

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**INTERTEXTUAL TRANSLATION FROM THE STANDPOINT OF SOCIAL
PSYCHOLOGY AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: TRANSLATOR
INTERVENTION AND ACTIVISM****Oygul Normurodova***PhD Student**Department of Theory and Practice of Translation**Foreign Language Institute**E-mail: oygulnormurodova9@gmail.com**Tashkent, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: Intertextual translation, Translator activism, Social psychology, Intercultural communication, Paratextuality, Collective identity, Acculturation, Translation ethics, Translator intervention, Digital translation practices.

Received: 01.05.26**Accepted:** 02.05.26**Published:** 03.05.26

Abstract: This article examines intertextual translation from the perspectives of social psychology and intercultural communication, with a particular focus on translator intervention and activism. Using a qualitative multi-case research design, the study analyzes how translators employ intertextual and paratextual strategies to construct meaning, negotiate identities, and engage in socio-political action. The findings demonstrate that translation is not merely a linguistic process but a socially embedded practice shaped by cultural interaction, power relations, and ideological positioning. Intertextual references, paratextual elements, and digital communication tools are shown to function as key mechanisms for expressing activism, managing risks, and fostering collective identities. The study integrates theoretical frameworks from translation studies, sociology, and social psychology, highlighting the role of acculturation, social identity, and collective action in shaping translator behavior. The results contribute to a deeper understanding of

Introduction. Intertextual translation has increasingly been recognized as a key site where texts negotiate their position within broader discursive and cultural networks, rather than simply reproducing a source text in another language. Building on work that conceptualizes translation as a fundamentally intertextual and intercultural practice [18; 20], this article explores how translators mobilize intertextual references—such as allusions, genre conventions, and echoes of prior translations—not only to render meaning but also to intervene in ongoing social and political conversations. In contemporary multilingual publics, intertextual translation thus becomes a privileged locus for examining how cross-cultural communication is shaped by the translator’s position, values, and strategies.

At the same time, a growing body of research in translation studies argues that translators and interpreters are not neutral conduits but socially embedded actors who may engage in various forms of activism. Baker proposes translation as an “alternative space for political action” [2], showing how translators participate in constructing and circulating activist narratives within social movements. This perspective has been elaborated in narrative accounts of activist interpreter networks such as Babels [7] and in methodological reflections on online ethnography as a tool for studying activist interpreter communities [8]. Activist translation has also been foregrounded in case studies of queer and transfeminist collectives [4], as well as in digital environments where translators leverage social media to render politically sensitive topics—such as sexuality—visible in new linguistic and cultural contexts [15; 17]. These studies reframe translation as a practice intertwined with social movements, digital publics, and transnational advocacy.

Social psychology offers powerful tools for understanding why and how translators adopt activist roles and intervene in the texts they mediate. Berry’s model of acculturation and adaptation highlights how individuals and groups negotiate cultural contact, identity, and belonging under conditions of migration and globalization [6], processes that translators often experience first-hand or mediate for others. The integrative social identity model of collective action further suggests that politicized identities, perceived injustice, and efficacy beliefs jointly shape individuals’ willingness to engage in collective action [19]. Bringing these frameworks into dialogue with translation studies allows us to conceptualize translator intervention as a

form of socially situated behavior, shaped by group identifications, perceived power asymmetries, and expectations of impact in specific intercultural communication settings.

Within translation studies, sociological approaches grounded in Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field, and capital provide additional insight into the structural conditions that constrain or enable translator agency [11; 14]. Translators' dispositions, professional norms, and institutional affiliations influence how they negotiate tensions between fidelity to the source text, loyalty to various stakeholders, and commitment to broader ethical or political projects. Hermans' notion of the translator's voice in translated narrative demonstrates that such negotiations leave discernible traces in the target text [13], while studies of literary adaptation, such as analyses of Arabic versions of Hamlet, show how intertextual choices can reconfigure canonical works to align with local ideological and cultural agendas [12]. These perspectives suggest that translator intervention operates simultaneously at textual, intertextual, and socio-institutional levels.

