



INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
QUANTITATIVE ETHNOGRAPHY

WEBINARS

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

Note this was automatically transcribed by Zoom so there are errors, and the timestamps do not match the video.

September 6th at 1:00 PM (CST), 8:00 PM (CET)

Teaching a QE Course: Triumphs and Tensions

David Williamson Shaffer

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens

Clemson University

Amanda Barany

Drexel University

Abstract

Join Amanda Barany, Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens, and David Williamson Shaffer as they discuss their experiences teaching Quantitative Ethnography courses at their respective universities. The QE instructors will share successes and challenges developing an introductory QE course and what these courses can mean for shaping the QE community. This webinar will be in a "podcast" discussion style. In the first half, the three participants will ask each other questions and engage in a discussion. In the second half, the participants will take questions from the audience.

1

00:00:20.420 --> 00:00:21.470

Brendan Eagan: Ah,

2

00:00:22.850 --> 00:00:24.840

Brendan Eagan: now register for that

3

00:00:24.940 --> 00:00:29.709

Brendan Eagan: Excellent! And Amanda beat me to the the chat. Well done,

4

00:00:32.479 --> 00:00:33.780

Brendan Eagan: all right.

5

00:00:34.190 --> 00:00:46.030

Morten Misfeldt: Maybe, Brendan, we I could chip in with you save money if you register now, it's much easier for us to, you know, buy the right amount of

6

00:00:46.380 --> 00:00:54.460

Morten Misfeldt: coca-cola sandwiches and and napkins, and so on, if you register now, so please do so.

7

00:00:56.220 --> 00:00:58.040

Brendan Eagan: Yes, that's a good point.

8

00:00:58.880 --> 00:01:03.330

Brendan Eagan: It's always nice to save a little bit of money and make planning easier for folks,

9

00:01:03.640 --> 00:01:06.289

David Williamson Shaffer: and we definitely don't want too much Coca-cola.

10

00:01:06.300 --> 00:01:11.589

David Williamson Shaffer: No, or too few that can. You know

11

00:01:11.600 --> 00:01:13.380

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I have to use my shirt?

12

00:01:14.120 --> 00:01:19.129

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I'm banking on the the Nordic cider and cheese that I think is in coming.

13

00:01:19.140 --> 00:01:20.199

Brendan Eagan: Yes,

14

00:01:20.460 --> 00:01:21.819

which is exciting,

15

00:01:22.910 --> 00:01:35.959

Brendan Eagan: all right. Well, I think at this point we've waited a long enough to have people come in. I'm sure a few more folks will join us as we get going, but welcome to the last of our Qe. Webinars from

16

00:01:35.970 --> 00:02:05.899

David Williamson Shaffer: two thousand and twenty two. I'm. Trying to remember what time it is We're talking about a pretty exciting topic today. Um teaching Qe. Ah, specifically talking about Ah and ah qeed courses, and the the title is Triumph's intention. So we're joined by David Williamson, Schaefer from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Bulldogs Ross Burgens, from Clemson University and Amanda Braney from Drexel University, all of whom have obviously been teaching Qe Um, and have been very involved with using it in their own research. So without further ado, I'm going to turn it over to them because they think they have a

17

00:02:05.910 --> 00:02:12.280

Brendan Eagan: on a set of things scheduled for us today, and i'm eager to learn or myself. Thanks,

18

00:02:12.970 --> 00:02:22.490

Amanda Barany (she/hers): thanks, Brendan and Morton, for your introductions. I'll echo the request to everyone to register for the conference today, if you can.

19

00:02:22.500 --> 00:02:24.299

Amanda Barany (she/hers): So we are.

20

00:02:24.850 --> 00:02:39.649

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Our plan today is to have more of a discussion with you, and to talk a little bit about each of our processes as we designed and implemented our courses at our different universities. And I know that, David, you

21

00:02:39.740 --> 00:03:07.990

Amanda Barany (she/hers): probably in taught the first Qe. And E. And a course and goal. I know you've learned from David's experiences, and I have the privilege of learning from both of your experiences. So that's the order in which we'll share a little bit about each of our teaching processes today. So i'm going to invite each of us to speak a little bit about the students that we worked with, and the way we design and taught our courses at our different universities, and then we'll open up the floor for some discussion amongst each other about what we've got

22

00:03:08.000 --> 00:03:14.430

Amanda Barany (she/hers): in our different contexts, any questions that you all might have, and any other ideas that come up.

23

00:03:15.270 --> 00:03:21.009

David Williamson Shaffer: So without further ado, David, could you lead us off? Tell us a little bit about your students and your class?

24

00:03:21.720 --> 00:03:37.660

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah. So in terms of students I teach, I've taught almost exclusively graduate students. I've had a few advanced undergraduate tape class over the years that I've taught it, and

25

00:03:37.900 --> 00:03:55.200

David Williamson Shaffer: I would say it's graduate students kind of from a variety of places, obviously from the school of education, but also school of human ecology, engineering, business, I think even medical school at various times. So a pretty eclectic group.

26

00:03:55.210 --> 00:04:13.070

David Williamson Shaffer: Um! When I When I first started teaching the course, there was no Qe book, so I will say that. And the course was, I think, pretty much kind of a mess. I don't know. Goal. Did you take the course way back then?

27

00:04:13.080 --> 00:04:22.189

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah, it was a mess right? So imagine trying to look at it by a Qe without even a dud text to describe it.

28

00:04:22.200 --> 00:04:27.089

David Williamson Shaffer: So that's been a big advantage to having the Qe. Text,

29

00:04:27.170 --> 00:04:44.360

David Williamson Shaffer: I would say, Ah, the the thing that So the way that I organized the course right from the beginning was around a project. So I think it's kind of the most important thing is for students to get their hands on some data and actually do an analysis.

30

00:04:44.370 --> 00:04:59.980

David Williamson Shaffer: And I would say the quality of those analyses has varied greatly over the years. It's getting better as time goes on, which I imagine is because I'm a better teacher. But I think also meaning. I'm getting better at it, but but also, I think, because there are more,

31

00:05:00.180 --> 00:05:07.179

David Williamson Shaffer: because there's a bigger community that the students are a part of. And So there's more examples that they can see

32

00:05:07.190 --> 00:05:25.570

David Williamson Shaffer: increasingly. I I've I've brought people from the community into the class. So this past year, for example, I I did an interview with, or you know, some of we had a visitor every every week. So there's just a lot more voices and a lot more examples and things that that students are seeing.

33

00:05:25.580 --> 00:05:39.550

David Williamson Shaffer: Um. Another thing that's that has happened over time. That I think has really helped is well that we have a conference, and then we have a poster submission process for the conference. So students actually have students complete a poster submission.

34

00:05:39.560 --> 00:05:52.289

David Williamson Shaffer: Um. Some of them actually wind up submitting it, but it becomes a very authentic task. But this is actually what people in the community do. This is what it looks like. Um! And so it. It It provides a nice, a nice frame it's not just kind of hypothetical.

35

00:05:52.940 --> 00:05:54.250

David Williamson Shaffer: Ah!

