Structured Abstract:

Purpose (mandatory)

This paper aims to describe, explain, and provide context for relationships between translation, trust, and distrust using accounts of the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake given by foreign residents who experienced the disaster.

Design/methodology/approach (mandatory)

This research provides a qualitative analysis of ethnographic interview data drawn from a broader study of communication in the 2011 disaster using the cases of 28 foreign residents of the disaster zone from 12 different countries of origin.

Findings (mandatory)

The study confirms the general importance, the linguistic challenges, and the context-dependency of trust in disaster-related communication at the response phase. It found that translation was involved in some trust reasoning carried out by foreign residents and that translation was an ad hoc act undertaken by linguistically and culturally proficient acquaintances and friends.

Research limitations/implications (if applicable)

The research examines a limited range of trust phenomena and research participants: only reason-based, social trust described by documented foreign residents of the 2011 disaster zone in Japan was considered. Furthermore, generalisations from case study data should be approached with caution.

Originality/value (mandatory)

This paper adds to the literature on trust and disaster response as opposed to trust and disaster preparedness, which has already been comprehensively studied. It responds to calls for more studies of the role of context in our understanding of trust and for greater attention to be paid in research to relationships between trust and other phenomena.

1 Introduction

This paper examines trust, distrust, and translation in the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake, Tsunami, and Nuclear Disaster. It uses accounts of communication relating to vulnerability, risk, and uncertainty gathered from foreign residents who were in the disaster zone in 2011 to describe, explain, and provide context for relationships between translation and trust in their experiences of responding to the disaster. Preparedness and hazard awareness have been comprehensively studied in the

literature on trust and disaster (see, e.g., Arlikatti *et al.*, 2007a, 2007b; Arlikatti *et al.*, 2014; Paton, 2003, 2007, 2008, 2013; Paton *et al.*, 2005). Trust phenomena observed in response settings have also been examined, yet to a lesser degree (see, e.g., Henry *et al.,* 2011; Hyvärinen and Vos, 2016; Steelman *et al.,* 2015). This paper adds to the literature on trust and disaster response. Moreover, scholars have expressed a need for more studies of the role of context – in particular high-stakes and safety-critical contexts – in our understanding of trust (Lyon *et al.,* 2016; Paton, 2007) and for greater attention to be paid in research to relationships between trust and other phenomena (Searle *et al.,* 2018). The research presented here offers a novel examination of relationships between trust, distrust, and translation and embeds the relationships observed in their social contexts.

Three questions were posed in this research.

1. What accounts of trust and distrust were described by foreign residents as part of their communicative interactions in the 2011 disaster?
2. How were translational processes involved in these trust or distrust accounts, if at all?
3. If translation processes were involved, what are the implications for crisis translation?

Before answers to these questions are presented, the objects of enquiry in this research will be clarified, relevant context for the 2011 disaster will be provided, and the way in which participant accounts were gathered and analysed will be described.

2 Defining and Delimiting Trust, Distrust, Translation

Trust, distrust, and translation are elusive concepts. The plethora of definitions of trust that exists has been noted (Arlikatti *et al.*, 2007a), and the difficulty of formulating an all-encompassing definition of translation has been asserted (Colina, 2016).

For the purposes of this study, trust and distrust have been taken to be reason-based and context-dependent social phenomena (Castelfranchi and Falcone, 2010) pertaining to a willingness or unwillingness to be vulnerable to another (see Rousseau *et al.,* 1998 for a widely-cited definition of trust and Sitkin and Bijlsma-Frankema, 2018 for an understanding of distrust). Trust in people and trust in institutions are also considered in this research. The idea that trust can be based on the 'rules, roles, and routines' that constitute institutions, as well as on individual relationships between people has been widely accepted in the literature (Möllering, 2006a, p. 355-357). Comprehensive definitions of trust and distrust should, therefore, recognise both institutional and interpersonal dimensions (Khodyakov, 2007). Trust in an institution depends on perceptions of its reliable functioning and legitimacy (Möllering, 2006a). Trust in people

depends on more symmetrical mutual interactions (Khodyakov, 2007). While institutional and interpersonal trust are understood differently, it is frequently observed that people are trusted or distrusted as performers or representatives of the rules, roles, and routines of an institution (Möllering, 2006a). Similarly, institutional trust can also enable or be a barrier to the development of interpersonal trust (Khodyakov, 2007). It is also useful in this research to subdivide interpersonal trust into: thick interpersonal trust, which is based on strong bonds of kinship, friendship, or similarity between people; and thin interpersonal trust, which is based on weaker ties with members of out-groups on whose reputation one depends (Khodyakov, 2007).

Translation, in this research, has been understood to be a form of communication across phases (House, 2018) in which a new text is constructed from an anterior text through the interpretation and application of interlingual and intercultural knowledge (Halverson, 2016). Translation mostly involves written texts (Colina, 2016). Nevertheless, a text can be understood to be a coherent stretch of written or spoken language (see, e.g., Carter and McCarthy, 2008), and this view of translation as something written or spoken is adopted here.

Despite multiple perspectives being taken on trust, distrust, and translation in the literature, there is wide agreement on the importance of these concepts to disaster settings, the challenge that language places on disaster-related communication and behaviours, and the need to pay particular attention to sources of information in a disaster.

Trust provides a vital way for social beings to deal with risk, uncertainty, and complexity (Möllering, 2006b; Nooteboom, 2002; Sztompka, 1999). Trust built through sustained contact prior to a disaster's onset is required for stakeholders to carry out their roles (Auf Der Heide, 1989; Stephenson, 2005). Trust is also central to crisis communication as a management tool when people must deal with complex hazards, both among affected people and between affected people and those tasked with response and recovery (Curnin *et al.,* 2015; Drabek, 2003; Eadie and Su, 2018; Wray *et al.,* 2006; Paton, 2008, 2013; Steelman *et al.,* 2015).

Clear, timely, accurate, and reliable information is essential for the success of disaster-related communication (Coyle and Meier, 2009). Increasing cultural and linguistic diversity across the globe intensifies the complexity of the communicative situation, and communicating appropriately is recognised as a complex process fraught with challenges that results in significant negative impacts if not addressed (Arlikatti *et al.,* 2014; Henry *et al.,* 2011; Nepal *et al.,* 2012). Ground-breaking scholarship focusing on interpreting in crises (Bulut and Kurultay, 2001; Moser-Mercer *et al.,* 2014; Tipton, 2011) and translation in crises (Federici, 2016; Federici and Cadwell, 2018; O'Brien *et al.,* 2018) has begun to address some of these challenges. Nevertheless, many more

questions remain to be answered. It is worth noting, too, that trust has been made a central concern for scholars working to define and delimit translation as a profession (see, e.g., Pym, 2012), to create ethical frameworks of practice for translators and interpreters (see, e.g., Mulayim and Lai, 2017) and has been found to motivate people's decisions to use informal networks of family, friends, and acquaintances as interpreters (Edwards *et al.*, 2005).

