Translating Ideology:
An Intergroup Mediation Perspective

Natalia Yarkina[1], Liudmila Yarkina[2],
Ivan Pougachev[2]

[1]University of Aberdeen, UK
King's College, Aberdeen, AB24 3FX, UK

[2]Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University)
6 Miklukho-Maklaya St., Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation

Abstract

Ideology is an important component of text production and reception, and therefore of translation. In the paper, we address the translation of ideology through the prism of the intergroup threat theory. The resulting intergroup mediation perspective is a practical framework aimed at helping translators to evaluate whether an ideological recontextualisation may be desirable when dealing with divergence in ideological contexts between the author, the source text readership and the target text audience. The framework includes ideology shifts analysis in terms of the roles ideology can play in a text: it can constitute a part of the message (foreground) or belong to the background. Although applicable rather generally, the framework is derived from an example-based study of news translation. The study focuses on translation between French, English and German using examples form online versions of major European news media, such as the French *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*, the German *Zeit Online* and *Die Welt*, and the British *The Independent*, *The Telegraph* and *Guardian*. The paper allows for a better understanding of ideology-related problems in translation, helps identify essential factors influencing translator's choices and could be used as a guidance in translation practice. Also, considering the formal character of the framework, it could eventually serve as a basis for handling ideology-related issues in machine translation in the news industry.

Keywords: *news translation, ideology, translating ideology, ideology shift, recontextualisation, intentionality, intergroup threat theory, background/foreground role of ideology*

Перевод идеологии
в ракурсе межгруппового посредничества

Н.В. Яркина[1], Л.П. Яркина[2], И.А. Пугачёв[2]

[1]Университет Абердина (Великобритания)
King's College, Aberdeen, AB24 3FX, UK

[2]Российский университет дружбы народов
ул. Миклухо-Маклая, Москва, 6117198, Россия

Аннотация

Адекватный перевод текста, отражающего различные аспекты жизни общества, невозможен без учета идеологической составляющей этого текста. В статье предложено рассматривать проблемы, связанные с переводом идеологии, в ракурсе межгруппового посредничества с опорой на теорию межгрупповых угроз (Intergroup Threat Theory). Практическая значимость работы заключается в том, что переводчику предоставлен действенный механизм для определения того, насколько желательна реконтекстуализация в случае различий в идеологическом контексте между автором текста, читателями текста-источника и аудиторией, на которую рассчитан переводимый текст. В основе данного механизма лежат предлагаемые в статье формальная модель идеологически обусловленной переводческой проблемы и методика анализа идеологических сдвигов с позиций фоновой/ключевой роли идеологии в переводимом тексте. Материалом для построения модели послужили новостные публикации в электронных версиях ведущих европейских изданий, таких как французские Le Monde и Le Figaro, немецкие Zeit Online и Die Welt, а также британские The Independent, The Telegraph и Guardian. Данное исследование позволяет лучше понять сложности перевода, связанные с отражением идеологии, установить основные факторы, влияющие на выбор, перед которым стоит переводчик, и может служить руководством в переводческой практике. Кроме того, предложенная модель, благодаря своему формальному характеру, может быть использована в машинном переводе, применяемом в новостной индустрии.

Ключевые слова: *перевод новостей, идеология, перевод идеологии, сдвиг идеологии, реконтекстуализация, интенциональность, теория межгрупповых угроз, фоновая/ключевая роль идеологии*

1. INTRODUCTION

Ideology is an important component of text production and reception, and therefore of translation. It affects the work of the translator in different ways. Firstly, its presence in the source text may be subtle and difficult to reproduce. Secondly, translators may be biased themselves due to a personal ideological stance. Finally, the problem may stem from the discrepancy in the reception of the source and target texts when the corresponding audiences belong to opposite ideological camps. In translation studies as well as in critical discourse analysis (CDA), it is customary to use the term "ideology" in a broad sense (Mason, 2009; van Dijk, 1998, 2006; Fawcett & Munday, 2009). This is as opposed to its narrow political, usually negative meaning which van Dijk (1998), for instance, formulates as "systems of self-serving ideas of dominant groups". In this paper, we hold to the definition adopted by Hatim and Mason (2005: 120): "the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups". Consequently, an attitude towards an event or phenomenon that is based on such beliefs and value

systems and that is shared by a group at a precise moment of time can be qualified as ideological. By "ideology shift" we mean a situation in translation where an ideology-motivated element or feature of the source text (e.g., an ideology-based evaluative statement) is transformed in the target text in such a way that it does not express the source ideology any more, or, vice versa, an ideological element or feature is introduced in the target text, thus adding an ideology that was not present in the source text. It is useful to distinguish a particular case of ideology shift when an ideology-based element or feature is transformed or replaced by an ideologically neutral element; we refer to such a shift as the "neutralisation" of ideology.

