

To Whom It May Concern:

**Review of Klaudia Bednárová-Gibová and Mária Majherová's
monograph *A Socio-Psychological Profiling of Translators
as Working Agents in the Language Industry***

The monograph expands and deepens the authors' previous body of work on Slovak translators' happiness at work (HAW) by investigating how translators in different professional contexts experience their HAW and what kinds of factors affect their experiences; in short, by establishing socio-psychological profiles of different translator cohorts. The monograph makes an important contribution to Translation Studies: translators' socio-psychological realities and experiences, including HAW, were hardly studied before the 2010s, and even today, the authors' work stands out in terms of both methodological innovativeness and its comprehensive examination of a national context.

The **theoretical background** (Chapters 1, 2, 3) embeds the authors' research within the broader framework of Translation and Translator Studies, particularly in relation to the sociological and psychological paradigms. Central trends and their early roots are expertly summarised by incorporating several perspectives. The authors critically discuss central concepts and relate them to each other. The central concept of HAW in particular is well distinguished from similar concepts and clearly operationalised. The discussion is insightful and thorough; the only additions I would recommend are the following:

- Section 2.1: comment on the socio-cognitive approaches (e.g., Risku, Rogl & Milosevic 2019, Risku & Rogl 2022);
- Section 2.2.2.3: comment on to what extent Warr's IWP questionnaire has been validated;
- Chapter 3: among early studies on translators' HAW, De Jong (1999) and Fraser and Gold (2001) could be mentioned;

- Chapter 3: when discussing Liu's work, two further articles (2013 and 2017) could be mentioned; and
- Chapter 3: Virtanen's 2019 dissertation on job satisfaction and status could be discussed (as you also discuss Svahn's dissertation).

In spite of these recommendations, however, the theoretical background is already very solid as is.

The **methods and material** of the study are outlined in Chapter 4. The methods are mainly quantitative (statistical analysis), with some qualitative observations, which is appropriate for the research setting. The specific survey instruments, described in more detail in Chapter 5, are also appropriate and, as far as I can tell, previously validated. More explicit comments on combining Warr's IWP Affect Questionnaire with Liu's happiness metrics (Section 5.4) would be relevant, as it is an innovation. Similarly, the method for the qualitative analysis should be explicated (apparently data-driven thematic analysis). The data collection process is clearly described (Section 4.2), however, and the limitations of the study are sufficiently addressed in Chapter 4 and later in Section 5.7.

Chapter 5 analyses the survey **results**: the respondents' views of Dam and Zethsen's occupational status/prestige, Veenhoven's happiness and Warr's affects, and what they tell of translators' HAW. The results are presented clearly and accurately, and the interpretations are by and large valid and well justified. In addition to some minor requests for clarifications indicated in the manuscript, I recommend the following revisions:

- Section 5.2.7 (influence/power): it needs to be noted that some of Dam and Zethsen's questionnaires did include an item on general influence, which is similar to the item included in the authors' questionnaire;
- Section 5.2.9. (appreciation by others): it could be mentioned that one of Ruokonen and Mäkisalo's (2018) main results is that while the translators' status perceptions were middling, they felt highly appreciated by their employers or commissioners – although this is made apparent in Chapter 6;

- Sections 5.2.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3., 5.3.5: some of the authors' comments on institutional/legal translators' views suggest interpretations that are strictly speaking not based on the data, and are partly in conflict with the results presented in Section 5.3.7. These passages, which I have indicated in the manuscript, may require either more explicit justification or reformulation;
- Section 5.3.6 (preparedness for translation problems): consider adding discussion on why literary translators feel less prepared than others (some suggestions added in the manuscript);
- Section 5.5 (qualitative analysis): specify on what grounds the examples for each translator habitus were selected (were they the most representative of that habitus, for example). Some details on to what extent the qualitative examples reflect similar tendencies as the quantitative results could also be added, either here or in Chapter 6.

The **discussion** in Chapter 6 expertly summarises the results, discusses their implications and possible roots, and relates them to previous research.

The **organisation, style and language** of the monograph meet the criteria of formal, well-formulated academic English to a very high degree, particularly considering that language revision is still pending.

In conclusion, although I have made some suggestions for improvement, the monograph is comprehensive and innovative and amply meets the criteria for a scientific study. I warmly recommend it for publishing.

Joensuu, Finland, 30 January 2023



Dr Minna Ruokonen, PhD

University Lecturer

English Language and Translation

E-mail: minna.ruokonen@uef.fi



References

- De Jong, Engelen 1999. The impact of motivation on the career commitment of Dutch literary translators. *Poetics* 26(5-6), 423-437. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X\(99\)00010-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(99)00010-8)
- Fraser, Janet and Michael Gold 2001. 'Portfolio workers': Autonomy and control amongst freelance translators. *Work, employment and society* 15(4), 679-697. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095001701400438>
- Liu, Christy Fung-Min. 2013. Revisiting the translator's visibility: Does visibility bring rewards? *Meta* 58(1), 25-57. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1023808ar>
- Liu, Christy Fung-Min. 2017. A longitudinal study of translators in greater China. *Hermeneus* 19, 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.24.197/her.19.2017.121-138>
- Risku, Hanna and Regina Rogl 2022. Praxis and process meet halfway: The convergence of sociological and cognitive approaches in translation studies. *Translation & Interpreting* 14(2), 32-49. DOI: 10.12807/ti.114202.2022.a03.
- Risku, Hanna, Regina Rogl and Jelena Milosevic 2019. Introduction. In: Risku, Hanna, Regina Rogl and Jelena Milosevic (eds) *Translation Practice in the Field: Current Research on Socio-Cognitive Processes*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1-24.
- Virtanen, Taru 2019. *What makes a government translator tick? Examining the Finnish government English translators' perceptions of translator status, job satisfaction and the underlying factors*. Dissertation, University of Helsinki. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-5535-1>