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Translation can serve the purposes of gaining, maintaining and even abusing political power in the interests of certain political groups. In order to identify political manipulation in translated texts, a text linguistics based tool called Political Bias Screener has been developed, which includes superstructure and macrostructure analysis, critical discourse analysis and political mass communication related theories. This article describes the most relevant theoretical foundations and the component models of the Screener, investigates its validity and reliability and introduces the most important research findings obtained with its help. The findings show possible tendencies of translator behaviour and are transferable to other research fields in Translation Studies.

La traduction peut servir à gagner, maintenir et même abuser du pouvoir politique dans l’intérêt de certains groupes politiques. Afin d’identifier la manipulation politique dans les textes traduits, un outil basé sur la linguistique textuelle a été développé qui s’appelle Screener, et qui comprend l’analyse de la superstructure et de la macrostructure, l’analyse critique du discours et les théories politiques liées à la communication de masse. Cet article décrit les fondements théoriques et les modèles de composantes du Screener, étudie sa validité et sa fiabilité et présente les résultats de recherche les plus importants. Les résultats montrent des tendances possibles de comportement de traducteur et sont transférables à d’autres domaines de recherche dans les études de traduction.
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1. Introduction

In several countries the interaction between Political Science and Translation Studies created prolific new research areas and trends in the recent 20 years as described in the literature reviews in Bánhegyi 2010, 2011a, 2011b and 2014. As attested most recently, for example, by Chilton and Schäffner (2002), Calzada-Pérez (2003), Schäffner (2004), Baker (2006), Gagnon (2006), Bánhegyi (2006), Baker (2007), Salama-Carr (2007), Munday (2007), Baker (2010), Conway (2010), Inghilleri and Harding (2010), Baumann, Gillespie and Sreberny (2011), Valdeón (2012), Guillaume (2016a), Guillaume (2016b) and Zanettin (2016) – with respect to bilingual national contexts and international contexts –, translation may play a prominent role in, and be a vital vehicle and means of, communication aimed at publishing and publicising political agendas as well as maintaining political power. In this respect, translation itself may easily become a political tool. Consequently and potentially, translation can serve the purposes of gaining, maintaining and even abusing political power in the interests of certain political groups.

One way of avoiding such misuses of translation is to create a civilian and professional counterpower in Translation Studies, which can identify and pinpoint textual features possibly supporting and/or contributing to political manipulation and power abuse. Such a counter power is in fact mental power, or professional knowledge, capacity and skills if you prefer to call it that way, that enables translators to spot manipulative translation practices in their own and others’ work.

In an attempt to facilitate the construction of such mental power, this paper – within the field of Translation Studies – focuses on the study of political texts, which are understood here, based on Schäffner’s (1997) functional definition, as any text that is part of or is the result of politics or political activism, or the topic of which is related to politics. More precisely, in the context of the present paper the scope of investigation is narrowed down to the scrutiny of argumentative political newspaper articles. Such articles in fact belong to mediatised political texts: these texts are produced by and are available in the media, and are designed to communicate political messages and to exert political influence.

Taking these considerations as a starting point, the present study introduces and describes the Political Bias Screener, which – through comparing diverse features of source and target texts – functions as a text linguistic tool for identifying and analysing political manipulation in translated texts. First, the study briefly introduces the most relevant theories that constitute the foundations of the Screener, and subsequently describes the Screener itself and its constituent models. This is followed by a discussion of the validity and the reliability of the Screener in its capacity as an analytical tool, and the paper ends with the presentation of the results obtained with the help of this analytical tool.
2. **Theoretical foundations of the Political Bias Screener**

With a view to the nature of political persuasion and political texts, the Political Bias Screener has been designed to allow for the analysis and comparison of source and target textual features. Bánhegyi (2008) has shown that three cognitively and affectively operating domains realise political persuasion in argumentative political discourse: (1) logical arguments, (2) feelings and sentiments evoked by such discourse and (3) psychological motivation induced by such texts. In political texts, logical arguments (sensible or sensible sounding arguments) are presented in the gist of texts (the macrostructure of the given text influenced by the superstructure of the text in question), which constitutes the shortest meaningful summary of a text that preserves references to all functional parts of the superstructure (e.g. situation, problem, response, etc.). On the other hand, feelings and sentiments evoked by political texts and psychological factors impacting the reader manifest as emotive persuasion, and are realised mainly through choices in lexis and style and through the political message of texts (as attested by Larson [2001] and Mazzoleni [2002]). The political message is shortest possible meaningful summary of a political text, ultimately derived from the gist of the same text by applying Tirkkonen-Condit’s (1985) Macrostructure Model, which adapts van Dijk’s (1980) Macrostructure Model. With a view to these textual features, the Political Bias Screener has been developed to enable researchers to focus their analysis on the gist and the political message as well as on the wider contextual characteristics of political discourse including social, cultural, historical, ideological and political features of texts published in the media. These latter features necessitate, on the one hand, the inclusion of a critical discourse analysis model, which allows for the investigation of power and ideology related aspects of the texts in question and, on the other hand, the incorporation of a mass communication related model, which enables the researcher to identify how this communicative context influences text production and reception. Briefly put, the Political Bias Screener analyses the superstructure, the macrostructure, the political and ideological content and context as well as the communication channel specific features of political texts.

Functionally, the Screener operates in the following way. The gists and political messages of the source and target language texts are identified with the help of Tirkkonen-Condit’s (1985) Macrostructure Model complemented by Hoey’s (2001) Problem-Solution Model, with the latter model providing the superstructure constituent. As the other two domains of political persuasion (feelings and sentiments evoked and psychological impact) are realised on the level of individual propositions, Kintsch and van Dijk’s (1978) notion of proposition – as defined and applied in their Model of Text Comprehension and Production (ibid.) – is used
to identify propositions carrying such emotionally and psychologically impacting textual features.