36

00:05:54.540 --> 00:06:02.530

David Williamson Shaffer: So let's see the biggest triumph. I see the biggest triumph. I would say you

37

00:06:02.540 --> 00:06:31.579

David Williamson Shaffer: was something not not surprisingly, that I stole from goal um, which was figuring out how to actually just start the process. And what's the very first thing that you do. You have a bunch of students. They have nothing particular in common when you're trying to get it. Some of the key ideas in qe as a way of kind of starting off the course. Um And I tried a couple different things. I Won't bore you with all the failures. But basically goal suggested, or, I think, in her own course, used a scene from

38

00:06:31.590 --> 00:06:49.069

David Williamson Shaffer: um of thrones, and then various iterations of that. So there's the scene. And then there's a transcript. And then there's a transcript organized into a excel sheet, and that kind of gives a nice way of getting into the discussion in part, because

39

00:06:49.080 --> 00:07:04.709

David Williamson Shaffer: some people actually no game of thrones and some people don't. And anyway, it turned out that was, I think, a really good start for things. There's also a game of thrones, Dna, that sax Wiki and other people put together so they can actually go right. Dna

40

00:07:04.720 --> 00:07:19.409

David Williamson Shaffer: um. I think the biggest lesson I've learned along the way is that it's important for students to see examples of kind of a full Qe analysis early.

41

00:07:19.450 --> 00:07:39.309

David Williamson Shaffer: They even have said said in the past like I so don't have any idea where this is going, so getting them to to sort of see and read examples of good qualitative, quantitative ethnography, using E and A. Using whatever early on gives them a sense of where they're going to, because it's a long, long path to get there.

42

00:07:39.320 --> 00:07:43.320

David Williamson Shaffer: Um! And I think the biggest challenge for me is um

43

00:07:43.890 --> 00:07:45.480

David Williamson Shaffer: that. Ah,

44

00:07:46.450 --> 00:08:00.460

David Williamson Shaffer: so I I always assumed that it was going to be a challenging course to teach, because most students won't come with both qualitative and quantitative backgrounds. And so you're always kind of backfilling one or the other for somebody.

45

00:08:00.590 --> 00:08:07.130

David Williamson Shaffer: I think The thing that I that I found challenging was that

46

00:08:07.240 --> 00:08:08.510

David Williamson Shaffer: people,

47

00:08:08.670 --> 00:08:13.599

David Williamson Shaffer: people's, backgrounds, even in either one, are often very

48

00:08:14.210 --> 00:08:30.789

David Williamson Shaffer: so. Even people who have studied statistics often. Don't really understand it deeply. Where people have used qualitative methods often practice it, but they haven't really thought deeply about it, and so it winds up, being a lot of backbilling, and as a result, there's just a ton of material to cover in the course,

49

00:08:30.800 --> 00:08:54.930

David Williamson Shaffer: even just to get to your first Dna model. If you think about the number of things, the number of chapters in the book, and the number of issues in those chapters that you don't have to wrestle with, just to get to chapter nine. Not to put it to simply um is a lot, and figuring

out how to make sure that people see the key points through all the ideas that are there. It's just It's been a real ongoing challenge, one

50

00:08:55.220 --> 00:09:11.559

David Williamson Shaffer: Amanda. Did I do my job with it? Was that it was beautiful, and I really really really, really really stood out in my course as well. We'll get there, of course. But there was this. I was surprised to find that there were some basic things related to the scholarly process.

51

00:09:11.570 --> 00:09:41.239

Amanda Barany (she/hers): The research process that some of my students weren't familiar with. So things like how to apply a deductive code. Um, how to organize your data, how to think about structuring it uh how to even collect data. So some of those things were woven into the process of helping them through their practical projects for me as well. Um. So it ended up being of oftentimes offering supplementary readings that were some of the admins to fill in to back those basis. Um, And I think that's something to think about depending on the audience students that you might have.

52

00:09:41.250 --> 00:09:45.920

Amanda Barany (she/hers): If anyone here ends up deciding to be a Qa instructor, which I would recommend

53

00:09:47.380 --> 00:09:48.470

Amanda Barany (she/hers): you

54

00:09:48.960 --> 00:09:54.780

Amanda Barany (she/hers): any other thoughts from goal? Or are you ready to launch into your discussion of your course in context.

55

00:09:55.470 --> 00:10:01.889

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Yeah, I can talk about my course. I can also build a little bit on what David and you have been saying

56

00:10:01.900 --> 00:10:04.279

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Hello, Everyone Nice to see everyone.

57

00:10:04.460 --> 00:10:05.730

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Um!

58

00:10:05.740 --> 00:10:27.659

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: So i'll talk a little bit about. Ah, some of the similar things, David and I, Of course I think it's pretty similar. I didn't use a lot of his materials. We chatted a lot um as he's told you. We both do the game of thrones. Introduction. Um! That works well for me, because I have never seen an episode of so actually the students who have seen game of zones end up being

59

00:10:27.670 --> 00:10:57.380

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: the experts, you know um, and can contribute right away to the course which is nice. And of course, like, as David said, where there's just so much information. Um, that that a lot of the students can feel wrong. So it's kind of a nice starting point. Um, I didn't choose game of thrones. That was the app that uh, that is available that Amanda Rainy is now showing. Um. It's an excellent teaching tool. It really kind of shows you a high level of what we can do with

60

00:10:57.660 --> 00:11:27.019

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: um. It has an e and a right it uses e and a as the keyword. It's like Dna light. I recall it doesn't have all the features, but you can look at discourse networks. A lot of it is scaffolded, meaning like the interpretation down there in the description is actually there which is nice, and it really introduces students right away to one of the most important things. You've heard me say this many, many times, which is closing the interpretive work. And so the discourse is right there next to that quantitative network representation.

61

00:11:27.030 --> 00:11:30.889

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: So right away, I uh introduce students to that.

62

00:11:31.630 --> 00:11:33.000

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Um.

63

00:11:33.230 --> 00:11:34.690

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: So

64

00:11:34.890 --> 00:12:04.859

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: just to back up a little bit, I am teaching a quantitative and an ethnography course in Clemson. I am in the College of Education and the Learning Sciences program. Um! When I taught it, this was two years ago. I'm teaching it again. This springs I've only taught at one time. Officially. I've done lots of cute workshops for you and I workshops, but i'm looking forward to teaching it again this spring. It is an official methods for us at Johnson University. It got passed through the curriculum committee. So that's really exciting It's open to all graduate students.

65

00:12:04.870 --> 00:12:06.530

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Um!

66

00:12:06.720 --> 00:12:23.870

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: The first time I taught it. I had all Phd. Student, mostly learning sciences. Not surprisingly. I did have two educational policy students and one human computer interaction, and at Clemson I'm. Slowly developing a human computer interaction following here. It's interesting.

67

00:12:23.970 --> 00:12:35.190

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: So I should also note that it was fully virtual when I first taught it, and in the spring. I'm teaching it in person, so I might have completely different insights if you come back to me later.

68

00:12:35.270 --> 00:13:03.800

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Ah, a few things i'd like to add as I did what David did, which I think I'm just going to echo it because I thought it was phenomenally motivating is that students from the beginning were told, the goal is to submit a poster Submission to ict. The submission itself was optional, but encouraged. But we set it up so that you know they had high levels of being successful meaning. Every week They were working towards this study, and they were even required to use the template for the conference

69

00:13:03.810 --> 00:13:33.389

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: to submit their final paper. Many students found this challenging. Two thousand words can be really challenging, but it's also a really really good practice, because that is very common when you're trying to submit a conference poster, or in a conference presentation. Right? You have to adhere to those um board limits. Um! And when you're learning a new method, such as Kiwi when there's qualitative and quantitative, and you're trying to. Uh, i'm laughing at Jamie's comment, and you're trying to mix these

70

00:13:33.400 --> 00:13:36.900

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: things together that can be really challenging when you're a novice.

71

00:13:37.580 --> 00:13:38.910

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Um!

