Episode 83: "Using Mixed Methods to Strengthen BI (Part 2)"

with Rhiannon Mosher, Human-Centred Design Researcher with the Behavioural Science Office within the Public Health Agency of Canada

In our second episode on mixed methods, Rhiannon Mosher explains how mixed methods are a crucial part of an anti-racist, Indigenized practice of behavioural science. She shares the value of deep learning about people and their context and remembering that results don't always generalize across contexts. Rhiannon also underscores the importance of involving people in research that impacts them and working together to bridge different ways of knowing and being.

Transcript:

KIRSTIN APPELT, HOST: Welcome to this edition of Calling DIBS. I'm your host, Kirstin Appelt, Research Director with UBC Decision Insights for Business and Society, or DIBS for short. Today, we're calling DIBS on part two of my conversation with Rhiannon Mosher.

Rhiannon is a human centered design researcher at the Public Health Agency of Canada. In part one of our conversation, Rhiannon introduced us to qualitative research methods and how combining qualitative and quantitative methods can strengthen individual BI projects. In part two of the conversation, we'll look at how mixing methods can improve the practice of BI more generally. Let's dive in.

All right. Bringing our different threads together, previously on the podcast we've talked about how behavioural science has traditionally been "WEIRD", which is Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich and Democratic. And that's both on the researcher side and on the participant side. In our most recent episode, we talked about a mixed methods approach, and we were focused there specifically on how a mixed methods approach can improve an individual BI project. But a mixed methods approach can also help us address the WEIRD critique of behavioural science. Can you unpack some of that for us?

MOSHER: Yeah. One of the reasons that we want to take a mixed methods approach and leverage qualitative methods and questions is really to help better understand context. And for me, I think this is where I see a real synergy between my training as a social anthropologist and the work of applied BI or BeSci because one of the basic foundations of BeSci is that context matters. Choice architecture matters, and the choices that we make are informed not just by, you know, the program or service that we're trying to improve, but also the broader context of that user, including culture, social positioning of the user in relation to that service and so on, and all of these little and big things that inform that decision making process, including those lived experiences, beliefs, motivations, drivers, and various forms of barriers.

So when we talk about BeSci as a WEIRD science, we're also talking about how there's a lot of those often unspoken cultural norms and values, ways of looking at and making sense of the world that are actually baked into the science that we do and the behavioural challenges that we identify. So in that sense, you know, one of the big challenges with BeSci, as a WEIRD science, is that on the one hand, behavioural scientists know that context matters for how people make and act on decisions, but, you know, potentially, on the other hand, is this kind of assumption that cognitive biases and levers hold across context because they've been thoroughly

tested, but often they've been tested in just one kind of context. So a Western context and even more narrowly in kind of academic research, which is often meant this lab setting, which is often meant with Psychology undergraduate students. So that's a very narrow population. So as an anthropologist, you know, my training highlights the ways that humans are the same, but also how our different cultural perspectives and our lived environments really affect how we interpret and experience the world around us.

So for me, I've always been interested in getting a better understanding of people's lives and their experiences and their perspectives. And when it comes to behavioural science, so we can better decide about whether the contextual factors are similar enough that we might be able to expect similar outcomes from the application of a particular solution in the field. So I think we're also seeing these kinds of challenges or provocations to WEIRD Science, WEIRD BeSci, come out of the work of some of the other friends of the podcast, and the Wiki, like Amaarah Martinus, who's, you know, a Senior Program Advisor at UNESCO and applies BeSci in South Africa and India. So you can, you know, hear about her in episode 77 or Stephanie Papik, who, you know, works with the Moose Hide Campaign as the Director for Public Service. And she's been interviewed in episodes 26 and 41, or Crystal Hall at the University of Washington, who gave the keynote for BIG Difference BC in 2022 and I think will be featured in a later episode.