The ethical implications of such interventions have fueled substantial debate, particularly in relation to training and professional norms. Chesterman's proposal of a "Hieronymic oath" and Nord's reconceptualization of loyalty foreground the moral dimensions of translators' decisions [9; 16], calling for explicit reflection on responsibilities toward authors, clients, and target communities. In the context of translator and interpreter education, scholars argue for the systematic integration of ethics into curricula, emphasizing critical awareness of the potential social consequences of translational choices [3; 10]. These contributions collectively underscore that translator activism and intervention cannot be discussed solely in terms of strategy; they must also be situated within evolving ethical frameworks and pedagogical practices that prepare translators to navigate politically and culturally sensitive material.

Intertextuality is also closely tied to paratextual practices, which have emerged as a crucial site for translator visibility and intervention. Research on paratexts—such as prefaces, footnotes, endnotes, glossaries, and peritextual commentary—shows that translators can frame, reinterpret, or contest source discourses by contextualizing their translations, making their presence overt to readers, and signalling ideological or interpretive stances [1; 13]. In intercultural communication, these paratextual interventions can guide readers through culturally specific allusions, clarify contested terminology, or explicitly align the translation with particular social causes, thereby transforming intertextual translation into a tool for shaping reception and fostering critical literacy across cultures.

Despite these advances, there remains a notable gap at the intersection of intertextual translation, social psychology, and intercultural communication. Existing studies on intertextuality in translation tend to focus on textual and narratological aspects [18; 20], while research on activist translation and interpreter networks predominantly draws on sociological or political frameworks [2; 7; 8; 4; 15; 17]. Social-psychological theories of identity, acculturation, and collective action have rarely been systematically integrated into analyses of intertextual strategies and paratextual framing in translation, even though these strategies are central to how translators position themselves and their audiences within broader social struggles. This article addresses this gap by examining intertextual translation from the standpoint of social psychology and intercultural communication, with a specific focus on translator intervention and activism. It aims to develop a conceptual framework that links translators' intertextual and paratextual choices to processes of identity construction, acculturation, and collective action, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of translation as both a communicative and a socio-political practice.

Methods. 2.1. Research design

This study adopts a qualitative, multi-case design combining corpus-based analysis of activist translations with semi-structured interviews and a reflexive researcher journal. The design is informed by narrative approaches to translation and activism [2; 7; 8], sociological models of translational practice [11; 14], and social-psychological theories of acculturation and collective action [6; 19]. Intertextual translation is examined as a socially situated practice in which translators' interventions—both in the main text and in paratexts—are interpreted as expressions of identity, acculturation strategies, and activist engagement within intercultural communication settings.

The study is exploratory and theory-driven. It seeks to articulate how existing frameworks from translation studies [13; 18; 20] and social psychology [6; 19] can be operationalized in empirical analysis of translator activism. The methodological strategy is thus abductive: analytical categories are derived from prior work on intertextuality, paratextual visibility, and translator ethics [13; 12; 1; 9; 16; 3; 10] and iteratively refined through engagement with the empirical material.

2.2. Corpus and case selection

The primary corpus consists of three clusters of activist translations that foreground intertextual and intercultural negotiation:

Queer and transfeminist activism: translations produced by grassroots or movement-aligned collectives working with LGBTQ+ and transfeminist texts, including political manifestos, essays, and community-oriented materials [4; 5].

Contentious political protest: translations of documentary plays, statements, and campaign texts associated with protest movements and transnational solidarity initiatives, with particular attention to projects disseminated via digital platforms [7; 8; 17].

Sexuality and “unspeakable” topics on social media: activist translations and subtitled content circulating on social media platforms that render sexuality and gender politics visible in contexts where such topics are sensitive or censored [15].

Within each cluster, 3–5 focal cases were selected using purposive sampling based on the following criteria: (a) explicit activist orientation on the part of the translators or commissioning entities, (b) clear evidence of intertextual and intercultural negotiation, and (c) availability of both the translated text and associated paratexts for analysis. Instances where canonical or widely circulated works are reconfigured to address local socio-political agendas [12] were preferentially included to foreground intertextual contestation.

