
Title	Protocol for selection of transcript excerpts, 2012. Comprehending Reading Comprehension (OER 9/10 RS)
Author(s)	Rita Elaine Silver
Published by	National Institute of Education (Singapore)

This document may be used for private study or research purpose only. This document or any part of it may not be duplicated and/or distributed without permission of the copyright owner.

The Singapore Copyright Act applies to the use of this document.

Citation: Silver, R. E. (2013). Protocol for selection of transcript excerpts, 2012. Comprehending Reading Comprehension (OER 9/10 RS). Singapore: National Institute of Education, Singapore.

**PROTOCOL FOR SELECTION OF TRANSCRIPT EXCERPTS,
2012
COMPREHENDING READING COMPREHENSION
(OER 9/10 RS)**

Rita Elaine Silver

7 Feb 2013

Background

As transcription is a costly process, it is important to carefully consider which data and how much data are needed to fulfil the goals of a specific project. Gass and Mackey 2005, p. 222) not that broad transcription might take only 1-2 hours for one hour of data but more detailed transcription might require 20- 40 hours per one hour of data. (See, also, Markee, 2000.) This document sets out the rationale and procedures for selecting excerpts of audio recordings from lesson observations for transcription in the project Comprehending Reading Instruction (CRC). The project investigates teacher-student discussion within primary school reading lessons in one Singapore school. Broad transcription is used to capture teacher talk (the main focus of the study) and students' public comments within the framework of the lesson. This document also includes information on the protocols for transcriptionⁱ.

The purpose of the CRC study is to examine implementation of an intervention focussed on increasing the quantity and quality of discussion in reading lessons. The intervention included introduction of Questioning-the-Author (e.g. Beck & McKeown, 2002; Beck, McKeown, Sandora, Kucan, & Worthy, 1996) with negotiation for meaning (NFM) (e.g. Pica, 1994) in a school-based collaboration with researchers from the National Institute of Education, Singapore.ⁱⁱ

General Guidelines

Excerpts of lesson observation transcripts will be created and analysed. In a prior study (OER 29/08), full transcripts were made for analysis in order to determine if teachers were able to implement use of QtA queries, turning back moves and Negotiation for Meaning (NfM), to what extent this was done, and how students responded. Based on those transcripts, it is clear that teachers can make use of QtA queries, turning back moves and NfM throughout the lessons. Therefore, full transcripts were deemed unnecessary for the Comprehending Reading Comprehension study as the goal is to determine if there is evidence of developing understanding and use of these new techniques, not to gauge frequency or percentage of use in each lesson.

The goal of the transcript excerpts is to capture the points where it is most likely that there will be open-ended discussion. We do not expect to show all use of QtA or NfM but only to show that it occurs (if it does) and how it is handled. Therefore three time points for each lesson are transcribed, near the beginning, middle and end. In general, the first and last 5 minutes of the

lesson are excluded because the first five minutes is usually devoted to classroom management (e.g. student seating, getting students settled for the lesson) and the last five minutes is often rushed (as the teacher tries to complete the lesson) or again classroom management (as the students go back to their seats, pick up bags, etc.). In addition, our observations from year 1 suggested that slightly different things are going on at these different times. Typically near the beginning the teachers are engaging in pre-reading discussions with title, cover, and /or visuals. Near the middle of the lesson they are typically more engaged with text and the ideas of the reading. Near the end of the lesson the teachers might be wrapping up or recapping the reading. Table 1 shows a likely selection of excerpts for a 1-hour lesson: **X** indicates points that are not transcribed; + indicates most likely points for transcription. The breakdown assumes approximately 5 minutes at the beginning of the lesson (often pre-reading), 10 minutes at the mid-point of the lesson when discussion is expected to be underway, and 5 minutes near the end of the lesson.

Table 1. Breakdown of a 1-hour lesson

5 min	classroom management (anticipated)	X
5 min	5 min only at pre-reading T led	+
5 min		
5 min		
5 min }	Anticipated discussion of passage (text)	+
5 min		
5 min		
5 min		
5 min	Approx 5 min for additional example of discussion	+
5 min		
5 min		
5 min		X

Excerpts are selected based on the premise that we are not trying to capture all uses of QtA queries, turning back moves and NfM, but only examples (as evidence of use). Three segments of 5-10 minutes for each 1-hour lesson will capture 25%-50% of each lesson. These segments should also be long enough to show the development of a particular topic or idea over several

turns. The lesson observer makes the final decision on which parts of the lesson to be transcribed, following the guidelines below.

These same principles are used to select excerpts for all lessons conducted in 2012 – Gen 1 and Gen 2, ‘QtA lessons’ and ‘Reading lessons’ (which are not specifically planned for QtA). A few selected lessons (all from Aug-Sept 2012) will be transcribed in full for a separate project which is doing a secondary analysis of the teacher interviews (Kim & Silver). Those lessons are transcribed in full but excerpts will be chosen (following the principles outlined here) for data analysis (QtA and NfM).

Specific Guidelines for Selection of Excerpts (QtA and non-QtA lessons)

1. Excerpts of QtA lessons

Since QtA lessons are planned by teaching teams at the same grade level with detailed lesson plans (LP), excerpts are selected according to the lesson plans and the major understandings (MUs) given by teachers in those lesson plans. These are pre-selected by the research team with the aim of transcribing similar points in lessons using the same passage (to the extent possible).

Prioritize the major understanding. Teacher lesson plans tend to state that a specific segment of the passage, usually designated with a given PowerPoint ‘slide’, will be used to address a given MU. However, the actual discussion of that MU might be at a different point – starting before or ending after the slide designated in the lesson plan. If the teacher does not address that MU (for whatever reason), transcribe the MU before or after the one that was not addressed. For example, if the teacher was going to talk about ‘difficulty in deciding on building a train system’ at Slide 10 but did not have time to cover that, the MU that came before that in the LP would be the point of transcription. For this reason, it is likely the transcription points across QtA lessons will not be identical even though the same lesson plans are used.