Translation can be regarded as inherently related to intergroup communication since source text (ST) and target text (TT) audiences rarely coincide. These groups do not always adhere to different, opposing ideologies, but when they do the translator cannot ignore this divergence for the following essential reason. Coming from an outgroup, a text challenging TT audience's ingroup ideology can be perceived by the readership as a symbolic threat. The latter is defined by the authors of the intergroup threat theory as an attempt by the outgroup to challenge, change, supplant or destroy the ingroup's system of meaning (Stephan et al., 2015: 256). Furthermore, Stephan et al. (2015) state that a symbolic threat not only amplifies negative attitude towards the outgroup, but also elicits such emotions as anger, disgust, contempt and righteous indignation. Needless to say that, if the author was addressing ST to an audience that shared the ideology of the text, then provoking the range of emotions listed above in the readership definitely was not his intention. Thus, the goal of the intergroup mediation approach to translation of ideology is to find an adequate way to convey the author's message under the conditions of an ideological conflict. This may require from the translator not only to be aware of the TT audience's ideological stance, but also to examine as closely as possible the ideological contexts of both the author and the ST audience.

Ideology can be reflected in texts and discourse at various degrees of explicitness and by different means, including context, semantic macrostructures, lexis, syntax, rhetorical devices, and so on (for more details see, e.g., van Dijk, 2006: 125—126). In this study, we remain at the lexical level, for it is rather explicit and relatively easy to analyse. But what is even more important in our context is that the translator, when facing ideology-motivated labelling such as "terrorist" versus "freedom fighter", has to make a conscious choice in favour or against the ideology shift, usually without being confused by the lack of formal equivalence in the target language, the subtle character of expression or other linguistic issues.

In what follows, we examine a few examples of ideology shifts and non-shifts in news translation occurring at the lexical level. These examples raise interesting questions regarding the conditions under which ideology-related interventions may be desirable and deemed acceptable and what factors influence the translator's decisions. We attempt to answer some of these questions by proposing a formal framework to analyse ideology-related translation problems in terms of ideological stances of the parties involved in translation and of the character of the source and target texts, as well as a classification of ideology-related shifts based on the role played by ideology in the text.

2. CASE STUDY

The words "migrants" and "refugees", while already considered "sensitive" previously (Baker et al., 2008), have definitely become part of ideology-loaded language in European countries including France, Germany and the UK in 2015 due to the migration crisis provoked by the situation in Syria. A closer look at newspapers of that period shows that in France the word "migrants" predominated, although numerous debates took place in August—September 2015 leading to a short-term divergence. The word "refugees" ("Flüchtlinge"), on the other hand, was predominantly used in Germany. Finally, in the UK the stance on the issue differed from one mass media to another. Thus, 18 September 2015 AFP (Agence France-Presse) released a news item (1) which begins as follows:

(1) **Un *migrant* meurt électrocuté sur le site du tunnel sous la Manche**
Un *migrant* est mort électrocuté jeudi soir sur le site du tunnel sous la Manche en tentant de monter sur une navette de ferroutage, a-t-on appris vendredi auprès de la préfecture du Pas-de-Calais. "Peu avant minuit, un *migrant*, vraisemblablement de nationalité syrienne, a été retrouvé mort à l'aplomb d'une navette fret sur le site du tunnel sous la Manche", a indiqué la préfecture à l'AFP. Il s'agit du dixième *migrant* tué depuis le 26 juin à Calais et ses environs en tentant de rallier l'Angleterre, selon une source officielle. (1, emphasis added)

The same labelling is used in the English version of the news item (2), which also could be found at the AFP website:

(2) ***Migrant* electrocuted at Channel Tunnel site: French police**
A *migrant* was electrocuted late Thursday near the entrance to the Channel Tunnel in France as he tried to climb on to the roof of a train to make his way to England, an official said. "The *individual* died after he was electrocuted trying to climb on to the freight car", a spokesman for the local authorities in northern France told AFP. The *migrant*, thought to be a Syrian, was found dead shortly before midnight Thursday. Officials said it was the 10th death of a *migrant* in or near the tunnel since late June. (2, emphasis added)

On the same day, the news appeared online in several European media, including the French *Le Monde* (3) and *Le Figaro* (4), the German *Zeit Online* (5) and *Die Welt* (6) as well as the British *The Independent* (7), *The Telegraph* (8) and the *Guardian* (9). The French media all used the AFP original labelling, i.e. predominantly the word "migrant"; in some occurrences the word was substituted by a neutral equivalent (person, victim, etc.). In both German versions, on the contrary, the opposite strategy was adopted and the word "migrant" was consistently substituted with *"Flüchtling"* (refugee). E.g., in (5) we read

(3) ***Flüchtling* in Calais am Eurotunnel durch Stromschlag getötet**
Lille (AFP) Bei einem Versuch, auf einen Zug durch den Eurotunnel zu gelangen, ist ein *Flüchtling* durch einen Stromschlag getötet worden. Der vermutlich aus Syrien stammende *Mann* wurde in der Nacht zu Freitag am französischen Eingang des Eurotunnels neben einem Frachtzug tot aufgefunden, wie die Behörden mitteilten. "Der *Mann* starb durch einen Stromschlag, als er auf den Zug klettern wollte", erklärte die Präfektur. Offiziellen Angaben zufolge kamen damit seit Ende Juni in der Region Calais zehn *Flüchtlinge* am Eurotunnel ums Leben. (5, emphasis added).

