

STANCE DRIFT UNDER NOTE-TAKING COMPRESSION IN ENGLISH-UZBEK DIPLOMATIC INTERPRETING

Islamova Nozima Anvar qizi

ORCID: 0009-0008-3741-2638

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: Diplomatic discourse is highly calibrated: people in different institutions regularly manage evaluative stance, directive force and degrees of commitment. In other words, they use a language that shows directly what they want to say or to do. However, in consecutive interpreting (CI) note-taking is considered as intentionally non-verbatim and oriented tool toward economy and retrievability. Thus, under such compression, it is believed that small pragmatic markers become more structurally vulnerable and may disappear from the noters [1, p.258].

Keywords: Consecutive Interpreting, Semantic Compression, Stance Drift, Evaluative Stance, Directive Force, Diplomatic Discourse, English-Uzbek, Measurement Framework

Introduction

In high-stakes diplomatic communication, pragmatic force is part of “meaning.” A shift from a softened institutional prompt to a categorical order (must / demand), or from cautious concern to condemnation, can alter the political signal of an utterance even when the topical proposition remains similar. Consecutive interpreting makes such shifts plausible because notes are intentionally compressed. Notation research characterizes consecutive notes as highly economical and instantly “seizable” - a personal aid for later oral production rather than a complete record (pp. 257-259) [1]. Uzbek methodological writing similarly defines interpreter note-taking (“tarjima semantografiyasi”) as brief meaning fixation, explicitly distinct from word-for-word stenography, and oriented toward later expansion in delivery (pp. 160-161) [18]. Therefore, the main focus in this paper lies on a specific and under-measured consequence of compression: stance drift. Here, stance drift means a systematic shift in force between the source and the interpreted target - either over-strengthening or over-weakening. So, the main goal of this article is not only to claim empirical results about professional interpreters but also it provides an operational framework and demonstration cases, so that future studies with student interpreters can measure drift quantitatively and connect it to concrete features of notes.

Empirical note-taking research in interpreting has addressed (i) the language(s) used in notes and the distribution of source/target elements, (ii) the role of symbols and layout in structuring information, and (iii) task variables that constrain note density.

For example, analyses of note language report systematic patterns and show that note choice is not always a simple source-vs-target rule (pp. 3-17) [5], while later work argues that language choice in notes is better described as a complex interaction of working languages, task conditions and individual strategies (pp. 222-244) [6]. Other studies examine how shorthand practices and language choice interact with efficiency pressures (pp. 129-147) [7], and how note language differs across levels of expertise (pp. 55-72) [8]. More recent outcome-oriented and process-oriented studies model note organization at discourse level and relate note layout to coherence building in CI (Article 106192) [22], and experimental work begins to quantify how source-speech timing affects note decoding and recall (Article e02242-4) [15]. Despite these advances, pragmatic force is rarely operationalized as a measurable outcome: most evaluations still focus on information accuracy (omissions/additions) rather than on systematic over-strengthening or over-weakening of stance.

The present framework addresses this gap by combining simple stance scales with a drift index that can be applied in training experiments in diplomatic discourse: evaluation, directives, and commitment frames. This article operationalizes stance as three interacting components that are especially salient in diplomatic registers:

- evaluative stance: how the institution positions itself (e.g., concern, approval, condemnation);

- directive force: how the institution prompts action (e.g., call upon/urge vs. demand/order).

- commitment framing: how strongly the institution commits itself or treats propositions (e.g., take note vs. reaffirm commitment; framing such as "I would like to note...").

These components are observable in official diplomatic texts and can be anchored to scale points. For example, the CICA compilation includes formulations such as "let us reaffirm our commitment" (high commitment) (p. 13) [19], "I would like to note..." (framing/mitigation) (p. 14) [19], "We take note..." (institutional acknowledgement with relatively low endorsement) (p. 266) [19], and "We strongly condemn..." (high negative evaluation) (p. 255) [19]. Such lexical choices illustrate why propositional paraphrase alone is insufficient for diplomatic adequacy.

A review by Chen outlines how the field includes both prescriptive manuals and descriptive research, and highlights methodological limitations of relying mainly on instructional recommendations without systematic outcome measurement (pp. 151-153) [10]. For a stance-drift perspective, this gap is central: if we do not measure pragmatic shifts, we cannot evaluate whether a note-taking strategy preserves force. This paper therefore treats stance drift as an outcome variable that can be quantified and related to note features. Crucially, any proposed improvement must respect task constraints. A classroom-based study reports that during note-taking, trainees perceive

delivery speed and information density as key difficulties (pp. 821-823) [3]. This evidence supports a design principle for stance preservation: cues must remain lightweight and rapidly writable; otherwise, they are unlikely to survive under realistic conditions.

