

Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Didaktika tlumočnické notace

Didactics of Note-taking

(bakalářská práce)

Olomouc 2014

Bc. Richard Sladovník

Didactics of Note-taking
Bachelor's Thesis

Autor: Bc. Richard Sladovník
Studijní obor: Angličtina se zaměřením na komunitní tlumočení a překlad
Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Veronika Prágerová, Ph.D.
Počet stran: 30
Počet znaků: 59 514
Olomouc 2014

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně a uvedl úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne 07.05.2014

.....

Děkuji PhDr. Veronice Prágerové, Ph.D. za odborné vedení a rady, které mi při psaní bakalářské práce poskytla.

Abstract

This thesis deals with the topic of teaching note-taking for the purposes of consecutive interpreting. Note-taking is a widely discussed topic among the theoreticians of interpreting and they advocate different approaches to it. Due to this discrepancy, there are also various opinions on teaching it. The first part of this thesis introduces note-taking as such and the main approaches to it represented by Rozan, Matyssek, and Seleskovitch. The second part describes four methods of teaching and practicing note-taking and evaluates them based on criteria formulated according to conclusions of Andres's empirical study of note-taking.

Keywords

Consecutive interpreting, note-taking, didactics, Rozan, Matyssek, Seleskovitch, Gillies.

Anotace

Tato práce se zabývá tématem výuky tlumočnické notace, která se používá při konsekutivním tlumočení. Tlumočnická notace je hojně diskutované téma a teoretici tlumočení k ní zaujímají různé postoje. Z tohoto důvodu také existuje několik různých názorů, jak ji vyučovat. První část této práce se zabývá tlumočnickou notací jako takovou a představuje hlavní teoretické přístupy k notaci, konkrétně díla Rozana, Matysška a Seleskovitchové. Druhá část popisuje čtyři metody výuky tlumočnické notace a hodnotí je na základě kritérií, která jsou stanovena podle závěrů empirické studie, kterou na téma tlumočnické notace vypracovala Andresová.

Klíčová slova

Konsekutivní tlumočení, tlumočnická notace, didaktika, Rozan, Matyssek, Seleskovitchová, Gillies.

List of Abbreviations

SVO Subject – Verb – Object

ESIT École supérieure d'interprètes et de traducteurs

ETI École de traduction et d'Interprétation

Contents

1	Introduction.....	8
2	The Role of Note-taking in Consecutive Interpreting	11
2.1	General Rules on What to Note	12
2.2	General Rules on How to Note	14
2.3	General Rules on How to Read Back Notes	15
3	Main Approaches to Note-taking.....	16
3.1	Note-taking by Jean-Francois Rozan	16
3.2	Note-taking by Heinz Matyssek.....	18
3.3	Note-taking by Danica Seleskovitch.....	20
3.4	Alternative Approach to Note-taking by Tony Buzan	21
4	Andres's Study.....	22
5	Didactic Approaches	24
5.1	Jean Herbert	24
5.2	James Nolan	25
5.3	Roderick Jones	27
5.4	Andrew Gillies	28
6	Evaluation of Teaching Methods	34
6.1	Operations Practised.....	34
6.2	System Taught.....	35
7	Conclusion	37
8	Resumé.....	38
9	Bibliography	40

1 Introduction

Consecutive interpreting is an interpreting involving the interpreter being in the same room as the speaker, listening to what the speaker is saying and often also taking notes. When the speaker has finished, the interpreter delivers the interpretation. (Consecutive note-taking, 2014) It is called consecutive, because the interpreter is speaking consecutively to the speaker. According to Gillies (2005, 3), the speech may be anything between one and twenty minutes in length and the interpreter will rely on his memory, notes and general knowledge to reproduce the message in another language. For consecutive interpreting, nothing more is needed than a speaker, an interpreter, a notepad, and a pen.

Consecutive interpreting is one of the two skills that constitute conference interpreting. The other one is simultaneous interpreting. In that case, the interpreter starts interpreting shortly after the speaker starts speaking and both end almost at the same time. The interpreter is speaking simultaneously to the speaker, hence the name simultaneous interpreting. It is done using the appropriate equipment involving microphones for speakers, sound-proofed booths for interpreters, and headphones for the delegates, who wish to listen to the interpretation. (Jones 2002, 5)

Conference interpreting became a profession at the end of the World War I when French lost its exclusivity as the sole language of diplomacy and international gatherings started using English as well. (Herbert 1952, 1–2) By that time, conference interpreting meant consecutive interpreting, because the equipment necessary for the simultaneous interpreting had not yet been invented. ‘Simultaneous interpreting came along after the World War II and by the 1970s had overtaken consecutive as the main form of conference interpretation.’ (Gillies 2005, 3) However, consecutive interpreting still has its place and is considered by many the superior of the two skills. (Gillies 2005, 3) Helen Campbell, an interpreter trainer and accredited conference interpreter for the European Union, adds, that ‘[consecutive interpreting] is the basis of what interpreting is about. If you can do good consecutive [interpreting], you can learn simultaneous [interpreting] very easily’. (Helen Campbell, 2013)

Note-taking is one of crucial operations involved in the process of consecutive interpreting. As Jones puts it, ‘none but exceptional interpreters can be expected to

work [...] without any real assistance from notes.’ (Jones 2002, 38) And yet, despite this importance of note-taking, the theoretical approaches to this issue vary significantly and sometimes are even contradictory. Widely discussed questions are, for example, whether interpreters should take notes in source, target or any other language; how many symbols should interpreters use; whether they should start taking notes immediately or with a time lag; or how much information should interpreters note and to what extent should they rely on their memory. This discrepancy in the theoretical field has also its implications for the didactics of note-taking. Some are sceptical to the notion of note-taking being taught systematically, some are neutral, and some are in favour. (Ilg 1996, 78) And even when theoreticians express their thoughts on this topic, their opinions again differ significantly.

This thesis consists of two major parts. In the first part, three main approaches to note-taking are introduced, along with one alternative approach. Note-taking is a highly personalized activity and each interpreter takes notes in their own way, but these three main approaches could be regarded as *extremes* setting boundaries within which the majority of interpreters operate. The alternative approach is different from the rest of the approaches to such extent that it should be mentioned here as well.

The second part of the thesis presents and evaluates four different methods of teaching and practising note-taking. They were chosen based on the following criteria: *universal applicability* (methods which can be used only with a particular language were dismissed) and *dissimilarity*. Authors of these four methods are: Herbert, Nolan, Jones, and Gillies. Herbert is the author of the first publication on the conference interpreting and represents minimalistic approach to notes. (Ilg 1996, 70–71) Nolan advocates using many symbols and focuses mainly on this area, while Jones and Gillies propose a complex system of note-taking with less symbols and better structured notes. This thesis analyzes both Jones’s and Gillies’s method, because on one hand, they advocate very similar note-taking system, but on the other hand, their methods of teaching and practising note-taking are completely different. It has to be noted, however, that only the Gillies’s method is a ‘step-by-step guide to the skill of note-taking’ (Interpreter Training Resources), the others are not that systematic and elaborate.

The methods are evaluated according to the criteria based on conclusions of Andres’s study. Andres conducted an exceptional study in the field of note-taking

(Pöchhacker 2004, 184) and based on the obtained data, she formulated conclusions applicable to note-taking teaching methods, which are described in chapter 4.

