ΜΕΤΑ

Volunteer translators as 'committed individuals' or 'providers of free labor'? The discursive construction of 'volunteer translators' in a commercial online learning platform translation controversy

Ji-Hae Kang and Jung-Wook Hong

Explore this journal

Article abstract

This study explores the ways in which volunteer translation in a commercial context is discursively constructed. It focuses on volunteer translation at Coursera, one of the world's largest MOOC providers, and its volunteer translator community, launched in 2014 to offer online learning in multiple languages. This move to mobilize volunteer translators by Coursera, a for-profit company, became controversial as different parties voiced distinct opinions regarding a commercial company's recruitment of volunteer translators. Using the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework and drawing on the notion of *digital labor*, this paper argues that volunteer translation is described by Coursera mostly in terms of a mission and a learner-initiated and community-building activity. This contrasts with the view of many social critics who tend to emphasize profit-making strategies, labor exploitation, and the degradation of the translation profession in their discursive construction of volunteer translation. This study shows that Coursera's foregrounding of a moral rationale and of philanthropic and non-profit discourses blurs the boundary between for-profit and non-profit contexts and does the ideological work of naturalizing translation without financial compensation in the context of a commercial company.

Volunteer translators as 'committed individuals' or 'providers of free labor'? The discursive construction of 'volunteer translators' in a commercial online learning platform translation controversy

JI-HAE KANG
Ajou University, Suwon, South Korea
jihaekang@ajou.ac.kr

JUNG-WOOK HONG
Ajou University, Suwon, South Korea
hongjungwook@gmail.com

RÉSUMÉ

Cette étude explore la manière dont les discours sur la traduction bénévole se construisent par une entreprise commerciale. Elle s'intéresse au projet de la traduction bénévole chez Coursera, l'une des plus grandes plateformes MOOC. Lancé en 2014, ce projet a pour but de faire traduire bénévolement des cours de Coursera en plusieurs langues. S'agissant d'une entreprise à but lucratif, cette initiative a créé une vive polémique et les avis divergent sur la question de savoir si une entreprise commerciale peut mobiliser à des fins lucratives des traducteurs bénévoles. S'appuyant sur le cadre de l'analyse critique du discours (CDA) et sur la notion de «travail numérique», cette étude soutient que la traduction bénévole est présentée, par Coursera, principalement en termes de mission, d'activité débutée à l'initiative de ses utilisateurs afin de renforcer un sentiment d'appartenance communautaire. Pourtant, certains critiquent cette initiative, en signalant le modèle économique de l'entreprise, les stratégies de rentabilité, l'exploitation de main-d'œuvre et la dégradation de la profession de traducteur. L'étude démontre que le discours de Coursera, insistant sur l'aspect moral et philanthropique du projet, brouille la frontière entre lucratif et non-lucratif, puis naturalise la traduction par un travail idéologique, sans aucune compensation financière pour les traducteurs.

ABSTRACT

This study explores the ways in which volunteer translation in a commercial context is discursively constructed. It focuses on volunteer translation at Coursera, one of the world's largest MOOC providers, and its volunteer translator community, launched in 2014 to offer online learning in multiple languages. This move to mobilize volunteer translators by Coursera, a for-profit company, became controversial as different parties voiced distinct opinions regarding a commercial company's recruitment of volunteer translators. Using the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework and drawing on the notion of *digital labor*, this paper argues that volunteer translation is described by Coursera mostly in terms of a mission and a learner-initiated and community-building activity. This contrasts with the view of many social critics who tend to emphasize profit-making strategies, labor exploitation, and the degradation of the translation profession in their discursive construction of volunteer translation. This study shows that Coursera's foregrounding of a moral rationale and of philanthropic and non-profit discourses blurs the boundary between for-profit and non-profit contexts and does the ideological work

of naturalizing translation without financial compensation in the context of a commercial company.

RESUMEN

Este estudio indaga en la forma en que se construye, discursivamente y en un contexto comercial, la noción del voluntariado de traducción. En concreto nos centramos aquí en el caso de Coursera, uno de los mayores proveedores de cursos abiertos, masivos y en línea del mundo. La movilización de traductores voluntarios a partir de 2014 por parte de Coursera, una empresa con fines de lucro, se convirtió en una cuestión no exenta de polémica. Utilizando el marco del análisis crítico del discurso (ACD) y basándose en la noción de «trabajo digital», este artículo muestra cómo Coursera describe el voluntariado en tanto que misión iniciada por el estudiante y mediante la que se favorece la construcción identitaria de la comunidad. Esto contrasta con el punto de vista de muchos sectores críticos que lo retratan como un modelo de negocio mundial, con estrategias para la obtención de beneficios, la explotación laboral y la degradación de la profesión. Nuestro estudio sostiene que el hecho de que Coursera ponga en primer plano una lógica moral y haga uso de discursos filantrópicos difumina la frontera entre los contextos con y sin ánimo de lucro, lo cual fomenta el que se naturalice la traducción sin compensación financiera en el contexto de una empresa comercial.

MOTS-CLÉS/KEYWORDS/PALABRAS CLAVE

traduction bénévole, crowdsourcing, éthique, travail numérique, MOOC, plateforme numérique
volunteer translation, crowdsourcing, ethics, digital labour, MOOC, digital platform
traducción voluntaria, crowdsourcing, ética, trabajo digital, MOOC, plataforma digital

1. Introduction

Volunteer translators have played a crucial role in various global initiatives that depend on the process of translingual production and dissemination of knowledge for their successful implementation. They have enabled speakers of different languages to engage in dialogue and have empowered marginalized groups to have access to information and knowledge, thereby contributing to the promotion of linguistic and social justice. As individuals who may or may not have formal training as translators, yet translate texts with little or no financial compensation, these translators are increasingly being studied by scholars from different disciplinary backgrounds. Within translation studies, there has been a growing research interest in recent years in volunteer translation activities in online environments, even though volunteer translation can occur in any environment. Online volunteer translation, which is the focus of this study, has been approached mostly as an act of translation carried out by enthusiastic amateurs or socially committed people who engage in translation as a form of social responsibility, self-fulfillment, enjoyment activism (Olohan 2014; Pérez-González and Susam-Saraeva 2012; Jiménez-Crespo 2017a). Diverse topics have been studied in relation to volunteer translation, ranging from motivation for participation (Olohan 2014; O'Brien and Schäler 2010) and social responsibility (Drugan and Tipton 2017) to translation quality (Jiménez-Crespo 2017b; Drugan 2013) and political engagement (Boéri and Maier 2010; Baker 2013).

Although volunteering may occur in all sectors of the economy, researchers have generally focused on the non-profit sector as the locus of volunteer activities, as

exemplified in studies of activist communities or NGOs (for instance, Boéri and Maier 2010). Considering that volunteering is commonly viewed as "unpaid non-compulsory work; that is, time individuals give without pay to activities performed either through an organization or directly for others outside their own household"[1] and that "unpaid" work is frequently understood in relation to "charitable" or "non-profit" institutions (Jenner 1982; American Red Cross 1988[2]),[3] the focus on the non-profit sector is hardly surprising. However, unpaid translation work carried out by volunteers has recently been increasing within the context of business settings and commercial organizations. The increasing mobilization of volunteer translators by commercial institutions raises the need to interrogate how the institutional environment impacts perceptions about volunteer translation.

High profile companies such as Facebook and Twitter have adopted the crowd-sourced translation model, which relies on volunteer translators, and other companies have followed this lead, mobilizing volunteer translators to meet their translation needs. In 2009, the online professional networking platform LinkedIn sparked a heated debate when it invited its members to complete a survey about their interest in translating its website. In the survey, members were asked to choose the kind of incentive they preferred from a list prepared by LinkedIn. The list, ranged from "because it's fun" to recognition on user profiles and an upgraded LinkedIn account, but did not include monetary compensation. Unsurprisingly, the survey generated criticism for asking its members, many of whom were professional translators, to indicate their intention to translate, without any financial compensation, for a company that promotes itself as being dedicated to professionalism.