In the UK, *The Telegraph* conserved the original labelling ("migrant"), *The Independent* consistently used "refugee", whereas the *Guardian* adopted an explicitly neutral stance:

(4) **Man electrocuted near Channel tunnel entrance in France**
A *man* has been electrocuted near the entrance to the Channel tunnel in Calais as he tried to climb on to the roof of a train to reach England, French officials have said. At least 10 *refugees or migrants* have now died at Calais since the end of June. "The *individual* died after he was electrocuted trying to climb on to the freight car", a spokesman for local authorities in northern France told AFP. The local prefect's office said the *man*, who died late on Thursday, was presumed to have been Syrian. (7, emphasis added)

The *Guardian*'s story provides an excellent example of ideology neutralisation, where the sensitive vocabulary is systematically replaced by neutral equivalents (note, in particular, "10 refugees or migrants"). A partial neutralisation may appear to have place in *Le Monde* (3); however the fact that the word "migrant" is left in the headline and is used as the only designator for migrants/refugees as a group suggests that the shifts here are stylistic rather than ideological. It is also worth noting that *The Independent* (5) uses predominantly the word "refugee" (cf. the headline: "Syrian refugee dies after being electrocuted..."), thus confirming the diversity of positions of UK media in contrast to France and Germany, where a dominant viewpoint is clearly discernible.

This small case study, which involves however several major European media, confirms that ideological recontextualisation, and specifically the recontextualisation by means of textual interventions, can be a common practice not only under regimes with actual political censorship, such as the Soviet Union, and direct state pressure is not the only reason for ideology-related text manipulation. Thus, even though these texts might not be regarded as translation within a strict equivalence-based translation theory (Nord, 1997: 45), we follow J. Palmer and consider them as such, since according to him translation in mass media generally implies "a mixture of selection, summary, contextualizing commentary and in extenso translation" strategies (2009: 189). Furthermore, it can be suggested that in this case translators find themselves in the commissioner-governed professional setting described by H. Vermeer, where the source text (including an ideology it may reflect) serves merely as a "point of departure" for the translational action (Chesterman, 2010). Therefore, with the "fidelity rule" put last, the ideology in the target text is determined either by the "skopos rule" (for instance, editor's position, as it is probably the case of the *Guardian* (9)) or by the "coherence rule" which postulates, in A. Chesterman's interpretation, that the target text must be "compatible with the receiver's cognitive context" (2010). The latter can be the case of the German versions of the article, considering the largely predominant use of the word "refugees" in this country.

One would expect from the media less flexibility in translation of interviews or direct speech, and a closer look on news websites shows that the ideology-related labelling seems to be often preserved in interviews and direct quotes, namely of political figures. Let us examine an example illustrating this. 3 March 2016, the then French

economy minister, Emmanuel Macron, said in an interview for the *Financial Times* the following in regard to the possible Brexit: "The day this relationship unravels, *migrants* [emphasis added] will no longer be in Calais" (10). Macron's words were reproduced by numerous media, namely the following German translation appeared in *Zeit Online* (11) and *Die Welt* (12): "An dem Tag, an dem sich die Beziehungen auflösen, wird es keine *Migranten* [emphasis added] mehr in Calais geben". It is worth noting that in both articles the word "Migranten" (migrants) occurs only once outside Macron's quotation, whereas the word "Flüchtlinge" (refugees) occurs six times in *Zeit Online* and 12 times in *Die Welt*. Thus, the original labelling of the quote is preserved even though the opposite labelling is predominant.

3. FORMAL FRAMEWORK
FOR IDEOLOGY-RELATED TRANSLATION PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Ideology as a set of beliefs and values and, by consequence, of attitudes, affects all the parties involved in the translation process and, what is more, influences the work of the translator in various ways. Therefore several approaches to address ideology-related problems have been adopted by translation theorists and practitioners. Ideology-related translation problems discussed in the literature can be divided into three major categories, although these categories are interconnected and the following classification is more a matter of perspective rather than a taxonomy:

1) ethical problems translators face as a result of their personal ideological stance (ethical perspective; see, e.g., Baker, 2006, 2008);
2) ideology transfer from ST to TT, including linguistic aspects as well as the influence, sometimes subconscious, of the translator's personal ideology on the translation process (CDA perspective; see, e.g., Munday, 2007; Rojo López & Ramos Caro, 2014);
3) problems related to the transfer of the text between ideologically conflicting contexts and ideological recontextualisation in order to ensure successful intergroup communication (intergroup mediation perspective).

We focus on the third category of problems, which relate to situations when ST expresses an ideology that contradicts the ideology of the text commissioner and/or TT audience. Here translators, whatever their personal ideological stance, play the role of mediators: as the experts in translation action (Vermeer, 2000: 228), they must be trusted to identify ideologically problematic passages in ST and decide how to handle them. This perspective is characterised by the emphasis on the external character of the ideological collision to the translator, who is supposed to remain neutral. Also, we assume that the translation is evaluated on a pass-or-fail basis — as if it had to pass a censorship — rather than to the degree of expression of the ideology, with which the second category of problems is concerned. Figuratively speaking, here translators may be telling themselves: "this passage is problematic; how should I translate it so that my translation passes the censorship?", which in practice can be formulated as "so that the text is accepted by the public" or "so that I adequately put across the author's message".