72

00:13:39.400 --> 00:14:08.590

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: And then i'll say one other kind of thing that I did that you might find interesting is I focused the two things i'll mention. I focused a lot on uh looking at research. The researcher themselves as a tool. The bias and world views that are embedded in the tools that we use, and the researchers themselves. So, in other words, I spent a whole class period on critical perspectives, um and critical reflexology. So not just being reflexive, but actually connecting our personal beliefs to the broader socio.

73

00:14:08.600 --> 00:14:29.300

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: So, for example, who are we? What sort of privileges do we have as researchers? Who are we investigating for what purposes, what sort of assumptions are baked into these tools? So I spend a lot of time thinking about that, and encouraging my students to think about that. So that's not something that's explicit in the book. So that's kind of an add on my course.

74

00:14:29.530 --> 00:14:34.579

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: And then the last thing i'll say is some fun. A land on a fun activity,

75

00:14:34.620 --> 00:15:02.409

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: I think, when we segmentation is is an important thing to talk about when it comes to Qe. And getting the the qualitative data prepared for computational or statistical analyses, That part is really important. You mess that up. It's going to be a really long course for you. So I do focus on what it means to segment your data in appropriate ways and make sure that your data is clean or hygienic for computational purposes. One fun way that I do that is, I choose music videos for students to look at.

76

00:15:02.420 --> 00:15:05.290

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Um, This is early on in the course, so

77

00:15:05.300 --> 00:15:30.800

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: they do not have data yet. So this is one of those early activities where I choose the data. So I have them choose a music video. They look, They watch the video. And then they analyze the lyrics segment. The lyrics called the lyrics. So it's sort of this mini activity that focuses on coding and segmentation, and also relates this idea of stanza right to poetry or lyrics. Um, And it can be really fun. If you pick all different types of genres. You have a very interesting conversation,

78

00:15:30.810 --> 00:15:47.720

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: and then I do what David calls the cooking show, where I already have analyzed some of these lyrics. So you know I've already had this meal prepared, so I have the students do it, and then I show them my analysis to kind of show up from start to finish what it could look like um to do an analysis of some some musical.

79

00:15:47.880 --> 00:15:52.680

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: So that's i'll end there, Amanda. So just some kind of interesting things that I do in my course

80

00:15:52.690 --> 00:16:21.680

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I learned so much from both of you. Actually, I think a couple of the things that you mentioned I took and ended up buying in parts of my course, so I I love the idea of bringing in concrete examples that you can return to throughout the course it kind of speaks to what you were saying. I think, David, about showing them as early as possible examples of complete quantitative ethnographic projects. And so in my week two one of the things I actually did was left a space to bring in different completed research examples

81

00:16:21.690 --> 00:16:40.169

Amanda Barany (she/hers): that students could read and engage with that were related to the topics of interest of the group that I was working with, so that they were really interested in like health sciences. I could put in some fine examples and from health sciences research if they were really interested in online learning, and they could put a couple of examples in, so that they could see that it's applied in an area that interests them.

82

00:16:40.440 --> 00:16:42.470

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Um. But then also having like

83

00:16:42.480 --> 00:17:06.829

Amanda Barany (she/hers): text that they or or discourse that they grapple with. So I use the game of thrones tool in my first week, as well as just an introduction to getting them exploring the complexities of discourse. But then, for another example, that I used was a song, and so song lyrics with sort of this regular pattern that I used to demonstrate different things. So I don't know how funny my students thought this was, but I was pretty amused.

84

00:17:06.839 --> 00:17:15.899

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I ended up Rick rolling them so for most of my class. I showed them examples because it has a nice repetitive structure,

85

00:17:15.920 --> 00:17:31.730

Amanda Barany (she/hers): so it made me laugh, and I think it worked to illustrate different examples, like what you know what a coding agreement might look like. If you're looking for keywords, similarities, if you're trying to calculate rows. So these ended up being examples that I could apply to showcase different parts of the process.

86

00:17:31.740 --> 00:17:45.080

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Um! So that was kind of fun for me. But I would. I would recommend that for any course like, try to get to something that that the the students can engage with in different ways at different times, and return to to explore some of the complexities.

87

00:17:45.140 --> 00:17:51.670

Amanda Barany (she/hers): So yeah, any other thoughts about goals, experience, or questions that anyone has, including you, David,

88

00:17:54.810 --> 00:18:01.450

David Williamson Shaffer: I'll just say that. So I also do a music, a song, lyrics activity. Yeah,

89

00:18:01.460 --> 00:18:18.720

David Williamson Shaffer: the way I do it a little differently. So in mine I actually am just trying to get students to think about quantifying discourse to begin with, and so I have them all pick a song, and then they in a group

90

00:18:18.730 --> 00:18:23.030

David Williamson Shaffer: uh figure out which two songs they think are are the most similar.

91

00:18:23.330 --> 00:18:32.439

David Williamson Shaffer: Then they do some to a little bit of. They figure out like, what's a way of coding it. That will show that it's that it's similar to the

92

00:18:32.450 --> 00:18:48.020

David Williamson Shaffer: they actually code. They code it sort of with a purpose i'm butchering the activity a little bit, but that's the basic idea is that they're actually starting to compare the songs, and they're comparing them along a very simple dimension. But it becomes really clear

93

00:18:48.030 --> 00:18:53.890

David Williamson Shaffer: the way in which your quantification can help, but also the way in which it's a limited view of what's going on.

94

00:18:53.900 --> 00:18:56.640

David Williamson Shaffer: But so a similar idea just a different focus.

95

00:18:57.210 --> 00:18:58.370

Amanda Barany (she/hers): What was that?

96

00:18:58.510 --> 00:19:08.180

David Williamson Shaffer: I really love the the emphasis that you place as well role on the critical perspectives. I tried to mention a lot to my students. This idea that

97

00:19:08.190 --> 00:19:25.650

Amanda Barany (she/hers): there is a series of choices that you make when you're constructing a quantitative epigraphic process, and there's no inherently perfectly right or perfectly wrong choice to make at any stage. But it's important to just be really intentional and thoughtful about the affordances and constraints of every choice that you make

98

00:19:25.660 --> 00:19:50.040

Amanda Barany (she/hers): when you segment this way. These are the affordances for answering your question. Here are the constraints for answering the question. When you code in a certain way, or a different way. There's importance as constraints. And so returning to that, and making it explicit at every step. But I think that something that i'd like to take into my course is that that is, is to interrogate your own biases to go into those decisions as well. So I really like that perspective.

99

00:19:51.730 --> 00:19:56.400

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Yeah, it's, I think, unique. I'll say, because

100

00:19:56.410 --> 00:20:22.129

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: it's not, you know, in qualitative research we do critical reflectivity. Qualitative research is similar for the qualitative part. But with Qe. We also have these tools that have these. And I said, there's these assumptions in them, so it's. It's like double critically. You. You

use so many tools, including yourself. You're also using computational tool that you really have to. I think. Um,

101

00:20:22.140 --> 00:20:28.210

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: if you want to do meaningful research, That's fair, right. Think deeply about where these tools come from.

