

<http://qesoc.org/webinar-series>

Note this was automatically transcribed by <https://otter.ai> so there are errors, and the timestamps do not match the video.

June 14, 8AM (CST), 3PM (CET), 11 PM+1day (AEST)

QE Data ChallengeField Report: Reflecting on the benefits of multidisciplinary research teams

Daniel Spikol

University of Copenhagen, DK

Stefano Schiavetto

State University of Campinas, Brazil

Barbara Wasson

University of Bergen, Norway

Karoline Schnaider

University of Umeå, Sweden

Abstract

For our seminar, we unpack our experiences and the resulting paper presented at the ISQE 2021 conference. The seminar looks at how a diverse team from multiple countries and research disciplines worked together with the QE tools to investigate how the different countries in Scandinavia responded at the beginning of 2020 (January to March). We use our paper, "Governmental Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic-A Quantitative Ethnographic Comparison of Public Health Authorities' Communication in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden", as a case to explore and reflect on the tools and team building. The seminar explores the challenges and opportunities of working with these tools.

Hendrik Drachsler 00:06

So we're gonna start. Hey, welcome everyone to this afternoon European time. My name is Henrik Drexler. David asked me and Brendan asked me if I want to moderate this in our webinars, I'm very pleased to do because we also started with DNA studies in Frankfurt, Germany and have some fun and fantastic outcomes of this. It's really an enriching our toolbox so much. And so I was really happy to be asked and being a learner on my own, and learning all the tricks, and details, really enjoy being here and being the moderator of today. And also, today's webinar, I think it's an excellent lineup. I mean, it cannot be more pressing and vergence reporting from data challenge secure a data challenge on how multiple countries and research disciplines have worked together on the QA tools to investigate COVID-19 for sure. And find the outcomes of that. So very urgent and important research to be can apply directly. And I'm really looking forward to this panel, exchanging the experiences and yeah, they're the advancements with DNA towards Mr. q&a towards in this direction. And I have with me and I go first with Barbara Watson from New York University of Bergen is here. To the left side, hi, Barbara. Kathleen Schneider. Can you Hey, there's Carolyn from Sweden, Stefan or she vecto. Hi Shiva, I Stephano. And last but not least, Daniel speaker University of Copenhagen, Denmark, who will interact in this exchange and panel discussion on on their achievements with the QA tools for the COVID-19. So I would say to the floors open, let's let's get this done.

Daniel Spikol 02:14

Hi, everyone, welcome. We're going to start with a very brief kind of overview of the paper in case you haven't read it, or you forgot, just to give some context of what's happening. I'll share my screen and try to talk if I talk too fast, just tell me because growing up in New York, you have to talk fast otherwise you couldn't eat in my house. So this paper was sort of started at the first data challenge. And even though I have the fight clubs, soap from the second data challenge here floating around in the Atlantic Ocean, and the title of the paper, as you can see, it is nice and long academic style. But it's a government response to covid 19 pandemic, using a QE, comparison of Public Health Authority communication in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. And we're really happy that you know that we came together for the data challenge and that native all the way to a full paper in the last conference. I think there's a lot to be said about the data challenges and an opportunity to bring different people together. I'll just start my timer so I don't talk too much. So if I go to the next slide, we have a multidisciplinary team. As you might imagine, Carolyn from eco University in Sweden, which is on the top of Sweden, even though that she lives in the bottom of Sweden in Malmo, Stephano from San Paolo, Brazil. Florian Maya from Aalborg University, Barbara Lawson, from the University of Bergen. And Benjamin Allsop also from Alberg and myself at the time at Normal University in Sweden. But now I sort of managed to cross the bridge and end up in Copenhagen. And this is actually the last time we physically got together when we were finishing the paper and having a conference about it in June. So we haven't actually really seen each other since then the face to face situation, which is, I guess, the same for many people in today's conference. And as you can see this, if you're unfamiliar with Scandinavia, this is sort of the top view of Scandinavia and a bit of Germany and other countries, but Norway and Sweden and Denmark, sort of down at the bottom connected to Germany. And you can see, of course, that Norway and Sweden not so many people in the center, lots of moose. So we had a clear research question, as you can see, and we were really interested in what are the similarities and differences between the government response of the coast Well, no crisis in the first part of January to March 2021. Between Denmark, Norway and Sweden through crisis communication strategies conveyed through public health authority press releases. And this is sort of based on Sally's sort of investigation in crisis communication with two types of emergency emergency information, preventative information and reactive action messages. And I think we chose this as we'll talk a little bit about, because we wanted us to have a manageable data set to work with, because we were sort of somewhat unfamiliar with the QA tools at this point. Oops. And so we had this nice process where we sort of extracted the data from the from the websites

