International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching
Volume 5, Issue 3, September 2017, p. 133-144

Received	Reviewed	Published	Doi Number
08.08.2017	12.09.2017	27.09.2017	10.18298/ijlet.2064

Revealing to Translate: The Intertextuality and Strategic Nature of Voices, Presuppositions and Metadiscourse in a Non-Literary Text [1]

Didem TUNA [2]

ABSTRACT

Reading a literary text might be considered to be mostly based on reading the implicit, the inferential, the implicative, and the inarticulate, rather than the explicit, the obvious, or the outspoken. Beyond what is apparent on the surface, the text of a literary work usually has equivoques, metaphors, symbols, enigmas, undertones, implications, inferential components, and different kinds of involvements and complications as well as intertextual aspects and the difference between appearance, perception, and reality. Translating a text requires, above all, comprehending it, and various applications of analysis are employed in this respect. Although a non-literary text is not usually expected to have as many pieces to put together or variables and constituents to bring to light as a literary one, it still needs to be read critically; the characters and the voices in it need to be identified and canvassed. In addition, the degree of responsibility that the writer assumes or avoids in each part of the text needs to be detected. Analysis becomes particularly significant when translation is in question because to be able to fully reflect the source text's particularities in the translated text, the translator needs to discover its singularity and specifications with its strategic and purposeful elements. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* by H. Douglas Brown is a textbook written for "prospective and new teachers who need to learn how to walk into a classroom and effectively accomplish communicative objectives" (Brown, 2000: xi-xii). Throughout the book's section entitled *Cheating* in the chapter concerning classroom management, the existence of the implicit in a non-literary texts is pinpointed using the concepts of presupposition and metadiscourse as discussed by Norman Fairclough within the framework of intertextuality. In addition, characters and voices in the text are examined. The instances of the occurrence of these elements of analysis are treated along with the text's coherence within itself in the presence of all those components. Furthermore, the importance of a translation-oriented analysis for the meaning of the target text is underscored with an emphasis on the prevention of unintended transformations of the meaning.

Key Words: Translation-oriented critical reading and analysis, Voice, Presupposition, Metadiscourse, Norman Fairclough

[1] Part of this study was presented under the title "Reading Presuppostions and Metadiscourse in a Non-Literary Text for Translation Purposes" at the XII. European Conference on Social and Behavioral Sciences in University of Catania, Sicily, Italy, during January 25-28, 2017.

[2] Asst. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Yeni Yüzyıl University, didem.tuna@yeniyuzyil.edu.tr

1. Introduction

This paper is based on a two-paragraph text taken from the book *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* by Brown. The book was first published in 1994, and the text analyzed in this study is taken from its second edition in 2000. According to the information provided in its preface, the target audience of the book is "prospective and new teachers who need to learn how to walk into a classroom and effectively accomplish communicative objectives" (Brown, 2000: xi-xii).

The book is divided into 23 chapters, one of which is *Classroom Management*. This chapter is divided into eight parts, including the one entitled *Teaching Under Adverse Circumstances*. This part is further divided into diverse subheadings, one of which is *Cheating*, the part that is used for analysis in this study. Through this part, the existence of the implicit in non-literary text is pinpointed using the concepts of presupposition and metadiscourse as discussed by Norman Fairclough within the framework of intertextuality. In addition, characters and voices in the text are also identified, as a part of the analysis.

One of the important steps to analyzing a text is to study the relationship between the text and the elements that surround it (Öztürk Kasar, 2009: 172). If we take the word "surround" to mean "encircling" and "enclosing" at the same time, the text analyzed in this study (*Cheating*) will be the innermost circle of a number of concentric circles. The part entitled *Teaching Under Adverse Circumstances* will cover *Cheating*, and it will be covered by the chapter entitled *Classroom Management*. Finally, the outermost circle will be the whole book (*Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*) itself (Brown, 2000).

