Journal of Language and Translation
Volume 2, Number 1 (pp.1-12), 2011

Manipulation of Ideology in Translation of Political Texts: A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective

Mohammad Hossein Keshavarz[1]; Leila Alimadadi Zonoozi[2]*

[1]*Islamic Azad University of Qazvin*

[2]*Tarbiat Mo'alem University,Tehran*

Received:10 July 2010 ; Accepted: 2 January 2011

ABSTRACT

As a culture-based phenomenon which involves both linguistic and social aspects, translation has been investigated from various perspectives. The present Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)-based study is an attempt to probe into the manipulation of ideologies in translations of political texts. A CDA approach, based on Fairclough (1989), Van Dijk (2004) and Farahzad (2007), was adopted to conduct this research. Three English political books alongside their corresponding translations in Persian were critically analyzed both at micro and macro levels. At micro-level, lexical features based on Van Dijk's model (2004) and grammatical features based on Fairclough's (1989) framework were analyzed. This was followed by the analysis of macro-features (based on Farahzad, 2007) such as notes, prefaces, and footnotes in the translated books for the purpose of revealing the translation network's diverse world-views and ideologies. The results show that translators make use of certain grammatical and lexical strategies for the sake of ideological ploy, i.e. the basic strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. That is, all the lexical and grammatical deviations used by the Persian translators were in the employment of *self* (i.e., Iranian) interests. Also the analysis of macro-features revealed the translators' ideological trends and judgments toward the source texts. More specifically, in the footnotes, the translators manifested negative attitudes towards the authors of the original texts by pinpointing their mistakes and false information about Iranian affairs as well as their hostility towards Iran. The findings are interpreted to have implications for syllabus designers as well as translation students and teachers.

Keywords: Critical discourse analysis, ideology, negative other-presentation and positive self-presentation

1. Introduction

Undoubtedly, in the era of communication and dialogue among civilizations, translation plays an important role in transferring different ideas among different nations. As a communicative event which involves the social use of language, translation can never be studied without taking its contextual and socio-cultural aspects into account. Thanks to recent studies in the field of translation and critical discourse studies, it has been indicated that formal variations in any given text would certainly bring about, among other things, particular ideological consequences.

Furthermore, language is the primary domain and the material form of ideology (Fairclough, 1989); thus, ideology exerts its influence on language. Consequently, translation may be considered as a means by which, on the one hand, discourse _ the use of language as a form of social practice (Fairclough, ibid.) _ is reflected, and on the other hand, ideology is transmitted and sometimes imposed in subtle ways.

Hence, Hatim and Mason (1997) emphasize that translation activities can never be divorced from their socio- cultural context. According to these authors, translation approaches and strate

Corresponding Author Email: Keshavarz.22@gmail.com

gies employed by translators are likely to have ideological consequences in the socio-cultural context in which translation takes place. Thus, translation may not be viewed as a neutral undertaking; rather it is, in itself, an ideological activity.

Schäffner (2004) asserts that modern Translation Studies is no longer concerned with examining whether a translation has been "faithful" to the source text. Instead, the focus is on social, cultural, and communicative practices, on the cultural and ideological significance of translation, on the external policies of translations, and on the relationship between translation behavior and socio-cultural factors.

Considering translation as a communicative event in which the socio-cultural and ideological trends of the translator's social context are manifested, translators not only transmit the source text's original ideological aspects, but also they may leave some ideological traces of their own. Hence, in the process of translating any given text, not only semantic meaning, but also ideological meanings are produced by translators. In other words, the target text reflects the translator's socio-cultural and ideological background as well as his/her beliefs and attitudes. It needs to be pointed out that in transmitting ideological aspects of a source text, divergences, alterations and discrepancies are inevitable due to some socio-cultural constraints of the translator's society which can bring about different ideological consequences. How and to what extent such ideological traits may be represented and analyzed within the framework of critical discourse analysis would be the main concern of this study.

1.1. Translation Studies as a Discipline

Schäffner (2004) points out that the increasing need for translation and interpreting in a variety of domains resulted in the development of Translation Studies as an academic discipline in the second half of the 20th century. Theoretical principles have been formulated which are the basis for the description, observation, and teaching of translation. She maintains that:

> There is a general recognition of the complexity of the phenomenon of translation, an increased concentration on social causation and human agency, and a focus on effects rather than on internal structures. Thus, the object of research in Translation Studies is not language(s), as traditionally seen, but human activity in different cultural contexts (p. 136).

Moreover, what Translation Studies and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) have in common is the interest in human communicative activity in socio-cultural settings, especially the interest in texts and discourses as products of this activity. In this respect, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) describe the aim of CDA as making "the ideological loading of particular ways of using language and the relations of power which underlie them more visible" (p. 258). In the case of translation, according to Schaffner (2004), textual features, ideological contexts, and underlying relations of power apply both to the source text and culture and to the target text and culture. The discipline of Translation Studies has developed concepts with which it is possible to describe and explain target text profiles, the translation strategies used, the appropriateness of those strategies, the conditions under which the translator operated, and the effects a text has had in its cultural context.