As a next step of using the Screener, the results obtained with the help of both Tirkkonen-Condit’s (1985) Macrostructure Model and Hoey’s (2001) Problem-Solution Model (i.e. the gist and the political message), as well as the full source and target texts serve as input for the next cycle of analysis. This cycle is constituted of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and applies the Translation-centred Discourse – Society Interface (TDSI) Model developed in the scope of this research. As the aim of the CDA analysis is to interpret and compare both the textual realisations of the full source and target texts as well as the gists and political messages of such texts in their relevant social, cultural, historical, ideological and political contexts, the corresponding analysis is carried out along the four components of Action, Context, Power and Ideology of the TDSI Model. This model is based on van Dijk’s (1993, 1997, 2001, 2003) critical discourse analytical model and his Discourse – Society Interface (ibid.). The political and ideological bias of source and target texts is revealed, compared and analysed by establishing the relevant properties of source and target texts along the above four components of the TDSI Model, and by pinpointing pertaining textual differences. These differences surface as translation shifts, which are contextually interpreted with the help of the four components of the TDSI Model.

As the majority of political texts are predominantly argumentative newspaper articles published in the press, i.e. mediatised political texts, the political mass communication context of analysed texts must also be taken into account so that all relevant contextual features (including political mass communication related ones) can be considered and interpreted. As the TDSI Model does not incorporate discursive political and media communication related theories that are capable of accounting for, and explaining the reasons for, journalists’ and translators’ (potential) political bias driven text construction in the case of producing mediatised political texts, a specific political mass communication theory based model, the Translation-centred Political Mass Communication (TPMC) Model has been included in the Screener. This component of the Screener has been developed on the basis of Mazzoleni’s (2002) Mediatised Political Reality Theory, which describes how objective political reality (the political events as they actually took place) is presented in the media. In addition, the TPMC Model also relies on Mazzoleni’s (2002) Theory of Bias, which addresses the issue of journalists’ personal political convictions as well as professional norms and standards of journalism. The TPMC Model allows for the interpretation of the research results obtained with the help of the TDSI Model with reference to the actual presentation of political reality and bias surfacing in mediatised texts. In its capacity as an analytical tool, the TDSI Model helps explore how and why journalism and translation contribute to the
presentation of political reality and to the production of politically biased texts. In fact, the TPMC Model provides a political mass communication based explanation of journalists’ and translators’ text-construction related behaviour, as this textually surfaces in source and target texts.

Figure 1 below contains a visual representation of the Political Bias Screener including its four constituent models. The four constituent models of the analytical tool are in a linear and hierarchical relationship: the output of a given constituent serves as an input of the following constituent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS OF ANALYSIS</th>
<th>CONSTITUENT MODELS</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPERSTRUCTURE OF TEXT</td>
<td>Hoey’s (2001) Problem-Solution Model</td>
<td>output: superstructure of source and target texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tirkkonen-Condit’s (1985) Macrostructure Model</td>
<td>output: macro structure affected by superstructure and political message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACROSTRUCTURE OF TEXT</td>
<td>Translation-centred Discourse-Society Interface Model (TDSI Model)</td>
<td>output: critical discourse analysis of source and target texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>Translation-centred Political Mass Communication Model (TPMC Model)</td>
<td>output: conclusions regarding translator behaviour and implications for translators’ critical awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Visual representation of the Political Bias Screener
As Figure 1 shows, the first constituent is the superstructure constituent, the next is the macrostructure constituent to be followed by the CDA constituent and finally by the political mass communication constituent. The output of the superstructure constituent, i.e. Hoey’s (2001) Problem-Solution Model, and the full source and target texts serves as the input of the macrostructure constituent, i.e. Tirkkonen-Condit’s (1985) Macrostructure Model. The output of the macrostructure constituent and the full source and target texts yield the input of the TDSI Model. The output of the TDSI Model is generated along four Components: Action (including intentionality, perspective, implications, consequences and components, as well as interaction), Context (including participants, the setting, props, action, higher level action, as well as local and global contexts), Power (i.e. social power of groups or institutions over society) and Ideology (including ideology-related evaluative beliefs and opinions, arguments, lexical choice, stylistic features and metaphors as well as the US vs. THEM distinction). The output of the TDSI Model is the input of the TPMC Model. More precisely, the TDSI Model components ‘Action’ and ‘Ideology’ serve as input for the TPMC Model component ‘Bias’ (the exercise of control over information channels for promoting political interests; within the TPMC Model ‘Bias’ is further subdivided into structural bias, i.e. bias towards a political side or ideology, and personal political bias, i.e. one’s own personal political convictions giving rise to politically and ideologically biased text production), while the TDSI Model components ‘Context’ and ‘Power’ are the input for the TPMC Model component ‘Reality’ (the more or less realistic portrayal of, and the more or less factual communication about, real-life events in the media; ‘Reality’ is further subdivided into subjective reality, i.e. how text producers interpret reality in their own texts, and constructed reality, i.e. what sort of ‘officially’ proclaimed and reinforced ideological reality text producers present to their audience). Figure 1 also displays the inputs and the outputs with reference to each analytical tool constituent.

Figure 1 also shows the focus of analysis with reference to each constituent: Hoey’s (2001) Problem-Solution Model operates at the level of superstructure, Tirkkonen-Condit’s (1985) Macrostructure Model operates on the level of macrostructure, the Translation-centred Discourse–Society Interface Model operates at the level of context including social, cultural, historical, ideological and political contexts, whereas the Translation-centred Political Mass Communication Model similarly works at the level of context taking account of political reality and bias. (Bánhegyi 2012c as well as 2013a and 2013b provide a more extended description of the use of the TPMC Model. In addition, these publications discuss results generated using the Model and formulate related implications.)

On the right hand side of Figure 1, the outcomes of the TDSI and TPMC Models are shown. The outcome of the TDSI Model reveals political bias in source and target texts, whereas the outcome of the TPMC Model, on the one hand, yields
conclusions regarding translator behaviour and, on the other hand, allows for the generation of implications regarding translators’ critical awareness.