From the way that these concentric circles are positioned, one may tend to infer that "cheating," as the innermost circle, is considered by the text to be an "adverse circumstance", with the potential to contaminate a teaching and learning environment. Thus, it must be worth being treated within the context of "classroom management," which is presented as one of the integral parts of the outermost circle, and the outermost circle is "teaching by principles," written for prospective and new teachers, who are determined as being the target audience in the preface.

In this study, characters and voices as well as presuppositions and metadiscourse in the text entitled *Cheating* are identified, and the instances of their occurrence are treated along with the text's coherence within itself in the presence of all these elements. In addition, the importance of a translation-oriented analysis for the meaning of the target text is underscored with an emphasis on the prevention of unintended transformations of the meaning.

2. Reading the Text: *Cheating*

> "Cheating is a special disciplinary matter that warrants careful treatment. For the sake of definition, we will say *cheating* is a surreptitious violation of standards of individualized responses to tests or other exercises. The first step to solving a perceived problem of cheating is to ascertain a student's own perception: Did he or she honestly believe they were doing something wrong? There is a good deal of cultural variation in defining what is or isn't cheating, and for some, what you may think is cheating is merely an intelligent utilization of resources close at hand. In other words, if the answer that is written on the test is correct, then the means used to come up with the correct answer are justified. Once you have adequately ascertained a student's perception, then follow the disciplinary suggestions as a guide to a solution.

> Minimizing opportunities to cheat—that is, prevention—may prove to be more fruitful than trying to tangle with the mixture of emotions that ensue from dealing with cheating after the fact. Why do students cheat? Usually because of pressure to 'excel.' So if you can lower that pressure (see Chapters 21 and 22), you may reduce the chance that someone will write notes on a fingernail or glance across the aisle. Remind students that you and the test are there to help them and to give them feedback, but if you don't see their 'real' selves, you won't be able to help them. If the classroom size permits, get students spread out as much as possible (this 'elbow room' also promotes some physical relaxation). Then, consider an 'A' and 'B' form of a test in which items are in a different order for every other person, thereby making it more difficult for someone to spot an answer" (Brown, 2000: 200).

3. Translating Voices, Presuppositions and Metadiscourse

"Ideally, speakers mean what they say and say what they mean,"[3] but neither spoken nor written communication may always function that simply. On the other hand, when translation is in question, the prerequisite for it is to understand the text, and to understand it fully, approaching it in a critical way may be helpful. Bartu (2002: 65-69) propounds a comprehensive list of possible questions that could be asked about any text, which may contribute toward a more effective reading of texts. Although this list has not been specifically developed for translation purposes, it may be useful to benefit from it to scrutinize the text to be translated for comprehension before transferring it to the target language. It might thus be favorable to approach the text to be translated from the perspective of the questions from the list, some of which are listed below and used in this study for analysis (Bartu, 2002: 66-69):

- Who is the text written by? For whom and why?
- What is the topic of the text?
- What is the writer's position with respect to the topic?
- Why is the text written this way and not in another way?
- What kind of verbs are used (active, passive, dynamic, state, modals)? Why?
- What adjectives or nouns collocate with the topic? What does this mean?
- What personal pronouns are used? Why?
- What mood is selected (statement, order, question)? Why?
- What do words mean in isolation and in this context?
- What identities/relationships are implied between writer–characters–reader?
- What characters are in the text and what are their roles?
- What ideas and beliefs are approved/disapproved of or merely presented? Why?
- What emotions are reflected? Why?
- How much responsibility does the writer assume when presenting ideas?
- How certain is the writer about the validity of these ideas?
- What will the effect of the text be on other readers? Why?

As mentioned, the list above is only a selection from Bartu's comprehensive list, and the chosen questions are thought to be relevant to the text analyzed in this study. According to the particularities of the texts to be analyzed, different combinations of questions may be used. In fact, Bartu especially underlines the fact that not all of the questions in the list would be relevant for all texts and the reader should decide which questions are worth answering in relation to a particular text (2002: 66).

[3] Kurland, D. *Dan Kurland's www.criticalreading.com. Reading and Writing Ideas As Well As Words*. http://www.criticalreading.com/inference_reading.htm [25.08.2017].