1.2. Political Discourse in Translation

Political discourse has been described as "a complex form of human activity" (Chilton and Schäffner, 1997, p. 207), based on the recognition that politics cannot be conducted without language. There is widespread agreement in modern linguistics that meanings are not restricted to words, neither are they stable. It is rather the case that language users assign meanings in communicative contexts, and in this process of meaning construction, the information presented in the text interacts with previously stored knowledge and mental models. Political concepts are relative to the discourse of a cultural and political group and thus they are contestable (Schäffner, 2004). In this regard, translators, who are operating in contexts which are shaped by social aims and ideologies, always use certain specific terms and avoid others.

1.3. Translation and Ideology

Schäffner (2003) claims that all translations are ideological since "the choice of a source text and the use that is made of the subsequent target

text are determined by the interests, aims, and objectives of social agents" (p. 23). Schäffner further explains that:

the ideological aspect can be determined within a text itself, both at the lexical level (reflected, for example, in the deliberate choice or avoidance of a particular word) and at the grammatical level (for example, the use of passive structures to avoid an expression of agency). Ideological aspects can be more or less obvious in texts, depending on the topic of a text, its genre and communicative purposes (p. 23).

Ideological aspects can also be examined in the process of text production (translating) and the role of the translator as a target text producer as well as a source text interpreter.

1.4. Critical Discourse Analysis

As Widdowson (2000) puts it, CDA is the uncovering of implicit ideologies in texts. It unveils the underlying ideological prejudices and therefore the exercise of power in texts. To illuminate the techniques and processes employed, it must be asserted that power relationships, ideologies and identities are created and naturalized by the manipulative styles of language

According to Kress (1990), Critical Discourse Analysis has an overtly political agenda, which serves to set CDA off from other kinds of discourse analysis and text linguistics, as well as pragmatics and sociolinguistics. While most forms of discourse analysis aim to provide a better understanding of socio-cultural aspects of texts, CDA aims to provide accounts of the production, internal structure, and overall organization of texts. One crucial difference is that CDA aims to provide a critical dimension in its theoretical and descriptive accounts of texts

A text, as Van Dijk (1997) puts it, "is merely the tip of the iceberg and it is the responsibility of the discourse analyst to uncover the hidden meaning of the text" (p.9). The basic conceptual and theoretical framework worked out and used by Van Dijk (2000a) in his CDA studies is as follows: macro vs. micro; power as control; access and discourse control; context control; the control of text and talk, and mind control. The micro-level comprises language, discourse, verbal interaction and so on, while the macro-level has to do with power relations, such as inequality and dominance. It is the objective of CDA to wed these two levels, since in actual interaction one can not separate them from each other; social power, in this approach, is viewed as a means of controlling the mind and actions of other group(s). The social power by itself may not be negative, but what in fact is of significance to CDA is the inappropriate use of power, which would bring about inequality in the society. In addition, Van Dijk (2002) takes ideology as the attitude a group of people hold about certain issues, hence the analysis of ideology is one of the main concerns of discourse analysis. In order to uncover ideology generated in discourse, Van Dijk (ibid) resorts to social analysis, cognitive analysis and discourse analysis of the text. Whereas, the social analysis pertains to examining the "overall societal structure," (the context), the discourse analysis is primarily text based (syntax, lexicon, local semantics, topics, schematic structures, etc.) Furthermore, Fairclough (2000) asserted that CDA tries to unite, and determine the relationship between three levels of analysis: (a) the actual text; (b) the discursive practices (that is the process involved in creating, writing, speaking, reading, and hearing); and (c) the larger social context that bears upon the text and discursive practices.

1.5. Main Directions in CDA

According to Van Dijk (2000b), CDA does not have a unitary theoretical framework or methodology because it is best viewed as a shared perspective encompassing a range of approaches instead of one school. Among the scholars whose works have profoundly contributed to the development of CDA are Van Dijk and Fairclough. A brief description of their contributions is presented below.

1.5.1. Van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Trend

The Cognitive trend of CDA is pioneered by van Dijk. His socio-cognitive discourse analysis values the importance of the study of cognition in critical analysis of discourse, communication and interaction. Van Dijk believes that cognition occupies the mediating role between micro level and society (macro level). Van Dijk maintains that the visible manifestation of different discriminatory practices of members of dominant groups and institutions are "based on a mental basis consisting of biased models of ethnic events and interactions, which in turn are rooted in racist

prejudices and ideologies" (Van Dijk, 2000c, p. 78).

