

How to Cite:

Abduvalieva, G. A. (2021). Features of Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian simultaneous interpretation. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 1451-1463. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1766>

Features of Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian Simultaneous Interpretation

Gulsanam A. Abduvalieva

Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic

Abstract---The relevance of the study lies in the fact that nowadays cooperation between countries is constantly developing at different levels, which necessitates the use of simultaneous interpreting services. In order to meet the demands of today's market and above all to live up to the expectations, it is important to understand the special features of Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian simultaneous interpretation, regardless of subject matter and degree of complexity. Such interpretation is quite a complex task, since Turkish is a language belonging to the group of languages that is spoken by 83 million people worldwide, mostly in Turkey and Northern Cyprus, where it has the status of an official language. In the Russian Federation there is little knowledge of Turkish, which seems to be the main reason for the growing demand for simultaneous interpreting. The purpose of the study is to conduct a linguistic analysis of Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian simultaneous interpretation, which will reveal the features of language structures that influence the choice of strategies and actions in the simultaneous interpretation process. The methodological basis of the study is synchronic, logical-cognitive and component methods as well as analyses of observation and study. Turkish and Russian are completely different languages, the specifics of which determine the rules for making the interpretation. Naturally, there are differences in the structure of both languages: Russian is inflectional and Turkish is agglutinative. The differences concern not only word formation, but also grammar and phonetics. When interpreting, it is important to keep in mind the different sentence order, the lack of grammatical gender, the extensive system of courtesies, certain phonetic rules and many other features of each language, ignorance of which can affect the quality of the interpretation. Besides linguistic differences, a big challenge is the fact that these countries come from different cultural backgrounds, so it is important to know not only the languages, but also the culture and history of each of them. Only interpretation that takes into account all linguistic and cultural differences can be considered professional simultaneous interpretation that fulfils its primary functions. The

practical significance lies in identifying the linguistic and extra-linguistic factors that affect the quality of interpretation.

Keywords---context, dialects, grammatical structure, language, linguistics.

Introduction

Due to rapid scientific, economic, technical and technological progress, as well as the development of the media, it has become necessary to overcome the language barriers that prevent the free flow of ever-growing information resources. Eliminating language barriers that divide people and whole nations promotes knowledge of foreign languages (Jacquemet, 2005). Pluralistic and centrifugal trends in communication policy and practice play a huge role in scientific, technical, legal, political and economic texts. Theoretical training in text translation to a certain extent intends to present simultaneous interpreting in the light of current interpreting studies, which refer to the results of works conducted in various scientific disciplines (Lamber & Moser-Mercer, 2018). The idea is to arrange partial opinions and views as much as possible in order to clearly represent the form of implementation, the linguistic and extra-linguistic mechanisms, as well as the cultural conditions. Simultaneous interpretation is a relatively young but increasingly common method of Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian translation, which is the result of technological developments facilitating access to the specialised technical equipment that enables it to be used. However, it is primarily one of the varieties of translation and the result of its constant evolution due to the development and progress of humanity (Jones, 2018).

Turkey is a country rich in culture and tradition, popular among tourists from all over the world. Every visitor from this country knows its original mentality, religion, art. The study of one or more of these aspects contributes immensely to the development of Russian-Turkish or Turkish-Russian simultaneous interpretation. There are many dialects in Turkish, which can complicate the process of interpretation (Sumner & Samuel, 2009). Depending on the region of the country, the language of the inhabitants can vary greatly in pronunciation and grammatical structure (Savin & Perchonock, 1965). The basis of the Turkish language is the Istanbul dialect, heavily influenced by the Ottoman language. Its writing uses the Latin script, which was officially adopted in 1928. The Turkish alphabet has 29 letters and each sound has one designation. This function simplifies the rules for reading and interpreting. However, in Turkish one can find many intricate structures created by borrowing words from the Oghuz (Chen & Dong, 2010). Dialects in the north-western approximation from phonetics to the Gagauz language, characterised by long vowels. Despite differences in the pronunciation of certain words, the general grammar of the dialects follows the same rules (Kraljic et al., 2008). The process of simultaneous Russian-Turkish interpretation defines communication between users of different languages. Substitution of bases on relative equivalence is equal to the value of the phenomenon being labelled based on a set of distinctive features (Cargile et al., 1994).