But you know what robust qualitative research can provide is that deeper line of sight into what people say, what they do and what they say they do, and some of the tensions in that space. So really about understanding that context and qualitative research can help us understand, you know, people's perspectives, their feelings, their beliefs, their attitudes, their experiences, and what their environment looks like to them, as well as those motivations or barriers. So it can help us into those 'why' questions that we can't see in quantitative questions when we're asking things like how much, how often, how many. And often, you know, when we're looking to combine different qualitative methods, as you would in ethnographic research, formal interviews with participant observation that can also help us triangulate our data and build out those different perspectives and insights so that we're getting, you know, a deeper understanding of the context. And have a better understanding of whether or not the things that are tested in a WEIRD environment also apply in a non-Western environment.

And I guess, to give you an example, there's this podcast episode, I don't really listen to a lot of podcasts myself, actually, but on Inside the Nudge Unit, which is a podcast from Behavioural Insights Team, there's this episode from 2021 called You Can't Read Your Way Out of a Complex Policy Problem. And I really love this episode, and it gave this really powerful example of what qualitative research can bring to understanding the context and to understanding, you know, the WEIRDness of BeSci. So there's lots of great examples in that podcast. But the one I want to talk about starts at kind of the timestamp around 34 minutes, and in New Zealand where they were doing this project, complementing their big data with lived experience.

So they were looking at access to postnatal care services. And what they found in the big data was that Indigenous populations were accessing these services much less than non-Indigenous populations. So from the big data, it was suggested that, you know, a policy change is needed to reach that population. So they went and did interviews with key audience members to understand their lived experiences. And, you know, the thing I love about qualitative research, surprise, something that you didn't expect.

So what they found was with these Indigenous clients, they were saying things like, “Why would I want to go and talk to a service provider about my breastfeeding when I've got this massive network of aunties and relatives and cousins and siblings that I could be talking to. You know, those people are my support network”. So they weren't using the services, not because, you know, it was a problem of uptake, they weren't using them because the need was already being met by community relationships and had, you know, the behavioural science folks just focused on that big data, those quantitative insights, they would have set

something up for these women that was considered unneeded by the women in the community and the government, and the behavioural scientists would have missed the opportunity to better understand these support networks. And to me, having that insight, it raises a different kind of policy question. It raises the question of, “Okay, so these are the things that are being used by this community. How do we support that family and social network in a way that ensures that everyone's gaining from that experience? What other kinds of services could be developed that use those key community figures for young Indigenous mothers?”. So when you have that kind of qualitative perspective, you're being able to get insight into different kinds of questions. And the challenges that arise might be different than you anticipate from, you know, kind of the traditional ways of evaluating and looking at data that we have in BeSci.

APPELT: I love that example from BIT. Instead of solving a problem that wasn't there, qualitative research helped the team see opportunities to instead support an existing solution that's already there, or in some cases, to tackle other problems that are there instead of ones that aren't. You mentioned the importance of context. Something that works in one setting or with one population may work differently or not at all in another setting or population. An analogy that helps me think about this is actually gravity.

On Earth, gravity is fairly constant as a contextual factor, and we don't adjust our solutions due to gravity, though if we're thinking beyond Earth, a solution that works here may or may not work in a near-zero gravity environment like outer space, or a planet like Jupiter with more than double our gravity. Back on Earth, gravity doesn't meaningfully vary, but other contextual factors do, and so different solutions work in environments with different contextual factors or factors that vary in their levels, like the example you just raised with deeper, more interconnected kinship networks. That's my tangential aside. Going back to BI and BI jargon, in behavioural science, we talk about context effects is something that limit generalizability, i.e. the wide applicability of different solutions and theories across populations and settings. And broad generalizability is often a goal of behavioural science, finding solutions or theories that are robust across contexts. Can you talk about the relationship between generalizability and qualitative methods?

MOSHER: Yeah. So I think, you know, when we're talking about mixed methods and different methods that we're employing, there's always going to be trade offs, whether we're using quantitative or qualitative methods. And those strengths and limitations always have to be considered in relation to our research questions, the challenge that we're trying to address, the questions we want answered. So when we're doing qualitative research, you know the goal isn't generalizability. The goal is really to generate a deep, rich understanding of a targeted population. So not a broad, generalizable, representative population. That's one of the trade offs, right? That's a limitation that the findings will not be representative in the sense of being broadly generalizable in the same way that we would expect high quality survey results to be.

