IDENTIFICATION OF MORPHOLOGICAL, LEXICAL, AND SYNTACTICAL OBFUSCATING ELEMENTS IN PSEUDO-RETRANSLATIONS*
SÖZDE YENİDEN ÇEVİRİLERDEKİ KAYNAĞI GİZLEYEN BİÇİMSEL, SÖZCÜKSEL VE SÖZDİZİMSEL UNSURLARIN BELİRLENMESİ

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Mehmet YILDIZ**
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi / The University of Texas at Austin
mehmetyildiz@comu.edu.tr

Abstract
Scholars opt for several ways to avail themselves of previous studies produced in a foreign language as they author in their native tongues. Among these ways is translation rendered either by authors themselves or commissioned translators. The author of this paper, a sequel to Yildiz (in press), observed another strategy adopted by Turkish scholars, i.e. pseudo-retranslation as an act and product, which can be defined as an academic author's partial or complete presentation of another author's translation as a retranslation of (a portion of) the original work. Although this definition is similar to plagiarized translation (Turell, 2004; Şahin, Duman, Gürses, Kaleş, and Woolls, 2019; Şahin, Duman, and Gürses, 2015), translational plagiarism (Gürses, 2011), translation

---

* This paper was derived from the author's post-doctoral project "Patient Zero: Pseudo-retranslation in Academic Papers" in the Center for Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Texas at Austin.
** ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0001-9482-4358

plagiarism (Taş, 2019; Parlak, 2008; Leighton, 1994), the author refrained from defaulting to one of these terms and thus coined a novel term, pseudo-retranslation, because the author did not wish to discuss the unethicality/ethicality of this act and present it as a misconduct but as a strategy of academic textual production by avoiding the confused and confusing terminological profusion. For the purpose of the study, he employed a software program, WCopyFind, to identify intertextual similarities and to harvest qualitative and quantitative data. By doing so, the present study is intended to analyze the pseudo-retranslations by Turkish academic authors to reveal morphological, lexical, and syntactical elements obfuscating the tie between their pseudo-retranslations (in Turkish) and the source translation (in Turkish). The corpus consists of one non-academic and 15 academic works, i.e. seven articles, five master's theses, two dissertations, and one book. Only the works containing "Drmrod" and "Dromrod", misspellings of (Jeanne Ellis) Ormrod, and incorporating her six-item list of metacognitive skills in Turkish were included in the study. These two common misreferences are operationalized as initial indicators of pseudo-retranslations. The results revealed that Kalafat (2004) was the first to translate Ormrod's six-item list into Turkish and to introduce the misspelt "Drmrod" and the other 15 (re)translations(!) were its pseudo-retranslations. The results also showed that the authors had recourse to partial or complete pseudo-retranslations, the 14 pseudo-retranslations incorporated textual properties obfuscating the source translation, and WCopyFind was not competent enough to detect Turkish intertextual similarities owing to the obfuscating properties in the pseudo-retranslations.

Keywords: Obfuscation, pseudo-retranslation, academic works, intertranslational similarity, misreferencing.

Öz

Bilim insanları, anadillerinde metin oluştururken yabancı bir dilde üretilen önceki çalışmalardan faydalanmak için çeşitli yollara başvururlar. Bu yollardan biri yazarın kendi yaptığı veya bir çevirmene yaptırdığı çevirilerdir. Yıldız'ın (baskıda) devamı niteliğindeki bu çalışmanın yazarı, Türk bilim insanları tarafından başvurulan başka bir strateji gözlemlemiştir. Yazar bu görüngüyü 'sözde yeniden çeviri' olarak adlandırmıştır. Bir eylem ve bu eylemin ürünü olarak sözde yeniden çeviri; bir akademik yazarın başka bir akademik yazarın çevirisini, kaynak metnin bir kısmının veya tamamının yeniden çevirisi gibi sunması olarak tanımlanabilir. Her ne kadar bu tanım çeviri intihaline (Turell, 2004; Şahin, Duman, Gürses, Kaleş, and Woolls, 2019; Şahin,

Duman, and Gürses, 2015; Gürses, 2011; Taş, 2019; Parlak, 2008; Leighton, 1994) benzese de yazar bu terimi kullanmak yerine yeni bir terim (sözde yeniden çeviri) üretmeyi tercih etmiştir. Çünkü yazarın amacı bu eylemin ahlaki boyutunu tartışmak ve söz konusu eylemi etik olmayan bir davranış olarak sunmak değil; çeviri intihalinin kavramsallaştırılması konusunda yaşanan karışıklıktan kaçınarak bu eylemi bir akademik metin üretme stratejisi olarak ele almaktır. Bu amaç çerçevesinde yazar, bütüncede bulunan metinler arasındaki benzerlikleri bulmak ve hem nitel hem de nicel veri toplamak için WCopyfind adlı yazılımı kullanmıştır. Bu yolla yazar, Türk akademik yazarların sözde yeniden çevirileri (Türkçe) ve kaynak çeviri (Türkçe) arasındaki bağı gizleyen/bulanıklaştıran biçimsel, sözcüksel ve sözdizimsel unsurları ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamıştır. Çalışmanın bütüncesi; yedi makale, beş yüksek lisans tezi, iki doktora tezi, bir kitap ve bir de akademik olmayan çalışma olmak üzere 16 eserden oluşmaktadır. Sadece (Jeanne Ellis) Ormrod'un hatalı yazımları olan "Drmrod" ve "Dromrod"u ve Ormrod'un altı üstbilişsel becerisini içeren çalışmalar (İngilizce kaynak metin, bir Türkçe kaynak çeviri ve 15 Türkçe sözde yeniden çeviri) bütünceye dahil edilmiştir. Bu iki yazım hatası, bütünce çözümlenirken sözde yeniden çevirilerin ilk göstergesi olarak işlevselleştirilmiştir. Sonuçlar; Kalafat'ın (2004) Ormrod'un altı maddelik üstbiliş listesini Türkçeye çeviren ve "Drmrod" yazım hatasını gerçekleştiren ilk yazar olduğunu ve diğer 15 (yeniden) çevirinin(!) Kalafat'ın (2004) sözde yeniden çevirileri olduğunu göstermiştir. Sonuçlar aynı zamanda; yazarların kısmen ya da tamamen sözde yeniden çevirilere başvurduklarını, 14 sözde yeniden çevirinin kaynak çeviriyi gizleyen metinsel özelliklere sahip olduğunu ve sözden yeniden çevirilerde bulunan gizleyici özelliklerden dolayı WCopyfind'ın Türkçe metinler arasındaki benzerlikleri bulgulandırmada yeterince yetkin olmadığını göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gizleme, sözde yeniden çeviri, akademik çalışmalar, çevirilerarası benzerlik, kaynak gösterme hatası.

133

Introduction

Scholars write to spread the results of their research across their respective academia and to become academically visible by contributing to the literatures of their fields. The dissemination of scientific knowledge – of any kind indeed – has become faster than ever before with the advent of internet and thanks to its use

as a sharing medium. This easily accessible environment has allowed publications to "migrate readily from one medium to another" (Modern Language Association of America, 2016) and led to the proliferation of high-quality but also questionable works (Beins, 2012). Undoubtedly, the mindset favoring 'publish or perish' has greatly contributed to the profusion of academic works and exacerbated the issue of low-quality textual productions.

