

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

3 May 2021 – 10:00 AM (CST), 4:00pm (BST), 1:00am +1 day (AEDT)

The Bellwether Problem: Publishing the First QE Studies in a New Field

Abigail Wooldridge
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Andrew Ruis
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Sarah Jung
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Abstract

Publishing QE research in fields that are not familiar with the theories, techniques, and research designs that QE scholars use can be a significant barrier to adoption, especially for junior scholars. In this webinar, three members of the QE in Healthcare SIG discuss their experiences presenting and publishing QE work in medical contexts and reflect on the strategies that helped successfully introduce QE to healthcare research.

BRENDAN R EAGAN: it's my pleasure today to be hosting this this webinar unfortunately my co host Hendrick dressler cannot make it today because he's lost his voice so he sends his regrets and he'll be joining us for for future installations, of the series.

4

00:00:23.730 --> 00:00:24.510

BRENDAN R EAGAN: But i'd like to.

5

00:00:25.800 --> 00:00:27.510

BRENDAN R EAGAN: introduce our speakers today.

6

00:00:28.950 --> 00:00:36.510

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Three of which I know i'm thankful to know fairly well so Sarah young is an assistant professor of surgery at uw Madison.

7

00:00:36.990 --> 00:00:43.650

BRENDAN R EAGAN: And she and I actually started graduate school together way way back when and it's been a pleasure to get to overlap with her here and there.

8

00:00:44.040 --> 00:00:51.840

BRENDAN R EAGAN: And abby wooldridge is an assistant professor in the industrial and enterprise systems engineering school at university of Illinois urbana champaign.

9

00:00:52.560 --> 00:01:09.210

BRENDAN R EAGAN: and forget it yeah I think I mentioned series at uw and a lot of you also know Lewis who's the associate director for research at the epidemic analytics lab here at uw Madison as well and they're going to be talking today about the bellwether problem publishing qe in new fields.

10

00:01:10.320 --> 00:01:21.090

BRENDAN R EAGAN: And I think they've also discussed a little bit with me beforehand that if you have questions that you'd like to ask during we're going to save time for questions at the end, but this can be a little bit more of a discussion if folks want to.

11

00:01:22.440 --> 00:01:36.090

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Post questions into the chat i'll be monitoring that during so it can it can be kind of a more engaged webinar that way so without further ado i'll turn things over to our today's presenters.

12

00:01:40.800 --> 00:01:42.930

Andrew R. Ruis: And thanks brandon and welcome everyone.

13

00:01:44.490 --> 00:01:47.130

Andrew R. Ruis: So when I asked you he approached.

14

00:01:48.180 --> 00:01:58.680

Andrew R. Ruis: A few of us in the nascent qe health and healthcare special interest group about doing a webinar we sort of went back and forth a little bit about what we might.

15

00:01:59.340 --> 00:02:08.220

Andrew R. Ruis: want to present and one of the things that we thought might be really useful is to actually talk about publishing the first qe.

16

00:02:09.300 --> 00:02:13.410

Andrew R. Ruis: Studies and a new field, because this is something that a lot of us and healthcare field.

17

00:02:13.920 --> 00:02:30.600

Andrew R. Ruis: Really, you know really struggled with early on, was trying to figure out how to get qe and kimmy adjacent research and to and to print and really get people who didn't otherwise have any knowledge or interest in curious are interested in the field.

18

00:02:31.830 --> 00:02:39.570

Andrew R. Ruis: And we think of this as a bellwether problem because it's not just about getting that first paper published or being able to publish something on.

19

00:02:39.870 --> 00:02:46.980

Andrew R. Ruis: on TV and a new field it's actually about leaving the field and in a different direction or new direction and really thinking about.

20

00:02:47.520 --> 00:02:54.660

Andrew R. Ruis: You know what it means to kind of bring a new approach or new way of thinking about research to a new set of problems or or.

21

00:02:55.140 --> 00:03:06.390

Andrew R. Ruis: or a field that hasn't really thought about things, and quite that way before, and so you know we're going to talk a little bit about our own experiences, you know with this challenge.

22

00:03:07.110 --> 00:03:19.470

Andrew R. Ruis: All of us are still obviously kind of in the middle of it, and so this is, this is a particular perspective that we have your mileage may vary obviously different fields different conventions and different.

23

00:03:21.150 --> 00:03:30.420

Andrew R. Ruis: You know challenges, and so this is again based on our experience from health care, which may or may not translate to all other fields but we're going to try to talk about it in a way.

24

00:03:31.200 --> 00:03:38.940

Andrew R. Ruis: In terms of the kinds of decisions that we made the way that we thought about you know these challenges and hopefully that will be useful for for all of you.

25

00:03:39.360 --> 00:03:48.240

Andrew R. Ruis: who are trying to do the same thing in other fields, we also want this to be a little less formal than some of the webinars where it's kind of a presentation and then.

26

00:03:49.170 --> 00:04:00.930

Andrew R. Ruis: Q amp a period feel free to throw questions in the chat or do a raise hand, you know, while we're talking i'm if there's things that you want to you know unpack a little bit more, as we go and really want this to be a discussion.

27

00:04:01.440 --> 00:04:09.150

Andrew R. Ruis: With the Community because we you know we see this question come up a lot both previous I securities and other events.

28

00:04:09.690 --> 00:04:16.710

Andrew R. Ruis: it's been a really common question it's one of the reasons we chose this topic, and so I know a lot of you guys have questions about this and.

29

00:04:17.430 --> 00:04:20.010

Andrew R. Ruis: You know we'd love to hear those questions and also.

30

00:04:20.520 --> 00:04:28.500

Andrew R. Ruis: There are people in the audience, who are face the same challenge and might have other perspectives and hours that they can add to this conversation so i'm really hoping that this will you know kind of.

31

00:04:28.890 --> 00:04:39.930

Andrew R. Ruis: provide that sort of deeper engagement with these with these challenges as curious growing as as a field of it's in and of itself and as people are starting to take it back to two other fields as well.

32

00:04:41.370 --> 00:04:58.410

Andrew R. Ruis: So we sort of divided our our thinking into three categories one is thinking about venues were to publish and what audiences to target strategy around getting from you know research that you're interested into.

33

00:04:59.430 --> 00:05:07.200

Andrew R. Ruis: submission and then the trajectory or i'm thinking again, not just about that one paper about about where whereas what is that setting up where is everything going.

34

00:05:08.700 --> 00:05:10.290

Andrew R. Ruis: On so let's start we'll start with you.

35

00:05:11.430 --> 00:05:18.000

Andrew R. Ruis: And again here we're thinking about sort of structural constraints, where you publish on the audience that you're targeting.

36

00:05:18.540 --> 00:05:24.330

Andrew R. Ruis: So i'm going to invite my colleagues Sarah and abby to think back a little bit on you know, the first.

37

00:05:25.260 --> 00:05:34.620

Andrew R. Ruis: paper that they were trying to publish or even subsequent papers and thinking through you know sort of how to choose the the venue for it and and.

38

00:05:35.100 --> 00:05:46.830

Andrew R. Ruis: And what the considerations were and what the decision calculus was and i'm going to put up some talking points we won't necessarily go through an order but they're just sort of there, so you have a sense of some of the key things that we're gonna we're gonna touch on.

39

00:05:49.980 --> 00:05:52.650

Andrew R. Ruis: Some Sarah abby either one of you guys want to kick it off.

40

00:05:53.430 --> 00:06:18.720

Sarah A JUNG: Sure i'm happy to to go ahead and start so as Brendan mentioned, I work in the department of surgery here at uw and I do surgical education, research, primarily, and when we were first thinking about using qe and specifically epistemic network analysis in our work.

41

00:06:21.120 --> 00:06:30.960

Sarah A JUNG: We had to think about it strategically right because it it, it was new, but we also thought it would be a great way to explain a very complex environment that we were working in.

42

00:06:31.740 --> 00:06:43.830

Sarah A JUNG: So I was doing some work with my colleague and husband he's who john who's a trauma acute care surgeon, and we were looking at simulation for teaching.

43

00:06:45.150 --> 00:06:56.640

Sarah A JUNG: surgical trainees and nurse trainees, how to best communicate around caring for dramatically injury patients and, as you can imagine a pretty complex situation.

44

00:06:57.270 --> 00:07:10.650

Sarah A JUNG: And, and we were having difficulty trying to describe that complexity and so you know to chose era, as as a way to do that, and so, then we have to think you know strategically.

45

00:07:11.400 --> 00:07:19.140

Sarah A JUNG: How do we, how do we introduce this into the surgical education field, because it, you know really hadn't been done.

