



**International  
Journal of Society, Culture & Language  
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: [www.ij scl.net](http://www.ij scl.net)  
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

## **Seeking Source Discourse Ideology by English and Persian Translators: A Comparative Think Aloud Protocol Study**

**Masood Khoshsaligheh<sup>1a</sup>**

### **ARTICLE HISTORY:**

Received December 2017  
Received in revised form February 2018  
Accepted February 2018  
Available online March 2018

### **KEYWORDS:**

Ideological discourse structures  
Discourse categories  
Translator education  
English-Persian translation  
Think aloud protocols

### **Abstract**

Discourse audiences are susceptible to fall victims of the concealed ideological representations in discourses at the expanse of changing and modifying their mental models through which they act on the world. Translators as readers and at the same time intercultural mediators need to be equipped with the knowledge of how ideology is accommodated in discourse both not to fall victim to it and to intervene as necessary. The curriculum of English translation undergraduate program at Iranian universities does not formally include any course or portion of the syllabus of a course to address ideology in discourse and translation. Using think aloud protocol procedure, the present study aims at investigating the extent of this knowledge of Iranian graduates of BA in English Translation. The results demonstrate that the trained English translators mainly examine the source discourse at more metaphorically visible levels of discourse and the more abstract discourse categories remain almost untapped.

© 2018 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, Email: [khoshsaligheh@um.ac.ir](mailto:khoshsaligheh@um.ac.ir)

Tel: +98-915-5012669

<sup>a</sup> Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

## 1. Introduction

Discourse, as text in context, is a cultural practice. Discourse production involves various levels of cultural, social, and ideological representations. The discourse producers consciously or subconsciously inscribe their world views between the lines of the text. No sentence is innocent of ideology, and it does bear with it a certain level of explicit and/or implicit statements from the author regarding how they perceive the world.

In more general texts by the laymen these representations can be justified to be on a more unplanned and subconscious side. However, in terms of the more planned types of texts such as journalistic or political texts, which are typically produced, modified, and edited by more than an individual and in fact by a group of professional and expert writers the indications and representations to certain social and cultural processes and institutions are not simple coincidences.

Political speech writers and journalists are well aware of the fact that their audiences are helpless victims to their hidden ideologies and covert worldviews, carefully concealed and knitted between the lines of their language productions, ranging from an oral speech, a written formal text, or the script of a motion picture.

Exposed to political and journalistic texts or other language productions, the discourse readership is prone to change their cognitive and mental models, through which they perceive and act on the world. Receiving the subliminal messages and beliefs covert in ideologically-loaded discourse, the readership is unwittingly brought to relinquish their own beliefs and adjust them to the way to which the authors of the discourse in question are inclined (Fairclough, 1989, 1995; van Dijk, 2000, 2015).

By the same logic, translators as readers are also susceptible to fall victims at the expense of changes and intrusions to their own mental and cognitive models. Similarly, translators as cross-cultural and interlingual mediators are also liable for facilitating the spread and transfer of such means of disseminating and implementing opposing and negative beliefs of the Other and allow the target text reader to

fall victims to manipulations of their mental and cognitive models, and accordingly how they receive, appreciate and conform to their own cultural norms and belief systems in comparison to those of the Others.

The curriculum of English translation program at Iranian universities does not directly address the need for a course or part of a course on critical/political/ideological discourse analysis. However, it is assumed that during certain courses such as translation of political texts, translation of journalistic texts, or even reading journalistic texts in English, the students are introduced directly or peripherally with the relevant principles in this regard.

Translation is an essential tool for all parties of power to legitimize their state in terms of ideological and political conflicts which can no longer be resolved merely locally in this globalizing world. Translators as social activists intercultural mediators play a central role in discursive negotiation of conflicting narratives at various translational actions ranging from choosing the texts to translate, to particular discursive decisions during rendition of the content from the source to the target version, and to visual and paratextual ways of presenting the texts (Baker, 2006, 2007; Boéri & Carol, 2010; Brownlie, 2007). Translators often are not aware of the role they play and the responsibility they have in presenting the world to their audience, even “translators of scientific texts are rarely aware that what they translate are ultimately narrative accounts of the world that may have significant political consequences” (Baker, 2007, p. 11).

The purpose of the present research concerns to what extent the fledgling translators freshly graduated out of English translation programs at Iranian universities are taught, familiarized, and equipped with this knowledge to stand against the covert and hidden ideologies and cultural and social indications. Also, the study aims to investigate whether the quality of the translation performance of the graduates has a relationship with the extent of sensitivity to examine the source discourse during translation deeper and more frequently. Consequently, the current think aloud protocol study was conducted to address the following question.

How does examining the source discourse for ideological and cultural representations compare and contrast between trained English and

Persian translators at different translating performance levels of average and high translation quality?

The theoretical framework of the study draws on parts of the socio-cognitive approach to the study of discourse for ideological representations (van Dijk, 1998, 2000, 2015).

## 2. Theoretical Framework

Critical discourse study or analysis is a cross-disciplinary field of research which lies at the intersection of investigating discourses and social institutions of power and cultural processes. Critical discourse study is not a particular research method. It is practically a research perspective through which scholars of different fields and backgrounds using their research frameworks and methods investigate discourse for the benefit of the oppressed and victimized in a world in which the individuals and institutions of social and political power use discourse as a cultural means to maintain the power relations and balance to their benefit.

