

SIMULTANEOUS CONFERENCE INTERPRETING IN THE TURKISH PRINTED AND ELECTRONIC MEDIA 1988-2003

Ebru Diriker
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, İstanbul, Turkey

1. Introduction

As social entities, professions shape and are shaped by the discourse (i.e. language use) pertaining to that specific field. As in other professions, the identity, image and status of simultaneous conference interpreting (here referred to as SI) are intertwined with the way the profession and the professional are (re)presented in the discourse on SI. For many years, essentialist approaches to language have assumed a one-to-one correspondence between objects and their (re)presentations in language. They have viewed language as a mirror reflection of the world 'out there'. Today, most contemporary approaches to language which come under different names such as social constructivism, critical discourse analysis and sociolinguistics, share the view that language is a construct which is socially conditioned and never a mirror reflection. According to Critical Discourse Analysis (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; Fairclough 1989, 1992, 1995, van Dijk 1987, 1991, 1993; Wodak 1996), whose basic assumptions also guide this paper, 'discourse' is not to be seen as a neutral presentation of the 'real' object or situation but as a social construct (re)presenting the socio-cultural and individual expectations, demands and perspectives with regard to that object. According to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), analysing discourse is a worthwhile activity not because such an effort will help unfold the 'truths' and 'realities' regarding the object at hand but because it will hint at the socio-cultural factors which shape and are shaped by the discourse on the object. In line with the basic tenets of CDA, the focus in this article will be the discourse on SI in the Turkish printed and electronic media from September 1988 to March 2003. The study will attempt to explore when simultaneous interpreters and interpreting become visible in the Turkish media and which aspects of the profession(al) become highlighted by the members of the press and professional interpreters respectively.

2. Exploring the (re)presentation of SI in the Turkish media

The materials to be analysed in this article are taken from the press collection of the Turkish Conference Interpreters' Association and the personal archives of some of its members. A total of 48 news items which make direct references to

the profession(al) are included in this survey. Those 48 news items certainly do not cover everything that has been said and written in the Turkish media during the nearly 15-year period analysed here. For one thing, despite its meticulousness, archiving news coverage on SI has not been one of the priorities of the Association and, secondly, as the researcher, I have been unable to ask or access all of the personal archives of its individual members. Therefore, the materials analysed here will not be exhaustive but rather indicative of some of the general trends and attitudes. My analysis of the material at hand will largely focus around the following questions:

1. When do simultaneous conference interpreting and interpreters become visible in the Turkish media? That is to say, when does a discourse on SI occur?
2. Which aspects of the profession(al) are foregrounded by the members of the media?
3. Which aspects of the profession(al) are foregrounded by the professional interpreters?

2.1. When does a discourse on SI occur in the Turkish media?

First of all, it must be mentioned that most of the news on SI in the Turkish media is triggered by an event or development which the media consider as important. Regular references and articles on SI are only to be found in the sectoral periodical *Kongre* which targets conference and fair organizers, travel agencies, hotels, etc. Published since 1996 on a monthly basis, the editor-in-chief of the periodical happens to be a conference interpreter and trainer. *Kongre* provides information about recent and upcoming conferences, rates the quality of the organizations and while doing so also mentions the names of the interpreters who work at these organisations. Moreover, the periodical has a page called 'From the Eyes of an Interpreter' where a professional interpreter/trainer who is also an AIIC member writes about the particularities of working with and working as conference interpreters.

Most of the other and more sporadic references to SI in the Turkish media occur in direct or indirect relation to a discourse-generator. By and large, there seem to be five main generators of discourse on SI in the Turkish media. These are:

1. Big Events; where interpreters play a crucial role.
2. Big Money; which interpreters are assumed to earn.
3. Big Mistakes; which interpreters allegedly make.
4. Personal Fame; which some interpreters acquire either from simultaneous interpreting or from their parallel professions/engagements.
5. Big Career; which some news items present SI to be.