46

00:07:20.160 --> 00:07:32.850

Sarah A JUNG: Too much at that time, so the approach that we took was to target a specific conference that we knew would be open to.

47

00:07:34.140 --> 00:07:52.440

Sarah A JUNG: New methods so we used DNA to analyze the conversations in some of the trauma simulations that we were running and then presented that at an American college of surgeons simulation conference.

48

00:07:54.000 --> 00:08:03.270

Sarah A JUNG: and, probably, you know some of the difficulties with that will come up later, but the reason that this was a nice entry for us into the the field.

49

00:08:03.990 --> 00:08:17.070

Sarah A JUNG: Was that along with this with presentation at this conference, which we were able to get a plenary presentation, it also came along with a journal submission.

50

00:08:17.640 --> 00:08:26.850

Sarah A JUNG: To a journal called surgery, which is is well known and fairly high impact in the field of surgery in general.

51

00:08:27.420 --> 00:08:40.500

Sarah A JUNG: Not only surgical education, and so what this allowed us to do was to publish a study using era in a format that was going to reach a broad audience in the field of surgery.

52

00:08:41.220 --> 00:08:53.040

Sarah A JUNG: That we have now been able to go back to and say it, as we we continue with our studies using DNA so so that was our initial approach to to sort of breaking into the the field.

53

00:08:58.260 --> 00:09:00.780

Abigail Wooldridge: So i'll pop on and say.

54

00:09:02.010 --> 00:09:12.960

Abigail Wooldridge: A little bit about my story right the first paper that I was trying to get published is actually coming out of some work I did in one of david's classes and.

55

00:09:13.530 --> 00:09:22.140

Abigail Wooldridge: So I didn't take the approach of sending it to a conference first instead I was looking for a journal in.

56

00:09:22.830 --> 00:09:36.090

Abigail Wooldridge: My area, like other than healthcare is human factors and systems engineering, so I was looking for a journal focused on that area healthcare in in that field that was open to.

57

00:09:37.050 --> 00:09:48.450

Abigail Wooldridge: Not only quantitative work or not only qualitative work but skewed a little bit more quantitative but was okay with mixed methods research as a whole, so I was looking for.

58

00:09:49.650 --> 00:09:55.080

Abigail Wooldridge: A journal, that would be happy to have a methods based paper, maybe not in the most innovative results.

59

00:09:56.130 --> 00:10:08.640

Abigail Wooldridge: From a theoretical perspective in the field, but using EA to clearly demonstrate, something that we we knew was happening and we even had an idea why it was happening, it was just hard to pick up using other analytic methods.

60

00:10:09.270 --> 00:10:19.980

Abigail Wooldridge: So that's that's how we chose the journal, I will say, I think we did have a little bit of an advantage, because that journal at that point was publishing more quantitative.

61

00:10:20.460 --> 00:10:38.880

Abigail Wooldridge: Operations research simulation type data from industrial engineering, so it was a nice connection to the quantitative folks in the audience and, since then, I think that

journals started publishing more mixed methods and qualitative work too, so it shifted a little bit as well.

62

00:10:41.370 --> 00:10:47.580

Andrew R. Ruis: Thanks Sarah i'm happy yeah um i'll just add a few you know other things, especially for for the juniors colors.

63

00:10:48.600 --> 00:10:54.240

Andrew R. Ruis: audience, so you know, one of the things that I think a lot of people don't realize is you can talk to the editors of journals.

64

00:10:54.420 --> 00:11:05.250

Andrew R. Ruis: You can you can email that man, you can say hey, it is a paper and considering you know, do you think this was a good fit for the for your Journal and that kind of thing and that can often be very useful because it if.

65

00:11:05.760 --> 00:11:14.580

Andrew R. Ruis: It saves you time if it's not a good fit you're not going to go and format it for that Journal and submitted and then wait for weeks or months to find out that they're not gonna be interested in any way.

66

00:11:15.060 --> 00:11:28.260

Andrew R. Ruis: but also those conversations with editors can actually be really useful in terms of thinking about how to how to pitch you know the work that you're doing to that audience and might actually help you, you know get through the peer review process, you know a little more.

67

00:11:29.970 --> 00:11:41.010

Andrew R. Ruis: efficiently The other thing is to think about you know the relative balance of publishing speed versus impact factor, and I think we'll get to this a little bit more later in the in the discussion, but.

68

00:11:41.670 --> 00:11:48.210

Andrew R. Ruis: You know it's often, especially for the very first paper better to get it out quickly than it is to get it in the highest sort of impact.

69

00:11:48.780 --> 00:11:53.550

Andrew R. Ruis: venues, I mean obviously everybody has different constraints and different needs for their their publications but.

70

00:11:53.910 --> 00:12:00.240

Andrew R. Ruis: You know a lot of the journals that have really high impact factors also have really slow publishing processes on again that depends on field but.

71

00:12:00.930 --> 00:12:06.630

Andrew R. Ruis: But you may you may not want to wait that long to try and get through that especially but then gets rejected and then he left it and try and find.

72

00:12:07.110 --> 00:12:19.530

Andrew R. Ruis: You know another venue for and so often it's better to get something out in print relatively quickly, that you can site that you can build on, for your for your subsequent some for your subsequent paper so that's that's another thing another thing that's goes.

73

00:12:20.970 --> 00:12:23.460

Andrew R. Ruis: we've already started to oh sorry go ahead.

74

00:12:24.030 --> 00:12:33.840

Sarah A JUNG: Oh, I just wanted to add on to what you just said, Andrew and you know follow up on a couple of these other points so yeah talking to the editors is.

75

00:12:34.440 --> 00:12:47.220

Sarah A JUNG: is so important, and you know I think the the venue we picked help but yeah there were definitely some things we learned that informed our strategy, which I know we're talking about next so as we were getting.

76

00:12:47.730 --> 00:12:56.400

Sarah A JUNG: Our work published the editor definitely had some questions and even wanted us to make some edits that would have.

77

00:12:57.420 --> 00:12:59.310

Sarah A JUNG: Actually, not.

78

00:13:00.780 --> 00:13:12.930

Sarah A JUNG: The the statements that he wanted us to make we're not true, in terms of what the analysis that we had actually done and what we were representing, and so it definitely was a conversation.

79

00:13:13.500 --> 00:13:24.630

Sarah A JUNG: With the editor about what it was that that we did, and how best to represented in the article, and then I remember that are discussing at this particular.

80

00:13:25.590 --> 00:13:34.800

Sarah A JUNG: conference, who was was very open to understanding what it was that we did, but he started out his discussion of our papers saying.

81

00:13:35.460 --> 00:13:48.780

Sarah A JUNG: i'm just a country trauma surgeon, and so I don't entirely know what it was that you did here right and I remember thinking oh boy okay um you know, and he had some great questions and again we ended up having.

82

00:13:49.290 --> 00:14:05.220

Sarah A JUNG: A really productive conversation with him and the audience in terms of questions, but I think that really informed our understanding of how we were going to need to situate cutie and DNA within.

83

00:14:06.570 --> 00:14:13.980

Sarah A JUNG: The surgical education context, because you know folks we're certainly interested in the.

84

00:14:14.550 --> 00:14:24.060

Sarah A JUNG: The approach, but one thing that surgical educators tend to be very interested in is application right, what can I learn from this that is going to help me.

85

00:14:24.360 --> 00:14:33.120

Sarah A JUNG: be a better teacher to my residents and students, and so I just wanted to throw that out there, that that having these conversations is really, really important.

86

00:14:34.560 --> 00:14:40.350

Abigail Wooldridge: I think, actually, this is a really good point it kind of comes back to something that I tell a lot of.

87

00:14:40.800 --> 00:14:49.320

Abigail Wooldridge: Students, and I think about a lot when i'm writing, which is know your audience i'm talking to the editor or going to a conference that is the audience new journal, you want to publish in.

88

00:14:50.040 --> 00:14:57.390

Abigail Wooldridge: that's a way to get to know your audience and understand their background what you can kind of expect them to know and what you need to.

89

00:14:57.780 --> 00:15:07.530

Abigail Wooldridge: build into the article, so that they will be able to keep up with you when you get to the main point, so you will have somebody saying i'm just a fill in the blank and I have no idea what you did.

90

00:15:08.460 --> 00:15:13.110

Abigail Wooldridge: Another way that isn't on the bullets here to do that is look.

91

00:15:13.950 --> 00:15:23.460

Abigail Wooldridge: i'm assuming right you're probably going to be publishing and journals that you read and if you're not or if it's maybe a smaller journal because you're going for that speed over hot super high impact.