2 The Role of Note-taking in Consecutive Interpreting

Fleming in his video on note-taking says: ‘I would put a public health warning on a consecutive notepad and it would be something like this: “WARNING: THIS NOTEPAD COULD SERIOUSLY DAMAGE YOUR ABILITY TO INTERPRET. Please, read the instructions carefully before use.”’ (Consecutive note-taking, 2014) He then continues and gives a list of instructions for use, out of which the first three are most relevant at the moment. They are as follows:

1. Listening, understanding, and analyzing matters above all.
2. Do not write anything until you have done all these three things.
3. Note down the main ideas and the links between them. (Consecutive note-taking, 2014)

The point number three represents two of the fundamental rules of note-taking, which form two of Rozan’s famous seven principles of note-taking (1956). These rules are closely connected with one role of note-taking, which is to support memory (and not to substitute it). As Rozan puts it, notes should ‘remind the interpreter at a glance of all the ideas in a given passage of a speech and the links between them, and [...] facilitate a fluent and stylish interpretation’. (2002, 25)

Fleming’s point number two is the exact opposite to Herbert, who says: ‘*The interpreter should always start taking notes as soon as the speech begins.*’ (1952, 33) This dichotomy only further illustrates the different opinions various interpreters have on the issue of note-taking. However, what is more important, Fleming stresses also the function of note-taking as a tool for analytical structuring of the source speech. In this respect, Gillies says: ‘Notes taken in consecutive interpreting are a representation of the skeleton structure of the speech. [...] In this way **your notes become the visual representation of your analysis of the source speech.**’ (2005, 6) The analysis and understanding of the source speech is beneficial also because of the fact that we remember better what we really understand. As Kautz argues, note-taking has consequently two purposes in the practical use: to intensify interpreter’s understanding of the speech and at the same time support their memory. (2000, 312)

Campbell mentions also another role of note-taking when she says that good notes help the interpreter divide between the main ideas and sub-ideas, the slightly less important ones. (Helen Campbell, 2013) Herbert adds that this proves valuable when ‘the interpreter is informed only at the end of the speech that he should make his interpretation much shorter than had been expected’. (1952, 35)

2.1 General Rules on What to Note

Knowing what to note is perhaps as important as knowing how to note it. Again, different theoreticians may accent different points, but a summary provided by Jones (2002) could be regarded as a basic blueprint for this issue. He recognizes two major groups of elements to be noted by an interpreter: things related to the interpreter’s analysis of the source speech and elements that ‘an interpreter cannot remember or does not want to make the effort to remember’. (Jones 2002, 41)

These four points belong to the category of things related to the interpreter’s analysis:

1. *Main ideas*. The point of noting the main ideas is not just to remember them, as one could argue that as the main ideas, they will be remembered anyway. A more important reason for noting them is to provide the interpreter with a skeleton outline of the speech. Well structured notes will ‘help the interpreter reproduce the speech without faltering, moving swiftly from one idea to the next without having to search in their mind for the next idea.’ (ibid, 41)
2. *Links and separations between ideas*. Sometimes it can happen that the speech has such a clear logic that the interpreter does not need to note the links and still is able to reproduce the speech flawlessly; however, most of the times it is not the case and then it is ‘absolutely crucial’ for the interpreter to render the links correctly. ‘Indeed, if anything, the links are rather more important to note than the so-called “main ideas” themselves,’ since a main idea can be noted in a very abbreviated form and then recalled with the help of one’s memory, but dealing with links such as *but*, *therefore*, etc. without noting them may be much more difficult. (ibid, 41)
3. *Point of view being expressed*. Just like with links, ‘it may not always be easy to build these [points of view] in faithfully without some reminder from notes,’ (ibid, 42) and it is crucial for the listener to know who is speaking.

4. *Tenses of verbs*. ‘The delegates need to know “what happened when”’. It is therefore important to note tenses and modes, if appropriate. Also modal verbs are important to note, as they ‘have a decisive influence on the function of other verbs and determine the meaning of a sentence.’ (ibid, 42)

The category of elements that are too difficult to remember or not worth remembering includes following three things:

1. *Numbers*. Numbers are completely abstract and even the simplest number may become difficult to retain for five minutes or more. When there is a series of numbers, notes become indispensable. Jones recommends to the interpreter to stop writing anything they are writing at the moment as soon as they hear a number or realize that there is a number to come. It is easier to come back and finish the previous idea once the numbers are taken than to finish the idea first and only then try to note the numbers. (ibid, 42)
2. *Proper names*. Well-known and familiar names may be easy to remember, but as soon as there are more of them or the interpreter is not acquainted with them, they need to be noted. It may also happen that the interpreter does not know how to write the name (as it may be written in script unfamiliar to them), then it is the best to note the name phonetically. (ibid, 43)
3. *Lists*. Interpreters should try to note lists as completely as possible, since they are too difficult to remember. The same rule applies as to numbers – interpreters should drop whatever they are just writing and try to note the list immediately. If they failed to note something, they should clearly indicate that something is missing; if they missed more elements, they should note how many. (ibid, 43-44)

Gillies further elaborates on this topic and in addition to the aforementioned points, he adds two more categories of things:

1. *Terms to be transcoded*. Speakers sometimes deliberately use certain words, often technical terminology, which must be repeated and not paraphrased in the target language. (Gillies 2005, 121)
2. *The last sentence of a speech*. The last sentence, or few sentences, often contains an important message and many interpreters note it in some detail to make sure they get it right. (ibid, 121)

2.2 General Rules on How to Note

Before listing particular approaches to note-taking, it should be mentioned that there are some rules, to which a general consensus applies. Kautz provides a concise summary of these rules when he says that notes have to be:

- clear;
- unmistakable;
- simple;
- expressive;
- easy to write;
- quick to decode; and
- flexible. (Kautz 2000, 315)

It should be also noted that shorthand is not an option in note-taking. Herbert offers three reasons for this ban:

1. Unlike in the case of longhand, even the best stenographers are not able to read several lines at one glance. Such ability is very important especially in cases when a speech has to be abbreviated or duplications have to be removed.
2. Should the need arise, it is impossible to adjust or correct a shorthand quickly enough (e.g. when speakers change what they have said or do not finish a sentence).
3. It is not possible to read the stenograph of a speech at the speed and with the assurance required from an interpreter. (Herbert 1952, 36–37)

A vast majority of interpreters also agrees on the choice of a notepad. Gillies provides a neat summary of all the requirements on the notepad and the pen with explanatory notes; to summarize it, an A5 sized notepad with a spiral bound from the top and a firm sheet of card as the back page is recommended, preferably with plain pages or with lines or squares as faint as possible. As for the pen, according to Gillies, the best choice is a biro, because it writes ‘quickly, smoothly, clearly and quietly’. (Gillies 2005, 15–16)

2.3 General Rules on How to Read Back Notes

Reading back notes requires fluency, natural intonation, engaging the audience and using the notes correctly to achieve these goals. As Gillies puts it, ‘the word “read” might be misleading when we talk about using notes to recreate a speech because interpreters do not read their notes in the usual sense of the word.’ (Gillies 2005, 72) He then adds that the best description of the note-reading technique is the one provided by Jones (2002). Jones warns interpreters from the risk of looking too much at the notes and not enough at the audience, which may result in worse communication. ‘Interpreters, like the public speakers, must learn the art of glancing down at their notes to remind them of what they are to say next and then delivering that part of the text while looking at the audience.’ (Jones 2002, 64) To help them with this task, Jones presents a specific technique, which he compares to a pianist reading music while playing. Pianists use sheet music to remind them of what they are about to play and they always read a bit ahead of their fingers. Similarly, interpreters should always glance down at their notes while still finishing the previous passage, so that the delivery is smooth and uninterrupted. (ibid, 64)

