

**Qualitative Research Data Management and Analysis Workshop**

**Health Research and Social Development Forum (HERD) and University of Edinburgh**

**29<sup>th</sup> December, 2013- 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2014**

**Godavari Village resort**

**Day 1: 29 December, 2013**

**Notes by Rekha Khatri (RK):**

**Welcome and Introductions** by Dr. Sushil Chandra Baral, HERD

**Dr. Jeevan R Sharma introducing the workshop;** what it would be, learning outcomes, methodology (ppt)

Participant Introductions done in pair

Participants asked to write their expectations:

**Expectations from the workshop participants:**

- Learning methods from other participants
- To learn systematic way of data analysis
- Understanding hands on experience
- Learn more in-depth qualitative research methods
- Know whether the data that's been collected after the interview is good or not
- Coding
- Effective analysis
- Management of collected data
- How to do analysis of collected data: what methods to use
- New techniques of qualitative research/ experiences of other participants
- Wants to verify what has been done
- Revisit the process
- Learn everything about qualitative research
- Enhance skills and nuances of qualitative research analysis
- Systematically doing thematic analysis and using it for his Ph D
- Revisiting already done analysis of the project
- Systematic coding and writing
- Different ways of analysis; computer assisted analysis
- Wants to know about research projects done by the participants and how they analyse
- How to reflect analysis in report

### **Dr. Ian Harper reflecting on the previous workshop: locating this workshop**

This is a mid point research workshop to revisit our questions, design and methods.

Translating research into practice and policy uptake: working with policy makers, aspect of this is operational research

Applying medical anthropological ideas; comparative research (South Africa, India and Papua new guinea)

Expand network of qualitative researchers

### **Ian asked the participants what we did in the first workshop**

RK: learnt and practiced different methods; differences in the nature of questions that qualitative and quantitative research can answer; characteristics of good researcher; researcher as tool of data collection.....

KD (Kapil): This is an ongoing process; qualitative research is spiral in nature; iterative nature of qualitative research; constantly revisiting the process

VP (Vikas): Detailed introduction on qualitative research and methods; learnt about Participant observation and its importance; started using it in my Ph D

IH talked about what participant observation is; spend time with them doing what they do

JS gave an example of different methods to understand one question; what FCHVS do?

Fieldnotes were helpful. Field notes is written product of participating and observing.

Kishore: How to choose a research topic? Fundable?

SCB (Sushil C Baral): links between research topic, context and researcher missing

Quantitative researcher and qualitative researcher

Focus on connection between RECOUP I and II

AL (Amrita): best part of the previous workshop was the practical sessions; used reflexivity

IH: practical session in FGD in the last workshop on women venturing out to public life; different responses in men and women group; have used it in teaching at Edinburgh; gender, power relations in the group; it does not give you neutral data

SCB: certain terms may not be understood; please ask what you don't understood

### **Post Lunch session:**

**Exploring Expertise of the group members:** The participants were divided in four groups and were asked to explore the expertise on the following, which they presented afterwards:

- Design Research Project/ Management: Data collection methods
- Analysis
- Writing for publication/dissemination

**Group 1: TPO Nepal:**

- Literature review: situation analysis, scoping (dristy, nawaraj)
- Research design and management: Dristy says not much involved in designing; college thesis; NHRC permission, field mobilization; NU (Nawaraj): developing questions, methods decision, sampling, criteria of respondents, make the draft and share with the colleagues for feedback
- Questionnaire development: drug study
- Field co-ordination: ministry to grass root level
- Pre test and data collection:
- Transcription and data translation
- Coding: start from transcribing, child behaviour research, read the data, manually, writing the code in flip chart; group division; read the transcript and come up with codes and discuss this is big group
- Data analysis: thematic analysis; content analysis, framework analysis
- Report writing
- Research finding presentation
- Publication:
- Methods: KII, FGD, free listing, RRA, PRA, consensus building exercise

SK (Sudeepa): What is RRA, PRA?

NU: Community scoping, transect walk; informal guff gaff

**Group 2: HERD TB team:**

- Research design and management: fellowships research; implemented research
- Envisioned by Ian and after we came, we revisited the research questions. Multiple level of understanding
- Research management:
- Reflective meetings
- Implementation of research projects
- Planning visits/ budgeting
- NHRC co-rodination/ getting permission
- Co-ordinating with relevant authorities
- Strengthening research networks and building on the existing networks: helps in data collection KD gave example of CCM meetings; attending meetings and identifying potential participants
- Initial workshops: community level
- Data Collection:

- In-depth interviews, peer ethnography, semi structured interview
- Some don't believe in FGDs.
- Writing field notes, reflexive diary, participant observation
- Documents, photographs, life histories
- We discuss in team as well about our data collection and help us further.
- Analysis:
- Atlas.ti
- Manual coding: semi structured interviews, excel sheets
- Indexing: writing page numbers (Ian doing in in field; Kapil ji doing after completing using different colours and inks)
- Writing:
- Report writing, field note writings, academic writing, policy level writing
- Different Writing for different audience: policy, medical, academic etc

Nawaraj ji: Can you tell us a bit more on PEER ethnography?

KD: exploring sensitive issue;

Critique of participant observation: outsider cannot be completely insiders.

Select people and train them on research methods and questions to make them interviewer;  
researchers ask the peer interviewer

### **Group 3: MIRA, NSA, Martin Chautari**

- Design: partially involved in a team; involved in tool; recruitment of data collector, training, tool development, NHRC permission, Behaviour change in pregnant mothers
- Data collection: KII, FGD, SSI, observation, photography (RT: utilization of mothers' group in rural areas to see impact of women's group; giving cameras to women (everyday, MIRA, access to health facilities); asking women to categorize the photo and generating questions;)
- Think aloud: quality of care
- Analysis: data management, KAP study, translation and transcribing; read and re-read information and use colours for patterns, NVIVO, manually (long table analysis);
- Writing: Report writing, publication in local journal, LANCET, PAHS (systematic review); food taboos in the process of publication
- Annual conference SASON: PESON, SSB, Wellcome trust strategic award, Nepal Nutrition group: Dissemination

Sudeepa: Long table analysis?

Rita (RT): women's empowerment study (read the transcript and generated the theme using folder, cut the transcript and putting the folder)

NU: how did you use the photography?

VP: to support the answer of research questions

RT: drawback in women's group: single photography and changing the dress; had asked to click within criteria of research questions

NU: Photo voice: to enrich the data; whatever they like to click

SK (Sudeepa): Healthy Kitchens and Healthy cities: asked the women to click pictures of their kitchens; used in Tobacco project

#### **Group 4: Migration [Social Science Baha, HERD, IOM]**

- Research Design: academic research (thesis, fellowships); project based research
- Research question: developed through the ToR; or self in individual research project
- Taking care of Ethical concerns
- Research area: pre-selected; issue based (for example remittance); background research
- Informants/Respondents:
- Time, travel, management; sample size; hiring of researchers; funds; equipments

(SS)Smita Sharma: mostly quantitative; television company; people resistant during data collection

AL (Amrita): site selection and sample size involvement; written research proposals; ToR based

SU (Sudeep): commission based; not led the overall design but writing the design part

AM (Anit): done academic research; started as data collector; involved in 26 projects; donors interested research proposal; different types of research areas

- Data Collection Method:
- Participant observation; interview; semi structured interviews, in depth; FGD
- Literature review
- Negotiating access
- Field notes: head notes; scratch notes; diary record
- Analysis: translation; transcribing; coding; triangulation
- Writing for Publication:
- Report writing; Publication of policy brief/analysis

AM: translation of Nepali interviews; transcribing for recording

Coding: identifying themes (repeated number of themes)

Triangulation: did model assessment; group discussion, in depth interviews; pre project and post project phase; used three sources of data for triangulation

AL: report writing; migration policy analysis; preliminary research findings

#### **Tea break:**

**Next session on Project Introduction:** participants to introduce their research project

- Topic/title: What is it about? Research Questions?
- Research Methods
- What stage are you at?

