

Development of note-taking systems for consecutive interpreting

Tosenberger, Tea

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2013

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:820804>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-06**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet

Diplomski studij engleskog i njemačkog jezika, prevoditeljski smjer

Tea Tosenberger

Development of note-taking systems for consecutive interpreting

Diplomski rad

izv. prof. dr. sc. Marija Omazić

Osijek, 2013

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to provide an insight into the development of note-taking systems for consecutive interpreting. For every consecutive interpreter, having an individual, effective note-taking system is indispensable. This paper presents the basic principles and guidelines, as found in the existing literature, to serve as a base and inspiration for developing one's own note-taking system. The first part defines consecutive interpreting, explains its use and provides a brief historical overview. In the main part, note-taking is presented as a part of consecutive interpreting and its function explained. After that, the principles and propositions for developing a note-taking system are presented and explained in detail, as proposed by experts in the field. In the next chapter, the pedagogy of note-taking is presented, i.e. the various stances on how it should be taught to students, and when it should be introduced in the curriculum, regarding the level of study, as well as the phase of consecutive interpreting teaching. An attempt is made to introduce some principles of note-taking that are adjusted to the Croatian language, most of the existing ones being written from English, German or French perspectives. In the end, the future of note-taking is discussed regarding the technology improvements and the possible substitute of note-taking by digital voice recorders, and the introduction of a new mode of interpreting, namely, the simultaneous consecutive mode.

Key words: note-taking systems, consecutive interpreting, principles, pedagogy, simultaneous consecutive

Contents

Abstract.....	1
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Theoretical background.....	4
2.1. Consecutive interpreting explained.....	4
2.2. Brief history of consecutive interpreting.....	5
2.3. Short historical overview of consecutive interpreting teaching.....	6
3. Note-taking in consecutive interpreting.....	7
3.1. Role of the interpreters notes.....	7
3.2. Effort model of consecutive interpreting and note-taking.....	8
3.3. Relation between processing capacity, memory and note-taking in consecutive interpreting.....	9
3.4. The choice of language in note-taking.....	11
3.4.1. The study by Dam.....	12
3.4.2. The study by Baselli.....	13
3.4.3. The study by Błaszczyk and Hanusiak.....	13
4. Basic principles of note-taking.....	15
4.1. Noting ideas.....	15
4.1.1. Sense in interpreting.....	15
4.1.2. Speech analysis.....	16
4.2. Using symbols and abbreviations.....	17
4.2.1. Symbols.....	17
4.2.2. Abbreviations.....	20
4.3. Organising the structure of the notes.....	23
4.3.1. The margin.....	23
4.3.2. Verticality and Shift.....	24
4.3.3. Links.....	27
4.3.4. The Recall Line.....	28
4.4. What to note.....	28
5. Pedagogy of consecutive interpreting and note-taking.....	29
6. Note-taking system from the Croatian language perspective.....	33
7. Future of note-taking.....	36
8. Conclusion.....	38
References.....	39

1. Introduction

When interpreting in the consecutive mode of conference interpreting, every interpreter needs to have a well-developed note-taking system. There are numerous suggestions as to how one should take notes, but they should serve only as a base for developing an individual system of taking notes.

The aim of this paper is to give an introduction into the development of note-taking systems for consecutive interpreting. First, an insight in the mode of consecutive interpreting is provided, including its definition, use and history. After that, note-taking is presented as an integral part of consecutive interpreting, and its role and function explained. The basic principles of note-taking are presented and explained in detail, according to already existing propositions found in relevant literature. Then, the pedagogy of note-taking is presented, regarding teaching methodology, time during training when specific units should be introduced, etc. In the end, the suggestions on the possible adaptation of note-taking principles to the Croatian language are made. In the last part, the innovations in the field of consecutive interpreting are presented and discussed.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. *Consecutive interpreting explained*

Consecutive interpreting is one of the two working modes used in conference interpreting. Unlike simultaneous interpreting where, as the name itself says, the interpretation simultaneously follows the speech that is being given; consecutive interpretation follows after a certain segment of the speech was delivered, the interpreter listened to it and took notes from which he/she could later reconstruct the speech in the source language.

He listens to the speaker's message in one language while taking notes, and reproduces it in full immediately afterwards (consecutively) in another language as if he were delivering his own speech. This may be done for the whole speech if it does not last more than 20 minutes or so ... (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:67).

It is suitable for meetings during which it is not required to interpret in more than two languages.

Consecutive interpreting is typically used for press conferences, after-dinner speeches and similar occasions. The statements to be interpreted can be as long as 20 minutes. As the capacity of the human memory is insufficient to provide a consecutive of longer statements, the interpreters make notes to support their memory and thus to facilitate the rendition in the target language (Albl-Mikasa and Kohn 2002:257)

We can differentiate between the classic or true consecutive and short consecutive as can be seen in figure 1 (Pöchhacker 2004:218). One of the most important parts of true consecutive interpreting is note-taking. Namely, the interpreters do not have to rely only on their memory; they have their notes to help them. In the case of short consecutive, taking notes is not necessary, because segments to be interpreted are very short, up to a sentence or two, while note-taking is an integral part of the true or classic consecutive.




Figure 1, (Pöchhacker 2004:18), a schematic representation of the difference between short consecutive and classic consecutive.

2.2. Brief history of consecutive interpreting

Beginnings of consecutive interpreting are associated to the League of Nations conferences, especially between the two World Wars, when meetings were held in French and consecutively interpreted in English (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:15). “Conference interpreting today – as opposed to interpreting as it has existed from time immemorial and which has often been called the second oldest profession – started with the foundation of the League of Nations, where everything was interpreted consecutively” (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:4).

The development of technology in the 20th century made the use of simultaneous interpreting possible, thus making consecutive interpreting less needed. “It was only in the 1920s, when transmission equipment was developed to enable interpreters work simultaneously, that it became meaningful to distinguish between consecutive interpreting and simultaneous interpreting” (Pöchhacker 2004:18). The prevalence of simultaneous mode of interpreting over consecutive mode occurred during the Nurnberg Trials, when due to the time consuming process of the latter, and use of four languages simultaneous mode was preferred. They tried to use simultaneous interpreting at the League of Nations, but in the end, the consecutive mode prevailed (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:20- 21). “The interpreter waited until the speaker had finished and then strode up to the podium and delivered his interpretation from his notes. The speech might have lasted 45 minutes or even an hour ...” (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:21). The United Nations used the consecutive mode till 1950s (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:21). Gillies (2005:3) points out that consecutive mode is still an “essential part of an interpreter’s repertoire and is considered by many to be the superior of the two skills.” Some of the important interpreters at

that time were Jean Herbert, Antoine Belleman, Robert Confino, André and Georges Kaminker, Georges Mathieu, Evans and Loyd, Ted Pilley (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:21).

2.3. *Short historical overview of consecutive interpreting teaching*

Though there are many conference interpreting schools, not all of them provide education in both simultaneous and consecutive mode of interpreting. Those that do are ETI (Geneva University), ESIT (Paris, Sorbonne University), and the University of Queensland Japanese Course (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:77).

In the past, there was no education for interpreters, most of them were self-taught. “In the old days, before the times of interpreter/translator training courses (the AIIC Schools Committee was set up in 1957), especially in the days of consecutive when interpreters were the élite globe-trotting jet-set, the distinguished, elegant, witty actors on the world stage, interpreters and translators were self-taught” (Taylor-Bouladon 2011:32). As Pöchhacker (2004:28) says:

The brilliant example of Paul Mantoux interpreting for the Allied Leaders at the Paris Peace Convention in 1919 marks a fundamental turning point in the modern history of international interpreting: the transition from ‘chance interpreters’ (i.e. more or less bilingual individuals who happen to be on hand) to the corps of specially skilled professionals working at the League of Nations and its affiliate, the International Labour Office (ILO), in Geneva.

The first interpreting and translation school was established in Mannheim in 1930, and was later transferred to Heidelberg. In the 1940s, two more interpreting schools were set up in Vienna and Geneva (Pöchhacker 2004:28).

To list some of the first and most famous and important books on interpreting published, Jean Herbert’s *The Interpreter’s Handbook* (Manuel de l’interprète) appeared in 1952 and had pedagogical orientation, while Rozan’s *La prise de notes en interprétation consecutive*, a book on note-taking published in 1956, was specifically didactic. Even today, Rozan’s book is held to be one of the most useful ones, and is used in note-taking teaching.