There have been several mainstream approaches to critical analysis of discourse such as the sociocultural approach to critical discourse introduced by Fairclough (e.g., 1989, 1995), the discourse-historical approach to critical discourse analysis majorly associated with Wodak and the Vienna School (e.g., Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Wodak, 2001), or one of the most regarded critical approaches to discourse, the socio-cognitive approach developed by van Dijk (e.g., 1998, 2000, 2006, 2015).

In the socio-cognitive approach to critical study of discourse, according to van Dijk (2015) several steps are taken by the analyst. An initial step of analysis may constitute the context analysis. Next, the analysis focuses on semantic macrostructures, via study of global meanings, topics or themes. In the next step, the critical analyst may focus on local meanings, including the meaning of lexical items, the structures and nature of propositions, and coherence and other relations between propositions, like implications, presuppositions, and levels of description. Subsequently, the analysis may focus on certain discourse structures which are normally less intentionally controlled or are even less consciously manageable by the discourse

producer, including intonation, syntactic structures, propositional structures, and rhetorical figures, in addition to the numerous spoken properties of spontaneous talk, such as turn-taking, repairs, pauses, or hesitations. A later step in this approach focuses on the analysis of mental models in the discourse. According to van Dijk, a discourse is not so coherent since its propositions refer to related objective facts in a possible world; however, it is coherent because the propositions in the discourse refer to the episodes (events and situations) as interpreted, defined and (seen to be) related by the audience. Such subjective interpretations are represented in episodic memory as mental models of events and situations. In other words, a discourse is coherent as long as readers can construct a mental model for it. These models, called event models, subjectively represent the events the discourse refers to. Event models are semantic, while context models are pragmatic. Context models are a special type of event models, actually a model of communicative events, so event models have essentially the same structure including setting, participants, and actions/ events with their respective subcategories and properties. According to van Dijk not only do discourse producers attempt to adequately express their own event models, but they formulate the text or talk in a way that the intended model could be accepted by the audience. "This is what persuasion is all about, and it may be obvious that without an account of mental model structures, such a verbal act and its associated verbal structures cannot be adequately described, let alone explained" (p. 76).

For van Dijk (1998, p. 263) the expression of ideology in discourse is normally more than an explicit or concealed display of an individual's beliefs. It does serve a persuasive purpose. The notion of ideological discourse strategies and structures may be ambiguous in the sense that specific structures are employed in the representation and persuasion of ideologies and cultural norms in discourse. Although that holds true, it should be assumed that in a given text any structure or substructure of discourse may be benefited to this end. On the other hand, van Dijk emphasizes that certain strategies or structures which may function ideologically in one context may not be ideologically loaded in another context.

Discourse is very complex, featuring many levels of structures, each with their own categories and elements, which may be combined in innumerable ways. As we have seen, ideologies may be expressed explicitly and then are easy to detect, but this may also happen very indirectly, implicitly, concealed or in less obvious structures of discourse, such as an intonation, a hesitation or a pronoun. (van Dijk, 2000, p. 42)

The socio-cognitive approach to critical discourse analysis introduced by van Dijk (1998, 2015) builds on the overall principle that most of the ideological discourses use – say positive thing about Us, and say negative things about Them. This form of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation is not only a very general characteristic of group conflict and the ways we interact with opposed groups, but also characterizes the way we talk about ourselves and others. Thus, van Dijk (2000) further maintains that ideology may be exhibited in virtually all structures of text or talk, yet on the other hand, it makes sense that this may be more typical for some than for other structures and sub-structures. He enumerates some of the structures of discourse that typically exhibit underlying ideologies:

- A. Meaning
  - a. Topics
  - b. Level of description
  - c. Implications and presuppositions
  - d. Local coherence
  - e. Synonymy, paraphrase
  - f. Contrast
  - g. Examples and illustrations
  - h. Disclaimers
- B. Propositional structures
  - a. Actors
  - b. Modality
  - c. Evidentiality
  - d. Hedging and vagueness
  - e. Topoi
- C. Formal structures
- D. Sentence syntax
  - a. Word order
  - b. Nominalization
  - c. Passive or active sentences
  - d. Topicalization
- E. Discourse forms
- F. Argumentation
- G. Rhetoric
- H. Action and interaction

The two overall strategies, positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, are very typical in ideologically charged discourses in favor of the text producer's own interests, while blaming negative situations and events on the outgroup. As illustrated in summary, these strategies can be applied to several discursive moves and structures (van Dijk, 2006, p. 273):

- Overall interaction strategies
  - Positive self-presentation
  - Negative other-presentation
- Macro speech act implying Our 'good' acts and Their 'bad' acts, e.g. accusation, defense
- Semantic macrostructures: topic selection
  - (De-)emphasize negative/positive topics about Us/Them
- Local speech acts implementing and sustaining the global ones, e.g. statements that prove accusations.
- Local meanings Our/Their positive/negative actions
  - Give many/few details
  - Be general/specific
  - Be vague/precise
  - Be explicit/implicit
  - Etc.
- Lexicon: Select positive words for Us, negative words for Them
- Local syntax
  - Active vs. passive sentences, nominalizations: (de)emphasize Our/Their positive/negative agency, responsibility
- Rhetorical figures
  - Hyperboles vs. euphemisms for positive/negative meanings
  - Metonymies and metaphors emphasizing Our/Their positive/negative properties
- Expressions: sounds and visuals
  - Emphasize (loud, etc.; large, bold, etc.) positive/negative meanings
  - Order (first, last: top, bottom, etc.) positive/negative meanings

In a quantitative study, Khoshsaligheh (2012) provided empirical evidence for the categorization of ideological discourse structures, conceptualized by van Dijk (1998, 2000, 2015) for various levels of analysis of the ideologically-invested discourses. The validation

study, through a series of factor analytical procedures, empirically provided confirmatory support for van Dijk's model (1998, 2000, 2015). The study managed to develop an empirically supported re-categorization of the ideological discourse structures. The resultant categorization can be seen in Table 1.