The trust and distrust in different sources of information prior to and in a disaster have been widely examined (Arlikatti *et al.,* 2007a, 2007b; Paton 2008, 2013; Paton *et al.,* 2005; Steelman *et al.,* 2015). It has been argued that the source of information plays a role independent of the content of the information itself (Paton, 2007, 2008, 2013) and that trust will be higher the more intimate the relation between the source and the receiver of the information (Arlikatti *et al.*, 2007a). Empirical findings on trusted sources of disaster-related information can be contradictory; surveys of disaster-affected populations sometimes present one source as being both trusted and distrusted by the same cohort of research participants in the same setting (see, e.g., Henry *et al.,* 2011; Hyvärinen and Vos, 2016; Nepal *et al.,* 2012; Steelman *et al.,* 2015). Theories of trust emphasising its context dependency help to explain such findings; a source trusted under one set of contextual factors could be distrusted under another (Henry *et al.,* 2011; Paton, 2007; Castelfranchi and Falcone, 2010). It is helpful, therefore, to embed trust and distrust in their contexts. To this end, the next section summarises details of the 2011 disaster in Japan that will be relevant to the accounts of trust, distrust, and translation analysed later on.

3 Context of the 2011 Disaster

A long-running, complex, and cascading earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear disaster began in Japan on March 11, 2011. The officially-designated disaster zone to which the 1947 Disaster Relief Act was applied encompassed ten prefectures over much of the eastern half of Japan's main island (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan, 2011). Approximately 670,000 foreign nationals from more than 190 different countries resided in this disaster zone (E-Stat, 2011). The numbers of foreign residents registered in Japan dropped dramatically during the disaster, and 41,207 fewer foreign nationals were resident in Japan by the end of March 2011 than had been there at the start of the year (Ministry of Justice of Japan, 2012). Massive amounts of communication were generated during the events of 2011: press conferences and meetings were held; announcements and instructions were issued; news was broadcast over television, radio, the Internet, and in print; affected people consumed this news, talked to each other about it, and telephoned, mailed, and used social media to connect with others affected and those in the outside world. Foreign residents were involved in this communication.

It should be remembered that the context of this communication was Japan; a highly hazard-prone country that, nonetheless, possesses an elevated capacity to cope and a sophisticated legislative and policy framework to guide disaster prevention and management. Policy on disaster in Japan finds its legislative mandate in the 1961 Disaster Countermeasures Basic Act and is formulated through the Basic Disaster Management Plan (Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, 2015). Stakeholders of the plan include national, prefectural, municipal, and local governments, designated public institutions and corporations (such as the Bank of Japan, the national broadcasting corporation, NHK, or the Japanese Red Cross Society) and even residents, and all stakeholders are responsible for formulating and implementing their own Disaster Management Operation Plans, Local Disaster Management Plans, or Community Disaster Management Plans based on this policy (Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, 2015). The first Basic Disaster Management Plan was formulated in 1963 and had been through some ten revisions based on lessons learned by the time the several-hundred-page document in force at the onset of the 2011 disaster was created (Disaster Management, Cabinet Office of Japan, 2017).

Despite such a formalised, dynamic, and well-resourced context, the scale and complexity of the devastation in 2011 managed to overwhelm some of these sophisticated legislative and policy structures, including in relation to communication with foreign nationals. Therefore, a case study was carried out to interrogate issues of language, culture, and translation in the communicative context of this disaster.

4 Case Study of the 2011 Disaster

Participant accounts analysed in this paper were drawn from this broader case study. The study used the cases of 28 foreign residents of the disaster zone who held diverse perspectives on the disaster: they came from 12 different countries of origin (Ireland, the Netherlands, France, Germany, Sudan, Tunisia, China, Bangladesh, the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) and varied in age, occupation, length of residence, and Japanese proficiency. Individual, face-to-face ethnographic interviews lasting approximately one hour each were conducted by the researcher with participants during a two-month visit to the disaster zone in 2013. (Ethical approval for this research project was received from the Research Ethics Committee of Dublin City University under reference DCUREC/2013/146.) Ethnographic interviews create relatively free-form dialogues between researcher and participant (Blommaert and Jie, 2010; Josephiddes, 2012), and the audio of these dialogues was digitally recorded and later transcribed by the researcher. An outline sent to participants prior to meeting to indicate potential interview topics can be seen in Appendix A. While most topics in this outline were covered in each interview, spontaneously discussed issues and the free-form nature of the dialogue are not captured in the pre-interview outline. A full record of all the dialogue

contained in each interview is available in anonymised and participant-checked transcriptions (see Cadwell, 2015). Interview transcripts were analysed along with relevant secondary data using a form of thematic analysis operationalised from Braun and Clarke (2006). One of the themes developed during the analysis of the interviews related to trust. Based on the operational definitions for trust, distrust, and translation adopted for this study and explained above, these passages were then recoded to: isolate instances in which a foreign national was willing or unwilling to be vulnerable to another; categorise these accounts by vulnerability; specify the channels of communication involved; search for evidence of translational processes in these accounts of trust and distrust; and clarify the sources of information involved.

Tables 1 and 2 summarise the results of this analysis of participant accounts of trust and distrust in the interview data. They will be used in the discussion that follows, along with direct quotes from the transcript data, to begin to answer the research questions posed at the start of the paper. The tables are presented here to support qualitative claims made about the breadth and depth of patterns elaborated through analysis of the interview data and are not an attempt to claim quantitative or statistical significance from the data.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Table 1 Summary of accounts of trust in interview data

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Table 2 Summary of accounts of distrust in interview data

5 Accounts of Trust and Distrust Related by Foreign Residents

Findings from the process of analysis described can be related to the three significant themes identified earlier in the literature on disaster and trust: the general importance of trust to disaster-related communication, the challenges that language brings, and the need to examine sources of information carefully.

5.1 Importance of Trust

Trust was a significant phenomenon for many participants in this research. A broad spread of participants – 25 out of a total of 28 – chose to recount instances of vulnerability to another in their descriptions of their communicative experiences, and comparing Tables 1 and 2 illustrates that more participants spent more time talking about trust than distrust in their interviews.

Almost all accounts of trust and distrust could be divided into three categories (see Tables 1 and 2, Vulnerability to Another) and no one category predominated.