92

00:15:23.730 --> 00:15:33.570

Abigail Wooldridge: spend a little bit of time looking through the tables of contents looking at if you pass article seeing if there are things that you know, maybe skew towards mixed methods work or.

93

00:15:34.890 --> 00:15:37.950

Abigail Wooldridge: Whatever the case may be, because that gives you a good idea.

94

00:15:38.550 --> 00:15:45.240

Abigail Wooldridge: If say you're a student and you don't feel like you can email, the editor first you can but that's a way to kind of.

95

00:15:45.540 --> 00:15:56.250

Abigail Wooldridge: get some of that information without actually emailing, the editor maybe you emailed, the editor and it's a pandemic and they haven't gotten back to you because, like I said that's a that can be a goal and the gap.

96

00:15:58.650 --> 00:16:10.980

Andrew R. Ruis: Okay, thanks, so I think we can probably move the strategy at this point we've already started touching on some of these things, but this is sort of you know you've got a result that you think is publishable and answer, how do you get from there to actually submitting to.

97

00:16:12.390 --> 00:16:24.780

Andrew R. Ruis: To a journal, so I know abby you really thought a lot about this, how do you how do you build from like this very you know, like a localized talk to you on the park bench or on campus through sort of all the way to the.

98

00:16:26.340 --> 00:16:28.680

Andrew R. Ruis: journal article so maybe you can say a little bit about parents.

99

00:16:29.190 --> 00:16:41.730

Abigail Wooldridge: yeah so I can definitely talk some about it so that paper that I wrote started off as a course paper, so I got feedback, of course, from the instructor and also the way the class was structured my peers.

100

00:16:42.210 --> 00:16:52.320

Abigail Wooldridge: And then I gave a departmental talk to people who read the journal, that I was thinking about publishing in to talk to them about it, so we skipped to the conference paper.

101

00:16:52.650 --> 00:17:00.540

Abigail Wooldridge: And said gave the departmental talk got some feedback and then went straight to journal papers so again, I think it for me really comes back to.

102

00:17:01.020 --> 00:17:05.280

Abigail Wooldridge: figure out the audience that you're trying to talk to our right to.

103

00:17:06.270 --> 00:17:19.170

Abigail Wooldridge: And then understand where they are the pieces they already have of the puzzle and the pieces they don't and when I talked with the people in my field, I gave the campus talk I understood pretty quickly.

104

00:17:19.920 --> 00:17:23.700

Abigail Wooldridge: The part that they were going to struggle with was the method behind DNA.

105

00:17:24.120 --> 00:17:34.920

Abigail Wooldridge: But there was a similar methods they understood you know the quantitative aspect of how do we actually develop these networks that I could use as an analogy to bridge that gap really effectively.

106

00:17:35.250 --> 00:17:45.120

Abigail Wooldridge: So, having given that talk and interacted with the attendees let me find that analogy, which really made the whole review process a lot easier.

107

00:17:50.130 --> 00:18:09.150

Sarah A JUNG: yeah I would, I would just a couple things one highlight you know the the importance of finding that something that your audience can connect to when you're trying to explain this, especially the first time, so um I had kind of an opposite.

108

00:18:10.290 --> 00:18:19.200

Sarah A JUNG: Experience to abby I think like there wasn't so I had tried talking about it, you know in relationship to principal components analyses and things like that, but.

109

00:18:20.010 --> 00:18:35.520

Sarah A JUNG: You know, found that that really wasn't resonating with the audience, I was working with and so another tip I would have is make sure to have conversations like this with with people who are doing this work and ask them about you know how they.

110

00:18:36.960 --> 00:18:46.950

Sarah A JUNG: different ways that they have presented that have seemed to resonate with folks so I remember you know, having a conversation with Andrew about you know how it was it was difficult to.

111

00:18:48.030 --> 00:19:03.780

Sarah A JUNG: To find something that resonated with folks in terms of understanding the method and he had some really great ideas and examples and tips that allowed me to put together a presentation that I do think you know really did resonate with folks and made.

112

00:19:05.310 --> 00:19:14.760

Sarah A JUNG: What what we were doing more clear so again just highlighting the the point down here, you know know know your audience right and sometimes it takes a little bit of.

113

00:19:15.210 --> 00:19:22.650

Sarah A JUNG: trial and error right, you may present it one way and find that it's not really resonating and so then have to go back and sort of rethink.

114

00:19:23.130 --> 00:19:31.620

Sarah A JUNG: Your strategy for that and then also you know the this idea of linking these novel methods and techniques to.

115

00:19:32.010 --> 00:19:43.320

Sarah A JUNG: domain theory and so, for me it was sort of a combination with theory but also the the practicality of some of the challenges that we have in.

116

00:19:43.620 --> 00:19:54.330

Sarah A JUNG: surgical education which one is often you know how do we explain the complexity of learning that's going on in some of these environments right and so.

117

00:19:54.660 --> 00:20:12.090

Sarah A JUNG: Being able to talk to folks about this as a method to help us understand complexity that we often have a really different difficult time doing and a way to use that to understand how to better intervene with our learners and also with something that that really resonated.

118

00:20:13.320 --> 00:20:13.980

Andrew R. Ruis: yeah.

119

00:20:15.810 --> 00:20:24.120

BRENDAN R EAGAN: I just wanted to jump in because there's some there's quite a bit of chatting going on right now that looks pretty good and I hate to interrupt but.

120

00:20:24.450 --> 00:20:33.570

BRENDAN R EAGAN: i'm meredith mentioned that that the ideas of reaching out to the the editors and also citing from that journal, is a good idea to link it to it and.

121

00:20:34.410 --> 00:20:36.810

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Rogers was following up saying that that's a great tip.

122

00:20:37.140 --> 00:20:48.510

BRENDAN R EAGAN: and asked in case the journal has already published using Ian a do you think it's still important to get in touch with the editors i'll just throw in my two cents that I think it doesn't hurt because they might appreciate different aspects of it but.

123

00:20:59.190 --> 00:21:00.360

BRENDAN R EAGAN: looks like I froze.

124

00:21:02.070 --> 00:21:04.680

Abigail Wooldridge: My back was it my yeah you're back.

125

00:21:05.460 --> 00:21:05.730

Okay.

126

00:21:08.640 --> 00:21:11.820

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Does the panel want to engage with Rogers question.

127

00:21:13.320 --> 00:21:18.570

Andrew R. Ruis: yeah I mean, I think I think it sort of depends right, I mean if you feel really comfortable with that journal.

128

00:21:20.490 --> 00:21:27.300

Andrew R. Ruis: You know you, you know that audience really well you wouldn't necessarily need to reach out to the editor but it's probably not gonna hurt right and the worst thing is, I found.

129

00:21:27.600 --> 00:21:32.910

Andrew R. Ruis: does not get back to you, as you pointed out, right, sometimes we just don't get a response we don't get a response from friendly enough.

130

00:21:33.960 --> 00:21:42.030

Andrew R. Ruis: Then you want to wait around, but you know it's rarely going to not going to be unhelpful to talk to her to talk to an editor, so I think it really.

131

00:21:42.660 --> 00:21:52.560

Andrew R. Ruis: it's really not you know not going to be a problem to do it, but you know, certainly there are cases where you feel comfortable enough that you don't need to and you could just come straight to the to the submission stage.

132

00:21:53.250 --> 00:21:59.760

Abigail Wooldridge: yeah I think I agree entirely with Andrew if they're publishing and I know they're publishing and I know my paper.

133

00:22:00.720 --> 00:22:17.280

Abigail Wooldridge: is likely to get there, I probably wouldn't spend the time i'd probably just letter to the editor say hey I think this is a great fit it in sight those couple of papers from that journal, that the interesting comment to me actually in the chat is from pamela and it says, I think.

134

00:22:18.960 --> 00:22:26.880

Abigail Wooldridge: So pamela is alluding to this fact that sometimes, some of us talk about quantitative ethnography and link it to mixed methods, because you're doing QUAL and Quant things.

135

00:22:27.240 --> 00:22:40.260

Abigail Wooldridge: In that is a little bit of a controversial thing in the quantitative ethnography an excuse me, we Community because we we see them as being very intertwined.

136

00:22:41.220 --> 00:22:51.000

Abigail Wooldridge: and basically the sum of the parts is greater than the two parts individually, I would say they're still probably divisible personally, but I know some folks might quibble.

137

00:22:51.660 --> 00:23:06.480

Abigail Wooldridge: With that the thing I will note and i'm the one that's been saying mixed methods, I do that because where I publish talks about mixed methods so that's an analogy that i'm using to get it more accepted, and of course that's pervasive right I get used to doing it in my.