A significant share of the discourse on SI analysed here (34 out of 48 news items) – whether in the form of comments by members of the media or comments by the professional interpreters addressing the media – are *directly* or *indirectly* triggered by one or a combination of these five factors. Since one of the aims of this study is to explore the similarities and differences in the way SI is (re)presented by members of the media and by interpreters to the media, I will analyse the discourse of the two separately.

2.2. Which aspects of the profession(al) are foregrounded by the media?

Most references to SI by the media are *directly* triggered by one of the discourse-generators mentioned above. Scanning the news items from 1988 onwards clearly demonstrates that 'Big Events' have been the major prompters of media discourse on SI. 'Big Money' (supposedly) earned by interpreters generated quite a few items of discourse in the late 1980s and early 1990s though it seems to have lost its importance as a discourse-generator since the mid-1990's. To a lesser extent, the 'Big Mistakes' (supposedly) made by interpreters and the 'personal fame' of some interpreters from parallel activities have also turned the eyes of the media to SI. Let us now take a closer look at the discourse of the members of the media and explore which aspects of the profession(al) have become foregrounded in their discourse on SI.

2.2.1. Big Events –

Without doubt, the use of SI in big events such as intergovernmental summits, important visits, live coverage of international conflicts and wars has been the main discourse-generator on SI in the printed and electronic media (22 out of a total of 48 news items analysed here refer to SI within the context of a major event). Unfortunately, a significant share of these 'Big Events' which have turned the eyes of the media to SI since 1988 have been wars (9 out of 22 news items).

The live coverage of the Gulf War in 1991 was the first trigger of media attention to SI. Its impact in turning the eyes of the media to SI has been so significant that even the most recent articles continue to underscore the role of the Gulf War in introducing SI to the public opinion:

Let us recall the Gulf War period once again. One of the strongest TV channels of the US is broadcasting live from Baghdad. The broadcast is in English but we watch its direct Turkish version for days. And, as a nation, we get acquainted with new concepts and persons. Desert Fox, Peter Arnett and simultaneous interpreting are the first that come to my mind, for instance. (*Sabah; İş ve Finans Dergisi; 02.03.2003, all translations from Turkish mine*)

Similarly the live coverage of the attacks of September 11, the wars in Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and, most recently, the war in Iraq have turned the eyes of the media to the profession(al).¹ Even the media seem to have noticed the force of wars in channelling their attention to SI:

REMEMBERED WITH WAR ... It smells like war again. Ever since the attacks of September 11, foreign officials have been delivering statements and organising conferences. Simultaneous interpreters who convey all these correctly, immediately and in a comprehensible manner have re-entered our lives. (*Milliyet*; 30.09.2001)

Scanning the news items on SI, it becomes apparent that a majority of the references to SI by the media have either concentrated on the difference between professional and non-professional interpreting or on some 'scandalous' aspect with regard to the use or non-use of SI in big events. The difference between professional and non-professional SI has been a major focus of the media discourse on SI because of the rather poor quality of SI on TV channels during the first days of the Gulf War when the TV channels tried to use their in-house staff (reporters, announcers, translators, etc.) as interpreters. Considering the difficulty of interpreting CNN live, the results of these endeavours were quite traumatic and the initial public image of SI was quite negative. As professional simultaneous interpreters gradually took over the task by first offering their services free of charge, the difference in the quality of SI became apparent. Here is how one magazine reported the difference:

As televisions went for the live coverage of war with CNN, the viewers of TRT started suffering anguish and exasperation with announcers who could not catch up translating what was said, who remained silent without uttering a word for minutes, who were incapable of building decent sentences, who were incomprehensible and who interpreted