Participants related trust and distrust equally to decisions about evacuation, radiation threats, and emergency procedures.

Face-to-face communication was also important for participants and was often associated by them in their interviews with trust, while it was rarely associated by them with distrust (see Tables 1 and 2, Communication Channel). Electronic communication channels – such as email, the Internet, and telephone calls – were also valorised by participants. One participant related a stressful account of realising her vulnerability and need to depend on others when watching a television news broadcast of an explosion that occurred at the early stages of the disaster at the damaged nuclear power plant. Email communication from a Japanese friend helped the participant make an immediate decision about the radiation danger she faced, but also highlighted problems she faced trying to respond to the disaster alone.

> I plugged in my TV and was watching it, and then the reactor exploded. That's when I realised – this is probably where the translation stuff comes in – that's when I realised I was completely alone and listening to Japanese news and had no idea what was going on; none at all […] And then I get an email from [my Japanese friend] that's like, "Everything is okay. It exploded, but that was a good thing. Like, it released the pressure." *(Participant 21: low-level Japanese proficiency; from the USA; age 30-39; in Japan for 5 years at onset; Recruitment Consultant*)

These findings support other research which has shown that word of mouth – in the form of direct, face-to-face communication or facilitated through telephone and other technology – appears to be the preferred channel for culturally and linguistically diverse communities (Arlikatti *et al.,* 2014; Nepal *et al.,* 2012). It also offers an indication of the presence of thick interpersonal trust in the data; personal familiarity and a strong emotional commitment were features of this trust encounter. This account also introduces other features of the interview data: the challenges that language presented in the participants' communicative experiences and the presence of translational processes in their accounts of the disaster.

5.2 Challenges of Language

It was found that about half of the participants who talked about trust and about a fifth of the participants who talked about distrust involved translational processes in their accounts (see Tables 1 and 2, Translational Processes). We can say, therefore, that more participants spent more time talking about translation being involved in trust instances than distrust instances; nevertheless, this should not diminish the qualitative significance of translation in the distrust accounts, and translational processes were significant to both trust and distrust. Several participants in this research moved into community evacuation centres after the onset of the disaster. The language of

communication in these centres was predominantly Japanese. Luckily, many communities of foreign nationals contained people with Japanese proficiency, and these key community members were relied on by others to carry out ad hoc translation.

> [The language in the centre was] mainly Japanese, but one or two people could comment in English. To use Japanese, it was not difficult for us, because all people [from the Bangladeshi community] were in the same place, and many of them know Japanese. In our community, three or four people know Japanese. If there is an announcement, instantly he translated, “Oh, this is like this.” *(Participant 16: low-level Japanese proficiency; from Bangladesh; age 30-39; in Japan for 2 years at onset; Student)*

These findings should not be interpreted as a claim that foreign residents trusted other friends and acquaintances *because* they were on the ground with them, or *because* they were foreign; i.e., while thick interpersonal trust depends on strong bonds of familiarity, it is not caused by them alone. Indeed, though acquaintance and proximity were sometimes factors that were taken into account in trust reasoning, there were examples in the data where communication from another foreign or Japanese resident on the ground was distrusted. Take, for instance, one participant’s distrust in the ability of other foreign residents to coordinate response and recovery efforts.

> A lot of the foreigners who organised these volunteer things were just people trying to help, but not Japanese speakers, so that’s where I thought, you know, how much of this is completely true or do you have a complete grasp of the situation? *(Participant 25: high-level Japanese proficiency; from Australia; age 30-39; in Japan for 11 years at onset; Sales Manager)*

Where translational processes were involved in these accounts, participants were vulnerable because of their lack of linguistic and cultural knowledge. Having a third party supplement this knowledge was often helpful and participants were frequently willing to take the ‘leap of faith’ that Möllering (2006b, p. 191) sees at the heart of trust. Nevertheless, participants still recognised that they could not be *sure* that taking this leap was a reasonable decision to make, and their vulnerability still remained, as can be seen in the following encounter. We also see from this encounter that institutions as well as people were the objects of trust and distrust reasoning in the interview data; participants queried whether they could take a leap of faith in their social interactions with organisations such as broadcasters and news agencies, and not just their interactions with people.

> I can’t read Japanese very well. So I started listening to NHK [Note: the Japanese national broadcaster] in English, because I think they built a lot of credibility during the crisis and I knew some of the people who worked there. But

> that's just a translation, and I don't know if it's a good translation. I think the story for what you are talking about is the fact that I am not doing Japanese media except the English version of it. I'm doing Jiji and Kyodo [Note: Japanese news agencies] and NHK, you know, I'm going off the wires every day, but that's just a translation and I don't know if it's a good translation. *(Participant 27: mid-level Japanese proficiency; from the USA; age 50-59; in Japan for 25 years at onset; Consultant)*

At the same time, other participants thought that being vulnerable to a linguistically and culturally proficient other – be it a person or an institution – would be a leap too far. For instance, one participant with low Japanese ability was due to move to Fukushima Prefecture where the damaged nuclear reactor was located to take up a job following the disaster. He recognised that information in the disaster zone would probably not be provided in a language he could understand and was unwilling to have to depend on others to contact him with translations.

> That was partly why I decided not to go up to Fukushima because I thought, "If something happens, even if they drive with an announcement, those are not going to be in English." And there, language would have been an issue. I would be totally reliant on others ringing me, thinking of me: "Oh, he's ringing because something has happened." I wasn't in a very vulnerable situation, at least not in every respect, but I also chose not to put myself in a situation where I would have been worse, at least that was my reasoning. *(Participant 22: low-level Japanese proficiency; from Germany; age 30-39; in Japan for 6 months at onset; Language Teacher)*

Thus, while we can argue from these interviews that translation was a factor in participants' trust and distrust accounts at times, the presence or absence of translational processes in an account did not correlate with a presence or absence of trust.

5.3 Sources of Information

The most notable pattern that could be perceived by using translation as a lens through which to view the interview data related to the sources of information in these communicative acts. The information summarised in Tables 1 and 2 indicates that participants considered more than one source of information in their trust reasoning when translation was involved: the source of the original text and the source of the translated text. Such layered sources are not unique to situations of translation; any situation involving intermediaries conveying trusted or distrusted information should take the issue into account. Nevertheless, the issue of layered sources of information is fundamental to translation because an original and translated text will always coexist, and these will frequently come from different sources.

We can see from Table 1 that in half of the accounts relating to trust, an acquaintance, friend, or work colleague on the ground in the disaster zone was the source on whom participants relied for translation. One participant described the importance of these pre-existing social links to trust and claimed that they were, at times, even more important than expertise. This aligns with findings on thin interpersonal trust in the literature discussed above (see, e.g., Khodyakov, 2007) concerning the importance of developing weak social ties that can be called on when needed to access otherwise unavailable resources or information.