Accordingly, the use of relevant questions may allow the translator to see different kinds of the implicit in addition to missing pieces in the text affecting its coherence and integrity. In any case, "like the literary critic or the linguist, the professional translator will never read a text that has to be translated in a naïve or intuitive manner, but will aim for a critical, comprehensive translation-oriented analysis" (Nord, 2005: 12).

As a result of the analysis, some gaps in the text may also be detected, and these gaps may be originating from the way the text is put down on paper, in relation with the writer's reasoning or negligence or a strategy behind the text among other aspects. Deficient or incoherent-seeming parts may also be generated in relation with the target culture, when a sign or concept does not have a meaningful equivalent or correspondent in it or when its counterpart sounds peculiar or nonsensical in the target language. This might be the case, for instance, for "writing notes on a fingernail" to cheat in an examination, which would sound rather unusual in Turkish. In addition, as "glancing across the aisle" for the purpose of cheating presupposes desks for one person only, between each of which there is an aisle, this example would not sound very clear at first sight for those school environments in which two or more students conventionally share the same desk, as in such cases, cheating from the student sitting beside sounds more doable than trying to see the paper of somebody who sits farther away.

As the result of a detailed analysis in light of relevant questions, characters and voices in the text may be exposed, presuppositions may be disclosed, different forms of metadiscourse such as the use of hedgings and modalities as well as the choice of a particular vocabulary may be detected as a result of which the strategies behind the text may come to light. This may give the translator the opportunity to see the impact of these elements on the meaning as a whole and thereby take decisions about the target text accordingly without skipping its unuttered sides. Furthermore, comprehension is provided through analysis, as a result of which the translator may more safely avoid unintended meaning transformations. On the other hand, sometimes the translator may take a decision in the opposite way as well, choosing to transform the meaning on purpose where considered necessary in order to cope with these gaps, sometimes sounding as if disjointed or causing incoherence, and overcome its deficiencies, which are generated either from the source text itself or from the target culture or language. To give an example, some problems generating from the source text may be based on presuppositions. In such cases, it might be useful to question what information presupposed to be known to the source text receiver has to be verbalized for the target text receiver (Nord, 2005: 110). Depending upon the answer, the translator may decide to explicitly say something that is not openly pronounced in the source text, thus transforming the meaning in the form of additional information because of some concerns regarding the text's comprehensibility by the target readers.

4. Analysis

Inference may be defined as "any implicit proposition that can be extracted from an utterance and deduced from its literal content" (Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1998: 24). In the course of life, in order to communicate, people may often have to infer what is not said from what is said. This means that all kinds of implicit signs, including subtexts, connotations, and other constituents of discourse such as different kinds of individual, social, cultural, and intertextual elements, are hidden between the lines, and "the extraction of an implicit content requires of the decoder a surplus of interpretive work"

(Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1998: 5). When translation is in question, the decoder that will undertake this interpretive work is the translator. These elements to be decoded, sometimes overlapping with each other, may include presuppositions, voices, and tones in the discourse as well as the degrees of responsibility the speakers take in their discourses, sometimes in a calculated and purposeful manner as a part of a specific strategy and sometimes quite unconsciously.

In addition, in a communication between people who know each other well, as the amount of shared information between people is increased, the amount of information pronounced in their communication is reduced; the interchanges become concise, thus making it more difficult for outsiders to grasp what is said without literally or articulately saying. What specific cultural elements in the source text may or may not mean to the target culture can be considered to fall in this category. On the whole, all these elements and factors are to be treated for an overall analysis.

4.1. Characters and Voices in the Text

Characters in the text are the writer, readers, and students. Readers are prospective and new teachers according to the preface. In addition, although the word "teacher" is not mentioned in the text, a person interested in what cheating is, why students cheat, and how cheating can be prevented must be a teacher, as other people do not have students and, therefore, do not have to give tests, thereby not having to cope with "cheating," at least in the sense it is used in the text.

Students are the other characters in the text, and they are important because if they did not presupposedly cheat, this text would never have been written; in other words, they are the reason why this text exists. Accordingly, one can infer from the text that in the world, there are some people who are called "students," and these people "cheat" for some reasons; there are also some people who want to prevent them from cheating, and there is at least one person in the world wishing to help these people to prevent students from cheating by writing this text: the writer.