online, we had to clean and process the documents, as we're all familiar with data processing. We did sort of iterative leaps of coding, using encoder and sort of inter rater reliability. And of course, we use DNA to sort of visualize this and to do the analysis, we had press releases from the Danish public health authorities in Norwegian Public Health Institute, and also the Swedish Ministry of Health between this time period. And we develop sort of these action codes and these information codes, as you can see from from the code book here, and we work quite a lot to to refine this. And I think Carolyn, and other people will talk about sort of the involved processes we are familiar with in developing a good set of codes for using the QE toolbox. And sort of quickly the results and analysis, we had subtraction networks for each country centroid, which indicates their confidence intervals, we wanted an easy way to compare the large number of networks. And we also wanted a close up view on the networks for each country, we had two signals for the epistatic network analysis, the position of the centroids, in relation to the position of the Kurds, and of course, the weighted line connection. And this is sort of what it looks like, we were very fortunate that we had pretty good differences between the three countries, from almost from the beginning. So this was we felt sort of nice that we at least could see a difference because I think we started off with the notion that the Scandinavian countries or Norway, Denmark and Sweden have a lot of similarities, at least on the surface. But as you can see from the analysis, they're actually quite different in how they responded. And there's more of a closer view of the means. And you can see that they responded quite differently in terms of the communication both in action, and illness. And we had four levels of analysis, we had the simple visual analysis, which the tools provide, we had the relation between codes and the ties between information or action, we had deeper analysis of the ties by relating the codes to their descriptions. And we, in a sense, close the interpretive loop by relating the quantitative results to qualitative data in terms of the quotes of the stances, although I won't talk about that in detail. At the moment, I'll just conclude sort of with what we found. And if we look at the findings, we can see, of course, everybody knows that Sweden is the Outliner and the COVID response. But you can see that there's quite differences between these three countries which share, you know, intellect, history, and similar culture, but slightly different responses. If you look at the bottom, we can see sort of a level of criticality in the state measures, we see a level of tolerance to political changes. And in Denmark, you see a level of critical criticality on the force and the democratic rights. And you can see the focus in Sweden has been on the academic epidemic spread and government response while in Norway with the biology of the disease, the monitoring status in the healthcare system, in Denmark, of course, also biology of disease monitoring and illness in healthcare system. And you can see that their responses were sort of different health authority guidance versus inclusive decision making and stronger political authority in the case of Denmark. And our talk is going to be about the reflections. We'll talk a little bit about, you know, how we did it, and sort of how we were guided. And to some extent, of course, you know, this was only a snapshot of what was happening, you know, and other data would have been nice to include, like, the speeches of the prime minister and other key figures, but we didn't do it for this paper. So I think I did this and pretty good. Time. This is really based on Carolyn and stephanos. presentation from from the conference, I just added that silly graphic. So thanks. And now we're going to start sort of more of a discussion between the four of us. And then hopefully, our script will give us some scaffolding. And of course, we can take some questions with that or any about the paper before we start the scripting conversation part. I don't see anybody's hand up. Everyone has just, like, enjoyed my presentation so much that they ready for the for the conversation,

Barbara Jane Wasson Lillehaug 10:43

I can say something because you the data was actually from 2020? Not from 2021. Okay. Yeah, that was? Well,

Hendrik Drachslar 10:52

thank you. Yeah, that makes sense. So maybe for questions that come up, just use the chat and put it there. Or even if you want to say it verbally, just say, I don't know, hands up or something. We can see it in a chat. Sometimes these hands bump from zoom, you don't see them directly, although they move to the left corner. But I think Daniel, you gave a crystal clear presentation looks like everybody is on spot.

Daniel Spikol 11:18

Alright, great. Well, we're gonna start our sort of conversation, because I think the main thing we want to accomplish is talking about the process that you know, what we learned from the data challenge, and also the ability for these types of tools to bring different researchers together from different disciplines and sort of the power and strength of that, which can be I think, sometimes unique in research, because a lot of times we end up siloed into talking about things we already know about interviews we already have, even though as scientists, we're not really, you know, supposed to have that mindset. And I think, you know, by participating in the data challenge, we were really able to come together and, and push each other and learn a lot. So yeah, I think we'll come back to that to get question about the DNA analysis and the conclusions, but I think we're going to answer those a bit in the questions and we'll leave some time to get into the details in that. So let's just start I just wanted to shut my timer off. Okay. So Stephano, you start the round of questioning?