Kapil Dahal: Global Fund's impact on TB. HIV programme and broader health system strengthening; interviews in Kathmandu, Nepalgunj and Surkhet

JS: Ethnographic approach? What do you write field notes about?

KD: meetings, who come, who stakeholder, community led NGO- how do they put their voice; how you negotiated access; reflective ideas/ experience; what can we add in further interviews/questions? Reflection after every interviews

Rekha: Lab strand of Wellcome trust research; looking at TB labs to understand their functioning and also impact on health workers and TB control with the introduction of Gene Xpert; participant observation at a Kathmandu lab; interviews and observation at labs in Nepalgunj and Surkhet; writing field notes

Sudeepa: TB/HIV strand; trying to generate understanding around TB/HIV infected people; how they deal with it

Research methods: PEER ethnography; co-ordinated with networks like NAPN, Jagriti Mahila Samaj; BDS; reaching through the existing networks; the advantage of this method is that it allows them to go back

42 interviews; 21 in Kathmandu; Nepalgunj: 11 and Surkhet: 10; Looking for journals to publish

JS: How long is it continuing?

SK: depends on the saturation

JS: have you reply to tentative research questions?

SK: health facility barrier; stigma and discrimination; not enough on TB-HIV barriers

**TPO team:** Perception of people and organization involved in psychotropic disease

- Lab people, MR people,
- Production of drugs, marketing of drugs, experiences, which system of government, bonuses; how doctors prescribe; MBBS, HA experience, nurse experience, side effects, availability and affordability
- Biographical approach of drugs
- Started from Pyuthan, Rupandehi; perceptions; situations; misuse from government and private projects;

- Purposive quota sampling; indepth
- 30 interviews transcribed and 19 translated
- Analysis stage
- DG: learning from field; there is no research in supply chain management in psychotropic drugs
- Difficult to find literature
- We had no idea of Revitalization department and when we knew it existed, we added and similarly kept on adding.
- Observation: writing down reflection after every interview and therefore learning about different issues like misuse, side effects etc

HK (Himalaya): how do you measure side effects?

NU: perceptions of people like shivering, not liking to talk; sleeping

HK: Are they really side effects?

IH: This is not a study to understand and validate side effects are; it's about what people describe

AM: Do you also look at drugs prescribed from prescription and not prescription?

NU: observation; pictures; place of drug storage; date expiry

IH: what people say and do is different—so observation is important.

Bharat Bhatta (BB):

TB: Development and implementation of supervision and patient support approach in drug resistant TB programme in Nepal

- COMDIS supported project
- Developing a supervision and support project
- Need assessment: talked to various patients; health workers; family
- 2<sup>nd</sup> stage: designing package
- Completed the need assessment: 12-15 MDR patients; 4-5 frontline health workers (DOTS facility); family members of patients; 3 FGDs in Kathmandu, Lumbini and Kapil vastu
- Tools: FGDs, semi-structured interviews; field notes and observation (after RECOUP I)
- Stage: designing intervention and rolling out; NTP and Ministry of Health co-ordinating

Obindra (OC) [Ashwin ji]:

- Looking at whether there is component of mental health in health books of class 8, 9, 10 designed for public schools;there should be according to WHO guidance;
- In public health schools
- Desk review of texts; KII interview using check list
- 12 interviews with teachers having at least 5 years of experience

- Reporting is good but analytical part seems weak

JS: Did you not look at texts?

OC: Did content analyses of the text books

RK: What were your research questions?

OC: experiences of teachers regarding no availability of mental health in curriculum; issues of mass hysteria

Vikas Paudel:

- How do women's group work within their group to bring change in nutrition status?
- Follow up certain numbers of women group doing participant observation,
- Observation, field notes
- Native Maithili speaker female; wanting to look at different dynamics

JS: aama samuha or mahila samuha?

VP: Aama Samuha

Observing for 15 months; tracking everything that mothers groups activities; semi structured interviews

Mixed method study

KD: Is there any intervention?

VP: Intervention as mothers group, cash, food supplement

NU: Observation in Intervention or control group? VP: in intervention group

IH commented: importance of qualitative research in RCT

Rita Thapa:

- How does health system decentralisation affect the retention of nurses in rural areas?
- Mixed methods
- Case study design
- Locally recruitment and not locally recruited (depending on numbers)
- Banke, Kailali and Dailekh: 16 health facilities; interviewed nurses; HFOMC and incharge
- SSI; FGD
- 137 nurses interview
- In the process of translation

KD: how did you distinguish more and less?

RT: I joined after the research was designed. But I think, 75% and more locally recruited facility was considered having more.

NU: How have you operationalised health system decentralisation?

RT: In terms of recruiting nurses;

We are also looking at permanent and temporary (job satisfaction, motivation, impact); there are different budget for these positions; looking at salary

NU: looked at frustrations as well?

RT: Yes

Smita Sharma:

Chhaupadi pratha: maximum work and low on diet

Understanding the perception of both male and female

80 female respondents; 30 male interview; FGD with FCHVs

Wanted to learn about how to do analysis

JS: that data is already processed

Amrita and Himalaya

Migration analysis in Nepal

Wanted to identify potential areas

How the returnees are integrated in local level

5 districts: 5 FGDs with returnees, aspirants

10 KII

Completion transcribing

IH: how did you chose the number?

Research duration: 1.5-2 months

NU: how broad was definition?

HK: India, gulf, Malaysia

IH: Were they from different ethnic groups?

HK: not really

IH: that could be one of the variables you can look at

Kishore Dhungana: what exactly are you looking at?

HK/AL: how they are integrated in the local job market

IH: "Pragmatic Saturation"

Sudeep Uprety:

Baseline Assessment of health vulnerabilities of inbound and outbound migrant workers

What are the health issues of migrants?

Mixed methods: qualitative and quantitative

FGDs and KII: 7 FGDs with departing, returnee and cross-border

KII with government and non-government actors

IH: Why did you choose FGDs?

SU: given in ToR

Anit Mishra:

Brought data for this workshop

Bhutanese refugees settlement:

17 attempted self harm: risk factors, socio-demographic profile;

Psychiatrist involvement reports: case history

IH: suicide here or in US?

AM: Here

DG: what's the duration?

2007 December- 2013 March

NU: What do you want to analyse?

AK: want to see if there is risk factor according to socio demographic characteristics and alike

JS: are the data anonymous?

AK: Yes

*After this session, we wrapped up for the day and asked for feedback.*

Feedback for the day:

- Linking the session with the previous year's experience
- Knowing about the experience from different researchers' projects
- Good introduction
- Explaining each other's area of expertise
- Hearing experiences from other researchers
- Happy if we revisit methods from RECOUP I
- Good facilitators
- Had great experience to learn that researchers can derive such various topics
- Would be glad if some backtrack can be done like designing, data collection be talked again
- Diversified participants
- Receptive/exploratory nature of resource person/participants
- Cool/silent environment
- Systematic sessions (arranged flow)
- Clarity on what to do and what next
- Lively sessions
- Work in team and working on own project was the great part of the day. Besides thinking over strengths of team/individual made us to think critically skills and abilities
- Too much of RECOUP I

### **Day 2: 30 December, 2013**

**First session:** Groups divided to explore what their positive and negative experiences were in doing qualitative research:

#### **Group 1:**

Positive experiences:

- Encouraging for professional devotion/respect for researchers
- Rapport with participants differs with subject matters: e.g. of TPO
- Latent aspect of things are discovered/looks at other side of the coin
- Opportunities for travel/hiking
- Understanding diverse/social context: adjusting in the local setting varies from village to resort
- Making intellectual rational guess:

Negative:

- Fear of going off the track
- Technological dependence (dysfunctional recorder)

- High expectation of the participants: especially with foreigners (IH: ppl think me as development practitioner; people ask what we are going to make)
- Time bound of researchers
- Life threatening: for example: vasectomy
- Time management of respondents: FGDs; people turning up at different times
- Emotional feeling-difficult to manage

IH: fear of going off track?