In the text, the writer seems to articulate different voices, and this situation is understandable because "people can sometimes take on more than one role at the same time and setting for various strategic purposes. The social role that is in the foreground at an instance of spoken or written discourse is called *voice*" (Bartu, 2002: 20). The writer has more than one role in the text for different strategic purposes, so his identity is not the same at every point. At the beginning, he speaks as a knower; he knows what cheating is and how it can be defined. Not only does he know what cheating is but he also shares what he knows with others. So, not only is he a knower but he is also an informer. He knows what he knows because he is a professor; therefore, he teaches too, and if he teaches, he is also a colleague. Due to this, readers can trust him and may be more willing to listen to him and agree with him. In giving suggestions, he is a facilitator; he knows that cheating is a problem, and he also knows how to solve it. He facilitates his colleagues' job by giving them advice, so he is an adviser and a philanthropist. He loves mankind and proves it with this text written to help others. He knows that cheating has to be prevented because if it is not, the result will be a mixture of emotions that are not easy to deal with. Here, he speaks as a psychologist who is trained in the study of the human mind and who knows the complexity of some strong feelings, although he does not explain what they are.

The writer answers different questions about cheating that can be asked with the six question words; he knows "what" cheating is and "what" may happen if it is not prevented; "who" cheats and "who"

has to prevent them; "when," "where," and "how" they cheat; "how" they can be prevented; and "why" they cheat and "why" they should be prevented. At this point, one of the things that might be questioned would be how the writer knows what he knows, especially how he knows why these people cheat. He may know about it based on his own experience or through reading. In other words, he may know about it as a specialist or researcher on education or as a teacher; he may also know about it as a result of his previous experiences as a student. The writer may have witnessed some cases of cheating, and he might be generalizing these experiences to create a general truth.

4.2. Presuppositions in the Text

Presuppositions can be defined as "all the information which, without being openly stated (i.e. without constituting, in principle, the real object of the message to be transmitted), is nevertheless automatically driven by the formulation of the utterance, in which it is intrinsically inscribed, whatever the specificity of the enunciative framework" (Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1998: 25). One important common specificity and common characteristic of presuppositions is that they are "taken by the producer of the text as already established or 'given'" (Fairclough, 2006: 120). To put it more clearly, a presupposition can be explained as "the name given to those facts, values, ideas, rules and positions which are taken for granted, that is to say accepted to be true, by the writer" (Bartu, 2002: 28). If we look at the text that we analyze for this study from that point of view, we come across a number of presuppositions in the sentences. However, coming across a presupposition is not sufficient to identify it because "since a presupposition is by definition a piece of information that is not verbalized, it cannot be 'spotted' in the text" (Nord, 2005: 107). To be able to understand a presupposition, a critical approach to the text is needed. In addition, the translator will have to "ascertain which culture or 'world' the text refers to" (Nord, 2005:107).

When we look at the beginning of the text for analysis, we see that the existence of cheating is presupposed through the use of the verb "be" by saying "cheating *is* a special disciplinary matter." Here, the use of "is" points out to the writer's 100 percent certainty of the existence and permanence of the concept. This presupposition is reinforced by the repetition of the verb "be" in the same way to define cheating as "cheating *is* a surreptitious violation […]" (Brown, 2000: 200). Another reinforcement of the presupposition about the existence of cheating is when "minimizing the opportunities to cheat" is mentioned. If the concept did not exist, then its minimization or prevention would not be talked about. Furthermore, cheating is openly referred to in the text as a "fact." A fact can be defined as "something that is known to have happened or to exist, especially something for which proof exists, or about which there is information"[4]; therefore, its existence is considered to be already established or given when the writer talks about "trying to tangle with the mixture of emotions that ensues from dealing with cheating after the fact."

