?* http://www.wisegeek.com/ what-is-a-white-paper.htm.

Enríquez Raído, Vanessa, and Frank Austermühl (2003). "Translation, Localization, and Technology: Current Developments." Luis P. González (ed.) *Speaking in Tongues: Language across Contexts and Users*. Valencia: Universitat de València. 225-250.

Esselink, Bert (2006). "The Evolution of Localization." Anthony Pym, Alexander Perekrestenko, and Brian Starink (eds.) *Translation Technology and its Teaching.* Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, Universitat Rovira i Virgili. 21-29.

Fidura, Christie (2007). *Terminology Matters*. http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/ wp_pdf_sdl-Terminology matters_web_en_tcm16-4928.pdf.

Graham, Gordon (2007). *Six More Diseases that Afflict White Paper Content*. http://www.whitepapersource.com/writing/6-content-diseases/.

Hammond, Michael. (2003). "Brown Corpus." *Linguistics 696f.* http://dingo. sbs.arizona.edu/~hammond/ling696f-sp03/.

Lionbridge (2008a). Lionbridge Company Overview. Waltham: Lionbridge. http://www.lionbridge.com/lionbridge/en-GB/company.htm.

Lionbridge (2008b). *Lionbridge Knowledge Center*. Waltham: Lionbridge. http://www.lionbridge.com/lionbridge/en-GB/kc.htm.

LISA (2008a). *Homepage*. Romainmôtier: Localization Industry Standards
Association. http://www.lisa.org/Homepage.8.0.html.

LISA (2008b). *Publications Catalogue*. Romainmôtier: Localization Industry Standards
Association. http://www.lisa.org/Industry-Data.512.0.html.

LISA (2008c). *Why LISA?* Romainmôtier: Localization Industry Standards
Association. http://www.lisa.org/Why-LISA.111.0.html.

LISA (n/d). *Statutes*. Romainmôtier: Localization Industry Standards
Association. http://www.lisa.org/LISA-Statutes.715.0.html.

Little, William, Henry W. Fowler, and Jessie Coulson (1993). *The Shorter Oxford English
Dictionary on Historical Principles*. London: Newnes.

Lommel, Arle R. (2007). *The Globalization Industry Primer*. Rebecca Ray (ed.). Romainmôtier:
Localization Industry Standards Association. http://www.lisa.org/ Globalization-
Primer.600.0.html.

Olohan, Maeve (2004). *Introducing Corpora in Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Pedersen, Bryan (2008). *What Are Whitepapers?.* http://www.wisegeek.com/what-are-
white-papers.htm.

Pym, Anthony (2003). "What Localization Models Can Learn From Translation Theory." *The
Globalization Insider* 2.4. http://www.lisa.org/globalizationinsider/
2003/05/what_localizati.html.

Pym, Anthony (2004). *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation, and Distribution.*
Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

SDL International (2007). *Online Support on the Global Stage*. http://www.sdl.com/
en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-online support on the global stage_web_en_tcm16-4965.pdf.

SDL International (2008a). Business Climate – Technology for the Translation Supply
Chain. http://www.sdl.com/en/company/company/business-climate.asp.

SDL International (2008b). *SDL Knowledge Center*. http://www.sdl.com/en/ globalization-knowledge-centre/whitepapers/Default.asp.

SDL International (2008c). *SDL Company Profile.* http://www.sdl.com/en/ company/company/.

Someya, Yasumasa (2008). *Someya Lemma List.* http://www.antlab.sci. waseda.ac.jp/antconc_index.html.

Stelzner, Michael (2008). *How to Write a White Paper – A White Paper on White Papers*. http://www.stelzner.com/copy-HowTo-whitepapers.php.

van der Meer, Jaap (2003). "At Last Translation Automation Becomes a Reality: An Anthology of the Translation Market." *EAMT-CLAW* 2003. 80-184. http://www.mt-archive.info/CLT-2003-VanDerMeer.pdf.

Wikipedia Contributors (2008). "Translation." *Wikipedia*. http://en.wikipedia.org/ w/index.php?title=Translation&oldid=254210125.