102

00:20:29.110 --> 00:20:31.769

Absolutely. Yeah, that's it. So the I get I

103

00:20:31.820 --> 00:20:37.039

David Williamson Shaffer: I use. I use sort of the same reflexive methodology that I do,

104

00:20:37.340 --> 00:20:57.129

David Williamson Shaffer: and that I use in when i'm teaching qualitative qualitative methods. So there's memos and questions in the memos about being reflected when we talk about it. So I think the thing that I Haven't managed to do is get it, though that level of reflectivity about the tools themselves, mostly because I think it's so hard for people to even understand what the tools are,

105

00:20:58.760 --> 00:21:15.550

David Williamson Shaffer: even if you're not diving into the details of what the tool is doing, just getting it to do something that's sensible is so hard that there's too many. There's too many layers that it would be required to be reflexive in that way effectively. But

106

00:21:15.560 --> 00:21:28.629

David Williamson Shaffer: um, you know that's only that's my own limitation. I think not necessarily. I mean goals right, of course every tool comes with its ah constraints and affordances, and it's important to keep that in mind.

107

00:21:30.520 --> 00:21:31.589

It's going on.

108

00:21:31.600 --> 00:21:33.660

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Go ahead, Brendan. I think you have a question.

109

00:21:35.180 --> 00:21:47.520

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Yeah, I just wanted to pig you back on what you were just discussing. I'm wondering if you could talk about common misconceptions that your students have, or areas where they particularly struggle, and maybe on the flip side of that coin

110

00:21:47.530 --> 00:21:58.870

Brendan Eagan: um things that they brought to bear that were useful for them to kind of build their own knowledge off of like something that they brought to the table. And what what helped them have a successful pathway into kind of getting into. Qe.

111

00:22:01.370 --> 00:22:02.440

It's a question.

112

00:22:05.850 --> 00:22:09.360

Amanda Barany (she/hers): The two places that I think I saw. My students

113

00:22:09.410 --> 00:22:19.860

Amanda Barany (she/hers): need a lot of extra support and ask a lot of questions, was the coding process. So organizing your data, so segmenting it

114

00:22:19.870 --> 00:22:48.960

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Um! And then applying codes to it, and calculating integrated reliability on those codes with something that was really new and unfamiliar to a lot of my students, and so there was a lot of of backfill and support and kind of walking them through it. We ended up doing more around that time when they were working on that in the projects, one on one for me or one on once with each other, where they were talking it through, and I also encourage them to engage in that with appear in the class, so that they can voice those questions to someone who is kind of in the same space.

115

00:22:49.300 --> 00:22:52.710

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Um, So I think that's that's one of the struggles. And then

116

00:22:52.820 --> 00:22:58.140

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I find that there's this really exciting moment where you show someone an epistemic network,

117

00:22:58.150 --> 00:23:04.860

Amanda Barany (she/hers): you you're trying to talk them through what they're looking at, and what they understand from it. And I,

118

00:23:04.870 --> 00:23:33.929

Amanda Barany (she/hers): lot of people come to it with preconceptions about what interpretations they can get. So things like the mean having meetings that it doesn't actually meet the position of nodes and the thickness of lines having meetings that it doesn't in this case. But I think it's one of the most exciting moments for me is spending one of the class periods walking through that step by step, and when it clicks it's so exciting when when they can start to pull, meaning and say, that mean is over there. That means that it's pulled towards this code. So this thing is happening more,

119

00:23:33.940 --> 00:23:53.420

Amanda Barany (she/hers): and they can bring that back to the data and understand the relationship between the patterns that are being visualized and the inherent pattern of the discourse. I think that's one of the most exciting moments, but it is. It's always a bit of a struggle. And so that's something. I tried to set aside an entire class period and continuing to return to it throughout the course.

120

00:23:54.100 --> 00:23:57.589

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Yeah, I agree, Amanda. That moment is so great.

121

00:23:57.600 --> 00:24:24.039

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: I think that that used to be my job. Actually, when I was working with David and Brendan. That was your job for a little bit, I'm sure many others. But working, sitting down with someone and working and interpreting their data together with Qe rules, is, is a great experience, and when that kind of aha moment comes up for that person. Um! That's great, and to be able to do that in a classroom. It is awesome. I do something similar. I actually have one on one meeting. My class was small enough

122

00:24:24.050 --> 00:24:35.590

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: right during one class session, while others were working on some activity. Don't remember now, I would pull them out for one-on-one meetings and at a critical point where they were interpreting their data.

123

00:24:35.700 --> 00:24:37.020

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Um

124

00:24:37.030 --> 00:25:05.900

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: and building Qe models. Uh: we would actually do that. We would walk through it together. Um! And they found that really really helpful. Uh, I was only able to do it once, but it was helpful. But yeah, I think that that's kind of a critical point in Brennan to answer your question at the coding, honestly validating code, and and that there's a lot in that. A lot of under steep understanding in that. But um, including using the tools, but also conceptual understanding of why we're doing it for what purposes, and it just takes a long time, so

125

00:25:05.910 --> 00:25:20.720

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: that that is really tough to do in A. In A. Qe course, and that's something that the three of us have talked a lot about in terms of the the semester timeframe and what to focus on. Yes, and that's been kind of a deep discussion.

126

00:25:21.390 --> 00:25:22.090

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Yeah,

127

00:25:22.100 --> 00:25:35.640

David Williamson Shaffer: I mean, I group. First of all, I think students find everything hard to be. To be honest, it doesn't seem to be anything that comes easily. I agree that interpreting the

128

00:25:36.090 --> 00:25:51.259

David Williamson Shaffer: you know networks is is difficult. The thing I think people I found people struggle most with is actually what interpreting the dimensions, just making sense of the idea that there's a dimension. And how do I talk about sort of what it means to be on the right of what it means to be on the left.

129

00:25:51.320 --> 00:26:00.920

David Williamson Shaffer: So there's that. The other thing. The coding is a coding is difficult, I think, mostly just because it's difficult like It's Actually, it's just hard to do.

130

00:26:01.050 --> 00:26:19.490

David Williamson Shaffer: I most, I would say I get many more students with quantitative backgrounds and qualitative backgrounds. Um! In the course there's there's over there some but um, and I think that the thing that ah, that those folks struggle a lot with is

131

00:26:20.320 --> 00:26:30.729

David Williamson Shaffer: essentially why Don't, we just do topic modeling, or why Don't, we just do X. That will be much easier than this hard thing that we're doing. And so there's a kind of lot of discussion

132

00:26:30.930 --> 00:26:32.120

David Williamson Shaffer: about.

133

00:26:32.710 --> 00:26:38.190

David Williamson Shaffer: You know. Well what what, what's going on in your data and getting people to actually kind of

134

00:26:38.210 --> 00:26:48.239

David Williamson Shaffer: focus on the data, read the data and start there as opposed to wanting to jump in kind of with a some more abstract

135

00:26:48.250 --> 00:26:58.639

David Williamson Shaffer: quantitative way of looking at, it, I think is a bit, is a big challenge, and there's a lot of as goal, says one-on-one discussions either at a break in class or after class, or whatever,

136

00:26:58.710 --> 00:27:06.789

David Williamson Shaffer: where I often say. So what can you show it to me in the data? And there's people going to go? Oh, Wait a minute. There's a kind of a

137

00:27:06.800 --> 00:27:08.600

David Williamson Shaffer: a hesitation as they are,

138

00:27:08.610 --> 00:27:26.460

David Williamson Shaffer: you know. Okay, I see what you see what your question is. But show me this in the data, and then we can talk about it, and that is productive. But I think it's something that people find hard to wrap their heads around even the folks from qualitative backgrounds, but especially from quantity

139

00:27:28.550 --> 00:27:29.730

great.