Let us now formally define ideology-related translation problems from the inter-group mediation perspective. We consider an arbitrary ideology which will be denoted A. In theory, ideology A can be concerned with virtually any subject. At the same time, it is needless to say that we are more interested in subjects that receive public attention and cause real ideological clashes, by consequence a statement reflecting A might be, for instance, "killing animals for their fur is wrong", "people coming to Europe from Africa and Middle East are refugees and should be helped", and so on. Now, generally speaking, with regard to ideology A, a text can be

1) explicitly in support, namely through explicit evaluative statements, tone, emotive details and references, a corresponding labelling pattern and references in a positive/negative context to practices (events, people, etc.) that are praised/condemned in the ideology discourse (e.g., if A is expressed by the statement about refugees given above, a text explicitly in support of A could contain the following sentence: "Hundreds of thousands of refugees, including many women and children, crossed to Europe in 2015 fleeing violence and war at home");

2) passively in support, namely through common references and a corresponding labelling, used however rather as the common ingroup language (cf., e.g., "Hundreds of thousands of refugees crossed to Europe in 2015");

3) neutral; the text might not treat the subject related to A at all, treat it using neutral, non-evaluative vocabulary, or, for instance, present both points of view without taking one side (cf., e.g., "Hundreds of thousands of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers crossed to Europe in 2015");

4) passively in opposition (cf., e.g., "Hundreds of thousands of migrants crossed to Europe in 2015");

5) explicitly in opposition (cf., e.g., "Hundreds of thousands of migrants, including many single men, illegally crossed to Europe in 2015").

Let us now turn to the parties involved in the translation — the author, the translator, the commissioner and the ST and TT readership. The audience as a group as well as the text producer individually (author, translator, etc.) can assume one of the following stands towards ideology A:

1) militantly in support;

2) passively in support as a member of a group exposed to the corresponding discourse; the boundary between this stance and the previous one may be somewhat vague, however we assume that the ideological stand here is unconscious rather than conscious and the attitudes are taken for granted rather than consciously constructed;

3) indifferent; not exposed to the related discourse;

4) divided; exposed to both discourses without one of them being predominant; do not have an established (joined in the case of the audience) stance towards A but can be sensitive to the subject;

5) passively in opposition as a member of an opposing group; exposed to the opposite discourse;

6) militantly in opposition.

Using the stances introduced above we can determine combinations that can be considered problematic for the translator. Table 1 lists various pairs of the TT recipient's and ST stances in relation to ideology A and for each combination indicates whether a possible recontextualisation of the text should be considered on the intergroup threat theory grounds. The ST column does not include stances "passively in opposition" and "explicitly in opposition" because the situations are symmetrical.

Table 1

Combinations of ST and the TT recipient's stances towards ideology A

Source text	Target text recipient	Evaluation
Explicitly in support	In support (militantly or passively) or indifferent	**No problem** A direct translation without ideological recontextualisation will be easily accepted by the TT readership.
Passively in support	In support (militantly or passively), indifferent or divided	
Neutral	Indifferent, passively in support or passively in opposition	
Explicitly in support	Divided	**Potential problem** Potentially, a direct translation can provoke a conflict within the readership, hence, based upon other factors (such as the ST audience's and the author's intention), a neutralisation may be considered.
Neutral	Militantly in support, militantly in opposition or divided	**Potential problem** An explicit neutrality with regard to A might be perceived negatively by militants on both sides. (Obviously, it does not concern texts where the A-related subject is not treated.)
Passively in support	Passively in opposition	**Potential problem** Potentially, ideology-related language or references may stand out, be perceived as "foreign", "unnatural", hence a recontextualisation may be considered.
Passively in support	Militantly in opposition	**Symbolic threat** A direct translation is likely to be perceived as a symbolic threat, hence a recontextualisation should be considered.
Explicitly in support	Militantly or passively in opposition	

TT recipient in Table 1 is the party with which the translator associates the role of actual or metaphorical ideological censorship. Our understanding is that such a metaphorical censorship can be associated with the TT audience, the commissioner or the two of them combined. For instance, if the translation is commissioned in the ST culture/ideology, the commissioner might not be aware of the ideological context of the target audience, and the "censorship" for the translator would be associated with the TT readership and its ideological stance. In many other cases, however, the ideological (even

ПЕРЕВОДОВЕДЕНИЕ СЕГОДНЯ И ЗАВТРА

in the metaphorical sense) censorship is associated with the commissioner. The commissioner may be guided in this function primarily by the TT audience (as perhaps in the case of the explicit neutrality of the *Guardian* in "migrants" versus "refugees" labelling), but also by the state power (as in a case of an actual state censorship) or by the interests of a third party such as a political movement, an industry, and so on. The fundamental difference between the two types of censorship is that in the one case the censor acts a priori against the initial intention of the author and, figuratively speaking, stands between the author and his readership. In the other case, however, the censorship is motivated by a divergence between the ST and TT audiences, and the censor, however negatively this figure might be perceived, can be regarded as an expert actually helping the author to adapt the text to a new audience, which is unfamiliar to the author. In this respect, we can view the first type of censorship as power- or rather interest-oriented and often intended to form or maintain an ideology, whereas the second type of censorship is audience-oriented and intended to make the text acceptable, given the existing ideology of the target audience. This brings us close to the concept of adaptation (Bastin, 2009), but we regard adaptation as one of the translation techniques allowing to pass the audience-oriented censorship. The audience-oriented censorship can be regarded as one of the core elements of the intergroup mediation perspective.