Stefano Schiavetto 12:31

Yeah. Hello, everybody. It's definitely your hi demeanor. small box. Nice to be here. Thank you, Brandon, for the invitation. Thank you all the team to be together and also had to be here. I will ask first to curling. So so we can start? What are the overall benefits of engaging other to challenge and multidisciplinary work? So yeah, yes,

Karoline Schnaider 13:00

thank you. And I'm also very happy to be here. So thank you very much for inviting me. And I will just make a brief presentation on myself before I ask the question. So my name is Colleen. And I'm a doctoral student at the Department of Education at new university in Sweden. And I'm researching digital technologies from a social semiotic multimodal perspective. And I've been using qualitative and quantitative research approaches in my studies and engage in quantitative ethnography the last year, and it was initiated by my participation in the 2020 data challenge. So I have some reflections on my experience participating in the 2020 data challenge during which the team that assembled and later formed the group that continued writing the paper as Daniel just said and talks about and I have two short reflections around that and I want to share that I think are like some kind of learnings learning examples. And first, I believe that it is of course, beneficial to work with senior or union researchers from different disciplines that you have not collaborate with before because you get the chance to be scaffolded and also maybe to some extent, scaffold, interdisciplinary procedures that you may not have had the opportunity to do otherwise. So, it is also beneficial from a learning perspective and how different methodological approaches to research and various disciplines such as sociology, a computer science, education, so on, can inform the research subject and also how it is done. So more specifically, I think that there is an added value, the unruly in totally like and also in in getting a more solid result, I would say, and secondly, for my own sake, I said My research is interdisciplinary, but still within the rather historical discipline of education that maintains its high status through the boundaries to other fields, I realized pretty quickly how the QE methods can help to improve more qualitatively oriented research. And I will go into more of that soon. So thank you very much. And the next question is for Daniel. So can you reflect on your thoughts of playing Project Manager for this diverse team?

Daniel Spikol 15:33

Sure, I can also introduce myself, I guess, some ways, part of me plays computer scientists and the other part of me works for the Center for Digital education at University of Copenhagen. So I've been involved in sort of computer supported collaborative learning and multimodal learning analytics for for a long time now. And but I also come from a background of project management. So before, in between my academic kind of careers, I worked for many different companies and had my own companies where I managed diverse groups of people. And when I sort of liked about the role that I played in this project was I was able to sort of use those skills again, you know, for a very sort of interesting project. And sort of the nice thing about this project was that, you know, there wasn't a difficult team to manage, surprisingly. And that, you know, that you also get to learn because you're the bridge between all the different people, and all the different types of research that we had, you know, many different perspectives, both, you know, politically, but also from our research domain, topics that, you know, sort of motivated me to find out more about, for instance, how Benjamin, you know, in Florian work with the data and their perspectives on sort of what this means, and at the same time, you know, being really challenged by sort of being introduced from, you know, Stefanos view on sort of sociology, and also, you know, seeing a different side of working with Barbara, and also finding a way to bring, you know, people together, because at the time, at Malmo, both currently, and Stefano, were sitting in, in the lab there, so and we were looking for a way to sort of collaborate, you know, across our domain. So this data challenge was a great way to, to do that. It gave us the opportunity and the means to, to have a concrete project instead of like, you know, coffee break conversations. And I get to ask Barbara, question a little bit more about, like, you know, how do we, you know, what was the process in selecting the data for this project? Well, you know, if you can recount, you know, why we chose to do this?

Barbara Jane Wasson Lillehaug 17:51

Yeah. So, we have to remember, this was very early in the, in what was going on in the, in the Corona, period. And, as Daniel has said, it's very, even though people think of Scandinavia, very alike, we saw differences in our own country, just our own observations when we were discussing it. So we were thinking, what was the data that we could use to visualize this, or to show this kind of difference. And we, we started by, in Norway, I was really impressed and interested in our Prime Minister speeches, because she, they were on the TV every day and having a lot of speeches. And then we would be having these press releases from the, you know, the public health authorities, which are the FHI. In Norway, FYI, in Sweden, and they SSI in in Denmark. And so we had three, you could say institutions that were equal, we had some of the Prime Minister speeches in each of the countries going on, but the data was not digital. It was, you know, audio. So we did are sort of in the textual data for it. So I think it was sweet and actually had a transcription already of all of the Prime Minister speeches, and we would like to have had it for the other countries. But given the short time in the timeframe we had, we had to avoid those. So as someone who works a lot with learning analytics, so I'm the director of the Center of learning analytics in Norway, where we really cognizant of what data we actually have. So the data that we had was representative of the discussions going on, it would have been more complete to have had the Prime Minister speeches as well, because then it's more political. But in this way, we got the the public health authorities data, which was equal across the three countries. So we sort of decided on that data that was already textual that we could then use in our decisions. Okay, now I'm going to ask Stephano a question because it was really nice to have a sociologist in this. I think the paper really gets lifted when you have the domain expertise. that you need to interpret the results. So Stephano Can you talk a little bit about how QE allows you to work with a different scale of texts in relation to Sociology?