1 With the live coverage of the Gulf War and later NATO's intervention in Yugoslavia, some of the larger news channels started recruiting free-lance professionals to interpret the developments round the clock. Following the war in Yugoslavia, two news channels (CNNTurk and NTV) decided to employ simultaneous interpreters. Both use their interpreters regularly and recruit free-lancers for round-the-clock live coverage in times of crisis such as the 9/11 attacks or the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Other channels have also come to realise the importance of SI though this awareness does not always lead to the use of professionals. Interesting enough, the live coverage of wars with SI has become so popular that one channel which was established right before the 9/11 attacks pirated the voices of the interpreters working for other channels and went on the air by superimposing the voice of the interpreters (which were being broadcast by another TV channel) on to the live images from the CNN.

wrongly. With the establishment of a team of simultaneous interpreters, the viewers were relieved from suffering gastritis pains in front of the TV. (*Tempo*; 03-09.02 1991)

Clearly, the failure of the non-professionals to ensure loyalty ("interpreting wrongly"), synchronicity ("failing to catch up") and fluency ("long silences" and "lack of decent sentences") were unacceptable for this reporter. From a reverse perspective, professional interpreters had probably relieved the gastritis pains of the viewers by fulfilling the same criteria. Other members of the media also shared the same view:

This year our TV channels were caught unprepared. They probably could not arrange for 'professional' interpreters. Knowing English well and doing 'simultaneous interpreting' are two separate things. Defne Samyeli and Elif Ilgaz know English well. They tried to do their best to decipher CNN. TRT and NTV did what they should do by matching the voice of a professional who can interpret fluently with the scenes on the screen. (Sina Koloğlu; *Milliyet*; 18.12.1998)

Once again, 'loyalty to the original speech' ("deciphering CNN"), 'fluency' and 'synchronicity' ("matching the voice of a professional who could interpret fluently with the scenes on the screen") were highlighted as the defining features of professionalism and non-professionals were criticised for failing to fulfill these performance criteria.

Similarly, one columnist who observed the interpreters at work in a European Summit expressed his admiration for them for remaining loyal not only to the 'word' but also to the 'letter' of the original speech:

Imagine you are giving a speech at a conference where, by the time you utter your first syllable, your words are interpreted into eight languages all at the same time. Nice and virtuous ladies who smoke fags inside the booths interpret every sentence you say letter by letter into English, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Dutch and Greek. (Hadi Uluengin; *Milliyet*; date unspecified)

Members of the media also turned their attention to SI when they perceived a 'scandalous' aspect with regard to the (non-)use of SI in major events. For instance, a famous columnist in a recent article was highly critical of the use of consecutive interpretation with relay (Turkish to English to Italian and vice versa) during the press meeting of the new Prime Minister in Rome:

Whoever organised the press meeting demonstrated how much we deserve Europe (!). The viewers, listeners and allegedly 250 journalists, TV reporters and commentators must have ridiculed the situation saying

"These people say they want to be European but they are not even aware of the existence of simultaneous interpreting". (*Milliyet*; 15.12. 2002)

'Scandalous' news with regard to the non-use of professional SI in 'Big Events' also hit the headlines prior to Italian prosecutor Di Pietro's visit to Turkey and the organisation of the U.N. Habitat Conference in Istanbul:

NO INTERPRETER FOUND FOR DI PIETRO AND HIS WIFE...The fact that Di Pietro is a lawyer and speaks in a southern accent has rendered it impossible to find an interpreter for him. (*Milliyet*; 19.01.1995)

Nobody contacted the interpreters for the Habitat Conference. (*Yeni Yüzyıl*; 06.05.1996)

2.2.2. Big Money – 'Big Money' interpreters were thought to earn was quite a significant discourse-generator in the printed media during the late 1980s before the media turned their attention to other aspects of SI with the live coverage of wars. Between 1989 and 1991, three out of a total of seven news items on SI in the media were about the money interpreters earned. To cite two excerpts:

They interpret in three languages. They earn 250.000 a day. (*Milliyet*; 02.09.1989)