1.5.2 Van Dijk's (2004) Theoretical Model

The framework which is intended to be employed in this study is that of Van Dijk's (2004). In this framework, Van Dijk elaborates on 27 ideological strategies. This categorization is very effective in implementing the fundamental strategy of 'self positive-representation' and 'other negative-representation. The former is an ideological function which is applied to describe oneself as superior than the others and the latter is to present the other as inferior.

Positive self-presentation or in-group favoritism is a semantic macro-strategy used for the purpose of 'face keeping' or 'impression management' (Van Dijk, 2004). Negative other-presentation is another semantic macro-strategy regarding in-groups and out groups, that is, their division between 'good' and 'bad', superior and inferior, *us* and *them*. This is full of ideologically charged applications of norms and values. These are discursive ways to enhance or relieve our/ their bad characteristics and, as a result, mark discourse ideologicallyVan Dijk (2004) provides a long list of discursive strategies four of which have been chosen for the purposes of the present study, namely '*hyperbole'* (a device for enhancing and exaggerating meaning), '*euphemism*' (a rhetorical device for using polite expressions instead of taboo language), *'polarization'* (categorizing people as belonging to *US* with good attributes and *THEM* with bad attributes), and *'vagueness'* (creating uncertainty and ambiguity).

1.5.3. Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Approach

According to Fairclough (1992), in the early days of critical linguistics, the authors only focused on texts as product and not enough on processes of production and interpretation of the text. Fairclough's (1989, 1992, 1995a, 1995b) model has three main components. The first one is "text analysis," the second component is "analysis of the discourse practice" (text production, text distribution, and text consumption), while the third component is "analysis of social practice," focusing in particular on the relation of discourse to power and ideology.

Along the same line, Fairclough (1989, pp. 110-12) provides us with a list of ten main questions and a number of sub-questions, which could be addressed when analyzing a text, as follows:

A. Vocabulary

1. What experiential values do words have?

   What classification schemes are drawn upon?
   Are there words which are ideologically contested?
   Is there rewording or over wording?
   What ideologically significant meaning relations are there between words?

2. What relational values do words have?

   Are there euphemistic expressions?
   Are there markedly formal or informal expressions?

3. What expressive values do words have?

4. What metaphors are used?

B. Grammar

5. What experiential values do grammatical features have?

   What types of process and participants predominate?
   Is agency unclear?
   Are processes what they seem?
   Are nominalizations used?
   Are sentences active or passive?
   Are sentences positive or negative?

6. What relational values do grammatical features have?

   What modes are used?
   Are there important features of relational modality?

7. What expressive values do grammatical features have?

   Are there important features of expressive modality?

8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?

   What logical connectors are used?
   Are complex sentences characterized to coordination or/subordination?
   What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

C. Textual Structure

9. What interactional conventions are used?

Are there ways in which one participant controls the turn of others?

10. What larger scale structures does the text have?

1.6. Translation and CDA in Iranian Context

Although the field of Translation Studies has employed various methods in its investigation, CDA-driven approach has been rare in translation analysis in Iran. Farahzad (2007) seems to be among the first scholars who have specifically used CDA in the Iranian context as an innovative approach in analyzing translation. She proposes a method for criticizing translation in an article entitled *'Translation Criticism'*. Farahzad (2007) suggests a model for translation criticism which is based on Fairclough's (1995a, 1989) approach to CDA and intertextuality.

For translation criticism, Farahzad (2007) adopts a two-level procedure: micro-level and macro-level. She states that at both levels, lexical choices, metaphors, grammatical elements, and multimodal elements are checked for ideological implications. In her model, the prototext (source text) is analyzed as a means of throwing some light on certain properties of metatext (target text). On the other hand, metatext is studied both as an independent text and a continuation of a given prototext. Here, the procedure Farahzad (2007) proposes comes under the headings of Micro-level and Macro-level:

A.Micro-level

At micro-level, the following features are investigated

1. Vocabulary
2. Grammar
3. Multimodal Elements (i.e., semiotic signs such as book coverage, pictures, images, etc.)

B. Macro-level

At macro-level, the following elements need to be considered:

Translator's, editors and publisher's judgments and comments, categorizations and classifications, representation of reality, power relations, ideologies, and implications.

Moreover, translation strategies are taken into account at this level. In this stage, the following items are investigated in the translation process: borrowing, calque, addition or over wording, under-translation, omission, substitution/ alteration, adoption of any specific type of translation, reordering of content, selection of part from whole optional shifts, and rearrange-ment of sentence elements.

1.7. Empirical CDA-driven Studies on Translation

Below a review of a few empirical studies which have been conducted within a CDA framework is provided.