So if we have a representative sample of, say, the Canadian population. So this is something that people who are not as familiar with qualitative research often get tripped up on, and may lead them to think that qualitative insights are not valuable or not real data. They're just anecdotes because they're not generalizable. But that's a challenge, you know, for people like me who do and advocate for the application of robust qualitative methods, because we also have to do the education and the advocacy work for this kind of research in a way that quantitative researchers seldom have to do. And there's something that's really valuable about those deep qualitative insights that can spark things for us, but doesn't mean that we can just apply them wholesale, you know, across contexts.

So in the example that I just gave from that BIT podcast, the research was really specific to Indigenous mothers in New Zealand. So while those service providers could start to think about how, you know, the community network that these women are relying on might be able to be leveraged in different ways to meet that particular target population, it doesn't mean that what they learned applies to all service provision for

Maori, or that the same kinds of approaches would necessarily be appropriate in say, different contexts such as, you know, similar service provision questions in First Nations communities across Canada, who, you know, besides being very diverse, you know, they may share some cultural norms and values as Maori, but they're also going to face other kinds of context based barriers that might matter more for the uptake of similar services or not having the same kinds of community based services. So it doesn't mean that the community solutions they found among Maori women were able to be applied to address uptake among non-Indigenous women elsewhere in New Zealand either, right. So we have this very deep dive into what's working or what the context is in one area that can lead us to think about other questions and challenges, but can't just be applied, you know, the same brush across multiple different contexts or populations.

APPELT: Yeah, I think that's a really good point. And it also brings to mind, to me just the idea that it's a finding that's specific and it may not apply elsewhere, but it's still adding it to our kind of repertoire of ideas. So it gives us the opportunity to take it to other contexts and see if there is a fit. So we may decide it's not a fit, but at least now we know about it, and we know when it might be appropriate, when it might not be appropriate. And if we hadn't done that phase, not only would we not have been able to work with that population, but we also wouldn't have this new idea in our repertoire, our pool of ideas.

Going back a little bit, you mentioned the importance of context and started to talk about that, but I think that's such a key point here, the value proposition of a mixed methods approach is that it helps us understand context effects. And I think that's just like such a fundamental part of behavioural science, this idea of context effects. So I'm wondering if you can elaborate a bit more here.

MOSHER: Yeah, I think that this is really where, you know, the more qualitative and quantitative parts of BeSci can come together in this great synergy and understanding how context affects our everyday lives and experiences and therefore the decisions that we make and what motivates them. And, I mentioned this last time, but a really great example of this is the study from the Office of the Chief Human Resources Officer in the Government of Canada. So this project was focused on improving the self identification of federal public servants, since having data about different sociodemographic factors can inform policymaking to support things like equity, diversity and inclusion.

So that project, they took on a phased approach, moving between the human centered design qualitative phases and those, you know, quantitative, experimental phases. And they developed this really deep understanding of the current self ID system that they were planning to modernize. They also learned, you know, what were people looking for. They found that the terms in the outdated system were actually very outdated. They didn't resonate at all with them for how they would self-identify, as well as the finding that people might be uncomfortable sharing this kind of personal information with their employer. So wanting that clarity about what's it going to be used for? Is it going to be used in good faith?

So, you know, this is the interesting thing about the study. Well, one of the interesting things, there's a lot of interesting things about it, but the thing that really resonated with me is that when they eventually tested these different messages to employees to encourage uptake of that new self ID system, the standard BeSci wisdom about, you know, less is more kind of messaging, it didn't work. So, you know, usually we want to not overwhelm people with information. We want to make it easy for them to do the thing. But in this case, the more detailed message was found to be more effective. And it's because they had done this rich qualitative work beforehand, the researchers could go back to that rich data on the context for making this particular decision, and to see, you know, that those who were hesitant, they were really looking for those details to make that informed decision. So in the specific context, the standard BeSci wisdom really didn't apply. But being able to make sense of that by having the deep, qualitative insights from the human centered design sessions, allowed the researchers to better interpret those quantitative findings.