Unlike in conceptual studies or qualitative research where categorizations draw on expert yet subjective opinions of the researcher or

theorist, in quantitative research, such as exploratory factor analysis, the categorizations are objective and result from the emerging patterns and paradigms based on the correlations of the variables across the dataset obtained from a large sample of cases. The achieved structures are irrespective of the analysts' preferences or orientations (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010; Field, 2018; Pallant, 2016).

**Table 1**

*Empirical Re-Categorization of Structures of Discourse*

<i>Discourse Categories (Renamed)</i>	<i>Structures of Discourse</i>
Text Organization	Paragraphing
	Formality Level
	Event Order
	Title & Abstract
Rhetoric	Irony
	Metaphor
	Simile
	Comparison
	Polarization & Contrast
Meaning & Content	Topics & Themes
	Situation Description
	Local Coherence
	Categorization
	Reasonableness
Argumentation	Counterfactual
	Disclaimer
	Litotes & Negation
	Victimization
	Authority
Evidential Support	Evidentiality
	Topoi
	Explanation
	Consensus
Lexical Choice	Repetition
	Word Order
	Hyperbole
	Lexicalization
Generality	Examples
	Generalization
	Presupposition
Sentence	Passivization
	Sub & Coordination
	Sentence Order
Unclarity	Euphemism
	Fallacy
	Vagueness

Note. Adapted from "Exploring Ideological Discourse Structure in English and Persian Translator Education," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) by M. Khoshsaligheh, 2012, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia. Copyright (2012) by the Universiti Sains Malaysia. Adapted with permission.

Besides the empirical support for categorization of van Dijk (1998, 2000, 2015), the model by Khoshsaligheh (2012) facilitates

research in the quantitative paradigm in which a clear-cut distinction between the categories is required for quantified measurements.

The original categorization, same as most theoretical models, is not a definitive classification and a number of structures and strategies are allowed to belong to more than one category – majorly to some and partly to another. Appreciating “systematizing ... proposals on ideological discourse structures”, T. A. van Dijk declares that at the level of theoretical analysis, “the classification of discursive moves and strategies is obviously not an exact science, and some levels and dimensions can be combined” (personal communication, April 14, 2010).

### 3. Method

#### 3.1. Participants

As Lunenburg and Irby (2007, p. 177) point out that qualitative data collection “uses sampling techniques that produce samples that are predominantly small and nonrandom. This is in keeping with the emphasis of qualitative research on in-depth description of participants’ perspectives and context.” As one of the specific approaches in purposive sampling domain, in this study criterion sampling procedure was employed. That is, those were invited to participate who could meet certain predetermined criteria (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 128).

Having recently completed a BA in English translation in an Iranian university and having either a high or average quality in translation performance were set as two criteria for the selection of participants. Other criteria included knowledge of English as a foreign language and Persian as a native language. One last criterion was that only participants in their early or mid-twenties were selected and invited to contribute to the study.

Considering all the criteria set, based on the collective opinion and familiarity of three of the full time translator trainers in an Iranian university on the translation performance of a group of graduates of BA in English Translation, two groups of recent graduates were selected and invited to participate in the study. Based on the overall assessment of the trainers in terms of their students’ quality of translation performance, five participants at the level of high quality translation performance and five participants at the level of average quality translation performance were determined and invited to take part in the experiment.

#### 3.2. Instrumentation

##### 3.2.1. Think Aloud Protocol

Think aloud protocol (TAP) technique was the qualitative instrument that was used in this study to collect the required data. The participants in two groups at two levels of average and high quality in translation performance were assigned to translate an English passage into Persian. Then, they were asked to do the task of initial analysis of the source discourse for its underlying and embedded representation of ideologies to be translated. TAP instrument was used to elicit data for description of the approaches of the participants in general and comparison of the approaches of the two groups in specific in tracing ideological representations in the source discourse by the translators at different translation quality levels.

Think aloud protocol technique as an introspective procedure of data collection has been fairly a controversial procedure. Criticisms have been leveled against this technique. For one thing, it has been argued that this technique jeopardizes the actual performance of the participants in such introspective studies. In addition, it has been asserted that participants may fail to verbalize everything accurately while performing a given task.

However, review of the literature on translation process research demonstrates a widespread TAP acceptability on the part of researchers of the field. In terms of the methodological and theoretical justifications of the procedure, Bernardini (1999) highly recommends and extensively benefits TAP technique in process-oriented research in translation studies. Think aloud protocol technique is recognized as one of the most effective instruments in the study of translation processes (House, 2009, p. 75; Pym, 2010, p. 81).