In addition, by stating that students "usually" cheat because of pressure to excel, the writer seems to presuppose that they cheat for other reasons too because "usually" means "not always." Furthermore, by talking about the "pressure" to excel, he presupposes that students are under pressure. According to the writer, if we can lower that pressure, we may reduce the chance that someone will write notes on a fingernail or glance across the aisle. This single sentence presents several presuppositions in itself. Firstly, "if" is often used "to introduce possible or impossible situations or conditions and their

[4] Cambridge Dictionary. http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fact [20.08.2017].

results."[5] In the text, "if" is accompanied by "can," and "can" is used in this sentence to express possibility and ability. This combination of "if" with "can" makes the condition possible or likely rather than impossible or unlikely. Yet, possibility or likelihood points out to the achievability or attainableness of something but does not guarantee that it will happen. Therefore, by saying "if we can," the idea that "we may not necessarily be able to" is presupposed, as the words "if" and "can" both have a restrictive nature. Secondly, "if we can lower that pressure" presupposes that we can only decrease that pressure and that the pressure cannot be totally eliminated. If it were possible to eliminate the pressure according to the writer, the writer would probably express it that way. Thirdly, "we may reduce" equally means that "we may not reduce" as well because "may" is used to signify 50 percent certainty. Fourthly, the verb "reduce," like the verb "lower," presupposes that we can only lessen students' chances of cheating and that these chances cannot be totally annihilated. Fifthly, by talking about reducing the chance that someone will glance across the aisle, the writer seems to take no account of students sharing the same desk and sitting side by side. In such a case, students do not necessarily have to glance across the aisle; they may as well spot the answers from the paper of the student sitting beside. By reducing the opportunities to cheat from a peer to "glancing across the aisle," the writer seems to presuppose that all of the desks in classrooms are for one person only and that there are no students sharing the same desk. After that, the writer talks about minimizing the opportunities to cheat, once again presupposing that the issue cannot be totally eradicated. As a result, the wording is especially important here, as verbs like lower, reduce, and minimize all presuppose that possibilities to cheat will always exist, at least to some extent, and the best thing we can think of is restricting them as much as we can. Similarly, when the writer suggests considering an "A" and "B" form of a test to make it "more difficult" for someone to spot an answer, he presupposes once again that cheating can only be made "more difficult," as it can never be made impossible.

The writer defines cheating as a problem and presupposes that the readers will want to know how to solve it; he talks about the steps to solving it. According to the writer, the first thing to be done is to understand how students interpret cheating, and he states that for the problem to be solved, students must honestly believe that what they did is wrong. Here, the writer presupposes that cheating is wrong. He also seems to presuppose that his readers would agree with him on this matter. At this point, if believing "honestly" that cheating is wrong is a prerequisite to solving the problem, then it might be assumed that in some cases some people may also "dishonestly" believe that something that is done is wrong. Similarly, the writer talks about the importance of seeing students' "real" selves, which presupposes that students may also have some "unreal" selves. The writer, however, does not explain how we can understand whether what we see is real or unreal.

The main and biggest presupposition of the text seems to generate from a question asked in the text, which is also the reason why the text exists. This question is as follows: "Why do students cheat?" The question takes for granted the idea that students cheat and takes it as already given and established. "Within an intertextual account of presupposition, the case where the presupposed proposition does constitute something taken for granted by the text producer can be interpreted in terms of intertextual relations with previous texts of the text producer" (Fairclough, 2006: 121). In considering cheating as already established, the writer seems to rely on already produced texts, which also take cheating for granted in classroom situations.

[5] Cambridge Dictionary. http://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/linking-words-and-expression s/if [20.08.2017].

"It should be noted that presuppositions, […] may be manipulative as well as sincere. That is, the text producer may present a proposition as given for another or established by himself dishonestly, insincerely, and with manipulative intent" (Fairclough, 2006: 121). In addition, language in general, with or without presuppositions in it, may be manipulated for different reasons, such as "to flatter, to impress, to persuade, to obfuscate, and to distort the truth" (Cavender & Kahane, 2010: 165). Therefore, to be able to fully understand the text to be translated along with the purposes lying behind it, if any, it is important to read the text in a critical and inquisitorial way.