APPELT: Yeah, and I think this is going to be a place where I see a lot of the next wave of behavioural science work being done is understanding what the limits of any given tool or technique are. Which context do they work? Which context don't they work in? I think that's a really exciting and positive development. Another benefit of a mixed methods approach is that it can open the door to giving folks more of a direct role in the work, rather than treating them as passive participants. Can you talk about the importance of this idea, especially when we start to talk about BI in the Global South and underrepresented populations in the Global North?

MOSHER: Mhm. So a lot of BeSci research is done covertly. So not unethically, but often without the kind of timely, active, and informed consent that I'm used to seeing in qualitative research. And this is because, you know, a lot of BeSci research leverages existing touch points, like a process or a program that users, your clients have already opted into and uses that administrative data or other forms of data without people necessarily knowing that their behaviours or decisions are being evaluated like it's in the legislation, it's there, it's legal, but it's not top of mind, right?

So, for instance, when a project evaluates the effectiveness of a message by measuring open or click through rates in an email, or you know how many appointments are booked following a message or how many people take that preferred action after that small tweak, small change in the user journey or, you know, decision architecture. So these users may not know that they're participating in a BeSci informed quality improvement project or whatever just by virtue of participating in that existing program. So that's what I mean when I say that the research is somewhat covert, because they don't necessarily realize that their choices are being evaluated as quantitative data points in a research project, which means, you know, as you're saying, that they're more passive, they're more on the passive end of the research participants spectrum.

So on the other hand, you know, not all qualitative research falls on that highly active participant end of the spectrum either. Generally speaking, professional research ethics require that participants in qualitative research give their free, prior and informed consent to be included in research. So the data collected here might include things like conversations gathered through interviews or observational data, images, video, even the collection of material artifacts, objects as examples of material culture.

But even in cases where people are giving their consent to be included in qualitative research, how they and their experiences, their opinions, beliefs, motivations, and so on are positioned as data might mean that they aren't, you know, active participants in the research process. So in the sense participants might be considered as more sources of information rather than co-creators of research or, you know, co researchers. Um, so they're not necessarily being asked by researchers to inform those research questions, the methods, the analytical interpretations, the reporting, the other outcomes of that research. So in that case, and like in the case of more covert BeSci projects, drawing on, say, administrative data, we still have this kind of divide between the researcher as the active expert and the research participant as the more passive source of data.

And then we're looking at kind of the history of, that I'm familiar with, I guess, of qualitative research and participatory research. We start seeing, you know, in the 1970s, these new approaches falling under headings like participatory action research that were intended to kind of shake things up and recognize and help address the power imbalance that exist between researcher and researched in kind of, Western academic contexts, in other research contexts, like government research. We saw this kind of coming out of attention to working with more vulnerable populations, more marginalized populations. So, for instance, between researchers coming from the global North to research in the global South, or, say, settler researchers researching Indigenous peoples in Canada, but also for other vulnerable groups like, say, you know, long term

care home residents and staff as part of a BeSci project by, you know, the Government of Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada.

So what more participatory approaches bring is this idea that research participants should be treated as experts of their own experiences, and that the outcomes of research should be to the benefit of those particular participants. So participatory action research and other approaches that draw on many different threads. But, you know, notably coming from scholars in the global South or from within grassroots or ground up movements, those are the things that kind of contributed at the beginning, I think, to these community action aspects of more participatory research approaches. So the idea baked into these more participatory approaches is that the people we want to learn about can also play an important role in shaping our research from start to finish. So this is a research ethic that's different in that people are not just sources of information, but they're also potential partners in research.

And that kind of approach can help build trust and rapport, because of course, you know, in that sensibility, there's this orientation towards having that research directly support the lives and the communities of the research participants. And because there's, you know, an intention to be more of an exchange relationship rather than an extraction relationship in that research process when it comes to, you know, knowledge, information or data gathered, how it's analyzed, how it's interpreted, how it's reported. So this might mean bringing community members on board as members of the research team, or seeking their expert advice as members of an advisory group at each stage of the project. So we can do this, you know, in many different kinds or contexts of research.

And as I mentioned in the last podcast, the work that we're doing at BeSci with long term care and antimicrobial stewardship, we have worked really closely with an advisory group of frontline staff, frontline workers in these care contexts to help make sure that we're including those perspectives into how the research has been designed and implemented and ultimately reported.