Let us now continue with the formal framework. Table 1 does not include the author's or ST audience's stances because whether a translation presents a potential ideology-related problem within the intergroup mediation perspective is determined by a discrepancy in ideology between ST (or rather its direct — without recontextualisation — translation) and the TT recipient. However, once the translation is confirmed problematic, the next step would be to analyse and compare the ideological stances of the author and the ST audience. This may allow to determine whether a recontextualisation would be desirable and presumably consistent with the author's intentions because the translator in our framework is situated between the author and the censorship, as a mediator.

Let us consider a symbolic threat situation identified in Table 1 and assume ST to be passively in support of ideology A (for example, through the use of a corresponding labelling), and the TT audience to be militantly against A. Table 2 lists various combinations of author's and ST audience's statuses and their interpretations in this context. Other ST to TT recipient combinations can be analysed in the same manner.

Now, for illustrative purposes let us apply the formal framework proposed above to the story about the tragic accident in the Channel tunnel. Let A be the ideology producing the "migrant" labelling. ST is passively pro-A, whereas the TT audience can be considered passively or militantly in opposition to A, so we deal with a translation that can go from potentially problematic to symbolic threat according to Table 1. The author — AFP — can be considered indifferent, since the news agency uses "refugee" labelling in its German articles. The ST audience — the French general public — is passively in support of A. Thus, apparently, an adjustment to the TT readership's ideological context had occurred in the first place, which to a certain extent justifies the subsequent recontextualisation.

**Combinations of possible author's and ST audience's statuses
when ST is passively pro-A and the TT audience is militantly anti-A**

Author	Source text audience	Evaluation
Militantly in support	Divided or in opposition (passively or militantly)	Here the text was intended for an opposing audience and the author was aware of the potential threat, so a priori **no recontextualisation is needed**.
Passively in support, passively or militantly in opposition, divided or indifferent	Divided or in opposition (passively or militantly)	In our opinion, in general these situations are uncommon: why would an author who is not militant for A address a pro-A text to an audience militantly opposed to A, for instance? However, if this was the case, the author might have had his or her reasons, which should be respected by the translator, so a priori **no recontextualisation is needed**.
Divided, indifferent or passively in opposition	Indifferent	These situations seem **rather unlikely**.
Militantly in opposition	In support (militantly or passively) or indifferent	
Militantly in support	In support (militantly or passively) or indifferent	Since the author is militant for A, he or she is likely to oppose the recontextualisation, which makes **textual intervention problematic**. Moreover, considering the militant stand of the TT readership it can actually be reasonable in some cases to chose **not to translate** the text at all. Thus, Kang (2007) points out that the Korean edition of *Newsweek* was increasing the number of articles about Korea written locally compared to those translated from the American edition precisely because recontextualisation was problematic and the translated articles were badly received by the readership, as readers' letters suggested.
Passively in support	In support (militantly or passively) or indifferent	This is a common and probably the most interesting situation for the intergroup mediation approach. The author who is exposed predominantly to a pro-A discourse but is not known as militant for it produces a text intended for the ideological ingroup. The ideology is likely to be expressed in the background, and a **recontextualisation (textual or paratextual) may be desirable**.
Divided, indifferent or passively in opposition	In support (militantly or passively)	In all likelihood, the author has adjusted the text to the cognitive context of the recipient, so a **recontextualisation should be considered**.

4. FOREGROUND/BACKGROUND ANALYSIS

We have established the situations in which an ideological recontextualisation of TT can be desirable on the grounds of the intergroup threat theory. However, textual recontextualisation in translation remains controversial even though, as our case study shows, it is rather widely used in practice, especially when the fidelity requirement is

relaxed (which is often the case of news translation or translation of children's literature; see, e.g., Inggs, 2015). We believe that it is important, in particular for the translator, to distinguish between two roles that ideology representation can play in a text or discourse: it can be intended and/or perceived as a part of the message, but it can also belong to the "background". In the case of ideology as "background" ideology-loaded language is not thought as a part of the message, but is rather used as a common, neutral language within the group (the group may very well be society in general in the case of a dominant ideology). Two factors determine whether ideology can be viewed as playing background or foreground role: the character of the expression of ideology (the degree of explicitness or the character of the text) and the ideological stance of the audience, or, rather, its exposure to the corresponding discourse. Subsequently, for simplicity, we can assume that in an explicitly pro- or anti-A text, as it was defined in the previous section, ideology A always plays the foreground role, whereas in a passively pro- or anti-A text its role is largely determined by the audience's stance.

