Translators who own it: A case study on how doxa and psychological ownership impact translators' engagement and job satisfaction

Esther Monzó-Nebot
Universitat Jaume I, Spain
monzo@uji.es

Abstract: This paper explores the job satisfaction of translators working for an international intergovernmental organization. The extant literature on translators' job satisfaction has explored a number of constructs. Based on developments in the field of organizational theory and the complexity of translation as a job, it is argued that psychological ownership may prove an adequate framework to explain translators' job satisfaction and instrumental in establishing a dialogue between the various analyses of different workplaces in the field of translation and interpreting studies. The study focuses on a specific multilingual intergovernmental organization and draws on the interviews of 17 Spanish-native translators of different nationalities. Their feelings of ownership are analyzed and variations in how they relate to constructs of psychological ownership — feelings of control, intimacy of knowledge, and self-investment— become apparent. Exploring patterns shows those variations to be related to translators' differing translation doxas, that is, their divergent, competing, and sometimes conflicting understanding of what translation is and should be. Furthermore, relationships between psychological ownership, translation doxa, and translators' efforts to advance their own doxas in the organization are examined with a view towards creating means to engage professional translators in advancing a doxa shaped by and for translators across workplaces.

Keywords: Institutional translation; intergovernmental organizations; psychological ownership; job satisfaction; translation doxa; interactional power; workplace studies.

1. Once upon a time…

This paper presents an empirical study that used qualitative interviews to examine the interactional power of institutional translators in a specific workplace. To provide context and clarity on the research goals, I will first reflect on my observations as a participant in the institutional workplace, discuss the questions that arose from those observations, and outline the subsequent inquiry. Additionally, I will briefly mention the relevant findings from previous analyses that inspired this study.

During my years of working as an institutional translator for various intergovernmental organizations, I observed a common characteristic across different workplaces: translators expressed high job-related satisfaction. Translators did not hide past and ongoing conflicts among translators and other sections within the same organizations, but they maintained a positive outlook on their work and job-related perspectives. Coming from a translation culture (a

translation degree and experience as a sworn and legal translator in the private market) where overt dissatisfaction with the positions and possibilities of translators was prevalent (as commented on in the literature, including Hermans & Lambert, 1998; Hermans & Stecconi, 2002), this stark contrast intrigued me and I started collecting information on the topic. While noticing specific exceptions to what seemed like a general perception of translation as a satisfying profession, questions arose as to (1) why some translators and interpreters were complaining about their lack of influence or their invisibility, while others in the same context and with the same objective status were satisfied with their positions, and (2) why some seemed to find it easy to engage with other agents within the organization to address perceived malfunctions, while others either acquiesced to new norms (either newly introduced or previously unknown to them) or expressed discontent without actively seeking changes, or surrender at early stages of their negotiation (generally after talking to a superior).

Regarding the lack of influence, initial comments I collected pointed to two main aspects: the overall professional configuration of the sections (i.e., promotions, temporary hires, negotiation and allocation of permanent positions), as well as procedural and substantial aspects of the work. In terms of procedures, concerns were raised about translation-specific processes, including technology (the lack of resources for implementing new technology, the introduction of new technology, or the substitution of or failure to substitute existing tools) and internal revision processes (the personal preferences of specific translation revisers, performance issues, or the added costs of unnecessary changes made during revisions). Other observations referred to the final product delivered to the institution, highlighting specific equivalences for specialized terms that deviated from practices in other social spaces (particularly national markets), or what was felt to be undue interference from other (non-translation) sections which resulted in unidiomatic renderings that had become the in-house rule.

Considering those issues and the diverging responses of translators, I turned to translation and interpreting profession studies (TIPS) to shape an inquiry into an underexplored social arena, that of institutional translation at international organizations (with well-known exceptions since Mossop's call in 1988, including Koskinen, 2000, 2008, as a pioneer in social approaches to institutional translation). When reviewing the extant TIPS literature, status emerged as a core concern. This prompted the design of an enquiry with in-depth interviews to examine the influence of status in translators' job satisfaction (Monzó-Nebot, 2019). The study particularly emphasized the distinction between objective and subjective status, that is, the hierarchically organized positions occupied by translators as set by the institutions vis-à-vis their perceived authority over other professional groups. The interview results yielded valuable insights, revealing no clear association between objective status and satisfaction, nor between objective status and the power to influence their environment. In contrast, subjective status and prestige, that is, how translators saw themselves in relation to other professions and the deference shown to them by other professionals in interaction, emerged as significant factors and highlighted the role of interactional power. The social dynamics analyzed showed promising links between the perceived deference and status (related to question 1 above) and translators' engagement style when encountering reasons for dissatisfaction (pertaining to question 2 above). Translators who framed themselves as influential and who identified with active roles (rather than bridges or invisible agents) seemed to feel more empowered to negotiate changes that may advance their views of what constituted 'good translation' for them.

In a second analysis (Monzó-Nebot, 2021), I examined the experience of translators who appeared to be successful but had chosen to transition away from their professional careers in translation due to unresolved dissatisfaction. This analysis revealed that these translators not only demonstrated a genuine interest in and comprehensive understanding of the translational field, but also possessed the necessary expertise to promote their perspectives and collaborate effectively with other professional groups within the organization. Moreover, they had been key or instrumental in introducing changes to improve translation processes and elevating the visibility and impact of translators within the organization. However, in the cases analyzed (all from one particular workplace), intra-professional conflicts (that is, conflicts within their own professional group) as regards the role of translation but also career development had led them to either abandon their jobs or their translation careers altogether.

Both studies emphasized the significance of translators' interpretation of 'good translating' and their role within the institution's mission and performance as salient in explaining their sense of empowerment to advance their own translation-related perspectives and values, as well as their overall comfort within the translation field. To some extent, all of those interviewed felt invested in both the process and the outcome, with some displaying a strong attachment to the organization. This led to a search for models that could account for these various aspects and provide coherent and actionable insights. Building upon this foundation, the study further surveys the translators' job-related psychological ownership and its impact on translators' feelings of satisfaction and empowerment to advocate for and promote their views on translation —their own translational doxa— against differing taken-for-granted assumptions on how translation is and should be.

2. Exploring job satisfaction through psychological ownership

The job satisfaction of translators and interpreters is an underexplored area of TIPS. Nevertheless, available studies offer valuable insights into how both TIPS scholars and practitioners have approached and perceived job satisfaction. The issue has garnered greater attention in the field of interpreting studies, most notably in the study of signed language interpreting. It is commonly assumed that there is a positive and direct correlation between job satisfaction and social status (see Dam, 2017, for the case of interpreters, and Ruokonen & Mäkisalo, 2018, for translators). There seems to be academic consensus that human beings show a preference for high status (Frank, 1985; Veblen, 1994; Wright, 1994; Gould, 2003; Brennan & Pettit, 2004), even though some individuals and groups accept and perpetuate lower positions and others favor equality (Whitmeyer, 2007). However, empirical studies have failed to establish significant correlations between translators' and interpreters' job satisfaction and their social status. Even when offering scathing criticism over their low status, translators and interpreters both tend to report high levels of job satisfaction (Kurz, 1991; Setton & Liangliang, 2009; Katan, 2011; Dam & Zethsen, 2016).

Some studies have tested the influence of other constructs. Rodríguez-Castro (2015) developed and validated an instrument to measure translators' job satisfaction that encompassed an admittedly wide range of factors, with self-efficacy and the disparity between actual and expected conditions playing prominent roles. Swartz's (2006) study found a narrower list of factors related to signed language interpreters in the United States and Canada, where autonomy,

leadership style, and promotion opportunities all positively influenced job satisfaction, whereas workload and role conflict had a negative effect. Autonomy has consistently emerged as a crucial factor in empirical studies on translators' and interpreters' job satisfaction (Koskinen, 2009), expressed through various constructs. Dean and Pollard (2001) found that *control* over the work environment and tasks positively influenced interpreters' job satisfaction, while Virtanen found that translators in Finland appreciated the possibility of redesigning their tasks through *job crafting* (2019).