Many translation practitioners and researchers responded to this incident. A LinkedIn group called *Translators against Crowdsourcing by Commercial Businesses* was formed shortly afterwards, and the resentment shared by many professional translators at the time was aptly summarized in a professional translator's blog[4] with the following remarks: "LinkedIn has always marketed itself as a professional site, but now it is treating its professional members (translators) as non-professionals" and "LinkedIn isn't asking its accountants for free accounting services or PR folks to do its market research and publicity work for free. Why then do they think it is ok to ask translators to offer their services for free?" In 2015, the Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (FIT), a key international association of translators and interpreters, released a position statement regarding crowdsourcing within translation, interpreting, and terminology services. In this statement, the association stated that crowdsourcing is "disrupt[ing] the organization of labor and professional status of industry practitioners."[5]

Meanwhile, translation researchers, such as McDonough Dolmaya (2011: 106), have argued that crowdsourcing "devalues the work involved in the translation process and contributes to lowering the occupational status of professional translators," despite the potential for enhancing the visibility of translation, translation's value to society, and non-financial benefits for participants. García (2012: 376), citing Kelly (2009),[6] pointed out that the LinkedIn case showed that "[i]f the crowd feels like it is being exploited, the model doesn't work."

The incident brought attention to the connection between volunteer translation and feelings of (not) "being exploited," but the discussion was not taken any further. Although people are arbiters of their own exploitation and have their own understanding of what counts as unfair, they may not feel like they are "being exploited"

when they "click on 'agree' from the safety of their home, without being physically coerced into work or the free labor is predominantly perceived as a fun pastime, even though someone else makes a huge profit from it" (Schmidt 2013: 532). Furthermore, crowdsourcing initiatives, even in commercial contexts, are typically connected to values (equal opportunity, global connectedness or universal access to information) or affect (passion for a particular technology, product or service) that have resonance for the participants, so the feelings of "being exploited" may not be readily experienced on the part of volunteer translators. While volunteers may focus on helping others or taking action based on their passion, the benefits that commercial companies gain in the form of capital accumulation as a result of using volunteer translators may not be clearly detectable. Identifying feelings of "being exploited" becomes even more challenging if the business model of the companies in question involves openness, participation, and equal access to knowledge. Companies, in their description of volunteer translation activities, may also use discursive strategies that foreground a commitment to a social mission and portray the translators' role mainly in terms of helping and supporting others and being part of a mission.

In this study, we investigate the ways in which volunteer translation activity is discursively constructed by a commercial company. This study examines the case of Coursera, an online learning platform launched in 2012. Having more than 35 million registered users and offering more than 2,700 courses as of May 2019, Coursera has become one of the largest online MOOC (massive open online course) providers in the world. The course videos are subtitled by members of Coursera's volunteer translator community. In this study, the discursive strategies that Coursera used to depict volunteer translation is compared with those used by other related actors. Particular emphasis is placed on critical points in the framing of the volunteer translation activity and the ethical problems raised in relation to Coursera's use of specific discursive strategies in the construction of volunteer translation.

2. Volunteer translation, for-profit institutions, and digital labor

Within translation studies, collaborative translingual activities done under free-will in online environments by groups of individuals who utilize participatory Web tools for a cause that is not profit-seeking, and for which there is often below market or no monetary payment, are referred to by numerous terms, including *community transla-tion* (O'Hagan 2011), *user-generated translation* (Perrino 2009), *crowdsourcing* or *crowdsourced translation* (McDonough Dolmaya 2012), *wiki-translation* (Cronin 2013), *non-professional translation* (Pérez-González and Susam-Saraeva 2012), and *volunteer translation* (Pym 2011). Pym regards these terms as being generally synonymous and suggests using *volunteer translation* instead of *crowdsourcing*, *collaborative translation* or *community translation* for the reason that they all refer to a "group translating where the work is largely voluntary (i.e. unpaid in financial terms)" and the central issue is whether "monetary payment [is] received (or not received) by the translator" (Pym 2011: 97). However, as the activities referred to by these terms continue to evolve and become more heterogeneous, researchers have attempted to identify the distinguishing features and conceptual boundaries between them (Jiménez-Crespo 2017a, 2019).

When *crowdsourced translation* is considered in relation to *volunteer translation*, some significant differences in meaning and usage may be identified. *Crowdsourcing*,

consisting of *crowd* and *sourcing*, refers to the process of harnessing the wisdom of the crowd in order to accomplish a task. Usually initiated by communities, businesses or other organizations, the process involves the outsourcing of a task to a group of individuals of varying knowledge (amateurs and experts), many of whom participate without financial compensation. As such, crowdsourcing is often viewed as a "business practice" (Howe 2008), "problem-solving model" (Brabham 2008: 76) or "process of organizing labor" (Whitla 2009:16). Although crowdsourcing may be subcategorized into "crowdsourcing with a monetary incentive" and "crowdsourcing without a monetary incentive" (Schmidt 2013: 531), compensation is often significantly below market rates, if any, and dependent on the qualifications or performance of participants. As the case of Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn have shown, the crowdsourced translation model that captures the interest of many commercial companies seems to be one that does not entail financial compensation to translators.[7]

Volunteering, on the other hand, has historically played an important role in meeting the needs of people in communities and societies, especially in times when government capacity was limited and private wealth lacking (Starr and Curry 1992). Citizens voluntarily collaborated to address social problems and nonprofits were established to provide services that neither government nor businesses would or could effectively provide. As such, volunteering is historically a humanistic, as well as a social and political, concept consistent with egalitarian principles and involving activities that provide potential benefits for both volunteers and service organizations. In many instances, it is different from participating in a crowdsourcing initiative, which tends to be more closely related to technological or business problem-solving. Crowdsourcing is a means for task completion that utilizes collective intelligence and digital technology and an increase in crowdsourcing initiatives has led to diversification of its form and functions. Although both volunteering and crowdsourcing may occur within non-profit or for-profit contexts, crowdsourcing in commercial contexts, especially in relation to software development, architecture, design, and funding projects, has become widespread (Schlagwein and Bjørn-Andersen 2014). In line with such developments, crowdsourced translation within the context of commercial companies is increasingly being regarded as part of the translation landscape, as shown by subcategorizations of crowdsourced translation based on the criteria of 'nonprofit' and 'for-profit' contexts within which translation activity is carried out (Flanagan 2016; Dombek 2014).

Due to the features shared by volunteer translation and crowdsourced translation (for example, a lack of financial compensation, participation based on affect, and people-centeredness in the work process), as well as the evolving nature of online translation practices in general, it is becoming increasingly difficult to identify the differences between the two terms. This difficulty, however, seems to have the effect of weakening people's awareness of the ethical problems associated with translation work without financial compensation in commercial contexts. Furthermore, the responsibility for translation work seems to be transferred onto volunteers and users of the translation under such circumstances, despite the fact that in most commercial cases those who ultimately benefit financially (commercial company) should bear the lion's share of the responsibility (translation cost).

Distinguishing whether an institution that utilizes volunteering is a for-profit or nonprofit organization is neither easy nor straightforward (Dees and Anderson 2003).

The categories of for-profit and nonprofit organizations respectively encompass diverse organizational forms and functions and are thus heterogeneous. However, the approaches to the study of organizations and institutions that focus on the differences among nonprofit, for-profit, and public institutions emphasize the distinction in their main goals. Whereas an appropriate return on invested capital for its shareholders is given the highest priority for for-profits, helping community (and in many cases being concerned with profit-making only to the extent that it is necessary to operate) is the main concern for nonprofits (Epstein and McFarlan 2011).[8] Meanwhile, public institutions focus on public interests and values, prioritizing upholding democratic principles, constitutional values, and public welfare (Christensen and Lægreid 2007).[9] Furthermore, the aspect of nonprofits, which is considered to be the most prominent, especially compared to for-profits, is their commitment to a *mission*, often providing services that neither the government nor for-profits are able or willing to offer. Thus, nonprofit organizations have a

> […] distinct mandate to be good stewards of the resources they receive *toward the pursuit of their mission*, whether those resources come in as philanthropic dollars, government contracts and grants, membership dues, or earned income through revenue-generating activities. (Tschirhart and Bielefeld 2012: 3; our emphasis)

More recently, however, the distinction between for-profit and nonprofit institutions has been breaking down. Commercial enterprises are interested in distributing not only profits but also social goods to constituencies other than their shareholders, as evidenced by an increasing emphasis on *corporate social responsibility*, *social capital*, and *trust* in business discourses (Shamir 2008). The *value-oriented* culture both within the company and in relation to its multiple stakeholders is being espoused in unprecedented ways. Meanwhile, nonprofit organizations are increasingly adopting the strategies, concepts, and practices of the business world. They have become more business-like by finding ways to generate fees for services rendered. This "sector-bending," which refers to "approaches, activities, and relationships that are blurring the distinctions between nonprofit and for-profit organizations, either because they are behaving more similarly, operating in the same realms, or both" (Dees and Anderson 2003: 16),[10] makes it difficult to identify whether an institution is for-profit or nonprofit. The fuzzy boundary becomes particularly problematic when the mobilization of volunteer translators by for-profit companies is considered.