Background/foreground roles of ideology constitute an important part of the intergroup mediation perspective framework and provide the translator with another tool helping to analyse and justify ideology shifts in translation. The essential point in background/foreground analysis is that even if the ideology in the text was expressed in the background by the author, it will be received in the foreground by the reader if the latter belongs to a different ideological context. Subsequently, in translations of passively pro-A texts to audiences militantly or passively opposed to A, a background ST ideology will necessarily transit into the foreground in TT unless a recontextualisation is performed. As a result, the perception of the text by the ST and TT audiences will be substantially different. In these cases we observe not a shift in ideology itself, but rather a shift in its role in the text, which, in our opinion, nevertheless distorts the author's message. Situations resulting in shifts or non-shifts in the role of ideology when translating a passively pro-A text are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3

Shifts and non-shifts in the role of ideology of a pro-A text

Source text audience	Target text audience	Role shift?
In support (militantly or passively) or indifferent	In support (militantly or passively) or indifferent	**Background → background** No shift in the role.
In support (militantly or passively) or indifferent	In opposition (militantly or passively) or divided	**Background → foreground** Problematic shift in the role, potentially implying intergroup threat; typical for the intergroup mediation approach.
In opposition (militantly or passively) or divided	In support (militantly or passively) or indifferent	**Foreground → background** Non-problematic shift from the intergroup mediation perspective; may occur, for instance, in translation of dissidents' works.
In opposition (militantly or passively) or divided	In opposition (militantly or passively) or divided	**Foreground → foreground** No shift in the role.

Background/foreground roles of ideology can serve as a basis for a classification of ideology shifts. Such a classification is presented in Table 4 and gives additional insight into acceptability and desirability of textual recontextualisation in translation which makes it into a useful tool within the intergroup mediation perspective, but also for analysis of translation of ideology in general. In Table 4 it is assumed that the translator has performed textual intervention resulting in the ideology shift; the ST and TT audiences belong to the opposite ideological camps. Note, that the first column lists the roles of the ideology in ST as intended by the author. The second column contains the roles of the ideology in TT as perceived by the TT audience.

Table 4

Classification of ideology shifts based upon background/foreground roles of ideology

Role in ST, as intended by the author	Role in TT, as perceived by the TT audience	Comment
Foreground	Foreground	This shift can be considered as the most controversial on fidelity grounds, although it still may occur in certain situations, for instance due to personal convictions of the translator or political motives. Shifts of this type are better analysed from an ethical perspective.
	Background	This type of shift occurred in the example discussed by Mason in (2009). Apparently, the background role of the ideology in TT was the reason for the shift going unnoticed by the editors, whereas its foreground role in ST was the reason for scholars' attention to the article.
	None (neutralisation)	Here again we can think of ethical or political motives. The Chinese translation of Obama's inaugural speech discussed by Munday in (2012) can be viewed as an example of this shift.
Background	Foreground	This is another controversial shift, which should be analysed from an ethical perspective. The feminist translation by Linda Gaboriau of N. Brossard's text *l'Écrivain*, discussed in (Godard, 1984; von Flotow, 1991), can serve as an example.
	Background	This is a common shift in news translation and can be easily analysed from the intergroup mediation perspective. The German versions of the story about the accident in the Channel tunnel discussed above is an example of this shift.
	None (neutralisation)	This shift is also common and can be analysed from the intergroup mediation perspective. *Gardian*'s article cited previously is an example of this shift.
None	Foreground	Here again we could think of feminist translation, for example the translation by Susanne de Lotbinière-Harwood of L. Gauvin's *Lettre d'une autre* also discussed in (von Flotow, 1991). It is subject to analysis from an ethical perspective.
	Background	Examples of this shift can be found, for instance, in some Soviet translations/adaptations of children's books. Also, this shift can be committed by the translator unintentionally. Interestingly, these shifts can be analysed from all three perspectives: ethical, CDA and intergroup mediation.

Finally, it seems possible for ST to distinguish between the background/foreground role of ideology as it has been intended by the author (which is mainly linked to the intentionality) and as it is perceived by the ST audience (in the same way as it is perceived in TT by the TT audience). Indeed, the two may differ. We suppose that the choice here is determined by whether the translation is aimed at mediating between the author and the TT audience or at creating a text that would be perceived by the TT audience in somewhat the same way as ST is perceived by the ST audience. The former approach clearly puts the translator into the ethics of communication, according to Chesterman's classification (2001: 140). Within the latter approach, however, the translator can be considered as following the ethics of representation (Chesterman, 2001: 139), but in its functionalist interpretation (Schäffner, 2009; Nord, 2006). Incidentally, for the same reason, the intergroup mediation perspective, although intuitively linked to the ethics of communication, should not be limited to it.

