NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Irina V. Ubozhenko

COGNITIVE POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: CREATIVE TRANSLATION TEACHING CASE

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: POLITICAL SCIENCE
WP BRP 41/PS/2016

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE

Irina V. Ubozhenko[1]

COGNITIVE POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: CREATIVE TRANSLATION TEACHING CASE[2]

The paper gives the author's view on the cognitive political discourse analysis procedure by researching the case of teaching creative translation. Of a particular interest is the fact that the research material is based on the example of the discourse analysis of modern political terminology and other non-equivalent vocabulary within the bounds of political contexts. Unlike traditional approaches connecting creativity to literary texts studies, the paper deals with the methodology of comprehending and translating foreign academic and scientific texts. Cognitive study of the aspects of contextual actualization of political concepts in the English and Russian discourses by means of comparative analysis is aimed at professional explanation of motivation in choosing translation equivalents. The algorithm of making up an associative thesaurus based on cognitive signs of lexical marking has been used as the major tool of political discourse analysis as well as the foundation for the original creative model of teaching translation suggested by the author.

JEL classification Z

UDC Classification: 303.7 (methods of analysis)

Key words: political discourse, cognitive discourse analysis, associative thesaurus, push-word methodology, teaching translation creativity

[1] National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Foreign Languages, Associate Professor; Laboratory for Political Studies, Chief Researcher; E-mail: iubojenko@hse.ru

[2] Acknowledgements: I would like to express my gratitude to Professor M.V. Ilyin (HSE, Moscow) for having rendered his assistance regarding relevant literature and his highly professional supervision of the whole research project (the HSE research grant No 13-05-0046). I would also like to kindly thank Professor L.A. Chernyakhovskaya (USA) for her valuable advice, useful comments and proofreading of my preprint.

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

"The great riddle — of archaeology, cognitive science, neuroscience, anthropology, sociology, political science, linguistics, religious studies, and the humanities from literature and music to dance and art — is how we became human, how we acquired modern minds."

(Turner 2014: 37)

"Governing responsibly — as opposed to purely responsively — involves setting priorities and making difficult choices."

(Diamond and Morlino 2004: 28)

The Research Relevance and Novelty

1. The current preprint illustrates the first interdisciplinary research attempt made to combine the methods of translation didactics and political science through using cognitive paradigm fundamentals with the aim to explore highly urgent issues of both political cognition and translation studies linked to the cross-cultural conceptual analysis of basic political notions, their adequate interpreting, and consequently, operationalizing through translation.
2. Functional cognitive comparison analysis of linguistic units that require adequate interpretation is to reveal their contextual actualization against a definite background, and thus demands profound knowledge of both political terminology in the Russian and English languages and the current world political situation as a whole.
3. Developing professional skills of making appropriate linguistic decisions while teaching translation of foreign (in our case English) scientific (academic) texts (into Russian) is based on detailed cognitive analysis of parallel political discourses that finally results in mastering the academic faculties of choosing the correct translation equivalent involving all modern political background knowledge.
4. One of the purposes of the research has been planned to create an integrated parallel bilingual thesaurus (glossary) comprising some definite representative cases of the examined subject fields of linguistic (political) realities units usage (such notions in the world politics as "governance", "accountability", "state", etc.).

5. The issue of the fundamentals of linguistic creativity, interdisciplinary[3] by nature and highly debatable, presents a gamut of topical research challenges, and investigating didactic principles of creative translation process has been one of the most empirically resourceful and valuable.
6. Research of creative approaches to translation of informative texts suggests a novel view compared to the current studies of literary language and literary translation.
7. The creative model of teaching translation offers an original associative mind-mapping scheme method of cognitive analysis and a novel didactic metalinguistic tool kit of making appropriate professional translation decisions in dealing with political discourse.
8. The author's term "translation creative occasionalism" is introduced and illustrated in the paper.