Rozan based his note-taking on a thorough linguistic, semantic and cognitive analysis of the original, together with his own perceptive way of dealing with equivalent reformulation and effective communication.

Above all he stressed the importance of abbreviating intelligently, keeping symbols to a mere handful ... (Ilg and Lambert 1996:71).

Most of the books written on consecutive interpretation are in fact books on note-taking, a skill essential for good interpreting in this mode. One of the interpreters who also contributed greatly to the field is Danica Seleskovitch, whose doctoral thesis finished in 1973 was on note-taking in consecutive interpreting. In 1975, she published the book *Étude de la prise de notes*, in which “she focused on cognitive aspects and dismissed retention and recall as automatic by-products of the comprehension of meaning” (Ilg and Lambert 1996:71). As stated in Ilg and Lambert (1996:71,73) authors like Wilfried Becker (1972), who “has contributed a useful, very straight forward booklet in German”, Heinz Matyssek (1989) who “opts for a very systematic and detailed code of drawings and symbols” also have to be mentioned. Sergio Allioni (1989) “defined a fairly structured ‘grammar of consecutive interpretation’ using English and Italian syntactic rules together with a moderate number of symbols”; Ruth Willet (1974) and Helene Kirchoff with her unpublished book *Didaktik des Dolmetschens* and article *Notationssprache* (1979) “provided a counterweight of sorts to Matyssek’s more extreme views.” There are also David and Margareta Bowen (1980) and Laura Gran (1979) (Ilg and Lambert 1996:72).

In this diploma paper, James Nolan’s *Interpretation Techniques and Exercises* will be used, i.e. the chapter on note-taking, as well as Andrew Gillies’ *Note-taking for consecutive interpreting- a short course*, both published in 2005.

3. Note-taking in consecutive interpreting

3.1. *Role of the interpreters notes*

Although there are various approaches to how notes should be taken, all scholars highlight the same thing - note-taking plays a key role in consecutive interpreting, being an indispensable aid to the interpreter. Considering the way in which consecutive interpretation takes place, it is clear that an interpreter could not possibly remember a speech lasting from 10 up to 60 minutes without writing down something that will revive his or her memory. According to Gillies, “notes

taken in consecutive interpreting are a representation of the skeleton structure of the speech” (2005:6). „The aim of note-taking has often been described as the process of capturing some abstract, global-level conceptual sense on the notepad“ (Albl-Mikasa 2008:208). Taylor-Bouladon (2011:68) agrees: „the aim is to take notes which represent ideas, so that they may serve as memory-joggers.“

In order for notes to be functional, they must be personal, and also enable easy retrieval of the speech that has to be interpreted. For this reason, even though many books on note-taking have been written, the fact remains that interpreters have to develop their own note-taking systems to be able to use them efficiently. As Seleskovitch (1975:84 cited from Pöchhacker 2004: 124) suggests, notes should be minimal cues, in whatever form, for retrieving a maximum of conceptual content. As stated in Nolan (2005:294) „developing a personal system of notes also helps to form the habit of summarizing and symbolizing words and phrases, which is an important aspect of the interpretation process.“ In Albl-Mikasa and Kohn (2002:258-259) we can read that note-taking is

commonly regarded as some kind of supporting technique, developed by practitioners for practitioners to help retrieve part of their source text understanding from memory... Three basic principles can be identified that are largely undisputed in specialist literature: Economy: to minimise the processing effort any notation should be as scarce and brief as possible. Instantaneous seizability: the strain on the memory can be effectively relieved only if the interpreter can read the notes at a glance. Individuality: note-taking is not governed by any obligatory rules or regulations. Generally speaking, anything that supports its function or that is subjectively felt to do so is admissible.

3.2. Effort model of consecutive interpreting and note-taking

Daniel Gile has developed the Effort Models “to explain well-known, recurrent difficulties in interpreting, as well as advice given to students to overcome them ...” (Gile, 2009:188).

He developed them initially for simultaneous interpreting, but a modified version of the first model can also be used for consecutive interpreting. As he himself states they are “essentially didactic and have been developed in such a way as to be immediately understood by student interpreters” (Gile, 2009:189). According to that model, there are two phases of consecutive

interpreting that can be clearly distinguished. The first phase is the comprehension phase (listening and note-taking), and the second phase is speech production (or reformulation).

In Gile (2009:175,176) it is explained that, during phase one, the interpreter listens to the speech, analyses it and takes notes. Four efforts can be distinguished: *L* – Listening and Analysis, *N*- Note-taking, *M*- Short-term Memory operations and *C*- Coordination. The Memory Effort refers to the „time between the moment it is heard and the moment it is written down ...“ There is, however, a Production Effort in the first Phase of consecutive, and „it is devoted to the production of notes“. As explained in Gillies (2009:7), the most common problem for student interpreters is that due to our finite intellectual capacity and the multitasking involved, interpreters cannot listen to the source speech and at the same time write it down, because they are thinking too much about how to note it, and do not listen carefully. Also, it happens often that they simply do not hear what was said.

In the second phase, three efforts can be distinguished: *Rem*- Remembering, *Read*- Note-reading, *P*- Production. Notes taken, thus note-taking in phase one, play an important role in the phase two of interpreting, because *Rem* processing capacity can be reduced if the notes are good. „When notes are taken according to a few simple layout rules, the layout itself can be hypothesized to act as a visual stimulator of memory regarding the logical structure of the speech“ (Gile 2009:176). In Gillies (2005:7) clear notes are compared to stage directions, because they tell the interpreter “when to pause, when to add emphasis and when not to.”

According to that model, consecutive interpretation will proceed smoothly only if the total capacity available is greater than total processing requirements.

3.3. Relation between processing capacity, memory and note-taking in consecutive interpreting

Gerver (1971: viii, cited from Pöchhacker 2004:55) defined the interpreting task as “a fairly complex form of human information processing involving the reception, storage, transformation, and transmission of verbal information.”

As pointed out in Ilg and Lambert (1996:72), „consecutive interpretation draws on cognitive faculties of memory and attention which are not typical of other forms of translation“. In a study on the depth-of processing conducted by Lambert it has been observed that during consecutive interpretation occurs the deeper processing of incoming material, when compared to simultaneous interpreting, shadowing and listening (1996:75). According to Gile (2009:177), in the first phase of interpreting (see 3.2.), during the Listening and Analysis Effort the capacity requirement becomes high, the interpreter can reduce the cognitive load by reducing the amount of notes being taken. On the other hand, due to manual nature of note taking, the process takes up time, which means that the cognitive load is greater in terms of short-term memory, which can lead to reduction of capacity available for the Listening and Analysis Effort. “It follows that in terms of processing capacity, note-taking is critical, which explains and justifies the large volume of literature it has generated, from Rozan (1956) to Matyssek (1989) ...” (Gile 178). Seleskovitch (1975: 120 cited from Pöchhacker 2004: 124) indicated that interpreters have to divide their attention between the conceptual processing of input and the taking of notes, latter must not detract from the attention needed for comprehension processes. As pointed out in Gile (2009:178), interpreters should concentrate on how they could reduce processing capacity and time requirements of note-taking and still be able to successfully use their notes as memory reinforcement.

As already mentioned, note-taking skills are closely related to the memory, as they serve to support it, „both as external storage devices (e.g. for numbers and names) and as a retrieval cues for memorized conceptual structures or patterns of sense...“ (Pöchhacker 2004:124). According to Pöchhacker, in the early days of conference interpreting interpreters' long-term memory and note-taking skills were highlighted as major aspects of interpreting process. Kintch (1998:217 cited from Pöchhacker 2004:124) defines long-term memory as „everything a person knows and remembers, episodic memory, semantic memory, as well as declarative and procedural knowledge.“ Although due to their complexity, cognitive mechanisms related to consecutive interpreting have not been fully investigated, it has been determined that “note-taking for consecutive interpreting is as much a matter of attentional resource management (‘short term processing’) as of long-term storage” (Pöchhacker 2004:124).