As Hale (2011) suggests, even though the literature seems focused on identifying areas for improvement, overall satisfaction among professionals is high. For instance, in a survey of the International Association of Conference Interpreters, Mackintosh (2002) reported that 88% of the 607 respondents exhibited high satisfaction with their profession. Less than a half of participants identified the travel involved and the perceived low prestige of the profession as negative factors, and even the high or very high levels of work-related stress reported by two thirds of the interpreters did not outweigh their satisfaction. Stress was also highlighted in Courtney and Phelan's (2019) study of translators, where perceived unfair treatment from agencies, inadequate remuneration, and uncertainty about the future were cited as sources of job-related stress. Yet, as with interpreters, job satisfaction was rated high to extremely high.

Empirical studies have identified other factors negatively influencing job satisfaction among translators and interpreters. These include minor disturbances while translating (Ehrensberger-Dow & Hunziker Heeb, 2016) and work-related health risks (Harvey, 2003; Bontempo & Malcolm, 2012; Fischer & Woodcock, 2012). In the latter case, the ability of professionals to cope and adapt has been highlighted (Qin, Marshall, Mozrall, & Marschark, 2008; Bontempo & Napier, 2011; Schwenke, Ashby, & Gnilka, 2014). While studying interpreters in Australia, Blignault, Stephanou, and Barrett (2009) found that successfully resolving role conflicts and perceiving themselves as valued members of the healthcare team positively influenced job satisfaction (and quality). When studying conference interpreters in South Korea, Choi (2007) pointed out adequate training as a positive influence in interpreters' job satisfaction and, a decade later, Lee (2017) found that job security and also social recognition (as different from status) were significant positive influences. Adequately differentiating status and prestige also showed important consequences in Monzó-Nebot's study of translators at international organizations. Feelings of being addressed with deference, being listened to, and having an impact on work-related issues influenced individual job satisfaction among groups with the same objective status (Monzó-Nebot, 2019). The perceived value and appreciation of their work emerged as factors influencing job satisfaction in a study by Hale (2011), where perceived appreciation by service providers and recipients was the rule. Similarly, focusing on conference interpreting at the OECD, Donovan (2009, 2017) found that involvement with delegates and conference organizers was esteemed, whereas remote interpreting was identified as a negative influence. Both physical and psychological proximity seem to rank high in interpreters' surveys. As for translators, the physical absence of colleagues was noted by Mossop as one of his own de-motivators as a government translator (2014, p. 586), and psychological proximity also proved relevant to job-satisfaction in Koskinen's (2009), Liu's (2013), and Rodríguez-Castro's (2016) studies. Further insights were provided in Hubscher-Davidson's studies (2016, 2018), which stressed the significant role of emotional intelligence and emotion expression in ensuring job satisfaction.

In the literature on organizational management, several theories and constructs have been developed to explain and predict job satisfaction, especially in connection with attempts to improve performance and work attendance (Sieger, Zellweger, & Aquino, 2013). Some contributions have focused on commitment, aiming to motivate behavior beneficial to the organization, mainly through rewards and punishments. However, tangible attainments such as pay and promotions have been shown to undermine motivation in some cases (Eisenberger, Pierce, & Cameron, 1999). As a consequence, the 'carrot and stick' approach has lost its initial traction. As in TIPS, status has also been seen to provide little insights into job satisfaction. While individuals may desire higher remuneration and status, attaining such goals does not necessarily make them feel successful (Hesllin, 2015). "The best people […] stay because they are engaged and challenged by work that makes them better at what they do" (Jamrog, 2004, p. 11).

More recent contributions share a focus on *engaging* individuals rather than driving their behavior. Attuning the environment to individuals' psychological needs has rendered powerful results. Notably, identifying features that nurture basic human needs in organizations and leadership styles (e.g., those favoring bonds between co-workers), job design (e.g., those promoting workers' autonomy), and satisfied individuals (e.g., emotionally intelligent) has encouraged conditions that are inherently appealing and trigger satisfaction. Rather than providing a catalog of satisfying features at various levels, these models have sought the rationale behind how and why these features work on individuals, allowing for both universal claims and contextual adaptations.

Job design, for instance, is an area where changes have yielded interesting results. Not all jobs are created equal, and certain factors influence their capacity to fulfill psychological needs (Pierce, Jussila, & Cummings, 2009). Strategies have been devised to address the challenge of engaging employees in tasks that may not inherently captivate their interest, such as by promoting the internalization of specific goals and values, ultimately enhancing workers' satisfaction (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, & Gardner, 2007; Jussila, Tarkiainen, Sarstedt, & Hair, 2015). This internalization approach has proven effective in elucidating how workers can be persuaded to embrace the organization's goals, mission, or even translation technologies (Estellés & Monzó-Nebot, 2015).

For those jobs that can provide stimulation and inherent satisfaction on their own, and are therefore performed out of interest, efforts have been directed towards identifying the conceptual boundaries and empirical relevance of the very basic human psychological needs and how job-related factors at all levels (personal, task-related, and organizational) connect to and satisfy those needs. TIPS has provided ample evidence of the intrinsically motivating "nature" of translation (as termed in Ruokonen, Lassus, & Virtanen, 2020), and therefore those approaches will be favored. Selecting a particular approach is a matter of strategy based not on any essential superiority of one approach over another, but rather its potential to broaden understanding and, if possible, promote the wellbeing of translators.

Based on the background of this research outlined in Section 1, the model chosen should ideally explain why, even though translators are by definition literate and comfortable within different normative systems (Toury, 1995), attachment to a particular doxa may wreak havoc on a person's identification as a translator (Monzó-Nebot, 2021), or conversely explain fulfilling job experiences. After exploring various constructs related to job-related satisfaction, psychological ownership emerged as a suitable framework. Like other models that underscore the relevance of intrinsic motivation (such as Deci and Ryan's 1985 self-determination

theory), psychological ownership offers paths towards understanding what may go amiss when something, such as a job, becomes 'too' fulfilling. The ownership approach focuses on how a job can align with an individual's own goals and values and become an extension of the person, creating a strong identification with the job. This research will place emphasis on translators' own doxas (Bourdieu, 1980, p. 111), their assumptions and beliefs as to what translation is and should be, the possible mismatches between their doxas and the organizations', and how translators engage in adjusting the system to better serve what they perceive as improvements. Psychological ownership was chosen on those grounds.

Psychological ownership is the subjective sense of possessing an object that, in the individual's mind, becomes an extension of the self. The theory was first formulated as the employee-ownership theory, which claimed that granting shares of a business to employees would stimulate their "zeal and careful working" (Webb, 1912, p. 138). Further elaboration on the theory distinguished the real and symbolic dimensions of ownership (Etzioni, 1991, p. 465), thereby introducing the ownership of intangible targets in the discussion and shifting away from a behavior-driving approach. Empirical testing revealed the psychological component as the key factor influencing group and individual outcomes (Pierce, Rubenfeld, & Morgan, 1991), and a link to emotional and psychological effects was finally established (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001). Ownership is about workers' passion, about their connecting deeply with their work and finding meaning in what they do. It has been found to positively impact job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee performance, and creativity. The theory has been extensively applied in sales management, leveraging individuals' ability to identify with objects, such as cars or phones, to create a genuine attachment to the objects that may persuade a customer to purchase the object. A feeling of ownership can be developed toward material and also symbolic objects, including tasks and jobs. In that area, it has been extensively used to analyze voice behavior (e.g., Shah, Shahjehan, & Afsar, 2016), that is, a person speaking up for their concerns, ideas, and critical views that may result in an improvement of job-related factors and organizational performance.