OC: for example, leaders like political leaders or those who keep on speaking on and on; interviewer waiting to ask other question but they say things beyond the questions

IH: What if our questions were wrong? The respondents might say what is important for them. I think it is useful. There are both sides of coin.

VP: rethinking checklist after couple of interviews and revising them.

KD: Expectation is natural from the participants.

IH: The idea of *vikas* is so powerful—it tells us about the context. We can write field notes about it.

JS: People go to different place. Natives don't differentiate between researcher and development practitioners. We are located in history and political context. They perceive us as powerful. So they might answer in different way.

KD: travelling in four wheeler and going around asking questions to people—people notice all these things and therefore expectations are natural

JS: we go to research but they are also researching on us by asking us different questions like how did you come, which organization, salary etc

IH: People asked us about eating fish? I said yes and they thought I didn't know anything as fish is considered as body heating—local perception of TB illness and food culture

AM: How did you manage emotional feeling?

OC: depends on researcher

DG: comes more in TPO case—communication skills are learnt to handling case. Recording stops and allowing them to cry or whatever they like to speak about.

NU: immediate referring to counsellor as well. calling supervisor immediately and referring—no harm to the participant. Clear instructions to the researcher—there is also information in the participant list to make calls and refer them where the services are available

IH: we are not qualified psychiatrist and counsellor but we need to be careful of the situation and make referrals

## **Group 2:**

### Positive:

- Establishing Networking with all types of people—helpful in next research as well
- Learn about new things
- Change in thinking pattern
- FGD: inspiring others to speak
- Increase in self confidence as the research progresses
- Adapt to the local culture and language to conduct interview
- Information to participants—they are convinced and which is useful for smooth interview
- Rapport build up—ownership

### Negative:

- Difficult to manage time with participants
- Managing Emotional situations
- Off the track , dominating presence in FGDs, hierarchy among the participants
- Lack of trust between participants and researcher
- Sudeepa: shared experience, age factor, the participant didn't look at her and didn't answer properly
- Expectation from participants
- Fear of getting the same problem: mental health
- Sudeepa: IDU interviews, at the end of third day, felt like what it is!
- Difficult to find right key informant
- Environmental factor: MDR patients interviewed in health facility; they couldn't express their opinions on health workers' behaviour and services
- Problem when not recording; may not be able to jot down the points
- Ethical dilemma: financial incentive, emotional background, feel like giving something

## **Group 3:**

### Positive:

- Familiar organization and people
- Ability to give feedback/advice to the participants: peer ethnography; give advice regarding treatment services, VCT, ART
- Long term study- time to think and reflect
- Satisfaction after In-depth interview: KD shared about an experience of lawyer, a war widow. "This is the first time I have ever spoken to anybody openly after my husband's death."
- Flexibility to follow network and trace people

### Negative:

- Informal talks don't remain informal as people think that this is part of the office and job
- Guilty feeling as people are reminded of their past
- People ask: What will you do after taking such information?
- Difficult to make people understand about insider's ethnography
- What is "field site"?—going away to community or even working in office? Interviewing or discussing with colleagues?
- People telling that 'you are from the same context, you know it better, why are you asking me?'
- "Somebody told me not to share idea with the boss to develop the proposal"
- Organizations in the same field thinking that the researchers have come to spy about work—context of HERD as SR and interviewing other SRs for Global Fund; we stopped interviewing for three weeks when they were developing proposal for second round.

#### **Group 4:**

##### Positive experiences:

- Very responsive participants—taking to other people
- Interesting focus group discussions even on sensitive issues
- Respondents suggestions/inputs
- Good gate-keepers arrange interviews in an organized manner
- Easier to approach local government officials than in Kathmandu

##### Negative experiences:

- Gender imbalance in research team: difficulties
- Sometimes dominant and sometimes silent participants in FGDs
- Imbalance in power dynamics: haliya and malik
- Difficult to make people understand what are we seeking
- Time and resource constraint
- Difficult to managing sample size: agriculture time etc
- Difficult in identifying the main respondent
- Inconsistency in respondent
- Ethical dilemma: supportive,
- Technical malfunctioning in recoding
- Difficulty in breaking the ice
- Discouraging participants—aggressive
- Difficulty to collect FGD respondent s in village

NU: shared the experience; Ethnography in school students; Principal asked me to teach maths and science and conduct terminal exams; dilemma whether to agree or not; students may not open up if I be a teacher; if not agree, principal, the gate keeper might say bye-bye

Researcher bias: I am a male and was nervous and not sure of conducting FGDs with female members but it turned out fine. Wanted to ask, "what is mean by gender?"

RK: Why is inconsistency a problem?

SS: In the same interview, people keep varying answer.

IH: healers, Cross-checking

KD: can try to understand why the person is giving different responses. Might be affected by the presence of who is interviewing

OC: cross checking with the participant himself/herself, can ask, 'but you said something else?'

JS: factual inconsistency or perception consistency; why people are giving different answers? They might be trying to say something else. Think about what we are learning rather than how many interviews have been conducted

DG: Factual inconsistency in process from the government officials in the same department

JS: Different people might see the same process differently. Different position, different perception; or think about why are people saying different things to me?

IH: Many people in chain were interested in money and surplus and maximizing money. Difficulty in looking at drug chains is many people know what they are talking about but there is a problem in interpretation. If we take interviews at face value, it may not serve the purpose because people lie.

RT: Study about nurses retention. Used the tool used in Kenya. Salary satisfaction: agree, highly agree and disagree; asked quantitative first and qualitative later; different responses, varied responses; and then later asked qualitative first and quantitative later; matched responses

NU: Is there a thing like factual inconsistency in qualitative research?

IH: talk about number of retailers, difficult to find the true number. Official number is one because there are also retailers who are not registered. Write in interpretation. It is difficult to find factual truth. Write about the process and differences in interpretation.

JS: the key is data source—where are you getting the data from. Attributing a factual data to source is important. Numbers are important in qualitative research as well. Are your research questions focussed on finding numbers or meanings or perceptions? If there is disjuncture, that is data. Every single puzzle you come across helps you explore more.

IH: Economic , political and strategic positioning on DDA guidelines. Powerful big forces with their own interests and we had to analyze that. Thinking it through is hard work.

### **Second Session on Methods based group:**

Discuss on the following three issues:

1. How/why did you choose the method? Why that method, to collect what information?
2. Very process of doing data collection—what did you do? How did you go about collecting that information: designing the tools and doing the actual data collection

### 3. Recording of data- how did you record?

#### **Group 1:**

Photovoice method:

NU:

- Individual camera given and asked to click whatever they liked—somali, afghani, Myanmar refugees, no language understanding, so thought of this method to be appropriate
- Asked them to group the pictures; while they did, we read the face, emotion and took notes; group and individual discussion
- Asked them to choose one pic that liked and carried the discussion

RT:

- Groups given camera to click on certain theme: it was used only as tool; it helped facilitation in asking questions and meanings
- Stone, medicine, MIRA logo: asked them to categorize
- Every section, they were asked to select top 10 pictures they liked and carried discussion from thereon.
- Recording: one person given the responsibility to see whether the recording is working or not

IH: If you could bring pictures that would be great.

RT: Sometimes, women have clicked single pictures of themselves with dress changes.

RK: But it also suggests what they like to do.