Research Background, Methodology, and Theoretic Framework

1. The idea of the research initially derived from the author's previous investigations of translator's intuition and creativity and her experimental attempts of thesaurus modeling of human thinking that finally led to the original methodical algorithm of teaching ingenuity in the field of practical translation.
2. As it is known terminology and the so-called non-equivalent lexical units are one of the most challenging while making translation. In the given study of all nowadays heatedly debated in the world political science issues - such as government and governance, state, power, etc. - accountability has been chosen as a major research question due to its being truly polysemantic, context dependent, multifaceted, and abounding in shadows of probable meaning explanations.
3. Judging by the political research experience accumulated by now the number of accountability types has been really impressive: general and specific accountability (Goodin 2004), external, internal, and transnational (Keohane 2006), democratic[4] (Behn 2001, Scharpf 2003, Goodin 2004), legal and political

[3] "A human being is a unified agency of biology, psychology, and social, environmental, and cultural patterns. And yet, the academic study of human beings is fragmented into scattered disciplines. How can science overcome this academic incoherence to launch a tradition of research in which neuroscientists, cognitive and developmental psychologists, archaeologists, vision scientists, evolutionary theorists, artists, art historians, semioticians, sociologists, and cultural historians join to explain the artful mind and its expression in cultures?" (Turner 2014: 5)

[4] "Accountability is a general concept implying the existence of monitoring and sanctioning mechanisms in principal-agent relationships. Constitutional democracies make use of a wide variety of such mechanisms (including hierarchical

(Ku, Jacobson 2003), horizontal and vertical accountability[5] (Morlino 2009), accountability based on action, competition (Goodin 2004), market conditions[6], so on and so forth. Various, including the above mentioned, definitions fairly justify to our hypothesis regarding the necessity to construct a cognitive cross-cultural thesaurus of the examined notion involving its possible mental representations in the two languages: English and Russian.

4. As the basic typology of accountability comprises its multilateral dimensions, regimes, mechanisms (Goodin 2004) as well as the urgency of both bridging the gap between governance and the accountability and eliminating power abuses through accountability (Keohane 2006), a thorough investigation of the pluralistic accountability system is being required for world politics (Ku, Jacobson 2003).
5. Thus it is claimed that
   - one of our basic axiomatic postulates considers the inner picture of the outer world of each person (a scientist, a translator) as well as the structure of his/her knowledge and associations as subjective and individual;
   - in case of general universals dominating in the structure of the translator's knowledge the variant of translation finally chosen will be pattern-like (ordinary), while the original structure of knowledge - when trivial and traditional cognitive vision does not dominate in his/her mind and does not prevent a person from blending concepts that at first sight seem impossible to be blended - and the individual cognitive mind structure presuppose the emergence (often immediately, intuitively) of the original, non-standard decision;
   - the task of a professional teacher of translation is obviously to stimulate the student's ability to involve the so-called "weak associative links" provoking in this way the original creative translation decision.

Though research on translation creativity has been very limited and rarely found in accessible sources, our review of relevant literature has shown the general correlation typical for

---

supervision, courts of accounts, judicial review, parliamentary investigations) — all of which serve important purposes, but do not add up to "*democratic* accountability" which is constituted by the electoral dependence of governors on the governed". (Scharpf 2003)

[5] "There is also an important linkage with horizontal accountability, because the single most important institutional guarantee of freedom and fairness (and hence competitiveness) in elections is an independent and authoritative electoral commission. This type of accountability is called vertical because it seems to run "upward" from citizens to leaders". (Morlino 2009: 25)

[6] R.E. Goodin speaking about democratic accountability claimed the three main sectors, where different types of accountability might be observed: 1) the state sector with action-based and hierarchy-based accountability, 2) the market sector with results-based and competition-based accountability, and 3) the non-profit sector with intention-based and network-based accountability. (Goodin 2004)

all of them: translation strategies discussion depends on the variable chosen in the research. The list of variables, as a rule, includes source text variables, target language variables, task variables, translator variables, socio-cultural variables and reception variables. Of all the variables enumerated above the task variables must be considered, in our view, as both most significant for the process of translation and possible to be taken into account in evaluating the so-called "degree of creativity". Besides the target (the task) of translation, the role of the commissioner, the client who commissions the translation, is often claimed as influencing the "degree of creativity used" in it (Lyngbak Fogh Holst 2010: 26). And I fully agree with this approach, as it is individuality that constitutes the greater part of the phenomenon of human creativity.