Psychological ownership can be understood by examining how it connects with individuals (its antecedents or *roots* within the individual) and how it is directed (its *routes*). Three roots or motives for ownership have been identified, which may or may not overlap in generating feelings of ownership. Those roots are effectance (ability to explore and alter the environment), self-identity (expressing the self through interaction with possessions), and finding a place or a home (owning a territory in which to dwell). When effectance is important to a person, they will spend "time and energy mentally and physically exploring the organization" (Pierce & Jussila, 2011, p. 87). Effectance generates feelings of control of the target, be it their role or the organization. Self-identity comes into play when the target of ownership aligns with a person's values and self-perceived personality (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009). Then the target becomes a part of themselves and triggers comfort, autonomy, pleasure, and meaning. This alignment may prompt individuals to personalize their workspace and they may even wear symbols of the organization or role outside of work. The third root, finding a place, refers to feelings of attachment towards the job. Individuals may feel at home in their job, which leads to them spending a great deal of time and energy in the target of their ownership. Whether individually or in combination, these roots have the power to sustain feelings of ownership over time.

As for the origin of those feelings, the *routes* to ownership, Pierce et al. (2001) developed a model describing how ownership emerges through (a) exercised

control over the target of the feeling, which has to be open to one's influence; (b) intimate knowledge of the object, that is, insights into and familiarity with work-related content and processes, and (c) the opportunity to invest the self into the object, be it one's own energy (intellectual, physical, and psychological), be it time, effort, attention, ideas, or skills (especially a variety of these). For instance, imposing how a task needs to be done without accord or negotiation would be detrimental to the feeling of ownership, and tasks for which the individual has had no training or skills would be less motivating. Conversely, higher levels of personal involvement and dedication, along with fewer distractions, intensify the feeling of ownership. These so-called *routes* induce the perception of the target as part of one's own, and thereby increase job satisfaction (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004), organizational commitment (Spitzmuller & Van Dyne, 2013), and a disposition for action (Sikavica & Hillman, 2008).

Psychological ownership is a feeling that fulfils basic needs and that can be directed to increase a person's satisfaction, thereby using their energy to advance an organization's goals. I contend that this concept may also be used in advancing a role or a field's roles by ensuring the agents' involvement. To do so, we must first understand how psychological ownership works for translators and interpreters, and whether it is connected to their engagement in advancing what they perceive as 'good translating,' that is, their translation doxa.

3. The case study: Interviews and participants

The aim of this study is first to explore the explanatory powers of psychological ownership and its constructs in describing translators' and interpreters' job satisfaction. The final purpose is to learn whether we may operate the routes to ownership for the benefit of the translation field.

The data for this study consist of in-depth interviews (n=17). The interviewees were Spanish translators (from various nationalities) working for one intergovernmental organization (8 female and 9 male). Seven participants were revisers (3 women and 4 men) and 10 were translators (5 women and 5 men). In intergovernmental organizations, translation careers are structured in a way that allows for progression from translating texts to a combination of translation and self-revision, and eventually to revising translations done by others. At the highest level, individuals primarily focus on revising and only translate when there is a shortage of translators. Furthermore, when working in-house, both translators and revisers may work on a temporary or a permanent basis. For temporary or fixed-term translators, the length of contract may vary. Usually, their first contract with an organization spans three weeks, whereas some successful translators may choose the length of their contracts and even specialize and work for only one organization up to 11 months per year. In this study's participant group, all seven revisers were permanent, whereas 4 of the translators were permanent and 6 were temporary, 3 of whom had short-term contracts with the organization. Permanent revisers will hereinafter be referred to as PR, permanent translators as PT, and temporary translators as TT. Table 1 shows those categories, along with participants' training backgrounds and genders. Participants' training is classified as either domain-specific (law, economics, politics), technical (information technology, engineering), or linguistic or translation (translation and interpreting, modern languages) to facilitate comparisons in the discussion.

Table 1. Interviewees' educational background

Interviewee	Undergraduate training	Graduate training	Gender
PR1	Domain + Languages	Domain	M
PR2	Language + Translation	Translation	F
PR3	Language	Non-related domain	F
PR4	Domain	None	M
PR5	Technical + Language	None	M
PR6	Translation + Domain	Domain	F
PR7	Domain	None	M
PT1	Technical	Technical	F
PT2	Domain	Domain	M
PT3	Translation	Translation (research-oriented)	F
PT4	Language + Technical	None	M
TT1	Language	Language (research)	F
TT2	Translation	Translation (practice)	F
TT3	Translation	None	M
TT4	Language	None	M
TT5	Technical + Translation	None	M
TT6	Translation	Translation (research-oriented) + Domain	F

The organization where these translators work or used to work is officially trilingual (English, French, and Spanish) and, in practice, most documents are drafted in English and then translated into French and Spanish. All the translators in this study worked in-house from both English and French into Spanish. The institution covers a wide range of topics in its documents, with a primary focus on legal and economic matters, but also scientific and technical. The organization's workforce is divided into professional and support staff. Professional groups include lawyers, economists, and translators, whereas support staff handle logistical, administrative, and editorial tasks.

Clearance for the interviews was given in 2013 by the Service Director. All interviewees were informed of the purpose of the interview (expressed in general terms as exploring their job experience and satisfaction) and explicitly accepted to participate. The interviews were semi-structured and conducted face-to-face over a two-year period. They were audio recorded and transcribed. For this study, a deductive content analysis applied codes developed from the ownership framework.

4. Results: Who owns translation?

The analysis aimed at finding out whether ownership may explain translators' overall satisfaction and their voice and proactive behavior in advancing their translation doxa. This section explores interviewees' feelings of ownership over their translation jobs and the organization. By exploring the routes to ownership, it seeks to identify the paths that may trigger translators' engagement with other agents in the organization to advance a translation-based doxa.

4.1 Feelings of control among revisers and translators

The first construct, feelings of control, refers to the extent to which translators perceive themselves as having influence within the organization. Questions related to this construct centered around work processes and decisions that affect translators' work and careers. Feelings of control have been associated with a deep understanding of how the organization operates and a sense of responsibility for its effectiveness (Liu, Wang, Hui, & Lee, 2012). Accordingly, interviewees were asked to assess their responsibility over the text-related processes, products, and performance of the organization.

The 7 revisers (with permanent positions) viewed the final versions of the texts, both source and target, as part of their responsibilities. Their responsibility extended beyond translation in a textual sense and expanded to translation as a work process from a source to a target text, and to the organization's communicative success irrespective of the language. In that sense, 5 of the 7 revisers also stated they had control or jurisdiction (in the sociological sense of legitimate control over a domain of work) over the final product, a jurisdiction which they shared with the drafters of the source documents. This showed understanding of a clear purpose within a complex cooperation structure of document production involving various professionals and the organization as a whole. However, one female reviser (the only one with an undergraduate degree in translation) did not hold the same jurisdictional views and actually stated "it is not my job" (PR2). Even though she acted out of her feelings of responsibility and did point out inconsistencies or mistakes in source documents, she did not feel entitled by her job description to go beyond the target text, and acted upon her own feelings of right and wrong (in relation to her textual doxa). One male reviser (PR5, with a technical degree) saw source texts as largely beyond his control. His work involved documents mainly produced outside of the organization, even though consumed within the organization. This may have an impact on his perspective.

As for their views on their power to impact the organization, two female revisers (PR2 and PR3) stressed a reported modification to work processes that restricted translators from directly contacting other professionals involved in the drafting of documents. Instead, translators were required to submit their queries around ambiguities or consistency to a central desk, which would distribute them to the relevant agents in the organization. The other female reviser (PR6) stated how this change was necessary and saw herself as a guardian of the organization's practices and policies rather than a voice in determining how processes should be designed. This incident was commented also by one male translator (PT2), who viewed a lost opportunity for translators to influence other agents and to make translation known across the organization.

Three male revisers (PR1, PR4, and PR7) highlighted a significant change that they were able to bring about in work processes. After identifying problems in the English texts that were being published before their translations were ready, they

first engaged the French translation section and then the legal section in charge of drafting the documents. In this case, translators convened a meeting to show these lawyers how translators may spot inconsistencies with an impact on application and adjudication procedures. They proposed that the publication of the English versions be sequestered until translations into French and Spanish were completed to ensure cross-linguistic and internal coherence. This showed translators' ability to impact the organization as a system.