When volunteer translation is examined from the perspective of the commercial company, issues related to real and potential benefits to the company emerge. The motive behind the increase in crowdsourced translation within commercial contexts has been discussed in connection to a number of factors[11]; however, it is economic considerations in the digital era that have been seen as the most significant motivation for a company's embrace of crowdsourcing. The cost of crowdsourcing, which is dependent on volunteer translators, is generally understood as being substantially lower than having translation done by professionals. Jiménez-Crespo (2017b), for example, citing Munro's (2013) report, states that the cost of a crowdsourcing initiative is only 20 percent of that of using professional translators, although DePalma and Kelly (2011) report that the cost of creating and managing a crowdsourcing platform might be the same as the cost of using professional translation services. Others have also pointed out that platform creation and maintenance is "a relatively

cheap solution" (Anastasiou and Gupta 2011: 640) compared to professional translation services. Trained staff may be needed to implement a platform in the initial stages, but less maintenance is needed for a basic crowdsourcing translation platform.

Most crowdsourcing initiatives are "performed through dedicated web platforms that are initiated by companies or organizations and in which participants collaborate with motivations other than strictly monetary ones" (Jiménez-Crespo 2017b: 479). Commercial companies with digital platforms are able to financially benefit from the value-adding activities of volunteers. Thus, the development of digital technology, which has enabled the crowd, including both amateurs and experts, to collaboratively complete tasks (including translation tasks) through digital platforms, has made employment conditions more precarious and has prioritized platform and customer needs over worker needs.

Researchers examining the realm of the political economy of networked new media technologies have focused on the negative impact of the coordination of labor through the use of digital technologies (Burston, Dyer-Witheford, *et al.* 2010; Fuchs and Dyer-Witheford 2013). As value in the digital era is created by users and audiences through digital technologies, these users and audiences can be considered digital workers on the platform. However, in many cases, their work on the platform remains unpaid or underpaid. Although there may be some exceptions, the involvement of users, audiences, consumers, and fans in the creation of content is not typically recognized as work (Scholz 2017). Using the term *digital labor* to refer to value-adding activities performed on platforms, these scholars focus on the changes in the perception of work and labor in the digital age and the ways in which increasing participation in activities weakens or even nullifies the distinction between work and play. The consequences of changes in the perception of work and labor in the digitally connected world are described by Scholz as follows:

> Our online identity, so eagerly performed, has a curious afterlife in faraway data centers where subjectivities and data are turned into monetary value. Without being recognized as labour, our location, expressions, and time spent on the network can be turned into economic value. The tracking and monetization of users is frequently justified with the significant operating costs of platform operators. It is unclear, however, what exactly is recorded, how its value is measured, to whom it is sold, and for what purpose. (Scholz 2017: 69)

The changes have impacted not only translation but also many other fields including journalism, music, and manufacturing. Volunteers taking part in crowdsourced initiatives and providing digital labor on platforms are susceptible to exploitation as there is "no minimum wage, no labor regulation, no governmental jurisdiction" (Rushkoff 2016: 50) in crowdsourcing. As an increasing number of people possess foreign language skills and are willing to share skills in collaborative problem solving and the circulation of ideas, translation lends itself readily to crowdsourcing projects initiated by commercial companies.

3. Case study: Coursera's global translation community and the discursive construction of volunteer translation

In the following, we examine the discursive strategies used by Coursera in describing volunteer translation and translators. This is done by comparing the ways in which

volunteer translation is discursively constructed by volunteer translators and the general public, in addition to Coursera. Coursera is an online learning platform that offers MOOCs, specializations, and degrees to learners around the world.[12] It was launched as a for-profit company in 2012 by two Stanford professors, Andrew Ng and Daphne Koller, and offers online courses on subjects that range from medicine and data science to humanities and social sciences. The company started out with $22 million in investment from venture capitalists,[13] but as of April 2019 its valuation stood at $1.7 billion.[14] Coursera is described as belonging to the category of "EdTech, Education, Enterprise, Internet," according to Crunchbase, a platform that offers business information about private and public companies, and as of April 2019, Coursera's estimated annual revenue was $140 million.[15]

Coursera has 35 million users and it partners with more than 150 universities, offering more than 2,700 courses. Many courses were offered for free to learners, but the number of free courses has rapidly decreased in recent years. In a report on Coursera written for Class Central's MOOC Roundup Series, Shah (2017)[16] states: "Coursera has pushed its learners aggressively towards paying for more and more features, many of which were initially offered for free." Coursera also offers 250 specializations (a sequence of online courses designed to enable learners to master a particular topic) and four degrees, neither of which are free.[17]

MOOCs, however, are typically considered to be free, and as a university slogan "A Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) is a way to help you learn for FREE"[18] shows, MOOC providers are characterized as allowing unlimited participation and open access via the Web. Thus, the assumption is often made that online education companies that own and operate learning platforms are nonprofit organizations. However, out of the three largest online learning platforms in the world, Coursera and UDACITY are for-profit and the remaining, edX, is a not-for-profit. For Coursera, revenue sources include employee training in commercial enterprises, subscriptions, certification, and human tutoring amongst others. In 2017, Coursera had partnerships with more than 500 companies, which was a dramatic increase from 30 in the previous year (Shah 2017). It has also continued to monetize its user base, as the number of paying users on Coursera grew by 70% in 2017 compared to 2016.[19]

The lectures are subtitled by volunteer translators belonging to the Global Translator Community (GTC) at Coursera. Launched on April 28, 2014, the community is responsible for translating course video subtitles, mostly from English into more than 65 languages. Following Coursera's announcement of the launch of GTC, social critics, educators, journalists, professional translators, and social media users have responded to and commented on this news. In this process, diverse meanings of volunteer translation and translators were constructed and circulated.

3.1. Framework of analysis

In this study, we use Fairclough's (1992, 1995, 2005) critical discourse analysis (CDA) framework. For Fairclough (2005: 924), discourse is "an element of social processes and social events, and also an element of relatively durable social practice." He proposes viewing discourse from three different dimensions: discourse as texts (written, spoken or other semiotic modalities), discourse practice (production and interpretation of texts), and discourse as a form of social practice (circulation of discourse),

which are inter-dependent rather than discrete. Focusing on the "relational way of seeing linguistic/semiotic elements of social events and practice as interconnected with other elements," the framework aims at not simply analyzing discourse per se but examining "the relations between discourse and non-discoursal elements of the social, in order to reach a better understanding of these complex relations (including how changes in discourse can cause changes in other elements)" (Fairclough 2005: 924). Hence, CDA is a problem-oriented and context-sensitive framework, which mainly takes on issues related to ideology, power, and dominance.

Translation researchers have used the CDA framework to examine discursive strategies adopted in the process of translating/interpreting, as well as to interrogate discourses on translating/interpreting in institutional contexts that range from media enterprises to non-governmental organizations (Kang 2007; Pan 2015; Zhang and Pan 2015; Maltby 2010). However, corporate discourse on translation in general, and on volunteer translation in particular, has not been analyzed using the CDA framework. Thus, the current study employs the CDA framework to analyze how volunteer translation is ideologically constructed, promoted, and transformed in Coursera's discourse, which is intertwined with the discourses of other related actors. Focus is given to interpreting how volunteer translation is socially and ideologically conceptualized and evaluated via dialectical relations and discursive strategies through texts.