Due to their lack of experience, student interpreters tend to have problems with capacity management, which results in poorly taken notes, and consequently in bad quality of their consecutive interpretation. A range of studies has been conducted with this in mind (e.g. Gile

1991a, Andres 2002). According to Pöchhacker (2004: 124), in Andres' study which included 14 professional interpreters and 14 student interpreters, she proved that processing overload occurred during the first phase of interpreting, due to insufficient automatic note-taking which made substantial demands on attention, which resulted in students not being able to write their notes fast enough, thus falling behind up to 6 seconds, and leaving gaps in their notes. The classroom experiment Gile (1991a) conducted, showed that student interpreters missed more names in their rendition of the speech when they had been taking notes, in comparison to consecutive interpretation without taking notes.

3.4. The choice of language in note-taking

Although regarding the language in which the notes should be taken, there are a few possibilities, i.e., interpreters can take notes in the source language, target language, in a mix of those two, in their mother tongue (regardless whether it is the source language, target language, or in some cases neither of the two languages), or in a third language, the two stances in the field regarding the choice of language for note-taking “seem to refer to the general choice of the language (i.e. the choice of the language for the whole of the noted text) and focus on two languages – the source language and the target language” (Błaszczyk and Hanusiak 2010).

The first group, as Dam (2004:256) illustrates, advises using the target language:

The advisability of using the target language has been stressed time and again (e.g. Herbert 1952; Rozan 1956; Seleskovitch 1975; Seleskovitch & Lederer 1989; Mikkelsen 1983; AIIC 1994) because it is felt that this option forces the interpreter away from the surface form of the source language speech and therefore makes for better processing of the text, and that it facilitates production of the target language speech.

The other stance (using the source language) is represented by “Kirchoff 1979; Ilg 1988; Alexieva 1993; Gile 1995” (Dam 2004: 256), and justified by the fact that due to the language conversion that takes place, the interpreter experiences an overload in the first phase, i.e. the phase that is paced by the speaker, as opposed to the production phase (Dam 2004:256). “In addition, some interpreting teachers report that their students perform markedly worse when they take notes in the target language (Alexieva 1993), while others contend that students perform poorly when writing in the source language (Seleskovitch 1975)” (Dam 2004:256).

3.4.1. *The study by Dam*

In her study on the choice of language, Dam (2004) tried to distance herself from the theory and establish what actually happens in practice. She used five sets of interpreters' notes made in the context of an experimental study on conference interpreting. All the interpreters were professionals employed in the EU, and working in the language combination Danish (A, or native language) – Spanish (B or C, foreign language). They were interpreting consecutively into Danish. There were four groups according to which the languages were divided: source language, target language, third language (mostly English) and the words which cannot be identified, i.e. could belong to either of the languages or to neither.

The results obtained showed that interpreters mostly used the target language (Danish, 72%), which is much more than the usage of the source language (Spanish, 10%), and the third language usage was even less frequent (English, 5%). To obtain even more precise results, the notes and the source text were divided into paragraphs and these smaller parts were analysed with the purpose to establish “in what cases the subjects had primarily used the target language for their notes, and when they had resorted to the source language.” (Dam, 2004:257). The results showed that there was a tendency to use the source language when noting the first few paragraphs, as well as in paragraphs that contained numbers. The target language was mostly used in paragraphs towards the end of the speech. Dam suggests that the paragraphs in which the source language was used, were more difficult for the interpreters to handle, so they used the source language (what is consistent with the Gile's Effort Models), and the paragraphs that were easy to interpret were noted in the target language. As Gile (2009:179) also suggests, “a reasonable alternative would be taking notes in the target language when cognitive pressure is not too high and reverting to source language notes when close to saturation.” Gillies (2005:16) also believes that one should note in the language one feels more comfortable with, and that this will mostly be the mother tongue, regardless whether it is the source or the target language. Dam concluded also that as the speech progressed, the interpreter got better acquainted with the style of the speaker, which made interpreting easier (thus shift to the target language towards the end of the speech). Also, the paragraphs containing more numbers were more difficult to note, thus the use of the source language. Dam noted also that for paragraphs in which cause-effect relations could be found, target language was used, because of the possibilities in note-taking

techniques concerning noting of these structures, “such as arrows and equals signs, in combination with a few keywords and standard connectives.” (Dam 2004:259)

3.4.2. *The study by Baselli*

Another study conducted by Baselli (2012) concentrates not only on the use of source or target language, but also on the use of A or B language, as well as the influence of the third language. The language groups involved were English- Italian and German – Italian. Interpreters were all students and native speakers of Italian. There were nine interpreters with Italian as A-language, English as B- language and German as C-language, and nine interpreters with Italian as A-language, German as B-language and English as C-language.

The results of the study were divided into four categories. First, notes from the interpretation from English to Italian indicated that in 5 cases of 9 mix of both languages was found, in 4 out of 9 cases notes in English (source language, but not at the same time the A-language). In the second category, the notes from Italian to English, mainly Italian notes were observed (in 6 out of 9 cases). Here Italian was both the source and A-language. The use of some German words was also noted (German being the C-language). In the third category, from German into Italian, the results showed that a mix of languages was used, in 5 out of 9 cases there were more Italian words, while in 2 out of 9 cases more German words. In 2 cases, notes were written only in German (source language and B-language). In the fourth category, from Italian into German, 100% of the notes were written in Italian (A language and Source language). Also in this case, some English words (C-language) were noted.

Results indicate that when the source language and A-language coincide, this is the preferred language choice for taking notes, but when this is not the case, B-language (source language) prevails. When translating from B- to A-language, students tend to use a mix of languages, and in some cases only B-language, i.e. source language.

3.4.3. *The study by Błaszczuk and Hanusiak*

In their study, Błaszczyk and Hanusiak (2010) focused mainly on the use of the third language in note-taking, from their own perspective and experience. They consider that “another aspect is the possible presence of the third language – the presence of non-symbolic expressions from neither source nor target language” (Błaszczyk and Hanusiak 2010:3). Although they are aware of the possible criticism and arguments that the third language may only confuse the interpreter, they suggest, as cited from Jones (1998: 60):

interpreters may choose to note things in any way they want, just for reasons of convenience, and may even wish to use words from a third language, perhaps because those words are very short and easy to note in that language, or because the interpreter has lived for a long time in the culture of that third language [...].

They admit that using the third language “may be highly idiosyncratic, depending on the number of languages that the given interpreter has command of, his/her interpreter training and professional experience, or absolutely arbitrary factors, e.g. individual preference” (Błaszczyk and Hanusiak 2010:3).

There were two interpreters included (the authors), their native language was Polish, and their B-language was English, whereas the third language for one of the interpreters was Swedish, for the other one Finnish. For the purpose of the study, three categories were created: using symbols, using abbreviations and using expressions in other languages.

The first language pair is Polish (A language), English (B-language) and Swedish (at least basic command). As the author argues, Polish is a language of long words and complex inflection, and thus not the best solution when taking notes. On the other hand, English and Swedish have shorter words. Second language pair is Polish, English and Finnish. As opposed to the third language suggested in the first language pair, i.e. Swedish, Finnish has very long words, but is still recommended by the authors. They argue that this language has other aspect that can be utilized, e.g. its morphological system.

Although the authors are aware that the solutions and suggestions made in this study are language specific, they paved the way for future studies on this subject.

4. Basic principles of note-taking

4.1. *Noting ideas*

Noting ideas and not words is one of the most important principles in the literature on note-taking. Rozan (1956:15), as one of the pioneers of note-taking indicates:

what is important is the translation of the idea and not the word. This is even truer of interpretation since the interpreter must produce a version of the text in another language immediately. He must be free of the often misleading constraints that words represent.


Gillies (2005:35) argues that there are two types of ideas. The first type refers to “parts of the message”, which inform us about “who did what to whom”, and “for the purpose of note-taking” he defines this type as the notion of the term idea in his book *Note-taking for Consecutive Interpreting- a short Course* (2005:35). The second type are ideas which Rozan described, and they refer to underlying meaning of a word or expression. Gillies refers to this type of ideas as “concepts”. He (2005:35-36) suggests that the answer to the question “who did what to whom”, which helps us determine the idea of the message, is the sentence, thus its basic units- subject, verb and object. In other words, Gilles suggests that the idea which interpreter should note down always consists of SVO group. As he admits (36), he “bent“ the definition used in describing language, and allowed verbs “to be” and “there is/are” to take objects. He also makes no difference between the direct and indirect object. In the case that the object is not a single word (2005:125), but a whole clause (usually preceded by the verbs of speech or thought: “say”, “think”, “declare”, “consider”, or by words like “that”, “which”, “who”), the interpreter should note a symbol to indicate a clause, separate the clause in SVO group, and then note it.