Although in the modern world it is difficult to imagine specific situations without the involvement of simultaneous interpretation, a factor hindering the existence of communication is the linguistic and cultural distances arising due to belonging to different communicative and cultural communities, i.e. ignorance of the language or other sign system to express and convey different types of mental content (Nan, 2020). Interpretation is carried out within the framework of a system of translational communication. It is advisable to consider this system not only as an integrated whole, but also at different levels of abstraction describing its individual and emerging elements. Simultaneous interpretation can and should make use of knowledge through linguistics within the framework of its research interests and their specific properties (Baugh, 1995). The other factors encountered in a Russian-Turkish or Turkish-Russian interpretation system constitute the object arising in the translation system. They represent the systems of rules that determine the ability of a particular group of people to communicate through statements. The universality of languages lies in the fact that they are used to express all the mental content. Moreover, other types of signs function in the context of language and its inherent conceptual thinking and can be interpreted linguistically (Zhong, 2001; Seleskovitch & Lederer, 2015). The purpose of the study is to conduct a linguistic analysis of Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian simultaneous interpretation, which will reveal the features of language structures that influence the choice of strategies and actions in the simultaneous interpretation process.

Materials and Methods

The methodological basis of the study is synchronic, logical-cognitive and component methods as well as analyses of observation and study. The synchronic approach involves analysing the order of Russian and Turkish words solely by studying synchronic linguistics, which makes it possible to consider the language at a particular time (Peniro & Cyntas, 2019). This is because it is necessary to understand how the simultaneous interpretation system is working at the moment, before changes to the one-step language analysis can be accepted. It is descriptive linguistics for studying how morphemes combine to form words and phrases, and correct syntax provides meaning to a sentence (Canagarajah & De Costa, 2016). In the 21st century, the search for a universal grammar, which is the basis for simultaneous interpretation, makes it possible to learn a language in a synchronised field of study. This methodology connects language units that are perceived by language users with appropriate timelines, depending on the rate of language development. In the synchronous description, translations from different epochs should be avoided by projecting them onto the relationships between the synchronous modules. The functionality of certain linguistic and connective units may diminish or increase over time, and may also change its own nature.

The logical-cognitive paradigm is about considerations presented as part of an oriented mind ontology. It is highly useful in the context of discussions of simultaneous Turkish-Russian interpretation and the old metaphysical assumptions of both natural and artificial linguistic systems (Bettini et al., 2010). Replacing the traditional concept of interpretation, a structure appears in certain definitions, which is the subject of cognitive processes – perception, thinking,

reasoning. It is based on the concept of information and representation. According to it, the cognitive system can be described as an apparatus that not only performs the functions of information interpretation, transmission and processing, but also creates beliefs, including false ones. The beliefs here are a kind of mental representations, because the presence of this ability is required to create linguistic aspects and the logical-cognitive methodology is able to create not only knowledge consisting of simple perceptual beliefs, but also more complex ones, acquired during simultaneous interpretation and requiring operations of logical thinking. It imitates and simulates certain functions based on appropriate algorithms and cognitive operations.

Component analysis consists of determining a synthetic indicator – an assessment of the components of a sustainable simultaneous Russian-Turkish interpretation. The spatial scope of the analysis covers a compact territory at the linguistic level describing the research units. The component level analysis consists in constructing three synthetic measures for each dimension separately. The environmental component defines the state of the environment and consists of three sub-components, each of which is characterised by corresponding empirical indicators. The linguistic and extra-linguistic components include characteristics of the linguistic structure through the analysis of cultural sectors. Additional units involve social aspects, including human characteristics and the quality factors of the interpretation. The collected research material was standardised according to the interpretation interval, resulting in the Russian-Turkish values providing synthetic indicators for assessing the level of the three components' development. The analysed territorial units were then grouped into syntactic and linguistic classes with a similar interpretation level. Thanks to component standardisation, the interpretation space is limited to a language frame of reference.