138

00:23:07.800 --> 00:23:11.910

Abigail Wooldridge: I don't know if you would call it like theoretical home or I don't even know what my main field.

139

00:23:13.200 --> 00:23:22.350

Abigail Wooldridge: For going to carry over when I talked to other people, so I think that's actually going back to that last point on the slide know your audience in sometimes.

140

00:23:22.830 --> 00:23:32.640

Abigail Wooldridge: being very pragmatic if you're in an academic position in your focuses, you need to get publication, so you can demonstrate impact, so that you can get tenure, so you can keep doing what you want to do.

141

00:23:33.600 --> 00:23:40.530

Abigail Wooldridge: You kind of make a few concessions along the way, and if saying this is a lot like mixed methods research helps you get published.

142

00:23:41.670 --> 00:23:56.310

Abigail Wooldridge: That might not be a very bad thing to give no i'm not, there are some points that of course you wouldn't give on right, but using an analogy or language that's familiar to the field to help expose them to this new idea to think about how we can do that more deeply.

143

00:23:57.780 --> 00:24:03.180

Abigail Wooldridge: I think, is not never a bad thing i'm interested to hear if my panelists are going to disagree with me.

144

00:24:04.860 --> 00:24:14.910

Andrew R. Ruis: Well, I mean I definitely agree, I mean on some level so so I can tell a story from one of the first papers that I published, and it was you know, looking at using.

145

00:24:15.930 --> 00:24:24.150

Andrew R. Ruis: qe approach to do performance analysis and it was a really complex analysis in many ways, because not only was I using DNA, which was I knew, you know.

146

00:24:24.450 --> 00:24:30.660

Andrew R. Ruis: tool for this audience, but I was doing a multi modal analysis I was just doing a lot of stuff that I knew was going to be really hard.

147

00:24:31.080 --> 00:24:38.760

Andrew R. Ruis: To explain to an audience that was unfamiliar and, as I was struggling on this paper one good one morning I got an email from a.

148

00:24:39.330 --> 00:24:44.490

Andrew R. Ruis: collaborator Carla Q, have you seen this article, and the latest annals of surgery.

149

00:24:44.910 --> 00:24:51.840

Andrew R. Ruis: And I had some I looked at it and it's basically a it was a theoretical piece I wasn't a surgery like one of the biggest hurdles in the field.

150

00:24:52.140 --> 00:25:01.950

Andrew R. Ruis: This is theoretical piece about how you know we spent all this time talking about like these individual behaviors or skills and what we really care about is how surgeons integrate them.

151

00:25:02.460 --> 00:25:10.860

Andrew R. Ruis: But we don't know how to measure that and it was like the perfect setup and, like, I could not have paid somebody to write a better setup for the paper, I was trying to write.

152

00:25:11.160 --> 00:25:16.440

Andrew R. Ruis: And hearing loss in the top journal, it was you know, like so so I could I could basically take that and say okay.

153

00:25:16.950 --> 00:25:22.470

Andrew R. Ruis: You know everybody's reading this piece now about you know how we can't just look at these skills in isolation and.

154

00:25:22.680 --> 00:25:30.570

Andrew R. Ruis: You know how it's all about behavioral integration for better and i'm everyone's saying like well what we do, how do we actually do that, and then I could basically just.

155

00:25:30.870 --> 00:25:35.940

Andrew R. Ruis: sort of everything up on a platter and it helps bring the whole paper together because I didn't have to pull.

156

00:25:36.300 --> 00:25:45.480

Andrew R. Ruis: theory from outside the field, in addition to trying to fall your methods and techniques and and have everything be about educated audience right and so.

157

00:25:45.990 --> 00:25:50.580

Andrew R. Ruis: So that I think I think they're you know, there are real advantages to.

158

00:25:50.880 --> 00:25:59.040

Andrew R. Ruis: sort of meeting the audience, where they are especially in those early papers and then, once you can once you can build a little bit of a foundation, then you can start to write papers.

159

00:25:59.280 --> 00:26:07.770

Andrew R. Ruis: You really want to write or that you know that do more radical things potentially on the theory side or on the method side, but then you have some foundation to build from.

160

00:26:08.100 --> 00:26:15.210

Andrew R. Ruis: And so I mean, I think it is, and I think it is more important than anything to really understand the audience that you're writing for because.

161

00:26:15.570 --> 00:26:29.100

Andrew R. Ruis: Because they're going to be the ones, a peer review, you know they're going to be the ones that ultimately read and are likely to cite the work that you're doing, and if you can't find a way to reach them that it's not going to matter yeah David go ahead.

162

00:26:30.570 --> 00:26:37.830

David Williamson Shaffer: And so I mean some some people that somebody from the group here, I already said something like this, too, but.

163

00:26:38.880 --> 00:26:40.050

David Williamson Shaffer: I, I think.

164

00:26:41.100 --> 00:26:46.980

David Williamson Shaffer: academia is like a cocktail party often a really bad cocktail party, but a cocktail party nonetheless.

165

00:26:47.460 --> 00:26:54.510

David Williamson Shaffer: um so you know people are sort of standing around the drinks in their hand, you know talking about whatever it is in their little subfield but they talk about.

166

00:26:55.050 --> 00:27:06.420

David Williamson Shaffer: um and when you want to you want to join that conversation like you can't just walk up and say, I think this cool thing with DNA like you know they're not you have to figure out the way in which.

167

00:27:06.960 --> 00:27:15.240

David Williamson Shaffer: The conversation what you have links to the conversation that thought they're already happening sometimes like in Andrews case you get really lucky.

168

00:27:15.630 --> 00:27:25.980

David Williamson Shaffer: And sometimes it's a you know it's a smaller piece that you that you connect to but they're already having a discussion, and you know we're we are you are sort of trying to.

169

00:27:26.580 --> 00:27:34.530

David Williamson Shaffer: Join that discussion and insert your ideas and that's true whether you're using DNA or not that's helpful metaphor, but on.

170

00:27:37.920 --> 00:27:41.550

Andrew R. Ruis: It yeah I mean I definitely second that I mean academia as about communities.

171

00:27:41.580 --> 00:27:56.280

Andrew R. Ruis: And you know publishing or giving talks or anything you do really is about engaging with some particular community or some sort of other Community and you have to know that Community the jewels have to be willing to to interact with it in a way that's not an option.

172

00:27:58.050 --> 00:28:04.050

Andrew R. Ruis: You can't just crash that group of people who are having a conversation you actually have to come into that conversation in a way that's.

173

00:28:05.220 --> 00:28:08.820

Andrew R. Ruis: Effective and respectful and so on, so yeah that's a lot of.

174

00:28:09.180 --> 00:28:19.650

Andrew R. Ruis: And that's a lot of what makes writing really challenging as if you're trying to figure out ways to do that, but don't compromise the things that you're going to argue and that you want forward, but then do make it possible for that.

175

00:28:19.980 --> 00:28:27.210

Andrew R. Ruis: For that community to see what you're doing to understand what you're doing and and all the way to validate it because, again, you can't get through the peer review process and.

176

00:28:30.270 --> 00:28:40.320

Andrew R. Ruis: So at this point, I think we'll we'll move to trajectory and then we will open it up to more general discussion as well, please feel free to keep you know either raise your hand or and.

177

00:28:40.380 --> 00:28:42.420

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Andrew it looks like there's another question in the.

178

00:28:42.510 --> 00:28:43.770

BRENDAN R EAGAN: In the chat.

179

00:28:44.760 --> 00:28:52.110

BRENDAN R EAGAN: There I asked what prior thinking do different fields have on the mixture compound whatever enos of whatever mixed methods actually referred to.

180

00:28:52.560 --> 00:29:01.920

BRENDAN R EAGAN: And I think that's kind of connecting to what David was just talking about in terms of figuring out what people are saying, if you want to shift the discourse.

181

00:29:02.490 --> 00:29:11.280

BRENDAN R EAGAN: You have to I like Andrew what you said you got to meet the audience, where they are right, you got to figure out what they're saying and then use their same language and slowly move it potentially not just but.

182

00:29:12.750 --> 00:29:22.620

BRENDAN R EAGAN: I don't know if people want to talk a little bit more about kind of the different States I mean obviously each field is going to be individual, but I think all of our panelists today or speakers today have.

183

00:29:23.010 --> 00:29:27.540

BRENDAN R EAGAN: At least multiple fields that they've engaged with, but do you guys want to tackle that question.

184

00:29:30.180 --> 00:29:37.080

Sarah A JUNG: yeah um no I thought I think that's a really great point to bring up, and you know, moving from.