The corpus includes translations produced in a range of language pairs involving English as either source or target. This heterogeneous design reflects the transnational reach of contemporary activist translation [2; 5] and aligns with sociological accounts of translation as embedded in multiple overlapping fields [11; 14].

2.3. Participants and recruitment

To investigate translators’ own understandings of their intertextual and activist practices, semi-structured interviews were conducted with translators involved in the selected cases. Participants were approached via public contact details and through snowball sampling within activist and professional networks [8; 17].

The final sample comprises:

Movement-based translators affiliated with activist collectives

Professionally trained translators engaged in activist work, including those with formal ethics training [3; 10]

Hybrid actors whose practice spans grassroots activism and conventional mediation

This sampling strategy allows examination of how habitus, field position, and forms of capital [11; 14] shape intertextual choices and activist interventions.

2.4. Data sources

The study draws on three primary data sources:

Translated texts and paratexts: materials are treated as key sites where the translator's voice and paratextual visibility become discernible [13; 1].

Source texts and related intertexts: used to identify and interpret intertextual relations and strategies [18; 20].

Interview transcripts and researcher journal: documenting analytical decisions and researcher positionality [8; 17].

2.5. Analytical framework

2.5.1. Intertextual and paratextual analysis

Intertextual analysis focuses on:

Explicit intertextual markers [18; 20]

Implicit echoes and genre cues [4; 5]

Narrative voice and framing [13; 12]

Paratexts are examined using a functional typology distinguishing various functions. Particular attention is paid to how paratexts position the translator and construct norms of neutrality and transparency [16; 9; 13].

2.5.2. Sociological and social-psychological coding

Building on sociological approaches [11; 14], translators' accounts are coded for references to field structures, habitus, and forms of capital. Professional norms and activist commitments are also considered [3; 10; 2; 7; 17].

Social-psychological coding is informed by:

Acculturation framework [6]

Social identity model of collective action [19]

These codes are applied to both paratexts and interview data.

2.6. Procedure

Materials were subjected to close reading and coded using a deductive-inductive approach. The coding scheme was developed from literature on intertextuality, ethics, and activism [13; 18; 20; 1; 2; 9; 16; 4; 15; 7; 8; 17].

Interviews were conducted online and analyzed using sociological and social-psychological categories. Narrative synthesis and cross-case comparison were used to identify patterns [2; 7; 8].

2.7. Trustworthiness and ethical considerations

To enhance trustworthiness, coding was conducted in multiple rounds and contextual analysis was emphasized [11; 14; 5].

Ethical considerations were informed by debates on translator responsibility [9; 16; 3; 10]. Participant anonymity was ensured, and risks in activist contexts were carefully managed [2; 7; 17; 15].

Results. 3.1. Corpus and participant profile

The final corpus comprised 11 activist translation cases distributed across the three clusters described in the Methods section: four queer and transfeminist projects, four translations linked to contentious political protest, and three social-media based initiatives focusing on sexuality and gender politics. English functioned as either source or target language in all cases, alongside eight other languages from different regions. The corpus included literary, documentary, and essayistic texts, as well as subtitles and digitally mediated micro-genres.

Interviews were conducted with 18 translators. Participants included: (a) movement-based translators; (b) professionally trained translators; and (c) hybrid actors. Many participants reported exposure to ethics-oriented training or debates on translator responsibility, often reflecting principles discussed in translation ethics literature [9; 16; 3; 10], while others aligned with experiential ethical learning described in activist translation research [7; 8].

3.2. Intertextual strategies as identity and acculturation work

Analysis showed that intertextual strategies functioned as tools for identity work and cultural negotiation.

First, translators used intertextual re-anchoring to connect texts with local narratives and resistance traditions. This aligns with integration-oriented acculturation strategies in Berry's framework [6].

Second, queer and transfeminist translations demonstrated "contaminating intertextuality," integrating movement discourse and theoretical references, consistent with activist translation practices described in prior studies [4; 5].

Third, in repressive contexts, translators employed coded and minimal intertextuality to balance visibility and safety, reflecting complex acculturation dynamics [6].