Ericsson (2002) indicates that in a TAP procedure, the closest connection between concurrent thinking and verbal reports are found when participants are asked to verbalize their ongoing thoughts as they are focusing on solving a task. As for the purposes of using TAP in translation studies, Kussmaul and Tirkkonen-Condit (1995) explain that this technique helps increase the potential for

describing translation processes and accordingly our theoretical understanding. They also introduce two didactic benefits for TAP research in translator education. First the strategies unveiled in TAP research can serve as models for effective translation. Likewise, the technique can be used as diagnostic tools to locate where participating students face problems. Therefore, the findings can help form a basis for translation didactics (p. 178).

### 3.2.2. *ST Discourse*

Two English passages (Obama, 2009, 2010) containing the remarks of the current president of the United States of America on the celebration of Nowruz, the Iranian New Year Holiday in two successive years, were used for translation into Persian. The passages under the titles, "Videotaped Remarks by the President in Celebration of Nowruz" and "Remarks of President Obama Marking Nowruz" were released by the White House on March 20, 2009 and 2010 in 582 and 762 words, respectively.

### 3.3. Data Collection

As one of the preliminary steps in the data collection using think aloud protocol technique, participants were trained in a rehearsal stage. Verbalizing one's thoughts is not a typical activity in everyday life. Given the significance of affective filters such as familiarity and comfort with the nature and context of the experiment, in order to ensure the efficiency of the study, the participants were asked to take part in a preparatory session. The session was planned so that they could get used to the context of the experiment and practice introspective verbalization as well as getting familiarized with a think aloud protocol procedure.

After some practices, in the actual sessions, the participants were individually asked to read and review the two ST passages while preparing to produce a translation based on a formal brief introduced to them. The quality standard was announced to be publication in a national newspaper. They were asked to focus on the overt and covert ideological representations and indications to the embedded world views of the source text producer. Then, they were asked to speak out their thoughts in this regard and verbalize any thought which crossed their mind while reviewing and translating.

The participants were reminded to concentrate on completing the task, which is detecting how ideologies are inscribed in the ST discourse, and they were instructed to consider the act of thinking aloud as the second concern. The sessions were audio-recorded. The presence of the researcher was minimized to controlling the audio-recorder and reminding the participants to keep talking when they were silent for some time. The time of each session was set by the participants themselves to lower as much affective filter as possible, such as hurry or stress. The duration of the TAP meeting could take as long as the participants needed, and they were also informed of that in the beginning for similar reasons.

According to the procedure discussed so far, ten verbal records of translators at two groups of average and high quality in translation performance were obtained. The protocols reflected the participants' approach to reviewing the given source texts for tracing the ideological representations of the text producer, namely, the US president or in fact his team of speech writers.

### 3.4. Data Analysis

As qualitative data is analyzed in numerous ways, and directly due to the nature, intents, and purposes behind qualitative research and mixed methods studies, the analysis of such data cannot be confined to a limited number of procedures. Dörnyei (2007) maintains that research involving qualitative data is "far from being a uniform approach but is characterized by diversity" (p. 242).

Given that "the formation of relevant categories is indeed one of the most crucial and difficult parts of a research project" (Williams & Chesterman, 2002, p. 94), in the analysis of the TAP data, drawing on the purpose of the study, the advantage of an available empirically validated categorization model of the ideological discourse structures achieved through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (Khoshsaligheh, 2012) was benefited.

The categorization model of ideological discourse structures was used to compare and contrast the verbal productions of the two groups of the participating translators. With regard to the essence of data analysis of any kind, William and Chesterman (2002) state

that comparison, looking for similarities and patterns, and contrast, looking for differences and variations, are two fundamental stages for analysis of any data.

The first step of data analysis was to break open the verbal protocols down to segments and smaller units. Based on the purpose of the study, an ideological discourse structure (van Dijk, 2000) was considered as the unit of segmentation of the think aloud protocols.

Eventually, through a review of the transcripts of the TAPs, the number of references made to each of the ideological discourse structures by each of the ten participants was recorded.

The review of the segment against the inventory of ideological discourse structures introduced by van Dijk (e.g., 1998, 2000) suggested that the participants were critically examining the source discourse at various discourse moves and structures such as contrast and polarization, repetition, distancing, comparison, and lexicalization. Resorting to intersubjectivity (Bogdan & Biklen, 1997; Hollway & Jefferson, 2000), when uncertain about a number of cases, the author negotiated the assigning of the instances under which structure in a group with two other scholars. The group decision was ultimately used. Since the validity of the participating students' analyses were not aimed at in this study, the justifications and reasonableness of the participants' analyses were not attended to.

At another stage, based on the categorization of the ideological discourse strategies and structures (Khoshsaligheh, 2012), the mean of the number of references to each of the discourse categories introduced in the framework was also calculated.

Subsequently, the references to each of the ideological discourse structures and discourse categories for exploring ideological and cultural representations in the source discourse during translation by the two groups of trained translators under the study were compared for the potential similarities and contrasted for the possible differences. That is, the approach of the two groups of translators in tracing ideological representations of the source text producer in the ST discourse by tapping into potential ideological discourse devices at two levels of discourse structures and their categories were compared and contrasted.