3 Main Approaches to Note-taking

As has already been mentioned before, note-taking is a highly personalized activity. There are many different opinions on what it should look like and this discrepancy projects itself also onto the theoretical field. Andres in this connection speaks about three main approaches to note-taking represented by three prominent authors: Jean Francois-Rozan (the Geneva School – École de traduction et d'Interprétation [ETI]), Danica Seleskovitch (the Paris School – École supérieure d'interprètes et de traducteurs [ESIT]), and Heinz Matyssek (the Heidelberg School – Universität Heidelberg). (2002a, 209)

3.1 Note-taking by Jean-Francois Rozan

The most important representative of the Geneva School is Jean-Francois Rozan and his book *La prise de notes en interprétation consecutive* from 1956 (translated into English by Gillies and published as *Note-taking in Consecutive Interpreting* in 2002). In this book, Rozan published his seven principles of note-taking, which are nowadays still relevant and often referenced. These principles are:

1. *Noting the idea rather than the word.* According to Gillies, this is '[t]he most oft repeated thing you will hear as a student interpreter'. (2005, 35) It means that interpreters should note the underlying meaning of a word or expression, which is more important than the actual word or words chosen to represent this meaning. (ibid, 35)
2. *The Rules of Abbreviation.* 'The rule of thumb is that unless a word is short (4-5 letters) the interpreter should note it in an abbreviated form.' (Rozan 2002, 16) When it comes to abbreviating a word, Rozan says it is more 'meaningful and reliable' to note the first and the last letters of the word, the latter in superscript, because this way interpreters avoid possible confusion (e.g. abbreviation of *statistics* would be *st^{cs}* and not *stat.*, which could mean *statistics*, but also *statue*). Furthermore, Rozan recommends indicating gender and tense in superscript as well (e.g. 'll' for future tense and 'd' for past tense; the letters for gender depend on the languages involved). (2002, 17) Kautz further elaborates on the topic of abbreviations and in addition to

abbreviations of words (*Wordabkürzungen*), he defines also abbreviations of the meaning (*Sinnabkürzungen*), by which he means synonymous expressions that are shorter than the original ones, e.g. ‘unimaginable’ for ‘beyond imagination’. (2000, 317)

3. *Links*. ‘A speech without links is a meaningless list of ideas’, (Gillies 2005, 56) it is therefore crucial to identify and note them.
4. *Negation*. Rozan mentions noting negation either by means of a line running through a word or symbol, or by writing the word ‘no’ before the word or symbol to be negated; the latter way is deemed clearer. (Rozan 2002, 19)
5. *Emphasis*. For noting emphasis, Rozan uses very simple yet effective system of underlining the words to be highlighted. One line represents *very*, *really*, and the like and two lines represent superlatives and absolutes. Alternatively, a dotted line may be used to note uncertainty or imperfection. (ibid, 19–20)
6. *Verticality*. Principles number six and seven are ‘the backbone’ of Rozan’s system of note-taking. (ibid, 20) According to the principle of verticality, notes should be taken from top to bottom rather than from left to right. This method enables a) logical grouping of ideas, and b) omission of many links that would otherwise be necessary to note to keep notes clear. Rozan divides this principle into two subcategories: *stacking* and *using brackets*. Stacking means placing different elements of the speech above or below each other. This way, various links can be omitted and lists can be made. These are examples from Rozan: (ibid, 20)

‘the report on Western Europe’

R^{ort}
W Eur.

‘Since the French, US and UK delegations have suggested...’

As $\begin{matrix} Fre \\ US \\ UK \end{matrix}$ suggest^d

In the section devoted to using brackets, Rozan suggests using them for noting elements that are not integral to the speaker’s train of thought but rather additional points meant to clarify an idea or to highlight a certain aspect. They should be noted below the main element to which they refer. (ibid, 21)

7. Shift. Rozan gives an explanation for shift, when he writes: ‘Shift means writing notes in the place on a lower line where they would have appeared had the text on the line above been repeated.’ (ibid, 22) It is probably best to demonstrate this principle on an example:

‘Over the course of 1954, prices rose, although not to the same extent as income, thus the population’s net income increased.’
 54, prices ↗
 but ————— no = ↗ income
 so ————— Pop^{on} ↗ (ibid, 21–22)

In the second part of his book, Rozan discusses the question of using symbols and how many should an interpreter have in his or her repertoire. He warns against using too many symbols, because then the notation may be too literal and the process of note-taking may become more descriptive and less analytical. He suggests that interpreters should use symbols ‘only for the major stages of reasoning and thought’. (ibid, 25) He then divides symbols into four families, out of which he considers the first three families to be obligatory to use and the fourth to be arbitrary:

1. The Symbols of Expression: here belong symbols for *thought, speech, discussion, and approval*;
2. The Symbols of Motion: here belong *the arrow for direction (or transfer), the arrow for increase, and the arrow for decrease*;
3. The Symbols of Correspondence: into this family belong symbols for *relation, equivalence, difference, framing, plus (+), and minus (-)*;
4. Symbols for Things (arbitrary): in this family, Rozan lists symbols for *country/nation/national, international/abroad, global/universal/world, labour/work/action, issue/problem/(question), members/participants, and trade/trade relations*. (ibid, 26–31)

3.2 Note-taking by Heinz Matyssek

An utterly different system of note-taking advocates Heinz Matyssek from the Heidelberg University. He proposes a system of note-taking independent of a language (*Sprachunabhängige Notation*). It is a very systematic and detailed code of drawings and symbols, Matyssek even says that notes of a speech are not a text; they are a picture (*‘Eine [Rede] Notizennahme ist keine “Schreibe”, sondern eine*

“*Male*”). (Ilg 1996, 72) Matyssek argues that thanks to using many symbols, note-taking can be very efficient and that using his system, even average students of interpreting will be able to interpret consecutively. Matyssek sees another advantage of such system in the disconnection between symbols and particular words, which makes it easier to interpret without any interference from the source speech. (Macek 2009, 22; Andres 2002a, 211)

‘Symbol’ in this context does not mean a visual representation free of any textual reference. Matyssek defines symbol as any sign that is able to carry a meaning; for example, it can be the word ‘so’ as a linking symbol, it can be the letter ‘D’ standing for ‘Deutschland’, or it can be ‘α’ representing ‘Arbeit’. (Andres 2002a, 211)

Matyssek formulates three fundamental principles for his note-taking system: first, it is the independence of words and languages (*Wortfreiheit* and *Sprachlosigkeit*), which should be achieved by means of symbols. Second, it is noting longer segments by single symbols; symbols can be modified and combined with each other so as to facilitate this task. And third, each interpreter should elaborate his or her own system of symbols; the system of symbols provided by Matyssek should serve as an inspiration, but a certain degree of personalization is desirable. (Macek 2009, 22; Ladychenko 2010, 67–68)

Matyssek’s system of note-taking shares some similarities with the Rozan’s one as well. He stresses the importance of noting all links and logical connections and recommends using arrows in the same way as Rozan does. Also the way of noting negation and emphasis is similar to what Rozan proposes, although in case of emphasis, Matyssek introduces, in addition to Rozan’s underlining by one or two lines, a wavy line to mark mild emphasis. (Ladychenko 2010, 68–70)