140

00:27:29.920 --> 00:27:47.029

David Williamson Shaffer: So we've got a couple of really good questions in the chat. So Elena was asking what backgrounds the students have? And she mentions highly quantitative engineering background with Ah for her context. So I think,

141

00:27:47.040 --> 00:28:01.570

Amanda Barany (she/hers): David. And well, you shared a little bit about the the kinds of the students, the student populations that you've worked with in the courses that you've taught. So i'll take this opportunity to talk a little bit about mine. So I taught the first round of the Qe. And E. And a course at the University of Pennsylvania last year.

142

00:28:01.580 --> 00:28:11.830

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I think there were six students in the course, and they were pretty diverse. So we had faster students, Phd. Students, and then some working professionals in the Education Department.

143

00:28:11.840 --> 00:28:34.149

Amanda Barany (she/hers): They were all working in the field of education. There were some very qualitative leading researchers in the group, ones who were doing and done exclusively qualitative research up to that point, and then some very quantitative ones. And so there was a lot of diversity in terms of what they wanted. They're also their topics of interest for wide. So some people were really interested in online learning.

144

00:28:34.170 --> 00:29:03.249

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Some wanted to look at, like the student output data from like um learning environments, learning intervention that they've done uh. And so there was just a lot of different diversity uh across the board for them. So it presented a really interesting opportunity, I think, for each of them to do their practical project, because I adopted the similar technique that David and Gold that you used where the they worked towards a final poster or paper that they could submit to the conference. Um, at the end of our uh fifteen weeks ago,

145

00:29:03.270 --> 00:29:22.580

Amanda Barany (she/hers): and this was an opportunity for them to see how these techniques can be applied in other contexts to find other meaningful and interesting outcomes. You know. Some of them were looking at longitudinal change, and so they were making models to compare things over time. Some were comparing groups, some were even interested in trying to explore how to use

146

00:29:22.590 --> 00:29:52.369

Amanda Barany (she/hers): unconventional. I guess I would say discourse data like extreme data from online learning tools. So that was an interesting challenge for the to kind of explore as well. Ah, so they were. They were pretty diverse, and what we ended up having to do is ah a lot of different applied examples. So additional videos that were like tailored to their interests. Guest speakers in class that I thought would be interesting to everyone like we had Sylvia Zorgo comments about segmentation.

147

00:29:52.500 --> 00:30:00.540

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Um! We had David come at the end of class which everyone loved because they were like. We had all our good questions, and we can tell him how our projects went,

148

00:30:00.550 --> 00:30:17.729

Amanda Barany (she/hers): and then we had friend to come and talk a little bit about row, so those were good for everyone, and then there were some tailored break-off sessions for people. So there were a couple of students interested in R, so I had a special session outside of class for them to meet with a couple of people from David's lab. I think Ron Andrew met with us,

149

00:30:17.740 --> 00:30:22.589

Amanda Barany (she/hers): and so this was trying to like meet the needs of a very diverse group of people.

150

00:30:22.600 --> 00:30:41.179

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I don't know if that's going to be the same in the future. If I get a more homogeneous group of students, things might change, but the whole idea that I wanted to bring to them from day. One was that this course was going to be flexible, based on the interests of the work, and for the most part they said that they felt like that worked well for them, and they would recommend that I

151

00:30:42.300 --> 00:30:50.270

Amanda Barany (she/hers): anything else that you want to add about your context. I think, David, you mentioned that you're more. You had more quant students than fall leaning.

152

00:30:51.590 --> 00:31:09.590

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah. Well, yeah, I think so I mean um. Well, first of all, let's just say there's a lot more quantitative work that goes on with the University of Wisconsin, and qualitative

work. I would say, overall in the social sciences. Um. So there's that. Ah, but yeah, I would say that there's

153

00:31:09.600 --> 00:31:20.189

David Williamson Shaffer: and that even often people who were doing qualitative work also had a relatively quantitative background, so like human factors, engineers, for example,

154

00:31:20.200 --> 00:31:25.719

David Williamson Shaffer: remember folks who, you know, who clearly had a had a strong quantitative, Bent

155

00:31:25.740 --> 00:31:31.999

David Williamson Shaffer: Abbey voltage for those of you who know her would be an example, and folks from her lab. Subsequently

156

00:31:33.300 --> 00:31:36.540

Amanda Barany (she/hers): something I learned from you go was, I thought. Oh, sorry! Go ahead!

157

00:31:36.690 --> 00:31:37.770

David Williamson Shaffer: Oh, good!

158

00:31:37.820 --> 00:31:56.589

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Ah was Ah! That idea of of making it like in spending a lot of time intentional and thinking about how to close the interpretive loop, and I think that was really important for some of my students that were more quantitative. Learning was okay. You have this model, and it's not just about putting this model on a piece of paper and publishing it. You have to then come back to the data,

159

00:31:56.600 --> 00:32:00.690

Amanda Barany (she/hers): interrogate whether this makes sense for your understanding of your data,

160

00:32:00.700 --> 00:32:14.690

Amanda Barany (she/hers): and and seeing whether or not it furthers the story of the data that you need to be immersed in. Um, and so I think that was an important step, and I made I I felt it was important to take a week when we talked about that intentionally, and I learned that from you. So

161

00:32:14.700 --> 00:32:17.490

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: thank you. I learned from both of you so

162

00:32:17.500 --> 00:32:23.540

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Oh, great! That's a good thing to teach your students. That's interesting. You said that I would say sometimes most of the time

163

00:32:23.550 --> 00:32:37.970

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: in just my experience working in Qi with with people. Um, it does go that way where you have the network, and then, or some sort of, you know, visual representation. And then people forget to connect back or ground it back in the original data

164

00:32:37.980 --> 00:32:46.390

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: actually in my class. I saw it the other way around where there was a qualitative description, and it didn't match the network. Right?

165

00:32:46.400 --> 00:33:03.559

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: So it actually it went like the other way around where they they built. They They build this argument on the qualitative data, and then they kind of just threw in the network in there, but it didn't really match, and I think one reason for that is, I have the opposite. I had a lot of more qualitatively inclined students,

166

00:33:03.640 --> 00:33:33.450

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: which I think that was the case. I mean, a lot of my students are here right now. Yeah, but I think that was the case. And so it was interesting, Seeing it the other way around, and and trying to find that balance in the course was was a theme for me uh, like, I had no student experience programming or using far, so that we didn't even go there there. There was just no time to teach students how to use our package. So we relied a lot on the web. But that might change right. This semester who knows,

167

00:33:33.460 --> 00:33:44.819

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: with my little computer science following, If i'm going to have more students who have used R. And and you know we'll have a mix, and that'll change how the course is taught. But yeah, I have a slightly different experience.

168

00:33:44.830 --> 00:33:46.790

David Williamson Shaffer: That's so interesting. I

169

00:33:46.980 --> 00:33:52.010

David Williamson Shaffer: The thing that i'm. That i'm always struck by is so. It's: I have two

170

00:33:52.550 --> 00:34:05.959

David Williamson Shaffer: kind of big regrets about the Qe book I won't take it a second, but one of them is that there's a place in the text where I talk about like the order in which how you present A. Qe. Result.

171

00:34:06.070 --> 00:34:13.390

David Williamson Shaffer: I sort of make the argument that well, sometimes you want to start with a quantitative, and sometimes you want to start with the qualitative, And I actually think that's a terrible idea.