Using descriptive statistics, the comparison of the results of the analysis of the think aloud protocols of the two groups of the translators was presented.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Ideological Discourse Categories

Initially, the researcher examined and reviewed the verbalized protocols by the ten participants, and quantified the data by coding every reference they made to any of the discourse structures during their translation task, while they were trying to delve into various layers of the discourse in pursuit of indications to ideological assumptions about the implicit ideologies of the source text producer. Whether the participants, partly or completely, correctly or incorrectly, arrived at and interpreted certain indications did not matter and every reference made to various ideological discourse structures of the source text was considered and counted. Nonetheless, even though irrelevant to the purpose of the study, the review of the results demonstrated that despite some incomplete or incorrect interpretations, the majority of the participants' interpretations made reasonable sense. Later, based on a larger unit of analysis, in order to compare and contrast how the participants of the two groups sought ideological indications in English to Persian translation at category level, the number of references to every category indicator (i.e., ideological discourse structures) was summed and divided by the number of corresponding ideological discourse structures at every category. Namely, the arithmetic average or mean score of every group for reference to each category was calculated.

The averaged frequency of examining every category by the participants of the two groups was used as a basis for later comparisons and contrasts. Table 2 shows the results for every category as well as their affiliating discourse structures. However, two of the ideological discourse structures, Title & Abstract under Text Organization category and Simile under Rhetoric category were excluded from the calculations of averaged frequency, because the two structures were not available in the source texts which was used for the think aloud protocol procedure. Since those indicators did not exist to be referred to by the translators, it only made sense for them not to



be included and counted in the study. In order to compare and contrast the two groups, based on the review of the resultant frequencies, the

categories from the most to the least frequently examined by every group were listed in Table 3.

**Table 2**

*Sum and Mean of Participants' Examination of Each Discourse Category*

Discourse Categories	Discourse Structures	HTQ		ATQ	
		Sum	Mean	Sum	Mean
Text Organization		11	3.66	13	4.33
	Paragraphing				
	Formality Level				
Rhetoric	Event Order				
		28	7	7	1.75
	Irony				
	Metaphor				
Meaning & Content	Comparison				
	Polarization & Contrast				
		35	7	13	2.6
	Topics & Themes				
	Situation Description				
Argumentation	Local Coherence				
	Categorization				
	Reasonableness				
		32	6.4	12	2.4
	Counterfactual				
Evidential Support	Disclaimer				
	Litotes & Negation				
	Victimization				
	Authority				
Lexical Choice		25	6.25	6	1.5
	Evidentiality				
	Topoi				
	Explanation				
Generality	Consensus				
		42	10.5	34	8.5
	Repetition				
	Word Order				
Sentence	Hyperbole				
	Lexicalization				
		27	9	10	3.33
Unclarity	Examples				
	Generalization				
	Presupposition				
		0	0	0	0
	Passivization				
	Sub & Coordination				
	Sentence Order				
		16	5.33	3	1
	Euphemism				
	Fallacy				
	Vagueness				

As shown in Table 3, the participants with an average translation quality level explored Lexical Choice level for ideological representations the most by far by and an average reference of over eight times. In descending order, Levels of Text

Organization, Generality, Meaning & Content, Argumentation, Rhetoric, Evidential Support, and Unclarity were the next seven explored layers of the source discourse, respectively. The most frequently examined categories in the study were Lexical Choice, Text

Organization, and Meaning & Content as well as Generality. As it made sense, these levels were the more visible and more concrete

building blocks of discourse which were more tangible to the average trainee translators.

**Table 3**

*Discourse Categories Explored by Groups in TAP in Descending Order*

<i>ATQ</i>		<i>HTQ</i>	
<i>Discourse Category</i>	<i>Average Reference</i>	<i>Discourse Category</i>	<i>Average Reference</i>
Lexical Choice	8.5	Lexical Choice	10.5
Text Organization	4.33	Generality	9
Generality	3.33	Rhetoric	7
Meaning & Content	2.6	Meaning & Content	7
Argumentation	2.4	Argumentation	6.4
Rhetoric	1.75	Evidential Support	6.25
Evidential Support	1.5	Unclarity	5.33
Unclarity	1	Text Organization	3.66
Sentence	0	Sentence	0

Review of the results pertaining to the HTQ group in Table 3 shows that Lexical Choice category was similarly the most explored layer of discourse by the participants with high quality in translation performance. This category was tapped for ideological representations during English into Persian translation at a frequency of over ten times. In descending order, Generality, Rhetoric, Meaning and Content, Argumentation, Evidential Support, Unclarity, and Text Organization, respectively, were the most frequently explored discourse categories. Those categories were referred to considerably more often by the HTQ group than by the ATQ group. As noted, the frequency of references to the above seven discourse categories by the HTQ group was twice as often or sometimes more, in comparison with the ATQ group. The same as ATQ group HTQ group similarly did not make any reference to the category of Sentence when approaching ST discourse critically during translation. That is, discourse at Sentence level was not examined at all when the HTQ participants were seeking implicit ideological representations in the source text during the translation task. But all in all, concerning the most frequently explored levels of discourse by English and Persian translation senior students of the HTQ, the results show that they delved much deeper into the source discourse for ideologies by examining more abstract levels like Generality, Rhetoric, Meaning & Content, Argumentation, Evidential Support, and Unclarity substantially more often than the ATQ group of participating translators.

As for the highlights of the findings at this stage and to address a dimension of the research question, the two groups could be compared and contrasted at the level of discourse category based on the following points. To compare, at first, what the two groups had in common was that they both examined Lexical Choice level of the source discourse the most in search of implicit indications to the ideologies and beliefs of the text producer during translation. Another similar result between the two groups was that the least attention was paid to discourse at Sentence level by both groups. Participants of both average and high quality of translation performance did not attempt to retrieve ideologies by means of any of the indicators of Sentence discourse category. Likewise, both groups explored the discourse for implicit ideologies at Generality level as one of the top three most examined categories, despite certain differences in degree of attention. Generality category was investigated by participants of high translation quality nearly three times more often.