In 2007, several Turkish scholars faced allegations of plagiarism[1] (Brumfiel, 2007) and one, on behalf of his colleagues, defended themselves against such allegations attempting to justify their intertextual "borrowing" by claiming "[f]or those of us whose mother tongue is not English, using beautiful sentences from other works on the same subject" "simply helps to better introduce the problem" (Yilmaz, 2007). They believe that unless they publish, they will "perish" "under pressure to publish [their] findings along with an introduction that reads well enough for the paper to be published and read, so that [their] research will be noticed and inspire further work (Yilmaz, 2007). The attempt of Yilmaz (2007) to justify his and his colleagues' recourse to other academic works' "sentences" epitomizes the pressure Turkish scholars may have to cope with and 'unorthodox' strategies they may resort to in order not to "perish" in the Turkish academic setting. This paper describes one of such unorthodox strategies that Turkish scholars adopt to produce academic papers, i.e. pseudo-retranslation, which can be defined as 'an academic author's partial or complete presentation of another author's translation as a retranslation of (a portion of) the original work' (Yildiz, in press). For convenience of the reader, the author operationalized 'to pseudo-retranslate (from)' as a verb to refer to the act and 'pseudo-retranslation' as a noun to refer to both the act and product. This novel translational phenomenon was conceptualized with specific foci on its differences from its two

---

[1] The present paper does not intend to accuse any academic work of plagiarism or unethical misconduct of any kind.

morphological   constituents,   i.e.   retranslation   and pseudotranslation, and from translational plagiarism.

1. Pseudo-Retranslation vs. Retranslation

Translation is roughly an inter- or intra-linguistic textual production based on a source text and, particularly for the ones who have no command of the source language, the produced target text assumes the duties, e.g. informative and aesthetic, that the source text should be fulfilling. Yet translations do not necessarily remain fully or partially functional; therefore, source texts may have to be translated again over time in view of "shifting needs and changing perceptions" (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2003: 23). This practice is called 'retranslation'.

Gambier (1994: 413) refers to retranslation as the new partial or complete translation of a translated text into the same language[2,3]. It is defined by Koskinen and Paloposki (2010: 294) as "second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language". The term refers to either "the act of retranslating" (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2011: 233) by a different or the same translator (Feng, 2014: 70) or "the retranslated text itself" (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2011: 233; Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010: 294). According to (Lowe, 2014: 415), a couple of reasons underline the need for retranslations. The first one is a publisher's belief that "available translations are not well done and that there is a market for a better version of the text". The second is related to the lifespan of translations. Because "'half-life' of a translation is thirty years, and that translations age more quickly than the original", "re-translation can be seen as a kind of historical revision, a modernization of the text to reflect changes in language and context". The last is the introduction of "a new edition of the source text", which "replaces earlier versions as the new standard reference" (Lowe, 2014: 416).

135

---

[2] La retraduction serait une nouvelle traduction, dans une même langue, d'un texte déjà traduit, en entier ou en partie.

[3] All the translations herein were rendered by the author unless stated otherwise.

The preceding discussions[4] about retranslation are intended for literary works as "[m]ost studies on retranslations" do (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010: 295), which supports the fact that "the phenomenon of retranslation is seldom discussed outside the book publishing and literary genres" (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010: 295). This scanty problematization can be justifiable since retranslation of non-literary works is an uncommon practice. (Jianzhong, 2003: 195) is of the view that retranslation of non-literary texts "should be strictly limited and not be encouraged" and even be "banned" except for the following three cases:

(a) "The language and terms used in the former version are out of date and need to be revised."

(b) "The former version has some major mistakes that would mislead the readers and need correcting."

(c) "The original has different versions and there are many differences in these versions" (Jianzhong, 2003).

As Jianzhong discusses, non-literary works should be retranslated if a new edition has been introduced because the former one is outdated, if the older version of the source text contains some critical mistakes and the new has been produced to remove these mistakes, and if the source text has been produced in many different versions with plenty of differences among them.

It is understandable from the foregoing remarks that retranslation is a new partial and complete translation of an already translated text into the same language by the same or a different translator and it denotes both the act and the product thereof. It is also evident that research on retranslation of non-literary works is as exiguous as non-literary retranslations themselves. To compare retranslation with pseudo-retranslation in consideration of these facts concerning the former, even though pseudo-retranslation is traceable back to a source text, it is not a product of an actual inter-linguistic transfer but of a partial or

136

---

[4] For more on retranslation of literary texts, see Tahir-Gürçağlar (2011) and Koskinen and Paloposki (2010).

complete use of another translator's interlinguistic rendition. Besides, pseudo-retranslations occur in non-literary texts, academic works in the present study, while retranslations are very rare in this genre.

Both retranslations and pseudo-retranslations cannot occur without a source text, yet there is a type of translation that can do so, namely pseudotranslations. The following part features their characteristics and provides a comparison between them and pseudo-retranslations.

2. Pseudo-Retranslation vs. Pseudotranslation

Translation presupposes a source text, from which it is derived. If a text is propounded as a translated one yet fails to prove that it is or is proven otherwise, then it can be regarded as a false translation, which is referred to as pseudotranslation. Accordingly, Toury (2012) proposes three assumptions pertaining to the existence of an actual translational rendition: (a) "there is another text, in another culture/language, which has both chronological and logical priority over it"; (b) "the process whereby the assumed translation came into being involved the transfer from the assumed source text of certain features that the two now share"; (c) "There are tangible relationships that tie [a translation] to its assumed original" (Toury, 2012: 29-30). All utterances which are presented or regarded [as translations] are assumed as translations (Toury, 1995: 32) until they fail to observe these three assumptions. In the event of such a failure, the text at hand assumedly regarded as a translation comes to be labelled as a 'pseudotranslation'. Rambelli (2011: 208-209) defines a pseudotranslation as "a target-oriented practice of imitative composition which results in texts that are perceived as translations but which are not, as they usually lack an actual source text". Pseudotranslations "resemble translations" (O'Sullivan, 2014: 123) and "may even mimic genuine translations" (Toury, 2012: 29) without being a product of "factual 'transfer operations' and translation relationships" (Toury, 1995: 40).

137

Pseudotranslations and pseudo-retranslations share similar characteristics. They both do not arise from an act of transferring from a source text, but pseudo-retranslations are derived from a source 'translation' and can be traced back to a source text written in another language. Additionally, they are both presented as actual translations and regarded as such if not shown they are not because one would hardly suspect their true nature until the "mystification" (Toury, 2012: 212) over them is uncovered, which is the primary concern of the present study. The upcoming title discusses the need for the problematization of such a concern and how pseudo-retranslation conceptually differs from translational plagiarism, which can be mistaken for a synonym of pseudo-retranslation.

3. Pseudo-Retranslation vs. Translational Plagiarism

Academic integrity forms the backbone of scholarly writings; therefore, any kind of academic text is expected to follow the ethical standards. Nonetheless, a plethora of unethical misconducts (Shepherd: Accessed. 05.11.2019; Jia: Accessed. 05.11.2019; NBCNEWS: Accessed. 05.11.2019; *Huckabee:* Accessed. 05.11.2019) can be listed. Among these academic wrongs is plagiarism, which can be committed intra- and inter-linguistically. Translation, majorly as an interlinguistic practice, can be manipulated by academics primarily to mystify the source, i.e. a piece of information, and thereby to bypass the efforts intended to detect plagiarism (Sousa-Silva, 2014: 76; Sousa-Silva, 2015: 305; Gipp, 2014: 35; Franco-Salvador, Rosso, and Montes-y-Gómez, 2016: 97; Alzahrani et al., 2012: 135). This act is called **cross-language plagiarism** (Ferrero, Besacier, Schwab, and Agnes, 2017; Ezzikouri, Erritali, and Oukessou, 2016; Danilova, 2013; Franco-Salvador, Rosso, and Montes-y-Gómez, 2016; Potthast, Barrón-Cedeño, Stein, and Rosso, 2011; Kent and Salim, 2010) or **translated plagiarism** (Pataki, 2012; Pataki and Marosi, 2013; Gipp, 2014).