With this in view, I would like to start with explaining what exactly I mean by creativity in translation and how to differentiate between creative and non-creative translation decisions.

Any act of *creativity* traditionally presupposes either *the process of choosing between the alternatives* or the procedure of producing, making up, *creating* something absolutely *new* and original.

It was Theodore Savory who in the second half of the twentieth century in his popular book "The Art of Translation" wrote that the continuous search for the "right" translation variant among all possible alternatives and the very act of making a final choice was the essence of the creative nature of a translator's art (Savory 1968: 26).

Professor Vilen N. Komissarov, a prominent Russian scientist, translator and my honored translation teacher, wrote in one of his last research works that choice was the heart of all creating, and where there was no choice there was no room for ingenuity.

Intuition and creativity as the highest functions of human mind are not easily accessible to analysis but the complexity of the task is no excuse for the refusal to tackle it. Translators training programs should be based on a proper understanding and an objective description of the translating process. (Komissarov 2004: 13).

Thus *the creative translation decision* is defined here as either the one chosen from the dictionary alternatives or a totally new one definitely not fixed in any dictionary, and therefore it may be considered as a pure translation *occasionalism* whose actual contextual meaning immediately evaporates as soon as the problem original unit has been placed in another contextual discourse segment. All other translation decisions, beyond the above described category, are, consequently, regarded as non-creative, *pattern-like.*

I see occasionalism as the fundamental theoretic concept in translation creativity understanding. It may be adequately "read off" and interpreted only by the representatives of a definite language and cultural community, who percept the reality around as the shared cognitive environment. Moreover, I suppose, that the abilities of a person to produce, "construct" linguistic (translation) occasionalisms influence his/her general intellectual - both verbal and non-verbal - potential and should be developed in every possible way, including its mastering in the course of translation practice.

It is well known that the major purpose of a qualified translator (I am particularly making it a point that I am writing about translation, and not about consecutive or conference interpreting, or any other type of oral translator's activity which - being not excluded from our empirical research base - presently lies beyond the frames of the given paper) is to adequately transfer the meaning of the original into the target language. But it is equally well known that the multifaceted notion (in cognitive terms, the concept) of "meaning" itself (or, in one simple word, "sense") has still been vague, highly polysemantic, if putting it linguistically, and has been interpreted variously and differently not only by researchers in linguistics, translation studies and cognitive science, but also by philosophers, sociologist, semioticians and representatives of many other relative fields of science.

In our study meaning is understood, on the one hand, as communicative information content entity,[7] according to L.A. Chernyakhovskaya (2011), a leading Russian and now also American cognitive linguist and translation scientist, and on the other hand, according to T.A. Kazakova (2006), Professor of Translation Studies at St. Petersburg State University (Russia), it is seen as a specific, often highly individual semiotic complex of a person's associations that exists in his/her mind and obligatory needs to be revealed and transferred in the process of translation from the source language into the target one (Kazakova 2006: 133).

Since verbal communication is exchanging communicative information, not just word meanings and model sentences, translators should pay more attention to information structure of messages, as of their "mind grammar" invariant requiring a different verbal re-shaping in a Target language. Content entities of various ranks, as well as their information parameters, may be used as translation units of respective ranks. (Chernyakhovskaya 2011: 284).

[7] "… translation process cannot be restricted to rendering specific Source language features into a Target language. Extraction of multi-level message information structure from the Source text and its reproduction by means of the Target language is a very important part of translation process, the translator/interpreter playing the role of the Recipient and extracting EE_3 [Eidetic Entity] from the original text, and then playing the role of a new Sender, to transform them into EE_4 verbal simulations of the original Referents in the target language. This is why, besides concentrating on rendering the RMs [Referential Meaning] and grammatical meanings *per se*, translators/interpreters should pay more attention to reproducing in the Target language the information structure of the Source text contents, as its inter-lingual invariant, and, shaping it into the Target language, look for adequate means of explicit or implicit presentation of content entities information parameters". (Chernyakhovskaya 2011: 285)

Therefore, our *main problem statement* is that *a translator's thinking thesaurus may be seen as an individual combination of pivotal* (steady) *associative links and remote* (weak) *associative links*, or, using Chernyakhovskaya's terminology (2011), "*content entities of various ranks*" *that* exist in a person's mind (in terms of the neuro paradigm, brain) and *can be activated in the course of teaching translation by means of certain* so-called "push-" or *"trigger words"* such as, for example - if to rely on the student's *knowledge of translation theory* - "context", "style" (formal, informal, neutral), "background"[8] (linguo-specific, culture-specific, encyclopedic), etc. (Ubozhenko 2012: 162).