Another male reviser (PR5) did not feel that he could have an impact on work processes involving other professionals in the organization. However, he actively collaborated with the administrative staff to ensure all corrections were introduced in the final (Spanish) documents. With a focus on the target text, he was able to exert control as the lead reviser of technical texts over translators working within his area of specialization and he enjoyed a high degree of autonomy from other sections and professionals in the organization (mostly lawyers and economists). He established different mechanisms to expand his doxa, such as training sessions, revision meetings, and mentoring practices. Translators in his area of influence appreciated his leadership and support, and his establishing a clear doxa of what was expected. The key point in his doxa and his message to translators was to communicate the content of the document in "good Spanish" (PR5).

The revisers' feelings of control were influenced by their understanding of what translation is and should be, and their understanding of processes, the organization, and their role in them. Revisers' translation doxas varied and this variation showed across a number of constructs. Those who viewed their role primarily as text-based focused on controlling the quality of the textual production, while their involvement with other professionals in the organization was seen as unnecessary. However, they recognized the importance of collaborating with support personnel responsible for final editing and publication of translated texts. In contrast, revisers who saw their duties as improving the organization's efficacy recognized the need to work in inter-professional teams, impact translation-related processes, and control the final product to help the organization achieve its goals. As one reviser stated, however, this was an implicit duty and dependent on individual attitudes, even though "it is somehow expected" (PR7). Of course, and considering that this organization relies heavily on legal and economic knowledge, the relation may be understood from the other end: when participants related to those professionals who were using the outcome of their work and became aware of its impact on those other professionals, their doxa expanded to understand translation as running through all the capillaries of the organization. Issues related to domain are further commented on in 4.2.

As for translators, both temporary and permanent, their feelings of control over the organization's performance were limited or non-existent. They perceived themselves as having little influence on overall translation processes, and chose to conform to organizational norms instead. Conversely, their sense of loyalty to and dependency upon revisers (rather than the organization) was generally strong. Translators generally felt a responsibility to communicate with revisers, seeking clarification and discussing issues with colleagues and revisers to ensure conformity with the organization's textual norms and maintain quality. PT3 stressed that "we sometimes manage" to make corrections in original texts, collectively referring to both herself, revisers, and administrative staff as "we," which provides hints as to her social identity. Interestingly, translators would not directly address lawyers without contacting revisers first, even when some were socially familiar with lawyers in the organization.

This different framing of the extent of translation versus revising does not mean translators lacked feelings of control, but rather they were targeted at different objects. Among translators, knowing the field's norms, the tools, what was expected from them, and who would assess their performance, provided a certain degree of autonomy and control, to the extent they were able to understand the rationale behind the decisions. Aspects such as knowing the deadline they were expected to meet or being given the corrections after revisers went through their translations were important triggers of feelings of control. However, these feelings were diminished by not knowing which reviser would be assigned to their translations and their perceptions of some revisers as acting out of subjective preferences, if not whims. The impression of revisers having distinct personal tastes was widespread. "It is hit and miss because you tell yourself, 'if I do this like that, that reviser will like it, but that other won't.' So, it's always a struggle" (PT3). It was also noted that most corrections were stylistic and did not affect the message conveyed, which implied that it was not a 'mistake' they made that was being corrected, nor a blatant misalignment between what they thought they should do and what revisers expected from them.

Nonetheless, some revisers seemed to go beyond what translators generally considered acceptable behavior: "Every reviser has their own pet peeves, but most know the boundaries. With some, you just get unlucky" (TT5). Some translators advanced hypotheses for such behavior: insecurity with the topic (PT2, PT3, TT2, TT7), lack of familiarity with the particular organization and its norms (PT2, PT3, TT3, TT4, TT6), or the need to make corrections to show they have worked on the translation (TT3, TT4, PR3, PR7), in addition to subjective "pet peeves" (all translators and revisers made some comment acknowledging this practice). The number and quality of comments made obvious that the heterodox corrections, together with a perceived or experienced lack of openness to negotiation of some revisers, eroded trust in revisers' competence and behavior and led to dissatisfaction among translators. This is understandable, as translators' contracts depend on their evaluation, which relies heavily on revisers' assessments of their work. However, those translators who had the possibility to specialize in specific domains knew with some certainty which revisers would review their translations. The feelings of control and general comfort and satisfaction were higher in those cases. Overall, translators' target of control, rather than the work and decision-making processes, seemed to be the target texts and their contracts.

As for the participants' possibilities to effect changes in how the organization sees translation, it is worth noting that verbal cues referring to invisibility and submission were frequent among individuals with a translation degree, regardless of their objective status (one reviser and six translators), and that they were used to justify the boundaries of acceptable behavior. References to invisibility were less frequent in those with an undergraduate language degree (present in TT4, who had read extensively in the area of translation studies) and non-existent in profiles based on or including a domain-specific degree. The dissemination of such a portrait may be problematic as studies show that expectations make individuals accommodate their behavior to conform to what they believe is expected from them (Anderson, Willer, Kilduff, & Brown, 2012). A projected expectation of an invisible role, that is, thinking others (either revisers or other professional groups) expect translators to go unnoticed may actually reduce the self-assessed acceptance of approaching other professionals, the range of self-assessed acceptable behavior, and the actual behavior. This understanding of the scope of translation may become a self-fulfilling prophecy when translators act on their cultivated views, triggering a social

dynamic that transfers their views to the field. This issue will be further addressed in Section 4.2.

4.2 Intimacy of knowledge: Feeling competent in the right type of knowledge

The second construct, intimacy of knowledge, is said to be developed through extensive "association" (Jussila et al., 2015), including formal and informal training, that allows an individual to deeply understand the target. Further, knowledge of the object, task, or any other target entity is built up through a "living relationship" (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2003) of repeated positive experiences in and with the target of ownership.

Following this conceptualization, the years of training in and experience with translation in general, translation in the international system, and the target organization in particular were hypothesized to account for the reported intimacy of knowledge of the job. Taking that in mind, information about the participants' training was elicited (see Table 1). All participants had university-level degrees and showed an interest in continuing (formal and informal) education. Variation was found along the length and intensity of their experience in the organization —from temporary translators with less than a couple of months in the organization and a couple of years in translation (TT1) to twenty years in translation and six in the then current organization (PR5) to twelve years in both translation and the organization (PR7). Responses revealed two noteworthy points.

On the one hand, knowledge of and experience in the organization proved key in contextualizing and providing complexity to answers. Domain-specific training was linked to responses mentioning other professional agents at the organization, the purpose of the organization, and its member states. The one reviser with technical training (PR5) did not elaborate on the link between the knowledge he was responsible to translate and the purpose of the organization and other professional groups, but did mention member states and their relationships. Revisers with language- and translation-based training (PR2 and PR3) did mention (without specifying) the purposes of the organization and its members, but they also elaborated on their perceptions of other professional groups' own views on translation. What these groups consider 'relevant others,' shapes their views on their jobs, their place in their jobs, and their job-related identity.

On the other hand, knowledge of the organization proved to be a cornerstone of translators' conception of what it is to succeed as a translator and their feelings of effectance. Knowing whom to approach for specific inquiries, engaging with colleagues and staff members, staying informed about the organization's activities and policies, and most importantly, having a clear understanding of translation-related expectations (role clarity) were all factors associated with confidence in one's own competence to effectively translate. The scope of relevant others for these translators primarily included agents participating in the translation process and most immediate context, excluding those using or being impacted by the translation (the organization, delegates, and member states). Interestingly, PT1 (technical training) and TT6 (translation training) did mention how the organization impacted member states in their responses. These differences across knowledge bases opened a promising door.