> You just wanted as much information as you could get, and then you start to parse it for yourself and figure out what's going on. You rely on the people that you trust for, you know, who might not frankly be really great arbiters of nuclear radiation and understanding what's going on with that. But at least you rely on them in a social context. *(Participant 20: mid-level Japanese proficiency; from Canada; age 30-39; in Japan for 5 years at onset; Advertising Executive)*

Indeed, it appears strongly from the data that personal more than the cultural bonds were significant in the relationships between translators and participants in accounts of both trust and distrust. While the beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviours that are common to certain populations can contribute to their perceptions of disaster risk and their vulnerability to hazards (Cannon, 2015), the data provided by participants in this research did not indicate a need for cultural similarity in the establishment of trust or distrust through translation. Indeed, we should understand that the crisis translators in the 2011 disaster were not only other foreign nationals but also local Japanese with particular pre-existing bonds to the foreign resident communities.

The interview data also confirm the common contradiction in studies of disaster-related trust that one source of information can be both trusted and distrusted by the same cohort of research participants in the same setting. Take, for instance, news media. We cannot say from these data whether news media were a trusted or a distrusted source of information; it depended on whom you asked and on the news media involved. Some participants were unwilling to rely on foreign news accounts of the disaster – especially the nuclear disaster – because they felt it was sensational coverage not based in fact. The same participants also distrusted Japanese news accounts because they felt that these sources were biased and withheld facts. Japan is often described as a high-context culture in which significant interpretation of the communicative context is required to achieve understanding (Hall, 1976) and a hierarchical society in which individual expression is frequently constrained (Hofstede, 2001). These features meant that the cultural imperative to maintain calm and avoid overt expression may have been stronger than a need to communicate risk effectively in the Japanese media in the 2011 disaster, in stark contrast to the sensational coverage present in the overseas media.

> I felt like the foreign media covered it [Note: the nuclear disaster] a lot, but there was too much opinion. There were a lot of loud opinions going around about how bad that was. Then, the Japanese penchant for understatement just left me with, like, where the hell do you draw the middle line? You don't know how far to one side or the other it should have been. I didn't trust it. *(Participant 12: low-level Japanese proficiency; from Ireland; age 20-29; in Japan for 5 months at onset; Company Employee)*

Nonetheless, other participants talked in their interviews about how they placed institutional trust in information from both overseas and Japanese news media – such as the BBC or NHK – in order to make decisions about their own safety and whether to evacuate out of the disaster zone.

> I think the BBC seemed like a trusted resource to us. We probably did check several other ones but we kept going back to the BBC one because they seemed to be the most up-to-date and non-sensational, I guess. *(Participant 28: low-level Japanese proficiency; from New Zealand; age 30-39; in Japan for 18 months at onset; Teacher)*

Trust reasoning is complex and context-dependent (Henry *et al.,* 2011; Paton, 2007; Castelfranchi and Falcone, 2010), so we cannot argue that one group of sources, whether people or institutions, will routinely be trusted over another group of sources. This calls into question the value of presenting lists of trusted or distrusted sources of information in disaster-related research without also presenting the sources' contextual embedding.

6 Implications for Crisis Translation

Having established the ways in which trust and distrust were described by participants in this study and the role of translation in these descriptions, a final question remains to be answered in this paper: what are the implications of these findings for crisis translation beyond the 2011 disaster? Before proceeding to answer this question, it should be remembered that the findings in this paper are based on case study data and that making generalised claims from case study data is open to question (see, e.g., Gomm *et al.,* 2000). Some authors argue that making claims about significant categories and relationships in case study data to guide further enquiry can be supported once rigour and transparency have been demonstrated (e.g., Mitchell, 2000). Implications beyond the 2011 disaster are presented here in this light.

Crisis translation was not a matter of prepared, coordinated, professional translation for participants in this research. Instead, when participants lacked linguistic and cultural proficiencies to interpret information about risks and vulnerabilities, they turned to those

nearby with the skills they lacked and on whom they already relied socially. The first implication, therefore, is that pre-existing personal bonds may be important considerations for generating trusted information through crisis translation.

6.1 Consider Personal Common Ground

How can we systematically explain the observation that personal acquaintance seemed significant to trust, distrust, and translation in this context? Priem and Nystrom (2014) suggest the use of Clark's (1996) concepts of "communal common ground", suppositions made about the cultural communities to which a person is perceived to belong, and "personal common ground", assumptions based on shared experiences gained over a period of acquaintance. Looking at the Sources of Translated Information in Tables 1 and 2, we see that many of the sources of translated information were Japanese and did not share the participant's country of origin: we might speculate that communal common ground between them was low. More significant in the relationships were the shared experiences of the participant and translator, through work, friendship, or exposure to the same hazards. Thus, regardless of cultural background, a crisis translator may want to consider strategically emphasising shared common experiences as a way to build trust with the person for whom they are translating.

6.2 Link Crisis Translation with Disaster Preparedness

Emphasising shared personal common ground will be a more realistic proposition if opportunities to build the necessary acquaintance are available to local responders and foreign resident communities prior to the onset of a disaster. In short, while crisis translation was examined in this research in the response phase, there may be benefits to linking crisis translation to disaster preparedness. Scholars who have studied trust in other crisis contexts argue for forging links between key potential local responders and culturally and linguistically diverse communities and providing these groups with community-based training (Arlikatti *et al.,* 2014; Hyvärinen and Vos, 2016; Nepal *et al.,* 2012). Conducting translation projects together *in advance* of a disaster could be one way in which to build personal common ground and foster trust between locally-based responders and diverse communities. Japan's 1961 Disaster Countermeasures Basic Act introduced in Section 3 recognises local residents and businesses as key stakeholders with responsibility for local level disaster planning – albeit in a voluntary capacity – and sets down in law that residents should have responsibility for self-preparedness, storage of basic necessities, and voluntary participation in disaster preparedness activities (Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, 2015). Foreign nationals have begun to be involved in citizen-centred disaster preparedness initiatives, with volunteering as translators and interpreters being one prominent activity. For instance, Tokyo Metropolitan Government has created a network of "Disaster Language Volunteers" that are being recruited and trained in preparation to carry out translation and interpreting activities in future disasters (Bureau of Citizens and Cultural Affairs,

2015). It has also been running annual disaster preparedness training drills for foreign residents since 2016 to improve capacity for self-help among residents and to increase cooperation between official responders and foreign communities (Tokyo Metropolitan Government, Bureau of General Affairs, 2019). These efforts are valuable, but participation by foreign nationals has been limited: about 129 foreign residents – with more than half linked to embassies – took part in the 2019 drill (Takahashi, 2019), out of a foreign resident population of 550,000 in Tokyo.