Since transcribers should follow the discussion which relates to an MU stated in the lesson plan, not the ‘slide number’ given in the lesson plan, observers must make the final decision on which points of the lesson will be transcribed. A table based on the

lesson plan and fieldnotes, indicating the specific points for transcription, will be prepared for each lesson, see Table 2.

2. Transcription of non-QtA/ reading lessons

Since there is no detailed lesson plan for the ‘non-QtA’ (aka ‘reading’) lessons, excerpts are chosen by the observer for each individual lesson, looking for segments at the beginning, middle and end of the lessons when open-ended discussion is used. Since the goal is to examine use of QtA, turning back moves and NfM, the observer should select excerpts when these are used, if possible. As in the QtA lessons, the observer must prepare a transcript selection table to indicate the selected transcription points (excerpts). Since there are no ‘major understandings’ for the non-QtA lesson, the observer must provide the time stamp and information on the topic discussed to help the transcriber find the correct points in the audio recordings. For research purposes, the observer must also state the reason why each excerpt was chosen for the non-QtA lessons. See Table 3.

Preparation of the Transcript Selection Table

For each transcript, use MS Excel to prepare a table (i.e. Tables 2 & 3) to show the expected selection point, MU (if a QtA lesson) or topic (if a non-QtA lesson), and time stamps for the points to transcribe. Time stamps are based on the teacher’s audio recording. When transcribing, the transcriber will always start with the teacher audio recording and then seek for related points in the student audio recording to complete the transcript (see Trans Excerpt _Protocols_ CRC_2012).

For QtA lessons, the softcopy of the teachers’ lesson plan can be used to create the first draft of the Transcription Selection Table. If the information varies from the pre-selected transcription points (i.e. if it is a different MU or the chosen MU appears at a different point in the lesson), be sure to note this in the table by crossing out the details of the lesson plan which are not relevant. (See Table 2, row 3, ‘~~Excerpt 3~~’). The observer should also indicate the suggested audiofiles to use for transcription (the teacher recording and 2-4 student recordings to be chosen based on selection around the room, see below).

In the top row of the table, include the transcript name. In the final row of the table (in the leftmost cell) list the recommended audio files to be used for transcription. Any additional notes which might be useful to the transcriber can be included in the observation fieldnotes. In general, the transcriber is the observer but this is not always the case, thus when creating the table and finalizing the fieldnotes, the observer must consider what information would be useful to a transcriber who has not seen the lesson.

Preparing the Transcript

Follow the standard transcription protocols for a simple transcript of the lesson. Use the standard abbreviations and formatting guidelines (see Trans_Protocols_ SOG.Rev.10.12.2012)

When creating your transcript, you will have three excerpts. Label them in the transcript as Excerpt 1, Excerpt 2, Excerpt 3 along with the time stamp from the teacher audio recording (e.g. ‘Excerpt 1, 7:10-12:20’ indicates that the first excerpt was chosen from 7:10-12:20 of the teacher’s audio file). Do not type the MU or topic into the transcript as this inputs extraneous information into the transcript.

Table 2. Example of the Transcript Selection Table (QtA lessons)

CRC_S9_5D_A1_Obs1_06.03.12	Selection	Major Understanding	Audio time stamp
Excerpt 1	p. 1, 2nd row, slide 2 Beginning of lesson	Describe the transportation of the future	10:00 – 28:00 (based on T audio)
Excerpt 3	p. 4, 2 nd row. Slide 6 Middle of lesson	It is important for ... Description of a good transportation system Author’s fallibility	46:30 – 51:30 (based on T audio)
Excerpt 3	p. 6, 2nd row, slide 10 End of lesson	Difficulty in deciding on building a train system	AI didn’t do this slide in this lesson Not covered and so a different MU was selected
Excerpt 3			
Suggested audio files: XXXXX XXXXXX XXXXX			

File naming

For purposes of file names, follow the standard conventions for OER 9/10 RS:

- Transcript file names end with TRANS
- Fieldnotes end with FN
- The Transcript Selection Table will be designated as TES.
- See Table 4 for an example.

Table 3. Example of the Transcript Selection Table (non-QtA lessons)

CRC_S9_5D_AI_Obs1_06.03.12	Topic	Why selected?	Audio time stamp
Excerpt 1			
Excerpt 3			
Excerpt 3			
Suggested audio files: XXXXX XXXXXX XXXXX			

Table 4. File Naming Protocols for transcripts, fieldnotes and transcription selection table

CRC_S9_5D_AI_Obs1_06.03.12	Observation information
CRC_S9_5D_AI_Obs1_06.03.12_TRANS	Transcript
CRC_S9_5D_AI_Obs1_06.03.12_FN	Fieldnotes
CRC_S9_5D_AI_Obs1_06.03.12_TES	Transcription Selection Table

References

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2002). Questioning the author: Making sense of social studies. *Educational Leadership*, 60(3), 44-47.

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., Sandora, C., Kucan, L., & Worthy, J. (1996). Questioning the author: A yearlong classroom implementation to engage students with text. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(4), 385-414.

Gass, S. & Mackey, A. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44(3), 493-527.

ⁱ For questions or further details, contact Rita Elaine Silver, English Language and Literature, National Institute of Education, Singapore: rita.silver@nie.edu.sg

ⁱⁱ These project referred to in this document was funded by the Education Research Funding Programme, National Institute of Education (NIE), Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. The views expressed in this paper are the author's and do not necessarily represent the views of NIE.