4.1.1. *Sense in interpreting*

In order to be able to note ideas, the interpreter first has to fully understand what the speaker had said. i.e. grasp the sense of the message. Theory of the Paris school, the so called “*theorie du sens*” or the IT paradigm, developed by Danica Seleskovitch at ESIT in Paris, highlights the importance of sense in interpreting. According to Pöchhacker (2004:68), the IT paradigm was

first applied to the study of note-taking in consecutive interpreting. This model suggests that not the “transcoding”, but the “interpreter’s understanding and expression of “sense”” is the essential process at work in Translation (Pöchhacker 2004: 97). Seleskovitch formed a triangular model of interpreting as follows:

Figure 2, (Pöchhacker 2004:97)



As Albi Mikasa (2008:200-201) reports, Seleskovitch argues that note-taking occurs during a non-verbal thought phase, and that only words such as numbers, names, enumerations and technical terms can be noted down directly. Other information should not be noted down as words, but as ideas which should remind the interpreter of the sense.

4.1.2. *Speech analysis*

In order to be capable of understanding the message of an utterance and moreover to be able to determine the main idea and make clear and concise notes, the interpreter first has to analyse the speech. Gillies (2005:6) argues that the “original speech is a group of ideas in a certain order; it is not an arbitrary muddle of unrelated ideas.” He explains that every speech has a micro-structure, i.e. words, expressions and ideas, and a macro-structure, i.e. the structure, framework, skeleton of the speech. Therefore, he emphasises the importance of speech analysis skills. As he indicates:












You will not only be listening to the words and the content as the normal listener does, but you will also be dissecting the speech in your head, analysing its structure and progression to find out what fits with what and why (Gillies 2005:17).

He claims that “speakers, even if improvising, will often stick to certain conventions” (Gillies 2005:17), and therefore recommends learning some standard conventions for giving speeches. He also suggests a bottom-up approach in analysing the source speech. In Pöchhacker (2004: 118) the distinction was made between bottom-up (i.e. input driven) and top-down (i.e. knowledge based) operations. As Gillies explains (2005:233), “here it means using a note-taking system to learn how to analyse a source speech, rather than using speech analysis to create notes.” Ilg and Lambert also note that interpreters must focus on the macro-text, and then the details (micro-text) will fall in place (1996:79).

4.2. Using symbols and abbreviations

4.2.1. Symbols

To illustrate the importance of symbols, Rozan (1956:25) dedicates one entire chapter of his book only to symbols. However he advises not to use too many of them, and recommends a total of 20, 10 of which “are indispensable.” They are divided into categories (Rozan 1956: 26-31):

The symbols of expression –thought	
speech	
discussion	
approval	
The symbols of motion - the arrow for direction or transfer	
the arrow for increase	
the arrow for decrease	
The symbols of correspondence- relation	
equivalence	
difference	
framing	


plus and minus 

Figure 3, (Rozan 1956:31). Group of symbols for concept of words that occur frequently:

Country, nation, national	□
International, abroad	⊗
Global, universal, world	W
Labour, work, action	w
Issue, problem, (question)	?
Members, participants, we etc.	Ms
Trade, trade relations, etc.	Tr

On the other hand, according to Ilg and Lambert (1996: 72), Matyssek “opts for a very systematic and detailed code of drawings and symbols, so much that beginners tend to perceive his approach as an interpreter’s shorthand ... his method has exerted considerable influence ...”

Gillies (2005:100) advocates using symbols for “concepts that come up again and again” (e.g. verbs like agree, decide, discuss, propose, or consider). As Nolan (2005:295) also notes, one should “adopt use the symbols that are useful for the subject you are dealing with.” Gillies also agrees with Rozan that there is no sense in having a symbol for every word, but for “more or less synonymous words and expressions”, because symbols represent ideas or concepts. He asserts that a symbol can be a picture, short word, pair of letters or a single letter. Nolan (2005:295) recommends thinking of a symbol that would always have the same meaning, i.e. “the main subject of the speech”. To the question “why use symbols”, he gives a simple answer—because they are easy and quick to write, easy to read and represent concepts and not words. Nolan (2005:295) recommends using pictorial or graphic devices ... because one is not “writing out the speech, one is “drawing a picture ...” Gillies (2005: 103-104) also argues that symbols have to be clear and unambiguous, quick and simple to draw, prepared in advance, consistent, organic (you must be able to develop more different symbols from one symbol) and they must mean something to you. Nolan (2005:296) agrees, and gives an example of this usage, e.g. if you decided to use the symbol x for time, the following variations are possible. (See Fig. 4) Nolan also notes that a symbol should always have only one meaning in a given context (2005:295).

Figure 4, Nolan's propositions for organic symbols:

x-	timeless, eternal
xx	many times, often
xx+	many times more
xx-	many times less
x t x	from time to time, occasionally
=x	equal time
+x	more time, longer time
-x	less time, shorter time
2x	twice
3x-/	three times less than
100x	a hundred times
100x+	a hundred times more
ltdx	a limited time
oldx	old-time, old fashioned
x!	It's time, the time has come
<u>x</u>	now, this time
gdx	a good time
xly	timely, on time
unxly	untimely, late
x)	time limit, deadline
x>	future
<x	past
ovrx	overtime
xng	timing
sumrx	summertime
xtbl	timetable, schedule
prtx	part-time
x,x	time after time, repeatedly
x.	time period
wrx	wartime

Similar to that is his proposition regarding writing down numbers. He suggests to think of a sign or symbol which would mean "three zeros" or "two zeros", "e.g. -, then 89 - - would mean 89

million” (Nolan 2005:295). Similarly, Henderson (1976:110) suggests for example, that e.g. 13 000 could be noted as 13 -, 13 000 000 as 13 =, and 13 000 000 000 as 13 ≡. In relation to organic symbols, Gillies suggests this symbol ° to represent people or a person associated with the meaning of a certain symbol, e.g. national (adjective) = □^{al}, but □° = national (noun), citizen; econ= economy, econ°= economist; π = policy, π°= politician, etc. In relation to objects in the form of clauses (discussed in 4.1.), he suggests the symbol ∩ when it refers to (128) *that, which, what*, and the ∩° when it refers to *who, whose, whom*.

For indication of gender Henderson (1976:110) proposes the biological signs for male and female, thus ♂ and ♀.

Gillies, same as Rozan, suggests using one symbol for relation, i.e. /. “Discussions are *about* something; reports, comments and policies are *on* something; attitudes and reactions *to* something; responsibility, permits, contracts and authorisation *for* something.” (Gillies 2005:165).

It is also possible to use “parasympols”. As stated in Błaszczuk and Hanusiak (2010:9) “This idea was expressed by Gillies (2007: 133-134), who proposed short words from other languages ... ” As discussed in 3.4.3., the authors also propose using words from the third language due to their shortness.

As the indication of verbs (i.e. tenses, negations and questions) is concerned, Gillies (2005: 132) recommends the following: he works= work; he doesn’t work= x work; does he know the consequences = ? he consequences?; working= work^g; work/= worked; /work= will work; wôrk= would work; wôrk/= would have worked. (Compare with Rozan’s above mentioned proposal). He also suggest abbreviations for modal words (2005:134): should = shd; could = cd; would = ^; must = >.

4.2.2. *Abbreviations*

In the section dealing with abbreviations, Rozan (1956:16-17) differentiates between abbreviated words, indications of tenses, gender and number, and abbreviating the register (group of words).

Regarding the abbreviated words, he advises to write the word in its abbreviated form, “unless a word is short (4-5 letters)”. He recommends abbreviating the word in such a manner that you keep the first and last few letters (e.g. *committee* and *Commission* should not be written *com.*, because it is ambiguous, and it should be therefore be *C^{tee}* for *committee* and *C^{on}* for *Commission*). He advises to indicate the tense by adding ^{ll} for the future and ^d for the past. To indicate plural, he advises the use of ^s. For the emphasis of the gender he uses ^e, since he worked from French into English and vice versa, he uses the French feminine ending. As far as abbreviating the register, he suggests that e.g. the expression “...which are worth looking at” can be noted only as *int^g*, which is the abbreviated form of the word *interesting*, that can be used to paraphrase the expression.