Having interpreters at a conference starts from 8.5 million TL. (*Hürriyet*; day and month unspecified, 1989)

Starting with the live coverage of the Gulf War, the power of 'Big Money' as a main discourse-generator weakened (only one news item out of a total of 41 between 1992-2003 specifically focused on the income of interpreters and two others referred to the income of interpreters as a side issue during interviews with interpreters). One reason behind the decline in the power and frequency of the 'Big Money' discourse could be the shift of attention to other aspects of the profession(al) after the Gulf War. Another reason could be the liberalization of the Turkish economy, which might have rendered the fees of interpreters insignificant compared to other sums of wealth created since the 1980s. Despite a general weakening of the 'Big Money' discourse, the media have never failed to turn the spotlight to the income of the interpreters if they drew 'scandalous' conclusions from the money interpreters earned, such as in the following news item where a conservative daily attacked parliamentarians of the government for wasting public money on SI:

WASTING MONEY ON INTERPRETING. Even though the Turkish Grand National assembly employs numerous interpreters, the Speaker

and various committee members have allegedly brought extra 'interpreting invoices' for their travels abroad. Hundreds of millions of lira is said to have been paid to the interpreters İrfan Köksalan – Member of Parliament from the Motherland Party – employed in his travels abroad. (*Zaman*; 12.12.1996)

2.2.3. Big Mistakes – 'Big Mistakes' interpreters (allegedly) made also shifted the attention of the media to SI (3 news items were specifically about 'Big Mistakes' and 3 others referred to the 'Big Mistakes' as a side issue during interviews with interpreters). In their focus on the 'Big Mistakes', members of the media uncontestedly based their judgements on the possibility of complete 'loyalty to the original word' and presented the news accordingly:

Germany's Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel has referred to the comments of Prime Minister Mesut Yılmaz that were misunderstood due to an interpretation error as "unacceptably tactless". In a meeting in Antalya with German and Turkish press members, Mesut Yılmaz, referring to the German Chancellor Kohl, had said "Old friends cannot become enemies". These words, however, were interpreted as "Our old friend Kohl is our new enemy" leading to new tension between the two countries. Kinkel has said "The most recent statements of Mr. Yılmaz on the German-Turkish relations were tactless. Apparently, Mr. Yılmaz is not aware of the harm he is causing to our bilateral relations with his statements". (Ahmet Külahçı; *Hürriyet*; 03.04.1998)

2.2.4. Personal Fame – The personal fame of some interpreters also triggered media attention to SI (10 out of 48 news items). Out of ten, six news items were on a famous actress who also worked as a conference interpreter, two were on a translator/interpreter who had recently received an award for his translations and two were on two experienced interpreters who had been in the business for many years. Such news generally took the form of interviews and therefore allowed the interpreters to express their views on SI (for the analysis of the discourse of the interpreters, see section 2.3.)

2.2.5. Big Career – Last but not least, seven of the news items analysed in this study focused on SI as a profession. The main objective in these news items was to introduce SI as an attractive profession to the public. Here is an example of a rather striking presentation of SI as an 'attractive'(!) career where 'loyalty to the original word' and 'simultaneity of the rendition' were presented as the challenging aspects of SI:

YOUNG GIRLS NO LONGER WANT TO BECOME MODELS. The favorite profession of today is simultaneous interpreting. Simultaneous interpreting has as many challenging aspects as attractive ones. You need to get across every word that leaves the mouth of speakers at conferences (...) Is it easy to bear the responsibility of interpreting the words a speaker utters simultaneously and without making any errors to another language during a very important meeting? (*Milliyet*; 02.09.1989)