Results and Discussion

Simultaneous interpretation is currently the most commonly used interpretation method, although it is the youngest one. In order to comprehensively describe the definition of simultaneous interpretation, the following types should be distinguished: simultaneous interpretation using specialised soundproofing equipment; whispered interpretation; real-time types of multimedia interpretation; card-based interpretation. All of the types mentioned above share the common feature of the simultaneous processes of receiving the source text and presenting the target text by the interpreter, but they differ in some elements of the situational structure that accompanies the interpretation process or the type of source text fixation. In order to enable simultaneous interpretation, an appropriate technical equipment, including soundproofing, usually a two-seat booth with headphones and a microphone, should be provided. According to generally accepted standards, it is important to ensure maximum visibility of all elements affecting the course of communication and the possibility of eye contact with the source text presenter (Gile, 2009). Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian simultaneous interpretation is characterised by parallelism. It deals with the reception of the source text and the presentation of the target text by the interpreter. The apparent simultaneity and some delays are necessary for the interpreter to perform the complex thought processes involved in producing a

translated text. The length of the delay depends on many factors, such as the manner, pace and completeness of the text, the subject matter of the translated message and the specificity of the given language pairs.

Interpreting is of great significance in many situations where speech interpretation is required. The translation industry uses modern technology for this type of translation. However, this does not mean that the work of an interpreter is replaced by translation equipment. On the contrary, an experienced interpreter is an indispensable element of interpretation. Interpreting requires a human factor, which is indispensable at many stages of interpretation. Simultaneous interpreters should be properly trained for performing their role. This is not a job for people with no experience. Only the best specialists can cope with simultaneous interpreting, which is very demanding not only in a strictly linguistic sense, but also in a psychological one: resistance to stress, fast reactions, constant use of the speech apparatus. It is a tedious job, so interpreters mostly work in pairs. This form of translation needs to be constantly improved. A simultaneous interpreter has to self-educate, learn new terminology and even know the spoken language. Likewise, industry-specific languages that require new nomenclature as technology advances. Simultaneous and consecutive interpretation is intended for experts in Russian and Turkish. There is no time for long analyses, searching for answers in dictionaries or terminology bases. An interpreter is required to interpret here and now. It is therefore one of the most difficult types of translation (Shang, 2020).

Today, Turkey and Russia are deep-rooted carriers of the spiritual wealth of nations. Increased cooperation between the two countries in the social and commercial areas, as well as the interest in the Russian language in Turkey, contribute to the development of simultaneous interpretation. One of its important features is the differences between languages in terms of structure. Grammar, phonetics, vocabulary, syntax and belonging to different language families constitute the biggest differences between the languages. Such differences lead to certain difficulties in simultaneous interpretation. The sound characteristics of the two languages are different. Therefore, a comparative analysis of both languages is of great importance. In Turkish and Russian, the formation and order of words in a sentence is completely different. Once caught up in a confusing grammatical structure, it is necessary to increase the vocabulary, while increasing it as part of simultaneous interpretation (De Vries et al., 2008). In this regard, words in the formation of idioms should be ordered in their semantic construction, explaining direct and figurative meanings. Since the semantic volume of Russian and Turkish words is not the same, it is challenging to select and use the right words when interpreting. It is known that mistakes made during simultaneous interpretation occur due to a breach of norms and rules. It is important to consider the analysis of such inaccuracies, the errors of which are in many cases uncharacteristic of the Turkish language. It should be noted that this situation is typical for Turkic languages. In Turkic languages, it is impossible for several consonants to precede a word. This situation arises because of the structure of the Turkish language. The meaning of certain words, the existence of a synonym or the suitability to compose an interpretation determines the sentence of the Russian language.

The volume of translation and interpretation into Russian and Turkish has increased significantly within the framework of the recently developing trade and political relations between Turkey and Russia. Russian simultaneous interpretation is one of the areas in which Turkish companies have the greatest need for understanding the specifications and content of the concepts. The most striking example of this includes the huge projects that have been carried out with Russian partner companies. Since these projects involve transnational companies, they require intensive simultaneous interpreting activities (Zieke, 2018). The volume of interpretation from Russian to Turkish and from Turkish to Russian can be rather large. Interpretations from Russian into Turkish by interpreters who are well versed in technical terms and areas are essential to promote various activities. The interpreters who provide spoken Russian interpretation support are experienced people who speak both languages and are competent in the necessary day-to-day and technical conversations. The interpreter listens to what the speaker has to say using headphones in a booth specially prepared for him or her and simultaneously transmits the interpretation to the audience through a microphone. With this method, the speaker's sentences are interpreted in their entirety and the interpretation is transmitted almost simultaneously with the speech. The role of the interpreter comes to the fore, for example, when holding an international conference, organising a congress for a multilingual group of guests or organising a training seminar with participants from different countries.