3.2. Data collection

The data for this study consist of texts related to Coursera's volunteer translation gathered from websites, magazine articles, news articles, blogs, and different types of social media, such as Facebook and Twitter. Google's search engine was used to collect data, using the keywords *Coursera+volunteer, Coursera+translate/translator/ translation/translating, Coursera+volunteer+translate/translator/translation/translating, Coursera+GTC/ Global Translator Community*, and *Coursera+volunteer+GTC/ Global Translator Community*. Coursera's official website,[20] blog,[21] and community blog[22] were also used to collect texts on Coursera's announcement of the GTC initiative, related information, and featured interviews of Coursera's GTC translators. In addition, related texts were collected from social media (Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter), many of which were linked to Coursera's main platform. In order to collect data which were more relevant to the focus of research, this study selected texts specifically addressing the GTC initiative, its translators or translation activities at Coursera that had been uploaded or published over a period of three years since Coursera's public announcement of its launch of the GTC via Coursera's community website on April 28, 2014.

The collected data were divided into three categories: Coursera's voice, the GTC translators' voice, and public voices. The categorization was based on the stated or assumed identity of speakers or writers. In the case of public voices, diverse views and beliefs on volunteer translation were identified, as the category includes opinions by not only ordinary users and commenters but also by specialists and professionals (translators, social critics, educators, journalists). As Coursera's official website and community blog continue to be updated and restructured, many of its previously uploaded postings, including the interview texts of GTC translators, were no longer available at the time of writing this paper.

3.3. Findings

3.3.1. Coursera's voice

In the following, we examine the discursive strategies used by Coursera to construct volunteer translation by analyzing the examples taken from a post entitled "Introducing Coursera's New Global Translator Community," uploaded by Coursera on its blog on April 28, 2014.[23]

> 1) Join us in this unifying mission to provide education access to everyone with Coursera's new Global Translator Community.
>
> Coursera's mission is to help make a world-class education accessible to anyone. One challenge we face is language: while the majority of our partners teach in English, only 40% of Courserians live in English-speaking countries.

In 1), volunteer translation is portrayed as joining a *mission*, which is not only qualified by *unifying* but also elaborated as *to provide education access to everyone* and *to help make a world-class education accessible to anyone*. By using *community*, *unifying mission*, *provide education access to everyone*, *help make…*, and *partners*, lexical items and phrases typically associated with philanthropy and non-profit activities, Coursera foregrounds ethical and moral aspects of translation activity. Within the context of Coursera, translating is an act that brings people together and upholds values of universal access to education, linguistic justice, and equality. In Coursera's discourse of embarking on a mission, *language* is highlighted as a key barrier or *one challenge*, and volunteer translators are singled out as actors who can remove this challenge and accomplish the mission. Thus, rather than describing what the act of volunteering actually entails (for example, subtitling the lectures, transferring the text from one language into another), Coursera's announcement uses a moral rationale and the logic of social responsibility to represent volunteer translation.

Of particular interest here is how Coursera discursively constructs itself as an ethical entity. In the announcement, Coursera portrays itself as an entity on a *unifying mission* to *make a world-class education accessible to anyone*, despite that it is described by Crunchbase and other databases as belonging to the industry category of "EdTech, Education, Enterprise, Internet." One of the key features of nonprofits is that, compared to for-profits, nonprofits tend to focus on *missions* and to view the pursuit and accomplishment of their missions as their main aim. Coursera's foregrounding of *mission* thus may be analyzed as a *hijacking* of the nonprofit discourse.

The use of discursive strategies that signal *in-group* and community-building is also found in 1). The translation audience is referred to as *Courserians* instead of *learners*, *audiences* or *consumers*, which may be analyzed as Coursera's strategy to discursively portray potential learners (consumers) as part of the Coursera community. The professors/lecturers are referred to as *our partners*, which may also be analyzed in terms of Coursera's practice of explicitly signaling that entities are given either *in-group* or *out-group* status. The strategies highlight two points: that people who become Coursera translators will become part of the community and that people will benefit from translation. These translators are not just learners in some part of the world but actual community members, thus possibly making volunteer work more personal and immediate.

In Example 2), taken from the same Coursera blog post, Coursera discursively constructs volunteer translation as a self-initiated activity organized by Coursera's learners.

2) Like many things here at Coursera, the GTC emerged from our learners. In classes ranging from Machine Learning to Social Psychology, we noticed learners spontaneously organizing to translate lecture subtitles for the benefit of their classmates. At the same time, we heard many Courserians asking us for even more translations.

The highlighting of the agentive role of *learners* in *the GTC emerged from our learners*, which is also emphasized by the marked thematization of *Like many things here at Coursera*, effectively hides Coursera's role in mobilizing volunteers to translate its contents on its platform. Furthermore, *learners* are not only initiators and actors of translation but also requestors and targets/recipients of translation. As the need for translation is attributed to *many Courserians* in *many Courserians [are] asking us for even more translations*, the urgency of translation is directly linked to *the benefit of their classmates*.

Coursera positions itself as an observer or supporter of Coursera learners. This is realized by the respective use of noticed and heard in we noticed learners spontaneously organizing to translate lecture subtitles, and we heard many Courserians asking us for even more translations, both of which are followed by the ideas or actions of learners. The translation needs of Coursera, the financial beneficiary of volunteer translation activities, are backgrounded.

The following example, also from the same post, shows how Coursera portrays the qualifications of volunteer translators and the benefits of translating at Coursera.

3) Now, anyone can contribute translations by signing up on our translation page. New translators will be directed to an online portal, which features active translations projects, translations resources, and ways to interact with other community members and the Coursera team.

Volunteer translation is represented as being open to anyone who gains membership to the GTC. By explicitly stating that no special qualifications are required to become a volunteer, realized by *anyone can contribute translations*, Coursera encourages any user interested in translating or volunteering to sign up.[24] Amateurs with or without experience may be regarded as being invited by Coursera, although subtitling a lecture actually requires an extensive understanding of the subject matter, a high level of language and translation competence, and a great deal of time and effort. Furthermore, the benefits of community membership are described in terms of gaining access to an online portal that features active translations projects, translations resources, and ways to interact with other community members and the Coursera team. Coursera foregrounds the openness of the community and the benefits of becoming a member, which may be viewed as a move to generate wide-ranging interest in volunteering.

3.3.2. GTC translators' voice

The GTC translator interview texts[25] were taken from the interview entries that had been uploaded on Coursera's community website. A total of 17 translator interview entries, uploaded between 2016 and 2017, were made accessible on the website. Written by the translators in response to five or six questions seemingly posed by the

community or Coursera, the entries reveal diversity in the language background of interviewed translators (Chinese, Hindi, Portuguese, Arabic, Spanish, Russian, Albanian, Ukrainian, French, Filipino, and Bulgarian). Each interview generally starts with questions about personal information, such as "Please introduce yourself" and "What courses have you helped translate?," followed by questions on GTC experiences, motivations, and benefits, which include "What motivated you to translate for the GTC?," "How has translating through the GTC benefitted your life?," and "What was a memorable experience in interacting with other GTC translators?." Hence, the content of interview questions and the structure of interview entries seem to have been customized in ways that would lead to answers that support or are in line with Coursera's voice. The entries were also followed by numerous comments from community members, mostly expressing support for or agreeing with the interviewees, showing the community's solidarity. Accordingly, the contents of the interviews seem to be interdiscursively formed and parallel to the meanings created in Coursera's discourse.

In the following, comments by GTC translators in response to interview questions are analyzed to reveal their views on volunteer translation.

4) My aim is to help people who don't speak English to have the opportunity to learn from wonderful courses taught by top professors. It is very gratifying to help people around the world. It's amazing to see that anyone with internet access can reach information from the most prestigious universities in world, freely, in their own language. "I hope more learners can join us, and together, we can make the world a better place."