The language in which notes are written is itself a variable that may shape stance preservation. Dam's empirical study shows that note-taking language choice can be governed more by the interpreter's A/B language status than by the simple fact of which language is currently the source or the target; the study summarizes this relationship in its results and discussion (p. 3; p. 12) [5]. Chen's review discusses this line of work in the broader context of "choice of language" in consecutive notes (p. 160) [10]. For English-Uzbek, this supports a realistic assumption: interpreters may combine English abbreviations, Uzbek lexical cues, and international symbols in a mixed system.

A stance-drift framework therefore should not presuppose a single "correct" note language. Instead, it should code note language choice and test whether particular choices correlate with under-encoding of pragmatic operators (e.g., modal auxiliaries, stance verbs, directive softeners).

Data and methodology

Data: transparent, verifiable diplomatic texts. To avoid unverifiable claims, the analysis relies only on publicly accessible institutional materials where the relevant stance markers can be re-checked by any reader. Two data types are used:

- Official bilingual (English-Uzbek) diplomatic texts from official Uzbek state platforms (e.g., government portal statements and presidential addresses). Because web pages do not have stable page numbers, examples are cited by short quoted fragments with a numbered reference to the official URL in the References section. [20, 21]
- Multilateral diplomatic documents published as compilations by an official secretariat. These sources provide stable PDF pagination and allow page-specific referencing [19].

These texts are treated as diplomatic discourse samples suitable for illustrating stance, modality and mitigation markers that an English-Uzbek consecutive interpreter would need to preserve. The study explicitly does not claim that the official Uzbek version is an interpreter-produced target speech; it is used only as a verifiable target-language realization of similar pragmatic functions. Important limitation: the paper does not claim to analyze authentic interpreters' notebooks or real interpreted outputs from this source. The note forms and Uzbek renderings presented below are simulated and are used only to demonstrate risk patterns and measurement procedures.

Analytical framework: stance dimensions and scales. Analytical unit: stance-bearing segments. For measurement, the unit of analysis should be a stance-bearing segment: a clause or short sentence containing at least one explicit

marker of evaluation, directive force, or commitment framing. Examples include stance verbs (express concern, condemn), directive frames (call upon, urge), and commitment statements (reaffirm commitment). Segments can be extracted from diplomatic texts and then used as prompts for student consecutive-interpreting tasks.

Stance scales. Stance drift becomes measurable only if “force” is operationalized. The paper proposes three ordinal scales (illustrative; they can be adapted for specific corpora):

Procedure: simulated notes and drift scoring. Because authentic interpreter notebooks are rarely publicly available and raise confidentiality issues, this paper uses simulated notes to demonstrate how compression patterns can trigger stance drift. Simulated notes are explicitly presented as illustrative - not as real student or professional records.

For each selected diplomatic fragment, two note forms are constructed:

- (i) an idea-only form that records the propositional skeleton with minimal pragmatic tagging;
- (ii) a stance-protected form that adds a minimal cue layer (e.g., MAY?, URGE→, NOTE/) intended to preserve force while remaining economical.

Stance drift is then scored as a signed difference between the stance level encoded in the source fragment and the stance level likely to be reconstructed from the notes during target delivery. Positive values indicate over-strengthening; negative values indicate over-weakening. This is a conservative scoring design: it does not assume a drift occurred, but identifies where drift is plausible if cues are omitted.

Reliability and validation of stance scoring. As stance drift is measured through human annotation (stance level assignment), empirical applications of the proposed framework should report inter-rater reliability. A practical procedure is to (i) develop a short codebook with stance-scale definitions and anchor examples, (ii) train two independent raters on a pilot subset, (iii) double-code the full dataset (or a large random subset), and (iv) report agreement statistics. For categorical decisions (e.g., whether a hedge marker is present/absent; whether a directive is softened), Cohen’s kappa is widely used [25] and provides an interpretable index of agreement beyond chance [24]. For ordinal/continuous stance scores, intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) are appropriate, and reporting should specify the ICC type and confidence interval following common reliability guidelines [23].

Validation can be approached at three levels. First, content validity: stance levels should be grounded in observable linguistic cues (modal verbs, evidential frames, mitigation verbs) and verified against parallel institutional versions when available (e.g., official English-Uzbek publications). Second, construct validity: the drift index should covary with note features predicted by theory (e.g., fewer stance cues in notes → higher probability of over-strengthening/over-weakening). Third, criterion validity:

a subset of outputs can be rated by expert interpreters for pragmatic adequacy and compared to the stance-scale scores. These steps do not change the present paper's demonstrative design; they specify how the framework can be converted into a replicable classroom or lab experiment.