Simultaneous interpretation is used during a linguistic group meeting. These meetings include conferences, symposia, trade fairs, lectures, industry training courses or congresses. Whispered interpretation can be used if the group of participants is small. The interpreter listens to the speech and is close to the audience and interprets the content for those interested. No equipment is needed. Special audio-visual equipment is used in a large group when a speech is interpreted into several languages and there are many interpreters involved. Such equipment includes, naturally, headphones and microphones, as well as soundproofing booths for interpreters. The work of a simultaneous interpreter usually takes place in groups of two. Two interpreters take turns at certain intervals. This allows for the breaks necessary to satisfy physiological needs as well as to clarify the thoughts. Simultaneous interpretation can be extremely tedious, especially if it lasts many hours. A live interpretation is a challenging task. It requires reflexes, an excellent knowledge of a foreign language, the ability to translate thoughts quickly and a resistance to stress. Different situations may arise during real-time interpretation. Approaches and practices of simultaneous interpretation develop in relation to a particular Russian-Turkish language pair. It covers different areas of knowledge as well as strategies categorised by type and topic. Social and cultural competencies are directly linked to simultaneous interpretation. For instance, empathy can help the interpreter better understand the emotional content of speech in the source language. This will prevent the situation where exceptionally emotionally rich content is interpreted without any emotions at all (Gerver, 2019).

The simultaneous interpreting process consists of several stages, the course of which is characterised by mutual parallelism. An example is the interpretation from Turkish language, where the complexity, and hence the longer text,

determines the features of the final order of the subordinate sentences or the negation at the end of the sentence. The self-reflection method stage uses retrospective images to explore in more depth the operations that accompany interpretation. This method is based on expressing one's own decisions about interpretation. The Russian language is divided into three main dialects: northern, southern and central. The most significant differences between the dialects of Turkish and Russian relate to intonation and word pronunciation. Sound stress is very important in the Russian language. For this reason, Cyrillic letters are used, making it easier to see where emphasis should be placed, compared to Latin letters. The reformatory differences between the common systems of the Russian and Turkish languages and their linguistic terminology argue that the words of simultaneous interpretation have only one meaning. The punctuality of meanings and the integrity of descriptive polysemy cause the semantic separation of polysemous terminological units. The meaning of a single word, usually as a result of a form change, has several meanings related to each other (Snelling, 1992).

The analysis of the polysemy in simultaneous Turkish-Russian interpretation takes into account the development of new various meanings that have some weight over the old ones, saving time and effort by using a minimum number of linguistic units. This is where the saving principle of linguistic signs comes into play, leading to changes in the semantic boundaries of terms and new meanings. The emergence of a constantly evolving reality reflects the process of understanding an evolving terminological system as a regular form of interpretation. The group of Turkish nouns consisting of verbs is characterised by regularity and development of meanings. The properties of these nouns indicate the meanings and combination of the verbs they consist of. The loss of linguistic characteristics leads to the development of objective meanings that interact with the meanings of the simultaneous process. The polysemy of Turkish terms is related to the structure of the concept system as a noun transfer in the terminological system. The peculiarities of simultaneous interpretation reject the idea of an orientation towards univocality, comparing it to the polysemy of language. The vagueness of the term does not mean that it is inaccurate. The regularity of terminological polysemy defines interdependence – the main criterion for regularity in the typical repetition of similar semantic combinations during interpretation. The linguistic form of the concept "ağız", meaning "mouth" in Russian, is the primary form of simultaneous interpretation. If it is seen as a comparison in Turkish nomenclature, a logical analysis of the unit "mouth" between two different spaces can be carried out. For example: "bottle neck", "mouth of the door", "tea mouth" (Neubert & Shreve, 2018).

Each language has its own worldview, given the trio of language-human-culture. Analysis of 'Turkish terms' actual function demonstrates that a term is a functional unit and tends to have one meaning within the system, while in a certain context it is detrimental to its communicative purpose (Altmann & Steedman, 1988). There is no polysemy in the field of linguistics as it cannot specify more than one meaning, classifying this as a case of unequal usage. Simultaneous interpretation is often referred to as an unusual skill because it is made up of many diverse component skills (Borris & Zecho, 2018). Its specificity relates to the tools of auditing, speaking or postponement. Simultaneous

Russian-Turkish interpretation can be divided into isolation, internationalisation and integration, the techniques of which have individual abilities. The processing features of simultaneous interpretation can be described as a set of operations performed using translation techniques in the order of processing and optimising the differences between the source text and its realisation (Widana et al., 2020). Its objectives act as a specific generalisation, contributing to the description of phenomena, most of which occur in parallel rather than sequentially. As the material to be interpreted is either Turkish or Russian, the most important efficiency of their processing is the activation of the translation equivalents. Targeted word formation is important for suppressing literal simultaneous interpretation, competing with it in such a way that the source language is subject to exclusion and avoiding interference during the process itself (Menaka & Sankar, 2019).

