

Writing Publishable Qualitative Scientific Research

Ishwar Bagoji

Lecturer in Anatomy, BLDEU's Shri BM Patil Medical College, Vijayapur,
Karnataka, India.

Research is “a systematic process of investigation, the general purpose of which is to contribute to the body of knowledge that shapes and guides academic and/or practice disciplines” Qualitative scientific research is a way of looking at the world and a constellation of approaches used to generate knowledge about the human world [1]. Writing and publishing good research papers is essential not only advancing researcher’s scholar’s scientists and academic careers but above all for spreading widely research findings and advancing the state of empirical knowledge. In addition, publications are important measures to make huge strides in advancing essential knowledge, can save lives, and improve the life style and finally personally needed for promotion. Another reason is that most researchers become experts in a given research area, and they are recognized as such by their peers when they contribute actively to the literature, helping to advance the state of empirical knowledge [2]. Many scientifically trained researchers or investigators and scholars are unaware of qualitative methods and some even take gratification in their ignorance. It is easiest to start with some widely held misconceptions about qualitative research: it is not about the measurement of quality; done properly, it is no less scrupulous or objective than quantitative work; it is not an easy haven for innumerate scientists; and it is not simply research using samples that would be too small for statistical analyses [3].

We clearly need and can benefit enormously from the quantification of many aspects of the physical, social, and psychological worlds. Indeed, it is the undeniable importance of quantitative enquiry that makes the need for improvements in its conduct so crucial [4]. This can be achieved in three ways. Firstly, by the development of more sophisticated statistical methods for handling quantitative data. Secondly, by using quantitative methods in combination with qualitative methods. And thirdly, by acknowledging that some situations are inevitably beyond the scope of qualitative methods take an holistic perspective which preserves the complexities of human behavior [5]. Publishing the best possible research papers is also the main goal of journal editors, who value papers of interest to their readership that show originality, importance, clear research questions, correct methods and excellent style. When evaluating your research,

editors consider whether your paper, if published in their journal, is likely to be heavily cited, thus enhancing the standing and reputation of their journal. Editors and reviewers spend hours reading manuscripts and greatly appreciate receiving papers that are easy to read and edit [1]. They abominate long, wordy papers in a poor style with conclusions not justified by data, showing an inability to follow the ‘authors’ guidelines’ and containing careless, sloppy mistakes. Before you start writing, it is important that you should be aware of the main goals of your publication. Your research should answer the relevant questions of the involved field and should arouse interest in the readers [6]. Furthermore, the researcher should also know whether the research and findings of the work are publishable at the given point or not. If the answers are ticked off positively, then the researcher can start preparing the manuscript. A good research paper constitutes:

- ⇒Introduction (Context)
- ⇒Analytical framework and hypotheses
- ⇒Material & Methods (Research design)
- ⇒Results
- ⇒Discussion
- ⇒Conclusions of the paper

Introduction

In the Introduction, the authors should explain brief context and background; it should state the problem being investigated, its contextual background, and the reasons for conducting the research.

Material Method

The material method section is the most important section of any research paper because it determines the empirical validity of the study and should be specific, concrete, technical, statistical, and sufficient, detailed enough that readers can replicate your research, and assess whether the methods justify the conclusions. The methodology section typically following sub sections

1) Sampling

Description of target populations research context and unit of analysis,

Sampling,

Respondent profile.

2) Data Collection methods



eISSN: 2522-7165
pISSN: 2520-7342

Correspondence: Dr. Ishwar Bagoji, Lecturer in Anatomy,
BLDEU's Shri BM Patil Medical College, Vijayapur, Karnataka, India. Email: ishwarbagoji@gmail.com.

3) Measurements

Results

The results section is a critical part of the manuscript. The presentation of results is the outcome of the application of methods to primary or secondary research resources. Some basic rules can help to strengthen results in the best possible way:

Interpret results and their implications, instead of simply presenting them in detail.

Use primary data, which is more relevant than secondary data;

Use a combination of text and visual aids such as graphs, charts and figures and tables – these need to be well designed in order to make sure the reader understands the results more easily. Presenting the data in graphs has the advantage of clarity and impact, and it can bring out relationships between various parameters

Keep simple properly designed graphs

Do not repeat information presented in tables and figures in the text instead, analyse data in qualitative terms without being repetitive

Check that tables, graphs charts and figures are correctly labelled with numbers and titles and that they are cited in the previous paragraph; make sure that you indicate the source of your data; Write results in the past tense, in a logical sequence

Match the arrangement of data to the methodology and communicates much information as is relevant

Don't write unexpected results or results that do not satisfy the hypotheses

Statistical results like one way and two way ANNOVA

Discussion

The Discussion section is an important part of the research manuscript that allows the authors to showcase the study. It is used for a focused synthesis and interpretation of findings and presentation of relevant take-home messages that highlight the significance and implications of their research.