Yunker, John (2005). "Idiom Tries to Capitalize on TRADOS Acquisition." *Global By Design.* San Diego: Byte Level Research. http://www.globalbydesign.com/ blog/2005/06/29/idiom-tries-to-capitalize-on-trados-acquisition/.

8 Corpus

8.1 Lionbridge (downloaded Oct. 1, 2008)

Lionbridge (2003). *Minimizing the Risk of Offshore Outsourcing*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/CIO_Views_On_Offshore_Outsourcing.pdf.

Lionbridge (2004). *Performance Testing in the Enterprise*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/performance_testing_in_the_enterprise.pdf.

Lionbridge (2005a). *Enterprise Terminology Management*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Enterprise_Terminology_Management.pdf.

Lionbridge (2005b). *Globalization-at-Source Courseware Development*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Globalization_at_Source.pdf.

Lionbridge (2005c). *How to Integrate Testing to Shorten the Software Development Cycle*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/How_to_Integrate_Testing_to_Shorten_the_Software_Development_Cycle.pdf.

Lionbridge (2005d). *Optimizing Quality Processes for Software Development*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/optimizing_quality_processes_for_software_development.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006a). *The Basics of Product Certification*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/the_basics_of_product_certification.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006b). *The Benefits of Web Services-Based Globalization Management*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Benefits_of_Web_Services_Globalization_Management.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006c). *Best Practices: Integrating a Multishore Strategy into your Global IT Organization*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Best_Practices_Integrating_a_Multishore_Strategy_into_your_Global_IT_Organization.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006d). *Building Stronger Brands Around the World*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/building_stronger_brands_around_the_world.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006e). *Build-Operate-Transfer for ISVs*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Build-Operate-
Transfer_for_ISVs_wp.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006f). *Client/Server Performance Testing*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/client_server_performance_testing.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006g). *DITA in Localization*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/DITA_in_Localization.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006h). *Enterprise Performance Testing Roadmap*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-
US/Enterprise_Performance_Testing_Roadmap.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006i). *Exploiting Gaming Skills in Simulation-based eLearning*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Exploiting_Gaming_Skills_to_Improve_
Corporate_Performance.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006j). *Five Strategies for Global Sourcing of Application Development*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Five_Strategies_for_Global_Sourcing_
of_Application_Development.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006k). *Global Expansion Requires New HR and Training
Strategies*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-
US/HR_and_Training_in_Global_Environments.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006l). *Global Sourcing: Seeing Beyond Cost Savings to Capture Sustaining Value*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/ZDM_Global_Sourcing.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006m). *Introduction to XLIFF*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Intro_to_XLIFF.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006n). *Learning to "Speak European:" Expanding Your Business in the European
Union*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Exec-Brief_Speak-European.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006o). *Moving Past Projects to Managed Service*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Moving_Past_Projects_to_Managed_Service.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006p). *Multilingual Content Management*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Multilingual_Content_Management_ROI.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006q). *Optimizing the Global Product Release Cycle in an On-Demand Environment*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Simultaneous_Shipment.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006r). *Reducing "Time to Proficiency" in Global ERP Deployments*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Reducing_Time-to-Proficiency_in_Global_ERP_Deployments.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006s). *Testing Mobile Applications is Different from Testing Traditional Applications*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/testing_mobile_apps.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006t). *VeriTest: The Benefits of Outsourcing vs. Contingent Staffing*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/The_Benefits_of_Outsourcing_vs._Contingent_Staffing.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006u). *What Makes Client/Server Testing Unique*?

http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/c_s_unique.pdf.

Lionbridge (2006v). *When to Use Machine Translation*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/When_to_Use_Machine_Translation.pdf.

Lionbridge (2007a). *Launching Global Clinical Trials*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Launching-Global-Clinical-Trials.pdf.

Lionbridge (2007b). *Process Discipline: A Balanced Approach to Development Projects*.
http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/process_discipline.pdf.

Lionbridge (2008a). *Application Portfolio Management: Delivering Improved Functionality to Drive Efficiency, Innovation, and Growth*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/APM.pdf.

Lionbridge 2008b). *Building a Global Web Strategy*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Building-a-Global-Web-Strategy.pdf.