Regarding how the two groups contrasted at category level, several points could be mentioned. Initially, the ATQ group explored categories the most, that metaphorically are closer to the surface of discourse and are more visually manifest to the translator, specifically Text Organization category. Whereas, HTQ participating translators in addition to considerable attention to the choice of words, delved deeper and more frequently in discourse and attended the several more abstract corners of discourse which seemed to

be less accessible to the average trainee translator. Besides, even as for every category that the two groups examined, the frequency of references made by the HTQ group was three to four times as often as ATQ group did, except in the case of Text Organization category. Text Organization category was the only category which was more attended to by ATQ translators.

#### 4.2. Ideological Discourse Structures

According to the model of van Dijk (2000) for categorization of ideological discourse structures there are forty-seven ideological discourse structures which were primarily used in the inferential statistical analyses by Khoshsaligheh (2012). However, through his confirmation of the model of categorization of the ideological discourse structures, ten of them were not empirically supported to be retained in the model. Subsequently, since the model was also employed to analyze the quantified TAP data to address part of the research question, the same reduced number of discourse structures was taken into account. Nevertheless, that did not disqualify them not to be meaningful in a descriptive statistical analysis, so all the forty-seven structures were considered in the next stage of analysis.

To address another dimension of the research question, the next part of the analysis was conducted at the level of ideological discourse structures. The results of the analysis of TAP revealed the frequency of examining each ideological discourse category when the participants explored the source discourse, seeking ideological assumptions. Table 3 shows the most frequently examined discourse structures by the participants of both groups in pursuit of hidden world views. The table

shows those structures which were examined ten times or more separately for each group.

Table 4 shows the eight highest explored ideological discourse structures which were tapped ten times or more by the HTQ translators. Implication and Lexicalization, the two most examined structures had been referred to almost twice as many as any other on the list. Implication was one of the ten structures which could not be retained in the model. However, according to the theoretical framework, it was introduced as an indicator of Meaning & Content category in discourse. Such a high frequency to Implication was consistent with earlier discussions of van Dijk (2000) explaining that Meaning & Content is the most reasonable level in discourse for both implicit and explicit ideologies to accommodate ideologies, and interpretation of ideological representations at any other levels regardless of their overlap with this level is improbable. Lexicalization, the second highest frequency ( $f=25$ ) by the high translation quality group in the achieved model was one of the pivotal indicators of Lexical Choice category; the category which was the highest referred to in the TAP study by the both ATQ and HTQ groups and was one of the top four categories which scored a mean above 2 (out of a maximum of 5) according to the survey results of the English and Persian translation students' perceived importance of various levels of discourse for retrieving ideological representations. About the functionality of Lexicalization in discourse, van Dijk (1998, p. 270) states that, "the most obvious and therefore most widely studied form of ideological expression in discourse maybe found in the words being chosen to express a concept".

**Table 4**  
*Most Frequently Tapped Ideological Discourse Structures*

<i>High Translation Quality</i>			<i>Average Translation Quality</i>		
<i>Rank</i>	<i>Ideological Discourse Structures</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Ideological Discourse Structures</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
1	Implication	27	1	Lexicalization	26
2	Lexicalization	25	2	Implication	11
3	Repetition	14			
4	Topoi	13			
5	Presupposition	13			
6	Situation Description	13			
7	Polarization/Contrast	12			
8	Generalization	10			

The remaining six structures, Repetition, Topoi, Presupposition, Situation Description, Polarization and Contrast, and Generalization according to the achieved model pertain to the Meaning & Content category of discourse.

The results of analysis at structure level for the HTQ participants with the results of ATQ participants could be compared in terms of the top two most explored structures. The two most explored structures by both the ATQ and HTQ groups were Lexicalization and Implication. The results of the two groups could also be contrasted on the basis that Lexicalization, the top most investigated structure by the ATQ group, was explored twenty-six times, while it was examined twenty-five times as the second most tapped structure by the HTQ group. Unlike the HTQ group, the ATQ group had only two structures which were frequently (ten times or more, ten being an intuitively set criterion) examined.

The ideological discourse structure of Implication as the second most investigated by the HTQ group ( $f=25$ ) was barely tapped over ten times by the ATQ group ( $f=11$ ).

Table 5 shows the highest ideological discourse structures pointed out by all the ten participants of the two groups. The two structures that all the ten participants referred to the most, listed at the top of the table, were Lexicalization, with a reference frequency of fifty-one, and Implication, with thirty-eight references. The ideological discourse structure of Lexicalization with the highest frequency among all the participants, and Lexical Choice category, as the highest investigated discourse category, supported that exploring the source text procurer's choice of words was the uncontested and most popular angle for the participants when attempting to realize the hidden world views.

**Table 5**

*Most Studied Ideological Discourse Structures by ATQ and HTQ*

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Ideological Discourse Structures</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
1	Lexicalization	51
2	Implication	38
3	Repetition	18
4	Topoi	16
5	Presupposition	16
6	Situation Description	16
7	Generalization	14
8	Polarization & Contrast	13
9	Authority	13
10	Comparison	12
11	Counterfactual	11
12	Categorization	11
13	Formality Level	10
14	Reasonableness	10
15	Topics & Themes	10

A specially significant contrast between the two groups which could support the rationale for contrasting the approach of the two groups was that the HTQ participants on average attempted to explore substantially more ideological discourse structures during the translation task ( $f=54$ ) than their ATQ peers who on average attempted to explore less than

half as many as the HTQ group did during the same translation task ( $f=22.6$ , see Table 5). This simple equation could provide initial evidence towards an assumption that there was a positive relationship between the translation quality of translators and the extent of exploring and delving discourse for ideological representations.