APPELT: Absolutely. And I think even going beyond that, we have wonderful cases where the population actually reaches out because they have a problem that they're hoping to tackle. So they're leading even the research question from the beginning of we have this problem, there's this behaviour that we're trying to create within our group, or there's this resource that people aren't accessing. And so from the very beginning, being part of the drivers of the research question is kind of an ideal scenario when, when we're able to work in that space. And I guess starting to draw on this in other ways.

I think another idea that I like about a mixed methods approach, mixed methods meant broadly, is that it can lay the groundwork for recognizing, valuating, and utilizing methods coming from other populations and cultures, including Indigenous ways of knowing and being. How does that idea resonate with you?

MOSHER: Yeah, I think in general we have a lot to learn about non-Western approaches to research, data collection and governance, whether it's quantitative or qualitative. And I think that within the methods that might already be normative within Western social sciences, we also have the opportunity to work to make them more inclusive or to be conscious in our practice of not replicating those kind of oppressive research practices of the past.

So just to give you an example, maybe a little bit of an aside, but I've seen this kind of recently and, I'm pretty new to kind of service design work as a field, so kind of learning about things. But I've seen some service designers use a method that they call a Service Safari. So for instance, this is a method that's been described in the Behavioural Insights Team's explorer report, which is really quite a nice little methods report and useful.

But I take issue with the term Service Safari, because to me, Service Safari is essentially a lighter touch version of what anthropologists or sociologists and others would know as participant observation.

So participant observation, as I mentioned the last episode of Mixed Methods, it's this deep, intentional approach to hang out with your research participants. So you learn by doing, that's the participant part, and observing. And it's typically a slow method. You know, academically it's a slow method that ideally takes place over longer periods of time, months to years, where you're just immersed in the daily life in your field site. So in industry, in public service, and other non-academic settings, we're seeing researchers adopt this approach on a much shorter timeline. But it can still give us this really deep, valuable sensibility of the context that can help us triangulate what people say and what they do and what they say they do, which can often be different. And this can also be really useful in helping us to build out that thick description that helps us interpret other forms of data that we might be collecting.

So my issue is not with the method itself, which is a really valuable way to learn by doing and observing, but my issue is with the language of safari, which is maybe because of my anthropological training, but it really gives me this kind of ick because of how closely to me it ties with these colonial practices of observing and judging based on Eurocentric or ethnocentric lenses. So like, to me, the language of safari brings to mind exotic right, exotic animals, landscapes, peoples, but also for me, conscious of, you know, because of that, the colonial practices of things like human zoos, which made non-Western colonized peoples these explicit subjects of European and Western gazes and contributed to creating these powerful racial hierarchies that many of us are still working to address and dismantle in our lives as citizens and as social researchers.

So for anthropologists and other social researchers, we've worked hard, I think, as individuals and as members of our scholarly discipline, to address and reconcile, you know, these parts of our scientific past with contemporary approaches to research that respect our research participants. So for that reason, I'd really prefer we not call participant observation light a Service Safari, because I think that our language and our choices in research design do really matter.

APPELT: Absolutely, talking about behavioural science and the importance of how we talk and making things attractive and social, that's just a huge red flag. So I'll let you continue. But I just wanted to flag that.

MOSHER: Yeah. And just I guess to give another example, I had this opportunity recently to attend a really interesting session through my work, by the First Nations Information Governance Center on OCAP. So OCAP stands for ownership, control, access and possession, which are key principles for collecting, protecting, using and sharing First Nations data. So the OCAP principles, I think this is a really interesting, you know, counterpoint, and a way to think about how do we do our work in a way that respects, you know, non-Western and Indigenous and anti-racist principles?

So the OCAP principles were developed to help address the legacy of harm and distrust, of research in First Nations communities, so specific to First Nations. So our presenter was Carey Calder of Nakanagis Consulting as a member of the Bingwi Neyaashi Anishinaabek or Sand Point First Nation. So one of the things that Carey discussed was how so much research with First Nations and other Indigenous communities has taken on a deficit lens, and that's really due to, you know, the Western and colonial research methods, data and knowledge sharing and outcomes, so including policies.