As we can see, the discourse of the Turkish media on SI was mainly triggered by certain discourse-generators ('Big Events', 'Big Money', 'Big Mistakes', 'Personal Fame' and 'Big Career'). In their discourse on SI, the members of the media focused on SI in its relation to the specific discourse-generator only. In that sense, the (re)presentation of SI by the news agents such as reporters, columnists, etc., relied on a significant scale of simplification of the task which some scholars working in the field of Media Studies saw as a characteristic feature of newsmaking. As Altheide (1976: 9) argued "the organisation of news for practical reasons encouraged the adaptation of a convoluted way of simplifying events". In a way which simplified the complexity of the event, a significant share of the news items on SI by the members of the media either highlighted the 'scandalous' aspects about the use or non-use of interpreters or pointed to the differences between professional and non-professional interpreting based on the criteria of 'loyalty to the original word', 'fluency' and 'synchronicity'. Especially, 'loyalty to the word' (or even to the 'letter' of the original) was presented as the most distinctive feature of 'professional' interpreting. The prioritization of 'loyalty to the word of the original speech' as the defining feature of professional SI seemed to conform with the views of some Media Studies scholars who argued that the production of news took place within the boundaries established by dominant values (Iyengar and Kinder 1987). Members of the media defined professional vs non-professional interpreting and good vs bad interpreting on the basis of these features and either praised or criticized actual instances of SI according to how much (they believed) such instances fulfilled these criteria.

2.3. Which aspects of the profession(al) are foregrounded by the interpreters when addressing the media?

Although both the discourse of the media (i.e., the discourse of the commentators, reporters, columnists, etc.) and the discourse of the interpreters to the media were triggered by the same discourse-generators, there were notable differences in the way they (re)presented and depicted the profession(al). The most striking difference in their depictions was on the issue of 'loyalty'. While members of the media were keen on underscoring the

importance of 'loyalty to the *word* of the original speech' as a defining aspect of SI, professional interpreters who addressed the media were careful to underline the importance of 'loyalty to the *meaning* of the original speech'. Here is an excerpt from an interview where a professional interpreter gave her definition of SI:

Interpreter: Conference interpreting is the exact transfer of an idea voiced in one language to another. I'm saying 'idea' here because conference interpreting and interpreters are not parrots – if I may say so – who only interpret whatever words they hear. (*Stüdyo İstanbul Programı; TRT 2; 25.09.1995*)

Clearly, in contrast to the emphasis on a word-for-word and even letter-by-letter rendition of the original message in the media's (re)presentation of SI, professional interpreters who addressed the media were quite particular about emphasizing the importance of rendering the 'ideas' and 'opinions' in the original speech. Here is another example where a professional interpreter defined SI as "the transfer of ideas and opinions":

Interpreter: Conference interpreting is the maximum transfer of ideas and opinions voiced in one language to another (...) It is about conveying ideas in an intelligible manner in another language. (*Cumhuriyet; 04.09.1989*)

Furthermore, in complete contrast to media's emphasis on 'loyalty to the original word' but also quite different from their own emphasis on 'loyalty to the original meaning', professional conference interpreters also underscored that their task entailed an 'interpretation' of the original message:

Interpreter A: People who interpret bring in their own interpretation, they bring in something of their own both in translation and interpreting. (*Metis Çeviri 1988: 127*)

While some interpreters like the one cited above considered 'interpretation' as inherent to both translation and interpreting, others thought 'interpretation of the original message' was unique to interpreting and acted as a differentiating feature between SI and translation:

Interpreter B: Some colleagues who do a lot of translation complain that written translation actually slows them down. A very good translator is someone who knows the most crucial words but, as we said in the beginning, in oral translation there is *interpretation*. The difference is there in the name of the tasks. (*ibid: italics were pronounced in English by the interpreter interviewed*)

On the other hand one interpreter who is also a famous actress, presented 'interpretation' as an intrinsic part of both acting and interpreting and said "I'm always interpreting whether on the stage or behind the microphone" (*Sabah; İş ve Finans Insert*; 02.03.2003).