Low participation rates and lack of preparedness could be culturally-bound. Evidence from the 2011 disaster suggested that foreign residents coming from hazard-prone countries to Japan were more sensitised to disaster preparedness. For example, participants from New Zealand and hazard-prone parts of the USA spoke of experiences in their home countries preparing them to some extent for the events of 2011. At the same time, participants from countries with a lower-risk hazardscape, such as Ireland or the Netherlands, declared a relative lack of preparedness. A stronger pattern in the interview data, though, attested to a lack of integration into local communities and a lack of weak social ties with close neighbours as a barrier to participation in disaster preparedness efforts, even for participants who had already lived in Japan for some time.

> I live in a *danchi* complex [Note: means a housing estate]. It's reclaimed land. The buildings are old, they are from the seventies. It's not safe if a big earthquake hits. But I am not aware of any disaster preparation measures they have in place in the community. I have lived there four years now. I don't know any of my neighbours. I know some people, I'll nod at them when I walk down the street, but at the same time, I'm not really interested in taking part in community activities […] maybe it is unfriendly on my part, but we come from different worlds. A lot of them are retirees, sixty, seventy to eighties – very Japanese domestic culture. They are nice people, but we have nothing in common. *(Participant 6: mid-level Japanese proficiency; from Canada; age 30-39; in Japan for 5 years at onset; PR Consultant)*

How can these barriers to disaster preparedness be overcome? Preparedness activities should be taken as opportunities to exchange cultural information to mitigate the cultural mismatch evident in Participant 6's comments. They could also be opportunities to build the thin trust, the weak social ties, that might not exist yet between foreign residents and their local neighbours. An example of using translation training for the purposes of community development and the generation of intercultural awareness in the context of disaster preparedness is described in Federici and Cadwell (2018) and Shackleton (2018).

6.3 Train Crisis Translators to Empower Others

This begs the question: what form should crisis translation training programmes take? There are many possibilities. Based on the findings of this research focused on trust, distrust, and translation, crisis translators need to be trained to translate as much about the sources and contexts of production of disaster-related information as about the content of the information itself. We have seen in this study's findings that trust reasoning is complex and context-dependent. To be denied access to relevant information about a source of information or the context of some information's production is to be denied the articulation and empowerment required by people to truly understand the uncertainty or risk that they face (see Paton, 2007, p. 375-377). Crisis translators can conceptualise part of their mission as one to empower the people for whom they translate to make informed decisions regarding a disaster. A key part of this decision making will be trust reasoning, and such reasoning requires context-rich translation. In practice, context-rich translation could be achieved through training in the framing techniques used in news production and translation (see, e.g., Reese, 2018; Valdeón, 2015). Framing involves combining the content of information with pre-existing end-user knowledge and associated context in order to achieve a specific outcome (Reese, 2018). The process of framing, while being used to empower others, would nonetheless be an expression of the crisis translator's power: to choose content, to make assumptions about the end-user, to interpret context, etc. For this reason, such training in framing techniques would need to be accompanied by a foundation of ethical principles and frameworks around disaster-related translation that would help the trainee to navigate such challenging decisions (see O'Mathúna *et al.*, forthcoming for guidance and recommendations on ethical issues to be considered in crisis translation).

6.4 Lobby for Further Policy Change

The Disaster Countermeasures Basic Act introduced in Section 3 calls for the Japanese Government to produce an annual White Paper on Disaster Management in Japan in which an overview of the hazards faced, significant crises or disasters experienced, and countermeasures taken over the preceding year are provided (Cabinet Office, Government of Japan, 2015). Lessons learned through this dynamic annual reporting system inform revisions to the Basic Disaster Management Plan. In recent years the plan has been revised as much as twice annually (Director General for Disaster Management, 2017), and the plan has been updated to take into account issues of language, culture, and communication with foreign nationals at various stages since the 2011 disaster.

The most recent version of the plan at the time of writing is the 2018 version. It acknowledges the need for those managing and those affected by a disaster in Japan to engage with languages other than Japanese in ways that were not present in 2011. The development of these revisions can be traced through the White Papers on Disaster

published in the intervening years.[1] The plan now proceeds from the basis that the behaviour and informational needs of foreign residents and foreign visitors may be different, but that a system for timely and accurate information transmission needs to be put in place to support both groups (Central Disaster Management Council, 2018, p. 5). Another salient guiding principle set down at the very outset of the document is that foreign nationals can be grouped together with the elderly and disabled (Ibid., p. 5), as well as with infants and pregnant women (Ibid., p. 15) as "people requiring special assistance" (要援護者). The principle here states that there is a need to adopt specific, detailed policies to support these categories of individuals. Communication with foreign nationals is acknowledged in the document in terms of disaster training and education (Ibid., p. 15), evacuation procedures (Ibid., pp. 31-32), communicating disaster-related information to evacuees (Ibid., p. 71), and communicating with foreign counterparts and governments overseas (Ibid., pp. 18, 37, 43), especially with respect to nuclear-related issues (Ibid., pp. 249, 261, 271, 272, 278). The plan also states that local governments shall devise an accessible information communication system that takes into account "people requiring special consideration" including foreign nationals (Ibid., p. 144). In short, many issues of concern in crisis translation have been incorporated into disaster policy in Japan since 2011 through dialogue from local to national level via the White Paper reporting system.

At the same time, trust has not yet been related in an explicit way to communication with foreign nationals in the plan. The importance of fostering trust between stakeholders through relationship building in advance of disasters is recognised in the plan (Central Disaster Management Council, 2018, p. 13) and there are multiple mentions of the importance of ensuring reliable physical infrastructure for telecommunications, transport, and power supply (Ibid., pp. 90, 112, 134, 163, 221, 231, 232). More can be done through knowledge dissemination and lobbying to argue for the fact that those who do not speak dominant local languages in a disaster setting will make different decisions about their safety based on the trust or distrust they hold in the sources and content of the information involved, especially when translation is involved, as has been shown in this research.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

The research presented in this paper used in-depth case study data to examine relationships between trust, distrust, and translation embedded in the context of the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake. It found that participant accounts of trust and

[1] A record of the White Papers on Disaster Management in Japan (防災白書) can be consulted in Japanese here http://www.bousai.go.jp/kaigirep/hakusho/ and English translations of recent White Papers are available here http://www.bousai.go.jp/en/documentation/white_paper/index.html (accessed 26 March 2019).

distrust confirmed the general importance, the linguistic challenges, and the context-dependency of trust in disaster-related communication. It found, too, that translational processes were involved in some of these accounts. The crisis translation involved was an ad hoc act undertaken by linguistically and culturally proficient acquaintances of participants on the ground in the disaster zone. Had this ad hoc translation not been available, a significant proportion of decisions made about emergency response, personal safety, and evacuation and return would have been reasoned differently by participants. For this reason alone, further work on relationships between trust, distrust, and translation seems warranted. It was also argued that findings from this case study could have implications for crisis translation more broadly. It was suggested that shared personal common ground could be used by crisis translators to build trust, that crisis translation could be linked usefully with disaster preparedness, that crisis translators should be trained to empower those for whom they translate to carry out more effective trust reasoning, and that lobbying for further inclusion of trust in disaster management policy should be undertaken.