4.3. Metadiscourse

"Metadiscourse implies that the speaker is situated above or outside her own discourse, and is in a position to control and manipulate it" (Fairclough, 2006: 122). To do this, "writers and speakers can distance themselves from the whole or a portion of their text by acting as if it belongs to another text.[…] Writers and speakers achieve this distancing effect by means of *hedging, paraphrasing, reformulating* and *redefining*" (Bartu, 2002: 30). In this study, this distancing effect achieved by the writer will be treated through the examples of hedging used in the text.

"Hedging" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, as cited in Fairclough, 2006: 122) can be realized with expressions such as "sort of" and "kind of." The use of hedging influences the degrees of responsibility writers take in their discourse, as different uses of hedging reduce the degree of responsibility writers take. As the degree of responsibility taken reduces, the risk of being challenged and proved wrong also decreases. Another way to hedge is to use adverbs of degree, such as quite, just, and almost; adverbs of quantity, such as much, many, a lot, a little, and some; and adverbs of frequency, such as sometimes, often, usually, in general, etc. In the text we examine for this study, one of the ways hedging is achieved is through the use of a frequency adverb. The writer asks why students cheat, and he answers his own question by claiming that it is "usually" because of the pressure to excel. "Usually" is an adverb of frequency, and it means "under normal conditions; generally"[6]; its implied meaning is "not always." If students "usually" cheat because of that pressure, then it means that they "rarely" cheat for other reasons, although the writer does not say what these other reasons may be. By using "usually," the writer's responsibility for his discourse is reduced in case there is somebody out there claiming that students cheat for other reasons too.

In addition, the use of pronouns may also be a sign showing how much responsibility writers take for what they say. The choice of pronouns may also be a strategic one for some particular purposes. At the beginning of the text, the writer uses the pronoun "we" while defining what cheating is and says "For the sake of definition, we will say […]." This beginning might give us a clue: "we" here may be the writer and his readers who are teachers and, therefore, colleagues. If that is the case, by using "we," the writer seems to create a relationship of equals with his readers and shares his definition and the responsibility for the definition with them, thereby increasing the chance that his readers will agree with him. As the readers are included in the definition and may share the responsibility for its validity, they may have more of a tendency to agree with him; in this way, his credibility and the power of his discourse may be increased, and his responsibility may be reduced as it is shared.

[6] English Oxford Living Dictionaries. https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/usually [22.08.2017].

In the rest of the text, readers are directly addressed as "you" seven times ("what *you* may think is cheating […]"; "once *you* have adequately ascertained a student's perception"; "if *you* can lower that pressure, *you* may reduce the chance that […]"; "remind students that *you* and the test are there to help them"; "but if *you* don't see their 'real' selves, *you* won't be able to help them"). In addition, the imperative form is used three times to give readers advice ("*remind* students […]"; "*get* students spread", and "*consider* A and B form of a test"). In these examples, the writer does not include himself and distances himself from his readers by rather occupying a position of authority as being capable of giving advice. In these examples, he seems to take full responsibility for what he is saying. However, although the writer distances himself through the use of "you" (and by not using "we"), he somehow preserves a direct relationship with his reader by using a person-to-person contact rather than the passive voice, in which address and discourse are unpersonalized.

As another means of metadiscourse, hedging may be realized through the use of modality, with the use of modals such as "can," "may," "might," and "must," each providing different degrees of certainty on the condition that they are less than 100 percent and more than none. All kinds of hedging provide the writer with some room for maneuver in case they want to evade or sidestep, to avoid risks, and as a means of escaping from the consequences or the responsibility.