Matyssek also elaborates on the layout of notes. Similar to Rozan, Matyssek advocates the principle of verticality. He proposes using left margin, where links should be noted, and horizontal lines to separate ideas. He further suggests that statements should be marked by a preceding colon, abbreviations should have a particular marker so as not to confuse them with prepositions, and the less important information should be noted in brackets. (Macek 2009, 23)

Even though Matyssek proposes a system of notes independent of any language, he expresses his opinion on the choice of the language of notes. He says

that mother tongue is best suitable for notes, because it provides the interpreter with a safe ground. (ibid, 24)

According to Matyssek, all first-year students of interpreting should be taught note-taking. (Ilg 1996, 78) To master this technique of note-taking requires a systematic teaching method and a lot of practice. At first, students should practise with written texts and only later advance to oral speeches. Matyssek also points out that students should practise in front of larger audience to get used to stress and prevent possible occurrence of 'stage fright' in the future. (Ladychenko 2010, 71–72)

It is argued that Matyssek's system of note-taking is only applicable to German (see Čeňková 2008, 58). However, Sergio Allioni, for example, one of Matyssek's followers, personalized Matyssek's system and defined 'a fairly structured "grammar of consecutive interpretation" using English and Italian syntactic rules together with a moderate number of symbols'. (Ilg 1996, 72)

3.3 Note-taking by Danica Seleskovitch

Danica Seleskovitch, one of the main figures of ESIT, introduces her highly influential concept of the Interpretive Theory of Translation, sometimes also called the *theory of sense*. 'The Interpretive Theory of Translation claims that languages are not codes so that words as such are not translatable. The object of translation is the *sense*'. (Choi 2003, 11) Sense basically means *meaning*; it is the idea behind the words. Seleskovitch describes three stages in the process of any oral or written translation:

1. the understanding of *sense*;
2. a de-verbalization stage, in which the words carrying the meaning are forgotten and only the *sense* remains present without any linguistic support;
3. the reformulation of the *sense* in other language. (Choi 2003, 10)

In other words, interpreters first have to analyze the source speech thoroughly and extract its *sense*, its meaning. The *sense* is wordless; it is a mental representation without any verbal description. When reconstructing the source speech in the target language, interpreters no longer work with the original utterance; they work with the *sense* they extracted from it. It means that they are completely independent of the wording of the original speech.

Seleskovitch ‘dismissive[s] retention and recall as automatic by-products of the comprehension of meaning’. (Ilg 1996, 71) Therefore she considers most important to note key words, which would remind the interpreter of the *sense*. She also claims that *sense* cannot be contained in symbols and much more efficient is to write out the key words in full or note them in form of abbreviations. In addition to the key words, Seleskovitch says there is another category of words that should be noted – lexical items with a unique meaning, e.g. numbers, proper names, lists, or standardized technical language. These words usually cannot be recalled from the context and would therefore pose a burden to the interpreters’ memory were the interpreters to remember them without the help of their notes. (Macek 2009, 20; Nohavica 2011, 16)

Seleskovitch strongly advocates taking notes in target language (which she supposes to be the mother tongue) (Čeňková 2008, 58) and is against systematic teaching of note-taking; she believes the technique evolves with the interpreter.

3.4 Alternative Approach to Note-taking by Tony Buzan

Buzan invented a system of Mind Mapping, which is sometimes also called patterned note-taking. ‘Mind Map is a thinking tool that reflects externally what goes on inside your head.’ (Tony Buzan, 2007) The main idea behind this system is that human brain does not think linearly; it thinks ‘by imagination and association’. (Tony Buzan, 2007) Buzan claims that ‘memory is primarily an imaginative process. In fact, learning, memory, and creativity are the same fundamental processes directed with a different focus.’ (Foer 2012, 167–168)

A Mind Map is created by ‘drawing lines off main points to subsidiary points, which branch out further to tertiary points, and so on. Ideas are distilled into as few words as possible[.]’ (ibid, 167) From the interpreter’s point of view, it can be used as a tool for a thorough analysis and better understanding of the speech; a Mind Map works as a visual representation of speaker’s train of thought. The creative way of taking notes is also supposed to serve as a memory boost and should facilitate the retrieval of information and reconstruction of the speech in the target language. On the other hand, due to the interconnectivity of thoughts, they should all be represented on one page, which makes this technique useful only for shorter utterances.

4 Andres's Study

Dörte Andres conducted an experiment in which fourteen students and fourteen professional interpreters were asked to consecutively interpret the same speech. Each one of them was filmed taking notes and delivering the speech. Andres then went through all the videos and exactly noted at which second was said which element in the original, when was it noted and when was it spoken by the interpreter. (Interpreter Training Resources)

At the end of the study, Andres suggests that for the purposes of teaching, consecutive interpreting should be divided into particular operations and abilities and students should practise problem-solving skills separately in all these operations. These operations and abilities are as follows: *understanding* (with the help of understanding the text structure, knowledge of the situation, and general knowledge), *self-confidence* (which is included here because it strongly influences interpreter's performance and can be stimulated by training), *rhetoric*, and *note-taking*. (Andres 2002b, 244–248)

Based on the data from the experiment, Andres says that note-taking has a different meaning and function than what numerous publications on this topic claim. She says it does not really matter, whether interpreters take notes in source, target, or any other language; how many symbols they use; or with what time lag they note. Andres claims that in regard to note-taking, it is more important to convey following:

1. A clear note-taking system with fixed rules of abbreviation and a sound basis of unambiguous symbols saves time, which can then be used for other operations.
2. Verbs and tenses are essential for the reconstruction of the source speech.
3. To note structure and value of information fosters comprehension and facilitates the production phase.
4. Segmentation and spatial arrangement of notes facilitates assignation of meaning and has a positive effect on the speech reproduction.
5. Noting linking words is important for cohesion of the target text.
6. Time lag varies (and is allowed to) depending on the understanding.
7. Everyone has to discover their own time lag.

8. A prolonged time lag of more than 7 seconds causes shortcomings in comprehension or note-taking.
9. Discontinued note-taking (noting elements in a different order to the order they are presented by the speaker) can be helpful in structuring and completing the noted information.
10. It is easier to reproduce rhetorical devices if they have been noted down.
11. Students' shortcomings in comprehension or notation processes reappear in the production phase. (Andres 2002b, 248–249; Interpreter Training Resources)

Andres also claims that the data from her study provides clear evidence that students who are taught a note-taking technique adopt and further develop this technique. It serves them as a basis they can build on as professionals. (Andres 2002b, 249)

5 Didactic Approaches

5.1 Jean Herbert

Herbert is the author of ‘the very first publication on conference interpreting’ (Ilg 1996, 70) and his style was ‘that of the self-taught pre-war old guard (Paul Mantoux; the Kaminker brothers, André and George), a brilliant summary, or at times a mere paraphrase based on minimal notes.’ (ibid, 70–71) His advice on note-taking strongly reflects this fact.