138

These two types of plagiarism should not be mistaken for **translational plagiarism** (Gürses, 2011: 6), which refers to a misconduct, in which "a translation is published as an original work and the translator acts as the author" or "an old translation is published under a new translator name". Similar terms have been used in the related literature to attend to the same phenomenon, among which are **plagiarized translation** (Turell, 2004; Şahin, Duman, Gürses, Kaleş, and Woolls, 2019; Şahin, Duman, and Gürses, 2015), **translation plagiarism** (Taş, 2019; Parlak, 2008; Leighton, 1994), **plagiarism in translation** (Şahin, Duman, and Gürses, 2015; Turell, 2004), **plagiarism in retranslation** (Şahin, Duman, Gürses, Kaleş, and Woolls, 2019), and **fake retranslation** (Şahin, Duman, and Gürses, 2015).

Reminding the reader of the definition of pseudo-retranslation would prove fruitful to better exhibit its difference from translational plagiarism. Pseudo-retranslation is 'an academic author's partial or complete presentation of another author's translation as a retranslation of (a portion of) the original work', which is Ormrod's (1990) six-item list of metacognitive skills in her book *Human Learning: Principles, Theories, and Educational Applications* in this paper. As can be inferred from this definition, pseudo-retranslation is observable in non-literary works, academic papers in particular. On the other side, translation plagiarism has been discussed in the realm of literary translation. Secondly, unlike translational plagiarism the author's purpose hereby is not to present pseudo-retranslations as unethical practices and discuss its unethicality/ethicality but to investigate it as a strategy of text production. Lastly, the author wishes to refrain from the aforementioned terminological confusion/profusion.

139

The next part depicts the methodological procedures followed to evidence the occurrence of pseudo-retranslation in academic papers and what kind of obfuscating elements exists in these papers.

4. Method

4.1. Corpus

The primary objective of the present study is to reveal to what extent pseudo-retranslations differ from the first translation (here by [Kalafat. Accessed. 28.05.2019][5]) and what kind of obfuscating elements exist in them. To this end, the author analyzed one source translation, which is in Kalafat (2004), and 15 Turkish pseudo-retranslations of Ormrod's (1990) list of six metacognitive skills.

4.1.1. Source Text

The source text is an excerpt from *Human Learning: Principles, Theories, and Educational Applications* by Jeanne Ellis Ormrod (1990), the first edition. The original text (Ormrod, 1990: 292) in English is as follows:

> 1. Being aware of one's learning and memory capabilities, and of what learning tasks can realistically be accomplished
> 2. Knowing which learning strategies are effective and which are not
> 3. Planning an approach to a learning task that is likely to be successful
> 4. Using effective learning strategies
> 5. Monitoring one's present knowledge state; knowing when information has been successfully learned and when it has not.
> 6. Knowing effective strategies for retrieval of previously stored information

To establish a tertium comparationis – "a text-independent meaning (invariant) shared by both the SL and TL unit, by means of which the variation in equivalence between the two units can be established" (Munday, 2009: 231) –, only the Turkish pseudo-retranslations of these six items were included in the analyses; in other words, all the other pseudo-retranslations attributed to 'Drmrod' were excluded from the corpus. The following title presents how a corpus of one initial translation and 15 pseudo-retranslations was refined from 47 online entries.

---

[5] Hereinafter referred to as Kalafat (2004) for stylistic consistency.

4.1.2. Initial/Source Translation and Pseudo-Retranslations

The author of this paper came across this phenomenon, pseudo-retranslation, as he translated academic papers. In the course of a commissioned translation, he realized that 'Drmrod' was a recurring misspelling of 'Ormrod' – the last name of the author who wrote *Human Learning: Principles, Theories, and Educational Applications* in 1990 – and these occurrences made a pattern.

	Online Entries	Academic Works Only	Drmrod-Only Academic Works	Six-Item Segment in Turkish
Articles		19	12	7
Master's Theses	**47**	14	7	5
Dissertations		8	6	2
Books		2	2	1
TOTAL		**43**	**27**	**15**

Table 1. Refinement from online entries to a corpus

141

A search on Google yielded 47 academic and non-academic online entries in Turkish, which incorporated the misspelling 'Drmrod'[6] (Table 1) as the primary source or as available in secondary sources and her six-item list of metacognitive skills. The 47 works were later reduced to 43 academic works. A further refinement resulted in 27 works, which include 'Drmrod' as the primary source. Lastly a final refinement was conducted to achieve a corpus of 15 works, which solely contains the Turkish academic works purporting to have translated Ormrod's six-item list directly from the original book. The author also included one non-academic work, Kalafat (2004), as it was found to be the first work to include the Turkish translation of the source text segment, which is the list of six metacognitive skills. As a result, he ended up with 16 works in his corpus (Table 2).

---

[6] 'Dromrod' in three cases, two of which are available in the resultant corpus.

	Year	Authors	Genre	In-text Citation	Referencing
1	2004	Kalafat	Unreviewed Article	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. Human Learning. Macmillan P. Company. New York: 1990
2	2007	Özkan	Dissertation	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human Learning. New York: Macmillan.
3	2007	Kozan	MA Thesis	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human Learning. New York: Macmillan P. Company
4	2008	Özkan	Article	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human learning. New York: Macmillan
5	2010	Güven and Belet	Article	Dromrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human learning. New York: Macmillan Company
6	2011	Olğun	MA Thesis	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human Learning. New York: Macmillan P. Company
7	2012	Alkan and Erdem	Article	Dromrod	Drmrod, J.E. (1990). Human learning. New York: Macmillan
8	2013	Tuncer and Kaysi	Article	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human learning. Macmillan P. Company. New York
9	2013	Doğan	Article	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human learning. New York: Macmillan.
10	2013	Kaysi	MA Thesis	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human Learning. Macmillan P. Company. New York
11	2014	Şengül and Işık	Article	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human Learning. New York: Macmillan
12	2014	Kuyumcu-Vardar and Arsal	Article	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human learning. Macmillan P. Company. New York
13	2015	Algan	Dissertation	Drmrod	Not available
14	2015	Demirci	MA Thesis	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human Learning. Macmillan P. Company. New York
15	2017	Köksal and Atalay	Book	Drmrod	Unobtained
16	2018	Değirmenci	MA Thesis	Drmrod	Drmrod, J. E. (1990). Human learning. New York: Macmillan

Table 2. Initial translation and pseudo-retranslations in the corpus

The following six-item list of metacognitive skills in Turkish is the initial/source translation by Kalafat (2004). It is supposed in the study that the 15 pseudo-retranslations were derived from this source translation. It is evident from the except below that he is the first to introduce "Drmrod", a misspelling of Ormrod, (also see Table 2), "hanilerinin"[7], a misspelling of "hangilerinin", and "yükseköğrenim"[8], an extralinguistic element.

---

[7] Marked with (?); Turkish for "which ones"
[8] Marked with (?); Turkish for "higher education".

1- Kişinin kendi öğrenmesinin, belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir şekilde tamamlanacağının farkında olmasıdır.
2- Hangi öğrenme yönteminin etkili, hanilerinin[?] etkisiz olduğunu bilmesidir.
3- Bir öğrenme görevine başarılı olması muhtemel olan bir yaklaşım planlamasıdır.
4- Etkili öğrenme stratejilerini kullanmasıdır.
5- Kişinin o anki öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi, bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde öğrendiğini yükseköğrenim[?] ya da öğrenmediğini bilmesidir.
6- Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri çağırımı için etkili yöntemler bilmesidir. (Drmrod, 1990; s.292).