While explaining how to solve the problem, the writer also seems to be taking responsibility for what he is saying; we learn from the writer that the first step to solving the problem *is* to ascertain a student's own perception and that there *is* a good deal of cultural variation in defining it. Here, the verb "be" is used instead of modals like "can," "may," or "must," and there is a difference between using such modals and "be." The use of the verb "be" through "is," realizing "a categorical modality" (Fairclough, 2006: 159), points out to 100 percent certainty, whereas the mentioned modals refer to lower degrees of certainty, "less categorical and less determinate degrees of commitment" (Fairclough, 2006: 158) as in some examples from the text. For instance, from the text we learn that prevention "may" prove to be more fruitful than trying to tangle with a mixture of emotions. May is a modal verb that shows 50 percent certainty, and there is an equal chance that the opposite of what is being proposed may prove to be true. In addition, according to the text, students usually cheat because of pressure to excel, and if we "can" lower that pressure, we "may" reduce the chance that students cheat. We also understand that we may not always be able to lower that pressure, and even if we are, what we understand from the text is that we may not always be able to reduce this chance.

4.4. Coherence in the Text

"Texts postulate, and implicitly set up interpretative positions for, interpreting subjects, who are 'capable' of using assumptions from their prior experience to make connections across the intertextually diverse elements of a text, and to generate coherent interpretations" (Fairclough, 2006: 135), and consequently, "*coherence* is the name given to the totality of meaning arrived at after the text is interpreted" (Bartu, 2002: 33). As a result of a critical reading of a text, the implicit in the text, including subtexts, between the lines, metaphors, connotations, presuppositions, prejudices, and different kinds of strategic uses of language, may be seen. In addition, coherent or incoherent sides of the text as well as gaps, deficiencies, and loopholes in it may be detected.

In the text entitled "Cheating," the writer underscores that it is important to ascertain the student's perception to solve the perceived problem of cheating. The disciplinary suggestions he offers are

standard ones and do not vary according to these implied different perceptions, so it is not clear why he insists on the importance of perception when his suggestions are not linked with this. Furthermore, the text does not seem to touch upon the fact that students' perceptions about cheating may be influenced by others surrounding them. Under some circumstances, these other people may include teachers as well as peers, and sometimes teachers may be responsible for indirectly encouraging students to cheat: if a student who studies hard sees that those who do not can get the same or better grades by cheating, s/he may be discouraged by injustice of this kind and may, therefore, decide not to make any efforts. At this point, it might be thought that a teacher should prevent cheating not for the sake of prevention only but for the sake of being fair. In addition, the writer also talks about a mixture of emotions that ensues from dealing with cheating after the fact, but he does not explain what they are, whether it is the students or the teacher or both who are affected by them, and why prevention may be better than dealing with them. He does not give any examples to persuade the reader and suddenly changes the subject to ask why students cheat.

According to the writer, opportunities to cheat may be reduced by lowering the pressure to excel, and this can be done by reminding the students that the teacher and the test are there to help them and to give them feedback; however, he does not further explain how this cliché piece of information can lower the pressure and prevent students from cheating. In addition, the idea that students usually cheat because of pressure to excel can be challenged because it reduces the concept of cheating to almost one general reason. In addition, those who want to "excel" are usually ambitious students with good academic qualities. They usually come in the first few ranks and try to excel by studying. Therefore, one may tend to think that those who cheat may rather be under pressure to only "pass," and they may, therefore, try to cheat from those who want to "excel" in order to get the minimum passing grade. At this point, one may agree with the writer that cheating necessitates careful treatment and that there is a cultural variation in defining it. Culture, as discussed here, may not necessarily mean a whole nation or country. In some cases, it may be a much smaller community, a particular school environment, or a classroom situation, in which brilliant students may want to "help" weak ones pass in the name of fraternity or friendship, so what some people may think is cheating might be a matter of helping or being helped for others.

The writer claims that lowering the pressure may reduce the chance that someone will "write notes on a fingernail or glance across the aisle." Here, through the examples given, the concept of cheating seems to be simplified. Glancing across the aisle may be thought of as a cliché when cheating is in question, and writing notes on a fingernail does not sound like a commonly usable way of cheating. As a precaution, the writer suggests that students be spread out if the classroom size permits but does not say what may be done if it does not. He also claims that this elbow room provides some physical relaxation. Elbow room means enough space to move, and it is true that it may provide some physical relaxation. However, this term has a second meaning too, which is doing whatever you want to do without being interfered by others. At this point, if the classroom is a large one or if students are brought to a larger classroom for the exam, some of them may at some moments be out of the sight and attention of the teacher, and unless there are additional teachers to survey the exam. This may mean that students are given "elbow room" in its secondary meaning, which is that they can cheat, if they want to, without being interfered with.