In this connection, the methodology suggested here is focused on the idea of the "indicator word", "assistant word", "marker word" which performs the role of an intensifying incentive meant to push a translator (or a student who is learning translation) to making an equivalent and most adequate linguistic decision. This word, after having been identified through the detailed reflexive semantic analysis of the original unit, serves as an activator of the whole scope of a person's knowledge and as a trigger of those weak associative links which remain unconscious until the new categorization procedure has been deliberately forced upon the student by a professional teacher.

The metalinguistic *algorithm involves such linguistic and cognitive tools* as

- word-by-word translating,
- polysemy solving (relying on the context),
- meaning explicating and argumentative explaining,
- revealing communicative intentions of the original,
- distinct utterance's target formulating, and
- following (often intuitively) the "norms" of idiomatic (natural) correlation of separate word meaning elements.

The role of *"triggers"* in the course of *cognitive discourse analysis* may also be played by purely *lexical key markers*, in other words, *core concepts* (words, phrases, sentences and other utterances of different syntactical ranks)[9] that can serve as pushing elements for *activating sub-concepts or periphery notions*.

Empirical Research Description

[8] The concept of "background information" may be defined as the amount of Cognitive information programmed by the text to be jolted in the Recipient's mind at the moment of interaction with the lingual information of the text, allowing the Recipient to interpret the text message (Chernyakhovskaya 2011: 287).

[9] Cognitive information about them constitutes *the world of Designata* and their logical interconnections. According to Chernyakhovskaya, Designata are interpreted as constructs of human mind created as a result of Cognition, with more or less similar qualities, from the point of view of their interpreters, and are rigidly labeled with names (Chernyakhovskaya 2011: 291).

The practical part of the research conducted consists of the three above mentioned illustrative cases. The first two of them will very briefly demonstrate (as it is not our intention to analyze it in detail in this paper) the importance of awareness of translation theory and the mechanism of context[10] domination while taking the adequate creative translation decision, illustrated by the example of translating a sentence from both a literary (fiction) text and a political context segment. The second one will dwell on translating a political discourse extract in detail, as it is stated in our title.

Example I.

SL: Sunlight penetrating her *nest of leaves* woke her.

TL: Она проснулась от солнечного света, проникающего сквозь её *убежище*.

Word by word back translation from Russian:

She was woken up by the sunlight penetrating her *shelter/refuge*.

- "her *nest of leaves*"

Step 1: explication of meaning and argumentative explanation.

According to the dictionary (www.multitran.ru), the noun *"nest" is polysemantic, so, it is necessary fist to* solve polysemy (relying on the context). *As idiomatic word correlation is an intuitively felt thing,* selecting variants - one after another - from the dictionary and *word-by-word translation* here immediately shows to a native speaker *the core suitable contextual semantic component* (which is, by the way, common to both languages, as the Russian word «убежище» has, besides other shadows of it, the same meaning of "a little cozy and safe place" as the English "shelter/refuge"):

- *nest* (noun) - a small cozy place.

Step 2: revealing communicative intentions of the original.

The communicative target of the problem unit in the original: to show the reader the fear and feeling of loneliness that struck the child lost in the night woods after the horrible earthquake, who finally, tired and hopeless, found some safe hole and made a kind of cozy nest of leaves, where for wild animals it was not so easy to catch her. The translator must *reveal the dominating emotional meaning component of the phrase* and transfer it in the target language.

Step 3: formulating adequate verbal translation decision (*now consciously observing the rules of idiomatic correlation* of all meaning elements of separate words)**.**

[10] On the significance of political context in detail, please, see Hutchings (2003).

The translator should verbalize the idea of “a small cozy place, where the lost kid could feel safe and was not so afraid to be grabbed by wild animals”.