So in addition to, you know, a historical over collection and ongoing over collection of First Nations data, there's also ethical considerations around how we actually, as government, as academics, how we collect and share that data without the consent or knowledge of the community or individuals. So the ethics around data ownership and possession of data for First Nations in Canada, it comes from quite a different perspective, a

collectivist perspective compared to Western cultural approaches that value, you know, really the much more individual level rather than community level. So if you look at our privacy laws, it's all about individuals rather than communities.

And so one of the things I learned from the sessions, for those of us who are operating from Western cultural perspectives, we might not even think about how data collection, how did use interpretation or dissemination that adheres to our ethical and privacy guidelines can still be harmful from a First Nations perspective. So, you know, OCAP is this tool or this framework that was created by First Nations to ensure that research is of use and beneficial to their communities through First Nations data sovereignty. So even taking a look at those principles, I think, can kind of give us a better sense of how to recognize, how to value, how to use non-Western perspectives in our work, which can also promote better outcomes for research, because we're respecting, for instance, First Nations perspectives and practices, which in turn, of course, can help us improve trust in research and BeSci in the communities or among populations that we want to support.

I have another thing that I wanted to talk about. It's another example of what can be gained by being open to including methods in a way and, you know, ways of knowing from non-Western and Indigenous communities. And I think that as a qualitative researcher, some of the skills that we develop can play a role in making those connections. So that research sensibility, again, of asking questions that make maybe more participatory approaches possible. So this past March, my office, the BeSciO, we had an all staff meeting in Ottawa. It was a really great opportunity to connect with each other in person and one of the training exercises that we did together was called the Kairos Blanket Exercise.

So if you're not familiar with it, the Kairos Blanket Exercise is this immersive, interactive educational exercise about the history and ongoing relationships between settlers and Indigenous Peoples in Canada. And it was launched in 1997. And it shares this history from an Indigenous perspective. And the goal, according to the website, is to build understanding about our shared history as Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Canada by walking through pre-contact, treaty making, colonization and resistance. And it was this really powerful exercise. And it's part of this program that's been running for over 25 years, which to me is saying a lot because to have something that has that much staying power, I think it speaks for itself.

So our facilitator was John Henry Commander. He was supported by Rochelle and Emile Bergeron. And so one of the things that struck me from the beginning of our session was that John Henry talks about, he described the exercise as being developed in partnership between Kairos and Indigenous peoples. So Kairos is this ecumenical program administered by the United Church of Canada. And they wanted to develop an educational program that teaches the history of Canada, including the history of colonization that many of us settlers and newcomers never really learned in school.

And the blanket exercise was in response to some of the recommendations out of the 1996 Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, which was launched in response to things like the Oka Crisis, the Meech Lake Accord, and as part of a response from the Government of Canada to status and rights issues that those events were raising. So the Royal Commission's report, it really broadly investigated the relationship between Indigenous peoples in Canada, specifically First Nations and the government of Canada and Canadian society as a whole.

And what I thought was so interesting about this blanket exercise is that, you know, rather than just going and developing their own training, Kairos decided to work in consultation with indigenous elders and representatives to create this new teaching tool. And because of that partnership and that listening and that asking, they were able to work together, drawing on Indigenous ways of teaching and knowing to create this unique educational tool. And John Henry, he also talked about how important oral traditions are in many

Indigenous cultures. And this kind of storytelling is really central to this exercise. And he also shared, you know, his own experiences and perspectives as an Indigenous man, throughout the training, which made it, I think, very impactful, and tangible as a way of learning about this living history. So rather than just reading about it or watching a video or otherwise kind of consuming this information more passively. So, I think this blanket exercise is a really interesting example of how recognizing and valuing and thoughtfully using methods from other populations and cultures can be done well and create this lasting impact.

So to bring that all back to a mixed methods research approach, and I think it also ties back to your early question about active versus passive participants, when we open and we make the decision to do true mixed methods, we bring the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research questions and perspectives together, right. So on the one hand we may have that BeSci project that's driving towards ultimately being able to evaluate whether a small change in the choice architecture had a statistically significant impact on people's decision making. But you know, how we get to our choice as researchers about what to change and why, so how we interpret and make sense of those changes, they might best be informed by qualitative methods. And then how we ask those qualitative questions and how we gather that qualitative data, how we decide on the questions that we even choose to ask, might best be informed by approaches led or advised on by our research participants, members of that target population themselves.