In 4), which is from an interview of a Brazilian Portuguese GTC translator posted on Coursera's community blog uploaded on April 27, 2017, volunteer translation is portrayed as an act of helping others and effecting changes, as shown by *My aim is to help people and we can make the world a better place*. This view of volunteer translation as a moral and social responsibility is similar to that found in Coursera's announcement in 1), although the perspectivization has shifted in 4). Here the GTC translator is speaking as an experiencer providing a personal description, using *My aim is…*, *It is very gratifying to…*, *It's amazing to see…*, and *I hope…*.

Out of 17 GTC translators interviewed, 15 mention volunteer translation as an act of helping others, emphasizing that doing so is the reason for their participation. From the collected corpus, 12 occurrences of structural patterns similar to *we can make the world a better place* in 4) are found. Furthermore, 12 instances of clauses were found with *we*, *I*, and *translation* appearing as an agent followed by the causative verb *make*, used to cause positive social changes such as *the world a better place*, *the world's best education accessible in other languages*, and *education more accessible for my fellow citizens*. Also, these instrumental actions maximize the volunteers' satisfaction and affect, as evaluated through such expressions as *amazing* and *very gratifying*.

In Examples 5) and 6), respectively taken from an interview of a Hindi GTC translator (March 2, 2017) and a Filipino translator (April 14, 2016), volunteer translation is discursively constructed as a learning experience.

5) Interactions with my Language Coordinator are some of my most memorable experiences as a translator. When I first started translating, I did not know how to type in Hindi but my LC [language coordinator] helped me. The most difficult

aspect about translating from English into Hindi is paying attention to the punctuation marks, but I am very grateful to my language coordinator who is always there to guide me through it. I am not be exaggerating when I say that every translation is a memorable experience for me!

6) I want to meet fellow translators and learn about their strategies on how to translate and manage a team of virtual translators. I also wanted to learn about other cultures, become friends with other people, and learn another language (aside from Filipino).

In 5) and 6), the emphasis given to learning and skills improvement is shown by *When I first started translating, I did not know how to…*, *my LC … helped me…*, *my language coordinator … to guide me*, *learn about other cultures…*. In 6), *learn* is even used three times within two sentences. In both examples, the learning opportunity is viewed as being supported by the community.

In the examples, the translators' view that volunteering provides the opportunity to develop translation competence and acquire project management skills, both of which are required to enter the professional translation industry, is highlighted. The benefits echo those typically associated with internships or volunteering undertaken in relation to particular career choices, such as a better understanding of professional practices, the development of relevant skills, improved networking ability, and enhanced employment opportunities. Examples 5) and 6) show that the non-monetary value of volunteering is apparent in GTC translators' discourse on volunteer translation.

3.3.3. Public voices

Texts produced by the public are analyzed in terms of the ways in which volunteer translation is discursively constructed. This group shows heterogeneous perspectives on Coursera's volunteer translation.

In the following example, volunteer translation is represented as an act of helping others and a learner-initiated activity.

7) Many of the providers offer courses in multiple languages, but the selection is mich [sic] more limited. Coursera wants to change that. After watching learnings [sic] spontaneously organize to create translations of their videos, they decided to throw some resources behind a program to get even more courses translated, and they are looking for help.

In 7), which is from a post entitled "Today's Webtip: Global Translator Community" (Dempsey 2014) published on an Austrian radio broadcast website, volunteer translation is portrayed as enabling Coursera's mission to help others and provide access to education. Coursera is described as an agent in the act of bringing about social change in *Coursera wants to change that*. At the same time, Coursera is presented as a sponsor and observer in the organization of translation activities in *After watching learnings spontaneously organize to create translations* and *they decided to throw some resources behind a program*. Example 7) shows parallels with Coursera's discourse, as shown in Examples 1) and 2). Both volunteer translation and Coursera are represented in terms of a sense of mission and moral rationale.

The following example, taken from a post entitled "LSPs Not Needed: Coursera's Approach to Translation" (Faes 2015) on Slator, a web publisher dealing with topics

related to the translation industry and language technology, describes volunteer translation as a business model and a source of profit-making.

8) Translation inevitably plays a crucial role in any international venture, especially one in the scale of Coursera. Unlike most other companies, however, that would generally partner up with a language services provider (LSP), Coursera is paving its own way with the help of partner organizations – which are usually philanthropic foundations or educational institutions – and crowdsourced translation powered by volunteers … Coursera's approach is in line with an increasing number of organizations that leverage direct, technology-enabled crowdsourcing of localization through a large and enthusiastic (read: sometimes willing to work for free) user base. With startups like CrowdIn getting serious traction and hitting 500,000 users recently, incumbent LSPs and tech vendors ignore this trend at their own peril.

Example 8) focuses on Coursera's mobilization of volunteers for profit-making purposes. Using lexical items typically associated with business management and the translation industry, such as *international venture*, *companies*, *partner up with a language services provider*, *leverage direct*, *technology-enabled crowdsourcing*, *localization*, *startups*, and *tech vendors*, volunteer translation is represented as a novel business model and Coursera as its creator.

Coursera's "crowdsourced translation" is described as being dependent on "volunteers," as shown in *crowdsourced translation powered by volunteers*, but especially interesting is the elaboration of Coursera's approach that follows this description: *Coursera's approach is in line with … enthusiastic (read: sometimes willing to work for free) user base*. The claim is being made that "crowdsourcing" is carried out by volunteers who provide free labor, which enable the global MOOC provider to enhance its competitiveness. Although Coursera's connection to shared values and non-profit organization and activities is mentioned in *partner organizations – which are usually philanthropic foundations or educational institutions*, the monetary value obtained from mobilizing volunteers is emphasized in the example.

Compared to 8), which describes volunteer translation from a business model perspective (a model cast in a potentially positive light), the following examples present a more critical view of volunteer translation from the perspective of the political economy.

9) It announced this week that it is recruiting skilled translators and asking them to donate their work to the company for free. What the volunteers receive, in lieu of income, is the satisfaction of being a member of Coursera's "community." Translation, says the company, is "much more than a means to an end. By joining the GTC [Global Translator Community], you'll become a member of a tight-knit community of committed individuals and organizations."

10) Rather than pay for services, Coursera uses rhetoric of community and solidarity to recruit volunteers to contribute to their "crowd-translating" project. While no money exchanges hands, these "volunteers" must sign a "Translators Agreement" to ensure that all ownership of produced services transfers to Coursera.

Examples 9) and 10) discursively construct volunteer translation as exploited labor in the age of the platform economy. Example 9) is from a Nicholars Carr's blog post entitled "Sharecropping for Coursera" (Carr 2014) in which Carr, an American writer and a critic of technological utopianism. He describes volunteer translators

as *skilled* individuals asked by Coursera *to donate their work to the company for free*. Citing the language Coursera used to announce the establishment of the GTC (for instance, *being a member of Coursera's "community," Translation… is much more than a means to an end, a member of a tight-knit community of committed individuals*), the example criticizes Coursera's discourse for strategically positioning translators as individuals who take satisfaction in obtaining symbolic recognition and community membership in exchange for their translation work. The substitution of financial compensation with community membership is emphasized by the use of affect in the *satisfaction of being…*. This highlights the manipulative nature of the value sharing and community-building discourse used by Coursera to describe volunteer translation.

Example 10), a post entitled "From Mega-Machines to Mega-Algorithms" (Sadowski 2015) from The New Inquiry website, also describes volunteer translation as unpaid work, as shown in the use of *Rather than pay for services…* and *While no money exchanges hands…*. Yet, despite the fact that monetary compensation is not provided, Coursera's volunteers are subject to legal obligations that go beyond typical duties, as evidenced by the mention of the "Translators Agreement"[26] that outlines the terms and conditions of Coursera's ownership of the product, translation quality management, confidentiality, and the lack of monetary payment. A contrast is found between *rhetoric of community* and *solidarity and sign[ing] a "Translators Agreement."* Although Coursera's discourse foregrounds mission and community, in practice volunteers seem to be required to sign an agreement that guarantees the transfer of all ownership of services produced by translators to Coursera. Although volunteer agreements may include responsibilities related to volunteering (such as, fulfilling volunteer roles, upholding procedures and confidentiality), 10) suggests that Coursera's actions go beyond typical volunteer agreements.