Hence:

SL - her nest of leaves

TL - её убежище (her shelter/refuge)

The linguistic decision described above is proved as creative as the Russian equivalent «убежище» (refuge/shelter) to the English word “nest”, as it can not be found in any dictionary; that justifies the status of the decision as a *translation occasionalism*.

Example II.

SL: Governing responsibly — *as opposed to purely responsively* — involves setting priorities and making difficult choices.

TL: Руководить ответственно - *а не просто выполнять поставленные задачи* - значит уметь расставлять приоритеты и принимать сложные решения.

Word by word back translation from Russian:

To govern with responsibility means to be able to rank priorities and take hard decisions and *not just to perform the tasks set*.

Step 1: explication of meaning and argumentative explanation.

Following the steady associative link in the process of our conscious speculating, the major meaning component to be revealed is “to give an appropriate feed back, if asked to accomplish a task”.

Step 2: revealing communicative intentions of the original.

The word “purely” in the original bears the core emotional connotation of the whole problem phrase stressing that being in politics one should not act as a machine but think hard and analyze all the circumstances before actually acting.

Step 3: formulating adequate verbal translation decision**.**

The translator should verbalize the idea of “giving a smart conscious feed back as opposed / vs to the machine working” (which is a weak associate here, in the chain of purposeful meditations of a translator).

Hence:

SL - as opposed to purely responsively

TL - а не просто выполнять поставленные задачи

The linguistic decision described above is proved as creative as the Russian equivalent unit is far from being a pure word for word replacement by dictionary versions what justifies the status of the decision as a *translation occasionalism*.

Example III.

Here the cognitive scheme discourse analysis as the basis for making up an associative thesaurus is presented.

The below given analyzed discourse *quotation 1* is referred to *the concept of accountability and its cognitive structure.*

SL:

What Do We Mean by *Accountability,* Anyway?

During 1998, for example, questions about President Bill Clinton's campaign fundraising and personal behavior generated numerous calls to hold someone accountable. "Perjury," said U.S. Representative (and speaker designate) Bob Livingston when he announced his retirement from Congress, "is a crime for which the president may be held accountable, no matter the circumstances." Former senator Bob Dole criticized Attorney General Janet Reno's failure to appoint an independent counsel to investigate the fundraising practices of the 1996 Clinton-Gore campaign committee and hoped that "someone in Congress will hold the attorney general accountable." Allegations of Chinese espionage at U.S. nuclear laboratories caused Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott to remark that somebody "made some major mistakes, and somebody needs to be held accountable." Everyone wants people — other people — to be held accountable. Mark Moore of Harvard University and Margaret Gates, a consultant to nonprofit agencies, write of "the public's demand for *accountability*," of "an unquenchable thirst for *accountability* that cuts across the political spectrum."

…Those whom we want to hold accountable have a clear understanding of what *accountability* means: *Accountability* means punishment. This punishment can be a fine, a jail term, the loss of one's job — all of which are subject to the requirements of due process. But the punishment can also be the public humiliation of being grilled by a hostile legislator, of being sued by an aggressive lawyer, of being subpoenaed by an unctuous prosecutor, or of being defamed by an investigatory journalist — none of which requires much due process. When people screw up, there are a variety of ways to hold them accountable — to punish them. (Behn 2001: 73)

Table 1.

Final Table Based on Cognitive Mind-Mapping Scheming

Cognitive Mind-Mapping Scheme			
1. nuclear units	***2. associative units***	***3. steady associates***	***4. weak associates***
1. *Accountability*	*accountable*	*to hold someone accountable* *to be held accountable*	*punishment*
2. *Measures of Performance*	*the public's thirst for accountability*	*by suing*	*by convincing juries*
3. *Mechanisms of accountability*	*the accountability system*	*accountability holder* *accountability holdee*	*official and unofficial accountability holders*
4. *Hold someone [in government] accountable*	*punishment*	*jail term*	*the public humiliation*

The following discourse quotation 2 analyses *the sub-notion of mutual accountability, its cognitive scheme analysis and Russian translation version.*

SL:

Mutual accountability requires cooperation. A compact of mutual, *collective responsibility* is designed to foster that cooperation among the web of people and organizations in the accountability environment. The parties to such a compact would seek to establish the terms under which they — and, they hope, others in the accountability environment — would cooperate to enhance government performance, subject to some agreed-upon constraints to ensure the proper use of finances and the equitable treatment of people.