5. CONCLUSIONS

We have discussed only a few types of ideology shifts presented in Tables 3 and 4, others being subject to further research. However, the intergroup mediation perspective and the classification proposed appear useful for exploring further the issues of acceptability of certain ideology shifts rather than others, translator's intentions when opting for a shift, as well as conditions on which an ideological shift can be committed unintentionally, in particular as a translation mistake. Of course, as any model, the proposed framework is a simplified representation of real-life situations faced by the translator. However, to our mind, it allows for a better understanding of ideology-related problems in translation, identifies essential factors influencing translator's choices and could be used as a guidance in translation practice. Also, considering the formal character of the framework, it could eventually serve as a basis for handling ideology-related issues in machine translation in the news industry.

Further research may be directed towards completing the practical framework with an inventory of translation strategies and techniques used to handle ideology-related problems. Among other problems related to ideology shifts in translation and worth investigating we would like to emphasise the neutralisation strategy (its scope of use, advantages and weaknesses), the possibility of handling dominant ideologies divergence as cultural differences (which could lift a part of ethical pressure from the translator), and also the influence of personal ideological and ethical position of the translator on the choice of translation strategy.

REFERENCES

Baker, Mona (2006). *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account.* Oxon: Routledge.

Baker, Mona (2008). Ethics of Renarration: Mona Baker is interviewed by Andrew Chesterman. *Cultus*, 1 (1), 10—33.

Baker, Paul, Gabrielatos, Costas, Khosravinik, Majid, Krzyzanowski, Michal, McEnery, Tony, & Wodak, Ruth (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis

and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society*, 19 (3), 273—306.

Bastin, Georges L. (2009). Adaptation. In Baker, M., & G. Saldanha (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd edn). London/New York: Routledge, 3—6.

Chesterman, Andrew (2001). Proposal for a Hieronymic Oath. *The Translator*, 7 (2), 139—154.

Chesterman, Andrew (2010). Skopos theory: a retrospective assessment. In Kallmeyer, W. et al. (eds.) *Perspektiven auf Kommunikation. Festschrift für Liisa Tittula zum 60. Geburtstag*. Berlin: SAXA Verlag. Retrieved from http://www.helsinki.fi/~chesterm/2010a.skopos.html.

Fawcett, Paul, & Munday, Jeremy (2009). Ideology. In Baker, M., & G. Saldanha (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd edn). London/New York: Routledge, 137—141. doi: 10.4324/9780203872062.

Godard, Barbara (1984). Translating and Sexual Difference. *Resources for Feminist Research*, 13 (3), 13—16.

Hatim, Basil, & Mason, Ian (2005). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Inggs, Judith (2015). Translation and Transformation: English-Language Children's Literature in (Soviet) Russian Guise. *International Research in Children's Literature*, 8 (1). Edinburgh University Press, 1—16.

Kang, Ji-Hae (2007). Recontextualization of news discourse: A case study of translation of news discourse on North Korea. *The Translator*, 13 (2), 219—242.

Mason, Ian (2009). Discourse, ideology and translation. In Baker, M. (ed.) *Critical readings in translation studies*. London: Routledge, 83—95.

Munday, Jeremy (2007). Translation and ideology: a textual approach. *The translator*, 13 (2), 195—218.

Nord, Christiane (1997). A functional typology of translations. In Trosborg, A. (ed.) *Text typology and translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 43—66.

Nord, Christiane (2006). Translating as a purposeful activity: a prospective approach. *TEFLIN Journal*, 17 (2), 131—143.

Palmer, Jerry (2009). News gathering and dissemination. In Baker, M., & G. Saldanha (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Routledge, 186—189. doi: 10.4324/9780203872062.

Rojo López, Ana María, & Ramos Caro, Marina (2014). The impact of translators' ideology on the translation process: A reaction time experiment. In Muñoz Martín, R. (ed.) *Minding translation*, Special Issue of MonTI, 1, 247—272.

Schäffner, Christina (2009). Functionalist approaches. In Baker, M., and G. Saldanha (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd edn). London/New York: Routledge, 115—121.

Stephan, Walter G., Ybarra, Oscar, & Morrison, Kimberly Rios (2015). Intergroup Threat Theory. In Nelson, T.D. (ed.) *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (2nd edn.). New York: Psychology Press, 255—278.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (1998). *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11 (2), 115—140.

Vermeer, Hans. J. (2000). Skopos and commission in translational action. In Venuti, L. (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader* (2nd edn). London/New York: Routledge, 227—238.

Von Flotow, Luise (1991). Feminist translation: contexts, practices and theories. *TTR — Études sur le texte et ses transformations*, 4 (2), 69—84.

Sources

(1) AFP (2015, September 18) Un migrant meurt électrocuté sur le site du tunnel sous la Manche. *AFP*. Retrieved from http://www.europe1.fr/faits-divers/mort-dun-migrant-electrocute-sur-le-site-du-tunnel-sous-la-manche-2516829.

(2) AFP (2015, September 18) Migrant electrocuted at Channel Tunnel site: French police. *AFP*. Retrieved from https://www.straitstimes.com/world/europe/migrant-electrocuted-at-channel-tunnel-site-french-police.

