

Re: \$1000/week?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.transcription/2004-09/4182.html>

From: Bam (*dearcounselor_at_comcast.net*)

Date: 09/27/04

Date: Sun, 26 Sep 2004 19:23:47 -0500

Rae your response doesn't make any sense to me, but to clarify my point....
Four years ago, there were services sitting in the conference rooms at
SpeechMachines tweaking their ability to "cheat" (my word not theirs) MTs
out of keystrokes.

One of the ways, and this was doable, was that the program would recognize C
H F and note that it was expanded but only pay for the C, the H, and the F,
no matter how many further characters showed up.

Now if you were the MT who has your speed up to 2000 lpd and then along
comes this software and your production with the SAME effort is now 1500
lpd, would you be bothered by that? I sure would.... in fact, just the
conversation pissed me off and I exited the board room.

"RaeMorrill" <raemorrill@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040926173048.19078.00001593@mb-m29.aol.com...

> >When an MT types CHF and expands it to congestive heart failure, she/he
> >thinks he's being paid for what 24 characters? The reality is some
services
> >are now paying for THREE
>
> First of all, much as I think it stinks, IF the MT agrees to this up
front,
> then so be it. However, who decides whether or not the MT typed something
out
> or not? Conceivably the MTSO could then make up a list of abbreviations
for way
> more words or phrases than the average person would ever remember,
especially
> if they did not come up with them on their own. So what, because the MTSO
knows
> some MTs type only "t" for the, that she will pay the MT that way
regardless?
>
> Rae Morrill in Maine
> "Ya can't get theyuh from heeah"
>
> _____
> Spam mailers WILL be reported to their respective postmasters and AOL
TOSSPAM!

Re: \$1000/week?

sci.med.transcription: Re: \$1000/week?

>
>