Adopting the CDA approach, Kuo and Nakamura (2005) conducted a study to analyze and discuss the news reports related to Taiwan's first lady Wu Shuchen's interview with the media which appeared in two ideologically opposing newspapers, i.e., the pro-reunification United Daily News and the pro-independence Liberty Times. Both news articles are translated from an identical English text. However, based on the analysis of headlines, editorial deletion and addition, syntactic and lexical variations, as well as stylistic differences in paragraph/thematic combination, Kuo and Nakamura found that noticeable changes were made by the two translated Chinese versions. They argue that these transformations and differences found in the two Chinese texts are not arbitrary, but rather they are ideologically motivated; that is, they reflect and construct the underlying opposing ideologies between the two newspapers.

Damaskinidis (2006) applied a CDA-based methodology to investigate any ideological shifts between the English source text and its Greek translation. The analysis of the ST (source text) and TT (target text) has shown how a CDA-based approach can throw light not only on the way culturally approved patterns reflect society's priorities and preoccupations but also on the way they influence them. The comparative analysis of this study has provided an interesting example of how a culture associated with English language, namely EU and its official working language, has influenced the translator's attitudes and motivations in his/her attempt to decode various ideological patterns. For example, left- and right-wing ideologies, and their associated "Imagined Readers," (Holland, 2000, p. 157) have been a major source of influence in choosing between ideologically-laden lexical patterns. This has led to a discourse which, on the one hand, reinforces ideological assumptions and, on the other hand, it

challenges them by emphasizing that the Others (EU) violate the very norms and values We (the Greeks) hold dear (Van Dijk, 1995).

In the Iranian context, Ghazanfar (2008) conducted a research to investigate linguistic and paralinguistic elements in translated books to find out if translation changes the ideological positioning of source texts and if CDA can be used in discovering the ideological implications of such probable deviations. In pursuing these objectives, two English books along with their corresponding Persian translations were used: 'Why Do People Hate America?' by Sardar & Davies (2003) and 'Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower' by William Blum (2005). The researcher conducted this study based on Fairclough's theoretical framework for CDA and Farahzad's article (2007), *Translation Criticism*. It was concluded that translated texts appear in a context different from that of the source texts. A text is produced in the context of 'Self' and is translated in the settings of 'Other' or at least for 'Others'

In another study, Shamsali (2007) conducted a study to examine whether political ideological differences occur when it comes to *trans-journalism* (i.e., translations which deal with journalism, such as news, editorials, etc.) and if so, in which media, namely conservative or pro-reform media, such differences are more considerable. To this end, the researcher used 30 trans-journalist texts from the above-mentioned media to translate the intended corpus of his research which was chosen from different pieces of news about Israel-Palestine conflict that potentially carried ideological weight. The theoretical framework of this study was adopted from Van Dijk's (1998) CDA model. The results indicated that there were significant differences between conservative and pro-reform media in translating the news. In the conservative media the percentages of political-ideological changes were much higher in comparison to pro-reform ones due to their different political-ideological perspectives and beliefs.

In another study, Shamlou (2007) tried to unveil the role of ideology that emanates from the dominant socio-cultural norms in shaping political journalistic texts. To do so, this research was carried out based on Van Dijk's (1995) analytical method of doing CDA and his notion of implicitness in the process of translation and the concept of mediation used by Hatim and Mason (1997). The researcher selected different pieces of political analyses and commentaries believed to have relatively high ideological load when translated. Then, he chose two groups of participants, i.e., translator-participants and reader-participants in order to translate and fill out the intended questionnaire out of those pieces of political analyses and commentaries. The outcome of this research revealed that ideologically manipulative shifts seem to be a common strategy used by translators, and their lexical choices, which have been originated from their own mind-set, created different effects on the TL readers.

Most CDA-based translation studies (both Persian and non-Persian) that have been conducted so far have mostly investigated the ideological shifts between source texts and their corresponding translations. The findings of these studies indicate that ideologically manipulative shifts are a common strategy used by translators thereby changing the ideological position of source texts.

1.8. Research Questions and Hypotheses

The present CDA-based study was conducted to answer the following questions:

RQ1- Does the ideological position of political texts change as a result of modifications made during the process of translation?

RQ2- Is the ideology behind a translated text revealed through the use of certain lexical patterns (e.g. hyperbole, polarization, euphemism and vagueness) and grammatical structures (e.g. active vs. passive and positive vs. negative sentences, actional vs. relational verbs, nominalization and the degree of completeness) in the process of translating political English texts into Persian?

2. Methodology

In this study, a descriptive-analytic method of research was utilized to deal with the analytic purposes of this research when analyzing the corpus of the study. More specifically, a CDA approach, based on Fairclough (1989), Van Dijk (2004) and Farahzad (2007), was adopted to conduct the research. Since Farahzad's (2007) model is composed of two levels (Micro-level and Macro-level), the corpus of this study was investi-

gated at these levels. At the micro-level, the analysis of lexical features of the corpus was based on Van Dijk's model (2004), whereas the analysis of grammatical features was based on Fairclough's framework (1989).