The next title compares this source translation with the 15 pseudo-retranslations to find out to what extent they differ from Kalafat (2004).

4.2. Limitations and assumptions

The present study is limited to the works which are retrievable online and which incorporate the misspellings 'Drmrod'. It assumes that Kalafat's translation, i.e. 'Kalafat (2004)', of the six metacognitive skills of Ormrod (1990) is the initial translation because (1) it is the earliest translation the author could collect and it is stated on https://psikoloji.gen.tr/bilissel-psikoloji/ustbilis-metacognition/[9] that it was published on May 30, 2004 at 00:37 am. Therefore, he operationalized Kalafat (2004) as the source translation. The study also assumes that the 15 pseudo-retranslations were derived from this source translation.

4.3. Analysis

The study was built on the textual similarities obtained by a software program, WCopyfind, to reveal the obfuscating elements in the pseudo-retranslations. The program "is an open source windows-based program that compares documents and reports similarities in their words and phrases" (Bloomfield: Accessed.

143

---

[9] Accessed: 28.05.2019

11.06.2019). One can harvest percentages of similarity and counts of overlapping words along with a side-by-side juxtaposition of the compared textual segments. The overlapping segments are highlighted in red by default.

The author operationalized the recurrent misspelling 'Drmrod' as the primary benchmark of intertextual relationships among the texts in the corpus. By utilizing the program, he was able to determine the counts and percentages of the overlapping words, which he operationalized as the first parameters to judge the extent of obfuscating. Thanks to these two parameters, he was able to order the 15 pseudo-retranslations in terms of the obfuscation criticality. Following this step, he compared the content of Kalafat (2004) firstly with those of one unobfuscated and the four least obfuscated pseudo-retranslations and then with those of the five most obfuscated ones. Thereby, he was able to produce major and minor categories of obfuscating elements.

5. Results

144

This title presents the results obtained with WCopyfind under two sub-titles, namely 'extent of obfuscation by word count and percentage' and 'extent of obfuscation by content'. The latter is further divided as 'unobfuscated and the least obfuscated pseudo-retranslations', and 'the most obfuscated pseudo-retranslations'.

5.1. Extent of Obfuscation by Word Count and Percentage

This title attempts to determine the extent of obfuscation in the 15 pseudo-retranslations in the corpus. In other words, it aims to reveal to what extent the pseudo-retranslations differ from the first translation available in Kalafat (2004).

	Academic Work	Count of Words Overlap with Kafalat (2004) by word count	Overlap with Kafalat (2004) by percentage
1.	Kalafat (2004)	62 words	100
2.	Kaysi (2013)	62 words	100
3.	Demirci (2015)	61 words	98
4.	Olğun (2011)	60 words	97
5.	Tuncer and Kaysi (2013)	56 words	90
6.	Şengül and Işık (2014)	41 words	66
7.	Köksal and Atalay (2017)	40 words	65
8.	Özsoy (2007)	40 words	65
9.	Özsoy (2008)	40 words	65
10.	Alkan and Erdem (2012)	40 words	65
11.	Doğan (2013)	39 words	63
12.	Kozan (2007)	36 words	58
13.	Algan (2015)	35 words	56
14.	Güven and Belet (2010)	27 words	44
15.	Kuyumcu-Vardar and Arsal (2014)	14 words	23
16.	Değirmenci (2018)	12 words	19

145

Table 3. Overlap of the pseudo-retranslations with the initial translation by word count and percentage

Table 3 provides the number and percentage of the words in the 15 pseudo-retranslations overlapping with the ones in the initial translation, which is available in Kalafat (2004). The first row reveals that the Turkish translation of Ormrod's six metacognitive skills in Kalafat (2004) consists of 62 words. It is obvious that Kaysi (2013) pseudo-retranslated from Kalafat (2004) because the number of the overlapping words is 62 words and the percentage thereof accounts for 100%. Besides, it can be understood from the table that Demirci (2015) and Olğun (2011) incorporate 61 and 60 words overlapping with Kalafat (2004), corresponding to similarity rates of 98% and 97%, respectively. It can be inferred from these figures that Kaysi (2013) contains no obfuscating elements, while Demirci (2015) and Olğun (2011) have one and two lexes, respectively, different from Kalafat

(2004). Another work involving a high rate of overlap (56 words, accounting for an overlap of 90%) is Tuncer and Kaysi (2013). Kaysi (2013) is a master's thesis and Tuncer of Tuncer and Kaysi (2013) is Kaysi's supervisor. Therefore, the similarity between Kalafat (2004) and Tuncer and Kaysi (2013) may not be an unexpected occurrence considering that Kaysi's (2013) similarity with the former accounts for 100%.

Two figures in the table are particularly prominent, i.e. an overlap of 14 words (23) and an overlap of 12 words (19%), which occur in Kuyumcu-Vardar and Arsal (2014) and Değirmenci (2018), respectively. These two can be anticipated to contain the most severe obfuscation. The figures concerning textual similarities between Kalafat (2004) and other nine remaining works are striking too since the lexical overlaps, ranging from 44 through 66, evidence that these pseudo-retranslations are likely to incorporate fewer obfuscating elements than Kuyumcu-Vardar and Arsal (2014) and Değirmenci (2018) do but higher than Demirci (2015), Olğun (2011), and Tuncer and Kaysi (2013). Moreover, they are particularly significant to exhibit how different pseudo-retranslation can get from the initial translation.

The data related to the intertextual similarities between the first translation and the pseudo-retranslation in view of word counts and percentages indicate that the number of obfuscating elements varied across the pseudo-retranslations in the corpus, which results in varying degrees of intertextual similarity. The numbers in this part may fall short of revealing the true nature of obfuscation in the pseudo-retranslations; hence, their contents should be further probed into to produce more valid data on the extent of obfuscation.

5.2. Extent of Obfuscation by Content

The preceding title presents the data on the extent of obfuscation in the pseudo-retranslations in view of word counts and percentages, yet these data should be triangulated because they offer partial insight into the nature and existence of obfuscating elements in pseudo-retranslations. Therefore, the contents of the pseudo-retranslations in the corpus should be

analyzed to obtain a thorough understanding of these blurring aspects. This part tackles the obfuscating elements in the pseudo-retranslations under two sub-titles: 'Unobfuscated and the least obfuscated pseudo-retranslations' and 'the most obfuscated pseudo-retranslations'. To save space in the tables, the author used codes the descriptions of which are available in Table 4.

Codes	Descriptions	Codes	Descriptions
1. UnCh	Unchanged	2. PhrSub	Phrasal Substitution
3. AltInf	Alternate Inflection	4. ClsOm	Clausal Omission
5. LexAd	Lexical Addition	6. ClsSub	Clausal Substitution
7. LexOm	Lexical Omission	8. SentOm	Sentential Omission
9. LexCor	Lexical Correction	10. SentSub	Sentential Substitution
11. LexSub	Lexical Substitution	12. SynReOr	Syntactical Reorganization
13. PhrAd	Phrasal Addition	14. ReWrd	Rewording
15. PhrOm	Phrasal Omission		

Table 4. Codes and their respective descriptions

5.2.1. Unobfuscated and the Least Obfuscated Pseudo-Retranslations

147

The reader can find the analyses of five pseudo-retranslations (Table 5). The data are presented in consideration of one unobfuscated/verbatim pseudo-retranslation and four least obfuscated pseudo-retranslations. As shown in the table, the counts of the overlapping words, which are highlighted in bold, range from 62 to 41.

