



Hansard editing in a (live)stream era

Does availability of (live)streams influence editing?





20th Century debate



TWEEDE KAMER DER STATEN-GENERAAL



Characteristics:

- Hardly any debates broadcasted live
- No possibility to watch debates on demand
- Report published on paper in weekly booklet



21st Century debate





Characteristics

- MP's use tablets and smartphones
- On-going debate on social networks (Twitter, Facebook)
- Availability of livestreams and streams on-demand



Live broadcasting



TWEEDE KAMER DER STATEN-GENERAAL



Debates on demand



Tweede Kamer
DER STATEN-GENERAAL | DEBAT GEMIST

Veelgestelde vragen | Contact

Zoek

Home Sprekers Mijn favorieten

uitgebreid zoeken

Meest recente debat: 3 juli 2015 (00:46 - 00:50)

Mededelingen



download | delen | * toevoegen aan favorieten

Dit debat is 213 keer bekeken

RECENTE DEBATTEN

Kies een periode
(dd-mm-11)

26-06-15

tot

12-07-15

Toon



3 juli 2015
Mededelingen

bekijk dit debat



2 juli 2015
Stemmingen

bekijk dit debat



2 juli 2015
Regeling van werkzaamheden (stemmingen)

MEEST BEKEKEN DE AFGELOPEN MAAND



25 juni 2015
Wet natuurbescherming

bekijk dit debat



11 juni 2015
Komst moskee in Gouda

bekijk dit debat



24 juni 2015
Herziening belastingstelsel

bekijk dit debat



Chairman makes a mistake





In writing...

De voorzitter:

Ik heet de staatssecretaris van Justitie van harte welkom. Ik geef als eerste het woord aan de heer Oosenbrug van de fractie van de VVD, pardon, ik bedoel mevrouw Oosenbrug van de fractie van de PvdA. Dit is haar maiden-speech. Zij mag dus niet geïnterrumpeerd worden, al zouden de leden dat willen.



On Twitter



Astrid Oosenbrug ✓
@AstridOosenbrug

+ Volgen

Aangekondigd door de voorzitter als meneer Oosenbrug, wel passend bij mijn maidenspeech ;-)
#transgenders #gba

RETWEETS

7



11:28 - 2 apr. 2013



PvdA Lansingerland
@PvdA_LL

+ Volgen

Het Tweede Kamerlid, de heer A. Oosenbrug (VVD) houdt zijn maidenspeech speech, zegt de voorzitter!
debatgemist.tweedekamer.nl/debatten/de-be...

08:28 - 3 apr. 2013



Primary purpose of the report

- Closely follow the speaker, in order to reduce the differences between the spoken and written texts as much as possible
- Grammatically correct and well readable report
- Focus on content
- Legislative history



Target groups

- The general public
- Government and Parliament
- The Government's administration and local authorities
- The judiciary
- Stakeholders' organizations
- All



Questions

- Has your organization made choices?
- Has editing largely changed since the introduction of (live)streaming and/or social media?
- Have new editing rules been introduced?
- Do you explain on your website why the report sometimes differs from the spoken text?
- Do you ever receive comments on these differences?

Hansard editing in a live stream era. Does availability of (live) streams influence editing?

Not so long ago the verbatim report was the source to use if you wanted to know what had been said exactly in a debate in Parliament. Now and then fragments of debates were shown on television. Sometimes a whole debate was broadcasted, but we lacked the means to watch it again.

The advent of the internet has changed a lot. We all can now watch everything. This has had an impact on Parliament itself: MPs now speak in a more informal way. It has changed the nature of the debates.

An example of this from the Dutch Parliament can be seen in a video footage of the general political debate in 2011, in which the prime minister has an argument with an MP. they snap at each other: "don't (you) make a fool of yourself, man!" (video).

Another effect is that MPs are more and more aware of the people who follow the streams. They frequently address the people who follow the debate at home as well. Some MPs adapt their language. When presiding over a sitting or meeting they urge the spokespersons to refrain from the use of abbreviations and jargon, because otherwise the people at home would not understand what the debate is about.

Does the availability of various means to follow the debate (live) change the nature of the report? That is the key question for us parliamentary reporters. In all parliaments transcripts are edited. Otherwise they would be unreadable. In the first place, an edited transcript is a comprehensive report, written in the first person singular. We omit clear mistakes, unnecessary repetitions and redundancies. Now that debates are available online on demand, watchers/readers can see/hear the differences between the spoken word and the written report. How do you cope with this?

We in the Netherlands, for instance, will rectify mistakes, unless we think that others may return to the matter later. In April 2013 a female MP held her maiden speech. She was introduced by the speaker as "mister x" and as a member of a political party she did not belong to. Both mistakes were recorded in the report. Later they came back in tweets, so they had been noted. (video, tweets, report). The funny detail, by the way, is that the debate was on transgender legislation.

This raises the question what we consider to be the primary purpose of our report. What do we find important? Following the speaker as closely as

possible? Making a grammatically correct and well readable report? Do we put the emphasis on the content? Do we want to provide clarity about the debate with a view to the legislative history?

We also have to ask ourselves whom we see as our primary target group: MPs, the general public, stakeholders' organizations, the government's administration, local authorities or the judiciary and others who have to interpret the laws. What is the purpose, who do you want to serve? Or is all this possible at the same time?

Has your organization made choices in this field? Have new editing rules been introduced? Has editing largely changed since the introduction of (live)streaming and/or social media? Do you explain on your website why the report sometimes differs from the spoken text? Have you ever had comments about differences, if any, between the spoken text and its transcription?

Workshop Hansard editing in a live stream era.

Does the availability of various means to follow the debate (live) change the nature of the report?

- Has your organization made choices in this field?

- Have new editing rules been introduced?

- Has editing largely changed since the introduction of (live)streaming and/or social media?

- Do you explain on your website why the report sometimes differs from the spoken text?

- Have you ever had comments about differences, if any, between the spoken text and its transcription?

What is the primary purpose of our report?

Following the speaker as closely as possible? Making a grammatically correct and well readable report? Do we put the emphasis on the content? Do we want to provide clarity about the debate with a view to the legislative history?

What is our primary target group?

- MPs, the general public, stakeholders' organizations, the government's administration, local authorities, the judiciary and others who have to interpret the laws?
- What is the purpose, who do you want to serve? Or is all this possible at the same time?