



Your source for Accurate, Dependable  
Affordable Transcription  
609-701-0801 [www.ADATranscription.com](http://www.ADATranscription.com)

### **Introduction:**

ADA Transcription is a professional transcription company who has done a blind 3<sup>rd</sup> party review of 6 transcripts and provided audio/video. We had no knowledge of where each version came from and the transcripts were reviewed based on content, accuracy, formatting etc. Our years as a professional transcription company working with research facilities across the country qualifies us to provide expert feedback. We regularly work with large and small institutions transcribing focus groups and interviews on a wide variety of topics.

For this project, the second half of the audio/video file was transcribed in six separate versions. The first half of the audio WAS listened to, in order to grasp the topics and speakers better, and then each transcript was reviewed by the same proofreader, studied in-depth and considered for accuracy, formatting, speaker tracking and ultimately judged on how useful it would be to the end client.

### **Individual Transcript Reviews:**

**BIB 0618rd - v1 REVIEW:** This transcript did not do well with speaker labeling and the content had many errors. Speakers were labeled as Speaker 1, Speaker 2, etc. The moderator was labeled as a speaker (not as moderator) but the transcriptionist was not consistent with what speaker number the moderator was. They did not capture a lot of the conversation even when only a few people would talk back and forth slight, yet they didn't even put in "crosstalk" to indicate that a conversation was taking place.

They used "inaudible" and "unintelligible" a lot when really those parts were not very difficult to make out. There also were a lot of drastic mishears throughout the document.

Examples of drastic mishears (meaning *errors that blatantly change the transcript*):

"How are you going to save \$4,000?" when it should have been "What were you going to say before, Darlene?"

"I'll put the blame on most voters" when it should have been "Ultimately the voters."



Your source for Accurate, Dependable  
Affordable Transcription  
609-701-0801 [www.ADATranscription.com](http://www.ADATranscription.com)

"Cut" when it should have been "Track."

"Interest in offices" when it should have been "State offices."

"They can pay the refund" when it should have been "Make it fair to everybody"

They only put one space at the end of every sentence. They used the % symbol instead of typing out "percent." Sometimes they would have six billion dollars, other times would have \$6 billion, so there was no consistency.

**BIB 0618rd - v2 REVIEW:** Layout was decent. Each person was labeled as Speaker 1, Speaker 2. Labeled the moderator also as a speaker but was not consistent with what speaker number the moderator was. A few times when someone was speaking and the moderator asked a question, they would not start a new speaker to indicate that someone new was speaking. There were formatting errors and inconsistencies as well. There were a concerning number of drastic mishears that did not properly capture the transcript.

Examples of drastic mishears:

"You park a wall, they're modest." when it should have been "Are you off the wall, from Mars?"

"It doesn't help me get a thing" when it should have been "If someone else will get it then?"

"I understand that" when it should have been "That's 10 percent right there."

"Puzzle me." when it should have been "Plug the leaks."

"I cross the downside" when it should have been "Park in downtown"

Sometimes they would have six billion dollars, other times would have \$6 billion, as an example of having no consistency. "Seven, eight, 10" when it should have been "7, 8, 10." They only put one space at the end of every sentence. They used the % symbol instead of typing out "percent"



Your source for Accurate, Dependable  
Affordable Transcription  
609-701-0801 [www.ADATranscription.com](http://www.ADATranscription.com)

**BIB 0618rd - v3 REVIEW:** The layout of the document was nice. The header, which included the file name and participant names makes it look very professional (although a Dan and a Phil spoke and their names were not included in the header.) They labeled each person speaking by name, instead of number. Having time codes in every minute was helpful, too. They didn't have too many mishears, and especially not the drastic ones. There *were* some words they completely omitted, but mainly as a result of crosstalk, so it was much more understandable. They had very few inaudible words in the document. They only put one space at the end of every sentence. They kept the word "cause" instead of putting "because". They kept in all ums, uhs, and duplicate/stuttered words.

I feel like this document (v3) was the best overall. It has the least errors; the formatting looked professional; not many mishears or missed words.

**BIB 0618rd - v4 REVIEW:** The cover page was a nice feature to this document and included all the important details of the file, including name, date, length. They broke down the speakers into Man/Woman/Moderator which was helpful, but didn't try to break it down further into Man 1, Man 2, et cetera, leaving less room for error. Many of the "inaudibles" should have been filled in and were fairly clear. They missed some conversations when more than one speaker was talking AND did not indicate that there was crosstalk at the time.

Examples of mishears:

"So there's this reality" when it should have been "Give to the municipalities"

"That is the problem. it's just..." when it should have been "Each department just says"

"You can't pull" when it should have been "We're paying for"

They only put one space at the end of every sentence. They used the % symbol instead of typing out "percent".

I feel like this document (v4) was the second best. The formatting looked professional, they did a good job indicating who was speaking. There were mishears and inaudibles but not as many as the other four documents, and not as many drastic ones.

**BIB 0618rd - v5 REVIEW:** This transcript missed pages and pages of dialogue and did. This transcript did not at ALL represent the audio. A proper transcript of this audio was about 25 pages or more, while this document was only three. This one did



Your source for Accurate, Dependable  
Affordable Transcription  
609-701-0801 [www.ADATranscription.com](http://www.ADATranscription.com)

not identify the moderator. It also did not always separate when a new speaker spoke, and rarely identified a speaker correctly. It did include time codes before each speaker and that was a positive idea theoretically. However, since pages of dialogue was missing and various speakers were missing within that dialogue, the time codes were largely useless. There were many inconsistencies and incorrect formatting such as transcribing \$6,000,000 instead of \$6 billion. Overall this one was in terrible shape because a majority of the discussion was not even transcribed leaving it largely useless to the client.

**BIB 0618rd - v6 REVIEW:** There were so many mishears throughout this entire document. It was not easy to follow what was going on in the focus group because there were no names identified, not even when the moderator spoke. Again, while it did not miss as much as v5, the level of mishears and the confusion of how to even separate speakers (let alone identify them) would have made this document not particular useful to the client.

Example of drastic mishears:

- "Savings" when it should have been "state agencies"
- "Absolutely" when it should have been "Too laid back."
- "Grateful" when it should have been "dreadfully uninformed"
- "Staff is thinking" when it should have been "deficit"
- "Non weighted" when it should have been "beyond inflated"
- "Weights" when it should have been "waste"

They only put one space at the end of every sentence. They used the % symbol instead of typing out "percent"

### **Conclusion**

The conclusion is that v3 was the best overall transcript, (followed by v4 as second place). V3 had the least errors, looked professional and was in overall good shape. V3 did the best job of tracking the speakers and capturing the actual focus group content. While there was some errors, they were not drastic errors and the focus group was well transcribed as a whole. V3 was also the most consistent in how it represented things such as money and numbers. The other four versions were in terrible shape. Far too many mishears, the formatting was not good; there were many words and sentences (and sometimes entire conversations) missed,



Your source for Accurate, Dependable  
Affordable Transcription  
609-701-0801 [www.ADATranscription.com](http://www.ADATranscription.com)

skipped or ignored. For versions 1, 2, 5 and 6 it actually appeared that the transcriptionists had not checked their own work at all, and for v5 did not seem to actually care about even capturing the audio.