	Kalafat (2004) (62 words)	Kaysi (2013) (62 words)	Demirci (2015) (61 words)	Olğun (2011) (60 words)	Tuncer and Kaysi (2013) (56 words)	Şengül and Işık (2014) (41 words)
Kalafat (2004)	1. Kişinin kendi öğrenmesinin belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir şekilde tamamlanacağının farkında olmasıdır	**Kişinin kendi öğrenmesinin belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir şekilde tamamlanacağının farkında olmasıdır**	**Kişinin kendi öğrenmesinin belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir şekilde tamamlanacağının farkında olmasıdır**	**Kişinin kendi öğrenmesinin belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir şekilde tamamlanacağının farkında olmasıdır**	**Kişinin kendi öğrenmesinin belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir şekilde tamamlanacağının farkında** olması	**Kendi öğrenme** sürecinin **belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin** tamamlanması gerektiğinin **farkında** olması
	Obfuscating Element	UnCh	UnCh	UnCh	AltInf	LexOm, PhrOm, LexAd, AltInf

2. Hangi öğrenme yönteminin etkili, hanilerinin(?) etkisiz olduğunu bilmesidir	**Hangi öğrenme yönteminin etkili hanilerinin(?) etkisiz olduğunu bilmesidir**	**Hangi öğrenme yönteminin etkili hanilerinin(?) etkisiz olduğunu bilmesidir**	**Hangi öğrenme yönteminin etkili** hangilerinin **etkisiz olduğunu** bilmesidir	**Hangi öğrenme yönt eminin etkili hanilerinin(?) etkisiz olduğunu** bilmesi	**Hangi öğrenme yönteminin etkili** hangileri nin **etkisiz olduğunu** bilmesi
Obfuscating Element	UnCh	UnCh	LexCor	AltInf	LexCor, AltInf
3. Bir öğrenme görevine başarılı olması muhtemel olan bir yaklaşım planlamasıdır	**Bir öğrenme görevine başarılı olması muhtemel olan bir yaklaşım planlamasıdır**	**Bir öğrenme görevine başarılı olması muhtemel olan bir yaklaşım planlamasıdır**	**Bir öğrenme görevine başarılı olması muhtemel olan bir yaklaşım planlamasıdır**	**Bir öğrenme görevine başarılı olması muhtemel olan bir yaklaşım** planlaması	Karşılaştığı **bir** görev için **başarılı** olacağ ını düşündüğü **bir yaklaşım** planlaması
Obfuscating Element	UnCh	UnCh	UnCh	AltInf	LexAd, LexOm, AltInf,
4. Etkili öğrenme stratejilerini kullanmasıdır	**Etkili öğrenme stratejilerini kullanmasıdır**	**Etkili öğrenme stratejilerini kullanmasıdır**	**Etkili öğrenme stratejilerini kullanmasıdır**	**Etkili öğrenme stratejilerini** kullanması	**Öğrenme stratejilerini etkili** biçimde kullanması
Obfuscating Element	UnCh	UnCh	UnCh	AltInf	SynReOr, AltInf
5. Kişinin o anki öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde öğrendiğini yükseköğreni m(?) ya da öğrenmediğini bilmesidir	**Kişinin o anki öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde öğrendiğini yükseköğreni m(?) ya da öğrenmediğini bilmesidir**	**Kişinin o anki öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde öğrendiğini ya da öğrenmediğini bilmesidir**	**Kişinin o anki öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde öğrendiğini ya da öğrenmediğini bilmesidir**	**Kişinin o anki öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde öğrendiğini yükseköğreni m(?) ya da öğrenmediğini** bilmesi	**O anki öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde** öğrenip **öğrenmediğini** bilmesi
Obfuscating Element	UnCh	LexOm	LexOm	AltInf	LexOm, ReWrd, AltInf
6. Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri çağırımı için etkili yöntemler bilmesidir	**Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri çağırımı için etkili yöntemler bilmesidir**	**Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri çağırımı için etkili yöntemler bilmesidir**	**Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri çağırımı için etkili yöntemler bilmesidir**	**Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri çağırımı için etkili yöntemler** bil mesi	**Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri** çağrılması için **etkili** yönt emleri **bilmesidir**
Obfuscating Element	UnCh	UnCh	UnCh	AltInf	AltInf

Table 5. Unobfuscated or the least obfuscated five pseudo-retranslations

It can be observed in the table that Kaysi (2013) has pseudo-retranslated Ormrod's six metacognitive skills in Kalafat (2004) verbatim, while there are some minor differences between Kalafat (2004) and the other four pseudo-retranslations. The table also shows that five types of obfuscating elements are available in the analyzed pseudo-retranslations, i.e. alternate **INFLECTION** (12 times), lexical and phrasal **OMISSION** (six times), lexical **ADDITION** (two times), lexical **CORRECTION** (two times), and **SUBSTITUTION** (e.g. rewording and syntactical reorganization) (two times). The reader can see that alternate **inflection** was employed 12 times[10], e.g. 'olması**dır**' of Kalafat (2004) into 'olması' of Tuncer and Kaysi (2013) in String 1 and 'bilmesi' in String 5 instead of 'bilmesi**dir**'. **Lexical omission** as the second most common operation in Table 5 occurs five times as with the omission of 'yükseköğrenim'[11] in String 5, which is an extratextual word and its removal potentially makes the segment more understandable. It is obvious that two of five academic works have failed to detect this non-coherent lexis. The other obfuscating element in Table 5 is **phrasal omission** in String 1 of Şengül and Işık (2014), which misses the adverbial phrase 'gerçekçi bir şekilde' available in Kalafat (2004). The table evidences that each of **lexical addition** and **lexical correction** is observable twice. For example, the lexis 'kendi' is added to String 1 of Şengül and Işık (2014), while 'hanilerinin[12]' – misspelling of 'hangilerinin[13]' – is corrected to restore its actual spelling. Another form of obfuscation is substitution, which occurs in Table 5 as **rewording** and **syntactic reorganization**. In String 5 of Şengül and Işık (2014), 'öğrendiğini ya da' are reworded as 'öğrenip'. The reassignment of the adjective 'etkili'[14] describing 'öğrenme' in String 4 to form an adverbial clause (i.e. 'etkili biçimde'[15]) and

149

---

[10] Recurring obfuscating elements in each string were enumerated only once.
[11] Marked with (?); Turkish for "higher education".
[12] Marked with (?); Meaning "of their painted combers"
[13] Turkish for "which ones"
[14] Turkish for "effective"
[15] Turkish for "in an effective way"

describe the predicate 'kullanması' exemplifies syntactical reorganization.

It can be concluded from Table 5 that the most commonly observed obfuscating aspect is alternate inflection, which is followed by omission, addition, correction, and substitution. It is expected that the numbers of these elements increase and the types thereof get diverse as the counts of the overlapping words decrease. The following title sheds more light on this interrelation among these three parameters by analyzing the contents of the pseudo-retranslations.

5.2.2. The Most Obfuscated Pseudo-Retranslations

Table 6 shows that the counts of the words in the five pseudo-retranslations overlapping with those of Kalafat (2004) range from 12 to 36, corresponding to Değirmenci (2018) and Kozan (2007), respectively. The overlapping words are highlighted in bold. The obfuscating elements in Table 6 can be roughly grouped into four obfuscation categories: (a) **SUBSTITUTION**, (b) **OMISSION**, (c) alternate **INFLECTION**, and (d) **ADDITION**. These phenomena were observed 36, 33, 26, and 10 times, respectively.