2.1 Corpus

Three English political books alongside their Persian translations were selected as the corpus of the present research. The rationale behind the choice of these books was that the original books were concerned mostly with the Iranian issues and their Persian translated versions had considerable ideologically manipulated changes at both lexical and grammatical levels. The first book was Turbulent Iran, recollections, revelations and a proposal for peace by Elden Griffiths (2006). It was translated by Farid Javaher Kalam under the name of and was published by Abi Publication in 2008. The second English book was The Iran-Iraq war and the first gulf war by King & Karesh (2006).Its translated version contains just the source book's first two papers written by Ralph King and Efraim Karsh (1987). The translated version rendered by Seyed Saadat Hosseini under the title was published by The Holy Defense Documentation Center in 2008. Finally, the last book was Modern Iran: Roots and results of revolution by Nikki R. Keddie (2003). The translated book consists of the three final chapters (chapters 10, 11, and 12) of the original book. These chapters were translated by Mahdi Haqighatkhah and were published by Qoqnoos publication company under the title of in 2004.

3. Results

3.1. Micro-level

At micro-level, the vocabulary and grammar of the original texts alongside their corresponding translations were investigated. The lexical analyses throughout this research were done based on Van Dijk's model (2004) of "Critical Discourse Analysis". Accordingly, some ideologically-laden lexical patterns embedded in the intended translations were investigated through a detailed comparison between each source text and its corresponding translation. In order to go through the analysis of the corpus in a more manageable manner, the translated texts were examined by virtue of a few categories adopted from the above model in order to uncover the tacit assumptions, beliefs, and value systems constituting ideologies of the target texts producers. These semantic discursive strategies were: hyperbole (rhetoric), polarization (meaning), euphemism (rhetoric) and vagueness (meaning). Therefore, the three translated texts were critically analyzed at the level of vocabulary to examine the role of the translators' lexical choices in the production of the basic discursive strategies, i.e., ideological trends called positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation throughout the corpus.

Table 1 below shows the frequency and percentage of each discursive strategy in each of the three books.

As Table 1 illustrates, among the four discursive strategies extracted from the corpus, polarization with the percentage of about 51.05% has the highest frequency, and hyperbole has the lowest frequency (6.31%). As it can be seen, the percentage of the use of discursive strategies in Turbulent Iran' (68.94%) is higher than the other two books. On the other hand, i, 'Modern Iran, …' these discursive strategies occurred less than the others, with 12.10 percent on the whole.

The above (lexical) semantic discursive strategies are employed for the ideological ploy that is the basic discursive strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, and these ideological positions have been altered in the translated texts. To test whether the data show any significant difference between the source and translated texts, a Chi square was carried out on the frequencies of these two basic discursive strategies, i.e. positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation in the source and translated texts. The Chi square (x^2) value was 131.714. This amount of Chi square at 1 degree of freedom and 0.05 level of significance exceeds the critical value (3.841). Based on these results, the second null hypothesis stating that 'the ideology behind a translated text is not revealed through the use of certain lexical patterns (e.g. hyperbole, polarization, euphemism and vagueness) in the process of translating political English texts into Persian' is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference between the two basic discursive strategies (i.e. positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation) in the source and translated texts. Next, the gram

matical analysis of the corpus was done based on Fairclough's (1989) framework of doing CDA. The following questions were adopted from Fairclough's (1989) framework:

1. What types of process predominate?
2. Is agency unclear?
3. Are sentences active or passive?
4. Are sentences positive or negative?
5. Are nominalizations used?

Beside these questions, other grammatical features, namely Van Dijk's (1998) degree of completeness, which is a category in his model (1998) that reveals over-complete vs. under-complete forms of translation, as well as Hodge & Kress's (2003) categories of actional and relational verbs were addressed in the process of analyzing the texts.

The extracted grammatical structures used by the translators were attributed to the two basic discursive strategies, proposed by Van Dijk (2004), namely the positive self-presentation and the negative other-presentation, which are regarded as the hidden ideological trends of the use of grammatical structures. The frequencies and percentages of these two basic discursive strategies, attributed to each grammatical structure in the corpus of this study, are shown in Table 2 below.

As Table 2 illustrates, positive self-presentation is the dominant basic strategy, enjoying 60.71%; whereas, negative other-presentation occurred only 39.28%. It can also be seen that among grammatical structures in the corpus, changing passive into active is the most frequent grammatical strategy for the purpose of ideological trends as it enjoys the highest percentage (23.21); whereas, over-completeness form of translation has just 5.35 percent of occurrence.