Obindra Chand:

- Content analysis of books from class 8, 9, 10: chose to see if there is mental health concept
- Revised book from 2064 for public schools--read and indexed
- Summarized the book; basic analysis; guideline developed

HK: Process of content analysis?

OC: started from chiya guff; Health and Physical education book; looked in health portion of the books in 9 and 10 books

#### **Group 2: Focus group Discussion:**

##### **Shree Niwas Khanal(SNK)**

- To triangulate the points/issues raised from individual interviews/ KII

- Checklist of a topic generated
- Roundtable discussion to maintain eye contact so that participants don't have to feel that they are behind in the group[ pachhi parein ki bhannu naparos]
- Ideally 3 people-facilitator, note taker; note taker might indicate questions that facilitator might forget to answer
- In relatively quiet place, Noting verbal gestures

OC: We talked about principle but also useful to mention how we are doing it in real practice.

JS: personal ideas?

SNK: We talk about the larger group and not personal.

JS: in village, talking in group is natural. How useful is it for us to use FGD? May be we should think about different methods?

NU: as an insider facilitator and outside facilitator, different experiences. Facilitator heavily influences the process and topics.

IH: In a public sphere, they want to suggest what is important to them. Palpa experience: *bikasit manchhe ko agadi k kura bhanne ki nabhanne...bhootpret ko kura;*

JS: People might feel that they are being judged in believing certain things.

### **Lunch break**

### **Continuing with the session:**

IH: It is not about what is right or wrong. We need to open up to our vulnerabilities as well.

JS: let's talk about our challenges.

### **Group 3: Interview**

Dristy:

- KII, semi structured interviews, peer interviews
- Sensitive issues- maintaining confidentiality
- Sometimes, it is pre-designed; SSI interviews: to guide our objectives
- Allows space for Individual observation
- Collecting data: literature review, research questions, co-ordination with local co-ordinators when there is programme at the district level, consent taking, telling about our research, assuring confidentiality, pros and cons of recording, mostly use recorder, especially in government officials, ppl talk after the recorder is off,
- When there are two people, presence of other people can also influence how the respondents' response.

JS: when you use recorder, do you take notes?

DG: the other person observes, takes notes

JS: If the person asking question also writes notes, the interviewer might take seriously.

OC: When we write, some people say, *tapain haru le kahan lekhne jasto kura garchhu ra!*

Sudeepa: There might be break in flow when the interviewer writes notes

RT: Introducing note keeper, have never written notes by self. The flow is disturbed.

JS: Checklist? Topic? Sentences?

SB (Sumitra): We had first made questions. The participants didn't open up. But later on, we looked at the questions, read them and didn't take questions during interview.

DG: One column: topic, second column: probing; when we don't have time to read questions, we look at the themes and ask questions.

Sometimes, people ask to look at questions—we make it attractive.

Sudeepa: We look at the questions at the end to see if we miss anything.

Rita Thapa (RT): we make all the questions.

IH: Why specific questions?

RT: to remember

JS: there are different styles.

NU: we write questions for some kind of similarity.

IH: you are in danger of superficial data when you follow structured questions.

7-8 researchers in four languages; process of reading each other's transcripts became important

KD: we got structured response in Surkhet. The participant said that he gave more information than we asked and we found it interesting and asked why he said that.

Sudeep Uprety: Issue specific topic: academic; organizations talk about.....

We write about that in transcripts.

VP: make structured questions; new people refer more to the checklist; the more people are experienced, the more they are comfortable

IH: We are constantly thinking and changing. It is iterative process of constantly thinking and doing analysis all the time.

JS: We said that we discuss about interviews at the end. That's where analysis starts.

JS: Do you have flexibility of reflection?

VP: early childhood...SSI. mothers of children below 5 years. We were sharing from field; same thing got repeated. Mothers said that they leave their children with mother-in-law We decided to do FGDs with mothers- in- law; Changed the participant group

IH: everybody saying same thing—how do you get beneath it?

RK: Short term research-makes difference in quality

NU: Researcher's positioning makes a lot difficult. The interviewee looked at only the foreigners.

KD: depends on whom we are interviewing; When we interview the 'head' of INGO, NGO, presence of foreigners doesn't matter much but it may at the community people.

RT: people gather very easily and talk more to foreigners

JS: perceptions of power relations

RK: hierarchy example; how executive director of an organization didn't even look up at my face instead played with pencil or just looked at the computer; the interview got over in 20 minutes; it could be because of age, gender etc

JS: *hakim* not wanting to talk; researcher-researched relationship; power relationship does play; we interview for 5 minutes and after that they start interviewing

AM: as a data collector, director of NEA responded very well. it depends on two things: interested in research and interested in the subject area; it might be that we may not have been able to make the research objectives clear

OC: In one of the interview, the doctor offered to fill questionnaire; couldn't probe at all—didn't realize it then

DG: People ask especially in govt settings: how old are you? What is your position? Salary? Marital status? I have started to wear kurta and tika etc and it has started to make me feel comfortable.

NB: Mugu experience; social distance when we are dressed up

VP: Terai difference; VDCI [Village Development Committee Interviewer] go for supervision, one VDCI ordered for chair and table, sat on it and asked questions while the interviewee sat on the floor

JS: power in researcher; there are concepts of interviewing up, equal, down

IH: genre of anthropology in studying up

JS: we talk about KII, SSI, indepth—are we talking the same thing? Length of interview?

DG: 20 minutes-2 hours

VP: with breaks; 4 hours as the interviewee carried on doing his/her work

JS: consent; how do we take consent?

SS: KII or in-depth interviews?

RT: Role of men in perinatal period; FCHVs, TBA as KII; they attended delivery ; general aru ko barema

SSI with husbands: personal things

NU: may not be directly related but knows about the stuff- KII; indepth interviews- about their own experience.

IH/ KD: KII interviews

JS: we might be using these terms differently; could be just a matter of language;

- Information about one person of her life
- Information about my perceptions of other things
- Information about her opinion on where she studied

IH: As editor, I find papers; they don't tell you what they do but write about KII, grounded theory etc

Quite a debate about what is good qualitative research; qualitative research would disagree

#### **Group 4: Ethnography:**

Vikas paudel

- RK/KD/IH doing it
- People speak and do things differently
- Observing labs in Nepal: how they work in labs, how they interact
- Built on existing relationships; unstructured; introduction from labs about technical terms, chemicals, equipments
- Observation and interaction tools:
- Writing notes initially; lab personnel asked to read and therefore later wrote notes in their absence or in bus

KD: we didn't know about the issue of the labs till we got there.

We haven't used that approach in global fund. We were not in particular sites like lab.

JS: Natural setting for labs

IH: Swiss aid meeting—nobody is there because USAID had called out meeting.

Kathmandu is so complicated; things are clearer when we go out from here.

NU: How far can we be participant? In Jawalakhel cell, the didis asked me to write legal terms.

JS: it is difficult to be a complete participant.

KD: studied uterus prolapsed with dutch doctors at Dhulikhel hospital. The hospital welcomed all with khada and all and I became a part of it. I didn't go to OT. I was at the nursing station. Some patient came and told me that they had problems thinking I was a doctor.

People would refer me as doctors during interviews and ask for suggestions. We would relay the message to nursing station. A 27 year old female; medically she was in need of operation but had family problems—relayed that to doctor and she was given ring pessary and sent back home

Vikas: observation in mothers' group: female didn't talk much when I was in the group; I went to a distance where I could listen and see; they were more open to discussions.

IH: I would walk into missionary hospital. Inter- subjective knowledge....

Sudeep: When you have done a body of work, is there a challenge to unlearn when we say we go with open mind?

KD: being open is about learning from all the sides. It is about not imposing.

RT: being structured does not mean that we just follow that. We build on those questions.