APPELT: Well, I feel like each of those points could be its own podcast episode. You brought up so many powerful ideas and just so much food for thought that could take days to unpack. So thank you for providing us, like, a teaser trailer into this idea and giving us a start where we can hopefully continue to dive into it more. But being conscious of time, I will wrap up here and ask what your message for our new BI practitioners in training is for this episode.

MOSHER: Yeah. So I think you alluded to this at the top of the episode, but I think that we're in this really interesting and exciting time when we're asking questions and we're thinking about not just how do we do behavioural science well, but how can we move our practice towards, you know, an anti-racist behavioural science and anti-colonial behavioural science? And what does that mean? So for me, uh, I think it's partly about having that awareness and that advocacy lens in my work, asking whose voices are missing, how can we include them? What's the best way to respect those voices in our work? And I know you have, you know, other guests on the podcast who do have much more expertise with anti-racist, and anti-colonial research methods and approaches than I do. It's not something I would actually claim to have expertise in, but I think that's okay.

So I think for new BI practitioners in training, part of practicing anti-racist and anti-colonial science, it's about acknowledging that you're still learning and unlearning. And part of that is recognizing, owning and learning from your missteps as you go. So I would say it's okay not to know, as long as you're making the effort to do better and to ask questions and to learn from those who are able to offer guidance. And so I think the new page on the UBC Behavioural Insights Wiki is a really great place to start.

APPELT: I certainly hope it's a useful resource for folks. I would totally echo what you just said. I think part of what I've learned on my own journey towards an anti-racist, Indigenized behavioural science practice is just how much I still have to learn. And one thing that's really resonated with me is that there's discomfort along the way. But that's okay. That means you're learning and trying to do the work. And we can each do our part. We may not be experts, but we can learn from each other's journeys. I know it's been helpful for me to learn from others along their learning journeys, and hopefully as allies, we can help lighten the load for those with lived experiences. So with that, I'll segue to the final question of our two part series. Last thoughts? Questions I should have asked?

MOSHER: Yeah. Just in general, thanks for this conversation. And I know, I know, it's cheesy, but there's this quote from Margaret Mead, who is a famous American anthropologist that kind of comes to mind here. And I'm sure your listeners will have heard it before, whether or not, you know, it's from Margaret Mead, famous anthropologist. It's actually I when I went into the office for the first time, I found it uncredited on one of those corporate teamwork posters where everybody has their hand in the middle, in this co-working space in the Public Health Agency of Canada office in Toronto. And it really made me laugh, but the quote is, "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." And I think that this is where we are right now with moving BeSci and other sciences in general, toward a more inclusive practice.

It's about, you know, being thoughtful and committed, but also sharing with the broader community and making it easier, you know, BeSci-ing it for others to learn about and adopt more inclusive scientific methods and research, you know, kind of questions and then, you know, sharing that social proof about how and why to practice BeSci in this way. So I'm looking forward to seeing the resources and the research publications on this new wiki page grow. I know it's just a starting place, and also to seeing how we can make these considerations part of mainstream BeSci thinking in Canada.

APPELT: Absolutely. I love that as an ending message and as a reminder of the call to share resources and ideas and edits to that wiki page, because it is just a starting place, and we do hope that it changes over time by having new ideas represented and edits to the way we've represented our ideas and new resources. So that's a really perfect message to end on. So thank you. As I think our listeners can tell, we probably could have chatted about this for days and had just ten episodes, but, I was so glad I had you on to the podcast for these two episodes. It's been such a pleasure to think about mixed methods with someone who brings such expertise and deep thought, and to be able to talk about how we hope to see the practice of behavioural science change and what we're doing on our journeys to be part of that change. So thank you, Rhiannon, and for joining us today.

MOSHER: Yeah. Thank you.

APPELT: And thanks to our listeners for joining another episode of Calling DIBS.