

1 **TITLE: HOW DO FIELD EPIDEMIOLOGISTS LEARN? A PROTOCOL FOR A QUALITATIVE**

2 **INQUIRY INTO LEARNING IN FIELD EPIDEMIOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAMS**

3 **Author information:**

4 Corresponding author – Matthew Myers Griffith, MPH, matthew.griffith@anu.edu.au,
5 National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Australian National University,
6 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia.

7 Emma Field, PhD, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Australian
8 National University, Canberra ACT 2601 Australia.

9 Angela Song-en Huang, MD, Taiwan Centers for Disease Control, Taipei, 10050, Taiwan.

10 Tomoe Shimada, PhD, Center for Field Epidemic Intelligence, Research and Professional
11 Development, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo 102-0071, Japan.

12 Munkhzul Battsend, National Center for Communicable Diseases, Ministry of Health,
13 Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia.

14 Tambri Housen, PhD, School of Medicine and Public Health, College of Health, Medicine
15 and Wellbeing, University of Newcastle, Callaghan NSW 2308 Australia.

16 Barbara Pamphilon, PhD, Faculty of Education, University of Canberra, Bruce ACT 2617
17 Australia.

18 Martyn D. Kirk, PhD, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Australian
19 National University, Canberra ACT 2601 Australia.

20

21 **ABSTRACT**

22 **Introduction.** COVID-19 underscored the importance of field epidemiology training
23 programs (FETP) as countries struggled with overwhelming demands. Experts are calling for
24 more field epidemiologists with better training. Since 1951 FETP have been building public
25 health capacities across the globe, yet explorations of learning in these programs are
26 lacking. This qualitative study will 1) describe approaches to training field epidemiologists in
27 FETP; 2) describe strategies for learning field epidemiology among FETP trainees; and 3)

28 explain the principles and practices aligning training approaches with learning strategies in
29 FETP.

30 **Methods and analysis.** The research design, implementation, and interpretation are
31 collaborative efforts with FETP trainers. Data collection will include interviews with FETP
32 trainers and trainees and participant observations of FETP training and learning events in
33 four FETP in the Western Pacific Region. Data analysis will occur in three phases: I) we will
34 use the constant comparison method of Charmaz’s grounded theory during open coding to
35 identify and prioritise categories and properties in the data; II) during focused coding, we
36 will use constant comparison and Polkinghorne’s analysis of narratives, comparing stories of
37 prioritized categories, to fill out properties of those categories; III) we will use
38 Polkinghorne’s narrative analysis to construct narratives that reflect domains of interest,
39 identifying correspondence among Carr and Kemmis’s practices, understandings, and
40 situations to explain principles and processes of learning in FETP.

41 **Ethics and dissemination.** We have obtained the required ethics approvals to conduct this
42 research at The Australian National University (2021/771) and Taiwan’s Ministry of Health
43 and Welfare (112206). Data will not be available publicly, but anonymised findings will be
44 shared with FETP for collaborative interpretation. Ultimately, findings and interpretations
45 will appear in peer reviewed journals and conferences.

46 **Key words** (MeSH Headings): Epidemiology (D004813); Workforce (D000078329); Education
47 (D004493); Learning (D007858)

48 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

- 49 • This study will be co-designed, co-developed, and co-interpreted with practitioners
50 to generate relevant, useful, and informative findings for field epidemiology training
51 programs, practitioners, and learners.

- 52 • Use of multiple data collection methods and theoretical frameworks will improve the
53 credibility of the findings.
- 54 • Engagement of participants and programs throughout the process to check
55 interpretations and facilitate dialogue on findings will strengthen the
56 trustworthiness of the findings.
- 57 • The methodology aims to explore experiences in depth, and resources restrict the
58 number of programs and participants that may enrol. So, there will be limits to the
59 generalizability of the findings beyond the included programs.
- 60 • As grounded theory aims for hypothesis generation not hypothesis testing, the
61 findings will be limited to explanations of training and learning and thus not
62 interpretable as statements of the effectiveness of training approaches or programs.