150

	Kalafat (2004) (62 words)	Değirmenci (2018) (12 words)	Kuyumcu-Vardar and Arsal (2014) (14 words)	Güven and Belet (2010) (27 words)	Algan (2015) (35 words)	Kozan (2007) (36 words)
Kalafat (2004)	1. Kişinin kendi öğrenmesinin belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir şekilde tamamlanacağının farkında olmasıdır	**Kendi öğrenme** süreçlerinin **farkında** olması	**Kendi** öğrenme sürecinin **bell eğinin ve hangi** görevlerin tamamlanması gerektiğinin farkındadır	**Öğrenme** sürecinin **bell eğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir** biçimde **tamamlanacağının** farkındadır	**Kendi öğrenme** sürecinin anlama kapasitesinin ve **öğrenme görevlerinin** tamamlanması gerektiğinin farkında olma	**Kendi öğrenme** sürecini **belle ğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin** tamamlanması gerektiğinin **farkında** olma
	Obfuscating Element	LexOm, LexAd, AltInf, ClsOm,	LexOm, LexAd, AltInf, PhrOm	LexOm, LexAd, LexSub, AltInf, PhrOm, ReWrd	LexOm, AltInf, PhrSub, LexAd, PhrOm, ReWrd	LexOm, LexAd, PhrOm, PhrSub, AltInf

2. Hangi öğrenme yönteminin etkili, hanilerinin(?) etkisiz olduğunu bilmesidir	**Öğrenme** yöntemlerini kendine göre ayrıştırabilmesi	**Öğrenme** yöntemlerinden **etkili** olanlarını bilir	**Hangi öğrenme yönteminin etkili olduğunu** bilir	Kendisi için **hangi öğrenme** yöntemlerinin etkili veya **etkisiz olduğunu** bilme	**Hangi öğrenme** yöntemlerinin **etkili** hangilerinin **etkisiz olduğunu** bilme
Obfuscating Element	PhrSub, AltInf, LexOm, PhrAd, PhrOm, LexSub	ClSub, AltInf, LexOm	ClSub, AltInf	PhrAd, AltInf, LexOm, LexAd	AltInf, LexCor
3. Bir öğrenme görevine başarılı olması muhtemel olan bir yaklaşım planlamasıdır	Karşılaştığı görevlerde **başarılı** olacağı yaklaşımı seçebilmesi	Başarı için ger eken işlemleri planlar	**Öğrenme** sürecinde **baş arılı** olmaya yönelik **bir ya klaşım** planlar	Bir görevle karşılaştığında bu görevde nasıl **başarılı** olacağına yönelik **bir Yaklaşım** planlama	Karşılaştığı bir görev için başarılı olacağını düşündüğü **bir** plan hazırlama
Obfuscating Element	ClSub, AltInf, PhOm, LexOm, LexSub	PhOm, ClSub, AltInf,	LexOm, LexSub, PhSub, AltInf	ClSub, AltInf	ClSub, PhSub
4. Etkili öğrenme stratejilerini kullanmasıdır	Not Available	**Öğrenme stratejilerini etkili şekilde** kullanır	**Öğrenme stratejilerini etkili** bir biçimde kullanır	**Öğrenme stratejilerini etkili** bir biçimde kullanma	**Öğrenme stratejilerini etkili** biçimde kullanma
Obfuscating Element	SentOm	SynReOr, PhrSub, AltInf	SynReOr, PhrSub, AltInf	SynReOr, PhrSub, AltInf	SynReOr, PhrSub, AltInf
5. Kişinin o anki öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde öğrendiğini yükseköğrenim(?) ya da öğrenmediğini bilmesidir	Kendi **öğrenme durumunu izleyebilmesi**	**Öğrenme durumunu** izler	Gerçekleştirdiği **öğrenme durumunu** izleyebilir	**Kendi öğrenme durumunu** izle me **ve bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde** öğrenip öğrenmediğinin **farkında** olma	**O anki öğrenme durumunu** izle yebilme **bilgiyi başarılı bir şekilde** öğrenip **öğrenmediğini** bilme
Obfuscating Element	LexOm, SentOm	LexOm, PhrOm, AltInf, SentOm	LexOm, PhrOm, AltInf, SentOm	PhrOm, LexSub, AltInf, ReWrd, LexOm, PhrSub	LexOm, AltInf, ReWrd
6. Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri çağırımı için etkili yöntemler bilmesidir	Hafızasındaki eski bilgilerini **geri** çağırabilme becerilerine sahip **olması**	Ön bilgilerini yeni görevlerde etkin hale getirir	**Daha önce** edindiği bilgileri etkili biçimde kullanır	Önceden **depo lanmış** olan **bilginin geri** çağrılabilm esinde **etkili** olan yöntemleri bilme	**Daha önce depolanmış bilginin geri** çağrılması için etkili yöntemleri bilme
Obfuscating Element	PhrSub, AltInf, LexAd, PhrOm, LexSub	SentSub	ReWrd, AltInf, PhrOm, SynReOr, LexOm, LexSub	ReWrd, LexAd, AltInf	AltInf

51

Table 6. The most obfuscated five pseudo-retranslations

These figures indicate that the most frequently occurring mystification phenomenon is **substitution**, which refers to a source translation's – Kalafat (2004) herein – lexis, phrase, clause, or sentence's substituting or being substituted by another lexis, phrase, clause, or sentence in a pseudo-retranslation. The analyses revealed 7 **lexical**, 11 **phrasal**, 6 **clausal**, and 1 **sentential** substitution, 6 **rewordings**, and 5 **syntactical reorganizations**. For instance, the lexis 'seçebilmesi' in Değirmenci (2018) substitutes for 'planlamasıdır' in String 3 of the source translation. Moreover, the adjectival phrase 'Öğrenme sürecinde başarılı olmaya yönelik' of Güven and Belet (2010) replaces another adjectival phrase 'öğrenme görevine başarılı olması muhtemel olan' in String 3. The sentence 'Ön bilgilerini yeni görevlerde etkin hale getirir' of Kuyumcu-Vardar and Arsal (2014) substitutes for String 6 of Kalafat (2004). Rewording and syntactical reorganizations can also be called as sub-categories of substitution because a lexical segment is reworded to replace another segment in the source translation, while the roles in a sentence of a pseudo-retranslation can reassigned to create a new sentence. To exemplify, the adjectival "daha önce depolanmış" in String 6 of Kalafat (2004) was rephrased as another adjectival 'daha önce edindiği" by Güven and Belet (2010), who relocated the adjective 'etkili' in String 4 of Kalafat (2004) and created an adverbial phrase 'etkili bir biçimde' to describe the predicate 'kullanır'.

Omission is the second most common phenomenon contributing to the mystification of the source translation of a pseudo-retranslation. The detected subcategories of this element are **lexical** omission, **phrasal** omission, **clausal** omission, and **sentential** omission, which occur in the table 16, 12, 1, and 4 times, respectively. The inflected lexis 'kişinin' in String 5 of Kalafat (2004) is omitted in the pseudo-retranslation of Algan (2015), while the entire String 4 of Kalafat (2004) is not available in Değirmenci (2018). There is only one case of clausal omission. The clause 'belleğinin ve hangi öğrenme görevlerinin gerçekçi bir şekilde tamamlanacağının' in String 1 does not exist in the pseudo-retranslation by Değirmenci (2018). As the second most

152

common omission type, phrasal omission occurs when Kuyumcu-Vardar and Arsal (2014) misses the adverbial phrase 'gerçekçi bir şekilde' of Kalafat (2004) in String 1.