Examples 11) and 12) contain professional translators' views on Coursera's volunteer translation.

11) As a professional translator, I cannot approve of this. If this were a really altruist, selfless initiative it would be all right for me. Unfortunately, they are proposing you to work for free for a private company which will make money from your intellectual effort without offering anything in exchange. Your work will only make the world a better place for Coursera's owners and shareholders.

12) As a freelance technical translator … translation is a craft and one that is hard to learn, with horrible examples of low quality work all over the Internet … The requirements to take part in the GTC are way too low (self-certified proficiency). This will inevitably result in low quality.

In 11), taken from a post entitled "Education For All: Volunteer In Coursera's Global Translator Community" (Basu 2014) on MakeUseOf website, volunteer translation per se is not the object of criticism; rather, the use of philanthropic and non-profit discourses by a for-profit company to mobilize volunteers to carry out intellectual work without financial compensation is represented as problematic. This is done by contrasting *a really altruist, selfless initiative* and *work for free for a private company which will make money from your intellectual effort without offering anything in exchange*. Example 12) is from a post entitled "What is wrong with Coursera's Global Translator Community and with crowdsourced translation in general" (Bianchi 2014) uploaded to Reddit. In both examples, the perspective of professional

translator is highlighted by the thematization of *As a professional translator* and *As a freelance technical translator,* and volunteer translation is discursively constructed as intellectual work that requires a high level of expertise and skills.

A different view of volunteer translation is identified in the following examples, which present a positive evaluation of Coursera's volunteer translation, discursively constructing it as a learning experience.

13) …one advantage of this free outsourcing method is that people with no-experience can get experience easily.

14) This is not just about payment. Sure, it's important, but imagine the experience gained from such a project.

15) To prepare them for this context, they must learn how to learn in that same environment. The "global digital classroom" then is the concept that learning takes place in a global context through digital networks. Students who engage in Coursera's global translation project would get practice communicating, collaborating, and creating in the cloud. They would connect to a global network of translators – their own personal learning network.

Examples 13) and 14) are comments posted in response to an article entitled "Coursera Seeks to Create a 'Global Translator Community'" on The Chronicle of Higher Education website. Volunteer translation is portrayed as an opportunity for amateurs without experience to gain practice and experience in translation highlights the non-monetary value of volunteer translation, realized in *one advantage of this free outsourcing method* and *This is not just about payment*. On the other hand, Example 15), which is from a post entitled "Global Learning through MOOC Translation?" (Frost Davis 2014) on Rebecca Frost Davis' blog, presents volunteer translation as a learning experience that relates to broader learning goals, namely learning to connect through digital networks. GTC is represented as an alternative for classroom learning in education (*global digital classroom*), and volunteer translators are portrayed as benefitting from the digital global learning environment (*get[ting] practice [in] communicating, collaborating, and creating in the cloud*). Examples 13)-15) echo the discourse of GTC translators contained in 5) and 6), but conflict with the views of professional translators represented in 11) and 12). The examples all portray volunteer translation as a learning experience, but the knowledge, competence, and skills that could be obtained and developed as a result of volunteering are elaborated in different ways among the public.

4. Discussion and conclusion

This study has examined how Coursera discursively constructs volunteer translation by comparing its portrayal of volunteering with the depiction of volunteer work by GTC translators and the public. In the case of Coursera, volunteer translation is represented in terms of a mission (universal access to education, linguistic justice, and equality), hijacking the discourse of philanthropic and non-profit activities. It is also shown as a learner-initiated activity, with the overt claim being made that the initiators, targets, and beneficiaries of translation are the learners. Furthermore, volunteering is constructed as a community building practice, enabling volunteers to engage with others in the community to effect change. Coursera's discursive work

is in line with its portrayal of itself as a moral entity, embarked on a mission. Notable parallels may be drawn between Coursera's discourse and that of GTC translators, with GTC translators portraying volunteer translation as an act of initiating social change, helping others, and community building. For GTC translators, focus is also given to training and experience in translation, as well as having the opportunity to interact with language coordinators. The most diverse and critical opinion of volunteer translation is found in discussions by the public. The portrayal of volunteer translation ranges from helping others and gaining experience to providing free labor and being a key component of the global business model.

As Coursera's discourse foregrounds morality, social responsibility, and community-building values related to volunteer translation, what is backgrounded is that Coursera makes and consolidates corporate profits as a result of delegating the responsibility of translation to volunteers. By using volunteers, Coursera not only saves translation cost but also earns revenues by tailoring its content to global audiences in their respective languages and gaining more subscribers. Critical opinions concerning Coursera's mobilization of volunteer translators are expressed only by the public (mostly social critics and professional translators). For those that posted negative opinions, the extent of criticism of Coursera's use of volunteers differs, ranging from emphasis of translation as intellectual work requiring a high level of expertise to condemnations of Coursera's use of translators' uncompensated labor for profit-making. Unsurprisingly, no mention of unfairness or exploitation is made by GTC translators, as most of their comments, which are in response to interview questions, are uploaded on their community blog. Although it is not known whether their comments were edited by anyone, this study found numerous words and phrases used by Coursera being repeated by volunteer translators, forming intertextual chains between Coursera and GTC translators.

The diverse opinions of different voices concerning volunteer translation show that the issue of volunteering in the platform economy is complex. When GTC translators or the public describe volunteer translation participation in terms of making a difference and connecting with peers and experts, their position may be related to their view of translators as active participants in the media landscape, engaged in cultural production and exercising citizenship. Also, when volunteer translation is portrayed as a learning experience and a source of training, this view may be based on the belief that volunteering is a rational career investment with a payoff. From the perspective of business pundits, a global company's mobilization of volunteer translators may be a rational business decision in that the company can enhance the financial position of shareholders while enabling volunteers to *do good* and offer recognition for their contribution, as well as allow them to gain much needed experience.

In a discussion of what counts as fair or unfair volunteering, however, the ways in which Coursera, a commercial firm, approaches, portrays, and uses volunteer translation are clearly problematic, because translation activity, which involves cultural and technological work in the form of digital labor, serves a global business enterprise without any financial compensation. Although non-monetary benefits are mentioned, volunteers' subtitling of lectures in different languages contributes, both directly and indirectly, to the earning of profits and financial position of its shareholders. More importantly, Coursera's use of discourses of moral and social responsibility, with the effect of blurring the boundary between for-profit and nonprofit

institutions when in fact Coursera is a for-profit company, raises ethical concerns. That Coursera is an online learning platform further ambiguates the boundary, given that MOOC providers are generally understood to serve broader social goals and causes. Meanwhile, the distinction between production and consumption, labor and culture, in relation to translation activity becomes fuzzy as a result of Coursera's use of discourses of self-initiation and autonomy on the part of translators. Coursera carefully highlights non-coercion by explicitating that translation activities are learner-initiated, even though invitations for participation are disseminated widely to non-learners and non-members. Particularly worrying about Coursera's discourse is the ideological work involved in naturalizing translation without financial compensation in the context of a commercial company. Thus, volunteering for Coursera may not be *experienced as exploitation*; nonetheless, Coursera engages in commercial and even exploitative use of the donated effort of translators and packages these efforts in discourses of giving and moral acts.

The findings suggest that volunteer translation in commercial contexts is an intricate issue involving discursive, economic, social, and technological factors. An understanding and portrayal of volunteer translation is connected to changing perceptions on translation and work, evolving economic and social situations, and digital technology, as well as the broader "economic experimentation with the creation of monetary value out of knowledge/culture/affect" (Terranova 2013: 36). As more organizations turn to translation and embrace volunteer translation as an effective way to involve and reach global consumers, there is a need for academia and industry to include translation-related issues in discussions concerning the ethical and responsible behavior of companies in the use of digital platforms that go beyond legal compliance. Translation researchers and practitioners should urge commercial organizations to examine their new responsibilities related to the ways in which they capture and use pools of social and cultural knowledge. Crowdsourced translation without financial compensation should also be included in discussions concerning ethical consequences of problematic commercial use of such knowledge.