The processing aspects of simultaneous interpretation concern the selected skills used in the processes. Based on the author's experience as well as on the hierarchy of the processes described within the accepted definitions of processing, most of the exercises contain a discussion element so that actors not only hear comments on the interpretation topic, but also share their thoughts and impressions on the processing of specific elements and reflect on the techniques used. Responsiveness and awareness of the solutions available result later in correct interpretation decisions. Exercises initially deal with more universal measures, such as predicting and correcting delays, then skills used in processing individual elements of the source text, and later, idioms, terminology and quotations for more advanced skills. The order of performing the exercises reflects the gradation of difficulties as part of the interpretation course. The examples presented in the exercises refer to the Turkish-Russian language pair. Furthermore, the exercise descriptions often refer specifically to preparation for interpretation in the mother tongue or a foreign language (Tiangco, 2020). Predicting the content of speech suggests to the interpreter an important skill that should be developed in the training process. It is the creation of a mental representation of the content before it is conveyed by the speaker's words. In words it acts as an expectation, corresponding to the content not yet expressed by the speaker. Simultaneous Russian-Turkish interpretation should use content anticipation on different levels, starting from the content of the whole speech through argumentation and ending with processing in a simulated interpretation based on syntactic structure or phraseology (Heltai & Lanstyak, 2018).

Delay control is an important tool for an interpreter who faces different types of calculations, so attention should be paid to keeping delays as short as possible, because the emerging elements load the working memory in the shortest possible time. When interpreting into Turkish, it is important to set up the enumeration in such a way that its elements can be interpreted in the denominator, thus avoiding problems with false cues. At the other end of the delay control continuum are sentences with complex syntax that require structural changes in the target language. A longer delay will help the interpreter avoid an awkward beginning of a sentence when interpreting. Another important element of simultaneous Russian-Turkish interpretation is the processing of out-of-context information, i.e. the information that cannot be predicted, remembered or recreated through context. It most often includes names, and numbers, which determine whether some

elements can be omitted and whether others need to be retained. It is worth discussing the methods that the interpreter has for such a task. These idioms can, naturally, be replaced by a linguistic equivalent, borrowing or paraphrasing the original concept. During simultaneous interpretation, it is possible to literally interpret an idiom, providing an explanation of its meaning if it is not understood. This approach is time-consuming, and the interpreter can simply rephrase the concept in the target language, with the result that the text loses its colour but retains the meaning of the communication. The terms that may have different interpretations in the thematic areas are in the relevant thematic context and have a very specific meaning (Carlet, 1998).

In order for Russian-Turkish or Turkish-Russian simultaneous interpretation to be effective, attention should be paid to the context in which the words are used and to the best way to convey the speaker's words. Simultaneous interpretation requires advanced knowledge in the relevant field, knowledge of different cultures and extensive experience. Its advantages include the following aspects: it is the most efficient way of communicating in multilingual meetings, it allows the use of several languages without losing time for translation, and there is no limit on the number of listeners. Linguistic units are defined as words, phrases and structures dependent on context and text. Since a unit in the source text may have several equivalents in the target language, it is argued that one should select the appropriate one according to the context by defining the concept of synonymous units. The equivalence of the extra-linguistic level provides for the preservation of some of the content that constitutes the purpose of communication. For instance, for a Russian-Turkish language pair, "to take a quarrel out of the house" literally translates into Turkish as "to throw out the trash from the house" – from "to throw out the dirty laundry". Such images and structures are different in the two languages, but it is clear that they can be used for an appropriate purpose. In this context, the structuring of the same non-language event in the translation process and the way it is set up requires particular consideration (Miller et al., 2013).