Lionbridge (2008c). *Demystifying Localization: Ten Best Practices to Turn your Efforts into Strategic Advantage*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Demystifying-Localization.pdf.

Lionbridge (2008d). *In-Country Review*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/In-Country_Review.pdf.

Lionbridge (2008e). *Machine Translation: Saving Time, Lowering Costs, and Improving Service*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/TB_Machine_Translation.pdf.

Lionbridge (2008f). *Shortening Mobile Device Testing Cycles: Best Practices for Testing Leadership in the Next Wave of Global Growth*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Shortening-Mobile-Device-Testing-Cycles.pdf.

Lionbridge (2008g). *Six Strategies for Improving the Cost and Quality of Software Testing*. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Improving_Software_Testability.pdf.

Rogowski, Ron (2006). *Creating Global Web Site Standards That Work*. ForresterResearch. http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Creating_Global_Web_Site_Standards.pdf.

Sargent, Benjamin B. (2001). "Multilingual Knowledge Management Empowers Global eBusiness." Special Supplement to KMWorld (May 2001). http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/km_wp.pdf.

Zasada, Marc (2004). *Microsoft Certification Standards Deliver Value to Enterprise Customers and Partners*.

http://www.lionbridge.com/kc_content/en-US/Microsoft_Certification_
Standards_Deliver_Value.pdf.

8.2   LISA (downloaded Sep. 30, 2008)

Dillinger, Mike and Arle Lommel (2004). *Implementing Machine Translation*.

http://www.lisa.org/Best-Practice-Guides.594.0.html - c1774.

Gibbs, Jennifer (2001). *Global Team Survey Final Report*.

http://www.lisa.org/Global-Teams-Survey.528.0.html.

Gibbs, Jennifer (2004). *Quality Assurance – The Client Perspective*.

http://www.lisa.org/Best-Practice-Guides.594.0.html - c1773.

Lommel, Arle R. (2003). *Global eBusiness Survey*.

http://www.lisa.org/Global-eBusiness-Sur.521.0.html.

Lommel, Arle R. (2004). *Translation Memory Survey*.

http://www.lisa.org/Translation-Memory-S.518.0.html.

Lommel, Arle R. (2007). *The Globalization Industry Primer*.

http://www.lisa.org/Globalization-Primer.600.0.html.

Lommel, Arle R., and Rebecca Ray (2006). *Ten Best International Web Support Sites*.

http://www.lisa.org/Best-International.576.0.html.

Lommel, Arle R., and Rebecca Ray (2007). *Best International Web Support Sites 2007*.

http://www.lisa.org/Best-International.575.0.html.

Pinto, Claudia and Andrew Draheim (2004). *Translation Business Practices Report.
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development – The World Bank*.
http://www.lisa.org/Translation-Business.578.0.html.

Toon, Alison, Andrew Draheim, Arle Lommel, and Pierre Cadieux (2007). *Managing Global
Content (Table of Contents and a short Excerpt)*.
http://www.lisa.org/Best-Practice-Guides.594.0.html#c1775.

Zielinski, Daniel and Yamile Ramirez Safar (2005). *Research Meets Practice: T-Survey*.
http://fr46.uni-saarland.de/download/publs/sdv/t-survey_aslib2005_zielinski.htm.

8.3   SDL International (downloaded Sep. 30, 2008)

Ambrose, Mark and John Tridgell (2007). *Best Practice Steps to Take a Website to a Global Audience*.
http://www.sdl.com/en/globalization-knowledge-centre/whitepapers/Best-Practice-Steps-to-take-a-Website.asp.

Ashton, David (2007). *Operational Brand Management*.
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Operational%20Brand%20Management_web_en_tcm16-2331.pdf.

Bartlett, PG, and Mark Ambrose (2008). *Best Practices for Communicating Global Product Information*.
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_SDL_Best%20Practices%20for%20Communicating%20Global%20Product%20Information_web_tcm16-9905.pdf.

Baudouin, Patrick (2007). *Global Information Management and Life Sciences*.
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Life sciences_web_en_tcm16-2323.pdf.

Clarke, Sue (2007a). *Technology Audit: Global Information Management*. Butler Group.
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/SDL%20Global%20Information%20Management%20(TA001266CMT)_tcm16-5237.pdf.