The knowledge accrued and deemed valuable differed widely across participants and most importantly was used differently across reported experiences. Translators in general and three revisers (PR2, PR3, PR5) claimed greater knowledge of the crafting of texts and both the source and target languages than drafters. They identified their language skills as a source of perceived competence

and a valuable contribution to the organization (to the quality of its work). They were aware that most drafters were using a foreign language they did not master: "You have Italians writing in Spanish" (PT3) or "Germans writing in English" (PT1, PT4, TT3, TT5). This recognition reinforced, in turn, their feelings of efficacy, as their linguistic decisions were rarely challenged. While there were occasional instances where they faced criticisms or requests to prioritize a delegate's Spanish dialect or use a term that was usual in the technolect but which translators perceived to be an anglicism that was not understandable for the general public (PT4), they were able to impose their criteria more often than not. Perceiving oneself not only as knowledgeable but also as *more* knowledgeable seemed productive in those cases, enclosing a jurisdiction where one felt free to not only dwell, but also to explore and to control.

When considering revisers and translators together, the differences in participants' knowledge base and their understanding of their job's scope and priorities seem crucial in determining which actions are deemed most suitable for advancing their purposes, and in achieving success as defined in their own terms. When the participants perceive their professional knowledge to be language-based and their self-reported missions stress language and target texts (PR2, PR3, and PR5) or even "language *purity*" (TT1), they will consider a 'job well-done' based on textual outcomes (and absence of corrections for translators). Their understandings of their roles and the knowledge and skills applied are more restricted than those of other participants who share the same positions and experience in the organization but who define their doxa otherwise. When a complex *intellectual* perception of the task combines communicative competence, organization- and domain-related knowledge, negotiation, and social skills, the extent of their perceived value and power to impact the organization's efficacy seems greater and both the roles they arrogate to themselves and those they attribute to drafters are more active (TT4, TT6, PT2, PT3, PR1, PR4, PR6, PR7) (see 4.3). Most importantly, they perceive a wider range of acceptable behavior.

It seems that a domain-related undergraduate degree (PT2, PR1, PR4, PR6, PR7) grants a perspective whereby translators play a very visible role and have a broader range of impact and acceptable behavior. One possible explanation may be that those with specific training in legal and economic fields feel more confident in their knowledge of the core matters of this particular organization and this intimate knowledge works as a route towards ownership. This leads to those translators having a voice and more positive experiences, which in turn reinforces their ownership. The characteristics of the organization itself may also partially explain the situation. The organization is a knowledge-intensive environment where international law is being performed and developed. Access to highly specialized and newly developed knowledge is thus required for successful translation of its texts. This knowledge, which is also necessary to understand the organizations' processes and the contribution of the agents involved across sections, may also provide insights into strategies to foster change.

However, among those who considered their power to impact the organization's efficacy to be greater, three had no domain-specific training (PT3, TT4, TT6). Their undergraduate training was linguistic (TT4) and translation-based (PT3, TT6) and they did not feel especially competent in legal matters, and yet they enacted a definition of teamwork that included professional agents beyond the translation section. The fact that two of these interviewees share a graduate interest in translation research made me ask TT4 if he had any interest in researching translation practice. Surprisingly, he had indeed read extensively on his own both

to further his education and to delve into specific issues related to translation and interpreting. PT3 made an enlightening remark in this regard: "At University, it was such an academic environment that I didn't see myself practicing. I always imagined myself doing my work in a corner. And here I saw that translation was something else —that translators are not alone." This comment showed a reflexive stance. We may argue this stance is expected from those interested in research in general. However, TT1 held a PhD in Spanish literature and did not seem to share the same openness towards other professional profiles but rather the contrary. Her short experience with translation and the organization at the time of the interview may recommend a follow-up on her views.

Other comments by those more proactive translators stressed a perception that the knowledge needed to translate is not always possessed by translators themselves but rather distributed across the members of a team. It is access to that knowledge that these translators emphasize when including different professionals in their ideal teams. In this regard, TT6 commented:

> I felt insecure because of the highly specialized nature of the work at the [organization]. Talking to lawyers was challenging because I felt I wasn't perceived as an equal. Being a woman matters, of course, but being able to elaborate on what they are talking about changed everything. If you make an effort not only to understand the texts but to keep up with what the [organization] is doing, then you are able to talk to lawyers… I don't know how to put it… You have quicker access to solutions, you find yourself understanding the text as a social event, you can tell them what you're translating and why it's interesting, and then even how countries behave and make jokes about stereotypes, or tell them [lawyers] something they don't know about translation. […] Then they're nicer next time.

It is interesting to see how PT3 and TT6 (both female) refer to socialized feelings of insecurity vis-à-vis domain-based professionals, and their views of their interaction with other professionals evolving with greater access to the organization and reflection on strategies to pursue. TT4 (male) did not refer to feelings of insecurity, but did show efforts made to increase his capacities for this and other organizations. Although further research is needed, this may suggest important avenues to explore gender-based differences and to design gender-dependent actions, especially when considering that both PT3 and TT6 decided to pursue other paths and eventually abandoned the translation field (see Monzó-Nebot, 2021).

4.3 Self-investment as a root: Also a symptom?

Self-investment is a construct that involves investing time and energy in one's labor, as well as efforts made to better know the target. The more we invest, the more likely we are to feel that what we create or produce is ours. Not all tasks or works offer the same opportunities for self-investment, though. "[M]ore complex jobs and nonroutine technologies allow individuals to exercise higher discretion, making it more likely that they will invest more of their own ideas, unique knowledge, and personal style" (Pierce et al., 2001, p. 302).

Among translators, overtime was the exception, with one individual taking the mandatory lunch break only once a month (TT6) and some taking coffee breaks only once a week (TT1, TT5, PT4). However, for some revisers, overtime was more frequent: PR1 regularly stayed one extra hour each day, whereas PR7 would stay a minimum of half an hour extra most days. On the contrary, PR2 and PR5 were on a reduced-time schedule (with their salary adjusted accordingly). It must be stressed that, contrary to support staff, professional occupations in the international system

are not paid for overtime. This observation supports an idea that appeared in the interviews (especially in PT2's) —that translation is needed and known within the organization, and that translators are expected to invest the time required to meet specific objectives rather than to provide labor for some specific hours per day. It also highlights the self-management and self-investment abilities of translators and revisers in aligning their work to fulfill the organization's goals.

When describing the skills required, all interviewees mentioned thematic, linguistic, and instrumental competences. However, some also included productivity (PR5, PR6), autonomy (PR5), negotiation (PR1, PR6, PR7, TT6) and social skills (PR1, PR4, PR7, PT2, PT3, TT4, TT6), teamwork (PR1, PR2, PR3, PR7, PT3, TT5, TT6), even "mind-reading" (TT6) or "self-promotion" skills (PR7). Connected to the set of competences they saw as necessary to perform their jobs, the descriptions of their own roles may shed some light on why the parts of self that they saw as involved in translating varied intensely across participants. For some interviewees, translators are the *inessential other* (de Beauvoir, 1953, p. 53), a background character, or even *non-existent* to other professional groups (PR2, PR3, TT3, TT5). This points out their perceived isolation from other agents, which some reported having experienced but managed to overcome. Some participants with less experience in the organization even talked about being perceived as performing machine-like roles (TT1, TT2). These perceptions seemed to impact their initiative to voice their views and contact other professional groups.

Those who recognized the involvement of a wider set of skills attributed more active roles to both translators and also document drafters. Participants who viewed drafters as experts or mediators had some domain-based training and showed higher self-investment as regards time and sets of skills. Those participants felt a greater sense of ownership overall, characterized the drafters' role as knowledge-intensive, and described their own roles as translators as involving knowledge-intensive and intellectual tasks. Conversely, when drafters' roles were described as "document producers," language- and translation-based training was dominant, both self-investment and contacts initiated with other professional groups were lower, and the words describing translators' own roles focused on *understanding* and *language*.