Omission is followed by 26 alternate **inflections**, detected in Table 6. It can be the inflection of verbs or nouns as an alternate to their respective inflected versions in Kalafat (2004). For example, the noun 'görev' in String 3 of Kozan (2007) is the uninflected form of the inflected noun 'görevine', whereas Algan's (2015) conjugated verb 'bilme' in String 2 is a different inflection of 'bilmesidir' in the source translation. These morphological shifts are thought to have occurred because Turkish is an agglutinative language, which translates to the fact that suffixes added to the end of a words also add to a chunk of meaningful morphological segments. For instance, "etkili yöntemler bilmesidir" in String 6 of Kalafat (2004) and "etkili yöntemleri bilme" in the String 6 of Kozan (2007) can be translated as "IS HIS/HER knowing effective methods" and "knowing THE effective methods", respectively. In these two examples, the upper-case lexes refer to the lexical difference between the segments. "bilmesidir" in the former example corresponds to "is his/her knowing", while "bilme" in the latter to "knowing". Similarly, "yöntemler" in the first and "yöntemleri" in the second refer to "methods" and "the methods", respectively. As clear from the examples, the attached suffixes in the Turkish segments translate into separate lexes in English.

In Turkish, lexical and morphological units preceding or following a lexis in a given segment can necessitate a different inflection of that particular lexis. In String 1 of Kalafat (2004), "tamamlanacağının" occurs as "tamamlanması" in Kozan (2007) because "gerektiğinin" following the latter obligates its inflection as such. Thus, the addition "gerektiğinin" as an obfuscating element requires the introduction of another.

The authors were also realized to have introduced new segments in their pseudo-retranslations. In the pseudo-retranslations in Table 6, eight lexical and two phrasal **additions** were identified, which adds up to 10 additions. For instance, Değirmenci (2018) was found to have introduced 'süreçlerinin' in

153

String 1 of her pseudo-retranslation, which is unavailable in the source translation by Kalafat (2004). Besides, Algan (2015) adds the prepositional phrase 'kendisi için' in her String 2.

There is one last obfuscating factor in Table 6, which is **lexical correction**. This phenomenon occurs in Kozan (2007), where she replaces the misspelt 'hanilerinin' of String 2 of Kalafat (2004) with the correct spelling 'hangilerinin'.

The analysis under this title indicates that substitution, omission, alternate inflection, and additions are the most observed obfuscating procedures. Although these phenomena are observable in Table 5 as well, the textual segments they cover in Table 6 are much longer, ranging from words to sentences.

6. Conclusion

The present study is intended to analyze the pseudo-retranslations by Turkish academic authors to reveal morphological, lexical, and syntactical elements obfuscating the tie between their pseudo-retranslations (in Turkish) and the source translation (in Turkish). The study was relied on a misspelling "Drmrod", a misspelling of Ormrod. Ormrod wrote the first edition of her book *Human Learning: Principles, Theories, and Educational Applications* in 1990, where a list of six metacognitive skills exists. This list is the source text which the first translation in Kalafat (2004) was derived from and all the 15 pseudo-retranslations in the corpus can be traced back to. The common referencing errors "Drmrod" in these 14 texts and "Dromrod" in two made the author of this paper investigate the source of this error. He detected an unreviewed online article, Kalafat (2004). On understanding that the existence of this misspelling potentially ascertains the intertextual ties in the corpus, by working his way up from Kalafat (2004) to the most recent academic work incorporating this misreferencing, he attempted to reveal the textual similarities by a software program, WCopyfind. Based on the counts and percentages of the words in 15 pseudo-retranslations overlapping with the ones in the source translation in Kalafat (2004) and by comparatively analyzing the content of Kalafat (2004) and that of each pseudo-retranslation, the author

discovered that the pseudo-retranslators were likely to opt for verbatim pseudo-retranslation or modify the source translation to varying degrees.

As far as the purpose of the present study concerns, the least obfuscated pseudo-retranslations were found to incorporate alternate inflection, omission, addition, correction, and substitution – from the most to the least common – as the obfuscating operations. On the other hand, the most critically obfuscating operations were discovered to be substitution, omission, alternate inflection, and addition – from the most to the least frequently employed. Another notable result is that the least obfuscated pseudo-retranslations involve modifications particularly at morphological or lexical level, while the most obfuscated pseudo-retranslations were realized to contain lexical to syntactical modifications.

References

Algan, Ela (2015). *Yükseköğretim öğrencilerinin değerlendirme tercihlerine ilişkin yapısal modellerin incelenmesi: Türkiye ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri örneği*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

Alkan, Fatma - Erdem, Emine (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının bilişötesi farkındalıklarına ilişkin bir çalışma, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, V.25, pp. 55-76.

Alzahrani, Salha M.- Salim, Naomie - Abraham, Ajith (2012): Understanding Plagiarism Linguistic Patterns, Textual Features, and Detection Methods. *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern*. V.42 I.2, pp. 133–149.

Beins, Bernard C. (2012). *APA style simplified: Writing in psychology, education, nursing, and sociology*. Wiley-Blackwell.

155

Bloomfield, Lou. (Accessed: 11.06.2019), "WCopyfind", https://plagiarism.bloomfieldmedia.com/software/wcopyfind/.

Brumfiel, Geoff (2007). Turkish physicists face accusations of plagiarism. *Nature*, V.449, p. 8.

Danilova, Vera (2013). Cross-Language Plagiarism Detection Methods. *Proceedings of the Student Research Workshop Associated with RANLP 2013*, Hissar: Bulgaria, pp. 51–57,

Değirmenci, Tuğçe (2018). *İlköğretim 4. sınıf Türkçe, matematik, fen bilimleri, sosyal bilgiler öğretim programlarının üstbilişsel açıdan incelenmesi*. Unpublished master's thesis, İstanbul: İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi.

Demirci, Niymet (2015). *Fen bilimleri dersinde üst bilişsel araştırmaya dayalı öğrenmenin dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin bilimsel süreç becerilerine, akademik başarılarına ve üst bilişsel süreçlerine etkisi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Aydın: Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi.

Doğan, Ali (2013). Üstbiliş ve üstbilişe dayalı öğretim. *Middle Eastern & African Journal of Educational Research*, I.3, pp. 6-20.

Ezzikouri Hanane - Oukessou Mohamed - Erritali Mohammed - Madani Youness (2019). Fuzzy Cross Language Plagiarism Detection Approach Based on Semantic Similarity and Hadoop MapReduce. *Recent Advances in Intuitionistic Fuzzy Logic Systems* (Eds. Said Melliani - Oscar Castillo), Switzerland: Springer, pp. 181–190

Feng, Lei (2014). Retranslation hypotheses revisited: A case study of two English translations of Sanguo Yanyi - the first Chinese novel. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, V.43, pp. 69-86.

Ferrero, Jérémy - Besacier, Laurent - Schwab, Didier - Agnes, Frédéric (2017). Deep Investigation of Cross-Language Plagiarism Detection Methods. *Proceedings of the Tenth*

156

Workshop on Building and Using Comparable Corpora, Vancouver: Canada, pp. 6-15.

Franco-Salvador, Marc - Rosso, Paolo - Montes-y-Gómez, Manuel (2016). A systematic study of knowledge graph analysis for cross-language plagiarism detection. *Information Processing and Management: An International Journal*, V.52 I.4, pp. 550-570.

Gambier, Yves (1994). La retraduction, retour et détour. *Meta*, V.39 I.3, pp. 413-417.