Interestingly enough, despite the emphasis they placed on the 'interpretation' involved in interpreting, most professional interpreters were also quite keen to underline that their 'interpretation' of the original message never meant an 'intervention' or a 'deviation' from the meaning in the original. For instance, the same interpreter who suggested that SI always entailed an 'interpretation' also argued that interpreters always accessed and transferred the meanings intended by the original speakers:

Interpreter B: The message has to be conveyed very precisely. You cannot allow even the smallest deviation or the smallest intervention. For instance, you may not agree with the speaker. In fact you may be people who advocate two completely different ideas. However, the only reason for your presence there is that you are an interpreter. You have a mission to fulfil. You are doing *interpretation* but the message must come across exactly. (*Metis Çeviri* 1988: 130-131)

Strikingly, however, although professional interpreters underlined that their 'interpretation' never meant a deviation or intervention from the original message, in their anecdotal accounts, they almost always referred to instances where interpreters had become involved in shaping the message. For instance, two interpreters, who were asked to recount an actual event, told about an interpreting assignment where they had to interpret between a top representative of the Council of Europe and an Uzbek Minister only to realize that the Turkish and Uzbek language (known to be affiliated) had very little in common for untrained ears. As it was too late to complain, the interpreters told the reporter how they had to guess parts of what the Uzbek Minister said underscoring that some of their guesses created puzzled looks on the faces of the two interlocutors (*İçimizdeki Dünya; TRT2*; 02.06.1997).²

In addition to these aspects, professional conference interpreters who addressed the media also foregrounded the importance of professionalism and

2 In fact, there is a popular book on SI written by a professional interpreter which includes numerous anecdotes from her professional experience (Çorakçı-Dişbudak 1991). All of the anecdotes there would be excellent examples of how the interpreters become involved in shaping the delivery in actual instances. However, as with the discourse adopted by interpreters when addressing the media, the author of the book was careful to underline that despite the 'interpretation' involved, simultaneous interpreters worked like 'electronic devices' and never intervened in the original message (*ibid*: 31).

the use of professionals, the qualifications of professional interpreters, work standards, ethical and training requirements. They seemed especially keen on emphasizing that SI required a special talent among many other qualifications:

Interpreter: Only people with special talents can overcome the difficulties of this profession (...) World knowledge, full mastery of the mother tongue, a versatile brain, empathy for other's thoughts, talent to act, stamina, smiling face and patience, physical and psychological fitness, knowledge of actual events, neutrality are needed to become an interpreter. (*Cumhuriyet*; 04.09.1989)

To sum up, professional interpreters gave a more complex (re)presentation of SI to the media. Interpreters' (re)presentation of the profession(al) deviated remarkably from that of the media on two issues. First of all, in contrast with the media's emphasis on absolute loyalty to the *word* and even to the *letter* of the original speech, professional interpreters underlined the predominance of loyalty to the original *meaning* in SI. Secondly, in contrast to the quests for absolute loyalty to the original word, professional interpreters also underscored that their task entailed an 'interpretation' of the original message. By doing so, they hinted at the subjective involvement of the intermediary in shaping the delivery. In fact, the involvement of the interpreter in shaping the delivery became undeniably visible when interpreters were asked to recount specific and hence contextualized instances of SI.

However, in their general and de-contextualised accounts of SI, professional interpreters resumed the more conventional discourse and carefully underscored that their 'interpretation' of the original message always coincided with the meaning in the original and never implied a deviation or intervention.

Similar to the discourse of the members of the media, professional interpreters were keen to underscore the importance of professionalism and emphasize the difference between professional and non-professional SI. They portrayed SI as a special profession which needed to be executed by special people with special talents, skills and training.

3. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to present a survey of the news coverage on simultaneous conference interpreters and interpreting in the Turkish electronic and printed media from September 1988 to March 2003. The survey of the material at hand (a total of 48 news items) sought to answer (1) when a discourse on SI occurred in the Turkish media, (2) which aspects about the profession and the professional became foregrounded by the members of the

media, and, (3) which aspects of the profession and the professional became foregrounded by professional interpreters addressing the media.