As part of this construct, participants' interest and investment in continued training were explored. Several translators mentioned engaging in informal training related to the organization, ranging from learning by dint of exposure to actively seeking sources of information to educate themselves on a wide range of topics pertaining to language, translation, international relations, science, economics, law, etc. Interest in learning seemed to be a given for the participants, but not necessarily formal training. Over half (10 out of 17) of the interviewees had pursued masters' and graduate programs. However, only two of those had chosen an MA or graduate program during their time at the organization and those were not related to their work (an MA in psychology and an MA in audiovisual translation). "I did it for myself, my own interests" (PR3) or "I wanted something new and fun" (PR2) were the reasons given for their choices. It is noteworthy that these two revisers did not see themselves as able to impact the organization processes (see 4.1), and when defining their team referred to the translation section and support staff (see 4.2). Thus, formal training was pursued by interviewees with a narrower view of the scope of translation, and it resulted from an interest to nurture intellectual activities outside of the organization rather than an investment in their jobs.

The analysis of this construct raises the question of whether specific substantive knowledge is a necessary condition for translators to feel knowledge-

able and motivated to invest in this organization. It also poses the question whether the myths involved in translation or linguistic training disempower translators by disseminating cultural beliefs of submission, limited influence, and invisibility, thus constraining the range of self-assessed acceptable behavior. Notably, translation graduates seem to report less interactions with other professionals in the organization, with the exception of those with translation research interests. Conversely, the more active and demanding the roles attributed to drafters and translators, the more frequent the interactions reported. Sometimes participants mentioned experiences where drafters were unable to shed light on the issues raised by translators, reinforcing the perception of drafters as non-experts and diminishing the translators' interest in further contacts. These experiences were also linked to the belief that translators were better drafters, an observation that was considered inappropriate (although not denied) by those who perceived the drafters' role as knowledge-intensive (especially, PR1 and PR7). In these cases, the complementarity of the roles within a broad-base team was stressed.

The analysis of self-investment seems to suggest that feeling more competent than others (drafters) in a particular task does not stimulate translators to self-invest nor to feel a wider ownership beyond target texts. Instead, attaching meaning to both translators' and drafters' roles and seeing the tasks as complementary within the organization drives translators to *own* their jobs in a broad sense that covers translation qua process and qua outcome, involving procedures and decisions that impact the translation environment. This sense of inhabiting a broader domain provides the energy to voice their concerns and initiate interactions across groups within the organization and to invest in a wider range of job-related skills.

5. Lessons learned: Same roots, different routes, separate destinations

Throughout this study, several noteworthy cases have been identified. They are briefly elaborated upon in this section to suggest actionable paths to empower translators (and revisers) and increase the influence of the translation field. This being a qualitative case study, lessons are to be understood as data potentially transferrable to other contexts and not generalizable in any sense.

The analysis has revealed the salience of differences in the definition of the participants' own place (and role) in the organization. A mutually defining dynamic between how the job is understood in terms of a translation doxa and the factors compounding ownership and job satisfaction has emerged. Participants seem to build their jurisdiction around what they perceive as expected, and they take this place to build themselves a home from which inroads are taken and explorations initiated. In this case study, the range of those explorations was clearly related to the scope of translation (of their dwelling within the organization), and the scope was visibly wider for those with domain-specific training for whom the organization at large (rather than translation tasks) shaped their views.

If we take PR2 as an example, her jurisdiction was defined in textual terms and her self-investment was reduced as a part-time worker who rarely engaged in overtime. She preferred to self-invest in intellectual development in an area of translation that was not related to her job and which provided genuine pleasure. In her comments, she stressed procedural changes at the workplace that limited her capacity to explore and to exert control in her own terms (4.1), and yet her satisfaction was high. Her confidence around doing a good job had been reinforced by promotions (she was a reviser at the time of the interview), and she felt

successful in terms of a doxa that was defined in textual terms and a place that was mostly built around translators. The target of her feelings of ownership were her translations and her translation and language skills. She felt at home in that role. Within that framework, she showed voice behavior in going beyond her job description to correct mistakes or ambiguities in source texts.

In contrast, a wider definition of relevant others provided a broader basis to understand the socially constructed dynamics and the role of translation as a process in and product of those dynamics. For example, PR7 would provide a broad contextualization of the rationale behind his work where not only translators but also other professional groups, the organization as a whole, and member states played a role in establishing priorities and justifying what 'should' be done. He was widely aware of how texts were crafted in negotiations by other professional groups and how they were used to fulfill the organization's and states' purposes. He would engage with other professional groups in the organization and with other revisers and translators both within the organization and in his spare time, he voiced his concerns with colleagues and superiors and took a mentoring role, cared for translators to understand his corrections and to understand the reasons behind translators' choices when revising their texts. He actually initiated negotiations to introduce a new process to ensure the organization's best interest and engaged other translators, translation sections, and professional groups in negotiating the final proposal. The change was appreciated and commented on extensively during the interviews. He showed a broad conception as regards what translators do and the skillset he was investing in his job. He did not mind working overtime and actually did so quite happily. However, PR7 eventually left the translation field (see Monzó-Nebot, 2021).

The dynamics identified seem to suggest, first, that widening the scope of translation-related stakeholders in the imaginary of translators (and translation trainees) may have an impact on their feeling empowered to interact with their organizational environments and advance their interests as a professional group. To do so, a work structure that ensures that agents are aware of how the outcome of their work impacts others and that they are intellectually able to understand the consequences (efficiency, pride, confusion, success) may be instrumental in linking the purpose of the job to the psychological needs of translators, thereby enhancing their possibilities for fulfilling engagement. A second strategy that we may derive from this case study are the benefits of a doxa in terms of clarity. Be that doxa text- or organization-based, the more coherently participants see others' and their own actions the more fulfilling the results.

This clarity of doxa emerged in accounts related to PR5. His ownership was focused on his area of influence, technical and scientific translation, where he enjoyed almost unlimited control and, even if working part-time, felt invested due to his technical knowledge and language-related skills. He defined translation doxa in textual terms and ensured this vision was clearly communicated to translators working in his area (especially PT1). He showed a mentoring attitude towards translators, even though his contacts with other revisers and professional groups within the organization were limited. He would frequently engage with support staff to ensure the texts were adequately edited and correctly published, organized seminars with translators to discuss technical and translation-specific topics, and felt trusted by his superior, who allowed him ample discretion and self-management. Translators working with PR5 were able to identify his priorities and would not talk about pet-peeves or whimsical unnecessary corrections. He was perceived as reliable and trusted. In contrast, translators would identify revisers

whose translation doxa was not clearly perceived and whose behavior (perceived as incoherent) would jeopardize both translators' trust in their competence and translators' job satisfaction (see 4.1). On the contrary, the (unofficial) technical and scientific translation section induced feelings of ownership and satisfaction for everyone involved, even though the jurisdiction seemed to have little connection with and exerted little influence in the rest of the organization. Whereas lack of clarity triggers a double bind (the need to satisfy the competing norms of different revisers), intra- and interprofessional coherence induces cooperation, trust, security, and the stimulus to explore.

These two main actionable lessons from this case study are that clarity of doxa induces job-satisfaction and that becoming aware (through knowledge investment and contact) of how the outcome of one's job impacts others can enhance that clarity and create a habitable home where all those involved can feel secure to explore further. That "further" must be qualified, as what is defined as home has been shown to vary based on the differing doxas and identification processes. When translators feel more connected to other professional groups, when those relevant others and their use of translation qua outcome are present in their decision-taking processes, their involvement with and ownership in the organization is greater. Conversely, when they base their rationales and logics of practice on those groups involved in translation qua work process, ownership and involvement are lower. This difference was seen as related to a domain-specific training, which seems to amplify the range of both translators' self-identity and acceptable behavior in the organization. On the contrary, translation myths (mainly invisibility) socialized in language- and translation-based training impose limits on what individuals perceive as acceptable behavior, and these limits seem to be overcome through translation research training (see 4.2).