67 INTRODUCTION

68 COVID-19 highlighted the importance of field epidemiology training programs
69 (FETP).(1-4) Nevertheless, many countries struggled to cope with the demands of the
70 pandemic. These struggles have been linked to insufficient numbers of, inadequate training
71 for, and low government regard for field epidemiologists.(5)

72 FETP “provide critically needed public health and global health security services
73 through a mentored, learn-by-doing approach that emphasizes fieldwork and improves the
74 effectiveness of the workforce and the systems required to provide those services”.(6)
75 Training includes 25% classroom and 75% field experiences (Figure 1). Core topics include
76 outbreak investigation, public health surveillance, epidemiologic methods, data
77 management and analysis, and public health communication.(6, 7)

78 FETP have been building capacity for over 70 years. In 1951, Alexander D. Langmuir
79 created the Epidemic Intelligence Service (EIS), aiming to develop epidemic expertise by
80 turning medical clinicians into field-savvy epidemiologists, transforming their focus from the
81 individual patient to the population.(8, 9) The first EIS class had twenty-two White male
82 physicians and one sanitary engineer.(10) In the 1970s and 1980s, countries began to copy
83 the EIS model.(11, 12) Today, 98 programs build public health workforce capacities in more
84 than 200 countries and territories.(13)

85 Despite FETP's importance, longevity, and spread, explanations of its learning
86 processes are lacking. One review of the FETP literature notes an impressive list of outputs
87 with few discussing how trainees apply new knowledge, skills, or attitudes.(14) Recent work
88 continues to document FETP outputs and contributions to public health.(1, 3, 4) Although
89 some publications utilize Kirkpatrick's (15) training evaluation levels to assess application of
90 learning, they do not explore the learning process.(16, 17) For instance, an evaluation of
91 multiple FETP focused on Kirkpatrick's levels 3 (behaviour) and 4 (results) found that most
92 graduates engaged in field epidemiology activities and perceived their FETP experience to
93 have helped them perform these roles. It did not assess program competencies or skills of
94 the graduates nor explicate the learning process.(18)

95 In contrast, articles describing learning processes in medicine and nursing
96 abound.(19-24) To take one example, Ohta and colleagues utilized grounded theory to
97 reveal learning processes in Japanese medical students' transitions to rural community
98 hospitals.(25) They found that integration of cognitive apprenticeship (26) and legitimate
99 peripheral participation in communities of practice (27) with learners' regular reflection on
100 performance facilitated their learning family medicine. For a second example in an
101 outbreak-like setting, Taber and colleagues illuminate learning processes of paramedics and

102 firefighters in Canada.(28) Their findings align with Lave and Wenger’s (27) learning
103 characterizations. Training sessions are only a beginning, while understanding comes in
104 practice where they learn from one another and adapt to fit their realities into the policies,
105 protocols, and structures to respond to emergencies. When they face novel situations,
106 paramedics and firefighters employ active, creative, and immediate learning that the
107 authors note merit further research. No such studies appear for learning in ‘field
108 epidemiology’ or ‘epidemiology’.

109 Considering the importance, diverse contexts in which it operates, and perceived
110 success at training public health professionals, FETP is fertile ground for learning research.
111 We propose a qualitative exploration of learning in FETP with the following objectives:

- 112 1. Describe approaches to training field epidemiologists in field epidemiology
113 training programs.
- 114 2. Describe strategies for learning field epidemiology among trainees in field
115 epidemiology training programs.
- 116 3. Explain the principles and practices that align training approaches with strategies
117 for learning in field epidemiology training programs.

118 We anticipate that understanding the FETP learning principles and practices will
119 inform how to upscale, adapt to context, balance standardization and adaptation, and
120 measure learning and how training approaches should evolve with the theories informing
121 adult learning today. Also, we hope that this protocol informs future research into FETP
122 learning across diverse geographical, wealth, and program contexts.

123 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

124 **Study design**

125 This qualitative, exploratory research will be designed, implemented, and
126 interpreted with end-users of the findings. The germ for research into FETP learning came
127 with the principal investigator (PI), but the design, including the questions and analytical
128 approach, and the interpretation of data will be collaborative efforts with FETP trainers of
129 participating programs who meet virtually each month, following the Critical Reference
130 Group approach of Wadsworth. Involving trainers in this collaborative approach is expected
131 to improve the study's relevance for the people who share the problem; focus research
132 questions; enhance study relevance for those whose jobs entail doing something about it;
133 increase the research design's effectiveness; improve the meaningfulness of the information
134 gathered; strengthen power and accuracy of the theory that the research generates;
135 improve relevance, creativity, and effectiveness of the actions that are based on the study;
136 and strengthen commitments for following up on actions and researching them further. (29)

137 We will use two methods for collecting data: participant observations of FETP
138 training and learning events and in-depth unstructured interviews with FETP trainers and
139 trainees. We will analyse the data in three phases, employing the constant comparison
140 method of grounded theory (30, 31) during the first two phases to generate categories and
141 properties inductively from the data. We will employ analysis of narratives and narrative
142 analysis (32) during the second two phases to construct narratives that reflect the domains
143 of interest. In the third phase, we will integrate the narratives to identify correspondence
144 and non-correspondence among practices, understandings, and situations (33) to explain
145 the principles and processes of learning in FETP.