Indeed, without such a responsibility compact for performance, those seeking to improve performance may be unable to move beyond an obsession with the rules for finances and fairness. Who, however, will agree to cooperate? Who will sign on to a "compact" that guarantees nothing more than experimentation? Who will trade *individual accountability* for *mutual accountability*?

Who (besides a public manager) will trade his or her well-understood (and relatively limited) *individual accountability* (often defined by professional peers) for some vague sense of

mutual, collective responsibility that will be devised, refined, and revised sometime in the future by people with unknown or even incompatible values? Who has an incentive to cooperate? And even if people do sign on to such a responsibility compact, will they remain bound by this informal (and not very enforceable) agreement? Who has an incentive to continue to cooperate? (Behn 2001: 129).[11]

TL (Russian):

Коллективная подотчётность требует сотрудничества. Соглашение о взаимной *коллективной ответственности* нацелено на инициирование такого сотрудничества между взаимодействующим и взаимосвязанным сообществом людей и организаций, функционирующих в среде подотчётности. Стороны подобного соглашения будут стремиться закрепить условия, при которых они – и, как они предполагают, другие участники этой среды подотчётности – будут сотрудничать с целью улучшения деятельности правительства, при условии некоторых оговорённых ограничений, гарантирующих должное использование финансов и достойное отношение к людям.

Безусловно, при отсутствии подобного соглашения о *взаимной ответственности* в процессе их деятельности, те, кто стремятся повысить качество последней, могут оказаться не в состоянии продвинуться далее полного погружения в рамки разумного расходования финансовых средств и справедливого обращения с гражданами. Кто же, однако, согласится пойти на такое сотрудничество? Кто согласится подписаться под соглашением, которое не гарантирует ничего, кроме участия в неком эксперименте? Кто согласится променять *индивидуальную ответственность* на *взаимную подотчётность*?

Кто (помимо государственного управленца) согласится променять ему/ей хорошо понятную (и относительно ограниченную) *индивидуальную ответственность* (зачастую определяемую профессиональными экспертами) на некое размытое чувство *взаимной, коллективной ответственности*, понятие которого будет разработано, а когда-нибудь в будущем откорректировано и пересмотрено людьми, ценности которых неизвестны или вообще сомнительны? У кого есть стимул сотрудничать? И если даже кто-то в итоге подпишется под подобного рода соглашением о *взаимной ответственности*, будет ли этот человек по-прежнему оставаться связанным данными неформальными (и не особо реально выполнимыми) обязательствами? У кого есть стимул продолжать сотрудничать?

[11] Words marked in italics and underlined words in both quotations as well as in the translation indicate the units identified as nuclear, associative, and then steady and weak associate ones respectively by using our original cognitive mind-mapping methodology (see Table 1), which combines the linguistic grammar technique known as “core-shell” analysis with the analytical political science method of “conceptual stretching” - introduced by Sartory - aimed at concepts’ categorization and classification (see: Collier&Mahon 1993).