Gipp, Bela (2014). *Citation-based plagiarism detection: Detecting disguised and cross-language plagiarism using citation pattern analysis*. Wiesbaden: Springer Vieweg

Gürses, Sabri (2011). Translational Plagiarism: National History Global Prospects. *Çeviribilim*, I.4, pp. 6- 7.

Güven, Meral - Belet, Şerife Dilek (2010). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının epistemolojik inançları ve bilişbilgilerine ilişkin görüşleri, *İlköğretim Online*, V.9 I.1, pp. 361-378.

Huckabee, Charles (Accessed: 05.11.2019). "Professor Who Was Fired for Plagiarism Sues Columbia U.", https://www.chronicle.com/article/Professor-Who-Was-Fired-for/41784

Jia, Chen (Accessed: 05.11.2019). "Professor sacked for academic plagiarism", http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2010-03/22/content_9619680.htm.

Jianzhong, Xu (2003). Retranslation: Necessary or Unnecessary. *Babel*, V.49 I.3, pp. 193-202.

Kalafat, Sezai (Accessed: 28.05.2019). "Üstbiliş (Metacognition)", https://psikoloji.gen.tr/bilissel-psikoloji/ustbilis-metacognition/.

Kaysi, Feyzi (2013). *Bilgisayar becerisi ile üst biliş düşünme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Fırat ve İstanbul Üniversiteleri örneği*. Unpublished master's thesis, Elazığ: Fırat Üniversitesi.

157

Kent, Chow Kok - Salim, Naomie (2009). Web Based Cross Language Plagiarism Detection. *Journal of Computing*, V.1 I.1, pp. 39-43.

Köksal, Onur - Atalay, Bünyamin (2017). *Öğretim İlke ve Yöntemleri: Çağdaş Uygulamalarla Yöntem ve Teknikler*. Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi

Koskinen, Kaisa - Paloposki, Outi (2003). Retranslations in the Age of Digital Reproduction. *Cadernos*, I.1, pp. 19-38.

Koskinen, Kaisa - Paloposki, Outi (2010). Retranslation. *Handbook of Translation Studies I* (Eds. Yves Gambier - Luc van Doorslaer). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 294-298.

Kozan, Saliha (2007). *Yansıtıcı düşünme becerisinin kaynak tarama ve rapor yazma derslerindeki etkisi*, Unpublished master's thesis, Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi.

Kuyumcu-Vardar, Aslıhan - Arsal, Zeki (2014). Öz-düzenleme stratejileri öğretiminin öğrencilerin İngilizce başarılarına ve tutumlarına etkisi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, V.2 I.3, pp. 32-52.

Leighton, Lauren. G. (1994). Translation and Plagiarism: Puškin and D. M. Thomas. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, V.38 I.1, pp. 69-83.

Lowe, Elizabeth (2014). Revisiting Re-translation: Re-creation and Historical Re-vision. *A companion to translation studies 11* (Eds. Sandra Bermann - Catherine Porter). Wiley Blackwell. pp. 413–424.

Modern Language Association of America (2016). *MLA Handbook (Eighth edition)*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Munday, Jeremy (2009). *The Routledge companion to translation studies*. London: Routledge.

NBCNEWS (Accessed: 05.11.2019). "Noose-case professor fired; plagiarism alleged", http://www.nbcnews.com/id/25354571/ns/us_news-

158

education/t/noose-case-professor-fired-plagiarism-alleged/#.Xgi1XUcza44.

Olğun, Müge (2011). *İlköğretim 4. sınıf fen ve teknoloji dersinde öz ve akran değerlendirme uygulamalarının yer aldığı işbirlikli öğrenme yönteminin öğrencilerin başarı, tutum ve bilişüstü becerilere etkisi*. Unpublished master's thesis, İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.

Ormrod, Jeanne Ellis (1990). *Human learning: Principles, theories, and educational applications*. Columbus: Merrill.

O'Sullivan, Carol (2011). Pseudotranslation. *Handbook of Translation Studies II* (Eds. Yves Gambier - Luc van Doorslaer). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 123-125.

Özsoy, Gökhan (2007). *İlköğretim beşinci sınıfta üstbiliş stratejileri öğretiminin problem çözme başarısına etkisi*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.

Özsoy Gökhan (2008). Üstbiliş. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, V.6 I.4, pp. 713-740.

Parlak, Betül (2008). Çeviri intihalleri bağlamında İlahi Komedi. *The Proceedings of Çeviri Etiği Toplantıs: Çeviri ve Çevirmenliğin Etik Sorunları*. İstanbul. pp. 147 – 159.

Pataki, Máté (2012). A New Approach for Searching Translated Plagiarism. *Proceedings of the 5th International Plagiarism Conference*, Newcastle.

Pataki, Máté - Marosi, Attila Csaba (2013). Searching for Translated Plagiarism with the Help of Desktop Grids. *Journal of Grid Computing*, V.11 I.1, pp. 149-166.

Potthast, Martin - Barrón-Cedeño, Alberto - Stein, Benno - Rosso, Paolo (2011). Cross-language plagiarism detection. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, V.45 I.1, pp. 45-62.

Rambelli, Paolo (2011). Pseudotranslation. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (Eds. Mona Baker - Gabriela Saldanha). London: Routledge. pp. 208-211.

159

Şahin, Mehmet - Duman, Derya - Gürses, Sabri (2015). Big Business of Plagiarism under the Guise of (Re)Translation: The Case of Turkey. *Babel*, V.61 I.2, pp. 193-218.

Şahin, Mehmet - Duman, Derya - Gürses, Sabri - Kaleş, Damla - Woolls, David (2019). Toward an empirical methodology for identifying plagiarism in retranslation. *Perspectives on retranslation: Ideology, paratexts, methods* (Eds. Özlem Berk Albachten - Şebnem Tahir-Gürçağlar). New York/London: Routledge. pp. 166-191.

Şengül, Sare - Işık, Satı Ceylan (2014). 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin üst bilişsel becerilerinin "Webb'in Bilgi Derinliği Seviyeleri"ne ait problemleri çözme süreçlerindeki rolü. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, I.24, pp. 93-127.

Shepherd, Jessica (Accessed: 05.11.2019). "When plagiarism is academic", https://www.theguardian.com/education/2007/oct/30/highereducation.uk.

Sousa-Silva, Rui (2014). Detecting translingual plagiarism and the backlash against translation plagiarists. *Language and Law / Linguagem e Direito*, Vol. 1(1), pp. 70-94.

Sousa-Silva, Rui (2015). 'Reporter fired for plagiarism': a forensic linguistic analysis of news plagiarism. *Oslo Studies in Language*, V.7 I.1, pp. 301–322.

Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz (2011). Retranslation. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (Eds. Mona Baker - Gabriela Saldanha), London: Routledge. pp. 233-236.

Taş, Seda (2019). Çeviri İntihalini Açığa Çıkarmak: Türkçede Sultan II. Abdülhamid'in Hayatı Üzerine Bir Çalışma. *Turkish Studies*, V.14 I.1, pp. 695-712.

Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Toury, Gideon (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies - and beyond (Revised edition)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

160

Tuncer, Murat - Kaysi, Feyzi (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının üst biliş düşünme becerileri açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Turkish Journal of Education*, V.2 I.4, pp. 44-54.

Turell, Maria Teresa (2004). Textual kidnapping revisited: the case of plagiarism in literary translation. *The International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, V.11 I.1. pp. 1–26.

Yılmaz, İhsan (2007). Plagiarism? No, we're just borrowing better English. *Nature*, V.449, p. 658.

Yildiz, Mehmet (in press). In search of patient zero: pseudo-retranslation in Turkish academic works. Journal of Academic Ethics. doi: 10.1007/s10805-020-09371-4.