146 **Reflexivity Statement**

147 The PI and co-researchers of this study are public health professionals who have
148 worked in governments, clinics, hospitals, universities, WHO, US CDC, and FETP. We were
149 born, raised, and educated in multiple countries, mostly in the Western Pacific Region. Most
150 of us are alumni of FETP. Our ages range from 30s to 50s, and most of us identify as female.
151 We are interested in learning processes and how to facilitate them with training approaches
152 to improve public health and health security, and we are interested in how differences in
153 cultural, educational, and professional backgrounds affect training and learning. Our
154 positionality influences our perspective and relationships to the research and participants.
155 Thus, we seek to co-design and co-interpret the study.

156 **Theoretical framework**

157 We will situate this research in the constructivist paradigm with grounded theory,
158 narrative inquiry, and critical action research. Grounded theory is a social research method
159 that aims to generate explanatory theory inductively from analysis of social research
160 data.(30) We will draw on the constructivist grounded theory methodology of Charmaz, who
161 argues that while quantitative research aims for statistical inferences, grounded theory aims
162 to fit theories emerging from the data with the data. It supplies evidence for emerging
163 hypotheses that quantitative research could pursue.(31)

164 Narrative inquiry focuses on narratives, which display human existence situated in
165 action.(32) It examines human lives and lived experiences as sources of legitimate
166 knowledge and understanding (34) and reveals our social nature, social structures, and how
167 humans make sense of the world(35). Here, we will employ Polkinghorne’s analysis of
168 narratives and narrative analysis.(32)

169 As public health practitioners, we believe research should inform action. We will
170 draw on the seminal work of Carr and Kemmis and of Wadsworth.(29, 33) Critical action
171 research aims for change: explanations and understandings are not ends but steps in the
172 process. Action research for learning relates practices, understandings, and situations to one
173 another to discover correspondence and non-correspondence.(33)

174 **Setting and participants**

175 Given the research resources available, we estimate that we can conduct 40
176 interviews and assume that fewer than eight interviews per program (2 trainers and 6
177 trainees of 3 per cohort) will not likely provide meaningful data. Thus, we aim to invite five
178 programs to participate. Although including multiple geographical regions could provide
179 useful insight, it will introduce more variability that will complicate interpretations. Working
180 across geographical regions will also increase the cost of the research. Additionally, we
181 consider that Basic and Frontline programs differ substantially from Intermediate and
182 Advanced because of the training content, duration, and target participants (see 36, 37),
183 and their inclusion will complicate interpretation. Thus, expecting that some invited
184 programs will not participate, the PI has invited seven Intermediate and Advanced programs
185 from the World Health Organization’s Western Pacific Region. These seven programs differ
186 in duration, cohort size, years in operation, host institution, recruitment strategy, entry
187 requirements, accreditation, and program design, as well as national language and health
188 systems. They have similar aims for developing field epidemiologists through field-based
189 service to contribute to national health security.

190 To participate, program directors will have to agree for trainers and trainees to enrol
191 in the study and for one trainer to serve as a co-researcher committing to monthly virtual
192 calls to discuss research aims, questions, direction, and interpretation of data. Among the

193 invited programs, six have agreed to take part. At the time of writing, four will participate:
194 Australia’s Master of Applied Epidemiology, Japan’s Field Epidemiology Training Program,
195 Mongolia’s Field Epidemiology Training Program, and Taiwan’s Field Epidemiology Training
196 Program. The other two programs expressed interest in joining the study but withdrew
197 because of administrative issues.

198 Participants will include trainees and trainers in the participating programs. For this
199 research, a ‘trainee’ will be anyone enrolled in a participating program during the study
200 period. A ‘trainer’ for this research will be anyone recognized by the program as one who
201 designs or delivers an activity intended to change the knowledge, skills, awareness,
202 attitudes, or behaviours of trainees. In FETP, many people are involved in such activities:
203 some are employed staff of the program with a responsibility to supervise or train; some are
204 public health professionals not employed by the program who provide short courses, advise
205 on projects, support field work, etc; and others lie between these extremes, such as
206 professionals not employed by a program who supervise field deployments and lecture
207 regularly. We will ask co-researchers to identify those most involved in training, mentoring,
208 or supervising current trainees as ‘core trainers’. We will not exclude participants based on
209 language.