(3) Le Monde (2015, September 18) Un migrant meurt électrocuté sur le site du tunnel sous la Manche. *Le Monde*. Retrieved from http://www.lemonde.fr/europe/article/2015/09/18/un-migrant-meurt-electrocute-sur-le-site-du-tunnel-sous-la-manche_4762174_3214.html

(4) LeFigaro.fr & AFP (2015, September 18) Tunnel sous la Manche: un migrant électrocuté. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved from http://www.lefigaro.fr/flash-actu/2015/09/18/97001-20150918 FILWWW00050-tunnel-sous-la-manche-un-migrant-electrocute.php

(5) AFP (2015, September 18) Flüchtling in Calais am Eurotunnel durch Stromschlag getötet. *Zeit Online*. Retrieved from http://www.zeit.de/news/2015-09/18/frankreich-fluechtling-in-calais-am-eurotunnel-durch-stromschlag-getoetet-18101205.

(6) Die Welt (2015, September 18) Flüchtling stirbt am Eurotunnel durch Stromschlag. *Die Welt*. Retrieved from http://www.welt.de/politik/ausland/article146552587/Fluechtling-stirbt-am-Eurotunnel-durch-Stromschlag.html.

(7) Dearden, L. (2015, September 18) Syrian refugee dies after being electrocuted on UK-bound Channel Tunnel train. *The Independent*. Retrieved from http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/syrian-refugee-dies-after-being-electrocuted-on-uk-bound-channel-tunnel-train-10507454.html.

(8) Mulholland, R. (2015, September 18) Migrant electrocuted at Channel Tunnel site. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/france/11874092/Migrant-electrocuted-at-Channel-Tunnel-site.html.

(9) Chrisafis, A. (2015, September 18) Man electrocuted near Channel tunnel entrance in France. *Guardian*. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/18/man-electrocuted-near-channel-tunnel-entrance-in-france.

(10) Chassany, A.-S., & Parker, G. (2016, March 3) French economy minister sends double Brexit warning to UK. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/2c669fd4-e054-11e5-9217-6ae3733a2cd1.html.

(11) Zeit Online (2016, March 3) Frankreich droht Großbritannien mit Grenzöffnung in Calais. *Zeit Online*. Retrieved from http://www.zeit.de/politik/ausland/2016-03/frankreich-grossbritannien-eu-austritt-fluechtlingspolitik-calais.

(12) Die Welt (2016, March 3) Dann kommen die Flüchtlinge. *Die Welt*. Retrieved from http://www.welt.de/newsticker/dpa_nt/infoline_nt/brennpunkte_nt/article152873815/Dann-kommen-die-Fluechtlinge.html.

Bionotes:

NATALIA YARKINA is Ph.D., Teaching Assistant in Translation Studies for the School of Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture, University of Aberdeen. She holds PhD in Applied Mathematics from RUDN University and MSc (Dist) in Translation Studies from the University of Aberdeen. Her academic interests are in translation studies and technical and scientific translation as well as in probability theory, mathematical modeling and telecommunications.
Contact information: e-mail: nat.yarkina@mail.ru

LIUDMILA YARKINA is Ph.D, professor of the Russian language department at the Academy of Engineering of RUDN University. She has authored and co-authored over 90 papers and books on foreign language teaching and translation.
Contact information: e-mail: YarkinaLP@mail.ru

IVAN POUGACHEV is Ph. D. (Advanced Doctorate), Professor and Chair of the Russian language department at the Academy of Engineering of RUDN University. He has authored over 200 papers and books published in Russia and abroad on foreign language teaching, speech culture and cross-cultural communication. His current research interests deal with communication studies, the use of the modern Russian language for specific purposes.
Contact information: e-mail: pugachev-ivan@mail.ru

Сведения об авторах:

НАТАЛЬЯ ВИКТОРОВНА ЯРКИНА — кандидат физико-математических наук, учебный ассистент секции лингвистики и переводоведения департамента языков, литературы, музыки и визуальной культуры Университета Абердина. Среди научных интересов — переводоведение, обучение переводу и особенности перевода технических и научных текстов. Ведет исследования в области прикладной математики, теории вероятностей, математического моделирования и анализа телекоммуникационных сетей.
Контактная информация: e-mail: nat.yarkina@mail.ru

ЛЮДМИЛА ПАВЛОВНА ЯРКИНА — кандидат филологических наук, доцент, профессор-методист кафедры русского языка Инженерной академии Российского университета дружбы народов. Научные интересы: межкультурная коммуникация, текстология, перевод и переводоведение, теория и практика преподавания иностранных языков. Является автором и соавтором свыше 90 научных работ и учебных пособий.
Контактная информация: e-mail: YarkinaLP@mail.ru

ИВАН АЛЕКСЕЕВИЧ ПУГАЧЁВ — доктор педагогических наук, профессор и заведующий кафедрой русского языка Инженерной академии Российского университета дружбы народов. Научные интересы: теория межкультурной коммуникации, теория и практика преподавания иностранных языков для специальных целей, культура речевой коммуникации. Автор свыше 200 научных работ, в том числе 2-х монографий, а также ряда учебных пособий.
Контактная информация: e-mail: pugachev-ivan@mail.ru