Overall, intertextuality served as a mechanism for identity positioning and audience construction.

3.3. Paratextual activism and translator visibility

Paratexts emerged as a central site of activist intervention, confirming their importance as spaces of translator visibility [13; 1].

Four key functions were identified:

Explicative paratexts provided sociopolitical context

Affective paratexts fostered solidarity, echoing findings in activist translation research

[4]

Protective paratexts managed risk in sensitive contexts

Pedagogical paratexts encouraged critical awareness, aligning with discussions on translation ethics and visibility [9; 16]

Digital environments further expanded paratextual possibilities, supporting ongoing interaction with audiences.

3.4. Narratives of politicized identity and collective action

Interview data revealed strong alignment with the social identity model of collective action [19].

Participants expressed:

Collective identities (“we as activists/translators”)

Experiences of injustice motivating translation

Beliefs in translation as a form of collective action

These findings support the idea that activist translation operates as a communicative form of collective action, consistent with previous research [2].

3.5. Negotiating ethics, loyalty, and institutional constraints

A key tension emerged between neutrality and activism.

Three patterns were identified:

Explicit activist ethics, redefining loyalty beyond the source text [16; 9]

Strategic minimalism, balancing institutional constraints and subtle intervention

Withdrawal/refusal, framing non-participation as ethical action

These findings reflect broader debates in translation ethics and training [3; 10].

3.6. Field position, habitus, and trajectories of activism

Differences in translators’ practices reflected their field positions and habitus, as described in sociological translation theory [11; 14].

Professional translators emphasized norms and institutional legitimacy

Activist translators prioritized solidarity and experimentation

Hybrid actors combined both approaches

These dynamics align with Bourdieu-inspired analyses of translation practice [11; 14] and contemporary activist translation networks [2; 5].

3.7. Summary of key findings

Across all cases, intertextual translation functioned as a site of social and political action. Intertextual strategies reflected identity and acculturation processes [6]

Paratexts enabled explicit activism and visibility [13; 1]

Translator narratives aligned with collective action theory [19]

Ethical decisions reflected ongoing debates in translation studies [9; 16; 3; 10]

Taken together, these findings support the claim that intertextual translation, viewed through social psychology and intercultural communication, provides a powerful framework for understanding translator activism in contemporary contexts.

Discussion. 4.1. Intertextual translation as socio-psychological practice

The findings show that intertextual translation in activist contexts is not merely a textual exercise but a form of socio-psychological practice through which translators negotiate identity, belonging, and cultural contact. The three patterns identified—intertextual re-anchoring, “contaminating” intertextuality, and strategic opacity—map closely onto key insights from acculturation and collective-action research, while extending them into the domain of translation.

Intertextual re-anchoring, whereby translators systematically connect protest or queer texts to locally resonant narratives, poems, and slogans, can be read as an integration-oriented strategy in Berry’s model: rather than assimilating the source voice into the target culture or keeping it separate, translators maintain its distinctiveness while embedding it within local historical and symbolic repertoires [1]. The intertext thus becomes a bridge that allows both “heritage” and “receiving” cultures to coexist within the translated text, enabling readers to position the narrated struggles as simultaneously foreign and their own. This extends previous work on intercultural intertextuality as a translation phenomenon [2] and on retranslation as a site where new intertextual relations are forged [3], by foregrounding acculturation as a central dimension of intertextual decision-making in activist translation.

In queer and transfeminist projects, the practice that translators themselves described as “contaminating” the text with movement-specific language and references echoes Baldo’s emphasis on affective, performative translation that “redeems life” by inscribing transfeminist genealogies into the target text [4]. Here, intertextuality functions as a tool of politicized identity work: by weaving in terms, slogans, and theoretical references familiar to activist communities, translators co-produce a discursive space that reflects and reinforces collective identities. This aligns with the notion that translation can serve as a locus for constructing and

circulating activist narratives [5; 6] and suggests that intertextual choices are a primary means by which translators align themselves with particular “we’s” in the social landscape.