This acceptable behavior seems to encompass key aspects of interaction, particularly visible in this case study in how translators' approach their need to solve incoherencies and ambiguities in source texts. PR7 saw a structural problem with one particular document the organization publishes once a year and convened meetings to discuss a solution. Such action successfully improved the quality of translations (translators became able to solve incoherencies in the source text during in the translation process), of the organizations' publications (coherence was increased for the source text and across linguistic versions), and translators' satisfaction (as abundantly commented during the interviews). In contrast, a second common practice was curtailed: that of translators individually sending queries for each translation job directly to its requesting officer without seeking first the agreement of other translation sections dealing with the same document. This change was perceived as a negative measure on the part of some translators (see 4.1). The question arises as to whether understanding how other professional groups operate and taking them into account as relevant others may enhance the possibilities of cooperatively finding a solution that is satisfactory for all the groups involved.

This third lesson includes a caveat also. The analysis has shown the potential of expanding the set of relevant others for increasing translators' engagement with and influence in the organization. However, are we risking diluting a professional identity into an organization-based identity? Does that risk entail significant implications for how we understand translation?

6. Conclusions: What is there to be owned?

This paper has applied the concept of psychological ownership to the analysis of the job satisfaction of 17 translators sharing a workplace and working for the same intergovernmental organization. Psychological ownership has proved useful in linking translators' beliefs in the significance of their work and their will to perform well with a shared general job-satisfaction. The analysis has also revealed variations in how translators perceive their roles and understand what constitutes quality in their work, opening up avenues for reflection and further scrutiny. The analysis has provided insights into why some translators feel empowered to advance their translation doxas across the organization when facing conflicting perspectives that may compromise their perceived job-related priorities and the quality of their work. By considering the factors of control, intimacy of knowledge, and self-investment (the constructs compounding a person's feelings of psychological ownership), the study sheds light on these dynamics and highlights the variations in translators' profiles that are relevant to understanding them.

The constructs related to psychological ownership have shown a high dependency on how translation work is defined. The assumptions about the nature of translation have an impact on how the possibilities of translators are shaped and also on how they define their satisfaction and success in their daily tasks. Such differences allow for adjustments to ensure job satisfaction even when different belief systems regarding acceptable behavior coexist. Comparatively, the paper has shown how constrained roles may facilitate higher satisfaction with lessened possibilities to impact work processes. Translators who define their responsibility in textual terms find satisfaction in controlling text production technologies, making terminological and stylistic choices, and meeting productivity and time targets. Conversely, those who see themselves as members of a multi-professional team, report feelings of control when they are allowed to influence work processes and perceptions of translation by other professionals. Variations in self-investment have been shown to operate along similar patterns, with the variety of skills and knowledge or time demands being related to a representation of translation as an intellectual challenging task. Equally, when exploring the intimacy of knowledge of interviewees, doxa variations have proven instrumental in ensuring translators' satisfaction. Yet, not all doxas have shown the same potential to motivate translators to engage with the relevant agents in the organization to advance their interests.

Engaging with work-processes may not be feasible for every translator, possibly owing to what they understand to be their purpose and the outcomes they are exposed to —corrections for most translators and negotiations at the level of the organization for some revisers. There are instances where translators (especially PT2, PT3, TT4, and TT6) show an understanding of translation that goes beyond texts and includes the organization. However, these exceptions aside, translators generally understand their role and the target of their ownership as the translated texts, often influenced by the pervasive myth of invisibility. Portraying the target as open and hospitable may be a way to engage translators in advancing a translation-based doxa and enhancing their job satisfaction. In this case study, research training in the field emerged as a gateway to broader and more active doxas.

Further conclusions point out the potential impact of gender differences on translators' perceptions and interpretations, which in turn impact behavior and beliefs governing the range of possibilities considered acceptable. The differences in inter- and intra-professional conflicts and impacts on doxa and satisfaction merit

further scrutiny. Additionally, exploring the capacity of translators for self-management and how leadership styles can shape their ability to influence the organization's culture, specifically its values vis-à-vis translation, presents an interesting avenue for future research.

As a qualitative study, this research did not seek to produce generalizable characterizations of translators but to construct data that can be transferred to other contexts and hopefully inspire future research opportunities. Further studies may widen our insights as to how the conceptions of translation expand an individual's framework of acceptable and voice behavior and shape a wider reaching doxa that allows them to work in the interest of the translation community. The study suggests that psychological ownership is a suitable framework to explore translators' identities and feelings of empowerment to make their doxas prevail. Will acting on those feelings spread a positive influence within the field among individual translators? Only time (and our collective efforts) will tell.

Acknowledgements

References

Anderson, C., Willer, R., Kilduff, G. J., & Brown, C. E. (2012). The origins of deference: When do people prefer lower status? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(5), 1077–1088. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027409.

Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2009). Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 677–693. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20294.

Blignault, I., Stephanou, M., & Barrett, C. (2009). Achieving quality in health care interpreting: Insights from interpreters. In S. B. Hale, U. Ozolins, & L. Stern (Eds.), *The critical link 5: Quality in interpreting. A shared responsibility* (pp. 221–234). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bontempo, K., & Malcolm, K. (2012). An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure: Education interpreters about the risk of vicarious trauma in healthcare settings. In K. Malcolm & L. Swabey (Eds.), *In our hands: Educating healthcare interpreters* (pp. 105–130). Washington: Gallaudet University Press.

Bontempo, K., & Napier, J. (2011). Evaluating emotional stability as a predictor of interpreter competence and aptitude for interpreting. *Interpreting*, 13(1), 85–105. https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.13.1.06bon.

Bourdieu, P. (1980). *Le sens pratique* [The logic of practice]. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Brennan, G., & Pettit, P. (2004). *The economy of esteem: An essay on civil and political society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Choi, J. (2007). Study on job satisfaction and directions for the training of conference interpreters. *Forum: revue internationale d'interprétation et de traduction / International Journal of Interpretation and Translation*, 5(2), 24–39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/forum.5.2.02cho.

Courtney, J., & Phelan, M. (2019). Translators' experiences of occupational stress and job satisfaction. *Translation & Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 11(1), 100–113. http://dx.doi.org/10.12807/ti.111201.2019.a06.

Dam, H. V. (2017). Interpreter role, ethics and norms: Linking to professionalization. In M. Biagini, M. S. Boyd, & C. Monacelli (Eds.), *The changing role of the interpreter: Contextualising norms, ethics and quality standards* (pp. 228–239). New York: Routledge.

Dam, H. V., & Zethsen, K. K. (2016). "I think it is a wonderful job." On the solidity of the translation profession. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 25, 174–187.

de Beauvoir, S. (1953). *The second sex* (H. M. Parshley, Trans.). London: Jonathan Cape.

Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. Q. (2001). Application of demand-control theory to sign language interpreting: Implications for stress and interpreter training. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 6(1), 1–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/deafed/6.1.1.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Springer.

Donovan, C. (2009). A study of changing patterns of language use in international conferences. In C. Laplace, M. Lederer, & D. Gile (Eds.), *La traduction et ses métiers, aspects théoriques et pratiques* (pp. 53–72). Paris: Lettres modernes Minard.

Donovan, C. (2017). The place of the interpreter and interpreting in an institutional setting. *CLINA*, 3(2), 91–113.

Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(4), 439–459. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.249.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Hunziker H. A. (2016). Investigating the ergonomics of a technologized translation workplace. In R. Muñoz Martín (Ed.), *Reembedding translation process research* (pp. 69–88). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eisenberger, R., Pierce, W. D., & Cameron, J. (1999). Effects of reward on intrinsic motivation — negative, neutral, and positive: Comment on Deci, Koestner, and Ryan

(1999). *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 677–691. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.677.

Estellés, A., & Monzó-Nebot, E. (2015). The catcher in the CAT. Playfulness and self-determination in the use of CAT tools by professional translators. In J. Esteves-Ferreira, J. Macan, R. Mitkov, & O. Stefanov (Eds.), *Translating and the computer 37* (pp. 66–78). London: Asling.

Etzioni, A. (1991). The socio-economics of property. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 6(6), 465–468.

Fischer, S. L., & Woodcock, K. (2012). A cross-sectional survey of reported musculoskeletal pain, disorders, work volume and employment situation among sign language interpreters. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 42(4), 335–340. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2012.03.003.