To test the proposed null hypotheses of the study and to see whether the data shows any significant difference between the source and translated texts, the same procedure as that carried out at the lexical level, was performed and the Chi square was calculated between the source and translated texts' two basic discursive strategies, i.e. positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. The value of Chi square (x^2) was 10.571. This amount of Chi square at 1 degree of freedom and 0.05 level of significance exceeds the critical value (3.841). Based on these results, the second null hypothesis stating that 'the ideology behind a translated text is not revealed through the use of certain grammatical structures (e.g. active vs. passive and positive vs. negative sentences, actional vs. relational verbs, nominalization and the degree of

Table 1. Frequency and percentage of the discursive strategies at the level of vocabulary in the translated books

Books Discursive strategies	Turbulent Iran		The Iran-Iraq War		Modern Iran: Roots and Result of Revolution		Total	
	Per.	Freq	Per.	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.	Freq.
Euphemism	34	59.64%	14	24.56%	9	15.78%	57	30%
Polarization	72	74.22%	16	16.49%	9	9.27%	97	51.05%
Hyperbole	10	83.33%	2	16.66%	0	00.00%	12	6.31%
Vagueness	15	62.5%	4	16.66%	5	20.83%	24	12.63%
Total	131	68.94%	36	18.94%	23	12.10%	190	100%

Tale 2. Frequency and percentage of basic discursive strategies (ideological trends) attributed to the grammatical structures in the translated books

Grammatical Structures	Basic Discursive Strategies P.S.P		N.O.P		Total	
	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.
Active into Passive Sentence	2	50%	2	50%	4	7.14%
Passive into Active Sentence	7	53.84%	6	46.15%	13	23.21%
Under-Completeness	11	100%	0	0%	11	19.67%
Over- Completeness	1	33.33%	2	66.66%	3	5.35%
Nominalization vs. Verbal form	5	45.45%	6	54.54%	11	19.67%
Unclear Agency	1	25%	۳	75%	4	7.14%
Positive vs. Negative	2	50%	2	50%	4	7.14%
Relational vs. Actional verbs	5	83.33	1	16.66%	6	10.71%
Total	34	60.71%	22	39.28%	56	100%

Key: PSP= Positive Self-presentation NOP= Negative Other-presentation

completeness) in the process of translating political English texts into Persian' is rejected. In other words, at the grammatical level there is also a significant difference between the two basic discursive strategies (i.e. positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation) in the source and translated texts.

3.2. Macro-level Analyses

At this level, the prefaces and footnotes provided by the publishers, editors and translators of the books in hand were investigated for the purpose of revealing their diverse world-views, assumptions, and ideologies from those of the original authors.

These notes, which can be considered as a mirror of the society's norms and values, clearly reflect the power network's (publishers, editors and market forces) and translators' ideological trends and judgments towards the source texts. The analyses revealed that in the prefaces and notes available in two of the target texts, as well as the footnotes provided in all of them, there was the same attitude towards the authors' works, pointing to the authors' mistakes and their wrong information about the Iranian issues and also their obvious hostility towards Iran.

4. Discussion

This study attempted to investigate and analyze some linguistic strategies on both lexical and grammatical levels to reveal the translators' hidden ideological trends in employing such strategies in the process of translating three political texts. Juxtaposing the original English texts with the translation products, the results of the study at the lexical and grammatical levels show clear differences between what the author had actually meant to convey and what has been rendered in the translated texts.

Since the three books investigated in this study are written in favor of the **others'** interests (i.e. non-Iranian readers), all the lexical and grammatical deviations and divergences used by the translators are in the employment of the Iranian (**Self**) interests which reflect their different ideologies and world-views. Thus, it is very natural that in the process of translating English texts written on Iranian issues, the basic discursive strategy would be the **positive self-presentation**. This is related to Van Dijk's (2004) claim that positive self-presentation or in-group favoritism is a semantic macro-strategy used for the purpose of 'face keeping' or 'impression management' which is full of ideologically charged applications of norms and values.

One interesting outcome of the present study is that the obtained percentages of the basic discursive strategies, i.e. the positive self-presentation and the negative other-presentation at the level of vocabulary (i.e. 75.13% and 24.86%, respectively) were close to those at the level of grammar (i.e. 60.71% and 39.28%, respectively). This shows that in the process of translating English political texts, there is a close link between the lexical and grammatical features used by the translators as they pursue the same aim and lead to the same ideological consequences.

This finding is similar to that obtained by Damaskinidis (2006), who investigated the ideological shifts between the English source text and its Greek translation. His study reinforces and challenges ideological assumptions by emphasizing that the **Others** violate the very norms and values **we** hold dear. In this study, the basic discursive strategy was negative other-presentation.