172

00:34:13.400 --> 00:34:20.900

David Williamson Shaffer: I think you should always start with qualitative, and I can. I can give you lots of good reasons for that, and we can talk about that if you'd like. But

173

00:34:20.909 --> 00:34:23.590

David Williamson Shaffer: I say that to the students explicitly

174

00:34:23.600 --> 00:34:27.039

David Williamson Shaffer: every year, and the number of students who don't,

175

00:34:27.210 --> 00:34:45.869

David Williamson Shaffer: who start with the quantitative, and then what wind up having their paper be problematic and all for all the reasons that you shouldn't start with quantitative. It's just it's kind of really striking to me, and I don't I don't quite know. I mean it's It's partly this idea about closing the interpretive loop,

176

00:34:45.880 --> 00:34:52.449

David Williamson Shaffer: but I also think increasingly that as a community we probably need to talk more about opening that the

177

00:34:52.540 --> 00:35:05.260

David Williamson Shaffer: interpretive loop, in the sense that there is a lot of studies that I think are using Qe in a relatively exploratory way, and I have nothing. I have nothing against using qe in an exploratory way,

178

00:35:05.270 --> 00:35:24.600

David Williamson Shaffer: but ultimately it doesn't really work like you used to be in an exploratory way. We use e and A. Or a tool like it in an exploratory way to understand the data, so that you then have a story. And then you tell that story in a non exploratory way like you actually have to tell the story, and I think that there's a There's a sort of sense in which

179

00:35:24.610 --> 00:35:30.929

David Williamson Shaffer: it's like with topic modeling, or lots of other tools. It's too easy to jump into quantifying,

180

00:35:30.970 --> 00:35:45.850

David Williamson Shaffer: and then kind of leave. The qualitative part is just dangling at the end. So even if you're closing the loop. You're not really closing Loop very deeply. You're just kind of looking for examples which is not really the same thing as I'm sure we all know. So I think that's been

181

00:35:45.920 --> 00:36:05.909

David Williamson Shaffer: something that folks have struggled with. Um. I also so want you to set up this really softball question in the in the chat. Thank you, You, Andrew, about. You know students asking about whether there's anything other than encoder and E and A. And it's

182

00:36:06.000 --> 00:36:22.479

David Williamson Shaffer: it's It's partly It's probably a softball question, because there's a paper that the conference is all Qe. Just dna um. And so if you come to the conference, you can hear the answer to that. You can hear that one answer to that question.

183

00:36:22.490 --> 00:36:27.530

David Williamson Shaffer: But I do think that's one of the challenges actually is that there have not been.

184

00:36:27.940 --> 00:36:36.069

David Williamson Shaffer: There have not been many really strong examples of a good Q. And A. Qe. Analysis

185

00:36:36.590 --> 00:36:41.160

David Williamson Shaffer: does not use E. And A. And that kind of

186

00:36:41.710 --> 00:37:01.280

David Williamson Shaffer: closes the whole circuit with the model. So there's plenty of things that people are doing in in pieces that Don't use Dna, but I think that's been hard. It's just showing students really good examples that Don't use Dna in the part, because

187

00:37:01.550 --> 00:37:20.290

David Williamson Shaffer: Dna was really designed as the tool to facilitate the kinds of arguments that you make in Qe. So people tend to gravitate towards it. Right? I think that's that's been a challenge, and I mean, I sue you guys got that question, too. I asked that part because, like Urania, I know your students actually asked me that question.

188

00:37:27.200 --> 00:37:36.370

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I got that question from start to finish, because you're right. I think there's good synergy between thinking like a quantitative photographer and

189

00:37:36.380 --> 00:38:05.010

Amanda Barany (she/hers): by epistemic deport analysis that doesn't necessarily mean that need to. But I also think so. I think that there's A. There's mostly overlap between Dna and Qe, but I think there's a small sliver of people who maybe use Dna, but Don't think like quantitative developers. And then maybe a small slimmer of people who are using quantitative ethnographic approaches that are not. I'm just going to tell you, but I think the majority of that is the overlap. Hence the confusion.

190

00:38:05.020 --> 00:38:34.330

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Um, and the most of the examples that I tried to find to to give to give people a sense of what it might look like to be a ah quantitative photographer that isn't using Dna, were things where it's like, you know. We started with the Dna, and a network academic network didn't find that it answered our question well, and moved to something else um like I forget what that was called. I did a project with Amanda, see Bernie, and stuff where we ended up all using a different kind of visualization. Um, but it's It's It's kind of cheating because we started with a Pacific networks that just and moved

191

00:38:34.340 --> 00:38:37.219

Amanda Barany (she/hers): a different technique. So I think.

192

00:38:38.090 --> 00:38:47.280

Amanda Barany (she/hers): Yeah, I think it's It's one of the tensions right like It's It's something still being negotiated by the community. And also, I think there's some some to be said about

193

00:38:47.290 --> 00:39:05.889

Amanda Barany (she/hers): what is an epistemic network, because we are doing a lot of different kinds of innovation in Dna, and we'll see that at the Conference there's tons of great works that we are going to be sharing about how they're expanding the application of epistemic networks. And so I think even that definition is shifting and being negotiated by our brilliant community as well.

194

00:39:05.900 --> 00:39:19.589

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I I think, mostly being open to that. The fact that it's it's not fully decided, and then inviting students to sort of celebrate that. We're all figuring it out right now, and we get to be a part of the community that's figuring it out. That was what was exciting for me, and I hope for that.

195

00:39:21.490 --> 00:39:39.389

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah, I mean, I want to hear what goal has to say about this, too. But I mean, i'll also add that like, I think this is going to be a particularly exciting conference. Um, you know, the first one was exciting just because it was the first that everybody was showing up, and nobody quite knew what to expect. And you know i'll be honest. I walked into a poster session, and

196

00:39:39.400 --> 00:39:59.080

David Williamson Shaffer: everybody was doing qe stuff I was like. Wow! That's pretty cool. There's a lot of people doing, too. Um! But you know, the next two last two conferences have been online,

and that's great in terms of ah showcasing work and talking about work. But there's something like getting together in person and having a chance to

197

00:39:59.090 --> 00:40:18.680

David Williamson Shaffer: kind of think about these issues together in ah, in a less formal way that I think will really advance the discussion in the community on these on these questions. So I think it's going to be a I think it's going to be a, I think, In-person conferences are always cool, if it you know, in a good community, but I think this one will be

198

00:40:18.690 --> 00:40:25.799

David Williamson Shaffer: particularly interesting to be at. Sorry Glad you mean to jump and jump on your ahead of you in the queue.

199

00:40:26.130 --> 00:40:55.400

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: No, that's great. I I that sentiment. I think it is going to be a really exciting Well, first of all, this will be a person, but it also Um, Things are changing like I've been looking at some of these Tv papers, and there are tools being developed that you know are soared of E and A, but some of them are not at all. Um, So that's really exciting, and I think we'll see a lot of those tools at the conference. So stay tuned that please register um. But but i'll say uh the way I approach it in my class is uh my link, so i'm lucky I was there from the beginning.

200

00:40:55.410 --> 00:41:07.529

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Um! So you know I I've been doing qe for a very long time. I helped, you know, design some of the Dna features, so I know the differences. So when I talk about Qe, I don't.

201

00:41:07.820 --> 00:41:21.709

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: I talk about it as a methodology as an approach, and e and A is just a tool that within the umbrella of that approach, and my language from the beginning of the class, I think, makes that pretty clear.

202

00:41:21.720 --> 00:41:34.739

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: So when I talk about Qe. I don't always talk about Dna. I talk about the higher-level ideas, and then, when we bring in Dna later, it's a tool for realizing some of those ideas.