Stefano Schiavetto 20:14

I've always heard that and if I say too much for the reader that you just put me speak too much. But it's a very, very, very good question. Very nice question. It is the thing that I dealt

a lot when we started, it was really challenging for me to do science in a different way. I never did science together with these technologies and tools, and etc. So it was a big thing for me this first, and they will try to answer very fast but for me what one of the things that it's really nice to see it, there's a lot of things that I could say, but one of the big impact for me was the different ways to generate knowledge from this course, are different ways to, to, to to have a relationship with this course invite squarish I mean, all kinds of human expressions that are not just human as no humans, but like a text like speech, like a press release, like ahead, there's a lot of types of discourse and key and sociology has different ways to approach the discourse, interest rate information, is a really nice thing to combine. And one, one of the things that is just caught the most my attention was, like this sociology, if we can put in a few words is about how to tell us how the totality influences or conditions, the particular or the particular is in each way of thinking, acting and feeling influenced by the totality. And we are in a globalized world, where the totality just has expanded a lot. And we have determination from all over the world, I live in Brazil, but I have terminations in my way of thinking, acting, and feeling from all over the world. So that had a huge amount of information that we need to understand of the totality in order to understand that in particular. So it's a really challenging thing. And I think t it, he helps a lot to to capture this totality in a different way than sociology or social sciences. So when we, when we have a speech we analyzed from sociology, for example, we have a guy speaking in front of us, we are watching it, and we can see the expression, we can see if he's confident or not, we can see also, if he is reading the text, or he's just talking, we can see there's a guy talking his ears or not. And all these kinds of information is is very good for you to understand why it's happening. But we can't do it with a lot of things with a lot of information we had today. So I think he gives a one of the specs that I want you to put in perspective is that key helps sociology know the other sciences to empower themselves when they talk about when they can make interpretations. And why? Because you have a relationship with the text that you make questions to the text and the text needs to react to you. So you ask the test, for example. Hey, hey, Dan, America, are you talking about what when you are talking about the COVID and center, Sweden, we're talking about what Sweden, we're talking about what and for example, we can strike from Denmark that they're talking a lot about force. And we just, we just go through, it just went through a huge amount of text that we couldn't have done if you were just interested in the more traditional way. So these kind of access to information you can have as a sociologist in the desk, how it helped me when I was searching for literature to make interpretations about our paper. I was just thinking, Hey, now I am confident to say that Denmark's talking about for us, I'm confident to say to say that Sweden is talking about, it's less politically talking. And we have an amount of literature that is talking about it. So now I'm more confident I have a scientific tool that is helping me to say something that used to be an impression for so this combination is very powerful, because you can integrate to different backgrounds in order to be more confident to talk about the reality about what's happening. So while sociology for example, can extract information for known rational things, Like the expression like the confidence like things you can see, by our eyes when you when you look, you can say you can see the same speech today in two weeks after today. And you can see difference by the way that the guy is talking or it changed his background. And you can see the text also if the guy's confident or not. But you can say that the perspective key gives there is confidence to have access to information that you just can't do. And if you want to do fast, tense, richer society, you need to that can make you more confident to, to say something that is important. And you can't take the time that this astrology needs. So it's really powerful. And I was really impressed to, to have all this information so fast about the countries and to associate with the literature that I'm used to read. So if I was clear, I just finished enough. And now, I don't know.

Daniel Spikol 26:13

Sure, I guess I can ask Carolyn. That's my job. How can QE methodology help push the boundaries between qualitative and quantitative research since you've been working with this for a while, also reflecting on it? Yeah,