185

00:29:39.270 --> 00:29:51.750

Sarah A JUNG: K through 12 education, and you know doing my degree here in ED psych and then going into medical and surgical education like this idea of mixed methods has definitely come up, and I think one thing that.

186

00:29:53.310 --> 00:30:00.660

Sarah A JUNG: we're working on right now is that when people say mixed mixed methods it's I mean it's not.

187

00:30:00.990 --> 00:30:12.690

Sarah A JUNG: Always mix methods in terms of what they're talking about right they might say, because they collected quantitative and qualitative data that it's mixed methods when maybe you know it wouldn't necessarily be.

188

00:30:13.770 --> 00:30:23.010

Sarah A JUNG: defined that way by everyone who considers themselves a mixed methods researcher um but you know back to what we were saying, I think.

189

00:30:23.610 --> 00:30:36.750

Sarah A JUNG: You know, rather than saying, and this is what I try to do as a reviewer like well that's not mixed method you know, have a conversation with them about what it is that they're trying to accomplish and you know why.

190

00:30:38.070 --> 00:30:46.470

Sarah A JUNG: Why they consider it mixed methods and maybe other things, for them to consider, because I do, I do think you know, there is still.

191

00:30:47.820 --> 00:30:56.190

Sarah A JUNG: Not a common definition that is always used around around mixed methods, at least, I found in.

192

00:30:57.030 --> 00:31:06.990

Sarah A JUNG: In our field, and I think you know, this relates to one other point I wanted to make to around publishing and helping folks to understand what it is that you're doing.

193

00:31:07.470 --> 00:31:18.840

Sarah A JUNG: um I think for most journals I know the ones that I submit to you have to suggest reviewers and so i've also been trying to be strategic obviously about who I.

194

00:31:19.920 --> 00:31:29.580

Sarah A JUNG: suggest is as reviewers because another thing i've encountered is that I have had papers held up because the editor was having a difficult time, finding someone.

195

00:31:30.750 --> 00:31:37.680

Sarah A JUNG: With the expertise to review them so just another thing to keep in mind as you're trying to get your work out there.

196

00:31:39.210 --> 00:31:41.730

Andrew R. Ruis: And i'll always add on top of that, from the other side, like.

197

00:31:42.840 --> 00:31:45.840

Andrew R. Ruis: I get a lot of review requests and some of them, I have to turn down because I.

198

00:31:46.290 --> 00:31:54.510

Andrew R. Ruis: can only do so many of them, but I never turned down the ones that are either DNA papers or clean paper is precisely because I know how hard it is for.

199

00:31:55.170 --> 00:32:04.260

Andrew R. Ruis: For journals to find people to review those papers and if i'm being contact is probably as the person who's supposed to know that that side of things, and so.

200

00:32:04.680 --> 00:32:13.470

Andrew R. Ruis: You know if you get requests to read those kinds of papers do try to do try to honor them if you can because it's it's probably one of your peers in this Community who's who's.

201

00:32:13.950 --> 00:32:24.720

Andrew R. Ruis: Submitting that paper and trying to get that work out and and you know we're still pretty small community so, and so you know editors don't have a really deep them ship people that they can that they can go to to review.

202

00:32:25.350 --> 00:32:30.120

Andrew R. Ruis: QA or Korea Jason papers on so yeah I definitely agree and.

203

00:32:30.660 --> 00:32:44.250

Andrew R. Ruis: You know, feel free to suggest reviewers who really will like understand the work you're doing and are likely to look on it favorably because they'll also give you better feedback like, even if they think that the stage of paper is that it's not quite ready to.

204

00:32:44.250 --> 00:32:44.970

Abigail Wooldridge: publish.

205

00:32:45.180 --> 00:32:47.880

Andrew R. Ruis: The feedback you get from most people will be a lot better than the.

206

00:32:47.880 --> 00:32:58.710

Andrew R. Ruis: Feedback you get from someone who's not back engaged with the Community side of things, and so yeah i'll just i'll definitely a plus one suggestion to put in suggested reviewers.

207

00:32:59.970 --> 00:33:02.160

Abigail Wooldridge: This my I think that's a great.

208

00:33:03.600 --> 00:33:11.490

Abigail Wooldridge: suggestion definitely think about who you suggest, as reviewers carefully and do it don't just leave it blank you know, even if it's optional.

209

00:33:11.940 --> 00:33:25.920

Abigail Wooldridge: The other thing that i'm going to say in response to this is actually related to the idea of trajectory so i'm not all fields have a common accepted definition of what mixed methods are multiple methods, whatever is.

210

00:33:26.970 --> 00:33:38.670

Abigail Wooldridge: In my field where I have this luxury now of using that analogy and using that to kind of make it easier, we wrote the paper that defined but mixed methods was and did a systematic review so think about.

211

00:33:39.210 --> 00:33:45.810

Abigail Wooldridge: order you publish and how it can help you and Andrew I hope I haven't stolen your thunder there so i'm gonna mute myself.

212

00:33:49.110 --> 00:33:55.350

Andrew R. Ruis: yeah, so I think like you know that's a really great transition to thinking about trajectory right, so there is some.

213

00:33:55.920 --> 00:34:05.460

Andrew R. Ruis: Some sense in which you're just trying to get that first paper published but it's really important, even when you're doing that to think about the sort of next papers right what is a longer game look like.

214

00:34:06.480 --> 00:34:15.360

Andrew R. Ruis: And so, a lot of this is just about the questions that you're going to ask yourself, because you know, this may be pretty particular to the research that you're doing.

215

00:34:15.720 --> 00:34:23.550

Andrew R. Ruis: Maybe field specific you know whether you want to leave with something theoretical something methodological whether a systematic review would be really helpful like there's a.

216

00:34:23.910 --> 00:34:30.690

Andrew R. Ruis: there's a lot of considerations it's hard to do kind of even a template for that, because I think there's a lot of different ways, you could you could.

217

00:34:31.140 --> 00:34:38.400

Andrew R. Ruis: Think through and effective trajectory and publishing those first few papers but but it's important to be thinking about it, I think that's really the.

218

00:34:38.790 --> 00:34:46.020

Andrew R. Ruis: kind of key thing and really thinking beyond that first page where you're trying to publish to what do you want to be publishing second or fourth.

219

00:34:46.380 --> 00:34:57.540

Andrew R. Ruis: Especially because your highest impact paper is probably not going to be the first one, in that field, it might, but more likely it's going to be the second or third or fourth paper when when you've already sort of built that.

220

00:34:57.810 --> 00:35:04.500

Andrew R. Ruis: understanding and then you can really you can really write the paper that that kind of does it all, so I mean I think that's.

221

00:35:05.820 --> 00:35:18.390

Andrew R. Ruis: Just some general considerations but abby Sarah if you guys want to think i'm talking a little bit about how you guys are founded on this in your own trajectories I think that'd be useful for people to hear.

222

00:35:21.900 --> 00:35:27.060

Sarah A JUNG: yeah so definitely for for me it was about.

223

00:35:28.740 --> 00:35:33.480

Sarah A JUNG: getting something out there, like I said we targeted surgery.

224

00:35:34.740 --> 00:35:38.820

Sarah A JUNG: journal first kind of trying to be strategic about you know.

225

00:35:40.980 --> 00:36:03.930

Sarah A JUNG: A journal that we we felt would be open to publishing the work because they do sort of do a mix of quantitative qualitative type things, but also that was going to be well known enough in the surgical Community for us to to site in in future publications.

226

00:36:06.030 --> 00:36:16.440

Sarah A JUNG: So, you know that that's been nice we've had a few papers, since Andrew has the other plug I wanted to put in was also for.

227

00:36:18.000 --> 00:36:27.450

Sarah A JUNG: keeping up on what is going on in this Community, the QA Community what your your colleagues are doing, because now as i'm writing and.

228

00:36:28.350 --> 00:36:40.050

Sarah A JUNG: I just put in a grant to a foundation and proposed in is one of my methods and it's great for me to be able to cite that i've done it obviously to show that I have expertise, but also.

229

00:36:40.770 --> 00:36:48.300

Sarah A JUNG: The the Foundation is looking at medical education and education, more broadly, and so it was really important for me to be able to show that.

230

00:36:48.690 --> 00:37:03.450

Sarah A JUNG: You know this has been used in other context as well in in medicine and in education, and so you know that's kind of how i've thought about it, I guess, like being able to show.

231

00:37:04.410 --> 00:37:19.620

Sarah A JUNG: My reviewer that I have expertise in this other people have expertise in it it's it's been used broadly, and you know, in an accepted and no one way to to approach these types of analyses.