KD: It also depends on the time duration of the research. We have time to flexible to be open and generate questions.

IH: the thickness of description

JS: Recording is important especially in ethnography. If there is nothing written, then it has not been done. The writing should be able to tell the readers everything even though they are not there. For all research, recording/ writing is important.

There are issues of how we ask questions. Do we ask questions as it is written? Do we write in our transcripts as we asked in interview?

### **Tea break:**

### **Next session: Kapil Dahal on Reflexivity:**

- Qualitative researcher needs to be more reflexive—how do we show it?
- Researcher is the instrument; so has to be reflexive as well. Think about how data is being produced, difficulties
- Qualitative research emphasizes the interaction with other living beings. The concept of participant; co-production of knowledge
- It is about being critical of self; about presence; education, height; clothes; gender etc relationship with the participants and answers might vary accordingly
- It's about honesty—how data is influenced because of me?

- Constantly watch yourself and your presence. That self is the person; the questions-revisiting; asking techniques; alternative methods to ask those questions like we discussed in earlier sessions
- Reflecting on data that has been gathered; the process of analysis starts with collection of data; enriches data and further guidance on how to go about it
- Positionality of researcher: In quantitative research, we talk about unbiased data. In qualitative research, we don't believe that knowledge can be unbiased. Our positionality and how the participants viewed us matter. We have been sharing our experiences about being researchers from HERD. We need to be open about it.
- Power is constantly played. It is not always with researcher that the power lies but it is also exercised about the participants. Example of research in madhes about dowry; the participants asked about the dowry practices in the researcher's culture
- When we are weak in the subject matter than the participants, then the power lies more with the researched—we could be better informed.
- How our presence is taken by the people? Inviting people for tea, home etc
- Observing hierarchy

VP: How do we incorporate reflexivity in analysis?

NU: I wrote about the earlier incident in the analysis section—my different roles.

VP: I observe certain things. I reflect on it. To what extent, can I use that in article?

KD: Description, interpretation should be different.

JS: depends on styles of writing. In ethnographic writing, I can use "I". We can put self in front. Depends on journal writing or writing norms

We just don't report on what the participants say. We put that in order and as we do that 'saayad' goes decreasing.

Reflexivity is central to data. Whether self is visible or not is a different thing but it is always there.

IH: received paper; There may be silences in data—

KD: description, interpretation: there should be cultural evidence to say why you feel the certain thing.

IH: "Negative evidence"; it should also be about what's not there, not just what's there

### **Next session: Quality in qualitative research by Kapil Dahal**

- Description of process: enhances quality in research; how do we describe the process shows our strength
- Biasness can't be removed. Mention about positionality

- Triangulation: in quantitative research, we use different sources. In qualitative research, we try to represent multiple voices from multiple angles and don't focus on triangulation. We see an object/ subject differently from where we are standing.  
For example: Different understanding of TB as disease by the patient, family
- Go native/ participant observation: understand language, terminology, phrases
- What people say and what people do is different—observe in participant observation.  
Enriches the data
- Whether our data is rich or not is determined by thickness of the data. Understanding about how embedded is it in the respective culture

Vikas: the person might be doing different things in different days

KD: so does the researcher's understanding

Sudeep: why are we looking for negative evidence when there are multiple voices?

JS: we may not be able to understand why certain things are not there.

KD: multiple voices are determined by social positionality. We are not doing research in isolation. We are doing literature reviews. If all the researches are talking about one thing and one research does not mention about it, then we get curious to see why it is not there.

IH: training on dhama jhankris; looking for possible silences; when urbane researchers go to field, then they may not talk about superstitions.

We need to think what it is not here and why.

NU: research on child nutrition; there were voices from family but the child was not allowed to speak in the presence of elders; negative evidence

DG: we do triangulation in qualitative data as well but KD said about not using it?

JS: Quantitative research uses triangulation to confirm facts but in qualitative research, we don't much delve in factual correction.

IH: we can't use one person to represent. Validity is strong because we do it as much as we can to make sure that what we are stating or writing is right. For e.g. using technique of diagnosis

RT: We talk to different group of people for triangulation. We use saturation for qualitative data.

IH: Triangulation is a term used in surveys. It's about measurement. There is greater danger in using one method.

Vikas: measuring height of mountain by three people? Triangulation?

JS: There's issue of fact in this question. If Rekha is visiting labs in different times, different days, when there are few and more people, celebration, then we are looking at multiple ways. It is stronger.

IH: The more people you talk to, the more themes emerge. There is more thickness. If we reach saturation too fast, maybe you are not probing enough.

KD: Saturation is not uncontested. Just because it is being repetitive in some context, it does not mean that there is saturation of data

JS: Saturation is one way of doing data not the only way to do. If we look at archaeologists, they dig and get few pieces of evidence and try to tell us what kind of building it could have been. They don't get everything of the building.

Similarly we are trying to build a picture with bits and pieces of information we are collecting. The more we talk to people, we will be able to build a better picture and be sure of it.

RK: what we are looking at should be constantly guided by our research questions.

### **Next session: Cleaning and Anonymising data**

JS/ IH: ground rules

Confidentiality of data

Remove identifiers: name of people, organization, place

RT: Interview, FGD data, cleaned and coded

VP: observation notes, raw phase, name of FCHVs, field co-ordinator's names

OC: place names, synonyms for teacher's name,

DG: anonymised data, interview data, code named

RK: fieldnotes, interview notes; not anonymised completely

KD: Not anonymised

Sudeepa: Not anonymised

AM: rephrased names, places, organizations

SU: FGD, KII, not anonymised

AL: KII transcripts, not anonymised

SS: processed data

NU: Do we give our data set to others? Our data are not transferable. It's available to read but not to take away.

JS: Which all data can we share?

- Rita
- Ashwin
- Nawaraj
- Sudeep
- Rekha
- Anit

### **Feedback of the day:**

- Very interactive session of discussion on various research methods
- Pretty much spoke on 'reflexivity' and its implication
- Whole day was exciting
- Learning from other colleagues
- Participatory session
- Sharing of experience was very fruitful; learned a lot from others' experiences
- Though hectic, the training is very useful.
- All was good but it would have been easier if the English terms were translated in Nepali.
- Learnt about how and why interviews are done
- Expectation was to start own data management and analysis after lunch as discussed earlier.
- In terms of coding the data and analysis, ultimately it would be good if we use individual data (own data)
- Day two was stimulating in understanding especially ethnographic study and reflexivity
- Hope following days will be more educational on coding and other techniques.
- Good base/background today before the main analysis exercise
- Interesting sharing of experiences
- Experience sharing during data collection, got lot of insights and very useful
- Liked the game in the opening (telling of 3 statements)
- Explanation of terminology by Kapil Dahal
- Voice of some participant was very low during discussion (should be encouraged more to speak louder-could not understand)
- Substantiated by lived experience
- Greater/wider involvement of the participants
- Review sessions
- Iterative process and hands on approach are working well.
- Participatory
- Group sharing of experiences
- Good group division-technique wise and sharing
- Nice examples
- Today's session was informative in terms of understanding terminologies such as reflexivity and triangulation. Sharing of challenges and positives experiences of data collection and what could possibly influence the quality of data was also interesting. However, some sort of refresher games as breaks would be welcome.