An extralinguistic event is an object in the reality of things that is voiced and presumably realised. It is defined as a set of non-linguistic relations between events that can be represented in different ways, and has the following properties for this type of equivalence: inconsistency of lexical content and syntactic structures, impossibility of semantic or syntactic changes between words and structure, absence of direct logical links between the source text and the target text. The equivalence of the second level reflects the same non-linguistic event as well as the transmission of a communicative intention expressed by an extra-linguistic phenomenon or a linguistic description form. Thus, the equivalence source anticipates the presence of the same non-language event in the Russian-Turkish or Turkish-Russian targeted simultaneous interpretations and the presence of different descriptions. The problems encountered in simultaneous Russian-Turkish interpretation stem from a deviation from the linguistic domain of the relationship between the target text and the source text. The translation, which initially focuses on linguistic transformations in the interpretation process, applies different structural, functional, semantic and semiotic approaches and trends. Its peculiarity lies in the fact that its theoretical approaches are based on experienced interpreters. In this sense, there is a difference between

interpretation theory and practice that should not have any gap (Kroll & de Groot, 2005; Hansen-Schirra et al., 2012).

Simultaneous interpretation of Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian requires many predispositions on the part of the interpreter. Listening and understanding are very important, as well as flawless diction so that the audience is not misled. The person performing such work should above all be extremely attentive, highly concentrated, have excellent reflexes and be highly resistant to stress. Without these features, it is impossible to focus on listening, analysing the meaning of the utterance, interpreting content into Turkish, as well as the instantaneous operation of the console (Rutten, 2019). It is also essential to be fluent in the target and source languages. Very often it is impossible to literally interpret the meaning of a sentence. The issues raised are between the various Russian-Turkish words, the influence of which limits the strategic environment and the connection between the concepts' explanation. Such interpretation gives rise to modern interpretation services. When performing this type of interpretation, the interpreter cannot take notes. Interpretation into the target language takes place at the same time as the speaker speaks in the source language. Most often, the interpreter is in a closed booth and pronounces the interpreted text, which he or she hears through headphones. Simultaneous interpretation is very stressful. The interpreter is not only required to be fluent in Turkish. Stress resistance and equanimity are important. Equally important are quick reactions, reflexes and extensive experience in the profession. Simultaneous interpretation can also be conducted directly rather than in the booth (Schmidt & Worner, 2014; Dayter, 2018).

Conclusions

Simultaneous interpretation is used to overcome language barriers, playing a key role in understanding the differences between simultaneous and consecutive interpretation. Interpreters must have outstanding bilingual linguistic skills in both Russian and Turkish, be confident linguists, have a deep understanding of both cultures and, above all, be proficient in the art of interpreting. The identity postulate is the basis of inter-lingual simultaneous Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian communication, and doubts in this regard cause serious disruption, as well as due to the loss of trust in interpreters. The characteristics of Russian-Turkish and Turkish-Russian simultaneous interpretation lie in the way in which the comprehension phase is separated from the reproduction phase of the message. The time required for the interpreter to recreate and adequately structure speech in the target language is very limited, and interpretation requires full knowledge of two language skills: auditory and spoken Turkish, combined with a good and clear voice tone.

Russian-Turkish simultaneous interpretation reveals its problematic nature, uncovering conflicting discursive interpretations, demonstrating the areas of uncertainty and undefined concepts, especially when dealing with highly emotional aspects. Interpretation is of fundamental importance to the creation and dissemination of narratives that create an intellectual and moral environment. The systematic study of such interpretation features, taken in the context of the course and outcome of events, is driven by globalisation and the

digitisation of the world. The generally accepted and completely illusory ideal of interpretation is neutral, detached, devoid of any trace of its own subjectivity, and interprets a message to which a completely inaccurate and ethically marked concept is applied without deep reflection. The assumption of mutual equivalence of target and source messages is based on a power structure. This is what follows largely independently of the actual content, the formal and cultural correspondence between the original text and its interpretation.