Clarke, Sue (2007b). *Technology Audit: SDL AuthorAssistant*. Butler Group.
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/SDL%20SDL%20AuthorAssistant%20(TA001281CMT)_tcm16-5239.pdf.

Clarke, Sue (2007c). *Technology Audit: SDL MultiTerm*. Butler Group.
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/Butler%20Group%20MultiTerm_tcm16-5648.pdf.

Clarke, Sue (2007d). *Technology Audit: Translation Managment System*. Butler Group. http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/Butler%20Group%20TMS_tcm16-5646.pdf.

DePalma, Donald A. (2007). *Going from Simple Translation to Successful Transactions on Global Websites*. Common Sense Advisory. http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/Common-Sense-Advisory-white-Paper_tcm16-4924.pdf.

Fidura, Christie (2007). *Terminology Matters*. http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Terminology%20matters_web_en_tcm16-4928.pdf.

Gilbert, Philip, and Matthias Heyn (2007). *Global Regulatory Challenges Drive Multilingual Regional Solutions*. http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Labeling-Lang_web_en_tcm16-2322.pdf.

Heyn, Matthias (2008). *Multilingual Labeling.* http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Multilingual%20labelling_web_en_tcm16-8900.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie (2007a). *Global Communication to the 21st Century*. http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Global%20communication%20to%20the%2021st%20century_web_en_tcm16-2334.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie (2007b). *Global XML.* http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Global XML- An executive briefing_web_en_tcm16-2335.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie (2007c). *Global XML – What to Know and Avoid When Migrating to XML*. SDL International. http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Migrating%20XML_web_en_tcm16-2325.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie (2007d). *High-quality Automated Translation for Global Brands.*
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-High%20Quality%20Automated%20
Translation_web_en_tcm16-3018.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie (2007e). *How to Internationalize your Website.*
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Internationalize%20your%20
website_web_en_tcm16-3011.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie (2007f). *Introduction to Global XML.*
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Global%20XML_web_en_tcm16-2336.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie (2007g). *Knowledge-based Translation.*
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-KBT_web_en_tcm16-2338.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie (2007h). *New Authoring Strategies Increase Reuse and Consistency.*
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-
New%20Authoring%20strategies %20increase%20reuse%20and%20consistency_en_tc
m16-2333.pdf.

Hurst, Sophie and RJ Jacquez (2007). *Global Ideas and Global Information.*
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_sdl-Global_Ideas_and_
Global_Information_1_en_tcm16-8434.pdf.

Lawlor, Terry (2007). *Globalization Management Systems.*
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-Globalization%20
management%20systems_web_en_tcm16-2337.pdf.

Lommel, Arle R. (2007). *Creating Global Content.* LISA.
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/LISA%20SDL%20Creating%20Global%20Content%20S
urvey%20Results_tcm16-5344.pdf.

Schwartz, Howard and Chip Gettinger (2008). *Dare I "Do DITA" Without A CMS? You could
but…*
http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-DareDitaWithoutCMS_en_tcm16-
10414.pdf.

Schwartz, Howard and Chip Gettinger (2008). *Dare I "Do DITA" Without A CMS? You could but…*

http://www.sdl.com/en/Images/wp_pdf_sdl-DareDitaWithoutCMS_en_tcm16-10414.pdf.

T21N - Translation in Transition

T21N offers a cutting-edge electronic publishing venue, created by experts for both young talent and established researchers from the worlds of translation and interpreting.

T21N provides a stage for emerging ideas and new academic talent to present their ideas in a digital reading site, where speed and ease meet enjoyment.

T21N is exclusively published online at http://www.t21n.com.

Articles in compliance with our style sheet may be submitted at any time and will be published at short notice.

T21N editors research and teach at the Institute of Translation and Interpreting at the University of Heidelberg in Germany.

Editors:
Dipl.-Übers. Viktorija Bilić, Dr. Anja Holderbaum,
Dr. Anne Kimmes, Prof. Dr. Joachim Kornelius,
Dr. John Stewart, Dr. Christoph Stoll