3. Testing the Political Bias Screener

In order to pilot and test the Political Bias Screener and to demonstrate its applicability, a translation assignment from Hungarian into English has been designed. Due to the fact that the present research seeks to explore the effects of all factors potentially resulting in bias and in the (re)production of ideology in translated argumentative newspaper articles and as the research concurrently wishes to test if these factors are analysable with the Screener, the above-mentioned translation assignment – simulating a potential commission to translate mediatised political texts – consists of the following scenario: in the scope of the assignment there are two politically opposing source texts, two translators with opposing political orientations and two clients representing diverse ideologies, which gives rise to different client expectations concerning both the target texts and the respective readerships associated with the publication of these texts. In order to explore how client expectations affect translated texts, or more precisely, to see how translators perceive client expectations and how they adjust their target texts to these expectations, the research-purpose translation assignment used for the piloting and testing of the Political Bias Screener has been developed in a way that it includes the two major Hungarian opposing political parties, the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP) and Fidesz Hungarian Civic Union (Fidesz), as clients of the simulated translation assignment. As part of this translation assignment, the translators were commissioned to translate two argumentative Hungarian newspaper articles into English for these clients.

Practically, this translation assignment incorporates the following scenario: two articles reflecting two opposing political standpoints are translated for two clients, i.e. for two opposing political parties by two translators, whose political commitments oppose each other. This gives altogether eight target texts: Translators 1 and 2 receive source newspaper articles 1 and 2, entitled Kompenzáció published in the Hungarian daily Népszabadság and Másnap published in the Hungarian daily Magyar Nemzet, for translation for Client 1 (MSZP) and Client 2 (Fidesz). The components of the translation assignment (translators, source newspaper articles, clients) as well as the political and ideological orientations of the components involved in the translation assignment are visualised in Figure 2: orange represents right-wing political orientation, whereas red represents left-wing orientation; non-colour-coded texts feature a mixture of political orientations. It was in the scope of
this translation assignment that the testing of the validity and the reliability of the Political Bias Screener was performed.

Figure 2. The eight target texts resulting from the translation assignment

3.1 The validity of the constituent models of the Political Bias Screener

Focusing on each component model, this section provides information about the validity of the Political Bias Screener. Simply put, with respect to an analytical tool, validity is concerned with whether the research tool in question is capable of generating the data required and expected in the scope of the analysis. Concerning the Political Bias Screener, it can be established that the superstructure model of the Screener centres on the investigation of the linearly arranged parts of argumentative texts, whereas the macrostructure model examines the most relevant and focalised content-related parts of argumentative texts. The CDA model is concerned with the critical interpretation of the social, cultural, historical, ideological and political context of argumentative texts, while the political mass communication model addresses mass communication related aspects of mediatised texts. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Political Bias Screener analyses those textual properties of discourse it has been devised to address, and it produces valid results in the fields of analysis it has been designed for and in which it operates. Briefly phrased, the Screener is capable of identifying of bias in mediatised political texts.
3.2 The reliability of the constituent models of the Political Bias Screener

This section discusses the reliability of the constituent models of the Political Bias Screener and thus touches upon this issue with respect to the superstructure, the macrostructure, the CDA and the political mass communication models constituting the Screener. In a simplified phrasing, reliability, in the case of an analytical tool, means that no significant difference is perceived between the results obtained through the use of the same analytical tool under the same circumstances.

3.2.1 Reliability of the superstructure analysis

In the scope of the superstructure analysis, coding was effected, on the one hand, by the writer of the present article and, on the other hand, by a co-coder carefully trained in the terminology and application of Hoey’s (2001) Problem-Solution Model. The two coders first worked independently of each other and after effecting the analysis of the two source and the eight target language texts, they compared their findings; in the case of disagreements, they agreed on the coding of certain problematic sentences. After the two coders independently classified the sentences of the source and target texts into the functional categories of the problem-solution structure (situation, problem, response, negative and positive evaluation, positive result), a reliability analysis was performed. The classification of each sentence by the two coders was compared and a reliability value was calculated on the basis of the two coders’ categorisation of the source and target text sentences. The congruence between the codings conducted by the two coders was expressed in a percentage value in order to generate a percent agreement index. Even if the method of obtaining such an index is not the latest, it is considered reliable in the case of two raters and not so numerous microstructural categories, where the likelihood of disagreement between the raters is predicted to be relatively low. The resulting reliability value was 83%: this can be considered reliable since the classification of superstructure categories is based on interpretation (Károly 2007), which scenario, for that reason, does not require a 100% match and a “certain margin of disagreement should be allowed” (Spooren and Degand 2010, 251) and be considered normal. In their linguistics-oriented research methodological study focusing on agreement values, Artstein and Poesio (2008, 37) consider an 80% match or above reliable. It can thus be concluded that the results of the superstructure analysis performed with the help of the superstructure component of the Political Bias Screener are reliable.

3.2.2 Reliability of the macrostructure analysis

The procedures of testing the reliability of the macrostructure analysis followed the same steps as those of the superstructure analysis. The researcher and a co-coder carefully trained in the terminology and application of Tirkkonen-Condit’s (1985)
Macrostructure Model first worked independently on establishing the macrostructure (affected by the superstructure) of the two source and the eight target texts. After the macrostructure analyses have been completed, a reliability analysis has been performed to assess the reliability of the data provided by the two coders with reference to the macrostructures of the source and target texts. The reliability analysis generated percent agreement indices, which varied between 77% and 86%. As discussed above, based on (Károly 2007) as well as Spooren and Degand (2010) and Artstein and Poesio (2008), these values shows that the results of the macrostructure analyses effected using the macrostructure component of the Political Bias Screener are quite reliable.