Results. *Demonstration cases from verifiable diplomatic sources (CICA)*

The cases below illustrate how stance drift can arise if notes preserve only propositions while omitting pragmatic force markers. All note samples are simulated. Uzbek renderings are illustrative suggestions (not official translations) meant to show the direction of drift.

Case 1. Strong necessity framing: "It is imperative ..."

Source excerpt (verifiable):

"It is imperative that the existing problems ... be resolved through negotiations"
(CICA Secretariat, 2026, p. 265)

Stance mapping:

Directive force scale: Level 4 (strong necessity / imperative). If the obligation cue disappears, the output may downgrade to Level 2-3 (encourage/urge) or even Level 1 (mention).

Simulated notes (two compression styles):

A) Idea-only (higher drift risk): *problems* → *resolve / negotiations*

B) Cue-protected (minimal stance layer): *IMP!/MUST* → *resolve probs / via negotiations*

Expected drift mechanism: because notes are designed to be sparse (Kohn & Albl-Mikasa, 2002, pp. 257-259), writers may omit "imperative" as a 'small' item. If omitted, reconstruction can shift from categorical necessity toward a softer recommendation, producing over-weakening ($D_{dir} < 0$).

Illustrative Uzbek realisation (not an official translation; shown only to illustrate drift direction):

"Mayjud muammolarni muzokaralar orqali hal etish lozim." (vs. weaker: *"hal etish maqsadga muvofiq"*)

Case 2. Low-endorsement institutional framing: "We take note ..."

Source excerpt (verifiable): *"We take note of the aspiration of the States of the Central Asian Region to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone"* (CICA Secretariat, 2026, p. 266)

Stance mapping: Commitment framing scale: Level 1 (acknowledge / take note). If "take note" is reconstructed as "support/welcome," drift is over-strengthening ($D_{com} > 0$).

Simulated notes (two compression styles):

A) Idea-only (higher drift risk): *Central Asia / NWFZ / aspiration*

B) Cue-protected (minimal stance layer): *TAKE-NOTE/ACK* → *CA NWFZ*

aspiration

Expected drift mechanism: If notes keep only the topic ("NWFZ aspiration") the interpreter may later 'complete' with an endorsing verb (welcome/support), especially under time pressure. That would shift institutional positioning from acknowledgement to endorsement ($D_{com} > 0$). Cueing TAKE-NOTE protects the intended low-endorsement stance.

Illustrative Uzbek realisation (not an official translation; shown only to illustrate drift direction): *"Markaziy Osiyo davlatlarining yadroviy quroldan holi hudud tashkil etish intilishlarini qayd etamiz."* (vs. stronger: *"qo'llab-quvvatlaymiz"*)

Case 3. Evaluative stance: *"We express concern ..."*

Source excerpt (verifiable): *"We express concern over the increasing impact of the global financial crisis"* (CICA Secretariat, 2026, p. 266)

Stance mapping: Evaluative stance scale: Level 3 (concern). If reconstructed as condemnation (Level 4) → over-strengthening; if reconstructed as neutral report (Level 1) → over-weakening.

Simulated notes (two compression styles):

A) Idea-only (higher drift risk): *global fin crisis / impact↑*

B) Cue-protected (minimal stance layer): *CONCERN! → fin crisis impact↑*

Expected drift mechanism: an idea-only note (topic + trend) can lead to neutral paraphrase, losing evaluation. Conversely, if the interpreter adds stronger emotion or blame, evaluation escalates. Explicit CONCERN cue keeps evaluation calibrated.

Illustrative Uzbek realisation (not an official translation; shown only to illustrate drift direction): *"Global moliyaviy inqiroz ta'sirining ortib borayotgani yuzasidan xavotir bildiramiz."*

Case 4. Soft directive force: *"We call upon ..."*

Source excerpt (verifiable): *"We call upon CICA Member States to intensify efforts towards the strengthening of dialogue and cooperation"* (CICA Secretariat, 2026, p. 266)

Stance mapping: Directive force scale: Level 3 (call upon/urge). If "call upon" drops, output may become Level 1-2 (mention/encourage); if reconstructed as "demand/must," it becomes Level 4.