**Table 6**

*Participants' GPA and Frequency of Examining Ideological Discourse Structures*

<i>Groups</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Average GPA</i>	<i>Examined Ideological Discourse Structures</i>	
			<i>Total References</i>	<i>Average References</i>
HTQ	5	17.63	270	54
ATQ	5	15.16	113	22.6

According to Table 7, the two groups could be also compared and contrasted based on where in the source discourse they did not explore. The top section of the table reveals that several discourse structures for ideological investigations were not available for the translators in the particular ST discourse which the participants analyzed during their

TAP procedure. Given that the text was destitute of a title, an abstract, and a lead, discourse structures of Title & Abstract and Title Form were excluded from calculations of average reference. Likewise, the Rhetorical structures of Simile and Number Offering were also left out for the same reason.

**Table 7**  
*Ideological Discourse Structures Not Examined by Participants*

<i>Classification</i>	<i>Ideological Discourse Structures</i>
Unavailable in the ST Discourse	Title & Abstract
	Title Form
	Simile
	Number Offering
Unexamined by the Two Groups	Sentence Order
	Passivization
	Subordination & Coordination
	Nominalization
Unexamined by Only the Average Group	Actor Description
	Litotes & Negation
	Euphemism
	Modality
	Evidentiality
	Metaphor
	Agency Clarity
	Local Coherence

As shown in the middle section of Table 7, the four discourse structures of Sentence Order, Passivization, Subordination & Coordination, and Nominalization were the only inconsistencies of the TAP results against the survey results of the translation students' perceived importance of which discourse structures to explore for ideologies. Both groups shared these four structures as the parts in discourse which they left untapped during TAP procedure. As noted, they pertain to the Sentence category which received zero frequency at the analysis at category level. According to the questionnaire results, the participants had rated the Sentence category as one of the highest to be explored when they seek ideological representations in discourse.

The third and final section of Table 7 demonstrates another point of contrast between the two groups of HTQ and ATQ. Unlike the participants of the high translation quality group, Actor Description, Litotes & Negation, Euphemism, Modality, Evidentiality, Metaphor, Agency Clarity, and Local Coherence

were the eight ideological discourse structures which were not examined at all by the translators of the ATQ group.

## 5. Discussion

Regarding the comparison, through the data obtained via think aloud protocol technique in response to the research question, the findings presented the similarities and differences of how the two groups of BA graduates of English and Persian translation approached the socio-political source texts (Obama, 2009, 2010) critically during translation. The selected participants were assigned to two groups of average translation quality (or ATQ) and high translation quality (or HTQ), based on the collective judgments of their teachers in terms of the quality of their translation performance during their undergraduate education. The analogy was drawn at two levels: ideological discourse structures and the categories of the structures using an empirically-verified model (Khoshsaligheh, 2012).

As for the comparison of the approach of the two groups at the level of ideological discourse categories, the results showed a number of similarities. One point of similarity was that both ATQ and HTQ groups explored the category of Lexical Choice the most in search of implicit ideological signs in discourse. In addition, the category of Generality was examined as one of the top three levels of discourse which both groups examined for concealed ideologies in the source text during translation. Similarly, on the other end of the extreme, both groups did not explore the source discourse at Sentence level, at all.

According to the above findings, the English to Persian translators, who had just completed an undergraduate training, regardless of the quality of their performance, seemed to securitize the source text in translation for the choice of words of the source discourse producer with the highest priority for the embedded ideologies. Besides, the findings suggested that both groups of BA graduates of translation paid relatively high attention to discourse at the Generality level when they attempted to read between the lines of the source text for hidden worldviews. However, the participating BA graduates of English and Persian translation in both groups practically overlooked each and every of the discourse structures under the Sentence category. It seemed that while the unit of word or vocabulary item was of the highest functionality for analyzing a text, the larger unit of sentence has absolutely no function for the trained English translators.

A major contrast between the two groups, at the discourse category level, was the difference between the extents of examination of the source discourse in terms of various categories. According to the TAP analysis, except for the Text Organization level, a category which can be assumed of more visual and concrete manifestation, and except for the highest explored discourse category by both groups approximately at an equal rate (i.e. Lexical Choice), the graduates of English translation with high quality in translation examined each of the discourse categories for concealed ideologies twice to above three times as often. The results indicated that BA graduates of HTQ delved much deeper into the source discourse for ideologies by examining

the more abstract levels like Generality, Rhetoric, Meaning & Content, Argumentation, Evidential Support, and Unclarity substantially more often than the trained translators with average quality in translation performance. The ATQ group examined categories the most which metaphorically are closer to the surface of discourse and are more visually manifest to the reader/translator, specifically Text Organization category, while BA graduates of translation delved deeper and more frequently in discourse and attended the several more abstract discourse layers of discourse that appear to be less readily accessible to the average trained English and Persian translator.