210 We will conduct participant observations, during training and learning events in
211 participating programs. Training and learning events will be those activities that are
212 organized to intentionally change knowledge, skills, awareness, attitudes, or behaviours of
213 field epidemiology trainees. We will utilize those events organized as a routine part of the
214 program instead of requesting programs to organize events for observation. Examples
215 include courses, workshops, case studies, mentor and supervisor meetings, and group
216 projects. Because of the nature of participant observation, all trainers and trainees present

217 during the observation will be participants, including trainers who may not be defined as
218 ‘core trainers’, such as guest lecturers.

219 **Recruitment**

220 Our sampling strategy will follow grounded theory approaches outlined by Glaser
221 and Strauss and Charmaz.(31, 38) Glaser and Strauss promote ‘theoretical sampling’, a
222 procedure with concurrent collection, coding, and analysis of data so that analyses can
223 suggest further data to collect. They note that the researcher should select individuals and
224 groups based on their potential to generate properties of categories and help relate
225 categories to one another. For Charmaz, theoretical sampling means collecting more data
226 about specific actions, experiences, events, and issues to illuminate variation within a
227 category or process. Charmaz distinguishes initial sampling from theoretical sampling. For
228 initial sampling, Charmaz advises setting criteria and starting with relevant material for the
229 study. Theoretical sampling begins when preliminary categories have arisen and helps to
230 check, qualify, and elaborate the categories and the relations among them.(31)

231 Our initial sampling will focus on participant observations and in-depth interviews.
232 For participant observations, we will select one training and learning event per program in
233 collaboration with each program’s co-researcher and program director. As the goal of the
234 participant observation is to provide an initial view into the nature of the training-learning
235 environment, the criterion for selecting the event is that it is routine for that program. To
236 maximise resources, we will aim for events occurring over at least five consecutive days. The
237 program director and co-researcher will distribute participant information sheets that are
238 approved by the ethics review committee(s) and explain the participant observation to all
239 individuals who may be present during the event, discuss risks and benefits, answer
240 questions, and identify individuals who hesitate to participate. For these individuals, the

241 director and co-researcher will ascertain if the hesitancy represents a refusal for the event
242 to be observed or a refusal for data to be collected on that individual. In the case of the
243 former, the participant observation will not proceed. For the later, the participant
244 observation will proceed with no data being collected on that individual. Directors will then
245 sign an assent form for the observation to proceed, which covers all participants at the
246 event. All participants at the event will be advised that they may raise ethical concerns,
247 hesitations, questions, and requests to halt the observation at any time by approaching the
248 co-researcher, director, or PI.

249 For interviews, we will enrol a pool of trainers and trainees from which we can
250 conduct initial and theoretical sampling. For trainees, we will use diverse strategies because
251 the cohort size and cultures of participation in research varies across programs. For larger
252 programs (>15 trainees) with high expected participation rates (>50% as judged by the co-
253 researchers and PI), we will randomly select ten trainees to approach. For larger programs
254 with low expected participation rates (<50%), as well as smaller programs (\leq 15 trainees)
255 regardless of participation rates, we will approach all trainees. We will seek to enrol 'core
256 trainers', and as the number of them is smaller than ten in each program we will approach
257 all of them.

258 Co-researchers from the respective programs will send an email invitation to all
259 selected individuals using the national language and include as attachments the participant
260 information sheet and informed consent form approved by the ethics review committee(s).
261 The invitation and information sheet will clarify that participation is voluntary and that no
262 one from the respective programs knows if they have chosen to participate. The invitation
263 will include a link to an enrolment website where the individual can enrol or decline to
264 participate. For those choosing to enrol, the website will ask the participant to confirm

265 having read the informed consent document and confirm agreement to participate with an
266 electronic signature. When participants confirm agreement to participate, the website will
267 request demographic information to facilitate initial sampling: year of birth, gender,
268 program, language, role (trainer or trainee) and for trainers their number of years training.
269 The registered responses will be available to the PI, not to the co-researchers. Because co-
270 researchers will not know the responses of the invited individuals, they will send two follow-
271 up emails at one-week intervals to all invited individuals in their programs. The follow-up
272 email will say that the co-researcher does not know who has decided to enrol and thus is
273 reminding all who have been invited. The pool of potential participants will comprise all
274 those who indicate through the website that they agree to participate.