Herbert recommends analysing the speech before taking notes and reflecting the structure by means of highly synoptic notes and margins of varying widths. He also suggests taking notes in the target language to facilitate reading of the notes. He proposes using symbols one is accustomed to and warns against using too many others, one should not add more than half a dozen at a time. He suggests noting negation and emphasis the same way as Rozan does. What he considers to be the most important elements to note are links. Herbert recommends starting taking notes as soon as the speech begins but he also says that everyone should find a time lag between hearing and noting that suits them best. (Herbert 1952, 33–47)

Herbert claims that ‘the taking of notes is a technique quite independent from the process of translation’ and as such, it should be ‘practiced apart from any linguistic preoccupations.’ (ibid, 46) The method he proposes to practice note-taking is independent of any particular way of note-taking.

He suggests a system of six steps, which should help aspirants improve their taking of notes. Students should:

1. Ask somebody to read aloud two or three pages from a book for them.
2. Take the best notes they can.
3. Try to reproduce in written form and in the same language the original text with the exclusive help of their notes.
4. Compare the result with the original text.
5. Try to identify reasons for every single mistake and omission made.
6. Incorporate into their system of note-taking any possible improvement they can think of. (ibid, 47)

Herbert also elaborates on the role of teachers in the process and how criticism should be delivered. He warns not to shower a long list of all the mistakes upon the student, as it ‘is of no use whatsoever to the student and can only result in giving him a most destructive inferiority complex.’ (ibid, 47) A mistake should be pointed out only with ample time for students to note it in detail, so that they can think about it later and then ideally present to the teacher probable causes they identified and remedies they intend to apply.

5.2 James Nolan

Nolan in his book recommends studying Rozan first as a good way to begin developing one’s own system of note-taking. Unlike Rozan, he accents the role of symbols. He suggests that students should:

1. Adopt symbols useful for the subject they are dealing with;
2. Adopt a symbol which will always mean ‘the main subject of the speech’;
3. Adopt symbols for ‘two zeros’ and ‘three zeros’;
4. Invent symbols for common prefixes and suffixes, e.g. ‘pre-’, ‘anti-’, ‘-tion’, or ‘-ment’;
5. Adopt abbreviations or acronyms for often used phrases;
6. Never double any consonants and delete any vowels that are not necessary to make the word recognizable;
7. Write notes as much as possible in the target language. (Nolan 2005, 294–295)

The exercises Nolan mentions are closely connected to his preference for using symbols. He provides a set of nine exercises, where he tries to prove some of his points (that it can be easier to note concepts in form of symbols and abbreviations than describe them verbally [exercise #1] and that it is not necessary to note any double consonants or ‘redundant’ vowels [exercise #8]), makes students invent their own symbols (for various ideas [exercise #3], common economic descriptors and figures of speech [exercise #7], and frequently used technical concepts [exercise #9]), and gives students material to practise (the rest of the exercises). (ibid, 298–304)

All of the exercises can be practised on one’s own, without anyone’s help. The exercises are as follows:

Exercise #1: Students are supposed to compare the difficulty and speed of several tasks, e.g.: ‘Describe a spiral. Draw a picture of a spiral’, ‘Describe the route you take from home to work. Draw a sketch of the route you take from home to work’ or ‘Define the word “motion”. Invent a symbol for it.’ (ibid, 298)

Exercise #2: Students should write the skeleton of a story (Nolan uses the story of ‘the tortoise and the hare’) using only symbols, lines, shapes, pictures, and abbreviations. Then they should note a news item on a similar topic (Nolan provides two such news items) using the same set of graphic devices as they used for the story. (ibid, 298–299)

Exercise #3: Students are supposed to draw pictures of 24 ideas, e.g. ‘the aircraft is taking off’, ‘the assembly welcomes the President of France’, ‘there are 70,000 displaced persons in refugee camps in 24 countries’ or ‘I have repeated this point many times before’. (ibid, 299)

Exercise #4: Nolan presents seven news items and students are supposed to make notes using mainly abbreviations, pictures, lines, and symbols. (ibid, 299–300)

Exercise #5: Students ought to take notes of news items and try to reproduce them, first in the same language, then in other than the source language. The performance should be recorded and compared with the original. They should first work with the news items from the exercise #4, later also with any other they choose. (ibid, 300)

Exercise #6: Nolan provides a text (about 500 words long) and asks students to read it out at a moderate speed and record it. Then they should play it back, take notes and reproduce the text, first in the same language, then in any other language. The performance should again be recorded and compared with the original.

In the second part of the exercise, students ought to read the whole passage out aloud and then try to repeat the first paragraph entirely from memory, record themselves, and evaluate the result. Then they should try to repeat the first two paragraphs, three paragraphs, and so on, until they try to repeat the whole text. They ought to keep recording themselves and noticing mistakes and omissions. Then, after repeating the whole text, students should create symbols and signs for things they missed or got wrong. With these signs, they ought to try to note the whole text and repeat it once again with the help of their notes. (ibid, 301–303)

Exercise #7: Students should create symbols for some common economic descriptors, e.g. ‘decline’, ‘hit bottom’ or ‘gain momentum’, and some figures of speech, e.g. ‘the lesser of two evils’, ‘to badmouth someone’ or ‘as if there were no tomorrow’. (ibid, 85–88, 237, 303)

Exercise #8: Students ought to translate 11 symbolic statements into verbal ones, first orally and then in writing, e.g. ‘In F wrkr mvmt united but in UK Lbour ÷ed’ or ‘Bsnai Gen: We pro peace but n @ any prx!’. (ibid, 303)

Exercise #9: Students should create a symbol, sign or abbreviation for 93 ‘frequently used technical concepts’ that Nolan enlists, e.g. ‘global warming’, ‘electronic data processing’ or ‘the demographic transition’, and regularly update this list with concepts they encounter in their work or reading. (ibid, 303–304)

5.3 Roderick Jones

Jones offers a set of six exercises that are supposed to help students begin note-taking ‘without falling into the trap of taking too many notes and concentrating so much on the notes that they fail to continue to apply active analytical listening.’ He recommends to the students not only to listen and take notes but also to deliver the speech in the target language, so that they realize that notes are not the end in themselves; what matters is the end product – the interpretation. (Jones 2002, 64)

Jones advocates a system of note-taking which is very similar to the one described by Gillies (see section 5.4). However, while Gillies provides an elaborate didactic method to teach this particular system, Jones offers a set of exercises that are meant to help students practise *what to note* rather than *how to note*. These exercises could therefore be used universally for any system of note-taking.

Jones suggests two groups of exercises: exercises to be done before starting taking full set of notes, and exercises designed to help students who already have experience with note-taking practise a particular area of note-taking. The exercises differ in the difficulty of the original speech and in the type of information students are supposed to note. (ibid, 64)

The first group includes these three exercises (they should be practised in this sequence):

Exercise #1: type of speech: ‘a fairly easy speech with quite a few numbers and/or dates’; instructions: note only the numbers, and dates. As a good type of speech Jones recommends a historical, chronological narration.

Exercise #2: type of speech: a similar speech but this time with a number of proper names; instructions: note only the numbers, dates, and proper names.

Exercise #3: type of speech: a speech of average difficulty; instructions: note only the main ideas. (ibid, 65)

The second group consists of following three exercises:

Exercise #4: type of speech: a highly structured, argumentative speech; instructions: note only the link words.

Exercise #5: type of speech: the same as in #4; instructions: note only the points of view.

Exercise #6: a combination of exercises 4 and 5. (ibid, 65)

5.4 Andrew Gillies

Gillies is the only author to provide a detailed, step-by-step method to acquire a note-taking system. The system he proposes adopts almost all of the Rozan’s principles (except for the principle of shift, which does not fit into the layout of Gillies’s system), but it also adds many new features.