The Novelty of the Results Gained and Anticipated

1. In this connection, the analysis performed has shown that the steady associative links regarding the important but still elusive and even murky (as R. Behn (2001), for example, puts it) notion of accountability comprise such core fields of meaning as “holding people accountable”, “responsibility”, “the accountability system and its mechanisms”, “liability” and “answerability”, “responsiveness” (Morlino 2009), and some others.
2. Simultaneously the accountability concept covers such periphery notions (or sub-notions based on the weak associative links traced in the analyzed discourse) as “the accountability holder” (including regulators and legislatures, politicians, auditors, lawyers and, what is more interesting, scholars and journalists) and “the accountability holdee” represented, in its turn, by the President, government officials, government bureaucracies, an agency’s clients, managers, donors, taxpayers and a number of other players and stakeholders each of whom may be researched as a separate push-notion (theoretically considered as a steady associative link).
3. Of high research interest may be such associative derivatives of “accountability” as “the accountability environment” (in contrast with, at first sight, close, but actually different semantic field and reality notion of “the accountability system”) and a very resourceful and controversial weak associate of “punishment” (never mentioned in any dictionaries as a connotation part of the meaning of the word “accountability”) leading not only to the traditional things understood by it such as fines, jail terms and the loss of one’s job, but also to such an associative link as “the public humiliation” (for some “wrongdoing”) which may be extremely useful as a part of the whole thesaurus regarding the concept of accountability.
4. The cognitive discourse analysis of the sub-notion of mutual accountability is associated with government performance that has definitely to be improved, with the controversy of individual and collective values as well as with an informal responsibility compact and the necessary incentive to cooperate.
5. All cognitive elements of the concept under study identified and mentioned above were taken into account when the presented here version of the translation was being made by the author.
6. The creative model of teaching translation is introduced, suggesting an original way of the cognitive scheme discourse analysis and new didactic devices used in developing linguistic creativity through training translation. The author’s idea of a “translation creative occasionalism” is explained in the paper.

7. The research of language creativity has been carried out by performing a cognitive discourse analysis of an extract from a foreign language text abounding in modern political terminology and other non-equivalent vocabulary within the bounds of political contexts, comprehending and translating academic and scientific texts.
8. The experience of reflexive thinking is necessary while searching for the right associative "prompt", "push-stimulus", "trigger-words" leading to making the translator's creative choice (often intuitively) that finally results in choosing the most acceptable variant of translation and following certain definite conscious methodological steps (the algorithm).
9. All the analyzed notions and sub-notions need an adequate interpretation in Russian with its further implanting in the mental thesaurus of both the Russian ordinary speakers and professional political scientists.

Conclusion

Despite often expressed academic misgivings and prejudices regarding the possibility and scientific usefulness of the attempts to research and, what is more, teach creativity, it is apparently seen that to teach linguistic and translation creativity is methodologically justified and valuable.

I want to particularly stress that it can hardly be overestimated that all the prospects for researching creativity as a whole should necessarily lie in the field of multidisciplinary studies in the Humanities and social sciences, political science including.

Undoubtedly, the model of teaching creative translation must be based on mastering the skills of individual interpreting the reality around that means training the ability to think, to meditate logically, reflexively, consciously and purposefully in order to argumentatively and again consciously choose the variant of a final decision. If a translator has that kind of learning experience, the accumulated un(sub)conscious techniques, when they are demanded in some difficult extraordinary situation, will definitely emerge in the memory triggered by his/her intellectual efforts to produce the targeted professional decision, adequate in the given circumstances.

Prospects for Further Research

Following L.A. Chernyakhovskaya (2011), we assume the element of creativity in the process of translation has been fairly proved by the fact that "some information components

implicit in the original become explicit in a translation, and *vice versa,* as they are addressed to people of different cultures. Depending on the peculiarities of a Target language, a translation may suggest a different verbal presentation: what was originally verbalized via grammatical meanings, in a translation may find expression via RM (Referential Meaning), and *vice versa;* EEs (Eidetic Entity)[12] may change their verbal presentation from a group of sentences to a single word,[13] and *vice versa".*

Obviously, the creative variety of information verbal presentation needs special research which may result in a very different - cognitive, interpretative, creative - translation theory that would "shed more light on the translation/interpretation process, seriously assist in improving the quality of translation in general and become an important tool in understanding and mastering translation/interpretation process, as well as in qualified interpreters/translators training"(Chernyakhovskaya 2011: 298). In its turn, actualized translation versions will make a profound grounding for the construction of adequately conceptualized and operationalized academic terminology extremely necessary for any professional research, the political science field being no exception.

References

Behn, Robert B. (2001). *Rethinking Democratic Accountability.* - Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Chernyakhovskaya, L.A. (2011). The Structure of Text Contents. *Russian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 4, Nos. 3/4 (Summer/Fall 2011).

Collier, D. and Mahon, J.E. (1993). Conceptual "stretching" revisited: adapting categories in comparative analysis. *The American Political Science Review,* Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 845-855.

Democratic accountability and the use of force in international law. (2003). / Edited by Ch. Ku and H.K. Jacobson. - Cambridge University press.