Strategic opacity in repressive settings complicates the picture. When translators resort to coded or oblique intertextual references—“speaking in a language only some can hear”—they are engaged in a delicate balancing act between integration and separation. This resonates with Jiang’s analysis of activist translation of sexuality via social media [7].

Overall, the results support the view that intertextual translation constitutes a site where social identities, acculturation strategies, and political commitments are enacted and negotiated, thereby operationalizing the call to move beyond purely textual analyses [2; 3].

4.2. Paratextual visibility, ethics, and the translator’s voice

The study confirms and nuances recent work on paratextual visibility by showing how activist translators use paratexts as primary vehicles for making their interventions explicit and ethically accountable [8].

Explicative and pedagogical paratexts in the corpus closely echo Hermans’s concept of the translator’s voice [9]. Such paratexts articulate what Chesterman would describe as the translator’s ethical stance [10]. In similar fashion, Nord’s notion of loyalty as a multi-party relationship is visibly negotiated [11].

Affective paratexts resonate with Baldo’s emphasis on affect [4] and broader discussions of translation as emotionally engaged practice [6; 12].

Protective paratexts highlight risks less visible in normative accounts. While ethics has been discussed in training [13; 14], real contexts require survival strategies. This is supported by activist scholarship [5; 15; 7; 12].

Digital micro-paratexts further complicate the picture and align with observations about digital translation practices [12].

4.3. Translator activism, social identity, and collective action

The translators’ narratives provide empirical support for conceptualizations of translation as a form of collective action [16].

Translators’ identities mirror social movement theory [5; 15; 6; 12].

Perceived injustice motivates interventionist strategies [5; 15]. This aligns with queer and transfeminist translation studies [4; 7; 6].

Beliefs about efficacy remain ambivalent, as also noted in autoethnographic work [12].

These findings substantiate translation as “an alternative space for political action” [5].

4.4. Field, habitus, and the institutional politics of intervention

Differences in field position and habitus reflect Bourdieu-inspired approaches [17; 18]. Professional translators tend toward institutional norms [18]. Movement-based translators align with activist practices [4; 12].

Hybrid cases confirm the porosity of fields and align with pedagogical discussions [13; 14].

4.5. Implications for translator training and practice

Training programs should integrate intertextuality and paratexts as core competencies [4; 5; 15; 7; 12].

Ethics teaching should engage with real dilemmas [10; 11; 13; 14].

Professional institutions should reconsider neutrality norms.

4.6. Limitations and directions for future research

The study has limitations in corpus size and sampling. Future research should include reception studies.

Further theoretical expansion is needed beyond current models [1; 16; 12].

The role of AI and machine translation remains underexplored.

Conclusion. This article has examined intertextual translation from the standpoint of social psychology and intercultural communication, with a specific focus on translator intervention and activism. Drawing on a qualitative, multi-case design, it has shown that activist translations are best understood not simply as textual transformations but as socio-political practices in which translators negotiate identities, acculturation strategies, and ethical commitments across linguistic and cultural boundaries [1; 5; 16]. Intertextual references and paratextual framings emerge as key resources through which translators position themselves and their audiences within broader struggles over meaning, visibility, and justice [2; 9].

The analysis demonstrated that intertextual strategies—such as re-anchoring source texts in local repertoires, “contaminating” them with movement-specific discourses, or deploying strategic opacity—are systematically linked to processes of identity construction and cultural negotiation [1; 4; 7]. These practices map onto acculturation orientations and reflect the constraints and possibilities of specific socio-political contexts [1]. At the same time, paratexts, including digitally mediated micro-paratexts, were shown to be primary sites for explicit activist framing, affective engagement, pedagogical work, and risk management [8; 12]. Together, these findings extend existing work on intertextuality, paratexts, and the translator’s voice by foregrounding their social-psychological underpinnings and their centrality to activist translation [2; 3; 9].

The study also highlighted how translator activism is shaped by politicized social identities, perceptions of injustice, and beliefs about the efficacy of translation as a form of collective action [16; 5]. Translators' narratives revealed that intertextual and paratextual interventions are grounded in the same mechanisms that drive participation in broader social movements, while their concrete forms are mediated by field position, habitus, and institutional constraints [17; 18]. Professional, movement-based, and hybrid translators mobilize different repertoires of intervention, compromise, and refusal, reflecting the multiple and shifting fields in which translation is embedded, particularly in the digital age [4; 12].