For the first question on when a discourse on SI occurred in the Turkish media, my analysis specified five main discourse-generators. These five discourse-generators were 'Big Events' (where conference interpreters worked mostly during the live coverage of wars on TV channels), 'Big Money' (which interpreters were thought to earn), 'Big Mistakes' (which interpreters were thought to make), 'Personal Fame' (which some interpreters acquired, usually from parallel engagements) and 'Big Career' (which some news items presented SI to be).

For the second question on which aspects of SI were foregrounded by the members of the media, my analysis suggested that the main focus points of media discourse were the differences between professional and non-professional SI and 'scandalous' aspects with regard to the use or non-use of SI in different contexts. In their discourse on SI, members of the media uncontestedly adopted the conventional and simplistic assumption of an interlingual equivalence between languages and foregrounded 'loyalty to the word (and even 'letter') of the original message' as the most distinctive and differentiating aspect of SI. They also presented 'fluency' and 'synchronicity of the delivery' as significant features of professional SI. When presenting, praising or criticizing SI, members of the media used these criteria, especially 'loyalty to the original word', as their reference point.

For the third question on which aspects of SI were foregrounded by the professional interpreters, my analysis pointed out the difference in the way professional interpreters (re)presented SI to the media. In contrast to the emphasis placed on 'loyalty to the *word* of the original message' by the members of the media, professional interpreters underscored the importance of remaining 'loyal to the *meaning* of the original message'. While highlighting the significance of loyalty to the original meaning, professional interpreters also underlined that their task entailed an 'interpretation' of the original message. In that sense, they suggested some form of an involvement of the interpreters in understanding and shaping the meaning of the original message. The involvement of the interpreters in shaping the delivery became very visible when members of the media asked professional interpreters to recount real-life events. In anecdotal and hence contextualised accounts of real-life events, interpreters almost always referred to the instances where they had become personally involved in shaping the delivery. However, despite the emphasis and anecdotal evidence on the 'interpretation' of the message, in their more general and hence de-contextualised accounts, professional interpreters were careful to underscore that their 'interpretation' of the original meaning always coincided with *the* meaning in the original message and never meant an intervention or a

deviation. In that sense, there seemed to be a willingness on the part of professional conference interpreters to reconcile the implications of *subjectivity* indicated in giving an 'interpretation' of the original message with the *objectified subjectivity* implied in remaining 'loyal to the meaning' and the *absolute objectivity* imposed in remaining 'loyal to the word'.

In closing, even though all instances of discourse analysed in this study seemed to be talking about the same 'object' (i.e., simultaneous conference interpreting), there were marked differences in how the 'object' was (re)presented depending on the identity, position and intentions of the presenter. Was the power of the perspective and socio-cultural context, once again, stronger in shaping our discursive (re)presentations of the world than the 'world' itself?

References

- Altheide D.L. (1976): *Creating Reality: How TV News Distorts Events*, Beverly Hills and London, Sage.
- Chouliaraki L. and Fairclough N. (1999): *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Çorakçı-Dişbudak B. (1991): *Tane Tane Simultane: Simültane Çeviri Hakkında Merak Ettiğiniz Herşey Komiklikler de Cabası*, İstanbul, Altın Kitaplar.
- Fairclough N. (1989): *Language and Power*, London, Longman.
- Fairclough N. (1992): *Discourse and Social Change*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Fairclough N. (1995): *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, London, Longman.
- Iyengar S. and Kinder D.R. (1987): *News That Matters*, Chicago-London, The University of Chicago Press.
- van Dijk T. (1987): *Communicating Racism*, London, Sage.
- van Dijk T. (1991): *Racism and the Press*, London, Routledge.
- van Dijk T. (1993): *Discourse and Elite Racism*, London, Sage.
- Wodak R. (1996): *Disorders of Discourse*, London, Longman.