Henderson (1976:110) proposes to use the verb plus suffix –^{ll} for future, suffix –^{ed} for past, and suffix –^{id} to indicate conditionals.

Nolan (2005:295) suggests using abbreviations or acronyms for often used phrases “examples: *asap*= as soon as possible; *iot*= in order to; *iaw*= if and when).” Also, he considers adopting symbols for prefixes and suffixes, e.g. “pre-“, “anti-“, “-tion”, “-ment”. One of his recommendations for abbreviating words is not to write vowels and double consonants when possible. (See Fig. 5)

Figure 5, Nolan’s suggestion for abbreviating words by leaving out vowels and double consonants.

Zbr	Zebra
Arpln	Airplane
Hstry	History
Cmtee	Committee
Elfnt	Elefante
Prtl	Petroleo
Bmb	Bomba

Gillies (2005:130-131), also recommends thinking of single letters to replace suffixes in words. He proposes using the letter n for suffixes –ition, -ation, -ution, -istion (constitution = constⁿ); letter z for – ize, -ise (privatize= priv^z); letter v for – itive, -isive, -ative (comprehensive=

comp^v); letter y for –ivity (competitivity= comp^y); letter t for –ment (government= gov^t); letter b for – able (fashionable= fash^b). One of the suggestions is also to write words down phonetically as opposed to writing them correctly.

Gillies and Nolan address the question of where to find symbols. Both agree that they are all around us. Gillies (2005:197) “there are already lots of them around, so don’t reinvent the wheel!” He suggests some sources of symbols: mathematics, science, music, keyboard, punctuation, maps, short words in other languages, other alphabets, registration plates, currencies, chemical symbols, text messaging. (2005: 107-108). Nolan (2005: 297) indicates that it is not important from where one adopts the symbols, as long as they are used consistently. To name just a few of the possible sources of symbols he suggests: proofreaders’ marks, symbols or abbreviations from dictionary entries, books on semiotics, ancient writing systems, pictographs and pictographic devices borrowed from ancient hieroglyphic scripts, signs of the zodiac, capital letters used for a specific meaning, children’s “picture-writing”, legal symbols, monograms, etc.

As for negations and emphasis, they form a separate chapter in Rozan’s book, while in Gillies they are incorporated in the chapter on symbols. Rozan suggest indicating negation by means of crossing the word to be negated, e-g. ~~OK~~, or by writing no in front of the negated word. Gilles proposition for negation is noted above. Both authors propose underlining as a means of emphasising important parts of the notes. Example from Rozan: very interesting = int^g; extremely interesting = int^g . By contrast, lack of emphasis may be indicated as follows: might be useful = useful. Also a word or idea can be labelled in terms of significance or insignificance: “important question” = ?, “imperfect solution” = so!m . Gillies shares a similar opinion: big = large; big = huge; big = colossal, etc. (Gillies 2005: 106-107). He also proposes (2005:161) writing words that are considered to be important in bigger letters.

These are all suggestions that could be taken into consideration and used as an inspiration, but one should bear in mind that the best way of developing an efficient note-taking system is to develop an own, highly individual system.

In a study by Dam (2004), in addition to choice of language (discussed here in 3.4.), also the choice of form for the interpreters notes (symbol vs. language) was investigated. Three categories were formed during the research, namely, words (words that had not been abbreviated), abbreviations (units in which only part of a word is represented) and symbols

(everything that is not language). Then results are as follows, and are a reflection of what interpreters actually used while note-taking. Even though the results vary from examinee to examinee, as a group the examinees mostly used symbols (41% of all note units), the next category is words (35%), and abbreviations were used the least (25%). Comparing the examinees' results with one another, it was determined that there are two groups among the examinees; the first group is symbol oriented, while the second group is more word-oriented while taking notes. It can also be claimed that the more symbols the examinees had used, the more units they managed to write down, and the more words the examinees had used in their notes, the less notes they produced.

4.3. *Organising the structure of the notes*

The way in which notes should be structured is a very important factor in developing a note-taking technique. Well organised, structured notes enable the interpreter to know at every time where to look for a certain part of the text, and to facilitate the reading of notes. The most commonly recommended way of organizing your paper is to split it in half by means of a horizontal line, and to leave an additional horizontal row in the left half, which is called the margin.

4.3.1. *The margin*

Gillies (2005: 137) suggests that the important things should be noted in the margin to make them stand out and “facilitate the production stage of consecutive”. He differentiates four categories, namely: opinions, structural elements (numbering, digressions and questions), dates, and anything important. The numbering refers to part of the speech where the speaker himself divides his speech into sections by means of words “firstly”, “secondly”. When it comes to digressions, which are of secondary importance, he proposes using the brackets (). Being very important, dates must be written down, and Gillies considers that the margin is the best place for that.

4.3.2. Verticality and Shift

Rozan (1956:20) introduces the principle of verticality, referring both to it and the shift (discussed further in text) as the “backbone” of his note-taking system. Principle of verticality implies taking notes from the top to bottom and not from left to right. According to Rozan (1956:20), it enables the interpreter to group his ideas logically, which will facilitate the reading of notes. If noting in this way, the interpreter is also not required to note down links, since the structure enables him to see the synthesis (connections). He differentiates stacking (Example 1) and the use of brackets. The same as Gillies (mentioned in 4.3.1.), he suggests using the brackets when noting things that are not “integral to the speaker’s train of thought”, but used for clarification or emphasis, see example 2.

Example 1 (Rozan 1956:20). Stacking:

“The report on Western Europe is an interesting document”

R^{ort} *int^g*
W Eur.

“The chapters of the report which deal with economic situation in Europe offer additional information and new statistics”

Ch^{rs} *info*
Ec.Eur *give new* *stat^{ics}*

Example 2 (Rozan 1956:20). Use of brackets:

„ ... which leads to new investment, particularly in the transport sector”

+ *inv^{ts}*
(*T^{ort}*)

As far as the principle of shift is concerned, Rozan (1956:22) defines it as follows: “Shift means writing notes in the place where they would have appeared had the text on the line above been repeated.” So, for him it represents both economy and saving time, by not writing down something repeatedly, but indicating the structure by means of shift (see example 3).

Example 3 (Rozan 1956:21).

54, prices ↗

but ——— no = ↗income

so ——— pop^{on} ↗

“Over the course of 1954, prices rose.
Although not to the same extent as income,
Thus the population’s net income increased.”

Gillies emphasises that:

Many a poor consecutive is sub-standard even though “everything is there”, since everything is given the same weight and no particular elements or threads are highlighted, making it difficult for the listener of the interpretation to know what the speaker is really trying to say (Jones 2002:22 cited from Gillies 2005:77).

In relation to his definition of idea (subject, verb and object), Gillies suggests noting the three segments diagonally across the page, as well as to separate each segment by means of a horizontal line, as can be seen in example 4 (2005:43). He enumerates a number of reasons in favour of noting ideas diagonally; he argues that notes taken this way are easier to read back, have a visible structure (make the structure of the speech visible at a glance), allowing eyes to move from left to right like (in a natural movement), the beginning of each idea is noted furthest on the left (beginning being the most important part of an idea), there is no syntactic interference and it gives the interpreter more free space for possible additions.

Example 4 (Gillies 2005:46).

S V

In the areas for which I have some responsibility, **there were** also, as the Prime Minister has

O


mentioned, some important **developments** at Feira.

S V

O

O


We took stock of the European Union’s **relations** with Russia and **the situation** there, including in Chechenya, in the light of the recent EU-Russia Summit, which I think was regarded as fairly successful.



As can be seen from example 5, besides of taking down the idea diagonally, Gillies uses Rozan’s principle of verticality, by writing words one below the other (relations, situation). The principle of parallel *values* suggests, that if there are for example two or more subjects for the same verb, providing they are of equal value, they should be noted parallel to one another (2005:78).

Example 5 (Gillies 2005:78).

Because French, German and British government have cut customs duties.