Gillies deals with the oft repeated rule ‘note the ideas not the words’ and points out that the term ‘idea’ has two different meanings. One of them is the one described by Rozan, the other one stands for a “‘part of the message”, which tells us “‘who did what to whom””. (Gillies 2005, 35) The way to say ‘who did what to whom’ is by means of a sentence, the basic units of which are the Subject, the Verb and often an Object. It is for this reason that Gillies proposes to regard an idea as a ‘**SUBJECT - VERB - OBJECT group**’ (SVO unit). (ibid, 35–37) SVO units constitute the key element of this note-taking system and the layout of this system closely reflects this deconstruction of ideas into SVO units. Gillies divides the page into three columns and a left-hand margin. A specific element is assigned to each column:

LINK (Structural elements) (Dates) (Anything important)	SUBJECT	VERB	OBJECT
---	----------------	-------------	---------------

The method is divided into 8 sections, which should be followed in the given order; Gillies recommends devoting one week to each section before moving to another. The first four sections deal with analysis of the text and the basics of note-taking; there is actually no production phase until the section #4. Sections 5 to 8 then focus on advancing one's note-taking system. (ibid, 10–14)

Gillies also discusses the kind and difficulty of texts students should be working with; he recommends starting working from the mother tongue into the mother tongue, then from a foreign source language into the mother tongue and as the last step, from the mother tongue into a foreign language. (ibid, 75) As for the format of texts, Gillies suggests that students should first practise with written texts (meaning verbatim transcripts of speeches given orally) and only after finishing all sections should they advance and try to practise all sections again, this time with spoken texts. (ibid, 10–14)

Each section has the same structure, which is as follows:

- Guidelines for using a technique
- Example of the use of that technique
- Practice task for student
- Example of how the task might have been completed
- Tips of further practice (ibid, 5)

Section #1: Speech Analysis. This section deals with the analysis of the 'macro-' level of a speech so as to facilitate identification of the skeleton of a speech. Without this skeleton in mind, all details noted by the interpreter are meaningless. (ibid, 17) Gillies introduces four exercises to help students with this task:

1. *Studying speech writing guides.* Gillies suggests that students find a speech writing guide written in their mother tongue (he provides one in English) and then try to analyze various speeches based on the structure provided by the

guide; in other words, students ought to try to find examples of particular points introduced in the guide.

2. *Structure maps*. This means an analysis of segments of a speech based on their structure and the function they fulfil, e.g. ‘Introduction’, ‘Example’ or ‘Background’. The aim is to understand what the speaker is trying to achieve with what they are saying.
3. *Mini-summaries*. A similar exercise to the structure maps, but this time students should note a very brief summary of the main ideas.
4. *Mind maps*. Students are supposed to note a speech using the technique of patterned note-taking described in section 3.4. (ibid, 17–34)

Section #2: Recognizing and Splitting Ideas. This section focuses on identifying ideas (SVO units) within the speech. It is to be done with written texts only. The aim is to capture the core meaning, therefore there would be a lot of things omitted. To give an example, Gillies uses this sentence:

‘In the areas for which I have some responsibility, there were also, as the Prime Minister has mentioned, some important developments at Feira.’ (ibid, 36)

The SVO unit extracted from this sentence is very simple, but it is the core message, without which the rest of the sentence would be meaningless. It goes as follows:

S V O
there... were... developments (ibid, 36)

To practise, Gillies suggests that students open the text of a speech in a word processing software and remove all paragraph spaces, which will leave them with a block of text. Their task is to separate particular ideas from each other, for example by means of hitting the return key. They can compare their results and discuss their choices with other classmates. (ibid, 41–42)

Section #3: The Beginning of Notes. This is the first section when students start taking notes. These will be very simple notes, though; the aim is to capture the SVO units only. Each SVO unit should be followed by a horizontal line so as to distinguish it from the next one. (ibid, 43)

To begin with, Gillies suggests that students use the texts they have already worked with in the section #2 and that they rewrite the SVO units they identified into notes (following the structure given at the beginning of this chapter). He stresses the

importance of noting only the basic structure of the speech. ‘The temptation will always arise to try and note everything down. RESIST IT!’ (ibid, 45) After processing texts from the previous section, students are supposed to practise with other materials, but each new text should be first subjected to the procedure from the section #2 and only then should be the already separated SVO units noted on a notepad. (ibid, 52–53)

Section #4: Links. As has already been mentioned before, a speech without links is a meaningless list of ideas. To illustrate this claim, Gillies presents following two sentences:

‘The economy is struggling. The Central Bank has left interest rates unchanged.’ (ibid, 56)

He then compares them with the same two sentences, but this time linked by linking words:

‘The economy is struggling. However, the Central Bank has left interest rates unchanged.’ (ibid, 56)

‘The economy is struggling. Consequently, the Central Bank has left interest rates unchanged.’ (ibid, 56)

The difference in meaning is obvious. This is the reason why there has been no production phase so far.

The task students are supposed to fulfil in this section is to go through all the texts they have been using so far, identify all the link words and write them down. The next step is to sort these words into groups with similar meaning, so called ‘families of links’. (ibid, 59) Students should then create a common symbol for each family of links. The last two steps are to repeat sections 2 and 3 but this time highlight and note also the links. (ibid, 67–68)

Section #5: Verticality and Hierarchies of Values. The aim of this section is to teach students to distinguish between various levels of importance given by the speaker and reflect them in their notes. Gillies suggests some techniques that should help students achieve this goal. Two of them are borrowed from Rozan’s seven principles – ‘stacking’ and ‘use of brackets’, which form the principle of verticality. Another technique proposed by Gillies is called ‘shifting values’. The underlying rule for this technique is as follows: ‘the more important something is the further to the left of the page we note it.’ (ibid, 83)

At this point Gillies suggests that students start working with spoken texts. To practise, they should listen to a text and take notes using the techniques described in this section. Before production phase, they should read through their notes to see whether they are clear and helpful and ‘correct’ any sections that could have been written better. (ibid, 98)

Gillies suggests that speeches should be given by other students. Students-speakers should make a set of notes first and then give a speech based on these notes. This way they get to practice note-taking and the speech they are giving is already analyzed, so it is easier for their colleagues to note it. Students-speakers can this way also practice their presentations skills and note-reading. (ibid, 74)

Section #6: Symbols. Gillies is not as sceptical to using symbols as Rozan, nonetheless, he still emphasizes that ‘if you don’t have a sound, consistent and meaningful note-taking system then no amount of symbols is going to help you.’ (ibid, 99) Gillies recommends using symbols for a) concepts that come up again and again, and b) ideas that will recur on a given day. (ibid, 100–103) He also provides basic guidelines on what symbols should be like:

- Clear and unambiguous
- Quick and simple to draw – more than three strokes of pen is probably too slow
- Prepared in advance
- Consistent – once you use a symbol for one concept, you cannot use it later again for another concept
- Organic – ‘one symbol should be the starting point for many other symbols,’ (ibid, 104) e.g. if □ means *nation, country, state*, then □^{ally} means *nationally*, □^{ze} means *nationalize*, etc.
- They must mean something to the interpreter (ibid, 103–104)

To practise, Gillies suggests that students go through the texts they have worked with, find concepts that occur most often and think of symbols to represent them. Then, students should read their note-pads, find long words that they write repeatedly and create or borrow symbols for them as well. Last point is to identify concepts that they sometimes note with a word and sometimes as a symbol and unify the way they note them. (ibid, 108)