As another precaution for prevention, the writer suggests considering an A and B form of a test, in which items are the same but in a different order. However, such a solution may work just for one single exam. After the exam, while discussing the exam questions, students will discover that the questions in the A and B sheets are, in fact, the same, and those who tend to cheat will be prepared for this for the other exams that will follow. It might be helpful to keep in mind that if teachers try to find solutions to what they may call problems, students may also have their own ways of finding solutions.

In fact, students' ways of cheating, their reasons for doing so, and teachers' solutions for prevention may be different in different communities, in different schools, and for different age groups. Therefore, ways of treating the issue in a primary school may be different from the ways of treating it in a high school or university, and it may not be helpful to overgeneralize the subject or reduce it by casually examining what is on the surface.

5. Conclusion

"Cheating," a two-paragraph part taken from the book *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* by Brown, was used in this study as an object of analysis to provide an example for the examination of a non-literary text. Although the text sounds like a simple one in terms of the subject it deals with and its choice of vocabulary, it has an implicit side in addition to what is obvious and explicit in it. In this study, these elements constituting the implicit side of the text were identified and evaluated, and the coherence of the text was also discussed with the help of a set of questions suggested by Bartu (2002: 66-69). Some of these questions, reckoned to be relevant for the text, were chosen to approach the text in order to create a multifaceted basis for analysis. As a result of a careful analysis of the text, different voices, presuppositions, and metadiscourse, all vocalized by the writer, were spotted as discussed by Norman Fairclough within the framework of intertextuality.

As a result of the analysis, the text, with its diverse elements, its voices, its presuppositions, and its use of metadiscourse, may be said to confirm a part of what is already known about cheating without adding something new to the issue. The reasons why students cheat and the ways to prevent them from doing so seem to have been sort of underestimated in the text. Just one reason why students may tend to cheat is listed. This reason does not seem to be relevant in most cases and does not seem to have an inclusionary nature as an example; therefore, it does not cover the subject as a whole. Next, ways of prevention do not seem to be considered in detail. A few conventional suggestions are mentioned, but they are not treated thoroughly. As a whole, the part reserved for cheating does not deliberate the issue in its complexity from a multidirectional perspective.

In conclusion, as a result of a translation-oriented critical reading and analysis under the guidance of relevant questions; voices, presuppositions, metadiscourse, and different kinds of strategic and purposeful uses of language, in short, many things that are not openly said but are present in the text, may be detected. This may provide the translator with the opportunity to transmit the text into the target language without skipping these implicit sides in its universe of meaning. In addition, such a reading and analysis may allow the translator to see how the choice of pronouns, active or passive voice, and wording may influence the overall meaning, as a result of which the translator may want to make an effort to avoid unintended transformations in meaning, or conversely, decide to sporadically transform the meaning on purpose in order to fill in its gaps and overcome its deficiencies, generating either from the source text itself or from the target culture or language.

References

Bartu, H. (2002). *A Critical Reading Course*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (2nd ed.). London: Longman.

Cambridge Dictionary. http://dictionary.cambridge.org

Cavender, N. & Kahane, H. (2010). *Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric. The Use of Reason in Everyday Life.* (11th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

English Oxford Living Dictionaries. https://en.oxforddictionaries.com

Fairclough, N. (2006). *Discourse and Social Change*. (12th ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1998). *L'Implicite*. (2nd ed.). Paris: Armand Colin.

Kurland, D. *Dan Kurland's www.criticalreading.com. Reading and Writing Ideas As Well As Words.* http://www.criticalreading.com/inference_reading.htm

Nord, C. (2005). *Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. (2nd ed.). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009). "Pour une Sémiotique de la Traduction". In C. Laplace, M. Lederer, D.Gile (Eds). *La Traduction et ses Métiers*. Caen: Lettres Modernes Minard.