Meanwhile, it is important that people considering volunteering make informed decisions. An awareness of specific conditions and contexts of their volunteering activity and the effects of their actions are now significant issues that need to be considered. This is needed even if the organizations for which they are considering volunteering clearly espouse values that have resonance for them. In future research, the ways in which volunteer translation is being used in other fast-growing, large-scale for-profit institutions need to be examined so that the findings from this study could be examined from a broader context. Furthermore, there is a need for research comparing discourses on volunteer translation among nonprofit, for-profit and public organizations. These studies would offer much needed empirical evidence for raising awareness on this issue in industry and academia and for more interesting and critical research projects to follow on the ethics of volunteer translation.

NOTES

1. ILO (2011): *Manual on the Measurement of Volunteer Work*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 13.
2. American Red Cross (1988): *Volunteer 2000 Study: Findings and Recommendations*. Vol. 1. Washington, DC: American Red Cross.
3. For example, Jenner (1982: 30) defines *volunteer* as "a person who, out of free will and without wages, works for *a not-for-profit organization* which is formally organized and has as its purpose service to someone or something other than its membership" (our emphasis). The American Red Cross (1988: III-11; see note 3) provides a similar definition of volunteers: "individuals who reach out beyond the confines of paid employment and normal responsibilities to contribute time and service to *a nonprofit cause* in the belief that their activity is beneficial to others as well as satisfying for themselves" (our emphasis).
4. Sommer, Jill (16 June 2009): Translators against Crowdsourcing by Commercial Businesses. *Musings from an overworked translator*. Consulted on 3 January 2017, <https://translationmusings.com/2009/06/16/translators-against-crowdsourcing-by-commercial-businesses/>.
5. Fédération internationale des traducteurs (FIT) (1 April 2015): FIT Position Statement on Crowdsourcing of Translation, Interpreting and Terminology Services. *FIT-IFT*. Consulted on 1 October 2015, <https://www.fit-ift.org/fit-position-statement-on-crowdsourcing-of-translation-interpreting-and-terminology-services/>.
6. Kelly, Nataly (June 19 2009): Freelance Translators Clash with LinkedIn over Crowdsourced Translations. *Common Sense Advisory Blogs*. Consulted on 1 October 2015, <https://web.archive.org/web/20170518021833/http://www.commonsenseadvisory.com/Default.aspx?Contenttype=ArticleDetAD&tabID=63&Aid=591&moduleId=391>.
7. Crowdsourced translation has been characterized as an activity initiated within the community itself and implemented on the basis of horizontal rather than vertical relationships (Jiménez-Crespo 2017a). However, these characteristics do not change the fact that crowdsourced translation initiatives carried out by volunteers for commercial companies lead to monetary gains for these companies.
8. Epstein, Marc and McFarlan, Warren (2011): Nonprofit vs. For-Profit Boards: Critical Differences. *Strategic Finance*. 92(9):28-35. Consulted on 29 March 2020, <https://sfmagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/sfarchive/2011/03/Nonprofit-vs.-For-Profit-Boards-Critical-Differences.pdf>.
9. Other differences may be found in ownership, internal structure, incentive systems, reporting processes, tax exemption, financing, organization-external environment interaction, and others (Tschirhart and Bielefeld 2012).
10. The "public-private partnership" is also being embraced as an effective organizational form in many fields, further making it difficult for ordinary people to understand the for-profit or nonprofit status of an organization. Thus, an institution may be public in some respects and private in others.
11. The production of multilingual content in a short span of time and higher web traffic are regarded by researchers as other reasons for companies to adopt crowdsourced translation.
12. *Coursera* (2020): Visited on 7 March 2020, <https://www.coursera.org/>.
13. Yuan, Li and Powell, Stephen (2013): *MOOCs and Open Education: Implications for Higher Education*. Bolton: JISC-CETIS, The University of Bolton. Consulted on 1 March 2017, <https://publications.cetis.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/MOOCs-and-Open-Education.pdf>
14. CNBC Staff (15 May 2019): Disruptor 50 2019, 21. Coursera. *CNBC*. Consulted on 7 August 2019, <https://www.cnbc.com/2019/05/14/coursera-2019-disruptor-50.html>.
15. *Crunchbase* (Last update: 25 April 2019): Coursera. Consulted on 10 April 2018, <https://www.crunchbase.com/organization/coursera>.
16. Shah, Dhawal (31 December 2017): Coursera's 2017: Year in Review. *Class Central*. Consulted on 5 April 2019, <https://www.classcentral.com/report/coursera-2017-year-review/>.
17. *Coursera*: About. Consulted on 7 June 2017, <https://blog.coursera.org/about/>.
18. University of East Anglia (Last update: 28 April 2015): What is a MOOC? *UEA*. Consulted on 3 March 2017, <https://www.uea.ac.uk/study/short-courses/online-learning/what-is-a-mooc>.
19. Coursera provides universities with course content, selling licensing rights to institutions to embed the course into the curriculum or use the content in a flipped-classroom model. These deals allow universities (currently, several state systems) to pay Coursera a base fee for course development and a tiered per-enrolled-student fee.
20. See note 13.
21. *Coursera Blog*. Consulted on 10 August 2018, <https://blog.coursera.org/>.

22.   *Coursera Community*. Consulted on 10 August 2018, <https://coursera.community/>.
23.   Coursera (28 April 2014): Introducing Coursera's New Global Translator Community. *Coursera Blog.* Consulted on 10 August 2019, <https://blog.coursera.org/introducing-courseras-new-global-translator/>
24.   Coursera, like Facebook, appears to have adopted a tiered hierarchical system of quality control, having paid professionals to oversee translation quality (Jiménez-Crespo 2017a). Indeed, it now employs highly involved and skilled volunteers as language coordinators, in charge of providing additional reviews of volunteers' translations in the community. See Jung, Helen (8 June 2018): The Lowdown on Translation Crowdsourcing: Overview and Benefits for Volunteers. *Personal & Professional Wisdom. Women in Localization*. Consulted on 5 April 2019, <https://womeninlocalization.com/lowdown-translation-crowdsourcing-overview-benefits-volunteers/>.
25.   We cannot provide references for the GTC Translator interviews, as they have been lost to updates and restructurings of Coursera's websites (see Section 3.2).
26.   Coursera (Last update: 8 May 2017): GTC Translator Agreement. *Global Translator Community.* Consulted on 10 August 2018, <https://translate-coursera.org/GTCTranslatorAgreement.pdf>.

REFERENCES

Anastasiou, Dimitra and Gupta, Rajat (2011): Comparison of Crowdsourcing Translation with Machine Translation. *Journal of Information Science.* 37(6):637-659.

Baker, Mona (2013): Translation as an alternative space for political action. *Social Movement Studies.* 12(1):23-47.

Boéri, Julie and Maier, Carol, eds. (2010): *Compromiso social y traducción-interpretación/ Translation-Interpreting and Social Activism.* Manchester/Granada: St. Jerome/ECOS Traductores e Intérpretes por la Solidaridad.

Brabham, Daren (2008): Crowdsourcing as a Model for Problem Solving: An Introduction and Cases. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies.* 14(1):75-90.

Burston, Jonathan, Dyer-Whiteford, Nick, and Hearn, Alison (2010): A Digital Labour: Workers, Authors, Citizens. *Ephemera.* 10:214-221.

Christensen, Tom and Lægreid, Per (2007): The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. *Public Administration Review.* 67(6):1059-1066.

Cronin, Michael (2013). *Translation and Globalization.* London/New York: Routledge.

Dees, Gregory and Anderson, Battle (2003): Sector-bending: Blurring lines between nonprofit and for-profit. *Society.* 40(4):16-27.

DePalma, Donald and Kelly, Nataly (2011): Project Management for Crowdsourced Translation: How User-Translated Content Projects Work in Real Life. *In*: Keiran Dunne and Elena Dunne, eds. *Translation and Localization Project Management: The Art of the Possible.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 379-408.

Dombek, Magdalena (2014): A study into the motivations of internet users contributing to translation crowdsourcing: the case of Polish Facebook user-translators. Doctoral dissertation, unpublished. Dublin: Dublin City University.