3.2.3 Reliability of the CDA analysis
In terms of the reliability of the CDA-focused TDSI Model, it must be noted that there is no absolutely perfect method of excluding subjectivity or subjective interpretation in any CDA analysis. This a priori subjectivity is explained by the nature of CDA: CDA is “a socially committed scientific paradigm” (Fairclough and Wodak 1997, 280) wishing to establish and interpret properties of texts including the context of such texts. Actually no interpretation of context, whatsoever, can be deemed absolutely objective due to the fact that for the interpretation of contextual information a “socially-based mental construct” (van Dijk 1997, 16) is necessary on the part of the researcher, which inevitable contains some subjective judgement. Nevertheless, the author consciously chose to take a politically, ideologically and emotionally neutral and objective standpoint. In addition, he purposefully distanced himself from all political and ideological influence and concurrently also excluded any kind of purposeful bias in the scope of this investigation. Furthermore, it must also be observed that CDA as an analytical tool is qualitative as well as quantitative in nature and the latter feature serves to improve reliability of analysis through the quantification of certain textual features. Therefore, the findings of the current research must be evaluated with all this in mind.

3.2.4 Reliability of the political mass communication analysis
Very much like CDA, political mass communication analysis is interpretative in nature. This suggests that any results generated by political mass communication analyses may potentially contain subjective elements, which is a characteristic feature of any approach of this kind. This, however, is counterbalanced by the structure of the Political Bias Screener. In the scope of the structure of the Screener, the TPMC Model is used for the interpretation of the results obtained with the help of the TDSI Model and thereby objectivity is ensured in the following way: the TDSI Model works with four components and with several aspects under each component (see
the discussion in Section 2 and Figure 1). If the results obtained with the help of the different components and aspects of the TDSI Model point towards similar textual features and thus towards the same conclusions in the TPMC Model, then this, in our interpretation, seems to suggest that the research results obtained with the help of the TPMC Model are reliable. Reliability analysis, on the other hand, is unknown in the field of political mass communication analysis (similarly to any CDA analysis, and consequently cannot be performed in this case, either).

On the basis of the examination of the validity and the reliability of the individual components of the Political Bias Screener, it can safely be concluded that analyses performed using the Screener will yield valid and reliable research results. Furthermore, for that reason, the Screener is a suitable research tool for the analysis and interpretation of the above-described textual features of mediatised political texts.

4. Results generated by the Political Bias Screener

This section outlines and briefly discusses the results obtained with the help of the Political Bias Screener. The findings are described in relation to the four above-described constituent models of the Screener. One source text and its four translations are used for illustrating the process of analysis, and the results described below were also generated using the same corpus. The source and target texts are printed in Appendix 1.

4.1 Superstructure analysis

For the superstructure analysis, Hoey’s (2001) Problems-Solution Model was used in the case of the source and target texts. Based on the results of this analysis, it can be stated that the target texts preserve the text-type specific functional characteristics of the problem – solution type argumentative source language discourse. This indicates that the target texts remain argumentative, which gives the reader the opportunity to agree or disagree with the featured arguments. As a consequence, the target texts, similarly to the source text, effect political persuasion. This indicates that the translators do not alter the superstructure of target texts in an attempt to effect ideological or political manipulation. For a sample of the superstructure analysis, see Figure 3 (see Texts 3, 4, 7 and 8 in the Appendix for potential English translations).
zártát kapott. [2] Majd arra intett, a törvényházak és a politikusokon a sor, hogy megtegyék a szükséges lépéseket és levonják a következtetéseket.


Az Őszödi Böszme régi-új énjet megcsillantva a Fidesz elnökét ostorozó harmadik felszólalásában újfent kísérletet tett arra, hogy hívható hazugságbeszédét átcsomagolja igazságbeszédé.

A kampányfinisben a kecskeméti szocialista törzsközönség előtt szenvedélyesen, ám nem latinovitsi fokon Cipollát alakító Gyurcsány most a „Nincs a teremtésben vesztes, csak én” Bándk báni szólamot igyekezett kiénekelni - meglehetősen enervált. [18] Sokszori megszólalásai tartalma kapcsán pedig inkább egy shakespeare-i parafrázis fogalmazódhatott meg a hallgatóságban: őrült beszéd, de nincs benne rendszer.

Figure 3. The superstructure of Source Text 2 entitled Másnap
4.2 Macrostructure analysis

Tirkkonen-Condit’s (1985) Macrostructure Model was used to analyse the macrostructure of the source and target texts. The results of the macrostructure analysis indicate that the propositional contents of the macrostructures (gist and political message) of the source and target texts do not differ significantly. The results also show that translators do not alter the target texts to the extent that this would cause a notable change in the macrostructure of the target texts as compared to that of the referent source text. This indicates that translators do not alter the macrostructure of target texts in an attempt to effect ideological or political manipulation. For a sample of the macrostructure analysis, see Figure 4.

Figure 4. The macrostructure of Source Text 2 entitled Másnap. Numbers denote sentence numbers in the analysed text, P. M. stands for political message.

```
| Macrolevel 6 | 3 |   |   | 18 | P. M. |
| Macrolevel 5 | 3 |   | 13 | 18 |
| Macrolevel 4 | 3 |   | 13 | 15 | 18 |
| Macrolevel 3 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| Macrolevel 2 | 2 | 3 | 6  | 10 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| Macrolevel 1 | 2 | 3 | 5  | 6  | 8  | 10 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| Microlevel   | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
```

4.3 CDA analysis

The CDA analysis has been carried out using the TDSI Model and is described below with respect to the findings identified with the help of the Model’s four components. As a summary, it can be stated that the analysis has revealed that the target texts reproduce all properties of the source texts in terms of the component Action. In connection with the textual features associated with the component Context, it can be established that the target texts exhibit a tendency of satisfying the political expectations of the clients having ordered the given translations. As far as textual features related to the component Power are concerned, target texts seem to undermine the dominance of the ruling elite irrespective of client expectations.