203

00:41:37.080 --> 00:42:01.040

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Yeah, I'm really interested to to think a little bit more about how do we in A. Qe class incorporate different tools, and if that's realistic, it's already so difficult to incorporate the A coding tool and a visualization tool. So what happens if there are more options? You know. What does that look like for teaching? Qe: So that's kind of an unanswered wondering of mine. And the other thing is

204

00:42:01.310 --> 00:42:02.700

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Ah,

205

00:42:03.480 --> 00:42:10.339

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: I think one, this is a little bit off topic of teaching. But I think one thing is is

206

00:42:10.640 --> 00:42:15.590

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: I mean, how many of you is Qe. Your central line of research.

207

00:42:16.460 --> 00:42:44.769

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: I think probably the people where Qi is. Their central line is a research. But, like you're doing real methodological research there's very few of us a lot of us. It's complementary to another vine of research. Right? I mean. People in Madison probably is here made a lot of you this way in London research, and there may be a few here in there globally, but I think for most of us, me included right. It's It's a secondary or parallel line of research to something else that, anyway. And so a lot of times, you know, David and I will talk, and that's a great idea. Well, you should build that

208

00:42:44.780 --> 00:42:52.649

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: a new, you know, a new Qe tool, for example. I'm like, Oh, i'm gonna find the time to do that with my other ones or research. So

209

00:42:52.660 --> 00:43:10.149

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: it's. It's like something, maybe, that we desire. But but it Hasn't happened yet, and the community is new, and I think soon, with new scholars we will see people who will dedicate their main research flying to C. Me methodological research, and that we will see, I know, in the next few years.

210

00:43:11.310 --> 00:43:29.799

David Williamson Shaffer: I mean one thing just you know. One thing that we've been thinking a lot about is how to build an infrastructure that makes it possible makes it easier for people to incorporate new tools into the Qe universe. I mean, right now, there's just a lot of work like

211

00:43:29.880 --> 00:43:46.589

David Williamson Shaffer: taking data getting it coded, getting into E and A, or whatever it is you might use, and getting, you know, and getting something out. And there's just that's actually a lot of. There's a lot of steps that are involved in that that you know, when I teach

212

00:43:46.600 --> 00:44:06.590

David Williamson Shaffer: Qe, I don't even I mean in some ways I don't really teach that part. We just teach each step, and then the kind of moving between the steps. We help somebody with it. They are struggling, but otherwise we just sort of assume that they're going to do it. And I think that that's not really a very strong infrastructure for building new things. You want somebody to be able to

213

00:44:06.600 --> 00:44:14.719

David Williamson Shaffer: just focus on the one thing that they're building and not have to worry about. A lot of compatibility issues not have to worry about. You know

214

00:44:14.730 --> 00:44:33.329

David Williamson Shaffer: what formats it's going to take and sort of be able to sort of plug and play. Um, we have, we? We sort of demoed something like that last year we haven't really released it. But that I think that's going to be an important component to. Is it kind of technological infrastructure, you know. I mean.

215

00:44:33.550 --> 00:44:51.969

David Williamson Shaffer: Ah, the the tool that we built last year is called Qe studio, and I know some of you have seen sort of wireframes of it in description. But you know but the idea there is that, like you, take your coding and you plug it into your e and a model, and then you see the results and all the stuff on the back end gets handled.

216

00:44:51.980 --> 00:44:55.739

David Williamson Shaffer: I actually think that that might make it much easier to teach this stuff, too,

217

00:44:55.760 --> 00:45:00.060

David Williamson Shaffer: because it's like that. You're not just you.

218

00:45:00.080 --> 00:45:02.790

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah, it's, and it's sort of

219

00:45:03.540 --> 00:45:09.779

David Williamson Shaffer: in the same way that the the E and a webkit makes it easier to do e and A than just doing it in our

220

00:45:10.380 --> 00:45:19.739

David Williamson Shaffer: The same thing would be true if kind of the whole pipeline was also visualized and graphic, and you know all those other things.

221

00:45:19.760 --> 00:45:34.089

David Williamson Shaffer: So I think I think there's work that the community has to do in developing the infrastructure that lets the community expand, and that will also make it easier to teach with all these different things. Right? So we're kind of at this moment where there's just a lot of

222

00:45:35.980 --> 00:45:39.320

David Williamson Shaffer: there's been a lot of energy. And now kind of

223

00:45:39.420 --> 00:45:45.259

David Williamson Shaffer: actually helping that energy come together is A is a bit of a challenge.

224

00:45:45.900 --> 00:45:48.199

David Williamson Shaffer: At least that's what seems to me.

225

00:45:48.350 --> 00:45:53.850

Amanda Barany (she/hers): I think we just did. You have your hand up earlier? You had a question. We may have moved away from your but

226

00:46:00.780 --> 00:46:05.680

Aroutis Foster: but but I was a you know, back, I know, when David was saying that a lot of people were

227

00:46:05.730 --> 00:46:20.060

Aroutis Foster: to get the approach of doing the interpretive portion first for to go to the fun portion. It's our Tv. I kind of voted that that's pretty much the way we've done. It directs a lot of the time because a lot of students are not not strong quantitatively. So. They're more comfortable going that route.

228

00:46:20.070 --> 00:46:37.340

Aroutis Foster: But I also feel that the Dna is so integral to people, because that's where it started. And for everyone, you know, I guess you know to think of Qe. I mean, we're still in the the germination stage, and we think about it come through to other areas. So it's natural that people are going to center everything around E and A.

229

00:46:37.350 --> 00:46:41.009

Aroutis Foster: And as golf, said I, I read a lot, You know some of those um

230

00:46:41.660 --> 00:46:47.010

Aroutis Foster: the current on people's at lcc. E. Me. And there are some interesting.

231

00:46:47.020 --> 00:47:02.760

Aroutis Foster: The models and methods that people are applying are there? Which are, you know. I'm looking forward to just to see the presentation for some of them, and I think you know, as as the figure grows, you know, so would be the additional analyses methods that we can can can apply to but one hundred, and

232

00:47:03.020 --> 00:47:04.850

Aroutis Foster: but you and he's pretty good, David.

233

00:47:06.700 --> 00:47:09.490

David Williamson Shaffer: Well, I don't think I don't think the criticism was a Vietnamese.

234

00:47:11.290 --> 00:47:14.050

David Williamson Shaffer: Um. So, Brandon, I

235

00:47:14.350 --> 00:47:32.169

David Williamson Shaffer: I know you taught a course over this summer as part of. So we have this learning and an online learning analytics, financial program at the Uw. Um, and Ah, I know your course was sort of based on, based on my course, which is also based partly on Goals course, and in conversations with Amanda and all the rest. But

236

00:47:32.180 --> 00:47:43.199

David Williamson Shaffer: the thing that that was interesting about that is that those were all students who had both kind of been deliberately trained in qualitative and quantitative methodologies, and then they had even

237

00:47:43.210 --> 00:48:01.169

David Williamson Shaffer: and into a lot of the kind of machine learning and learning, analytics, tools, does the kinds of issues that we're talking about Did that group stumble in the same places, or were some of those made easier by their preparation? I'm. Just curious as to it's sort of a naturalistic experiment in some ways.

238

00:48:01.920 --> 00:48:23.969

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah. Ah, it's a great question. I I think that the um. The coding was still hard for everybody, right? So that was still there. Um, but the the I think that for for a lot of the students it they were set up to kind of understand the questions or challenges that Qe. Is trying to address. And so for them it was like a relief

239

00:48:23.980 --> 00:48:41.990

Brendan Eagan: in a lot of ways they're like. Oh, this makes so much sense. This is my favorite course that I've taken in this and that's outside of the normal reactions that I get with just Dna that has its own kind of ooh and on wow, factor, like the clicking moments that we were talking about where they see this like we've watched some of those videos that promotionally are there,

240

00:48:42.000 --> 00:48:44.629

Brendan Eagan: but I think that it definitely helped somewhat.