As already mentioned, Gillies advises noting ideas diagonally across the page. One of the reasons he proposes that is that the beginning of each idea is the most important segment, and it should be therefore noted further to the left. In his principle of *shifting values*, he proposes

shifting everything that is of relevance to the left, and vice versa, everything less important to the right, thus facilitating reading back notes (2005:83). As stated in Gillies: "This system suggests that the most important elements are furthest to the left, and that any two elements in the same section of notes, the same idea, that are vertically aligned on the page are of equal value" (2005:86).

Ilg and Lambert indicate that in 1974 Buzan introduced a different approach both to studying in general and note-taking. He proposes a system of manipulating the space on the page, and not in a usual, linear manner, but using a method called *patterned note-taking*. The explanation of this term by Norton 1981: 68 (cited from Ilg and Lambert 1996: 87):

The main idea behind patterned notes is that the student identifies the central argument or concept in the information presented and that this is represented by a key word or phrase placed in the middle of the page. From this central point, it is possible to build up a structure using arrows, shapes, pictorial illustrations and lines which radiate out from the central concept in as many different directions as required.

As Ilg and Lambert (1996:87) argue, this pattern of noting is more in tune with the way our brain works, as opposed to the conventional linear method of noting, from top to bottom and from left to right.

4.3.3. *Links*

Both Rozan and Gillies point out the importance of noting down links, as they serve to connect ideas. As Herbert (1956:47, cited from Rozan 1956:18) argues, the most important, and at the same time most difficult to note is the sequence of ideas and links between them. There is no use of noting the idea without being able to connect it to what had previously been said, and to what comes next. Rozan emphasises the importance of noting down links and asserts that "we should never miss out the links" (1956:18). He proposes determining an abbreviation or symbol for a link that has certain meaning, and then use it for all the links that have the same or similar meaning. To name just a few examples: *tho* although, despite the fact that; to convey opposition, *tfe* therefore, one can then conclude: to convey conclusion. *In+* in addition, furthermore, if we also take account of; to convey the idea of additional precision. Jean Herbert (1956:46, cited from Rozan 1956:19) indicates that

Linking is not just about representing the idea; it will often impact on the very content of the speech. It is a question of noting quickly and without repetition the group of subject words and the group of complement words to which the idea relates. This problem can be solved quickly and easily by using the recall arrow.

Gillies (2005:58) agrees that “a speech is all about two things: the ideas and the links between them.” He also highlights that what is important to bear in mind, is that the interpreter should recognize and write down, not the words or expressions which the speaker uses to signal ideas, but the links he sees between ideas. The same as Rozan, he proposes thinking of abbreviations or symbols which can be used to represent certain groups of links, e.g. TO (purpose) = (in order) to, in such a way as to, so that, with the aim of, the purpose being to. It is pointed out, however, that these symbols/ abbreviations must mean something to the interpreter, not his teacher or a colleague. According to Gillies (2005:62), links should be noted on the left side of the page, i.e. in the margin. The two reasons for it are visibility (what is noted in the margin stands out), and readability (due to natural eye movement, and if noting ideas starting from the left, the eyes go to the left at the beginning of each new idea).

4.3.4. *The Recall Line*

The recall line is, as previously stated, a means of linking a previously stated idea to the new section in which it is stated once again. Gillies (2005:135), however warns that it should not be used for links: “The recall line is not a link, it is a quick mechanical way of avoiding noting the same thing twice on one page.” He also indicates that the recall line should be a simple line, not with an arrow (not to be confused with the causal relationship between two parts of the speech), and that it has to be drawn in a way that it does not obscure the already written notes.

4.4. *What to note*

According to Gillies (2005:120) things that must be noted are the following: ideas; links; who is speaking; verb tense and modal verbs; proper names, numbers, dates, lists; terms to be

transcoded (certain words that the speaker is using, e.g. technical terminology) and the last sentence of the speech (often conveys an important message).

In case the interpreter did not have enough time to note something, or simply did not hear well, a blank line should be left, in order to remind him later, during the reformulation phase, that something is missing, and to give him a chance to use the context and his memory (2005:168).

A pro-form is “for the purposes of note-taking ... a lexical unit that refers back, not just to one person, or object, but to a whole passage, a whole idea, or series of events” Gillies (2005:151). It is similar to a recall line. An example of a pro-form is *this is why, it was for this reason* (Gillies 2005: 151). He suggests drawing a close bracket on the right side of the notes, alongside the idea the reference was made. The height of the bracket should correspond to the top and bottom of the idea noted. Another line should be drawn from the centre of the bracket to where the reference is made.

Ilg and Lambert (1996:78) argue that note-taking should be used for noting information “which is not easily stored in and retrieved from the memory, i.e. structure of the text, facts, figures, names, and deliberate nuances.”

5. Pedagogy of consecutive interpreting and note-taking

Regarding the issue of how and at what phase of consecutive interpreting training note-taking should be taught, there are many different stances. Since consecutive interpreting requires many skills, e.g. speech analysis, note-taking skills (thus a developed note-taking system), public speaking skills, it seems that there is no consensus about what should be taught first and how.

Gillies (2005:17) considers that the first step in consecutive interpreting training is speech analysis (discussed in 4.1.2.). Since speeches are not just an “arbitrary muddle of unrelated ideas”, and are made up of logically related ideas. He therefore argues that once students learn to recognize these structures, it will be easier for them to write notes in a structured way. In his book, he introduces a series of exercises in English (he suggests using the interpreter’s mother

tongue at this level as well as written texts) that aim at recognizing and analysing parts of the speech, making structure maps, i.e. “summarize the function and structure of the speech component parts alongside the original text” (Gillies 2005:23), making mini-summaries (summary of main-ideas), making mind-maps of speeches. As the next step he introduces his notion of idea (discussed in 4.1.), followed by a series of exercises where students should recognize ideas in a text. Up to here, there is no production phase from notes, students are writing texts in their mother tongue. Although the next chapter of his book is “The Beginning of Notes”, students are exercising splitting ideas into SVO groups and writing them diagonally across the page (discussed in 4.3.2), even though he recommends using a foreign language at this stage, the exercises are still done in writing. As the next step, he proposes reproducing speeches from notes made from written texts in mother tongue into the mother tongue. Then he introduces a foreign language (written texts are however still used for taking notes). After the students had practised only by using written text as the source, he suggests starting with spoken speeches, but to go back to chapter 1 and 2, thus analysing and summarizing the speeches and writing SVO groups (ideas) diagonally, first in the mother tongue, then in foreign language. After 13 weeks of exercise, according to his estimation, the real note-taking exercises should be introduced. First the exercises for speech production from notes taken in the mother-tongue source, then from a foreign language.

Henderson (1976:113) suggests that the tutor should

first explore the nature of the process: the place of short-term memory, the principles discussed above; the note-pad itself and the physical limitations of notation at speed. To discourage a common initial tendency to make excessively detailed notes, remarks must from the start be delivered at ‘normal’ speed though this is a somewhat elastic term; a better phrase is perhaps ‘natural delivery’, avoiding any temptation to speak at dictation speed). In this way the first principle to note ideas rather than words-is in effect forced upon the student.

He indicates that note-taking is just “a tool which the consecutive interpreter needs to master”, and to accomplish that, he needs to go through all phases of the consecutive interpreting, including the reconstruction of speech from notes. He concludes that literature on this topic, regarding the actual teaching strategies is mostly limited to examples of “‘pre-interpreting’ exercises and gambits leading up to the real thing, i.e. succinct and effective notation of a complete speech.” But he stresses the benefits of these exercises, especially forms of monolingual and interlingual precis. He proposes two methods of note-taking training. The first

method suggest working from smaller to larger semantic groups, i.e. words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs. Although it is a good preliminary work, it will not teach the student to recognize ideas in a longer speech. The second method follows after the tutor had explained the principles and showed a few examples. It consists in interpreting longer passages which contain more than one idea, they should however be “fully within the student’s comprehension.” Tutors should be careful regarding the level of advice and criticism. The students should be encouraged to add more detail in their interpretation, both from the notes and memory, advised to pay attention to style and faithfulness. He proposes to intensify the difficulty of the exercises by introducing different levels of registers, lexicon, accent, quality of the speaker, speed, etc., but emphasises the importance of the appropriate level of difficulty at the beginning, regarding clarity, audibility and comprehensibility, in order that students could achieve “high standards of interpretation from the start.” The principles of verticalism and shift, i.e. the page layout, have to be stressed as being just as equally important as symbols and abbreviations.