Karoline Schnaider 26:29

thank you. So this, this thoughts I have now is, was evoked during the data challenge and also deepened in a way in my own work. So I'm making like a general reflection here. So as I mentioned before, the QE QE methodology can be appealing to researchers from different areas for several reasons. And specifically because of the approach as I see it, offer to the data, which might expand the queue is potential to impact the work in more qualitatively oriented research fields. By letting qualitative processes and data and quantitative consider with no graphic methodology intersect in different ways. So one example of that is being close to the data while assembling it, as many qualitatively oriented researchers generally are, and at the same time, being able to fish efficiently and methodologically. And precisely attend to all the details with the help of the QE methods. That I think is one one aspect of can be appealing for qualitatively oriented researchers. Another thing is the comprehensibility and transparency that is offered by the QA theories, methodology and tools. From the process of collecting your data to the analysis explicated throughout the whole process. It also makes you as a researcher, you're quite confident in relying on the tools as I say it's an example of that is related to my own experiences, where I used qualitatively collected data from video recordings, interviews and observations. And I also use that with Aqa rationales. And I had a deductive approach that helped me establish the epistemic frame and a structural approach to the data. Because of that, so initially, I was defining essential elements or components. and determining that these more constant related parts was the starting point for further refining data model models. Through the more qualitatively QE strategies such as transforming the data into text formatting, segmenting, transferring data between documents and software and so on, that I think qualitatively oriented researchers are more confident with, meaning that the QA methodology and tools can scaffold you from the initial steps in handling the raw data to the actual analysis, where preparatory steps for instance, can make you as a researcher advanced in both knowing your data and making a stretch abstractions around it. So to get the firmer grip of the data, the coding part, I think it's specifically worth highlighting. Since underlying rationales and tools like encoder offers a structured way to model codes and code words that is direct and transparent without making the researcher as I see lose themselves in the data or interpretations. For instance, operationalizing the qualitative components in the academic frames signified into the codes and later validated through the encoder is a qualitative feedback to the researcher that your definition in some way holds grounds So another example of that would be the combination of qualitative and quantitative in the work with DNA that enables you to really trace the different steps of the data management to the subsequent analysis that takes you back to the, to the interpretation, also of the raw data by using the quotes, for instance. Yeah, so I want to ask you, Daniel, a question. So why is multidisciplinary teams important and how to manage them or try to manage them.

Daniel Spikol 30:39

But for me, coming from a multidisciplinary background, it's been, you know, one of the things that attracted me to, to sort of come back to research was that, you know, ability to work in teams, you know, with different perspectives. I think one of the things I didn't like about my master's experience was, even though there wasn't a multi disciplinary field, it was still very, sort of narrow at times. And I think what attracted me about like, multidisciplinary teams is that, you know, ability of coming together with different perspectives to solve challenging problems. And, and I think this is really more of a question for Barbara, because I think she has a lot of experience in creating these types of teams, both, you know, as a as a lab director, but also, you know, from being involved in many projects over the last years. So maybe I think, you know, that we spend some time asking her How does she create the successful teams? Since she has the real track record of it? Yeah,

Barbara Jane Wasson Lillehaug 31:42

I think I think I'll continue on with expanding on Daniel's answer. And I think that maybe from what both Stephano and Karolina have explained, you can see why we needed the different experiences, I think we started out it showed that two of them had very, very good experience in working with the data and could get the data and could partition it and get it, you know, the data management part of a of a have a job. So that's really good as the head and then we started into trying to really understand the data. And then we needed the people who had a little bit of experience in coding, which I think Danielle and I had, and we helped Carolyn really did a lot most of that work. And really, we really, you know, pushed her and and talked about the questions. And when it came in, and stefana was involved in that work, too. And then we actually tried to use the QE tools. And we actually went and got some experience the answers from both my PhD student, Camilla, who's worked on a different project during that, but also the group at Madison, who were very helpful in helping you with using using the tools and understanding them. So we went back and re coded the data and spent a lot of time redoing that when we understood some more aspects of the tools and things like that. So then you need that kind of experience as well. And then I think one of the big things with with these data analytic approaches is that we can take a very, let's say, computer science oriented approach to it, because you do need computer science experience, really to handle some of the data, but then to interpret it and put it into a perspective, then we really need the discipline, for example, in this case, sociology to understand it. So the results of the paper would not have been what they were at all without Stefanos input here and being able to help us interpret it because we're no experts on political situations or political, you know, speeches or talks or how to put it into context. And I think this is a really good example of a project that shows why you need this different, you know, backgrounds of people working together. And I think, a lot of the criticism, for example, in learning analytics, let's say, where you show dashboards, it's, you know, what computer scientists think are interesting. It's not what teachers want, or what, you know, the end user stakeholders want. So it can be thought of, in my experience in putting together these, you know, these teams with with multidisciplinary, and even though everybody, especially when we're talking about learning, let's say everybody has an opinion about what learning is, but are you speaking about learning from a, you know, a psychology perspective, or from an education perspective, they're very different things. So having an idea about what your results are going to really say? In which discipline, they're going to have a have a comment. I think it's really important that you have that expertise in your team as well. So that's sort of my experience, and we really had a very interdisciplinary, great team. It was really, really fun to work on. Okay, so I will ask, let's say David might, David might want to sneak your question.

Karoline Schnaider 34:51

Yeah. This is this is really fascinating. It's, I love kind of hearing the deconstruction of how the team worked and the roles that people play. And how it was all brought together? I'm just that I'm wondering, you know, there's this notion in interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary work of a boundary object, something that that sort of sits partly in one domain and partly in another domain and allows people to talk to one another sort of through that object. I'm just wondering if if that. Well, I guess, one it was QE that an object that boundary object in the team? And if not, what was in? Like, how did that work? How did it work? Whatever the boundary object was?