275 For initial sampling, we will aim to enrol from the pool three trainers and three
276 trainees per cohort (e.g., six for Advanced programs) for each program. We believe three is
277 a minimum initial sample to guide theoretical sampling. If two participants have opposing
278 perspectives, a third perspective would suggest sampling towards one or the other. We will
279 also aim to include one male, one female, one 35 or older, and one younger than 35 for
280 both trainers and trainees from each program. Trained bi-lingual interviewers not
281 associated with the programs will contact these individuals by email to arrange the first
282 interviews. Interviews will begin with a review of informed consent, confirmation to video
283 or audio record, and clarification that the participant can skip any question, halt the
284 interview, and decide at any point until the data are prepared for publication to remove the
285 interview from the study.

286 As we analyse data from the initial sample, categories and properties emerging from
287 the data will suggest further sampling from the same participants (i.e., follow-up interviews)
288 or from others who agreed to participate until we reach theoretical saturation. Charmaz

289 describes theoretical saturation as the saturation of theoretical categories with data, when
290 relationships among categories and variation within and between them have been defined,
291 checked, and explained.(31) If necessary, we will invite trainers or trainees beyond the initial
292 pool.

293 **Data collection**

294 Data collection will employ two methods: participant observation and in-depth
295 interviews. DeWalt and DeWalt describe participant observation as a data collection
296 method that occurs in a naturalistic setting involving observation and/or participation in the
297 activities of the people under study. As a method, it utilizes explicit recording and analysing
298 of information gathered from participating and from observing. This method can provide
299 context for sampling, interviewing, and construction of interview guides and is rarely the
300 only technique for a study.(39) Patton summarises the advantages of the method: facilitates
301 better understanding and capturing of context within which interactions occur; allows the
302 researcher to be open, discovery-oriented, and inductive; and provides opportunities to see
303 what escapes the awareness of the people in the setting and to learn about things that
304 individuals may not disclose in interviews.(35)

305 For participant observations, the co-researcher of the respective program will
306 introduce the PI at the beginning of the selected event, clarify procedures, and answer
307 questions. The co-researcher will note that as an experienced field epidemiologist and
308 trainer, the PI is available to support the event as much as possible. For example, trainers
309 and trainees may ask the PI questions and solicit help where relevant. This approach aligns
310 with the *participant* aspect of participant observation and reduces the discomfort of being
311 observed by an outsider. The PI will participate in and observe participants' interactions,
312 discussions, and behaviours, as well as the setting. The PI will engage in casual conversations

313 with participants letting them lead conversations to avoid tending towards interviews.

314 Where the PI does not speak the language, a bi-lingual member of the program will
315 interpret. The PI will record notes and convert them into field notes at the conclusion of
316 each day. Words and behaviours will not be attributed to individual participants but to ‘a
317 trainee’ or ‘a trainer.’ Field notes with the researcher’s ruminations on them will comprise
318 the data of participant observations.

319 We will use in-depth interviews because, as Patton observes, they allow researchers
320 to enter the perspective of research participants, understand what we have observed, and
321 gather feelings, thoughts, intentions, and meaning.(35) Though we do not believe the topic
322 is sensitive, participants in many FETP are government employees. They may hesitate to
323 disclose opinions in participant observations or focus groups but feel comfortable doing so
324 in confidential interviews.

325 We will conduct in-depth, unstructured interviews with trainees and trainers to
326 explore experiences with training and learning in FETP. Interviews will last one to two hours
327 and be conducted online. Participants can choose the time and place for the interviews
328 according to their comfort and the rules of their workplace. For trainees, we will explore
329 their experiences with training and learning. Training experiences have been defined above.
330 Learning experiences will be those in which the trainee sought or perceived a change in
331 knowledge, skills, attitudes, awareness, or behaviours for field epidemiology. Topics on the
332 trainee initial interview guide include motivation to learn field epidemiology; daily life/world
333 in the program; learning or conducting outbreak investigations, surveillance, public health
334 communication, and epidemiologic methods; participating in courses or classes; mentoring
335 and supervising; most difficult/important thing to learn in FETP; process for getting through
336 struggles or challenges; perceived changes in self throughout FETP; how gender, age,

337 culture, or background made the experience easier/more difficult; and how FETP fits with
338 the trainee's vision. For trainers, we will explore their experiences with training in these
339 programs using similar topics on the trainer initial interview guide but relevant to training,
340 e.g., motivation to train field epidemiologist.