- Session on reflexivity and quality was helpful; helped me understand the importance of observation
- Day second is very useful for me as I learn about triangulation, reflexivity
- The interactive sessions were interesting today.
- I am happy with the progress in our workshop.
- It would have been better if we had connected to some theoretical approaches along with the sharing of the experiences.
- Today we discussed about negative and positive experiences while involving in study. So it is good chance to share each others' experiences which helped to enrich our knowledge.
- Again we discuss about method of qualitative study so we could share our ideas and gained knowledge from others which will be helpful for further study.
- In total, today's meeting was fruitful for us in different aspect which will be helpful.
- Too much information
- Got a bit too long on the experiences part
- Little over loaded
- Coffee not tasty

### **Day 3: 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2013 (Half day)**

#### **Session on Coding exercise**

- Four groups working in four sets of notes by Rekha, TPO, Rita and Obindra

#### **Sharing session on how we did coding:**

Dristy: Maternal health care FGD (Rita's data)

- Difference in how many pages we read: indepth reading/ surface reading
- Similar way: Pen pencil underline; remarking/commenting on the side
- Some read the questions and some didn't
- Highlighted some issues
- Kapil and Dristy made some category
- Translation also makes some difference: it would have been better if it was in Nepali
- Difficulty in reading others' transcript

KD: It was an operational research. What would have facilitated the nurses retention? Thought of the questions and marked hindering themes (minus); enabling (positive)

JS: It was very interesting that he had analytical framework

DG: KD had used highlighter. I write in copy as well with page number for further references. I make arrows to make the links.

RT: Translation makes difference. If simple words are used in translation, then it becomes easier.

JS: Not much difference in categories

## **Group II:** TPO's data

Nawaraj:

- All read, underlined, identified themes
- Differences: some wrote summary in separate pages, some indexing
- Different focus on the transcripts among the members: our backgrounds affected
- Differences in circling; round; rectangle, long; some words, some sentences; numbering paragraph
- IH: made some questions that might have missed
- Different themes: fear, gender, trust, relationship
- For the transcript to speak, there could be a background.

IH: One issue that came was TPO has note books. Personal reflections book, Interviews and observations go hand in hand. That's useful practice.

NU: The field note book has everything in it; personal emotions, research related etc

JS: please say what themes were; examples please

NU: drug administration (for example page 6 paragraph 2; 6.3, 7.1) etc; available services and treatment category merged (used arrow)

IH: Indexing different things; I indexed disease and nobody else. It is theoretical. My training helped in thinking like this.

AM: If we have separate things coming in, how is it scientific?

IH: This is science. The more reflexive we are, the more scientific it is. The process of reflecting and thinking and understanding our biases is good science. This is good practice.

JS: need to differentiate between biases and scientific research. We look for different things based in our background. We haven't looked at same thing in contradiction but the focus has been different. What lens have been used is important.

KD: Sometimes it could be contradictory as well. In case of TBA, a doctor and medical anthropologist can code same thing differently. The same thing could be a barrier to the doctor and medical anthropologist might not see it as barrier.

IH: I am writing a book now. I was a doctor and then I was trained in anthropology. It changed my relationship with public health. It is a reflexive book. It is an awareness process of that change.

NU: I used to think that scientific research is free and fair but even in quantitative research, there are biases: recall bias, selection bias etc. We can't do away with bias.

IH: It is complicated. There are methods that tell us about real world.

JS/IH: and that's why there is reflexivity.

**Group III:**Obindra's data

JS: transcripts in full sentences but people sometimes speak half sentence....how do you write?

OC/SU: we generally write full sentences

NU: keep .....

JS: there are also issues of translation as well

SNK: difficult translating certain phrase *like mutu bhat bhat poleko*; we keep these words in bracket

JS: Meaning is important [bhanna khojeko kura k ho is important]

IH: Anthropologist can write a whole article on one word; stacy piggs on vikas, viswas etc

DG: Brandon and somebody other wrote an article on "Man"

KD: It was Brandon and Ian!

NU: standard checklist for translation issues

**Group IV:** Rekha's data (fieldnotes)

Vikas:

- Similarities: everybody underlined; wrote some notes; bracketing; categorization
- Somebody wrote themes in copy
- Grouped research question and named a, b, c, d: linked text with the codes
- Sometimes, we didn't know where to keep some data
- Double ticked on important: gene xpert
- Some write reflections at the end; some within the text
- Rekha, Sudeepa and I came with similar themes whereas Shree Niwas ji looked for psycho social aspect in the data.

RK: I was surprised how Vikas had similar codes to mine and when I asked, he said that lab is not new for him as his father is a doctor and his sister has done course on lab technology and therefore labs are not entirely new thing for him.

IH: there are different styles; there is no hard and fast rule

NU: I wrote in French when there are something sensitive

JS: Maoist insurgency during Ph D. Field work site far from where I was living; they would ask what it is in bag; rumours about what clothes Maoists and army wear; I was selective about what I wrote; that was limitation; use head notes

NU: What's bracketing?

RK: demonstrated how she did in the copy

JS: use of line numbers

IH: line numbers are very helpful for indexing and commenting

RT: FGD, code number and line number

JS: footer and headers ma file number lekhyo bhane sajilo hunchha

IH: the slides are available online in RECOUP

### **Ppt on qualitative data analysis process**

JS: There are slides and manual in recoup website.

VP: more about comparison?

JS: what are you comparing against? Comparing with previous projects? Comparing with how retailers view drugs vis-a-vis administrators

You may want to think about what all do you want to compare let's say in two institutions; it's kind of tabulating;

JS: if you don't write down, it doesn't matter what you did. Analysis begins from there when you write. Knowledge is produced from comparison because we compare it all the time.

IH: There are multiple levels and layers of comparison.

Feedback of the participants:

- Best so far; very stimulating; would love to hear more from Dr. Ian and Jeevan sir about how they did coding....
- Nice exercises on how different people start analyzing the data; nice interaction in plenary
- Nice game by Sudeepa ji
- Lunch/dinner need to be changed (variety, not Chinese though)
- Good breakfast
- Today's session is so much helpful to track the data and also supporting for analysis as well but better to give concrete tips for analyzing and others
- Sharing of data: interesting to read somebody else's transcripts and try to analyze it
- It was useful day today as well. Individuals had their own idea of analyzing the raw data and there were similarities as well. Even though people had different process of doing it, everybody is right in their own place.
- Great to hear and learn about different style of (analysis) (coding)
- Discussions in group were fruitful. Sharing of practice of individual was good.

- The task of trying to analyze the data was very productive as I got to learn about different ways people start the analysis and different ways of forming codes. I found even simple ideas such as numbering the lines very helpful. Looking forward to further sessions!
- Today it was excellent, there was a good combination of individual work, group work, sharing and theoretical discussions. I think similar process should be continued in the days to come.
- This session was very interactive and practical (analysis); sharing of analysis process being practiced was good
- Good exercise on data coding. Helpful!!
- Stimulating discussions; varieties of doing analysis
- Day 3 was informative in terms of understanding various forms of data analysis and styles. It was interesting to understand various experiences of participants in terms of analysis.
- Reflection on same data by multiple individuals was helpful in many ways.
- Session was practical-felt like time was properly used; break of 'half of today' and 'tomorrow' may revitalize by breaking somehow already developing monotony.

#### **Day 4: 2<sup>nd</sup> January, 2014**

##### **Notes by Kapil Dahal (KD)**

10: 20 arrived in the hall. 'Titanic game' played out as an energizer.

10: 30 RK showed a sample of filing, transcription, how to anonymize the contents in the file and some challenges of anonymizing.

-ways to name file (RK presented illustrating the files of her previous multi country study... and compared it with the filing system of current Wellcome Trust study)

-mentioned about the ways to back up and archiving

-JS: file management is also not only a technical task of organizing files but also a part of the process of data analysis

##### **Notes by RK**

##### **Session on groups discussing how they manage and store data including transcribing and translating issues**

##### **Group I:**

RT: district file; stakeholder's name; ANM, staff nurse naming (starting from 1000)

VP: project name; observation notes; three VDCs; three arms; haven't written date as of yet;

OC: mental health research folder; male and female folder;

We haven't discussed storage. VP: Ph D folder; back up in gmail

RT: external hard drive; emails; 5-7 places

OC: data with two people

Transcribing and translation:

RT: self involved; contextual analysis easy; looking at others' data and difficult to analyse

When in beginning, it used to be difficult. U bhayera u hunchha—don't know what that means!  
Later on started probing

"fill in" words

OC: It is difficult to understand context at times; it becomes difficult to translate some phrases like *ekdum samanya rup ma*

VP: Maithli interview; field co-ordinators translate that in Nepali; English translation by consultant or process evaluation officer

Now I understand maithli and therefore not very difficult; observation notes in copy; Neha Sharma is hired for this work and she is native Maithli speaker and knows English too.