232

00:37:26.100 --> 00:37:27.030

Abigail Wooldridge: So I think.

233

00:37:27.810 --> 00:37:38.340

Abigail Wooldridge: This is a part of this this academic game that is a little challenging for me because there's a lot of strategy involved in it's a lot to try and manage so.

234

00:37:39.480 --> 00:37:42.780

Abigail Wooldridge: When you go to publish one paper, it is really good to think about.

235

00:37:43.890 --> 00:37:49.050

Abigail Wooldridge: What do I need to write the next paper, but also kind of when you're at this stage.

236

00:37:50.610 --> 00:37:59.580

Abigail Wooldridge: Of you're thinking about I want to write this project, I want to write a proposal down the line, think about what you'll need for that proposal so that's what Sarah was just describing so you're kind of playing this game of.

237

00:38:00.120 --> 00:38:10.770

Abigail Wooldridge: Thinking about Okay, I want to be here, what do I need to do to get there and then also okay i'm here what can come next so you're kind of looking both ways and, in some ways it's a little bit.

238

00:38:13.500 --> 00:38:25.170

Abigail Wooldridge: When I was first out of my do it in a professorship That was something that I had to learn and think about doing but it's really valuable forward.

239

00:38:29.130 --> 00:38:31.140

Andrew R. Ruis: So I think at this point well I.

240

00:38:32.070 --> 00:38:38.220

Andrew R. Ruis: Encourage you all to go out and get writing but also open it up for other questions or things that.

241

00:38:39.720 --> 00:38:40.320

Andrew R. Ruis: You know that.

242

00:38:42.570 --> 00:38:49.860

Andrew R. Ruis: You still have questions about in terms of you know issues publishing Curie and in your field.

243

00:38:51.000 --> 00:39:03.420

Andrew R. Ruis: we're happy to take questions about specific fields I can guarantee you that there's someone in the audience, who, who will be able to help on that, but feel free to pose the question we if we can answer it maybe we can find someone you can offline at some point.

244

00:39:04.590 --> 00:39:12.300

Andrew R. Ruis: or any other questions that you have about publishing I think this is, this is a really good opportunity to ask those so so, the floor is open.

245

00:39:22.170 --> 00:39:30.720

Rogers Kaliisa: yeah I think I have maybe a question or comments, but so I have some little noise in the background, so many helpers at.

246

00:39:31.050 --> 00:39:31.680

Rogers Kaliisa: This time.

247

00:39:32.400 --> 00:39:32.760

But.

248

00:39:33.900 --> 00:39:42.000

Rogers Kaliisa: So my question is on the it's not a question, but easton i've been working on QA paper with a with a colleague and.

249

00:39:42.930 --> 00:39:51.780

Rogers Kaliisa: And at some point we're talking about okay what's the best venues in a place where we already have QA papers or a paper, a place where.

250

00:39:52.290 --> 00:40:00.630

Rogers Kaliisa: Because Maybe those people didn't know the approach and they will get very critical reviews, but of course from the discussion now it's I think it's better to actually go to.

251

00:40:01.230 --> 00:40:14.010

Rogers Kaliisa: a place where people already know this work, and I think it makes it easier, possibly and in case you have a different perspective, then I will come that then the other thing is on the class, I think you.

252

00:40:15.270 --> 00:40:19.260

Rogers Kaliisa: You highlighted on the issue of having a compass talk like today, I had.

253

00:40:20.370 --> 00:40:34.110

Rogers Kaliisa: A talk about DNA so that was my first time talk about DNA so brandon thanks for the materials and delivery and so it was interesting in my lab because these are people were doing so much into the learning of Sciences and the do a lot of qualitative work and.

254

00:40:35.130 --> 00:40:46.050

Rogers Kaliisa: And transactional analysis and rather intellectual analysis and we are so curious to know Okay, what does this method, how does it work and I tried my best, of course, to explain and.

255

00:40:46.590 --> 00:40:55.560

Rogers Kaliisa: an Indian I was curious to know Okay, what do they think about the approach and an Indian a solid question they had were more focused approach may be better for.

256

00:40:55.980 --> 00:41:05.640

Rogers Kaliisa: Because I attached that tutorial pay per click which was explaining about the experts and versus the novice and so maybe it could be better for such a kind of audience rather kind of.

257

00:41:07.080 --> 00:41:14.430

Rogers Kaliisa: A case but in so they're asking Okay, how do you get very fun codes and how do you present in in the context of.

258

00:41:15.720 --> 00:41:19.470

Rogers Kaliisa: Education, how do you really make sure that what you are visualizing is.

259

00:41:20.490 --> 00:41:33.960

Rogers Kaliisa: Is WiFi is what is actually existing so I mean I tried to highlight that because I didn't have much time to go through all the coding approach on coding process that is involved in the key but I hated that that that's one of the.

260

00:41:35.100 --> 00:41:45.270

Rogers Kaliisa: main thing that is emphasized in kiwi that will cut it short, I feel that that's that that's a very different approach, like having a compass to hear what people think and literally fought.

261

00:41:45.690 --> 00:42:03.060

Rogers Kaliisa: This is interesting, and I think they said Oh, I think we, we may have people from the lab maybe David and and colleagues to come and have a token we see whether we do more stuff and collaboration with them, so I think that's really an interesting approach, I think, from my perspective.

262

00:42:05.760 --> 00:42:09.180

Andrew R. Ruis: And i'll just throw out that I think one of the things that I think about.

263

00:42:09.270 --> 00:42:15.840

Andrew R. Ruis: In terms of publishing sort of internally or externally right publishing for the QA Community versus publishing, for you know.

264

00:42:16.470 --> 00:42:21.480

Andrew R. Ruis: A different field is also partly on the goals of that publication, you know if it's a it's really.

265

00:42:21.840 --> 00:42:32.340

Andrew R. Ruis: About qb methods right and some advanced and key methods, it makes sense to target a venue that's going to be mostly where it's mostly other to me folks we're going to pay attention to it, you know if it's more of an empirical.

266

00:42:33.030 --> 00:42:40.050

Andrew R. Ruis: Study that's kind of domain specific or not really addressing a problem or a challenge that another field is having.

267

00:42:40.440 --> 00:42:48.780

Andrew R. Ruis: Certainly Those are the things I could bring the acuity community, but more likely though more legs, if I if I take them to those fields, and so I think at least.

268

00:42:49.350 --> 00:42:58.380

Andrew R. Ruis: Some of the time that's sort of that sort of the calculus than that i'm that I use in terms of thinking of where to place things again there's certainly exceptions to that.

269

00:42:59.430 --> 00:43:06.750

Andrew R. Ruis: But I think a lot of it is again back to this sort of the cocktail party analogy like what what group do you want to sort of move into and start talking to.

270

00:43:07.200 --> 00:43:18.360

Andrew R. Ruis: You know, is it other people to do Curie already and they've already drunk the Kool aid and are are bought in or you know, is it people who are working on a particular problem or class of problems or.

271

00:43:20.100 --> 00:43:26.790

Andrew R. Ruis: You know, think about problems in a particular way and you want to talk to them, and you want to bring QA and have that conversation.

272

00:43:28.530 --> 00:43:37.320

Abigail Wooldridge: I think what Andrew say is 100% spot on and how I think about it, every time i'm working on a paper, whether it's single author students lead or.

273

00:43:37.770 --> 00:43:45.960

Abigail Wooldridge: Leading with co authors I come up with like a one to two sentence, this is the main point that I want to make with this paper.

274

00:43:46.530 --> 00:43:56.910

Abigail Wooldridge: And if it's about quantitative ethnography and some methods for in qe it needs to go somewhere that's using that language and talking about it, if it's domain specific like.

275

00:43:57.570 --> 00:44:03.600

Abigail Wooldridge: We should get clinicians together to do a team handoff rather than have them like play phone tag.

276

00:44:04.170 --> 00:44:09.420

Abigail Wooldridge: And it's going to go to a journal that's talking about that or if it's something like.

277

00:44:09.810 --> 00:44:20.850

Abigail Wooldridge: Well, the way we design processes that can support teams work or make it much, much more difficult for the team to accomplish that goal, then it's probably going to go to a human factors or teams.

278

00:44:21.300 --> 00:44:34.440

Abigail Wooldridge: type of journal right so that main point, having a really clear vision of that main point as early as you can and the writing process makes your life a lot easier because it everything else follows it, am I.

279

00:44:38.670 --> 00:44:39.300

Sarah A JUNG: Yes.

280

00:44:40.680 --> 00:44:41.370

Sarah A JUNG: Go ahead Brendan.