341 We will train bi-lingual qualitative interviewers to conduct interviews in English,
342 Japanese, Mongolian, or Mandarin Chinese, transcribe them, and translate them into
343 English. Following the work of Polkinghorne(40) and McCance (41), we will train
344 interviewers to use the guide to elicit trainees' narratives of their experiences, emphasizing
345 depth over breadth; to develop rapport with casual conversation; and to use broad
346 questions based on the topics. For example, *tell me about the last outbreak investigation*
347 *you participated in*. We will train them to avoid interrupting responses and to probe to
348 facilitate relating stories.

349 Interviewers will transcribe the interviews. Interviewees will then have 30 days to
350 review the transcripts to add comments, indicate where the meaning has been
351 misunderstood, and request removal or alteration of sections that they feel are difficult to
352 de-identify. This step will ensure participants do not perceive unnecessary risk to their
353 program nor their career. Interviewers will then translate the interviews and include
354 perceived changes in verbal and non-verbal communication, such as laughter and speeding
355 up speech, to aid analyses.

356 We will digitise all data and upload them to secure password-protected folders.
357 Once the PI has reviewed interview transcripts and the interviewer has clarified doubts and
358 questions, we will destroy the original recordings.

359 **Data analysis**

360 We will analyse the interview and participant observation data in three phases. For
361 phase one, the PI will begin with open coding of data using the line-by-line comparison
362 method (31) with NVivo 12 Pro (42). The PI will present the coding book and de-identified
363 excerpts of the data to the co-researchers, who will then discuss interpretations as
364 compared with those of the PI to focus analyses and inform phase two: focused coding. In
365 focused coding, we will use constant comparison for larger sections of data and introduce
366 analysis of narratives (32). Following Charmaz, we will retain multiple major codes while
367 remaining open to modifying focused codes and moving between open and focused coding
368 because the process is not linear.(31) We will employ Polkinghorne’s analysis of narratives,
369 identifying stories about focused codes and using paradigmatic analysis to generate themes
370 or classifications [categories and properties in grounded theory] across the stories.(32) The
371 unit of analysis is thus the story in phase two, which Polkinghorne defines sustained and
372 emplotted accounts having a beginning, middle, and end, plots being the conceptual
373 schemes that display contextual meaning and draw events and actions together into an
374 organized whole. During the third phase, we will employ Polkinghorne’s narrative
375 analysis.(32) We will use the stories in the data and elements from data not in storied form
376 to develop narratives that reflect the domains of interest to the researchers. We will
377 integrate these narratives to reveal correspondence/non-correspondence of practices,
378 understandings, and situations(33) for training and learning in FETP. We will arrange to
379 dialogue with participating programs’ trainers and trainees including those not involved in
380 interviews and with the wider FETP community to interpret correspondence and non-
381 correspondence and explain training and learning.

382 **Trustworthiness and Credibility**

383 We will implement the following procedures suggested by Patton to improve
384 trustworthiness and credibility: 1) conduct in-depth qualitative field work guided by
385 established methods and theoretical frameworks, integrating and triangulating diverse
386 sources of qualitative data; 2) use constant comparative analyses; 3) involve multiple
387 investigators to triangulate analyses; and 4) seek alternative explanations, divergent
388 patterns, rival explanations, and negative cases in the data to avoid biases shaping the
389 findings.(35) Also, following Wadsworth, the co-design, co-implementation, and co-
390 interpretation of the research with practitioners in FETP should improve the study's
391 relevance, focus research questions, increase design effectiveness, improve meaningfulness
392 of the data, strengthen power and accuracy of the generated theory, and improve the
393 relevance and effectiveness of recommendations.(29)

394 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

395 We have obtained approval from The Australian National University Human
396 Research Ethics Committee to conduct this research (2021/771), unconditional approval
397 from ANU Institutional Research, which oversees research on ANU students, and approval
398 from the Institutional Review Board of Centers for Disease Control, Ministry of Health and
399 Welfare, Taiwan (112206). No additional approvals are required.

400 We will publish findings in professional journals and conferences. A website with
401 links to disseminated findings will be available to the public and to participants.

402 **Patient and Public Involvement Statement**

403 As described in this, we have involved end-users as collaborative researchers in the
404 design, implementation, and interpretation of the research and will engage program

405 directors, trainers, and trainees including research participants to share and interpret
406 findings.