IH: How do you translate "fill in" words?

JS: don't think that's important

RT: we remove some certain words;

IH: you can translate some...

VP: do we quote, make it bold? JS: yes

### **Group II (TPO):**

How many interview of each Category: data collection, transcription; in office

Code: LMD\_KTM\_01

Interviewer's name

Involvement in check list; data collection

Data collector does the transcription; we write the answers as it is; even the sounds and pauses, expressions

DG: translation

Some certain words like 'chai' we ignore.

In interview if somebody uses short form, I write in long form in bracket

Proverbs in roman in bracket

Codes in nepali first and then in English only

Transcription in Nepali;

Lot of things get missed during direct transcription and translation; transcription in nepali has to be done in the copy by whoever has conducted interview.

From now on, we will use Nepali transcripts for analysis and do translation later.

We also check if the meanings have been intact in translation; informal “marma checks”

If questions incomplete, we leave it with ..... and mention that the question was in complete

NB: short term people who go for data collection; if they are involved in analysis, it becomes useful.

JS: They do analysis in nepali; it is interesting!

IH: We couldn't do it earlier because we were working across multiple teams and multiple languages.

NU: thinking nepali; writing in English and feedback

IH: Ph D level ma garho hunchha talking and thinking in English and nepali

### **Group III**

SU: Naming file like RK demonstrated

Amrita: project name code, types of organization; people's name, date; sometimes, have to talk to same person different times

HK: Transcription: Express scribe software; it helps in playing your recordings as you want with pauses, slowing down; useful than the windows media player

We write names of people in the transcripts; they are activists and wanted to be named.

SU: questions in nepali; answers in nepali; write up in English;

HK: don't record non-verbal gestures

NB: We do record because sometimes it becomes helpful in meaning construction.

AM: For example; jargons used (in research of substance use); we don't know understand jargons and pronunciation

IH/JS: PI foreigner; questions in English; translated in nepali; answers in nepali; translated back in English

Too much translating may be problematic; can train in local language

IH: long answers but very short translation

Transcribing takes time;

VP: giving breaks to people who transcribe as it is draining

TPO: takes two days to transcribe one interview!

JS: data management; storage; issues in transcribing and translation given less importance in research

#### **Group IV:**

File naming-as discussed

Sudeepa: organization folder and numbering interviews

Central data storage: Rekha in external hard drive as well in computers; emails

Peer ethnography-debriefing notes-shared

KD: also stores data of all three strands

Sudip and Sumitra ji: personal folder; store meetings data

Photos sharing: technical difficulties; internet; interruption in sharing data

Pseudonyms being used for file storage

Bharat ji: different organization and different categories folders; number interviews

Anonymising organization's name to share with external partners

Ian: JISCMails as an analytical tool; has search functions

Transcription/translation:

Fieldnotes, interview notes, debriefed notes

KD: transcribing without questions—but now on including

RK/KD/ SK: phrases, peculiar terms in nepali

Sometimes, Sudip Bhattarai and Sumitra ji transcribe interviews, we give it out for translation; problems in doing that as the translated version get shorter

IH: We don't have to think in English—but some organization heads want to talk in English.

JS: we can think of these issues about translation/transcription; whether it is important to transcribe in nepali; translating required or not

IH: ESRC funding—open access and now fighting for it because they want everything to be in central data base

RK: declined to share transcripts with other colleagues at work because we have promised that the data will be shared within the research team only

Vikas : we use Framework analysis.

Fast reports: transcribing only those required in themes

### **Lunch break:**

Everybody worked on our own data.

## **Day 5: 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2014**

### **Today's programme:**

- Sharing of data analysis ( by Rita, Amrita, Nawaraj and others)
- Sharing of ongoing data analysis
- Continue data analysis
- “writing” as analysis

Rita Thapa:

- Published paper on quantitative study
- Computer analysis: NVIVO
- Lots of codes—tabulating
- What different stakeholders say within one code: putting their views in table
- Descriptive report of every VDC
- Merging codes to generate themes
- Demonstrated a table from her data: “Definition of empowerment”: women's and men's empowerment
- Used free listing for this: selecting top three options and discussing on them
- Small study on quality of care: what women, men and HMC said

JS: Is there an example of descriptive report?

RT: not now

RK: Do you write descriptive report of every theme or each VDC?

RT: comparative between intervention and control arms

JS: Are there separate tables?

RT: we know which is intervention and control; we make separate tables

In quality of care, we wrote a paragraph about VDC including everything. Then we can also separate what men and women say about staff absenteeism in intervention and control district.

JS: For analysis, how does it matter to have number of people?

RT: It doesn't make much difference in men and women...the numbers are helpful in ascertaining standard numbers of FGD; It helps us in building context.

JS: It's not a category by methods but by participants.

RK: In evaluation research, we were asked to state number of participants in FGDs to show the coverage of people.

AM: gives strength to the research

KD: There are 12 people in group; is this table representative of all the voices in the group or does it represent varying voices as well?

RT: We try looking for consensus. If two people say varying things, then they discuss among themselves and tend to agree on one view later. We write the consensus view.

DG: You focus more on what the majority say or do you not include what the lesser voice say?

RT: We include the minority voice as well but mostly there are consensus view.

OC: how to address outliers? How to address variations? I felt the same while reading my own data. It would be useful to discuss how to address variations.

RT: Do we give value to what one people in the group says?

JS: We believe in representing multiple voices in qualitative research. There might be extreme voices. We can analyze why there are two extreme voices. We can also make generalized statement if people loosely say something.

We should consider what is fact and opinion. If we are talking about perception, then even different voice of one person is interesting. We make comparisons within the group.

KD: In OR, we can also numerically back up to see what problems or causes are faced by majority.

Challenge to link with other themes. It might be difficult to put what issues to keep where.

JS: how to understand data in thematic or inter-linkaged way

Amrita:

- Coding Excel sheet: three sheets
- NGO, govt; migrants; FGD separate sheets
- Categorizing participants; summarized information; not use of long sentences
- Different codes and categorizing information according to the major area of study
- Print out all the information together and we start writing according to codes

JS: How do you come up with codes and who makes it?

AL: worked with foreign university ; they gave us codes and we adapt; based on structure of our report, questions we asked

SK/VP: How do you bring quotes?

AL: important are kept in the excel sheet itself; locating in transcript is done manually

JS: links within themes could be challenging to represent when we fragment data in different sections. IH will talk about it later. And one of the reasons our structure of workshop is like this is because we don't want to recommend one way of doing it.

We should understand data in context.

Nawaraj Upadhyaya

Read; re-read; indexing (page number and paragraph); copy paste in word file (pg number and reference); sub themes within themes

Table: theme, sub theme (drug procurement, bidding); theme coming from whom; repeated content (how many people saying); supportive texts from the transcripts; deviant texts from the transcripts; variations summarized; similarities; theoretical orientations (from researcher or from the participants); anything associated with the theme; any emerging research questions coming from theme; any policy implication at different level

Table of summary and copy pasted text: look through

If the paper takes the table; we keep the table in paper

DG: I haven't done it this systematically. Copy pasting text within theme and sub theme

Sudeepa: copy pasting in excel sheet

**Ian:**

More anthropological approach;

Paper on mental health written together with Brandon

Jhankri and doctors say different things

Brandon was telling me about Naresh. I spent a long time with woman in western Nepal. They had been seeing doctors and jhankris. Started with individual study.