The research presented here should be seen in the context of its limitations. Firstly, generalisations from case study data should be approached with caution, though they can be used to suggest avenues for future research. Secondly, only a limited range of reason-based social trust phenomena were considered; other forms of trust that can be irrational, implicit, culture-based or derived in part from someone's personality (Castlefranchi and Falcone, 2010) were not dealt with. Finally, only documented foreign residents in the disaster zone in 2011 were interviewed for this research; the perspectives of other foreign nationals in Japan for the disaster – such as foreign emergency responders, short-term foreign business visitors or tourists, or undocumented migrants – were not analysed due to the difficulty of gaining access to these groups.

Despite these limitations, there is scope for further work arising out of this research. As translation was observed to be a factor taken into account in participants' trust reasoning, studies could be developed to hypothesise and test this relationship further. In particular, it would be useful to examine ways in which the layered sources of information characteristic of translation moderate trust phenomena. In addition, it could be beneficial to study whether shared personal or perceptual experiences can be factors in building trust during an act of crisis translation. Finally, in relation to a broader project of establishing crisis translation as a systematic practice, it would be worthwhile to develop and evaluate training on the concept of trust and its relation to translation in existing crisis translation courses.

Reference List

Arlikatti, S., Lindell, M. and Prater, C. (2007a), “Perceived stakeholder role relationships and adoption of seismic hazard adjustments”, *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 218-256.

Arlikatti, S., Lindell, M. and Prater, C. (2007b), “Building trust among community stakeholders”, in Durmaz, H., Sevinc, B., Sait Yayla, A. and Ekici, S. (Eds.), *Understanding and Responding to Terrorism*, IOS Press, Washington, DC, pp. 383-392.

Arlikatti, S., Taibah, H. A. and Andrew, S. A. (2014), “How do you warn them if they speak only Spanish? Challenges for organizations in communicating risk to Colonias residents in Texas, USA”, *Disaster Prevention and Management*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 533-550.

Auf Der Heide, E. (1989), *Disaster Response: Principles of Preparation and Coordination,* Mosby, St. Louis.

Blommaert, J. and Jie, D. (2010), *Ethnographic Fieldwork: A Beginner's Guide,* Multilingual Matters, Bristol.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), “Using thematic analysis in psychology”, *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 77-101.

Bulut, A. and Kurultay, T. (2001), “Interpreters-in-Aid at disasters: community interpreting in the process of disaster management”, *The Translator*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 249–263.

Bureau of Citizens and Cultural Affairs (2015), “Tōkyōto bōsai (gogaku) borantia”, available at: http://www.seikatubunka.metro.tokyo.jp/chiiki_tabunka/tabunka/tabunkasuishin/0000000145.html (accessed 20 March 2019).

Cabinet Office, Government of Japan (2015), “*Disaster management in Japan”,* available at: http://www.bousai.go.jp/1info/pdf/saigaipamphlet_je.pdf (accessed 20 March 2019).

Cadwell, P. (2015), “Translation and trust: a case study of how translation was experienced by foreign nationals resident in Japan for the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake”, PhD thesis, Dublin City University, Dublin, available at: http://doras.dcu.ie/20839/1/PHD_Thesis_Patrick_Cadwell_2015.pdf (accessed 13 June 2019).

Cannon, T. (2015), “Disasters, climate change and the significance of 'culture'”, in Krüger, F., Bankoff, G. Cannon, T., Orlowski, B. and Schipper, L. F. (Eds.), *Cultures*

and Disasters: Understanding Cultural Framings in Disaster Risk Reduction, Routledge, London, pp. 88-106.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (2008), *Cambridge Grammar of Englis*h, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Castelfranchi, C. and Falcone, R. (2010), *Trust Theory: A Socio-Cognitive and Computational Model*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.

Central Disaster Management Council (2018), "*Bōsai kihon keikaku", available from:* http://www.bousai.go.jp/taisaku/keikaku/pdf/kihon_basic_plan180629.pdf (accessed 27 March 2019).

Clark, H. H. (1996), *Using Language*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK.

Colina, S. (2016), *Fundamentals of Translation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Coyle, D. and Meier, P. (2009), *New Technologies in Emergencies and Conflicts: The Role of Information and Social Networks*. UN Foundation-Vodafone Foundation Partnership, Washington, D.C. and London, UK.

Curnin, S., Owen, C., Paton, D. Trist, C. and Parsons, D. (2015), "Role clarity, swift trust and multi-agency coordination", *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 29-35.

Disaster Management, Cabinet Office of Japan (2017), "*Tōhoku chihō Taiheiyō oki jishin o kyōkun to shita jishin tsunami taisaku ni kansuru senmon chōsa-kai*", available at: http://www.bousai.go.jp/kaigirep/chousakai/tohokukyokun/10/pdf/sub1.pdf (accessed 25 March 2019).

Director General for Disaster Management (2017), "*Bōsai kihon keikaku no sakusei shūsei no rireki*", available at: http://www.bousai.go.jp/taisaku/keikaku/kihon.html (accessed 25 March 2019).

Drabek, T. E. (2003), *Strategies for Coordinating Disaster Responses*, Institute of Behavior Sciences, Boulder.

Eadie, P. and Su, Y. (2018), "Post-disaster social capital: trust, equity, bayanihan and Typhoon Yolanda", *Disaster Prevention and Management,* Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 334-345.

Edwards, R., Temple, B. and Alexander, C. (2005), "Users' experiences of interpreters: the critical role of trust", *Interpreting*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 77-95.

E-Stat (2011). "*Tōroku gaikokujin tōkei (nenji)",* available at: http://www.e-stat.go.jp/SG1/estat/GL08020102.do?_toGL080201].02_&tclassID=000001048666&cycleCode=7&requestSender=estat&tstatCode=000001018034 (accessed 27 November 2018).