Barbara Jane Wasson Lillehaug 35:39

I, I will I will do a quick answer. And then I think, like curliness, I think it was the coding of the data actually, is the boundary object, because that's what we really had to work hard on. Understanding, you know, first, how to make the categorizations and things like that. So I think, yes, there's a methodology. The the actual coding of the data was key, in my opinion, what do you think, Carolyn?

Daniel Spikol 36:06

Yes, I agree with you completely. Yeah, I think I also, I'm sorry, go ahead. No, go Go. Go next. I wasn't. Yeah, I think the process of coding and also working with the data as well, you know, where we use, you know, in the beginning, we use other techniques that Florian sort of used to visualize, help us visualize that the whole process was really about finding that common ground by, you know, looking through this lens that Stefanos sort of provided and discussing that back and forth and testing it, you know, and, you know, the, you know, the most of our time was spent on the coding process.

Hendrik Drachsler 36:54

It's, it's kind of known, it's the coding is a very time consuming, especially if a lot of data process, you guys know, the interrater reliability score, that you push further, what level that was at the end? Because if you say that these coding is this object in the middle for the communication, I'm surprised about this, because then you could also say you go was more traditional towards right, because this is not something particularly your era, that that makes DNA, a new tool for me. I mean, you also have it with transcribing of interviews where you do the coding, and you have a call rate, and all this whole interrater reliability thing is actually something that that is known. But yeah, Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Jane Wasson Lillehaug 37:46

I think it's the way because we did that initially, the way that we normally would do it, and it ended up not being good enough, because of the way in which the QA and QA tools work. That's what I tried to say that it was related to how we had to code it so that it worked, you know, within the QE way of understanding, so we actually went back and redid full categories, because it was not about synonyms, per what, per se, but ideas. So the way in which you coded was it, it was not as literal as maybe it would be in other other disciplines. I can't remember our interrater reliability. Do you remember? carlina? Was

Karoline Schnaider 38:29

Yes, I remember them. And they were above point nine for all sweet sets. In the end.

Hendrik Drachsler 38:36

Yeah, this is I mean, this is fantastic to to, I think, to peel that out in a broad, this new quality level. And that's also something I learned from David, I mean, I, I grew up with an interrater reliability, acceptance rate of 60%, that was something that was common in all papers. But that in a kind of forces you or even triggers and motivates you to push it to the 90% level or even beyond, to really get good data, and then a good alignment among these interdisciplinary teams. That is fantastic. Yeah.

Daniel Spikol 39:11

So a little bit about the scale of the data. Um, you know, even though this was a pretty, you know, pretty, relatively small scale data set for QA, but it was still not really manageable, sort of by hand. And so that, you know, you have to feel as Stephen doesn't mean, you have to feel confident that, you know, you had something, you know, that you can actually, you know, attempt to make it draw a conclusion from and I think the tool really, you know, forced us to really reconsider lots of times and come to common ground and discuss what we actually meant, you know, with the, you know, codes or the capital C's much more than, you know, maybe as a computer scientist, I would write you know, I'll 75% I'm happy you know, let's let's talk about that. You know, the clustering algorithm of the regression, you know, and so I think, you know, now we were sort of forced to really talk about, you know, what was actually happening? You know, and I think that was, was really nice about the tool set.

Stefano Schiavetto 40:18

Yeah, I think what, what helped a lot in this boundary, as David was saying, Barbara, and Daniel scenes that I think in the beginning, when we were coding, we had a lot of questions. And we had, we had a lot of conceptual questioning. So we are talking about democracy, for example, but what is democracy? What is power? What is politics? In New York, we are in an interdisciplinary team, but also in a multicultural team. So for example, what is the more precise power from a guy from South America is different from our personal from Europe, for example? So we need to do a lot of negotiations in the beginning of negotiation in a in a good sense. I don't know how it sounds in English, we're talking in a good sense, because we need to, we need to understand each other What are we talking about in this is a really, this this, this comes from losses in all the sciences that comes from philosophy. So when we, we are in a mood, good routine, we remember we need to do it, we don't go with with common sense, common sense, like something that we just adapted to it, we become much more critical sense because we're not understanding each other. And I think it affects the questions we give to the text, because when we give good questions to the text, we get good questions back from the text. And we were forced to do it in a in a, in a in a good way, in debating, and understanding and etc. So we need all we need to do all these these in the beginning. And I think I have this impression. But I think it helps us to get better scores or ratings, because we were, were were more conceptual, after the negotiations. So we needed to do these two strike to the data to do the interpretations. And I think, for example, when we're talking about high trust and state, high trust in the States, it was it was stressed, for example, and and we should do these questions before we can look into better what what the threats are related to the democracy and etc. So I think it was a good boundary. And the thing that helps us to, to give better questions to the text, and then when the text react, we say, hey, the text is talking about eat and not dead. For example, I should tell you the lot.