Simulated notes (two compression styles):

A) Idea-only (higher drift risk): *members → intensify efforts / dialogue + coop*

B) Cue-protected (minimal stance layer): *CALLON → MS / intensify / dialogue+coop*

Expected drift mechanism: Dropping "call upon" risks two kinds of drift: (a) under-directive paraphrase (over-weakening) or (b) replacement with categorical obligation forms (over-strengthening). Encoding CALLON→ is a minimal tag that preserves institutional softness while keeping the directive function.

Illustrative Uzbek realisation (not an official translation; shown only to illustrate drift direction): *“A’zo davlatlarni muloqot va hamkorlikni kuchaytirish yo’lida sa’y-harakatlarni jadallashtirishga chaqiramiz.”*

Case 5. Strong negative evaluation: *“We strongly condemn ...”*

Source excerpt (verifiable): *“We strongly condemn terrorism in all its manifestations” (CICA Secretariat, 2026, p. 255)*

Stance mapping: evaluative stance scale: Level 4 (strong condemnation). If the intensifier (“strongly”) is dropped, evaluation may weaken to Level 3 (condemn/concern) or lower.

Simulated notes (two compression styles):

A) Idea-only (higher drift risk): *terrorism / all forms*

B) Cue-protected (minimal stance layer): *CONDEMN++ / terrorism (all)*

Expected drift mechanism: intensifiers are easy to omit in compressed notes, but “strongly” marks escalation. If omitted, the target delivery may under-represent institutional resolve (over-weakening: Deval < 0). A compact intensifier marker (++, !) protects the level without expanding notes.

Illustrative Uzbek realisation (not an official translation; shown only to illustrate drift direction): *“Terrorizmning barcha ko’rinishlarini qat’iy qoralaymiz.”*

Case 6. High commitment framing: *“reaffirm our commitment ...”*

Source excerpt (verifiable): *“let us reaffirm our commitment to peace and security” (CICA Secretariat, 2026, p. 13)*

Stance mapping: Commitment framing scale: Level 3 (reaffirm/commit). If noted only as “peace+security,” the interpreter may downgrade to generic hopes (Level 2) or neutral mention (Level 1).

Simulated notes (two compression styles):

A) Idea-only (higher drift risk): *peace + security*

B) Cue-protected (minimal stance layer): *RE-AFFIRM/COMMIT+ → peace & security*

Expected drift mechanism: if the commitment verb is not cued, the output can drift toward vaguer ‘support’ language. A short COMMIT+ cue keeps the speech act type (reaffirmation) present in reconstruction.

Illustrative Uzbek realisation (not an official translation; shown only to illustrate drift direction): *“Tinchlik va xavfsizlikka sodiqligimizni yana bir bor tasdiqlaylik.”*

Case 7. Mitigating frame: *“I would like to note ...”*

Source excerpt (verifiable): *“Here I would like to note that the issue of international terrorism has been growing in the world” (CICA Secretariat, 2026, p. 14)*

Stance mapping: commitment/framing: the “would like to note” frame is weaker and more polite than a bare assertion (“I note / it is”). If dropped, the output can become

more categorical (over-strengthening).

Simulated notes (two compression styles):

A) Idea-only (higher drift risk): *terrorism issue* ↑ *worldwide*

B) Cue-protected (minimal stance layer): *WOULD~NOTE/FRAME* → *terrorism issue* ↑

Expected drift mechanism: framing devices are frequently treated as removable under compression, yet they shape interpersonal and institutional tone. Encoding a short FRAME cue helps avoid reconstruction as a blunt assertion.

Illustrative Uzbek realisation (not an official translation; shown only to illustrate drift direction): “*Bu o‘rinda shuni ta’kidlashni istardimki, xalqaro terrorizm muammosi kuchayib bormoqda.*”

Case 8. Combined calibration: “*We welcome ...*” + “*urge ...*”

Source excerpt (verifiable): “*We welcome the cessation of hostilities ... to which we urge all relevant parties to maintain their commitment*” (CICA Secretariat, 2026, p. 352)

Stance mapping: evaluative stance (welcome) + directive force (urge). If notes capture only “cessation of hostilities,” the output may lose both positive evaluation and the directive component.

Simulated notes (two compression styles):

A) Idea-only (higher drift risk): *hostilities stop / parties keep commitment*

B) Cue-protected (minimal stance layer): *WELCOME+ / cease hostilities / URGE* → *parties keep COMMIT*

Expected drift mechanism: this combined structure shows why stance drift can occur in multiple dimensions at once: losing WELCOME weakens evaluation, while losing URGE weakens directive force. Compact dual tags preserve both layers.