Section #7: Memory Prompts. The system of note-taking taught in the previous sections is ‘simple and consistent, but the notes [...] are too complete.’ (ibid, 109)

The goal of this section is to teach students how to reduce the amount of notes taken and let the memory take over. Gillies argues that there are particular things that can be noted only by three dots (to represent that there is something to be recalled) or by a word and interpreters would not have problems recalling it. Among these things belong *information of secondary importance noted in brackets, examples, reasons, opposites* (the second half of the argument), and sometimes *stories and jokes*. Gillies also recommends not trying to capture speaker's register in one's notes and he suggests that students should 'note the simple for the complicated'. (ibid, 115) This way, instead of the sentence 'One of the significant consequences expected from climate change is an increase in the frequency and severity of extreme weather events,' interpreter's notes would read 'climate change means more weird weather' and the interpreter would then just adjust them appropriately. Last point mentioned in this section is reliance on one's general knowledge; it is not necessary to note what the interpreter knows. (ibid, 109–119)

Gillies suggests that students do two exercises to practise these techniques. First, they should try to take minimal notes of suitable parts of speech, e.g. the aforementioned, and test limits of their memory. Second, they ought to read through their notes and then rewrite them without all the information they consider to be unnecessary for the speech reproduction. (ibid, 119)

Section #8: What to note. In this section Gillies gives an overview of what should be noted, this summary is similar to the one already mentioned in section 2.1.

The second part of Gillies's book is dedicated to fine-tuning of one's system of note-taking. He gives suggestions on noting clauses, verbs, verb tenses, and modal verbs. He agrees with Rozan on rules of abbreviation and adds abbreviations of suffixes. He also addresses the issue of time lag between the hearing and noting: it is not necessary to note elements in the same order as they are presented by the speaker; on the other hand, the SVO structure makes it possible to do so even in cases when it would normally be troublesome, e.g. when the verb comes last. Generally, Gillies recommends noting elements that are important or difficult to remember sooner and the elements that are less important or easy to remember later. Last point he mentions is to note that the end of the speech is approaching, so that the interpreter can adjust properly and start building towards a conclusion. (ibid, 125–171)

6 Evaluation of Teaching Methods

To recapitulate Andres's conclusions in regard to teaching consecutive interpreting, she argues that various operations taking place during interpreting should be practised separately. She suggests that students should practise *understanding*, *self-confidence*, *rhetoric*, and *note-taking*. The first part of the evaluation of the teaching methods presented in this thesis therefore reflects whether these methods deal also with other areas than just note-taking (as they are all expected to deal with note-taking, since they are methods *of teaching and practising note-taking*).

The other part of the evaluation is based on the conclusions Andres formulates in regard to the system of note-taking taught by a particular method. For the purposes of this evaluation, these conclusions are reformulated into following criteria:

Methods should teach students a system which includes:

1. fixed rules of abbreviation and a sound basis of unambiguous symbols;
2. noting verbs and tenses;
3. noting links;
4. noting structure and value of information;
5. segmentation and special arrangement of notes with the possibility of noting elements in different order to the one presented by the speaker; and which
6. deals with the issue of time lag between hearing and taking notes.

6.1 Operations Practised

The results are demonstrated on the following table ('1' is positive, '0' is negative):

	understanding	self-confidence	rhetoric	note-taking
Herbert	0	1	0	1
Nolan	0	0	0	1
Jones	1	0	0	1
Gillies	1	0	1	1

Table 1: *Evaluation of practised operations.*

Herbert, apart from note-taking, touches also on the issue of self-confidence, when he gives tutors advice on how to deliver criticism and not give students inferiority complex.

Nolan is the only one to address only the issue of note-taking; his method does not reflect any other of the examined operations.

The method to practise note-taking proposed by Jones is brief on the issue of note-taking itself; the major goal of this method is to train analytical skills of students, so that they better understand the source speech.

Gillies provides the most complex method in context of this evaluation; the only area he does not address is self-confidence. The first two sections of his book deal almost exclusively with understanding the source speech and its structure and he includes rhetoric on two occasions: when students are supposed to present speeches based on their own notes and when he recommends marking the approaching end of the speech in order to start building towards it.

6.2 System Taught

The results are demonstrated in the same fashion as in the previous section. Jones and Gillies advocate the same system with only minor differences; therefore, they will be evaluated as one and referred to as Gillies's system, because his system is in some respects more elaborate than Jones's. The criteria follow the same order in which they are presented at the beginning of this chapter.

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Herbert	0	0	1	1	0	1
Nolan	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	0	0
Gillies	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 2: *Evaluation of taught systems.*

The system proposed by Herbert meets half of the criteria. He does not mention any fixed rules of abbreviation or noting verbs and tenses and his system does not enable discontinued note-taking nor proposes some special arrangement of notes. On the other hand, Herbert emphasises links as the most important elements to be noted, proposes ways of noting emphasis and the importance of ideas, and his thoughts on time lag are in accordance with Andres's conclusions.

The evaluation of Nolan's system is two-fold, because at the beginning, Nolan recommends reading Rozan. All the criteria fulfilled by Rozan's system are marked as '1', but they are in brackets, because Rozan's principles are in no way further promoted or emphasised and Nolan does not mention them anywhere in the rest of

the text. The contribution of Nolan himself is then only in introducing a sound basis of unambiguous symbols. He does not mention any fixed rules of abbreviation, but it is expected that students have read Rozan's principle and are familiar with Rozan's rules of abbreviation.

Gillies's system of note-taking meets all the criteria. It includes fixed rules of abbreviation (similar to Rozan's) and a basis of unambiguous symbol; it proposes noting verbs, tenses, and links; it suggests a way of noting value (use of brackets, stacking) and structure (the SVO units) of given information; notes are arranged in a manner that enables discontinuous note-taking; and Gillies also addresses the question of time lag when he says which elements should be noted sooner and which should be noted later.

7 Conclusion

The evaluation of the presented four methods of teaching and practising note-taking proves that Gillies's method is the most elaborate and useful out of them, it meets nine out of ten presented criteria; the only criterion it does not meet is the criterion of addressing *self-confidence*. The note-taking system taught by this method meets all the demands articulated by Andres in her study.

Herbert's method, even though it was the first to be formulated, meets half of the criteria and is the only one to address the issue of *self-confidence*.

Based on the results of the evaluation, it can be said that the least effective and useful method of teaching and practising note-taking is the one proposed by Nolan. It meets only two criteria (five when taken into account his recommendation to read Rozan), out of which one is the criterion of addressing *note-taking*, which is the only criterion met by all the methods.

Jones's method was subjected only to the first part of the evaluation, because it proposes very similar note-taking system as Gillies's. However, it meets two out of four criteria and in this respect can still be regarded as superior to Nolan's method.

What is very important to mention, though, is the fact that the presented methods are not mutually incompatible. Even though Gillies's method was evaluated as the best one, there is still room for improvement and features from other methods can be used. This way for example students who would like to use more symbols in their system of note-taking could be referred to Nolan and students who struggle with the analysis of the source text could be given exercises proposed by Jones.

Based on the evidence stated in this thesis, I believe that systematic teaching of note-taking could be highly beneficial for students of interpreting. In case such classes are realized, it is recommendable to teach note-taking according to the method proposed by Gillies and use elements from the other methods as alternatives or additions.