Federici, F. M. (2016), *Mediating Emergencies and Conflicts,* Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills.

Federici, F. M. and Cadwell, P. (2018), "Training citizen translators: design and delivery of bespoke training on the fundamentals of translation for New Zealand Red Cross", *Translation Spaces*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 23–43.

Gomm, R., Hammersley, M., and Foster, P. (2000). *Case Study Method: Key Issues, Key Texts*, Sage, London.

Hall, E. T. (1976), *Beyond Culture,* Anchor Press, Garden City, N.Y.

Halverson, S. L. (2016), "Implications of cognitive linguistics for translation studies", in Rojo López, A. M. and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano, B. (Eds,), *Cognitive Linguistics and Translation: Advances in Some Theoretical Models and Applications*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 33-73.

Henry, M., Kawasaki, A. and Meguro, K. (2011), "Disaster information gathering behaviour after the Tohoku Earthquake Part 2: Results of foreign respondents", paper presented at 10th International Symposium on New Technologies for Urban Safety in Mega Cities in Asia, 12-14 October, Chiang Mai, Thailand, available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266868138 (accessed 27 November 2018).

Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations*, 2nd ed., Sage Publications, London.

House, J. (2018), *Translation: The Basics*. Routledge, London.

Hyvärinen, J. and Vos, M. (2016), "Communication concerning disasters and pandemics", in Schwarz, A., Seeger, M. W. and Auer, C. (Eds), *The Handbook of International Crisis Communication Research,* Wiley Blackwell, Chichester, UK, pp 96-107.

Josephiddes, L. (2012), "Finding and mining the talk: negotiating knowledge and knowledge transfer in the field", in Skinner, J. (Ed.), *The Interview: An Ethnographic Approach,* Berg, London, pp. 89-104.

Khodyakov, D. (2007), "Trust as a process: a three-dimensional approach", *Sociology* Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 115-132.

Lyon, F., Möllering, G. and Saunders, M. N. K. (2016), “Introduction. Researching trust: the ongoing challenge of matching objectives and methods”, in Lyon, F., Möllering, G. and Saunders, M. N. K. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods on Trust*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK, pp. 1-22.

Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan (2011), “*Tōhokuchihōtaiheiyōokijishin ni kakaru saigaikyūjohō no tekiyō ni tsuite”,* available at: http://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/houdou/2r98520000014j2y-img/2r985200000167hm.pdf (accessed 27 November 2018).

Ministry of Justice of Japan (2012), “*Heisei23nenmatsu genzai ni okeru gaikokujin tōrokushasū ni tsuite”* available at: http://www.moj.go.jp/nyuukokukanri/kouhou/nyuukokukanri04_00021.html (accessed 15 August 2017).

Mitchell, J. (2000), “Case and situation analysis”, in Gomm, R., Hammersley, M. and Foster, P. (Eds.), *Case Study Method: Key Issues, Key Texts*, Sage, London, pp. 165-186.

Möllering, G. (2006a), “Trust, institutions, agency: towards a neoinstitutional theory of trust”, in Bachmann, R., and Zaheer, A. (Eds.), *Handbook of Trust Research*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, pp. 355-376.

Möllering, G. (2006b), *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity,* Elsevier, Amsterdam.

Moser-Mercer, B., Kherbiche, L., and Class, B. (2014), “Interpreting conflict: training challenges in humanitarian field interpreting”, *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 140-158.

Mulayim, S. and Lai, M. (2017), *Ethics for Police Translators and Interpreters*, CRC Press, Boca Raton.

Nepal, V., Banerjee, D., Perry, M. and Scott, D. (2012), "Disaster preparedness of linguistically isolated populations: practical issues for planners", *Health Promotion Practice*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 265-271.

Nooteboom, B. (2002), *Trust: Forms, Foundations, Functions, Failures, and Figures*, E. Elgar Pub, Cheltenham, UK.

O’Brien, S., Federici, F. M., Cadwell, P., Marlowe, J. and Gerber, B. (2018), “Language translation during disaster: a comparative analysis of five national approaches”, *International Journal for Disaster Risk Reduction,* Vol. 31, pp. 627-636.

O'Mathúna, D. P., Parra Escartín, C., Roche, P., and Marlowe, J. (forthcoming), "Engaging citizen translators in disasters: exploring ethical challenges", *Translation and Interpreting Studies.*

Paton, D. (2003), "Disaster preparedness: a social-cognitive perspective", *Disaster Prevention and Management,* Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 210-216.

Paton, D. (2007), "Preparing for natural hazards: the role of community trust", *Disaster Prevention and Management,* Vol 16 No. 3, pp. 370-379.

Paton, D. (2008), "Risk communication and natural hazard mitigation: how trust influences its effectiveness", *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 2-16.

Paton, D. (2013), "Disaster resilient communities: developing and testing an all-hazards theory", *Journal of Integrated Disaster Risk Management,* Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 1-17.

Paton, D., Smith, L. M. and Johnson, D. (2005), "When good intentions turn bad: promoting natural hazard preparedness", *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 25-30.

Priem R. L. and Nystrom P. C. (2014), "Exploring the dynamics of workgroup fracture: common ground, trust-with-trepidation, and warranted distrust", J*ournal of Management,* Vol. 40 No. 3, pp.764-795.

Pym, A. (2012), *On Translator Ethics: Principles for Mediation between Cultures*, translated by Walker, H., John Benjamins Pub. Co., Amsterdam.

Reese, S. (2018), "Foreword", in D'Angelo, P. (Ed*.), Doing News Framing Analysis II: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*, Routledge, New York, pp. xiii-xvi.

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S. and Camerer, C. (1998), "Not so different after all: a cross-discipline view of trust", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 393-404.

Searle, R. H., Nienaber, A.-M. I. and Sitkin, S. B. (2018), "Implications for future directions in trust research", in Searle, R. H., Nienaber, A.-M. I. and Sitkin, S. B. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Trust*, Routledge, London, pp. 536-541.

Shackleton, J. (2018), "Preparedness in diverse communities: citizen translation for community engagement", *Proceedings of ISCRAM Asia Pacific 2018*, Massey University, pp. 400–406.

Sitkin, S. and Bijlsma-Frankema, K. (2018), “Distrust”, in Searle, R. H., Nienaber, A.-M. I. and Sitkin, S. B. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Trust*, Routledge, London, pp. 109-121.

Steelman, T. A., McCaffrey, S. M., Velez, A.-L. K., and Briefel, J. A. (2015), “What information do people use, trust, and find useful during a disaster? Evidence from five large wildfires”, *Natural Hazards,* Vol. 76 No. 1, pp. 615-634.