As far as target textual features related to the component Ideology are concerned, the following results have been obtained. Translators reproduce all evaluative beliefs (a statement concerning which there is no objective, empirical truth
criteria on the basis of which it can be incontestably decided whether the statement functioning as an evaluative belief is true or false) and opinions (a practically unjustifiable or false belief that is grounded in moral or other judgements) of the source text once they translate for clients who share the same ideology as the one expressed in the source text. If the client does not share the same ideology as the one surfacing in the source text, translators only partially reproduce such ideological contents. This seems to suggest that translators always keep the client and the ideology shared by the client in mind and they produce target texts that ideologically suit the client. On the other hand, the arguments appearing in the source text are not manipulated by translators in the target texts. However, the lexical choice in the gists is manipulated: lexis is selected in a way that the choice of lexis, as a rule, reflects the client’s ideology. In addition, stylistic features and metaphors expressing ideology in the source text are reproduced in the target texts on condition the ideology they express is identical to the ideology shared by the client. If this is not the case, translators only partly reproduce such stylistic features and metaphors. In a similar fashion, the US vs. THEM distinction is retained in target texts. Nevertheless, the lexical choice appearing in the referent sentences can support or undermine the effectiveness of the ideology behind the US vs. THEM distinction: the lexical choice in the reproduction of this distinction mirrors the client’s ideology. Strange as it may seem, it is noteworthy that translators hardly ever include those of their own ideological beliefs that oppose the ideology of their actual client. This practically means that translators’ own ideological beliefs do not surface in target texts unless they are also shared by the client. In sum, it can be concluded that the target texts produced in the scope of the present research predominantly reflect the political bias of the client. For a sample of the Critical Discourse Analysis using the TDSI Model, see Figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative beliefs in Source Text 2 entitled Másnap (No. of Sentence)</th>
<th>Target Text 3 (No. of Sentence)</th>
<th>Target Text 4 (No. of Sentence)</th>
<th>Target Text 7 (No. of Sentence)</th>
<th>Target Text 8 (No. of Sentence)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dacos vasárnapi megnyilatkozásaiban (6) [in his defiant utterances on Sunday]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>defiant Sunday night reactions (6)</td>
<td>insolent Sunday night reactions (6)</td>
<td>insolent and impertinent Sunday night reactions (6)</td>
<td>In Target Text 3, this is not an evaluative belief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engedékenyebb húrokat pengetett (6) [struck more lenient strings]</td>
<td>sounded more moderate (6)</td>
<td>sounded softer (6)</td>
<td>his speech was more manageable (6)</td>
<td>sounded more agreeable (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Text</td>
<td>Target Text 1</td>
<td>Target Text 2</td>
<td>Target Text 3</td>
<td>Target Text 4</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vádaskodó hang (8) [accusing voice]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>accusing tone (8)</td>
<td>accuses (8)</td>
<td>accusations (8)</td>
<td>In Target Text 3, this is not an evaluative belief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gondosan homályban hagytott (12) [was carefully left in the dark]</td>
<td>was not elaborated on (11)</td>
<td>deliberately obscured (11)</td>
<td>deliberately cloaked (13)</td>
<td>deliberately cloaked (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>népszavazással Magyarország […] veszített (13) [Hungary lost due to the referendum]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Hungary will sadly miss something as a result of the referendum (14)</td>
<td>Hungary will sadly miss something as a result of the referendum (14)</td>
<td>In Target Texts 7 and 8, the referent proposition of Source Text 2 is reproduced as an evaluative belief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kissé letargikus (13) [a bit lethargic]</td>
<td>mildly melancholic (12)</td>
<td>mildly lethargic (12)</td>
<td>slightly lethargic (14)</td>
<td>slightly lethargic (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hirhédト hazugsábészéd (16) [disreputable lying speech]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>infamous Ösződ speech of lies (14)</td>
<td>infamous Ösződ speech of lies (17)</td>
<td>infamous Ösződ speech of lies (17)</td>
<td>In Target Text 3, this is not an evaluative belief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szenvedélyesen, ám nem latinovitsi fokon Cipollát alakító (17) [forming the character of Cipolla passionately but not at a level of Latinovits]</td>
<td>passionate Cipolla though not quite as talented as the great Hungarian actor Latinovits (16)</td>
<td>played Cipolla passionately but not at actor Latinovits’s standard (16)</td>
<td>passionately acting in the role of Cipolla but not as perfectly as Latinovits (18)</td>
<td>passionately acting in the role of Cipolla but not nearly as perfectly as Latinovits (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meglehetősen enerváltan (17) [in a quite enervated way]</td>
<td>rather enervated manner (16)</td>
<td>rather enervated manner (16)</td>
<td>enervated tone (18)</td>
<td>enervated tone (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>őrült beszéd, de nincs benne rendszer (18) [mad speech but there is no method in it]</td>
<td>‘This be madness and there is no method in ‘t. (17)</td>
<td>‘This be madness and there is no method in ‘t. (17)</td>
<td>‘This be madness and there is no method in ‘t. (19)</td>
<td>‘This be madness and there is no method in ‘t. (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.** Evaluative beliefs in Source Text 2 and in its four translations. Dashes mean the given target text did not reproduce the evaluative belief in question.
4.4 Political mass communication analysis

This analysis has been performed using the TPMC Model. The results obtained suggest that the political mass communication setting of the target texts under scrutiny prompts translators to create such target texts that politically and ideologically meet the political and ideological expectations of the actual client. This is very similar to journalists’ behaviour, which is observable in the communicative context of producing newspaper articles: journalists tend to satisfy the ideological expectations of the newspapers that commission them. It follows from this that, with reference to the translation of argumentative newspaper articles, translator behaviour is influenced – obviously and primarily – by client expectations. It is apparently also the case that the level of translators’ critical awareness in terms of critically assessing the political reverberations of their target texts (since they primarily keep the client’s expectations in mind), as attested by the current research, is rather low. For a sample of the political mass communication analysis, see Figure 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Political Mass Communication Analysis</th>
<th>Reality</th>
<th>Bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of the Components of the Political Mass Communication Analysis</td>
<td>Subjective reality</td>
<td>Constructed reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>translators rely on their own subjective realities, which surface as</td>
<td>translators present different constructed realities in target texts for different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>translation shifts in the target text</td>
<td>clients depending on the political and ideological expectations of the actual client</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Summary of selected findings of the political mass communication analysis

A more extensive and detailed presentation of the diverse results generated by the Political Bias Screener is offered in Bánhegyi (2012a and 2012b).
5. Summary and conclusions

The present study outlined the major theoretical pillars of a translation centred analytical tool designed to be used with mediatised texts: these include superstructure, macrostructure and critical discourse theories as well as political mass communication related theories. Based on these theoretical foundations, the essay described the Political Bias Screener, which is an analytical tool for pinpointing, identifying and analysing textual features potentially, and actually, capable of supporting and contributing to political and ideological manipulation.