281

00:44:41.460 --> 00:44:46.050

BRENDAN R EAGAN: No, no, you should add, because I was going to turn to other comments and think.

282

00:44:46.980 --> 00:44:53.970

Sarah A JUNG: Oh yeah so I was actually going to I was looking at david's comment in the chat about.

283

00:44:55.320 --> 00:45:01.260

Sarah A JUNG: You know client methods work what methods are considered the quote unquote gold standard.

284

00:45:01.740 --> 00:45:13.590

Sarah A JUNG: A hook can be that the key is that gives a current model to connect qualitative data and research and, yes, absolutely I think you know that's a that's a hook that we in that i've been able to use, you know, I think.

285

00:45:14.760 --> 00:45:30.780

Sarah A JUNG: The field of medical education is evolving and definitely qualitative research is being used more and more becoming more and more accepted more journals are publishing it that maybe haven't in the past, but also.

286

00:45:32.010 --> 00:45:42.990

Sarah A JUNG: You know I think for many folks they do consider the the gold standard, and so a useful way to describe it, and actually I just had a colleague.

287

00:45:43.380 --> 00:45:54.570

Sarah A JUNG: Sarah Larson present we had our association for surgical education conference last week, and she presented a paper and used DNA as one of the methods and you know it.

288

00:45:55.110 --> 00:46:01.830

Sarah A JUNG: Was I mean that's exactly how she described it rightly we have all of this complex qualitative data.

289

00:46:02.130 --> 00:46:10.260

Sarah A JUNG: And here's a way for us to quantify it and be able to see these comparisons, as well as make some statistical comparisons, and I mean that really.

290

00:46:10.680 --> 00:46:21.870

Sarah A JUNG: It really resonated with with the group, it was it was cool to see the questions that arose and it wasn't questions around the method it was questions about me what was found with that method and so.

291

00:46:22.860 --> 00:46:35.070

Sarah A JUNG: it's been kind of fun to see it evolve into you know not fixating necessarily so much on the method, but but rather what the method allows us to to be able to say.

292

00:46:36.120 --> 00:46:41.580

Andrew R. Ruis: yeah another interesting thing about medicine, which is probably somewhat different from a lot of fields is that.

293

00:46:42.060 --> 00:46:49.410

Andrew R. Ruis: It very much are sort of quantum forward and that might also have this tremendous respect for expertise and this idea that like well you know.

294

00:46:50.010 --> 00:47:02.760

Andrew R. Ruis: You know, only an expert surgeon can really assess like you know how well someone's doing a surgery or things like that, where there's that sort of tension between being able to quantify something but also sort of believing deep down that like.

295

00:47:03.330 --> 00:47:12.990

Andrew R. Ruis: Nothing is going to really replace that qualitative judgments and so, in some ways that actually set up a revival is a very good setup for for something like QA because it's really about.

296

00:47:14.610 --> 00:47:17.340

Andrew R. Ruis: elevating both of those right and and.

297

00:47:18.720 --> 00:47:34.800

Andrew R. Ruis: and not one or the other right, and so, and so I think, at least in my work that's actually been really useful to be able to acknowledge both sides of that and then and then say luck and if we unify them we get something even better, and I think that's that's been a really.

298

00:47:36.810 --> 00:47:50.640

Andrew R. Ruis: Powerful or persuasive argument in that field and again every field is different, but I think that's a unique tension in many ways a unique tension and medicine that has also made cutie a little bit easier potentially to introduce to that field.

299

00:47:53.340 --> 00:47:59.040

BRENDAN R EAGAN: I want to throw something out really quick right asked a good question about kind of foot in the door examples.

300

00:48:00.030 --> 00:48:07.020

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Car and fray I think has done some of some really great thinking here, I know that she's had really great results in hand.

301

00:48:07.440 --> 00:48:17.430

BRENDAN R EAGAN: And metered them out very slowly and watered them down to make them palatable for her audience, so this exactly what I think our panelists just talking about today is to say okay.

302

00:48:17.760 --> 00:48:27.990

BRENDAN R EAGAN: I know where these people are and also Ada one of one of her co authors, has done a lot of thinking about that that was a big parts of the discussions in terms of putting together these articles was to say okay.

303

00:48:28.560 --> 00:48:35.760

BRENDAN R EAGAN: How do they think about these things, what are they going to want what's going to be a bridge too far, and then, knowing that, then you can actually space them out.

304

00:48:36.060 --> 00:48:46.590

BRENDAN R EAGAN: And not even get to what you think is the media's thing until they've already kind of accepted the methodology initially and and not found it threatening and not have it be too complex to digest.

305

00:48:47.340 --> 00:48:52.980

BRENDAN R EAGAN: So I like those two, as you can see that they're actually end is pretty small part and there's a lot of other meat in those articles.

306

00:48:53.280 --> 00:49:00.240

BRENDAN R EAGAN: And that's one potential strategy, but again, it depends on the Community and the audience I think i'm so i'd like to to.

307

00:49:00.960 --> 00:49:12.270

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Ask i'm going to save a little bit of time for announcements Dan, but I think this has been a very good discussion and engage discussion what other questions do folks have things that they want to ask for comments that people would like to make.

308

00:49:13.620 --> 00:49:23.790

Andrew R. Ruis: And while people are thinking i'll just say to you know we don't have enough time during the webinar to answer all the questions you ever if you think of something later feel free to reach out to us an email, you know.

309

00:49:24.210 --> 00:49:33.600

Andrew R. Ruis: posted lag on slack please there's a lot of venues, and so, you know as you as you started working on those papers, or as you're thinking about this, you know more deeply and.

310

00:49:33.900 --> 00:49:44.550

Andrew R. Ruis: You know later if questions come up you know I think I won't speak for anyone else but i'm certainly happy to answer questions or or you know set up time to chat with people, and I know a lot of my colleagues are as well.

311

00:49:47.070 --> 00:49:57.660

Abigail Wooldridge: I just unmuted myself, because when I was looking for foot in the door when I students for those foot in the door in the Web tool, the end web tool.

312

00:49:58.020 --> 00:50:10.740

Abigail Wooldridge: That methods, right up the references in that methods list is a nice solid starting point and even if it's outside of your field those papers are good resources to point people to to say hey you have questions about.

313

00:50:11.190 --> 00:50:20.940

Abigail Wooldridge: The math go look here hey you have questions about how we go back to quality that goal up here so use that I think that's what I think of as the list.

314

00:50:22.140 --> 00:50:27.420

Abigail Wooldridge: i'm really excited about these papers you dropped in for and then now could they go dig into them.

315

00:50:31.260 --> 00:50:44.370

David Williamson Shaffer: I have i'm noticing the chat there's a there's been some back and forth about about mixed methods and methods and so on, one of the things, so this is a challenge that people sometimes face is that is basically the.

316

00:50:45.810 --> 00:51:02.520

David Williamson Shaffer: I would call it the sort of but what about question that people get when they're writing in acuity framework, but why isn't this just X, Y Z it's just why um and you know what I try and do when I get in those situations is.

317

00:51:03.900 --> 00:51:16.920

David Williamson Shaffer: To just specifically talk about what the importance is are of what i'm doing for the question that i'm interested in, rather than trying to get into a bar fight about whether something is considered mixed methods or multiple methods or or anything else.

318

00:51:18.030 --> 00:51:26.520

David Williamson Shaffer: And you know I I do that, in part because actually think that a lot of the literature on or the whole sort of discussion of mixed methods is a little bit.

319

00:51:28.620 --> 00:51:38.430

David Williamson Shaffer: Well vapid honestly i'm in the sense that even making a distinction between the multiple methods and it mixed methods, meaning that the two methods are actually mixed.

320

00:51:39.660 --> 00:51:40.080

David Williamson Shaffer: Is.

321

00:51:41.610 --> 00:51:46.470

David Williamson Shaffer: It doesn't actually tell you very much about what that mixture what it means to be mixing the methods.

322

00:51:47.160 --> 00:51:54.990

David Williamson Shaffer: You know, is it really just I do a survey and then from the survey I choose my qualitative participants or.

323

00:51:55.770 --> 00:52:03.930

David Williamson Shaffer: You know I run a regression and then based on their regression I look at qualitative folks to follow up with where I do a qualitative analysis to help.

324

00:52:04.380 --> 00:52:13.890

David Williamson Shaffer: You know, create my survey, I mean sure those are mixed but there isn't really much discussion there about what what they epistemological intelligence right, what does it actually mean.

325

00:52:14.670 --> 00:52:21.750

David Williamson Shaffer: To be mixing and what does that do to the claims and the warmth and make um so.