[12] "One cannot penetrate the black box of human thinking, but one thing is evident: segments of non-lingual reality are projected into the human mind as their personalized, psychic-emotional simulations which undergo the process of so called "eidetic reduction" (eidetic - "pertaining to the faculty of projecting images"; … an Eidetic Entity (EE) is *a mental image that, being alienated from its prototype, reproduces the prototype in its features essential to its observer at the moment of communication* (Chernyakhovskaya 2011: 292).

[13] For example, "I am not at all a have been" may be translated into Russian as «Жив!» ("Alive!")

Diamond, L. and Morlino, L. (2004). The Quality of Democracy. An overview. *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 15, Number 4. October 2004, pp.20-31.

Goodin, R.E. (2004). *Democratic Accountability: The Third Sector and All*. - Paper presented to Seminar series on "Institutional Analysis of Law, Politics, and Society". Baldy Center for Law & Social Policy. - Social & Political Theory and Philosophy Programs. Research School of Social Sciences. Australian National University. Canberra, Australia. - 73 p.

Held, D. Democratic Accountability and Political Effectiveness from a Cosmopolitan Perspective. - 36 p.

Hutchings, V.L. (2003). *Public Opinion and Democratic Accountability.* - Princeton University Press.

Kazakova, T.A. (2006). *Hudozhestvennyi perevod: teorija i praktika. Uchebnik.* [Literary Translation: Theory and Practice. Textbook.] - SPb.: OOO "In#jazizdat". [St.Petersburg: "ForeignLang. Publishing House".]

Keohane, R.O. (2006). Accountability in World Politics. Journal compilation. Nordic Political Science Association. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, Vol. 29 – No. 2, 2006, 75p.

Keohane, R.O. (2002). *Global Governance and Democratic Accountability*. - Chapter prepared for a volume to be edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi from the Miliband Lectures, London School of Economics. - Duke University, Department of Political Science, Durham.

Komissarov, Vilen N. (2004). On Linguistic Basis of Creativity in Translation. - *La Traduzione. Saggi E Documenti. Quaderni di Libri e Riviste D'Italia.* N. 33.

Lyngbak Fogh Holst, June. (2010). *Creativity in translation: a study of various source and target texts*. *PhD thesis.* http://pure.au.dk/portal/files/11416/Creativity_in_Translation.pdf

Morlino, L. *Qualities of Democracy: How to Analyze Them*. (2009). - Istituto Italiano di Scienze Umane, Florence (Italy). - 43 p.

Savory, Th. H. (1968). *The Art of Translation.* - London: Jonathan Cape, Thirty Bedford Square.

Sharpf, F.W. (2003) Problem solving, Effectiveness, and Democratic Accountability in the EU. 37 p.

Schmitter, Ph.C. (2004). The Ambiguous Virtues of Accountability. *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 15, Number 4, October 2004, pp. 47-60. DOI: 10.1353/jod.2004.0073

Sousa, P.A.B. Central Bank Independence and Democratic Accountability. (2002). - Portugal. - 26 p.

Stasavage, D. Transparency, Democratic Accountability, and the Economic Consequences of Monetary Institutions. - pp.389-402.

Turner, M. (Ed.) (2014). *The Artful Mind: Cognitive Science and the Riddle of Human Creativity*. Oxford University Press.

Ubozhenko, I. V. (2012). The Theoretical Basis of a Linguo-Didactic Model of Developing Creativity in Translation: "Push-Word" Methodology, Prospects for the Neurolinguistic Approach. In: *Abstracts of 4th UK Cognitive Linguistics Conference* (London: King's College).

About the Author:

Irina V. Ubozhenko iubojenko@hse.ru

is an Associate Professor of the School for Foreign Languages at *National Research University Higher School of Economics* (HSE, Moscow, Russia), Chief Researcher of the Laboratory for Political Studies (HSE), Board Member and Head of Translation Staff Teaching Department of Union of Translators of Russia, the field of her research interests: translation theory and practice, teaching creativity in translation, political science and interdisciplinary research, cognitive and neuro sciences, creativity and mind, discourse analysis, innovations in higher education

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

© Ubozhenko, 2016