8 Resumé

Tlumočnická notace je jednou z klíčových součástí konsekutivního tlumočení, pouze výjimeční tlumočníci jsou schopni tlumočit delší úseky zcela bez pomoci poznámek. Je to však také velice kontroverzní součást konsekutivního tlumočení, každý tlumočník si dělá poznámky vlastním způsobem a teoretické přístupy k tlumočnické notaci se značně liší a často si až protiřečí. Tato nejednotnost v teoretických přístupech se následně promítá také do didaktických postupů. Někteří teoretici tvrdí, že se notace nedá metodicky vyučovat a každý se k ní musí dopracovat sám, jiní zase zastávají názor, že by systematická výuka tlumočnické notace měla být součástí vzdělávání budoucích tlumočníků již od prvního roku studia. Je tedy pochopitelné, že příruček pro výuku tlumočnické notace není mnoho a ty, které existují, prosazují značně odlišné postupy.

Výzkum v této bakalářské práci hodnotí čtyři metody výuky tlumočnické notace a na základě kritérií, které byly stanoveny podle závěrů empirické studie Dörte Andresové, posuzuje, která metoda je pro výuku nejvhodnější.

První kapitola představuje konsekutivní tlumočení a přibližuje problematiku tlumočnické notace, resp. neshody, které panují mezi teoretickými přístupy k notaci.

Druhá kapitola se zabývá rolí tlumočnické notace v procesu konsekutivního tlumočení a popisuje základní pravidla, která odpovídají na otázky *co* zapisovat, *jak* zapisovat a jak z poznámek *číst*.

Ve třetí kapitole jsou představeny tři hlavní teoretické přístupy k tlumočnické notaci a jeden alternativní. Tyto přístupy se od sebe značně liší. Jedná se o díla Rozana, Matysska, Seleskovitchové a Buzana. Jean-Francois Rozan ve svém díle formulovat svých sedm principů tlumočnické notace, které jsou dodnes uznávané a často zmiňované. Heinz Matyssek razí zcela jiný přístup a zastává metodu tlumočnické notace, které je nezávislá na jakémkoliv jazyku, jedná se v podstatě o zcela nový jazyk složený ze symbolů a fungující na základě gramatických zákonitostí němčiny. Seleskovitchová naopak notaci přisuzuje jen vedlejší roli, podle ní je pro tlumočení klíčové především perfektní pochopení smyslu sdělení. Buzan je představitelem alternativního přístupu k notaci, který spočívá v zapisování poznámek formou myšlenkových map.

Čtvrtá kapitola přibližuje empirickou studii Dörte Andresové a její závěry týkající se tlumočnické notace a její výuky.

V páté kapitole jsou blíže představeny všechny čtyři metody výuky tlumočnické notace, je popsána jak jejich didaktická stránka, tedy postupy a cvičení, které k výuce používají, tak systém notace, který učí. Konkrétně se jedná o metody autorů Herberta, Nolana, Jonese a Gilliese. Herbert je autorem první publikace na téma konferenčního tlumočení a je zástupcem tlumočnicků, kteří k poznámkám zastávali minimalistický přístup, nicméně jeho poznatky se dotýkají mnoha různých oblastí tlumočnické notace. Nolan se naopak zaměřuje pouze na jednu oblast, a tou je využití symbolů, což se projevuje také na cvičeních, která doporučuje. Jones popisuje dobře propracovaný systém tlumočnické notace, nicméně jeho metodické rady se snaží studenty naučit spíše *co* si mají zapsat, než *jak* si to mají zapsat. Gillies doporučuje velice podobný systém notace jako Jones, ale na rozdíl od Jonese nabízí detailní postup, jak tento systém učit. Začíná s analýzou textu a postupně se přes zapisování pouhé kostry textu dostává až k pokročilému způsobu zápisu.

V šesté kapitole jsou na základě závěrů Andresové formulována kritéria, podle kterých jsou poté jednotlivé metody posuzovány. Hodnotí se oba popsané aspekty jednotlivých metod, tedy jak jejich didaktická stránka, tak i systém notace, který učí.

V závěru jsou interpretovány výsledky hodnocení jednotlivých metod. Jako nejlepší je vyhodnocena Gilliesova metoda, která uspěla v devíti z deseti posuzovaných kritérií, jako nejméně vyhovující se naopak ukazuje Nolanova metoda.

9 Bibliography

Andres, Dörte. 2002a. "Die Funktion der Notation im Konsektivdolmetschen", in: Kalina, Sylvia/ Best, Joanna (Hrsg.). *Übersetzen und Dolmetschen in Praxis und Lehre – eine Orientierungshilfe*. Tübingen: Francke. 209–215. 978-3-8252-2329-8.

Andres, Dörte. 2002b. *Konsektivdolmetschen und Notation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 3631398565.

"Consecutive note-taking," YouTube video, 10:17, posted by "Lourdes de Rioja," March 30, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v0yyZ72eiKc&list=UUmAf1_IEFHRu3X-_yUmF5qA.

Čeňková, Ivana. 2008. *Úvod do teorie tlumočení*. Praha: Česká komora tlumočnicků znakového jazyka. 808715374X.

Choi, Jungwha. 2003. "The Interpretive Theory of Translation and Its Current Applications." *Interpretation Studies*. 1–15.

Foer, Joshua. 2011. *Moonwalking with Einstein: the art and science of remembering everything*. New York: Penguin Press. 0143120530.

Gillies, Andrew. 2005. *Note-taking for Consecutive Interpreting – A Short Course*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing. 1900650827.

"Helen Campbell: Note-Taking for Consecutive Interpreting - Back to Basics Multi-Languages Annual Conference 2013," YouTube video, 41:07, posted by "Multi-Languages Corporation," February 2, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8D_-NPSB9NE&list=PLIreXuKKKiFdCRt7Pm-KmICJg4t202mlx&feature=c4-overview-vl.

Herbert, Jean. 1952. *The Interpreter's Handbook. How to Become a conference interpreter*. Genève: Georg.

Ilg, Gérard & Lambert, Sylvie. 1996. "Teaching consecutive interpreting." *Interpreting* 1(1). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 69–99.

Interpreter Training Resources. Accessed May 6. interpreters.free.fr.

Jones, Roderick. 1998. *Conference Interpreting Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing. 1900650576.

Kautz, Ulrich. 2000. *Handbuch Didaktik des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens*. München: Iudicium. 3891294492.

Ladychenko, Viktoria. 2010. *Rjurik K. Minjar-Belorutschew als Vertreter der Sowjetischen Schule der Dolmetschwissenschaft*. MA thesis.

Macek, Julia. 2009. *Die Rolle der Notizentechnik im Konsekutivdolmetschunterricht Deutsch – Portugiesisch. Eine Fallstudie*. MA thesis.

"Maximise the Power of Your Brain - Tony Buzan MIND MAPPING," YouTube video, 5:38, posted by "iMindMap," January 7, 2007, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MlabrWv25qQ>.

Nohavica, Jakub. 2011. *Rozdílné aspekty notace při tlumočení z různých aktivních jazyků*. BA thesis.

Nolan, James. 2005. *Interpretation: Techniques and Exercises*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 1-85359-790-2.

Pöchhacker, Franz. 2004. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge. 0415268877.

Rozan, Jean. 2004. *Note-taking in consecutive interpreting*. Krakow: Tertium, 2004.
8391476480.