Gile (2009:186) argues that the Efforts Model and the process of processing capacity should be explained to students at the very beginning, and that they “seem to be efficient in helping them understand many difficulties they experience as well as interpreting strategies and tactics advocated by teachers, including conference preparation, ... , note-taking in consecutive and language skills enhancement.” He advises exercises of speech repetition in the same language (not interpreting at the beginning) as well as conduction a following short experiment (2005:187) for awareness-raising. Students should be divided into 2 groups. The first group should take notes, and the second one should take notes only when it comes to numbers, names and technical terms (if necessary). The students are then required to interpret a short presentation containing a few names, and whenever s/he comes to a name, the students should indicate whether they heard it properly. After the comparison of the proportions of names heard correctly between both of the groups, it turned out that the students who were not taking notes heard the names better than the group of students who did take notes. According to Gile, it is a great introduction to the presentation of Effort Models. As already mentioned, they are didactic, and have been developed with the goal that student can easily understand them (2009:193).

Pöchhacker (2004:183) indicates that the most publications on pedagogy of consecutive interpreting are concerned with note-taking. According to him, authors “describing their teaching approaches (e.g. Seleskovitch and Lederer 1989, 1995; Kalina 1998) usually stress the need for

preliminary exercises to enhance ‘active listening’, message analysis and recall, including such techniques as ‘clozing’, ‘chunking’ and visualization.”

Ilg and Lambert (1996:73) recommend introducing exercises in sight translation and interpretation as well as exercises in summarizing and expanding. At this stage, they also recommend *unilingual exercises*, first with written texts and then with verbal information, in order for students to learn how to syntactically *restructure* and *paraphrase* the written text or speech. This will also help students become aware of the difference between a written message and improvised speech. It is also highlighted that students need to develop “an eye (and an ear) for *larger units*, for entire sentences and paragraphs” (1996:74).

They argue that students’ focus should be on *speech comprehension* and *production*, and on how to organise their thoughts for them to be able to plan a convincing statement. *Memory* exercises without taking notes are also suggested, in order to give students the opportunity to see how their memory operates (some have a verbal memory, some visual). They also emphasise the importance of learning phraseology, register, public speaking conventions and rhetorical devices. They consider that “note-taking explanations and demonstrations should come as late as possible in the curriculum”, they argue that in order to do something in practice, one must first have the theoretical background, and then acquisition of the necessary skills will advance faster.

Regarding the question if note-taking should be taught systematically, Lambert lists a few authors’ stances: “Some are sceptical (Thiery, 1976, 1981), and some remain neutral (Seleskovitch & Lederer, 1989). Others view it as fundamental for all first-year students (Matyssek, 1989).” According to Ilg and Lambert (1996:78), in the group of those who suggest teaching note-taking systematically, it is emphasised that it should be highly individual, and based on principles of efficiency and economy. Ilg and Lambert (1996:87) argue that it is important to find the most economical and effective way of abbreviating concepts and terms, in memory and on paper. When explaining the importance of attending to the macro-text, she made the following comparison: “They should learn to read the road map before looking for the footpath in the countryside”, referring to the need to develop the sense for the sentences and paragraphs before looking for symbols and acronyms. Lambert poses a question whether information processing is more successful when the interpreter only listens or when s/he both listens and takes notes, and admits that it needs to be investigated. But, it is sure that in an untrained interpreter, taking notes detracts attention from the listening process, what results in

too many notes (usually the surface structure of the text, and not the deeper meaning). It is therefore important to teach students ways to process the information they hear, and to “complement this process with the appropriate consecutive note-taking techniques”, because note-taking can “enhance the listening process” (Ilg and Lambert 1996:86).

Schweda-Nicholson (1985) argues that the common problem of students noting too many things down can be solved by using videotapes in the classroom. Since students at the beginning of their training find hard to believe that it is easier to produce the interpretation from their notes if they have noted only few things, the author considers that showing them how trained interpreters take notes will help them. Even though note-taking techniques are individual, she argues that certain principles, e.g. use of spacing, indentation, indication of repetition, structuring techniques regarding lists and examples are used similarly by most interpreters, and therefore argues that videotapes are good way of presenting these techniques to students. Trained interpreters take notes of a short speech on the blackboard; the process is videotaped and later shown to students. In that way, students are provided with the possibility to see how the notes are taken while listening to the speech. They can see that interpreters do not take a lot of notes, also that they first listen and analyse the text and then write it down.

6. Note-taking system from the Croatian language perspective

Books on note-taking have been written by many authors from different countries, but none of the proposed note-taking principles and/or systems was concerned with the Croatian language. Most of the publications were either written in English, German or French, or translated into one of these languages. As far as symbols are concerned, they are language-independent, and therefore can function in any language and be easily incorporated in abbreviations. My suggestions will for that reason, mainly be concerned with abbreviations.

Regarding abbreviations, a few authors (Gillies, Błaszczuk and Hanusiak, Rozan) already proposed using the morphology of a language to form symbols or abbreviations for certain prefixes and suffixes. Since Croatian language differentiates gender forms; similarly as suggested by Rozan, gender could be indicated with a letter in the exponent, preceded by the base of the word. I will use the word *prevoditelj/ica* (engl. translator/interpreter) to illustrate the

suggestion. Since there are more than one endings in Croatian that could form masculine gender, (however, most female nouns end in *a*), there is no sense in trying to think of that many symbols for indicating gender. Although there is another solution to the question of the female gender, namely the letter *a* in the exponent, I would still propose the following (because the proposed letters *ž* and *m* are the first letters of the Croatian words for gender; *muški rod* and *ženski rod*, so that the symbols come from the usual abbreviations for those expressions)

ž for female prevoditeljica = prevod^ž
m for masculine (independent of the suffix) prevoditelj = prevod^m

Regarding the number, the situation is a bit different. To indicate the masculine plural, the ending *i* is used, and to indicate female plural the ending *e*. I therefore suggest using these letters to indicate plural. Singular does not need to be specially indicated, since it is implied if no signal for plural is indicated:

e for female plural prevoditeljice = prevod^e
i for masculine plural prevoditelji = prevodⁱ

Since Croatian language has seven cases, which might be a problem in some cases, the above mentioned proposal might not be the best solution. In certain contexts, it might not be clear what refers to what without pointing out the case. For example, the third case, *dativ*, answers to the question: *to whom, to what?*, and the endings are different regarding both number and gender. In these situations I suggest writing the last three letters of the words in the exponent, or indicate by means of an arrow with the letter *d* (for *dativ*) in the exponent that something refers to the word *prevoditelj*, and in the end of the word add symbols for singular, plural, masculine or feminine gender:

Dativ plural masculine: prevoditeljima	prevod ^{ima} or → ^d prevod ⁱ
Dativ plural feminine: prevoditeljicama	prevod ^{ama} → ^d prevod ^e
Dativ singular masculine: prevoditelju	prevod ^{elju} → ^d prevod ^m
Dativ singular feminine: prevoditeljici	prevod ^{ici} → ^d prevod ^ž

Since this is not much shorter than the original words, it should be used only when the situation is not clear from the context.

As regards common noun suffixes such as -stvo, -ost, -anje, etc. I suggest thinking of a symbol or words to indicate it. For example:

čovječanstvo – čovO or

partnerstvo –partO

ministarstvo-minO

znanost- znaST

moćnost-mogST

znanje- znaNJ

obrazovanje-obrazNJ

državljanstvo- □^{stvo} (providing that □ is considered to be a symbol for a country)

Another possibility is to come up with a symbol or abbreviation for a certain group of words, e.g. one symbol/abbreviation following a word to represent all sciences:

biology = biologija = bioL

psycology = psihologija = psihL

Some adjectives, for example, those in –ski or –čki could be presented by a symbol for the noun, and then encircled with an arrow to indicate that it is an adjective:

ekonomija = E; ekonomski = E (but encircled with an arrow to indicate an adjective)

politika = polt. ; politički = polt. (encircled with an arrow)

The same goes for verbs, if we assume that e.g. ↓ represents a symbol for a verb:

proizvodnja = proz^{nja}; proizvoditi = proz↓

rad = rad; raditi = rad↓

As far as short words are considered, for example ja (eng. I), on (eng. he), ona (eng. she), hoće (will), biti (be), da (yes), ne (no), etc., they are short both in English and Croatian, so there is no use in interchange between languages.