241

00:48:44.640 --> 00:49:11.479

Brendan Eagan: But one of the things that was kind of this is ah on the edge or the margin for some of the cases. But I did come across people who have been trained to be entrenched in a given camp

like they're taught in a qualitative approach, and they're told to not trust those quant folks, or like someone who is really like Ah, very quantitatively minded. And just doesn't think that there's a lot of substance to qualitative research. And so one of the things that was really interesting for me was

242

00:49:11.490 --> 00:49:22.610

Brendan Egan: as they had had more exposure, and they had language around kind of the other camp. Then to see how these things could be brought together, and that they weren't necessarily commensur. It was kind of fascinating. Those are like The most interesting reflections to me

243

00:49:22.620 --> 00:49:31.930

Brendan Egan: was to see how I used to think this. But now I was very skeptical of these approaches like literally, I would have done everything in the But now I can see how that could happen,

244

00:49:31.940 --> 00:49:43.650

Brendan Egan: and I think because they'd have those primers that really allowed for that of a different type of experience to happen, but they also liked a lot. Yes, and I also,

245

00:49:43.720 --> 00:50:03.689

Brendan Egan: Jamie said, it is okay to be wrong. That's how we learn and grow. The other thing i'll say, too. I'll just point out someone mentioned to me in chat, too, is we also had, like podcasts that were part of the thing that were very similar to how all the other instructors talked about having guests come in, and people loved that as well, because it kind of drew the curtain back a little bit on.

246

00:50:03.700 --> 00:50:22.690

Brendan Egan: Okay, I read this person's paper, or I see this other thing. But actually, can one hear from them as a human being, but also they can talk about the ugly process of the sausage making side of trying to do good research, and how challenging that could be in the decisions that people made. And that was, I think, probably one of the most popular things in the course.

247

00:50:23.220 --> 00:50:26.389

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah, those podcasts were fun.

248

00:50:26.470 --> 00:50:45.239

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah, I mean it was it was. It was fun to do. I I will see one of the So I was saying like a lot of my students are fun students. Um! And I think the reason is that a lot of those people want to do qualitative research. They know that there's There's more than just what they're doing quantitatively,

249

00:50:45.250 --> 00:50:48.730

David Williamson Shaffer: but they're in a field where nobody will respect it.

250

00:50:48.740 --> 00:51:18.049

David Williamson Shaffer: So, Jamie, you're sort of in a I mean, i'm not with the words. You're out right, but in medicine. Yeah, right? I mean, like you want something deeper, and you know that people aren't going to listen to it unless there's numbers associated with it. And so that's sort of that. That's I mean, there's some people, you know, in my own students column, and you know there's some people in education who are enjoy learning analytics more broadly, but that seems to be a lot of the folks that that come to my classes when i'm teaching it, which is just an interesting I mean, I guess maybe it's not so surprising, but

251

00:51:18.060 --> 00:51:25.899

David Williamson Shaffer: but I wasn't thinking that that was the way it was going to roll out when I you know, first started teaching the course.

252

00:51:26.570 --> 00:51:28.790

David Williamson Shaffer: Some people desperately want that t-test Yes,

253

00:51:28.800 --> 00:51:35.929

David Williamson Shaffer: anything they just they I mean, you know it. You're able to say Yes, I've I've

254

00:51:37.050 --> 00:51:46.049

David Williamson Shaffer: I've actually looked at everything, and you know I mean you get some weird stuff like there's some people who will say, but you did social moderation. But what was your Kappa?

255

00:51:47.560 --> 00:51:49.089

But

256

00:51:49.100 --> 00:52:00.450

David Williamson Shaffer: social moderation means We read everything, and we agree. So the cab was one, and they're like, but that's not really testing it. I'm like, what What do you want to test that? So there's all sorts of funny things that come around in that margins when you do it that way.

257

00:52:04.980 --> 00:52:28.750

David Williamson Shaffer: I think also I really liked what he said. Jamie possibly talk a cheek about it, it being okay to be wrong. But that was something I actually tried to celebrate with my students is like most of the reading reflections I had them do every week was, Tell me what you don't understand. Tell me what you think is incorrect. Tell me what questions you have, and Then I built our discussions, our lectures around those things, and I would actually post

258

00:52:28.790 --> 00:52:53.629

Amanda Barany (she/hers): anonymously their questions or critiques. And so then I think it helped, because everybody was, you know. At first it's a lot to take in. It's a lot in a course, and so

everybody's kind of like overwhelmed, and see that other people are asking these questions was really helpful to the group to sort of normalize the experience of you know what legitimate peripheral participation right? You are still a valid member of the Cv community. If you don't understand, every detail about

259

00:52:53.640 --> 00:53:09.350

Amanda Barany (she/hers): model comes together, or if you don't know exactly upfront, how you want to code your data or segment. It, like all of that, is part of engaging with your data. And sometimes that's iterative. And I think that was really important to to help them, because I think it. It helped them get more confident as the person.

260

00:53:13.360 --> 00:53:18.490

Golnaz Arastoopour Irgens: Well, Amanda, that's just good teaching.

261

00:53:21.770 --> 00:53:24.790

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah, I will say. And I know we should. We should close up, because, uh,

262

00:53:24.800 --> 00:53:35.550

David Williamson Shaffer: I want to say a few words at the end. But having having written, you know, having taught, then wrote a book where I was trying to put down all the things I was teaching.

263

00:53:36.580 --> 00:53:52.489

David Williamson Shaffer: I will say it's very humbling to discover that people can go read the book, and then they still need to be thought exactly the same about like There's something about actually doing it and and making the mistake and expressing your uncertainty, and then trying to work through that with other people that makes things stick,

264

00:53:52.500 --> 00:54:09.059

David Williamson Shaffer: no matter how well it i'm not saying the book is necessarily describing things as well. But even if it was describing things really well, I think that there's still there's still an importance in teaching and learning by doing stuff that you can't capture just by watching a video or or reading a book

265

00:54:11.020 --> 00:54:13.009

Amanda Barany (she/hers): that he said. My students left your book.

266

00:54:14.310 --> 00:54:15.189

David Williamson Shaffer: Thank you.

267

00:54:15.200 --> 00:54:44.299

David Williamson Shaffer: Yeah, I think people do enjoy it quite a bit. But qi is one of those approaches where it takes a lot of practice in questioning and working with others and thinking with

others. And so I think that's like Why, a lot of learners really enjoy and value. You know kind of what Amanda is describing what we're going on from there. Um, I I do want to make some announcements, and also let Amanda and more potentially make some announcements, as they have more official roles with the upcoming conference. Um, but so if you have more questions, so you want to kind of

268

00:54:44.310 --> 00:55:07.060

Brendan Eagan: to keep this conversation going. I know, I think sung, and maybe Ayano is is going to be teaching Corsayano. I think Osaki just taught what there's another one of our invited panelists uses the book and her courses in a totally different area. So there are going to be more people at the Conference That would be, I think, interested and willing to talk about Qe, obviously outside of the panel that we've had here today.

269

00:55:07.070 --> 00:55:19.540

Brendan Eagan: So thank you all for Ah joining us, and then I think i'll stop the recording now, because we don't need those announcements to stay on um in, you know, forever. So i'll go ahead and stop the recording, and then I will turn things over.