Decisions made by the Editing Ethics Committee

Work group on editing ethics: Jules Bündgens-Kosten, Michelle Proyer, Nicole Gotling, Rieke Dieckhoff

Last update: December 2023

(a) Problematic terms used by interviewees

Sometimes, interviewees use words that the editing team would not endorse. For example, in one specific case, an interviewed person uses a word that was historically used to describe people with Down Syndrome.

Decision: "historical framing instead of omission": Add some kind of footnote or comment ("This word was historically used to describe people with Down Syndrome. For information on which terms people with Down Syndrome prefer, see...")
Note: This interview was not included in the final manuscript for reasons unrelated to language use.

(b) Content notes/warnings

When working with the transcripts in university seminars, we realized that some of the content of the interviews might be painful for readers, and that some students might prefer to skip over some specific text segments.

Decision: A page is included in the manuscript that provides an overview of potentially problematic topics that are discussed in specific interviews. Students who are concerned about specific content can check before reading if the segment they will read contains it. Students who do not mind can skip this information. Putting all content notices in one place was preferable to adding them to each interview as some students had shared that they found constant content notices made it more difficult to focus.

(c) Off topic sections

Some interview transcripts created lengthy "off-topic" sections.

Example:

> I2: Ja es ist wirklich. Ja. Ich hab dir eh geschrieben [NAME VON I1] du hörst mich wahrscheinlich nicht oder?
> I1: Ah ich hör dich sorry. Ich hab natürlich nicht, ah passt, ja du äh, das Bild ist jetzt eingefroren aber wir sind sowieso schon am Ende. Ich hätt jetzt nur [noch]
> I2:   [Das Problem ist ähm] ok.
> I1: Bitte. {Verbindungsstörung mit Zoom}
> I1: Was [ist]

Decision: At the beginning and end of the interviews, detailed greetings, farewells, comments on technology (in the case of remote interviews) and introductory small talk were cut from the interviews without signaling this within the transcripts. In the case of repetitions in the interviews (for example, because there were comprehension or transmission problems and one partner had to repeat themselves multiple times to be understood), these parts were also shortened, signaled in the

transcript by [...]. In rare cases, interviews were also shortened if the interviewers described their own opinions and experiences in great detail.

(d) Punctuation & transcription signs

Some of the transcripts used a transcription style without punctuation, in which transcription signs were used to signal changes in intonation; others did not. Some transcripts signaled pauses using (...). Some transcripts signaled emphasis through capitalization.

Decision: To standardize the transcripts, and to improve readability, standard sentence punctuation was implemented throughout. This did involve a certain level of interpretation, but was done as carefully as possible. Information on pauses was either deleted or replaced by ...

Information on emphasis, when it appeared to be relevant for the comprehension of the section, was maintained.

(e) Deviations from standard language norms/features of spoken language

The transcrips reflect language as it is spoken. This means that they are characterized by repetitions, false starts, incomplete sentences, hesitations, etc. Also, transcripts reflect the typical deviations from standard language norms that can be found in all conversations.

Decision: Smaller deviations from standard language norms that are typical of spoken language were corrected when they could impact the reading flow. Example: "Das ist **den** Konzept der Lehramtsausbildung geschuldet" was changed to "das ist dem Konzept…" Dialectal language use was not modified towards a standard norm.

Beyond that, texts were not smoothed to improve readabilityin order to maintain their characteristics as interviews as opposed to polished written texts.

(f) Anonymization

While all interviews were anonymized by the students involved in conducting them, the approach to and the quality of anonymization were variable.

Decision: A standardized approach to anonymization was chosen (deleting identifying information and replacing it by a description of that information, e.g. [NAME]). Additionally, special efforts were made to delete personal information (such as age, profession, hometown) that might make a person identifiable.

(g) Sharing key decisions with readers

Editing practices mediate between the interview participants and the reader.

Decision: The introduction to the interview handbook contains a short section on editing practices to make this process visible.