Drugan, Joanna (2013): Quality in Professional Translation. Assessment and Improvement. London/New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Drugan, Joanna and Tipton, Rebecca (2017): Translation, ethics and social responsibility. *The Translator.* 23(2):119-125.

Fairclough, Norman (1992): *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, Norman (1995): *Critical Discourse Analysis.* Boston: Addison Wesley.

Fairclough, Norman (2005): Peripheral Vision: Discourse Analysis in Organization Studies: The Case for Critical Realism. *Organization Studies.* 26(6):915-939.

Flanagan, Marian (2016): Cause for concern? Attitudes towards translation crowdsourcing in professional translators' blogs. *The Journal of Specialised Translation.* 25:149-173

Fuchs, Christian and Dyer-Whiteford, Nick (2013): Karl marx@internet studies. *New Media & Society.* 15(5):782-796.

García, Ignacio (2012): Book review of *Crowdsourcing: Why the Power of the Crowd is Driving the Future of Business* by Jeff Howe [2008, New York: Crown Publishing Group]. *The Translator*. 18(2):373-377.

Howe, Jeff (2008): *Crowdsourcing: Why the Power of the Crowd is Driving the Future of Business*. New York: Crown Business.

Jenner, Jessica (1982): Participation, leadership, and the role of volunteerism among selected women volunteers. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*. 11(4):27-38.

Jiménez-Crespo, Miguel (2017a): Crowdsourcing and Online Collaborative Translations. Expanding the limits of Translation Studies. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jiménez-Crespo, Miguel (2017b): How much would you like to pay? Reframing and expanding the notion of translation quality through crowdsourcing and volunteer approaches. *Perspectives*. 25(3):478-491.

Jiménez-Crespo, Miguel (2019): Technology and non-professional translation. *In*: Minako O'Hagan, ed. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Technology*. London/New York: Routledge, 239-254.

Kang, Ji-Hae (2007): Recontextualization of News Discourse: A Case Study of Translation of News Discourse on North Korea. *The Translator*. 13(2):219-242.

Maltby, Matthew (2010): Institutional identities of interpreters in the asylum application context: A critical discourse analysis of interpreting policies in the voluntary sector. *In*: Mona Baker, Maeve Olohan, and Maria Calzada-Perez, eds. *Text and Context: Essays on Translation and Interpreting in Honour of Ian Mason*. London/New York: Routledge, 215-240.

McDonough Dolmaya, Julie (2011): The ethics of crowdsourcing. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series–Themes in Translation Studies*. 10:97-110.

McDonough Dolmaya, Julie (2012): Analyzing the Crowdsourcing Model and Its Impact on Public Perceptions of Translation. *The Translator*. 18(2):167-191.

Munro, Robert (2013): Crowdsourcing and the crisis-affected community. *Information Retrieval*. 16(2):210-266.

O'Brien, Sharon and Schaler, Reinhard (2010): Next Generation Translation and Localization. Users Are Taking Charge. *ASLIB 2010: Translating and the Computer 32 Conference*. London, 18-19 November 2010). Visited on 5 March 2017, <http://mt-archive.info/Aslib-2010-OBrien.pdf>.

O'Hagan, Minako (2011): Community Translation: Translation as a Social Activity and its Possible Consequences in the Advent of Web 2.0 and Beyond. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*. 10:1-10.

Olohan, Maeve (2014): Why Do you Translate? Motivation to Volunteer and TED Translation. *Translation Studies*. 7(1):17-33.

Pan, Li (2015): Ideological positioning in news translation: A case study of evaluative resources in reports on China. *Target*. 27(2):215-237.

Pérez-González, Luis and Susam Saraeva, Şebnem (2012): Non-professionals Translating and Interpreting: Participatory and Engaged Perspectives. *The Translator*. 18(2):149-165.

Perrino, Saverio (2009): User-generated Translation: The future of translation in a Web 2.0 environment. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*. 12:55-78.

Pym, Anthony (2011): Translation research terms: a tentative glossary for moments of perplexity and dispute. *In*: Anthony Pym, ed. *Translation Research Projects*. Vol. 3. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 75-110. Visited on 1 June 2017, <http://www.intercultural.urv.cat/media/upload/domain_317/arxius/TP3/isgbook3_web.pdf>.

Rushkoff, Douglas (2016): Throwing Rocks at the Google Bus. How Growth Became the Enemy of Prosperity. New York: Portfolio/Penguin.

Schlagwein, Daniel and Bjørn-Andersen, Niels (2014): Organizational Learning with Crowdsourcing: The Revelatory Case of LEGO. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*. 15(11):754-778.

Schmidt, Alexander (2013): The Good, The Bad and the Ugly: Why Crowdsourcing Needs Ethics. *In*: Jinjun Chen, ed. *CGC '13: Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Cloud and Green Computing*. (CGC 2013: International Conference on Cloud and Green Computing, Washington, DC, 30 September-2 October 2013). Washington, DC: IEEE Computer Society, 531-535.

Scholz, Trebor (2013): *Digital Labour: The Internet as Playground and Factory*. London/New York: Routledge.

Scholz, Trebor (2017): *Uberworked and Underpaid: How Workers are disrupting the Digital Economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Shamir, Ronen (2008): The age of responsibilization: on market-embedded morality. *Economy and Society*. 37(1):1-19.

Starr, Jerold and Curry, David (1992): National Voluntary Service: A Humanist Alternative. *Humanity & Society*. 16(3):369-389.

Terranova, Tiziana (2010): Free labor. Producing culture for the digital economy. *Social Text*. 18(2):33-58.

Tschirhart, Mary and Bielefeld, Wolfgang (2012): *Managing Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Whitla, Paul (2009): Crowdsourcing and Its Application in Marketing. *Contemporary Management Research*. 5(1):15-28.

Zhang, Meifang and Pan, Hanting (2015): Institutional power in and behind discourse: A case study of SARS notices and their translations used in Macao. *Target*. 27(3):387-405.

APPENDIX

Corpus references

Basu, Saikat (1 May 2014): Education For All: Volunteer In Coursera's Global Translator Community. *MakeUseOf*. Consulted on 15 August 2018, <https://www.makeuseof.com/tag/education-volunteer-courseras-global-translator-community/>.

Bianchi, Fabrizio (29 April 2014): What is wrong with Coursera's Global Translator Community and with crowdsourced translation in general. *Reddit*. Consulted on 15 August 2018, <https://www.reddit.com/r/coursera/comments/249iuf/what_is_wrong_with_courseras_global_translator/>.

Carr, Nicholas (1 May 2014): Sharecropping for Coursera. *Rough Type*. Consulted on 15 August 2018, <http://www.roughtype.com/?p=4464>.

Coursera (28 April 2014): Introducing Coursera's New Global Translator Community. *Coursera Blog*. Consulted on 10 August 2018, <https://blog.coursera.org/introducing-courseras-new-global-translator/>.

Dempsey, Dave (29 April 2014): Today's Webtip: Global Translator Community. *FM4*. Consulted on 15 August 2018, <https://fm4v3.orf.at/stories/1737733/index.html>.

Faes, Florian (24 August 2015): LSPs Not Needed: Coursera's Approach to Translation. *Slator*. Consulted on 15 August 2018, <https://slator.com/academia/lsps-not-needed-courseras-approach-to-translation/>.

Frost Davis, Rebecca (29 April 2014): Global Learning through MOOC Translation? *Rebecca Frost Davis: Liberal Education in a Networked World*. Consulted on 15 August 2018, <https://rebeccafrostdavis.wordpress.com/2014/04/29/global-learning-through-mooc-translation/>.

Perez-Hernandez, Danya (29 April 2014): Coursera Seeks to Create a 'Global Translator Community.' *The Chronicle of Higher Education Blogs*. Consulted on 15 August 2018, <http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/coursera-seeks-to-create-a-global-translatorcommunity/52129?cid=pm&utm_source=pm&utm_medium=en>.

Sadowski, Jathan (28 April 2015): From Mega-Machines to Mega-Algorithms. *The New Inquiry*. Consulted on 15 August 2018, <https://thenewinquiry.com/from-mega-machines-to-mega-algorithms/>.