407 **Data availability Statement**

408 Data will not be publicly available because of privacy concerns.

409 **FULL REFERENCES**

- 410 1. Parry AE, Law C, Pourmarzi D, Vogt F, Field E, Colquhoun S. Contribution of the Australian
411 field epidemiology training workforce to the COVID-19 response, 2020. *Western Pacific surveillance
412 and response journal*. 2022;13(4):1-100.
- 413 2. Singh SK, Dikid T, Dhuria M, Bahl A, Chandra R, Vaisakh TP, et al. India Field Epidemiology
414 Training Program Response to COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020-2021. *Emerging infectious diseases*.
415 2022;28(13):S138-S44.
- 416 3. Cui A, Hamdani S, Woldetsadik MA, Clerville JW, Hu A, Abedi AA, et al. The Field
417 Epidemiology Training Program's Contribution to Essential Public Health Functions in Seven National
418 Public Health Institutes. *Int J Public Health*. 2023;68:1606191.
- 419 4. Hu AE, Fontaine R, Turcios-Ruiz R, Abedi AA, Williams S, Hilmers A, et al. Field epidemiology
420 training programs contribute to COVID-19 preparedness and response globally. *BMC Public Health*.
421 2022;22(1):63.
- 422 5. Griffith MM, Parry AE, Housen T, Stewart T, Kirk MD. COVID-19 and investment in applied
423 epidemiology. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2022;100(7):415-a.
- 424 6. TEPHINET. About FETPs: TEPHINET; 2023 [Available from:
425 <https://www.tephinet.org/about/about-fetps>.
- 426 7. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Field Epidemiology Training Program (FETP)
427 2021 [updated 17 December 2021. Available from:
428 <https://www.cdc.gov/globalhealth/healthprotection/fetp/index.htm>.
- 429 8. Schaffner W, LaForce FM. Training field epidemiologists: Alexander D. Langmuir and the
430 epidemic intelligence service. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1996;144(8 Suppl):S16-22.
- 431 9. Langmuir AD. The Epidemic Intelligence Service of the Center for Disease Control. *Public
432 Health Rep*. 1980;95(5):470-7.
- 433 10. Etheridge EW. *Sentinel for Health: A history of the Centers for Disease Control*. Berkeley, CA:
434 University of California Press; 1992.
- 435 11. Foege WH. Alexander D. Langmuir--his impact on public health. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1996;144(8
436 Suppl):S11-5.
- 437 12. Malison MD, Dayrit MM, Limpakarnjanarat K. The field epidemiology training programmes.
438 *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 1989;18(4):995-6.
- 439 13. TEPHINET. Training Programs 2023 [updated May 2022. Available from:
440 <https://www.tephinet.org/training-programs>.
- 441 14. Flint J. Evaluating the Impact of Field Epidemiology Training Programmes 2022 [Available
442 from:
443 <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5fb4723e225bcb20d28f0f76/t/609669cef4ebbb6e85bb50c0/1620470225427/Evaluating+the+Impact+of+Field+Epidemiology+Training+Programs.pdf>.
- 444 15. Kirkpatrick DL, Kirkpatrick JD. *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels* 3rd ed. San
445 Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc. ; 2006.
- 446 16. Abduljalil M, Al Kohlani A, Jumaan A, Al Serouri A. Yemen Advanced Field Epidemiology
447 Training Program: An Impact Evaluation, 2021. *Epidemiologia (Basel)*. 2023;4(3):235-46.
- 448