The present study also investigated the translated books' given notes, prefaces and footnotes to further reveal the translators' ideological trends. These notes, which can be considered as a mirror of the society's norms and values, clearly reflect the power network's (publishers, editors and market forces) and translators' ideological trends and judgments towards the source texts. It was found that in the prefaces and notes available in two of the target texts, as well as the footnotes provided in all of them, there was the same attitude towards the authors' works, pointing to the authors' mistakes and their wrong information about Iranian issues and also their obvious hostility towards Iran.

It is worth noting that the Persian translated version of **Turbulent Iran**, having just some footnotes without any preface and pre-note, had the highest percentage of the use of lexical and grammatical strategies leading to ideological consequences. In this book, the translator has made a greater number of lexical and grammatical alterations and deviations, as well as the omissions of many lexical items, phrases and even a number of paragraphs in the original text.

On the other hand, the translators of the other two books, namely **The Iran-Iraq War** and

Modern Iran, Roots and Results of Revolution, which have prefaces and pre-notes to reveal their ideological stances towards the original texts, have tried to be as loyal as possible to their corresponding original texts since in their translations of these two books the occurrence of lexical and grammatical alterations is less than the translated version of **Turbulent Iran**. Based on the results of the present study, it is suggested that in the process of translating English political texts one should be more loyal to the source texts rather than manipulating and omitting some parts of them. By providing prefaces and relevant notes, the power network and translators can express their attitudes and ideas towards the content of the source texts while producing a faithful translation of the original texts.

Referring to Table 1 in the previous section, it can be seen that the occurrence of polarization among semantic discursive strategies outnumbers the other ones while the basic ideological ploy is positive self-presentation. On the other hand, as Table 2 shows, changing passive into active sentences had the highest frequency of occurrence among grammatical features, and once again the basic ideological ploy was positive self-presentation. Furthermore, at macro-level, investigation of the translated books' given notes, prefaces and footnotes clearly revealed the power network's ideological trends, reflecting once again the basic discursive strategy of the positive self-presentation.

By calculating the Chi-square statistics between the source and translated texts two basic discursive strategies, i.e. positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation at both lexical and grammatical levels, the proposed null hypotheses of this study were rejected. Thus, the first null hypothesis stating that "the ideological position of the political texts does not change as a result of modifications made during the process of translation", as well as the second null hypothesis stating that "the ideology behind a translated text is not revealed through the use of certain lexical patterns (e.g. hyperbole, polarization, euphemism and vagueness) and grammatical structures in the process of translating political English texts into Persian" were rejected.

In line with the outcomes of this study is another CDA-driven translation study in which Ghazanfar (2008) investigated linguistic and paralinguistic elements in Persian translated books to find out if translation changes the ideological position of source texts. It was concluded that translated texts appear in a context different from that of the source texts. A text is produced in the context of **'Self'** and is translated in the settings of **'Other',** or at least for 'Others'.

As the findings of the present study illustrate, translators through employing semantic discursive strategies and also grammatical structures can achieve some ideological goals. This finding is similar to that of a study conducted by Shamlou (2007) to unveil the role of ideology that emanates from the dominant socio-cultural norms in shaping political journalistic texts. The outcome of this research also revealed that ideologically manipulative shifts seem to be a common strategy used by translators.

Furthermore, the outcomes of this research are in line with Kuo and Nakamura's (2005) findings. The researchers of this study argue that transformations and differences found in the two Chinese texts are not arbitrary, but rather are ideologically motivated, that is, they reflect and construct the underlying opposed ideologies between the two newspapers under scrutiny.

5. Conclusion

The results of the present research proves that translators make use of grammatical structures as well as semantic discursive strategies for the ideological ploy, that is the basic discursive strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Therefore, since translation as a social phenomenon by its nature is the site of ideological clashes, the translator tries to pursue the interests of the power network of the translation, especially when it follows some social and political ends. Moreover, the movement of texts from the context of Other to the context of Self is an undeniable change of ideological positioning. The justification for this is that the interests of 'Other' is different from those of 'Self'. In addition, as the findings of the present study illustrate, translators through employing semantic discursive strategies and also grammatical structures can achieve some ideological ends.

The findings of the present study indicate that Critical Discourse Analysis can be an appropriate method for detection of biased and manipulative language. In the case of translating political texts, polarization (in-group favoritism vs. out-group derogation) in van Dijk's (2004) framework, is a very effective discursive strategy particularly at

the disposal of the original writers. Accordingly, since positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation lead to inclusion and exclusion, Van Dijk's grammatical structure, i.e. degree of completeness and especially under-completeness in the case of this study, alongside Fairclough's (1989) passive vs. active voice have been considered as devices to establish the perspective that We and Our political views are superior.

The pedagogical implications of this study is that the translators necessarily need to be aware of social, political and ideological backgrounds of the writers as well as underlying layers of texts in order to be able to render a message from the source to target language. Thus, it is recommended that the curriculum designers pay attention to social aspects of translation and the role translation plays in power relations.