326

00:52:22.590 --> 00:52:33.150

David Williamson Shaffer: In a sense, there isn't much purchase to get on what the difference between Curie, and that is because there's actually not much there in the in the comparison so as a result.

327

00:52:33.510 --> 00:52:49.500

David Williamson Shaffer: Focusing just on what is it that we're trying to do with qe rather than is this the same or different than something else to see see the better better so Sarah and and abby nodding was saying so, I guess, maybe we're not too far off.

328

00:52:51.090 --> 00:53:01.200

Sarah A JUNG: yeah no I I would absolutely agree, I think there's that, and you know there's other things that come up to where you know exactly as David said, rather than like.

329

00:53:02.610 --> 00:53:07.560

Sarah A JUNG: Spending the time arguing like is this or isn't it right it's like well what.

330

00:53:08.790 --> 00:53:23.460

Sarah A JUNG: What is it about what's the perspective, what is, what is this buying you right, and you know, is the argument that you're making for that really solid you know, rather than what what is the specific terminology, I guess yeah, so I would I would definitely agree.

331

00:53:25.650 --> 00:53:27.750

Abigail Wooldridge: yeah 100% I mean.

332

00:53:29.220 --> 00:53:37.440

Abigail Wooldridge: It for me it all comes back to that point and if i'm going to I probably never will, because this would make my head hurt and I would get irritated but if I was going to write a paper.

333

00:53:37.740 --> 00:53:45.870

Abigail Wooldridge: And the point was mixed methods needs to be this that and the other and it can't just be something as simple as you do, a survey to pick a participant.

334

00:53:46.260 --> 00:54:02.430

Abigail Wooldridge: there's not true integration okay fine then it's been the word space doing it, but I don't want to write that paper one and two that's not the point of any of the papers i'm writing so like I really like david's term of a bar fight it's a bar fight there's no value, why have the argument.

335

00:54:04.320 --> 00:54:07.170

Abigail Wooldridge: except if you're in a research methods class and your Professor makes you.

336

00:54:09.840 --> 00:54:12.090

BRENDAN R EAGAN: A safe a safe space for a bar fight right.

337

00:54:13.740 --> 00:54:14.190
BRENDAN R EAGAN: we've got.

338

00:54:14.880 --> 00:54:22.290
BRENDAN R EAGAN: One more question, we can sneak in here before we we wrap things up, unfortunately, I feel bad because I think the conversation is really good.

339

00:54:23.760 --> 00:54:33.180
BRENDAN R EAGAN: But it looks like he was saying, Professor shave shave or mentioned, we need to connect a research with some existing published paper i'm wondering if we think qe is a good way to solve a problem in.

340

00:54:35.040 --> 00:54:41.700
BRENDAN R EAGAN: But we do not know where the result will lead us right lead us to how should we navigate our paper searching and what is the strategy to build codes and.

341

00:54:42.780 --> 00:54:46.020
BRENDAN R EAGAN: Then mining or sense, making this is a pretty deep.

342

00:54:47.070 --> 00:54:53.760
BRENDAN R EAGAN: Pretty deep question, but you know, do you guys want to take a crack at them kind of the remaining few minutes we have.

343

00:54:55.110 --> 00:54:57.060
Abigail Wooldridge: To take a first step if that's okay with you and your.

344

00:54:57.570 --> 00:55:08.310
Abigail Wooldridge: girlfriend so if you're publishing in a new domain or really anywhere, I want to exclude like learning learning sciences, since that's where it comes from.

345

00:55:09.060 --> 00:55:12.660
Abigail Wooldridge: The papers, you need to look at to figure out what conversation, you can join.

346

00:55:12.960 --> 00:55:23.790

Abigail Wooldridge: or not here, you need to be looking at your domain so like if I was writing about teams in healthcare i'd be reading papers about teams in healthcare, not including qe as a search term initially maybe.

347

00:55:24.090 --> 00:55:31.440

Abigail Wooldridge: Once i've started writing the paper and i'm like Okay, let me see if there's a journal that has this maybe I do a really quick and dirty search, but I already know.

348

00:55:31.770 --> 00:55:43.500

Abigail Wooldridge: My codes, I already have done the analysis I already know how it's doing with most of that domains literature knowledge, so, in a sense, when you're doing this going into a new field.

349

00:55:44.520 --> 00:55:52.920

Abigail Wooldridge: You have to be really on your game, because you need to know the literature of the field, or the domain you're moving into plus the the theory philosophy in.

350

00:55:53.400 --> 00:56:01.380

Abigail Wooldridge: The field of quantitative ethnography is kind of a you're jamming two things into one, and I think that's a really important thing to be aware of.

351

00:56:03.210 --> 00:56:06.690

Andrew R. Ruis: I think, also, if you want to address from practical and pragmatic.

352

00:56:07.740 --> 00:56:15.510

Andrew R. Ruis: Challenges there's there's working at this back to the trajectory point right, but first, you have to convince people that you know the method is sound and then you have you have.

353

00:56:15.900 --> 00:56:22.500

Andrew R. Ruis: Any other, you have the right set of codes, that the right models and things like that that's there's sort of preparatory work to being able to then.

354

00:56:22.710 --> 00:56:34.080

Andrew R. Ruis: scale that up essentially into into a more practical problem, and so I think a lot of that is about thinking through how you build that acceptance and then by the time you you actually want to get to the scale of.

355

00:56:34.710 --> 00:56:44.280

Andrew R. Ruis: sort of coercion or you know, do something with those those methods that will have some real world implications, whether it's assessment or whether it's.

356

00:56:45.000 --> 00:56:53.130

Andrew R. Ruis: You know, characterization or something or whatever it is like you have to have already by that point you have to have already established everything that that's built on.

357

00:56:53.430 --> 00:57:07.110

Andrew R. Ruis: And so I think that's that's a you know a good place to think about that trajectory is, you know how do you how do you understand you know how do you establish that this is the right code book from you're saying this problem and how do you how do you understand that this way of.

358

00:57:08.250 --> 00:57:14.610

Andrew R. Ruis: modeling things is the right way to approach that kind of problem and so there's some smaller studies, presumably that you're doing to kind of.

359

00:57:14.940 --> 00:57:24.930

Andrew R. Ruis: lay that groundwork before you get to the point of of doing something that has has implications beyond academic loans right and actually affect real world decision making in some way.

360

00:57:26.910 --> 00:57:37.350

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Great and I I hate to cut this short I also noticed meredith posted in the chat you know we can continue as Andrew mentioned, we can continue these conversations.

361

00:57:38.010 --> 00:57:52.650

BRENDAN R EAGAN: But i'd like to just give a quick round of applause and say thank you to our speakers today it's really appreciated, I have a couple quick announcements one is we'll be posting and announcing the next webinar series.

362

00:57:54.000 --> 00:58:01.080

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Soon, we have a tentative speakers lined up but we're just finalizing exactly who they're going to be, but it's a team that.

363

00:58:01.590 --> 00:58:10.410

BRENDAN R EAGAN: was successful, the first coven data challenge that we had, and that will be June 14 so look on the website and also will be making an out Twitter and email.

364

00:58:10.950 --> 00:58:25.350

BRENDAN R EAGAN: For references there and then following up that on July 12 we're going to have yo Tom hold speaking about putting the keeping or putting the E and qe so focusing on ethnographic perspective another quick announcement since we're talking about publications.

365

00:58:26.370 --> 00:58:34.140

BRENDAN R EAGAN: i'm announcing that the international society for quantitative ethnography is pushing back the deadline for submissions two weeks to be in.

366

00:58:35.100 --> 00:58:46.290

BRENDAN R EAGAN: Mid June, rather than at the end of May, so you have a little bit more breathing room just under six weeks from right now so that's a heads up to everybody you'll be seeing communications around that but there's an extension there that we wanted to share.

367

00:58:47.460 --> 00:58:54.120

BRENDAN R EAGAN: So yeah Thank you all again we're a little bit over we're at full time, although we started a couple minutes late.

368

00:58:54.690 --> 00:59:00.660

BRENDAN R EAGAN: So keep in mind that we've got that extension also keep these discussions going, I think this is this your great.

369

00:59:00.930 --> 00:59:17.190

BRENDAN R EAGAN: conversation to be having and I like that we can be explicit about kind of our strategy and share with things that have worked or things to avoid when we're trying to be successful as we share these approaches and and ways of thinking with folks so thanks again to everybody and.

370

00:59:18.270 --> 00:59:21.150

BRENDAN R EAGAN: getting us off to a great start for this this season of webinars.