Brendan Eagan 42:51

One thing I just want to mention, that strikes me about having seen a little bit pair group work, so kind of following the results and, and hearing reflections is that by really deeply engaging with the coding, and getting a good grip, where like you first kind of, yes, there's the processing and segmentation. But in terms of pointing to something in the data and feeling I like the term confidence or something like that theoretical saturation of thinking that, okay, we've actually done such a quality job, at this point, have higher standards with the interrater reliability and as a measurement of validity, then that allows you to do much more in your subsequent analysis. And yes, you can go back and recycled to it. But I think the fact that from the get go, this team had such a deep commitment to getting that kind of initial grip, that that then facilitate your you're avoiding the gaggle problem, you're avoiding having garbage in garbage out and not being able to do as much with with interrogating the text or answering questions, because you made that kind of initial founding. Thank you. It's kind of interesting that that's, that's where you guys started, in terms of what was the organizing thing, and probably a good lesson for groups is the more shared understanding you have of that coding level, it allows for deeper analyses and better questioning and discussions.

Daniel Spikol 44:14

Yeah, but I think we also had an advantage that, you know, Stefano, was able to sort of ground this in sort of, you know, the, you know, sociology or the politics of power, much more than, you know, most of us could have really have done or we could have picked out these terms, but we weren't able to ground it. And I think that is what sort of really helped us, you know, also create common ground that, you know, we just didn't, we had more than our sort of own political opinions. You know, as sort of, you know, individuals we also had sort of the theories that Stefano would bring in and, you know, we have to relate to and maybe you could talk a little bit about that, in terms of this political lens of crisis communication, and sort of like an Then I guess, you know, we can take some more questions. How does that sound? Stefano? I think

Stefano Schiavetto 45:18

I think crazies in, in all the literature is a is a privilege or a good moment. Because in the scientific way not for society, of course, it's sometimes for society, society, but for science is good, because during crisis you the political factors that are everybody, but some of them has more power because they are inside institutions, but they, they needed to be creative. And when when you need to be creative, you expose yourself, because you need to you or challenge you, for example, in our case, how do you react during the crisis? Trying to to when people are looking more deeply into what we're doing? In our case? How can you keep democracy waiting, we need to act fast. So you'll get a really challenge now, because you need to be creative. So you will be challenged to be creative in trying to keep democracy running. And you cannot rely so much in the past. And for that, we look into it in the three countries. And it was really nice, because we have, for example, the Robert Tao, the guy who's talking about the polarities and democratization. And we can see in the, somehow the period of creativity, what is done in the world, because we achieve some kind of stability, the economical crisis in 2008 2009 was a challenge because, hey, now, now we have to check again, how we're doing things because how the economy is changing our our rights, and what are we doing good. We have a raising of concentration of wealth, we have a worst scenario in social inequality worlds. But when we're not, we're not health prices come to Kings. Now we have again, this guy's too true. To see how creative they are being in nowadays. We can see no the world that everyone says everyone says they are being democratic, like I'm in Brazil. So now he's saying that he's democratic, for a reason. And in the guys from the repressive or Democrat. So what's happening with democracy? It's a privilege Time Crisis to to we think about why is this. So to be short, I think in crisis communication reveals to us how, how we are keeping things as traditional keeping things as common sense, and how the political actors, the society, or the guys who have foreign institutions, how they are going to be creative, how they are developing their creativity, to keep society in the same kind of path that we want. So it's a really, really special time for science to check that To try and to be sure to fix this. Well, I think, yeah, Barbara, go first. correction.

Barbara Jane Wasson Lillehaug 48:36

I think it was, it was interesting, because even though the three countries are similar, we had a different, different structure as to who was making decisions in the country. And that came out in our data as well. So in Sweden, they had quite a different decision maker on the policies and what was being implemented then in Denmark and Norway are much more similar. And that actually can be seen in the results. It's kind of interesting.

Hendrik Drachsler 49:05

Yeah, I just wanted to comment on Stefan, I mean, it's amazing how far we got from here from reporting Europe, in a COVID study, to what what, what is democracy and how we have to define it, and see how much impact DNA can have. It's really in philosophy, discussion, but I just want to stress again then also what I just subjectively saw, I mean, also how you communicate this information, Stefan, you just said that you need to have objective measures to do this. But if I would imagine that your paper would be communicated in the news or something, you know, the press does not have the patience to to look detail and to balance the arguments. So they need to fire quickly the facts basically, and also how social media reacts. So I think in a is a tool to show it to many people, but still we have this this challenge to of communicating was was the diversity of people in the democracy? What is their best to go when this was many challenges that we are facing? I mean, Corona has done we have to focus climate again, I guess. And it remains like this. But DNA is a window to to make more informed and become more aware of different positions and solutions maybe. I think seems like overall commitment that we're kind of running to the end of this.