Stephenson, J. M. (2005), “Making humanitarian relief networks more effective: operational coordination, trust and sense making”, *Disasters*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 337-350.

Sztompka, P. (1999), *Trust: A Sociological Theory,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Takahashi, R. (2019), “Tokyo's foreign residents prepare for worst at multilingual disaster drill”, available at: https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2019/01/16/national/tokyos-foreign-residents-prepare-worst-multilingual-disaster-drill/#.XJkvhlX7QdV (accessed 22 March 2019).

Tipton, R. (2011), “Relationships of learning between military personnel and interpreters in situations of violent conflict: dual pedagogies and communities of practice”, *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 15–40.

Tokyo Metropolitan Government, Bureau of General Affairs (2019), “Disaster preparedness training”, available at: http://www.bousai.metro.tokyo.jp/foreign/english/taisaku/2000023/2002105/ (accessed 19 March 2019).

Valdeón, R. A. (2015), "Fifteen years of journalistic translation research and more", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 634-662.

Wray, R., Rivers, J., Jupka, K., and Clements, B. (2006), “Public perceptions about trust in emergency risk communication”, *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 45-76.

Appendix A

Below are the four main topics that I hope to cover in our talk together. I have included some questions for each topic to illustrate how our conversation might develop.

A. Your experiences of communication and information gathering:

1. Tell me about your experience of the 2011 disaster in Japan.

2. How did you communicate with the important people in your life during the disaster?

3. How did you find out information about the things you needed during the disaster?

4. How did power and connectivity affect your ability to communicate?

5. What websites provided information specifically to foreigners in the disaster?

6. What were your thoughts on social media before the disaster? Did that opinion change following the disaster?

7. Were there aspects of the disaster that you feel you did not get enough information about?

B. Your links to your local community in Japan

8. Did you feel part of your local community in Japan before the disaster?

9. Were you aware of any slogans designed to build community response after the disaster?

10. Were you aware of any other efforts to build community response after the disaster?

11. Before the events of 2011, how prepared did you feel for a disaster?

12. What disaster information had your local authorities (neighbourhood association, ward office, city office, etc.) given you before the disaster?

13. What contact did you receive from your local authorities (neighbourhood association, ward office, city office, etc.) after the onset of the disaster?

14. Is there anything that would have made you feel better-prepared for the disaster in 2011?

C. General:

15. Is there anything else you'd like to mention in relation to experiences or needs in 2011 or your feelings of community in Japan?

D. Your feelings on the research process:

16. How did talking about your experience of the 2011 disaster today make you feel?

17. What benefits or burdens do you think talking about your experience of the disaster could bring to you, if any?

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Dublin City University and the National Development Plan under a Daniel O'Hare PhD Scholarship. Fieldwork for this research was also part-funded by DCU's School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies and Centre for Translation and Textual Studies. The author would also like to thank Prof. Richard L. Priem and Prof. Dr. Antoinette Weibel for advice given at a conference in 2016 to put context and participant voices at the centre of my study of trust, distrust, and translation.

Table 1

Participant	Vulnerability to Another	Communication Channel	Translational Processes	Source of Original Text	Source of Translated Text
08	Emergency procedure decision	Face to face	Present	Residents' association	Japanese building receptionist
19	Emergency procedure decision	Face to face	Present	Train station announcer	Japanese co-worker
28	Emergency procedure decision	Face to face	Present	School principal	Japanese co-workers
08	Emergency procedure decision	Face to face	Present	Building management	Japanese co-workers
21	Radiation danger decision	Email	Present	Japanese broadcaster	Japanese friend
24	Evacuation/return decision	Face to face	Present	Emergency responders	Japanese hotel staff
03	Evacuation/return decision	Emergency radio	Present	Japanese language broadcasts and news	Japanese local Embassy staff
15	Evacuation/return decision	Face to face	Present	Municipal authorities	Japanese university professor
13	Evacuation/return decision	Telephone call	Present	Railway operators	Japanese-speaking foreign national
16	Emergency procedure decision	Face to face	Present	Evacuation centre staff	Japanese-speaking foreign national friends
20	Radiation danger decision	Internet and face to face	Present	Japanese government and power plant operator	Japanese-speaking foreign national friends
20	Evacuation/return decision	Twitter	Present	Japanese government and power plant operator	Japanese-speaking foreign nationals
27	Radiation danger decision	TV news	Present	Japanese broadcaster	Journalists
27	Radiation danger decision	News wires	Present	Japanese news agencies	Journalists and translators
28	Radiation danger decision	News website	Absent	BBC News Website	n/a
23	Emergency procedure decision	News website	Absent	BBC, CNN, Al Jazeera	n/a
08	Evacuation/return decision	Email	Absent	Embassy	n/a
26	Evacuation/return decision	Email	Absent	Embassy	n/a
08	Radiation danger decision	Letter	Absent	Embassy	n/a
28	Evacuation/return decision	Email	Absent	Family and friends overseas	n/a
23	Evacuation/return decision	Telephone call	Absent	Home university	n/a
01	Emergency procedure decision	Face to face	Absent	Japanese building receptionist	n/a
10	Evacuation/return decision	Face to face	Absent	Japanese customers employed at nuclear plant	n/a
05	Evacuation/return decision	Face to face	Absent	Japanese employer	n/a
09	Radiation danger decision	Email	Absent	Japanese inlaws and friends	n/a
04	Evacuation/return decision	News programmes	Absent	Japanese language broadcasts and news	n/a
27	Radiation danger decision	News website	Absent	Journalists at New York Times	n/a
27	Radiation danger decision	News website	Absent	New York Times	n/a
06	Evacuation/return decision	Face to face	Absent	Foreign national friends	n/a
09	(Outlier) Request to run business	Telephone call	Absent	Foreign national employer	n/a

Table 2

Participant	Vulnerability to Another	Communication Channel	Translational Processes	Source of Original Text	Source of Translated Text
02	Evacuation/return decision	Face to face	Present	Japanese government	Japanese girlfriend of participant
22	Evacuation/return decision	Telephone call	Present	Municipal authorities	Japanese-speaking foreign nationals
17	Emergency procedure decision	Social media	Absent	Chinese social media sites	n/a
12	Radiation danger decision	TV news	Absent	Japanese news media	n/a
04	Evacuation/return decision	TV news	Absent	Japanese news media	n/a
27	Radiation danger decision	Newspapers	Absent	Japanese news media	n/a
07	Radiation danger decision	TV news	Absent	Japanese and overseas news media	n/a
03	Evacuation/return decision	TV, radio, website	Absent	Overseas news media	n/a
25	Emergency procedure decision	Email	Present	Other foreign national in Japan	n/a