Frank, R. H. (1985). *Choosing the right pond: Human behavior and the quest for status*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gould, R. V. (2003). *Collision of wills: How ambiguity about social rank breeds conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hale, S. B. (2011). The positive side of community interpreting: An Australian case study. *Interpreting*, 13(2), 234–248. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/intp.13.2.04hal.

Harvey, M. A. (2003). Shielding yourself from the perils of empathy: The case of sign language interpreters. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 8(2), 207–213. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/deafed/eng004.

Hermans, J., & Lambert, J. (1998). From translation markets to language management: The implications of translation services. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 10, 113–132.

Hermans, T., & Ubaldo, S. (2002). *Translators as hostages of history*. http://europa.eu.int/comm/translation/theory/seminars.htm.

Hesllin, P. A. (2015). Experiencing career success. *Organisational Dynamics*, 34(4), 376–390.

Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2016). Trait emotional intelligence and translation: A study of professional translators. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 28(1), 132–157.

Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2018). Do translation professionals need to tolerate ambiguity to be successful? A study of the links between tolerance of ambiguity, emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. In I. Lacruz & R. Jääskeläinen (Eds.), *Innovation and expansion in translation process research* (pp. 77–103). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jamrog, J. J. (2004). *The perfect storm: The future of retention and engagement*. Florida: Human Resource Institute, University of Tampa.

Jussila, I., Tarkiainen, A., Sarstedt, M., & Hair, J. F. (2015). Individual psychological ownership: Concepts, evidence, and implications for research in marketing. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 23(2), 121–139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2015.1002330.

Katan, D. (2011). Occupation or profession: A survey of the translators' world. In R. Sela-Sheffy & M. Shlesinger (Eds.), *Identity and status in the translational professions* (pp. 65–87). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Koskinen, K. (2000). Institutional illusions. Translating in the EU Commission. *The Translator*, 6(1), 49–65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799055.

Koskinen, K. (2008). *Translating institutions: An ethnographic study of EU translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Koskinen, K. (2009). Going localised – getting recognised. The interplay of the institutional and the experienced status of translators in the European Commission. *Hermes. Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, 93–110.

Kurz, I. (1991). Conference interpreting: Job satisfaction, occupational prestige and desirability. In M. Jovanović (Ed.), *XIIth world congress of FIT – Belgrade 1990. Proceedings* (pp. 363–376). Belgrade: Prevodilac.

Lee, J. (2017). Professional interpreters' job satisfaction and relevant factors: A case study of trained interpreters in South Korea. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 12(3), 427–448. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/tis.12.3.04lee.

Liu, C. (2013). A quantitative enquiry into the translator's job-related happiness: Does visibility correlate with happiness? *Across Languages and Cultures: A Multidisciplinary Journal for Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 14(1), 123–147. http://dx.doi.org/10.1556/Acr.14.2013.1.6.

Liu, J., Wang, H., Hui, C., & Lee, C. (2012). Psychological ownership: How having control matters. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(5), 869–895. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2011.01028.x.

Mackintosh, J. (2002). *The AIIC workload study – executive summary*. Geneva: AIIC.

Mayhew, M. G., Ashkanasy, N. M., Bramble, T., & Gardner, J. (2007). A study of the antecedents and consequences of psychological ownership in organizational settings. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 147(5), 477–500.

Monzó-Nebot, E. (2019). Interviewing legal interpreters and translators: Framing status perceptions, interactional and structural power. In Ł. Biel, J. Engberg, R. Martín-Ruano, & V. Sosoni (Eds.), *Research methods in legal translation and interpreting: Crossing methodological boundaries* (pp. 189–211). London: Routledge.

Monzó-Nebot, E. (2021). A case study of unquiet translators. Relating legal translators' subservient and subversive habitus to socialization. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 33(2), 282–307. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/target.21069.mon.

Mossop, B. (1988). Translating institutions: A missing factor in translation theory. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 1(2), 65–71. http://dx.doi.org/10.7202/037019ar.

Mossop, B. (2014). Motivation and de-motivation in a government translation service: A diary-based approach. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 22(4), 581–591. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2014.948889.

Pierce, J. L., & Jussila, I. (2011). *Psychological ownership and the organizational context. Theory, research evidence, and application*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Pierce, J. L., Jussila, I, & Cummings, A. (2009). Psychological ownership within the job design context: Revision of the job characteristics model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(4), 477–496. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.550.

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 298–310. https://doi.org/10.2307/259124.

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2003). The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research. *Review of General Psychology*, 7(1), 84–107. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.7.1.84.

Pierce, J. L., Rubenfeld, S. A., & Morgan, S. (1991). Employee ownership: A conceptual model of process and effects. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 121–144. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/258609.

Qin, J., Marshall, M., Mozrall, J., & Marschark, M. (2008). Effects of pace and stress on upper extremity kinematic responses in sign language interpreters. *Ergonomics*, 51(3), 274–289. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00140130701617025.

Rodríguez-Castro, M. (2015). Conceptual construct and empirical validation of a multifaceted instrument for translator satisfaction. *Translation & Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 7(2), 30–50. http://dx.doi.org/10.12807/ti.107202.2015.a03.

Rodríguez-Castro, M. (2016). Intrinsic and extrinsic sources of translator satisfaction: An empirical study. *Entreculturas: Revista de Traducción y Comunicación Intercultural*, 7–8, 195–229. http://dx.doi.org/10.24310/Entreculturasertci.vi7-8.11334.

Ruokonen, M., Lassus, J., & Virtanen, T. (2020). 'I fulfil my place among the humankind, in the universe'. Finnish translators' job satisfaction in three empirical studies. *MikaEL*, 13, 109–123.

Ruokonen, M., & Mäkisalo, J. (2018). Middling-status profession, high-status work: Finnish translators' status perceptions in the light of their backgrounds, working

conditions and job satisfaction. *Translation & Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 10(1), 1–17. http://dx.doi.org/10.12807/ti.110201.2018.a01.

Schwenke, T. J., Ashby, J. S., & Gnilka, P. B. (2014). Sign language interpreters and burnout: The effects of perfectionism, perceived stress, and coping resources. *Interpreting*, 16(2), 209–232. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/intp.16.2.04sch.

Setton, R., & Liangliang, A. G. (2009). Attitudes to role, status and professional identity in interpreters and translators with Chinese in Shanghai and Taipei. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 4(2), 210–238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/tis.4.2.05set.

Shah, S. I., Shahjehan, A., & Afsar, B. (2016). The facade of voice opportunity and intragroup conflict. *Makara Human Behaviour Studies in Asia*, 20(2), 101–108. http://dx.doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v20i2.464.

Sieger, P., Zellweger, T., & Aquino, K. (2013). Turning agents into psychological principals: Aligning interests of non-owners through psychological ownership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(3), 361–388. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/joms.12017.

Sikavica, K., & Hillman, A. (2008). Towards a behavioral theory of corporate ownership and shareholder activism. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings* 1, 1–6. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2008.33718573.

Spitzmuller, M., & Van Dyne, L. (2013). Proactive and reactive helping: Contrasting the positive consequences of different forms of helping. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(4), 560–580. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.1848.

Swartz, D. B. (2006). Job satisfaction among sign language interpreters. *Journal of Interpretation*, 17, 47–78.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Veblen, T. (1994). *Theory of the leisure class*. New York: Penguin.

Virtanen, T. (2019). *What makes a government translator tick?: Examining the Finnish government English translators' perceptions of translator status, job satisfaction and the underlying factors.* Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Helsinki.

Webb, C. (1912). *Industrial cooperation: The story of a peaceful revolution*. Manchester: Cooperative Union.

Whitmeyer, J. M. (2007). The acceptance of low prestige. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 26(2), 33–45. http://dx.doi.org/10.2990/26.

Wright, R. (1994). *The moral animal: Evolutionary psychology and everyday life*. New York: Pantheon Books.