References

- Altmann, G., & Steedman, M. (1988). Interaction with context during human sentence processing. *Cognition*, 30(3), 191-238. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(88\)90020-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(88)90020-0)
- Baugh, J. (1995). The law, linguistics, and education: Educational reform for African American language minority students. *Linguistics and Education*, 7(2), 87-105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898\(95\)90002-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0898-5898(95)90002-0)
- Bettini, C., Brdiczka, O., Henriksen, K., Indulska, J., Nicklas, D., Ranganathan, A., & Riboni, D. (2010). A survey of context modelling and reasoning techniques. *Pervasive and mobile computing*, 6(2), 161-180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmcj.2009.06.002>
- Borris, D. ., & Zecho, C. . (2018). The linguistic politeness having seen on the current study issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 32-44. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v2n1.10>
- Canagarajah, S., & De Costa, P. I. (2016). Introduction: Scales analysis, and its uses and prospects in educational linguistics. *Linguistics and Education*, 34, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.09.001>
- Cargile, A. C., Giles, H., Ryan, E. B., & Bradac, J. J. (1994). Language attitudes as a social process: A conceptual model and new directions. *Language & Communication*, 14(3), 211-236. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309\(94\)90001-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(94)90001-9)
- Carlet, L. (1998). GV Chernov's psycholinguistic model in simultaneous interpretation: an experimental contribution.
- Chen, Z., & Dong, X. (2010). Simultaneous interpreting: Principles and training. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(5), 714.
- Dayter, D. (2018). Describing lexical patterns in simultaneously interpreted discourse in a parallel aligned corpus of Russian-English interpreting (SIREN). In *FORUM. Revue internationale d'interprétation et de traduction/International Journal of Interpretation and Translation* (Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 241-264). John Benjamins.
- De Vries, M. H., Monaghan, P., Knecht, S., & Zwitserlood, P. (2008). Syntactic structure and artificial grammar learning: The learnability of embedded hierarchical structures. *Cognition*, 107(2), 763-774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.09.002>
- Gerver, D. (2019). *The effects of source language presentation rate on the performance of simultaneous conference interpreters*.
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* (Vol. 8). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hansen-Schirra, S., Neumann, S., & Steiner, E. (2012). *Cross-linguistic Corpora for the Study of Translations*. De Gruyter Mouton.

- Heltai, P., & Lanstyak, I. (2018). *Translation and bilingual language use: Two subtypes of bilingual communication*.
- Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language & communication*, 25(3), 257-277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2005.05.001>
- Jones, R. (2018). *Conference interpreting explained*. London: Routledge.
- Kraljic, T., Brennan, S. E., & Samuel, A. G. (2008). Accommodating variation: Dialects, idiolects, and speech processing. *Cognition*, 107(1), 54-81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.07.013>
- Kroll, J. F., & De Groot, A. M. B. (2005). Simultaneous interpreting: a cognitive perspective. In *Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 454-479). Oxford University Press.
- Lamber, S., & Moser-Mercer, B. (2018). *Bridging the gap: Empirical research on simultaneous interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Menaka, G., & Sankar, G. (2019). The language learning assessment using technology for the second language learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 5(4), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v5n4.674>
- Miller, G. A., Galanter, E., & Pribram, K. H. (2013). *Plans and the structure of behavior*. New York: Martino Fine Books.
- Nan, X. (2020). Analysis of the principles of simultaneous interpreting. *Journal of Shaanxi Normal University*, 3, 54-61.
- Neubert, A., & Shreve, G. (2018). *Translation as text*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- Peniro, R. ., & Cyntas, J. . (2019). Applied linguistics theory and application. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 3(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v3n1.7>
- Rutten, A. (2019). *Information and knowledge management in conference interpreting*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Savin, H. B., & Perchonock, E. (1965). Grammatical structure and the immediate recall of English sentences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 4(5), 348-353. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(65\)80070-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(65)80070-6)
- Schmidt, T., & Worner, K. (2014). Exmaralda. In: J. Durand, U. Gut, G. Kristoffersen (Eds.), *Handbook on corpus phonology* (pp. 402-419). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seleskovitch, D., & Lederer, M. (2015). Interpreter pour traduire. *Traduire*, 232, 141-143. [in French].
- Shang, H. (2020). On techniques of simultaneous interpretation. *Science and Technology Information*, 5, 77-84.
- Snelling, D. (1992). *Strategies for simultaneous interpreting: From Romance languages into English*. Udine: Campanotto.
- Sumner, M., & Samuel, A. G. (2009). The effect of experience on the perception and representation of dialect variants. *Journal of memory and language*, 60(4), 487-501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2009.01.001>
- Tiangco, J. A. N. Z. (2020). Deconstructing the evolving roles of English language educators in the 21st century. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 6(4), 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v6n4.905>
- Widana, I.K., Dewi, G.A.O.C., Suryasa, W. (2020). Ergonomics approach to improve student concentration on learning process of professional ethics.

- Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 12(7), 429-445.
- Zhong, W. (2001). Simultaneous interpreting: Principles and training. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 22, 303-311.
- Zieke, W. (2018). *Conditioning your memory*. New York: Sterling Publishing.