| Erica: | Write yourself into the story. So you can also reflect as you're writing, right? So you can, you can write it, whatever, however way it comes natural to you. And in some ways this will be, cause I haven't really seen the way that either one of you write, other than, than your papers, your summary and analysis and based on your summary and analysis, you both write really differently, which is not a problem. I think actually your writing styles really compliment one another and we don't have to talk about the editing process yet, but, but I actually think that the three of our writing styles are going to be fine, but it would be good if both of you wrote separately the process. Don't necessarily look at what the other one's writing.In fact, I wouldn't even write it in the joint Google Doc. I would write it somewhere else. |
|---|---|
| Erin: | And then copy paste. |
| Erica: | Yeah. And then copy paste. |
| | Yeah.  So what did we do? What was our methods process? What did we start with? What did we look at? How do we code? You may want to look back at Saldana and talk about the In Vivo coding process and what that looked like for you. How was that different than previous coding that you did? Because you've done coding before. What was this process? How was this process different for you? And what did it teach you about qualitative coding? What did it teach you, Erin, about qualitative coding for the first time? Cause you hadn't done coding before. Wait, isn't that right? |
| Erin: | Yes. Yeah, this is my first time. |
| Erica: | So you can talk about the process in both a this is what we did way and also a reflective way because if we're going to storify the methods section, then it might be helpful for us to all write our own stories of the methods. Right. And the article itself. So, they have, they have a length requirement of 2000 words. I think they'd settle for 2,500, but that means that that doesn't include transcripts and stuff like that. And they might get a little flexible with us if we're doing a web text right. Where things are broken out. But if we're going to storify it, then we have to think about length. Yeah. |
| Abby: | That's what I was worried about. |
| Erica: | But I think more starting with more and then pairing down is easier than starting with less. And I can write my version of what we did. And I think what might be really interesting for |

them from a pedagogical perspective is what I was thinking about our process from a teacher perspective and from thinking about qualitative research practices and why I structured it that way.

And then hearing what you guys took from it and writing into our methods that we did our methods analysis separately. Right. You wrote it separately. I wrote it separately. Here's what we came up with. This is what Abby said, Erin said we did. This is why Erica said we did it. And if we come up with too much methods text, we can do a blog, right? Yeah. And there can be a whole separate blog about our methods that lives somewhere else. And then that blog is a public writing piece and then it's linked in here, right? So, you get around because really this is kind of a methods piece in general. And they may be more interested in hearing more about the methods then they are hearing about the stories because it is feminist.

Erin:                             Because it's a feminist.

Abby:                           And then it kind of ties in with like the purpose of an archive. Can it be a catalyst for change? Well, it got three women to come together to learn how to do feminist research in the hopes of in the future also doing more and learning more and then inspiring more people to learn about it. So that obviously is important.