Therefore, an important point supported by the findings thus far was that in the presence of high quality in translation, there was the presence of more extended and deeper critical exploration of the source discourse. In other words, the two variables of TQA and exploring ST discourse critically in translation appeared to correlate positively with each other. A word of caution, however, had to be reminded that the findings of the study which were derived from a small sample of participants and qualitative data are not necessarily generalizable. In other words, further studies with triangulated designs and an adequately large and probability sample of participants would be necessary for the verification of such a conclusion.

At the level of ideological discourse structures, the comparison and contrast of the approach of the two groups as well as the study of the overall approach of the two groups together revealed a number of points. According to the findings, one main similarity was that both groups of the BA translation graduates as the two most examined ideological discourse structures referred to the discourse structures of Lexicalization and Implication. These results about Lexicalization, one of the main indicators of Lexical Choice category, indicated that the choice of words was an inevitable venue for trained English and Persian translators, regardless of their translating performance quality. Similarly, as one of the main discourse structures of Meaning and Content according to the theoretical framework, Implication appeared to be another unavoidable venue for deriving embedded and concealed ideologies in the source discourse for the participants.

Another major similarity between the two groups of translation graduates was that they both completely ignored the four discourse structures of Sentence Order, Passivization, Subordination and Coordination, and Nominalization while searching for hidden ideologies during translation. As pointed out in the discussion on the categories, the English and Persian translators appeared to be focused on the word as the unit of analysis rather than the sentence as another larger possible unit for critical analysis of discourse.

As such, ideological discourse structure of Lexicalization, having received the top frequency, and discourse category of Lexical Choice, as the highest investigated level in discourse by the trained translators of average and high quality in translation supported that exploring the source text producer's choice of words was the most popular solution for trained translators for obtaining indications to assumptions about the world views and ideologies of the source text producer.

However, in contrast to the graduate translators with high translation quality, the ATQ translators examined only the two structures of Lexicalization and Implication rather frequently (i.e., over ten times), and even the ideological discourse structure of Implication – as the second most investigated by the HTQ group, examined twenty five times – was barely tapped over ten times by the translators with average translation quality.

Moreover, one main contrast between the two groups illustrated one main difference between the approaches of the two groups of trained translators. Translators with a higher quality of translation on average attempted to explore substantially more ideological discourse structures during the translation task than the translators of an average translation quality who on average explored less than half as many structures as the translators of high translation quality examined during the same translation task. In the same line as the earlier findings via TAP results at category level, this simple equation, too, provided to conclude that there was seemingly a positive relationship between the translation quality of the translators and the extent of exploring various discourse structures for embedded ideologies in the ST discourse during translation.

Another difference manifested between the approaches of the two groups of translation graduates was that contrary to the translators with high translation quality, ATQ translators totally overlooked the following eight ideological discourse structures of Actor Description, Litotes and Negation, Euphemism, Modality, Evidentiality, Metaphor, Agency Clarity, and Local Coherence.

In conclusion, the study indicated that the lexical choices of the source text producer was of the highest priority to examine for the trained English and Persian translators when seeking ideological and cultural representations in the source discourse during translation. In addition, the study demonstrated that the trained translators hardly examined any of the sentence related ideological discourse structures in their critical analysis of the socio-political source discourse during translation. The study also provided evidence toward the assumption that there were indications of correlation between the quality of the translation performance of the English and Persian translators participating in the study and the depth and the frequency of their examining the source text for ideological representations. Finally, the research findings provide qualitative evidence that the trained English translators mainly examine the source discourse at more metaphorically visible levels of discourse and the more abstract discourse categories remain almost untapped. However, to confirm or modify the insights provided by this case study would require further triangulated research and quantitative studies with larger probability samples and more controlled variables.

## References

- Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account*. London, England: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (2007). Reframing conflict in translation. *Social Semiotics*, 17(1), 151-169.
- Bernardini, S. (1999). Using think-aloud protocols to investigate the translation process: Methodological aspects. *RCEAL Working Papers in English and Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 179-199.
- Boéri, J. & Carol M. (Eds.). (2010). *Translation/interpreting and social activism*. Granada, Spain: ECOS.

- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1997). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.
- Brownlie, S. (2007). Situating discourse on translation and conflict. *Social Semiotics*, 17(2), 135-150.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2002). Towards a procedure for eliciting verbal expression of non verbal experience without reactivity: Interpreting the verbal overshadowing effect within the theoretical framework for protocol analysis. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 16(8), 981-987.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London, England: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London, England: Longman.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2000). *Doing qualitative research differently: Free association, narrative and the interview method*. London, England: Sage.
- House, J. (2009). *Translation*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Khoshsaligheh, M. (2012). *Exploring ideological discourse structure in English and Persian translator education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.
- Kusmaul, P., & Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1995). Think-aloud protocol analysis in translation studies. *TTR*, 8(1), 177-199.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2007). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Obama, B. (2009). *Videotaped remarks by the president in celebration of Nowruz*. Retrieved from [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/VideotapedRemarks-by-The-President-in-Celebration-of-Nowruz/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/VideotapedRemarks-by-The-President-in-Celebration-of-Nowruz/)
- Obama, B. (2010). *Remarks of President Obama marking Nowruz*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-marking-nowruz>
- Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring translation theories*. London, England: Routledge.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination. Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London, England: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London, England: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse and Society*, 17(3), 359-383.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 63-85). London, England: Sage.
- Williams, J., & Chesterman, A. (2002). *The map: A beginner's guide to doing research in translation studies*. Manchester, England: St. Jerome
- Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-94). London, England: Sage.