The article continued to investigate the validity and reliability of the Screener and concluded that this analytical tool is both valid and reliable with respect to the analysis of political, ideological and bias-related manipulative textual features. The paper ultimately introduced the most important research findings obtained with the help of the Screener.

It can be established that the Political Bias Screener connects Translation Studies, text linguistics and political mass communication studies relying on the most current findings of these three research fields. In the scope of this endeavour, the Screener combines several disciplines: van Dijk’s (1993, 1997, 2001, 2003) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model has been connected with Translation Studies and a translation-centred adaptation of van Dijk’s above model has been proposed. In addition, this multidisciplinary model is further extended by a mass communication component, which yields a complex analytical tool specifically designed for use in Translation Studies research.

Finally, for the purpose of the contextualisation of the current paper, it must be pointed out that this research is intended as a qualitative study. Its aim has been to garner a discourse-specific theory and, on the basis of this theory, it intended to develop, introduce and test a text-type specific analytical tool by way of applying this very tool in the scope of a case study. Given that this research is based on a limited number of source and target texts, the current results and findings cannot be generalized to any other text or text type than argumentative political newspaper articles, to any other language pairs than Hungarian and English, or to any other translators than the two participants of this research. The results, however, are transferable within Translation Studies or other disciplines with reference to the study of mediatised texts, and the obtained findings show possible tendencies of translator behaviour, which can be justified or rejected by later research.
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Appendix 1. Source text 2 and its four translations

Másnap (The Next Day) by Attila Farkas published in Magyar Nemzet on 11th March 2008
Az eddigi referendumokkal összehangolva is kiemelkedő részvétellel lezajlott és az igének elsőprő sikerét hozó szociális népszavazás estéjén Sólyom László köztársasági elnök kijelentette: az eredmény egyértelmű. Majd arra intett, a törvényhozókon és a politikusokon a sor, hogy megtegyék a szükséges lépéseket és levonják a következtetéseket.

Ezt a feladatot kíséreltek meg abszolválni tegnap az Országgyűlésben. Az már előzetesen nyilvánvaló volt, hogy minden a vizitdíj, a tandíj és a kórházi napidíj eltörlését kezdeményező Fidesz és KDNP, mind a megszüntetésük ellen mindent bevetve sikertelenül hadakozott kormány-pártok törvénymódosítással kívánának eleget tenni a nép akaratának, méltányolván a napirend előtti felszólalásokban is oly sokszor emlegetett voks populit.

Az Őszödi Böszme és a színnap egyéb kisbetűs szereplői (Kóka, Lendvai, Hiller) azzal érveltek, hogy az önző "háromigenesek" az ingyenesség haszonlesői.

Az Őszödi Böszme régi-új énjét megcsillantva a Fidesz elnökét ostorozó harmadik felszólalásában újfent kísértet tett arra, hogy hírhedt hazugságbeszédét átcsomagolja igazságbeszéddé.

Az Őszödi Böszme régi-új énjét megcsillantva a Fidesz elnökét ostorozó harmadik felszólalásában újfent kísértet tett arra, hogy hírhedt hazugságbeszédét átcsomagolja igazságbeszéddé.

A kampányfinisben a kecskeméti szocialista törzszöközés előtt szenvedélyesen, ám nem latinovíti fokon Cipollát alakító Gyurcsány most a „Nincs a teremtésben vesztes, csak én” Bánk báni szólomat igyekszett kiírni – meglehetősen enerváltan.

Sokszori megszólalásai tartalma kapcsán pedig inkább egy shakespeare-i parafázis fogalmazódhatott meg a hallgatóságban: őrült beszéd, de nincs benne rendszer.
Target text 3

The Next Day
By Attila Farkas
[1] On the evening of the referendum with a record high participation rate compared to other similar occasions so far, and a strong ‘Yes’ victory, Mr. László Sólyom, President of the Republic of Hungary, claimed that the result speaks for itself. [2] Then he declared that now it is legislators’ and politician’s turn to draw the consequences and take the necessary steps.

[3] This task was attempted to be absolved in the House of Parliament yesterday. [4] It was obvious from the beginning that both Fidesz-KDNP (Hungarian Civic Union – Christian Democratic People’s Party) initiating the abandonment of the visit fee, the daily fee for hospital treatment and the tuition fee and the governing parties vehemently opposing the abandonment want to take legislative steps to submit to the wish of the people in an appreciation of the popular vote frequently mentioned also in pre-agenda speeches.

[5] Mr. Ferenc Gyurcsány’s speeches dominated the pre-agenda session. [6] This time, more relaxed, he sounded more moderate than in his castigating Sunday night reactions when he envisioned all ‘No’ voters as socialist supporters and the 3.3 million ‘Yes’ voters as people reluctant to pay. [7] At the beginning of his manifold statements, surely resulting from his evaluation of the situation, he said that the referendum result will be respected, according to which at least 3 million people disagree with the “speed and depth of the changes of the recent one and a half years.” [8] Later, however, the usual critical tone: the majority voting ‘Yes’ did not decide on who is to pay the fees repealed. [9] Criticism was communicated towards everyone: the journalists who did not keep on asking this question, the Constitutional Court and indirectly its first president, the current President of the Republic of Hungary, how they deemed such questions suitable for a referendum. [10] The “Jackass of Öszöd” and the more insignificant members of the cast (Mr. Kóka, Ms. Lendvai, Mr. Hiller) argued that those selfish ones who voted 3 times ‘Yes’ are the bargain hunters of free deals. [11] Mr. Tibor Navracsics Leader of the parliamentary group of Fidesz called attention in vain to the premise that nobody thinks that nothing ever has had to be paid for health care or education: speeches advocating the standpoint of the government were trying to convince fellow MPs and TV viewers that we have not been paying at the doctor and in higher education twice, not even once while the GDP proportionate state contribution spent on education, healing and prevention was not elaborated on.