Illustrative Uzbek realisation (not an official translation; shown only to illustrate drift direction): “*Harbiy harakatlarning to‘xtatilishini olqishlaymiz va barcha tomonlarni sodiqlikni saqlashga da’vat etamiz.*”

Discussion. The demonstration cases illustrate a general mechanism: stance and calibration are often carried by short functional items - verbs of stance (express, condemn), directive frames (call upon, urge), commitment frames (take note, reaffirm), intensifiers (strongly), and mitigating frames (would like to note). Because consecutive notes are designed to be sparse and instantly readable, such items are precisely those that can be omitted unless the interpreter’s notation system includes compact cues for them (pp. 257-259, 266-267) [1]. Under training conditions, speed and density make this omission more likely (pp. 821-823) [3]. The result can be an output that preserves topical propositions but shifts pragmatic force - stance drift.

Note-taking research reviews emphasize the need for systematic, replicable designs that connect note properties to interpreting outcomes (pp. 151-153) [10]. The

present proposal contributes a replicable unit of analysis (stance-bearing segments), an explicit drift metric (signed distance on ordinal stance scales), and a minimal feature set for notes. Together, these components provide a bridge between instruction-oriented traditions and outcome-oriented research: teachers can train specific stance cues, and researchers can quantify whether such training reduces pragmatic drift under realistic speed/density constraints.

The paper's central limitation is that drift is demonstrated rather than empirically measured on real student outputs. The framework is therefore best understood as a measurement proposal. Its value is that it defines observable variables (tags, omissions, stance levels) that can be tested experimentally under controlled speech rate and density. Because speed and density are explicitly reported as note-taking difficulties in training (pp. 821-823) [3], any future experiment should manipulate these factors and then quantify stance drift between source fragments and target renditions.

Conclusion

This expanded article proposed a replicable framework for measuring stance drift under note-taking compression in English-Uzbek diplomatic consecutive interpreting. Drawing on notation theory that treats notes as an economical, implicit notation language (pp. 257-259, 266-267) [1] and on training evidence that speed and information density are major difficulties during note-taking (pp. 821-823) [3], the paper defined stance drift as systematic over-strengthening or over-weakening of pragmatic force. Using verifiable diplomatic formulations from the CICA compilation (pp. 13-14, 255, 265-266, 352, 356) [19], the demonstration cases showed how idea-only notes can delete stance verbs, directive softeners, commitment frames, or intensifiers, producing predictable drift directions. A practical implication is the proposal of minimal stance tags (EVAL/DIR/FRAME/COMMIT) that preserve calibration while respecting semantographic principles in Uzbek pedagogy (pp. 160-161) [18]. Finally, the framework treats note language choice as a measurable factor rather than a fixed rule, aligning with empirical findings that note language correlates with the interpreter's language status (p. 3) [5]. Future work should implement the proposed protocol with student interpreters, report inter-rater reliability, and test whether stance-tag training reduces drift under controlled manipulations of speech rate and density.

References

- [1] Kohn, K., & Albl-Mikasa, M. Note-taking in consecutive interpreting. On the reconstruction of an individualised language. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series - Themes in Translation Studies*, 1, 257-272 (published online 2021). <https://doi.org/10.52034/lanstts.v1i.19>
- [2] Gile, D. *Prise de notes et attention en début d'apprentissage de l'interprétation*

consécutive - une expérience - démonstration de sensibilisation. *Meta*, 36(2-3), 431-439 (1991). <https://doi.org/10.7202/002898ar>

[3] Arumí Ribas, M. Problems and strategies in consecutive interpreting: A pilot study at two different stages of interpreter training. *Meta*, 57(3), 812-835 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017092ar>

[4] Gile, D. The Effort Models of Interpreting as a Didactic Construct. In R. Muñoz Martín, S. Sun & D. Li (Eds.), *Advances in Cognitive Translation Studies* (pp. 139-160). Springer (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-2070-6_7

[5] Dam, H. V. Interpreters' notes: On the choice of language. *Interpreting*, 6(1), 3-17 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.6.1.03dam>

[6] Dam, H. V. From controversy to complexity: Replicating research and extending the evidence on language choice in note-taking for consecutive interpreting. *Interpreting*, 23(2), 222-244 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00062.dam>

[7] Szabó, C. Language choice in note-taking for consecutive interpreting. *Interpreting*, 8(2), 129-147 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.8.2.02sza>

[8] Abuín González, M. The language of consecutive interpreters' notes: Differences across levels of expertise. *Interpreting*, 14(1), 55-72 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.14.1.03abu>