Regarding terms that might be frequently used in consecutive interpreting I will give only a few suggestions:

Dame i gospodo = DG

Srdačno Vas pozdravljam = ♥p

Lijepo Vas pozdravljam = LP

Hrvatska vlada = HR G^{ovt} (here, the English abbreviation of government is used, since Croatian abbreviation would be HV, which refers to the Armed Forces of the Republic of Croatia)

S druge strane = s2.s

Dnevni red = Dn.R.

As suggested by Nolan, some words can be written without vowels, e.g. konkurencija = knkrnc.
ljubav = ljbv., natjecanje = ntjc., država = držv., životinja = žvtnj., rast = rst., danas = dns, etc.

The symbol for Croatia could be CRO (international), RH (indicating Republic of Croatia – Republika Hrvatska) or HR (Hrvatska).

Also, for example P could be a symbol for the president (since in both languages, this word starts with P- president/predsjednik), but then politics (politika) should be noted differently, e.g. polt. (if it were only pol. it could also be understood as a half - pola), or the symbol π could be used, as proposed earlier (see 4.2.1.). Razl. could be an abbreviation for razlika (difference), but then for razlog (reason) it should be for example raz., and for razvoj (development) perhaps raz→; potpisati = potp. and potpisnik = potp^m, but then for potpuno = potp. (but in a circle).

These are all just suggestions, and due to complexity of Croatian language and much of English words and abbreviations which are often used, it is hard to think of something that would be a better solution for a lot of terms, therefore, a much deeper research would be necessary to establish a whole note-taking system with Croatian language as its base.

7. Future of note-taking

The development of technology might bring some changes into the note-taking as we know it. In the future, a notepad and a pencil may not be the only thing an interpreter can use. A new method might be introduced, i.e. the so called simultaneous consecutive interpreting. It functions

in a way that the original speech is recorded by a digital voice recorder, and then played back to the interpreter via earphones, and the interpretation then follows in the simultaneous mode.

According to Pöchhacker et Hamidi (2007:277), the first to successfully use the “digitally mastered consecutive” was the EU staff interpreter Michele Ferrari. He tried this method in a real setting in 1999, in 2001 and again in 2003 within the DG Interpretation in a series of tests. “The aim of these tests was not only to compare traditional and simultaneous consecutive interpreting, but also to examine different devices, such as handheld PC, a notebook with digital audio-editing software, and a digital voice recorder” (Pöchhacker et Hamidi 2007:277). The results of the first series of tests showed that simultaneous consecutive was “more complete and precise”, but also sounds “too artificial” for certain language combinations (Pöchhacker et Hamidi 2007:277). The second series showed that simultaneous consecutive was a “viable possibility”, but that the use of electronic devices needs to be practised. There are two more interpreters in the United States who also tried the new technique, namely John Lombardi (2003) and Erik Camayd-Freixas (2005), who used it for court interpreting. Lombardi tested it informally; Camayd-Freixas carried an experiment at Florida International University in 2005 and even “established label marketed by his language consulting firm” (Pöchhacker et Hamidi 2007:278). The aim of the experiment was to compare classic consecutive, with notes and simultaneous consecutive and to determine the accuracy of the interpretation, which was estimated regarding the words that were missing in the interpretation. Higher accuracy rate was measured in the simultaneous consecutive mode, especially when longer statements were involved. The interpretation using the new method proved to be more faithful to the original regarding intonation and liveliness, and the interpreter is able to listen to the speaker more carefully, since he is not taking notes, which results in better comprehension of the speech.

Another study was conducted at the Vienna University Center for Translation Studies (Hamidi 2006). The aim of the study was to answer the following questions: 1. Does technology-assisted consecutive interpreting yield better results than the conventional consecutive method?, 2. How does the audience respond to the new consecutive technique compared to the traditional one?, and 3. Is simultaneous consecutive likely to be adopted by professional interpreters as an interpreting method in its own right? (Pöchhacker et Hamidi, 2007:278-279). There was one group of three interpreters with at least ten years of experience as interpreters, who had to interpret two similar speeches, the first one using a digital voice recorder, the second one in the classic consecutive mode. The results showed that two of three interpreters felt more comfortable

doing the simultaneous consecutive, and that they considered the interpretations done in that mode to be superior. As an advantage of this mode, they indicated that it is not as strenuous as consecutive, and it offered them a chance to listen to the original twice. It was however pointed out that they had to interpret everything, which was considered as a drawback. After the performances were assessed on the basis of transcript analysis, self-assessment and audience response, the results showed that the new method “permits enhanced interpreting performances, reflected in more fluent delivery, closer source-target correspondence, and fewer prosodic deviations” (Pöchhacker et Hamidi 2007:288). These results were corroborated by the “favourable response” of the audience regarding the new method. These ratings were again confirmed by the interpreters who had participated in the study, who easily adopted this mode and consider it “a viable technique.” This new method needs to, however be further investigated.

8. Conclusion

As has been said, the aim of this paper was to give a brief overview of the development of note-taking systems for consecutive interpreting, an efficient note-taking system being the essential part of this mode of interpreting.

After having given an introduction to the consecutive interpreting in general, and the note-taking as a part of it, the basic principles of note-taking were presented. All in all, there are many different approaches as to how one should take notes. Principles and examples presented in this paper were taken from relevant literature in the field, and should serve as a basis and an inspiration in developing one’s own note-taking system. Opinions and propositions were made for every relevant aspect of note-taking, as proposed by major experts in the field. Also, an overview of note-taking teaching was provided, regarding when it should be introduced in terms of level of study, phase of consecutive interpreting teaching and the manner in which it should be taught. In the end, a proposition of possible adjustment to Croatian language was given, and the future of note-taking discussed, in terms of technology improvement, which suggest that note-taking soon might be replaced by digital voice recorders.

References

Albl-Mikasa, M. (2008). "(Non-)Sense in note-taking for consecutive interpreting", *Interpreting* 10:2, 197-231.

Albl-Mikasa M. and Kohn K. (2002). "Note-taking in consecutive interpreting. On the reconstruction of an individualised language." In: Van Vaerenbergh, Leona (ed). *Linguistics and Translation Studies. Translation Studies and Linguistics. Reihe Linguistica Antverpiensia 1/2002*. Hogeschool Antwerpen, Hoger Instituut voor Vertalers & Tolken, 257-272.

Baselli, V. (2012). "Which language do interpreters use in Consecutive Interpreting?" (Advanced Research in Scientific Areas 2012 December, 3. - 7. 2012). Available at: <http://www.arsa-conf.com>

Błaszczuk P., Hanusiak D. (2010) "The Choice of Language for Note-taking for Consecutive Interpreting: A Polish Perspective." MikaEL Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu. Electronic proceedings of the KäTu symposium on translation and interpreting studies 4.

Dam, Helle V. 2004. "Interpreter's notes. On the choice of language". In: Gyde H., Malmkjær K., Gile D. (2004). *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies. Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Copenhagen 2001*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Gile, D. (2009). *Basic Concepts and Model for Interpreter and Translator Training. Revised edition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Gillies A. (2005). *Note-taking for Consecutive Interpreting - A Short Course*, St. Jerome Publishing.

Hamidi A. and Pöchhacker F. (2007). "Simultaneous consecutive interpreting: a new technique put to the test", *Meta* 52 (2), 276-289. Available at: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/016070ar>

Henderson, John A. (1976). "Note-Taking for Consecutive Interpreting", *Babel*. V22, No3, 1976. pp107-116

Ilg G. and Lambert S. (1996) "Teaching consecutive interpreting", *Interpreting* 1(1), 69-99.

Nolan, J. (2005). *Interpretation Techniques and Exercises*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Rozan, J.F. (2002.) *Note-taking in Consecutive Interpreting* (tr. A. Gillies/B. Hrehorowicz). Kraków: Tertium.

Schweda-Nicholson N. (1985). "Consecutive Interpretation Training: Videotapes in the classroom", *Meta : journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal*, vol. 30, n° 2, 1985, p. 148-154. Available at: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/003731ar>

Taylor-Bouladon, V. (2000). *Conference interpreting: principles and practice*. (third edition 2011).