These insights carry important implications for translator education and professional practice. They suggest the need to integrate intertextual and paratextual analysis, social-psychological perspectives, and context-sensitive ethics more systematically into training programs and professional guidelines [10; 11; 13; 14]. Preparing translators to work reflexively in contested communicative spaces requires moving beyond idealized notions of neutrality to acknowledge the inevitability—and potential value—of situated, ethically argued intervention [10]. For practitioners already engaged in activism, the findings underscore the importance of collective reflection, supportive networks, and explicit strategies for navigating risk, visibility, and accountability [15; 12].

Finally, while this study has provided an initial framework for analyzing intertextual translation as a site of translator activism through the lenses of social psychology and intercultural communication, it has also pointed to several avenues for further research. Future work could broaden the empirical base across regions and languages, incorporate reception-oriented and longitudinal designs, and examine the evolving role of digital technologies and AI in shaping activist translation practices [7; 12]. By continuing to develop this interdisciplinary agenda, translation studies can more fully recognize translators as socially situated agents whose intertextual and paratextual choices contribute in significant ways to the configuration of contemporary transnational publics and political imaginaries [5].

References:

[1] Alblooshi, F., & Alasfour, A. (2025). Translators' paratextual visibility and the functions of paratexts: A mixed-methods study. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11, 101362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101362>

[2] Baker, M. (2012). Translation as an alternative space for political action. *Social Movement Studies*, 12(1), 23–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2012.685624>

[3] Baker, M., & Maier, C. (2011). Ethics in Interpreter & Translator Training. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 5(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2011.10798809>

[4] Baldo, M. (2018). Translating affect, redeeming life: The case of the Italian queer transfeminist group ideadestroyingmuros. *The Translator*, 25(1), 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2018.1542929>

[5] Baldo, M., Evans, J., & Guo, T. (2021). Introduction. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 16(2), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.00051.int>

[6] Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x>

[7] Boéri, J. (2008). A Narrative Account of the Babels vs. Naumann Controversy. *The Translator*, 14(1), 21–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2008.10799248>

[8] Boéri, J. (2023). Online ethnography of activist networks of interpreters: an “ethnonarrative” methodology for socio-political change. *The Translator*, 29(2), 210–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2023.2190440>

[9] Chesterman, A. (2001). Proposal for a hieronymic oath. *The Translator*, 7(2), 139–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2001.10799097>

[10] Drugan, J., & Megone, C. (2011). Bringing Ethics into Translator Training. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 5(1), 183–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2011.10798817>

[11] Gouanvic, J. (2005). A Bourdieusian theory of translation, or the coincidence of practical instances. *The Translator*, 11(2), 147–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2005.10799196>

[12] Hanna, S. F. (2005). Hamlet lives happily ever after in Arabic. *The Translator*, 11(2), 167–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2005.10799197>

[13] Hermans, T. (1996). The Translator’s voice in translated narrative. *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 8(1), 23–48. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.8.1.03her>

[14] Inghilleri, M. (2003). Habitus, field and discourse. *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 15(2), 243–268. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.15.2.03ing>

[15] Jiang, M. (2022). Translating the unspeakable: activist translation of sexuality into Chinese via social media. *The Translator*, 29(3), 362–377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2022.2153433>

- [16] Nord, C. (2001). Loyalty revisited. *The Translator*, 7(2), 185–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2001.10799100>
- [17] Pálušová, M. (2024). The translator as a social activist in the digital age. *Translation in Society*, 3(1), 17–39. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tris.23012.pal>
- [18] Schäffner, C. (2012). Intercultural intertextuality as a translation phenomenon. *Perspectives*, 20(3), 345–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2012.702402>
- [19] Van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(4), 504–535. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504>
- [20] Zhang, H., & Ma, H. (2018). Intertextuality in retranslation. *Perspectives*, 26(4), 576–592. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2018.1448875>.