[12] At the same time we learnt from the mildly melancholic head of government that Hungary lost with the referendum in the long run. [13] And, obviously judging from his own experience of the privatization of the Szalay utca building and the Öszöd holiday complex, PM Gyurcsány stated that it does not lead to a strong and modern Hungary to talk citizens out of taking part in using services when concurrently paying their own contribution. [14] Approximately this was the essence of PM Gyurcsany’s introspection. [15] The “Jackass of Öszöd”, showing a glimpse of his old-new self, attempted again to convert his widely-known Öszöd speech into a speech of justice in his third speech directing criticism at the President of Fidesz.

[16] At the finish of the campaign, PM Gyurcsány, like a passionate Cipolla though not quite as talented as the great Hungarian actor Latinovits, appeared in front of the socialist supporters of Kecskemét and tried to sing the Bank Ban opera tune “There is no one unluckier on earth than me” in a rather enervated manner. [17] His manifold statements conjure up a Shakespearian line paraphrased in the audience: “This be madness and there is no method in ‘t.”
The Next Day
By Attila Farkas

[1] On the evening of the referendum with a record high participation rate compared to other similar occasions so far, and a strong ‘Yes’ victory, Mr. László Sólyom, President of the Republic of Hungary, said that the result speaks for itself. [2] Then he motioned that now it is legislators' and politician's turn to draw the consequences and take the necessary steps.

[3] This task was attempted to be absolved in the House of Parliament yesterday. [4] It was obvious from the beginning that both Fidesz-KDNP (Hungarian Civic Union – Christian Democratic People's Party) initiating the abandonment of the visit fee, the daily fee for hospital treatment and the tuition fee and the governing parties opposing the abandonment fiercely, at all costs and to no avail want to take legislative steps to fulfill the wish of the people in an appreciation of the popular vote frequently mentioned also in pre-agenda speeches.

[5] Mr. Ferenc Gyurcsány played the dominant tune of the pre-agenda session. [6] This time, more relaxed, he sounded softer than in his defiant Sunday night reactions when he tried to vision all ‘No’ voters as socialist supporters and the 3.3 million ‘Yes’ voters as people favoring their wallet. [7] At the beginning of his manifold statements, surely resulting from his evaluation of the situation, he said that the referendum result will be respected, according to which at least 3 million people disagree with the “speed and depth of the changes of the recent one and a half years.” [8] Later, however, the usual accusing tone: the majority voting ‘Yes’ did not decide on who is to pay the fees repealed. [9] And then everyone was disapproved of: the journalists who did not ask this question all the time, the Constitutional Court and indirectly its first president, the current President of the Republic of Hungary, how they dared consider such questions suitable for a referendum. [10] The Jackass of Őszöd and more insignificant members of the cast (Mr. Kóka, Ms. Lendvai, Mr. Hiller) argued that those selfish ones who voted 3 times ‘Yes’ are the money grubbers of free deals. [11] Mr. Tibor Navracsics Leader of the parliamentary group of Fidesz in vain called the attention to the fact that nobody thinks that nothing ever has had to be paid for health care or education: the performers of the retuned pro-government canvass-speeches tried to convince their fellow MPs and TV viewers that we have not been paying at the doctor and in higher education twice, not even once while the GDP proportionate state contribution spent on education, healing and prevention was deliberately obscured.

[12] At the same time we learnt from the mildly lethargic head of government that Hungary lost with the referendum in the long run. [13] And, obviously judging from his own experience of privatizing the Szalay utca building and the Őszöd holiday complex, PM Gyurcsány stated that it does not lead to a strong and modern Hungary to talk citizens out of taking part in using services when concurrently paying their own contribution. [14] Approximately this was the essence of the Gyurcsanyesque introspection. [15] The Jackass of Őszöd, showing his old-new self, attempted again to convert his infamous Őszöd speech of lies into a speech of justice in his third speech reprimanding the President of Fidesz.

[16] At the finish of the campaign, PM Gyurcsány, who played Cipolla passionately but not at actor Latinovits's standard in front of the socialist supporters of Kecskemé, now tried to sing the Bank Ban opera tune “There is no other loser on earth but me” in a rather enervated manner. [17] The content of his manifold statements reminds the audience of Shakespeare paraphrased: “This be madness and there is no method in ‘t.”
The Next Day
By Attila Farkas

[1] On the evening of the referendum, characterised by an unprecedented high participation rate compared to other similar occasions so far, and a strong victory of the ‘Yes’ side, Mr. László Sólyom, President of the Republic of Hungary, said the result speaks for itself. [2] Consequently, he urged legislators and politicians to draw the conclusions and to take the necessary steps.

[3] The House of Parliament was engaged in doing so yesterday. [4] From the beginning of session, both Fidesz (Hungarian Civic Union) and KDNP (Christian Democratic People’s Party), the parties having initiated the repeal of the visit fee, the daily fee for hospital treatment and the tuition fee, as well as the governing parties, who had been strongly opposing the repeal, have obviously felt motivated to take the necessary legislative steps to guarantee the fulfilment of the wish of the people appreciating the ‘popular vote’ frequently referred to in the pre-agenda speeches.