Some important point to improve discussion:

If your findings were unexpected and/or contradictory, you need to explain why you think that was. Did your sampling method contribute to it? Or your choice of methodology? At this point, make sure you have sufficiently justified your methodological decisions in the methodology part of your thesis. Unusual findings can be good, but they might also elicit more questions from the committee and other readers, so make sure you have all the answers.

- Start with the major findings in your work. Explain why such findings should have occurred and discuss other possible explanations

- It is then logical to compare with other similar works, explaining the possible reasons for the differences. This

will bring up the limitations of the study and suggestions for future work.

State the immediate clinical relevance of your findings clearly.

Conclusion

A conclusion is a short paragraph that discusses the overall results of an experimental procedure and explains whether the proposed hypothesis at the beginning of the experiment was correct or not.

Some important rules to follow strong conclusion:

Link conclusions with the introduction conclusions must have a direct relationship to the

objectives stated in the beginning of the paper and answer the research questions objectives and hypotheses;

No new facts should be introduced in the conclusions.

Compare conclusions to previous research and point out implications and contributions of paper to advancing knowledge in the field of research;

Avoid repetition of results presented in the previous section and any ambiguity or speculation;

Make conclusions solid, synthetic, brief, clear and convincing;

Explain study limitations and make recommendations for future research.

Nutshell to improve qualitative research

a) An article should be provided with a structured abstract (background, aims, sample, methods, and results).

b) The sampling should be well described and justified.

c) The theoretical background of the entire study should be described, to show that the sample and data collection were consistent with the study's theoretical background.

d) The context in which the study was carried out should be described. The authors must describe the characteristics of the field in which the study was carried out, and what made it different from other settings.

e) A detailed description of the research intervention should be included, and of how study participants responded during that intervention.

f) A detailed description of the analytical methods applied, how they were used, including the tools used for minimizing bias; and a validation of the results should be presented.

g) A description of the manner of data processing (e.g., technical aspects and procedures) is needed.

h) Description of outcomes and their interpretation are obviously necessary. This includes a discussion of limitations (contextual validity of results), and an analysis of how the design of the study reflects these limitations.

Effective scientific writing will create information exchange, to improve knowledge progress of a person. Scientific literatures such as

publications are among the most popular ways to update and intransitive one's knowledge in a particular area. More frequent use of qualitative methods will greatly enhance both aetiological and health services research. Failure to use them more has retarded the advance in medical knowledge and at times led to false trails being followed. This has partly arisen because of scepticism on the part of quantitative scientists about the objectivity and rigor of qualitative methods. While this view may be justified occasionally, it is not a valid reason for ignoring the potential use of qualitative methods.

References

1. Higgs, J., Trede, F., & Rothwell, R. (2007). Qualitative research interests and paradigms. In J. Higgs, A. Titchen, D. Horsfall, & H. Armstrong (Eds.), *Being critical and creative in qualitative research* (pp. 32–42). Sydney: Hampden Press.
2. Powers, B. A., & Knapp, T. R. (1995). *A dictionary of nursing theory and research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
3. Weems, M. (2002). *I speak from the wound that is my mouth*. New York: Peter Lang.
3. Kelly J, Sadeghieh T, Adeli K. Peer Review in Scientific Publications: Benefits, Critiques, & A Survival Guide. *EJIFCC*. 2014;25(3):227-43.
4. Stenius K., Mäkelä K., Miovsky M., Gabrhelik R. How to write publishable qualitative research. In: Babor T. F., Stenius K., Savva S., O'Reilly J., editors. *Publishing Addiction Science: A Guide for the Perplexed*, 2nd edn. Hockley, Essex: Multi Science Publishing Company Ltd, UK; 2008; 82–96.
5. Black N. Why we need qualitative research. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1994 48(5):425-6.
6. Dipendra Raj Pandeya. Practice of Good Scientific Writing. *MJSBH* 2108; 17 (1): 1-2.