- 449 17. Dey P, Brown J, Sandars J, Young Y, Ruggles R, Bracebridge S. The United Kingdom Field
450 Epidemiology Training Programme: meeting programme objectives. *Eurosurveillance*. 2019;24(36).
- 451 18. Al Nsour M, Khader Y, Bashier H, Alsoukhni M. Evaluation of Advanced Field Epidemiology
452 Training Programs in the Eastern Mediterranean Region: A Multi-Country Study. *Frontiers in Public*
453 *Health*. 2021;9.
- 454 19. Cho KK, Marjadi B, Langendyk V, Hu W. The self-regulated learning of medical students in
455 the clinical environment - a scoping review. *BMC Med Educ*. 2017;17(1):112.
- 456 20. Wiese A, Bennett D. Orientation of medical trainees to a new clinical environment (the
457 ready-steady-go model): a constructivist grounded theory study. *BMC Med Educ*. 2022;22(1):37.
- 458 21. Kozato A, Shikino K, Matsuyama Y, Hayashi M, Kondo S, Uchida S, et al. A qualitative study
459 examining the critical differences in the experience of and response to formative feedback by
460 undergraduate medical students in Japan and the UK. *BMC Med Educ*. 2023;23(1):408.
- 461 22. Najafi Kalyani M, Jamshidi N, Molazem Z, Torabizadeh C, Sharif F. How do nursing students
462 experience the clinical learning environment and respond to their experiences? A qualitative study.
463 *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(7):e028052.
- 464 23. Lee JJ, Yang SC. Professional socialisation of nursing students in a collectivist culture: a
465 qualitative study. *BMC Med Educ*. 2019;19(1):254.
- 466 24. Jantzen D. Refining nursing practice through workplace learning: A grounded theory. *J Clin*
467 *Nurs*. 2019;28(13-14):2565-76.
- 468 25. Ohta R, Ryu Y, Katsube T, Otani J, Moriwaki Y. Strengths and Challenges for Medical Students
469 and Residents in Rural Japan. *Fam Med*. 2021;53(1):32-8.
- 470 26. Collins A, Brown JS, Holum A. Cognitive apprenticeship: Making thinking visible. *American*
471 *educator*. 1991;15(3):6-11.
- 472 27. Lave J, Wenger E. *Situated learning : legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge England ;
473 New York: Cambridge University Press; 1991. 138 p. p.
- 474 28. Taber N, Plumb D, Jolemore S. "Grey" areas and "organized chaos" in emergency response.
475 *Journal of Workplace Learning*. 2008;20(4):272-85.
- 476 29. Wadsworth Y. What is Participatory Action Research? *Action research international*.
477 1998:Paper 2.
- 478 30. Glaser BG, Strauss AL. *The discovery of grounded theory; strategies for qualitative research*.
479 Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.; 1967.
- 480 31. Charmaz K. *Constructing grounded theory*. 2nd Edition. ed. London: SAGE; 2014.
- 481 32. Polkinghorne DE. Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *International journal of*
482 *qualitative studies in education*. 1995;8(1):5-23.
- 483 33. Carr W, Kemmis S. *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research*. London:
484 The Falmer Press; 1986.
- 485 34. Clandinin DJ. *Engaging in narrative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press, Inc;
486 2013.
- 487 35. Patton MQ. *Qualitative research & evaluation methods : integrating theory and practice*.
488 Fourth edition. ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.; 2015. xxi, 806 pages p.
- 489 36. Andre AM, Lopez A, Perkins S, Lambert S, Chace L, Noudeke N, et al. Frontline Field
490 Epidemiology Training Programs as a Strategy to Improve Disease Surveillance and Response. *Emerg*
491 *Infect Dis*. 2017;23(13).
- 492 37. Traicoff DA, Suarez-Rangel G, Espinosa-Wilkins Y, Lopez A, Diaz A, Caceres V. Strong and
493 Flexible: Developing a Three-Tiered Curriculum for the Regional Central America Field Epidemiology
494 Training Program. *Pedagogy in Health Promotion*. 2015;1(2):74-82.
- 495 38. Glaser BG, Strauss AL. *The discovery of grounded theory; strategies for qualitative research*.
496 Chicago,: Aldine Pub. Co.; 1967. x, 271 p. p.
- 497 39. DeWalt KM, DeWalt BR. *Participant Observation : A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Blue Ridge
498 Summit, UNITED STATES: AltaMira Press; 2010.

- 499 40. Polkinghorne D. Narrative knowing and the human sciences. Albany: State University of New
500 York Press; 1988.
- 501 41. McCance TV, McKenna HP, Boore JRP. Exploring caring using narrative methodology: an
502 analysis of the approach. *Journal of advanced nursing*. 2001;33(3):350-6.
- 503 42. Lumivero. NVivo 12 Pro Windows. 12.6.1 ed2017.
504

505 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

506 MMG developed the study concept and approach collaboratively with all co-authors,

507 drafted the manuscript, and revised the manuscript.

508 EF developed the study concept and approach collaboratively with all co-authors and

509 revised the manuscript.

510 ASH developed the study concept and approach collaboratively with all co-authors and

511 reviewed the manuscript.

512 TS developed the study concept and approach collaboratively with all co-authors and

513 revised the manuscript.

514 MB developed the study concept and approach collaboratively with all co-authors and

515 reviewed the manuscript.

516 TH developed the study concept and approach collaboratively with all co-authors and

517 revised the manuscript.

518 BP developed the study concept and approach collaboratively with all co-authors and

519 revised the manuscript.

520 MDK developed the study concept and approach collaboratively with all co-authors and

521 revised the manuscript.

522 **FUNDING STATEMENT**

523 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,

524 commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

525 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT**

526 The authors declare no competing interests.

527

528




Figure 1. Example FETP designs. (Top) a 2-year “Advanced” program with intensive introductory course like the programs in Japan and Taiwan; (middle) a 2-year “Advanced” program with module-based instruction like Australia’s program; (bottom) a 1-year “Intermediate” program with intensive introductory course like the program in Mongolia.