On the other hand, the findings of the present study in the area of text analysis and particularly in uncovering the ideological implications of divergences of target texts from source texts have implications for translation students and teachers alike. Translation students should be made aware of the fact that changes of meaning may occur as a result of changes in those aspects of texts which can include ideological ramifications (for instance, grammatical changes such as changing passive into active sentences and vice versa, and choice or avoidance of a specific lexical item, etc.). Furthermore, this CDA-driven study would provide some insights into the socio-political and ideological factors which determine the strategies applied in the process of translating political texts.

References

Blum, W. (2005). *Rogue State: A guide to the world's only superpower*. London: Common Courage Press.

Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and politics. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, Vol 2: Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 206- 30). London: Sage Publications.

Damaskinidis, G. (2006). MA studies on translation. Retrieved from: http://europa.eu.int/ comm/ employment- social/ elm/ summit/ en/ papers/ guide.htm.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Poloty Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2000). *Language and power* (2nd Ed.). New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In Van Dijk, T. A., Political Discourse and Political cognition. Congress paper on political discourse, Astone University July 1997. Retrieved from Van Dijk' homepage: http://www.let.uva.nl~teun.

Farahzad, F. (2007). Translation criticism. *Journal of Translation Studies*, 6 (24), 39-47.

Gazanfar, M. (2008). *A Critical discourse analysis approach to the representation of cultures and ideologies through translated texts: A case study*. Unpublished M.A thesis. Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.

Grffiths, E. (2006). *Turbulent Iran, recollections, revelations and a proposal for peace*. London: Seven locks Press.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hodge, B., & Kress, G. (2003). *Language as ideology* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Holland, B. (2000). Applications of Text Analysis. In Coulthard, M., Moon, R., Johnson, A., & Holland, B. (eds), *Written Discourse*. University of Birmingham.

Keddie, N. (2003). (2nd.Ed.) *Modern Iran: Roots and results of revolution*. New Heaven and London: Yale University Press.

King, R., & Karesh, E. (2006). *The Iran-Iraq war and the first gulf war*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kress, G. (1990). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Robert Kaplan (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, II. Retrieved from: http:// users.utu.fi/ bredelli/cda.htm.

Kuo, S., & Nakamura, M. (2005). *Translation or transformation? A case study of language and ideology in the Taiwanese press*. Retrieved from: hptt://das,sagepub.com.

Sardar, Z., & Davies, M. W. (2003). *Why do people hate America?* London: Disinformation Books.

Schäffner , C. (2003). Third ways and new centers: Ideological unity or difference? In M. Calzada-Perez (Ed.), *Apropos of ideology* (pp. 23-42).

Manchester: St. Irome.

Schäffner, C. (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics* 3,1.

Shamlou, H. (2007). *The impact of ideology on translator's lexical choices in translation of political-journalistic texts*. Unpublished M. A. thesis. Teacher Training University, Tehran.

Shamsali, M. (2007). *The Effect of political ideology on the translation of journalistic texts*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Political discourse and political cognition*. Congress Paper on Political Discourse, Aston University, July 1997. Retrieved from van Dijk's homepage: http:// www.let.uva. nl~teun

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Critical discourse analysis*. Retrieved from: http://www.hum.uva.nl/ teun/ cda.htm

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000a). *Ideology and Discourse*. Retrieved from http://www.discourse-in-society. org/teun.html

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000b). *Critical discourse analysis*. Retrieved from: http://www.discourse in society.org/2003.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000c). *Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity*. Retrieved from: http://wwww. hum.uva.nl/teun.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). The discourse knowledge interface. In Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (eds.) *Theory and interdisciplinarity in CDA* (pp. 85-109). London: Palgrave.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Politics Ideology and Discourse*. Retrieved from: http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html

Widdowson, H. (2000). Critical Practices: On Representation and the interpretation of text. In S. Sarangi & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Discourse and social life* (pp. 59-77). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Mohammad Hossein Keshavarz

is professor emeritus of applied Linguistics at Tehran Teacher Training University. He is currently a faculty member of Islamic Azad University of Qazvin. He has published on various topics in Applied Linguistics and TEFL in several national and international journals including Language in Society, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Journal of Research in Psycholinguistics, and International Journal of Bilingualism. He has also presented papers in professional conferences such as AILA, Systemic functional Linguistics Conferences, and Bilingualism Symposia. His research interests include sociolinguistics, bilingualism, discourse analysis, and phonology.

Leila Alimadadi Zonoozi

has a BA in English Translation Studies from Islamic Azad University of Karaj and an MA in Translation Studies from Tarbiat Mo'allem University of Tehran. Since her graduation from Tarbiat Mo'allem University in 2009, she has been engaged in translating literary books from English into Persian and vice-versa.