And Brandon, I think wanted to make some some announcements to to keep the field moving, Brandon.

Brendan Eagan 50:46

Sure. So I just want to say thank you to our panel. And if you know, folks have other questions, feel free to reach out and you can check out their paper as well. But I really appreciate the focus of this, because I think these teams are crucial for us to do QE well, right. I think it's this is a really good example of how different perspectives are necessary to really kind of make the methodologies alive and kind of harmonize and resonate well with folks and push us to do better work and ask them questions and, and

Hendrik Drachsler 51:24

get censored again, bringing. Yeah, I think Brandon is out. But so maybe I'd take over then, for the moment until he's back. Yeah, thank you everything for these insights. It's really amazing. I think it was really nice setup to have you here and see that also from the different disciplines, different countries to study is a really nice example for what practices in the field. I think Brandon wanted to remind you that the deadline for the conference for the NA conference is kind of heading tomorrow, European time. So wrap up the papers you have submitted, or maybe you have a smart idea to, to do some things to put it on paper and submit it. That's I think everything to say right now. David, Did I miss anything as you're still here?

Karoline Schnaider 52:27

Yeah, I don't actually know what, what announcements Brent was gonna make. So I can't I can't speak for him. But But I will say just Yeah, the deadline. I think it's today in the US. So everybody can calibrate that in terms of where that would be for them. But the posters and poster submissions are relatively short. And one of the things that I think was really helpful for the field was people, a number of people at the conferences so far, have submitted perspective work as a poster. So here's the study I'm planning to do. And here's how I'm planning to do it. And then they get feedback, obviously, the poster session, but it gives everybody else a chance to see sort of what the breadth and scope of the methodology can be. So if you have a four, if you have a four page description of something that you're thinking that you're planning to do going forward, consider submitting it as opposed to,

Daniel Spikol 53:25

yeah, also, there'll be some nice workshops we hope to. And don't forget about the data challenge, which will be coming up again, I guess, after the summer. So I think the daily challenge is a great way to, to, to get your hands into QE and to meet other people. And although I organized it or co organized that this year with many other people, I should say, I don't know, I don't know what the experience was for the participants. But I think it was a good experience for the people as well. I'm hoping we see some more papers from this year's data challenge. So I think the QB community is a very open community, that invites many different perspectives in and I think that's something that we that we should sort of celebrate and to, to work with, because I think that's really also important as researchers and as people that you know, that we can have a community that is sort of inclusive, and that brings people together and brings different perspectives. Because, you know, as these communities get bigger and bigger, that gets harder and harder. So, this is sort of like the ground floor opportunity to to be part of a community that is that is, you know, bringing people together to to research, you know, things as big as democracy and as small as a press release from, you know, a small Scandinavian country or three small Scandinavian countries, or at least in population size.

54:58

Did the Slide gets shared after my internet cut out? No, let me let the slide just promoted the conference. Oh, and I need to get if someone could, when I got dropped, I lost my host privileges. So if someone could make me, one of the CO hosts can make me a co host, that would be fantastic.

Hendrik Drachsler 55:16

Not sure we'd also let's see. Who else who might be the if anyone else can make me a co host, that would be great. I don't have the option for that. I'm sorry.

55:36

I don't know if Delaney maybe you're the if you're the host at this point after I got dropped, I believe it's actually Carolyn, but I can pull up the slide and share as well, that would work. That would be fantastic. But basically, we would just like to let everyone know that yo Tom hood from the University of Haifa is going to be speaking at the next webinar, Monday, July 12. I believe at this the same time. And he's going to be talking about putting the E and QE. So one of the things that this group had that was nice is very strong, qualitative and theoretically grounded. teammates. And I think that that's one of the things that our community needs to continue to develop. And foster is focusing on the qualitative or ethnographic side of things. So please take a look at at register. Joining us for yo Tom's talk, which will be you know, in about a little under a month. You can look for the same you know, go to the same website and register and appreciate everybody being here and thank you for bearing with me getting dropped off the internet.

Hendrik Drachsler 56:54

Okay, fantastic. Looking forward to the next webinar. I think it's really nice in between discussions, warming up for the conference. Everyone, thanks for being here. Recordings will be shared when processed. And thanks to the speakers again. fantastic job. CEO at least in a month. Bye