[5] MP Ferenc Gyurcsány gave the keynote speech in the pre-agenda session. [6] More in terms with the actual situation, this time, his speech was more manageable than his insolent Sunday night reactions, when he imagined all ‘No’ voters as socialist supporters while the 3.3 million ‘Yes’ voters as people deciding purely on financial grounds. [7] Most probably as a result of his evaluation of the current situation, at the beginning of his numerous speeches, he announced that the results of the referendum will be respected with at least 3 million people disagreeing with the “speed and depth of the changes in the recent one and a half years.” [8] Yet, later there came the usual accuses: the majority voting ‘Yes’ did not in fact settle who is to compensate for the fees to be repealed. [9] And then the journalists got scolded, who failed to ask this question time and time again, to be followed by the Constitutional Court and indirectly its first president, the current President of the Republic of Hungary with the Prime Minister questioning how come they did consider such questions suitable for a referendum. [10] The Dimwit of Öszöd and the less significant members of PM Gyurcsány’s team (Mr. Kóka, Ms. Lendvai, Mr. Hiller) claimed that those selfish persons who cast three YES’s in the ballot boxes in fact wish to receive services for free. [11] Mr. Tibor Navracsics, Leader of the parliamentary group of Fidesz, was in vain trying to highlight that nobody thinks no contribution whatsoever has had to be paid for health care or education services. [12] Parliamentary advocates of the re-echoing pro-government propaganda tried to persuade fellow MPs and the TV viewers that one does not pay at the doctor and at the university once, let alone twice. [13] Naturally, at the same time, data on the GDP proportionate state contribution allocated to education, health care and preventive medicine were deliberately cloaked.

[14] However, the slightly lethargic Prime Minister revealed that in the long term Hungary will sadly miss something as a result of the referendum. [15] And, obviously based on his experience of privatizing the Szalay Street building and the Öszöd holiday resort, PM Gyurcsány assured us that no strong and modern Hungary can be built if citizens are convinced that using services can by no means entail having to pay one’s own contribution. [16] All in all, PM Gyurcsány’s introspection extended to as much as this. [17] While having the President of Fidesz under fire, the Dimwit of Öszöd made yet another attempt to translate his infamous Öszöd speech of lies into a talk of truthfulness in his third pre-agenda speech revealing his new-old self.
[18] At the close of the campaign, PM Gyurcsány, while passionately acting in the role of Cipolla but not as perfectly as Latinovits in front of socialist supporters in Kecskemét, this time was trying to sing the part in the opera Bank Ban “There is no one unluckier on earth than me” in an enervated tone. [19] For the audience, the essence of his numerous speeches can be summarized in a Shakespearian paraphrase: “This be madness and there is no method in ’t.”

Target text 8

The Next Day
By Attila Farkas
[1] On the evening of the referendum, characterised by an unprecedented high participation rate compared to other similar occasions so far, and a strong victory of the ‘Yes’ side, Mr. László Sólyom, President of the Republic of Hungary, said the result speaks for itself. [2] Consequently, he urged legislators and politicians to draw the conclusions and take the necessary steps.

[3] The House of Parliament was engaged in doing so yesterday. [4] From the beginning of session, both Fidesz (Hungarian Civic Union) and KDNP (Christian Democratic People’s Party), the parties having initiated the repeal of the visit fee, the daily fee for hospital treatment and the tuition fee, as well as the governing parties, who had been (unsuccessfully) moving heaven and earth to campaign against the repeal, have obviously felt motivated to take the necessary legislative steps to guarantee the fulfilment of the wish of the people appreciating the ‘popular vote’ frequently referred to in the pre-agenda speeches.

[5] In the pre-agenda session MP Ferenc Gyurcsány acted as the lead piper playing the domineering tune. [6] More in terms with the actual situation, this time, his speech sounded more agreeable than his insolent and impertinent Sunday night reactions, when he fantasized that all ‘No’ voters were socialist supporters while the 3.3 million ‘Yes’ voters were people deciding purely on financial grounds. [7] Most probably as a result of his evaluation of the current situation, at the beginning of his numerous speeches, he announced that the results of the referendum would be respected with at least 3 million people disagreeing with the “speed and depth of the changes in the recent one and a half years.” [8] Yet, later there came the standard accusations: the majority voting ‘Yes’ did not in fact settle who is to compensate for the fees to be repealed. [9] And then the journalists got scolded, who were to ask this question time and time again, to be followed by the Constitutional Court and indirectly its first president, the current President of the Republic of Hungary with the Prime Minister questioning how come they did consider such questions suitable for a referendum. [10] The Dimwit of Ószöd and the less significant members of PM Gyurcsány’s cronies (Mr. Kóka, Ms. Lendvai, Mr. Hiller) claimed that those selfish persons who cast three YESs in the ballot boxes in fact wish to receive services for free. [11] In vain was Mr. Tibor Navracsics, Leader of the parliamentary group of Fidesz, trying to highlight that nobody thinks no contribution whatsoever has had to be paid for health care or education services. [12] Parliamentary advocates of the re-echoing pro-government propaganda were making all efforts to persuade fellow MPs and the TV viewers that one does not pay at the doctor and at the university once, let alone twice. [13] Naturally, at the same time, data on the GDP proportionate state contribution allocated to education, health care and preventive medicine were deliberately cloaked.
[14] However, the slightly lethargic Prime Minister revealed that in the long term Hungary will sadly miss something as a result of the referendum. [15] And, obviously based on his experience of privatizing the Szalay Street building and the Őszöd holiday resort, PM Gyurcsány assured us that no strong and modern Hungary can be built if citizens are convinced that using services can by no means entail having to pay one’s own contribution. [16] All in all, Gyurcsány’s introspection extended to as little as this. [17] While having the President of Fidesz under fire, the Dimwit of Őszöd made yet another attempt to translate his infamous Őszöd speech of lies into a talk of truthfulness in his third pre-agenda speech revealing his new-old self. [18] At the close of the campaign, PM Gyurcsány, while passionately acting in the role of Ci-polla but not nearly as perfectly as Latinovits in front of socialist supporters in Kecskemét, this time was trying to sing the part in the opera Bank Ban “There is no one unluckier on earth than me” in a enervated tone. [19] For the audience, the essence of his numerous long-winded speeches can be summarized in a Shakespearian paraphrase: “This be madness and there is no method in ‘t.”
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