Linguistic analysis of the certain terms; moving between levels of abstractions; individual and programmatic interventions

Thinking; notice things, go back to things; notice more things and write about it—writing is analysis

Critical event analysis; DDA guidelines; how did everyone react to it?

JS: IH talked about how to look at analysis through writing

KD: How did you know that state is weak? From the data?

IH: We keep talking about it at Chautari. within weeks of the introduction of guidelines by DDA, it had to be backtracked.

The statement that 'state is weak' is empirical observation through this data

JS: read out a part of IH's article regarding the medical representatives

IH: being there is making us believe—it happened because I saw it there. How do you make it believe? By saying that I was there

JS: It is not necessary to do ethnography but we write notes in the beginning during interview and we can use it

NU: I had a table in the midst of a transcript; described picnic day; story matched the theme; how the boys and girls mixed up; how they were friends

JS: picture of what he drew

Reading; re-reading; migrant literature and brick kiln literature; we discussed the key ideas and made a table; put it in annex of the report; no direct text from transcript; but interpretation or summarizing; categorizing differences and similarities

This is not finding but made for self; describing about the brick kiln; process at brick kiln; mid step before writing; there were also statements made from the observations and interviews and readings from literature on migration; this writing is not for audience

HK: How did you decide the topics in the table?

JS: The three of us discussed together and made the table. We used the table and notes to start writing.

Lifted the field notes; as you write, you process the information as well; we share writing in the team and the team provides feedback

IH: there are theoretical orientations and positions

JS: we started looking at how they spend their leisure time; something that is not important in Marxist analysis; there is a life they create for themselves; it is important to know what sort of analytical framework are we using for the same; it is important to bring them up in reflexive notes

KD: it could be overlooked depending on positions;

IH: It is important to think about what we are missing when we look from particular angles

AM: the aim or objective of the study?

JS: where people internally migrate, what are the main issues that they have? It was part of a big study to understand social change in rural lives.

### **Coding exercise:**

Lunch break:

### **Session on sharing where we are on analyzing our own data:**

Obindra:

2 interviews, summary: finished

Research questions ko basis ma points haru lekhe; no line numbers;

Re-looked at the content of mental health in the text: made notes for self; wrote field notes after reading the transcripts; limitations of bringing two transcripts only

JS: Do you plan to collect data more?

OC: haven't talked to curriculum development team; some health teachers trained as counsellors; thinking to expand on the study in a bit broader terms

Vikas: three observation notes; read the notes; made some notes and have kept in tabular form; 8 codes; key reflections; what I observed in columns; starting the write up

JS: will you be able to prepare a one page writing on mothers' group functioning? Sufficient material?

VP: It was a bit difficult for them in the first meeting; there is material

Rita: Data from one VDC; also ready by Smita and JRS

Quality of care, satisfaction, motivation, factors affecting retention; water, quarter, job satisfaction, understanding of motivation by community; rude permanent staff, barriers to quality of care; differences between contracted and permanent staff

Smita: HFOMC responsibility, political pressure on jobs, answers are reflecting RQs; decentralization of power but not practiced

RT: difference in policy and practice

JS: lots of issues

KD: 10 interviews each; 26 themes; 20 overlapping; the extra 6 are more methodological and not directly from text

Differences in coding; underlining and writing

I also look at inter-linkage as suggested from texts

JS: what do you want to do?

KD: discuss with Ian

Sudeepa: 4-5 transcripts; I had debriefed them already; there are certain things that are missed in debriefing; data scattered in raw data;

Kishore: 4 transcripts; different coding areas; medical history, patients' awareness, perceptions towards self, disease, others, family, services; source of information;

Anit: different types of case studies; places of treatment is also important to look; i have added certain variables; have liked the tabular form in the morning and therefore have used in excel sheet

JS: if a study has to be designed later, this data might be useful

HK: 3-4 interviews; trying to make a table; CSO, private lawyer, DoFE, foreign employment promotion board-trying to look at their roles

Category: nature of cases, role of CSO and other stakeholders, who is involved where; how cases are settled (negotiations; legal; settlement;)

Policy category: to see policy gaps; since we are looking at redressal mechanisms, it is important to see policy gaps

Sudeep: FGDs, predefined codes; linking text to codes; there are chances of comparison with male and female on using their leisure time; knowledge on HIV; less knowledge on other STIs; gender and migration health (harassment, stigmatization), impact on families because of migrants' health

DG: divided in groups; reviewed last evening; coding, indexing, key issues and wrote summary on it; further exploration of where are gaps; place for theoretical orientations; complicated data and therefore we are planning to write; planning for follow up research

NU: theoretical orientations on the following

- Confidence level of doctors to prescribe drugs
- Security threats in health workers
- Where can we reflect on field notes?
- Planning to write post interview reflection in the transcript

- Following a case study: following a patient

KD: what were the other themes?

NU: availability of medicines; perception of people towards drugs; misuse

Ian: not discussed with Rekha; nearly all notes; indexing and reflecting and thinking of issues; looks at lab system and network in tuberculosis; new technology has been placed

Relationship between different organizations in network: NTP, HERD, IOM, BNMT, INF

Emergence of private hospitals and labs

Quality control system

Writing and describing all these issues

Staff relations within these institutions: perception of NGO staff towards government staff

Biosafety of laboratories: comparison in NTC clinics, IOM labs, NATA clinics

Perceptions of safety, TB bacteria: appalling in the government system

Structural issues around safety:

RK: description of labs

IH: describing it to your audience is important

JS: when we work for long in the same field, we try to take things as if everybody else knows.

NU: ethnography is done in community. How is it different in labs?

IH: we are following the bacillus and transformation. The issues are same in village and lab. Process is the same. You learn the language that they are speaking and what's important for them. basic principles are the same.

Another session on writing a page based on our reading of data so far since writing is also part of analysis.

Feedback for the Day 4 and 5:

- Day 4: Interesting to know about coding styles; Day 5: Good way of reflecting own work and sharing nuances of analysis styles
- Interesting to learn about matrix/ cross tab in analysis
- Realise the use of field notes as narratives in reports; each day is adding to knowledge
- Good time utilization while working on our own data
- Idea on sharing everyone's method of analysis while doing it at the same time was appreciable.

- All participants doing the same thing at a time was very useful to those who had little idea on such research. Learning while doing is indeed very good.
- Today's activities are quite good. I request you to use more powerpoint presentation for data analysis technique.
- Spending more time in group work gives important tools and technique of data analysis and experiences sharing.
- Felt like working at home
- Last two days were a bit different than those of previous one and helped a lot to improve our own data
- Very practical approach of analysis (enriched a lot)
- Due to high involvement, time seems insufficient
- Liked the game (paper/ scissor/rock)
- Peer learning on coding (learnt/ get acquainted with some new techniques)
- Lot to know that commonalties are possible even amidst subjective ways of coding.
- Learnt about new things from own's data and happy to be writing about it. I hadn't known that I could work like this and I hope the learnings from here will have positive impact in my life. Thank you Jeevan sir and HERD team.
- Sharing of thinking theme and codes were valuable; gained knowledge/idea of data management
- Warm up game play was nice; compelled to do data analysis-a very fruitful exercise making everybody absorbed to own work
- Sharing of experiences on how people process the data was useful
- Reading the transcripts again has been helpful in reflecting on data and revisit them to think further
- Sharing of personal experiences is a good exercise where I am learning a lot. Hands on experiences and working on our own data has helped me to not feel any guilt about not doing our organization's work. However, if while sharing, the focus is given to technique rather than what they found from the data, then we could have some valuable time.
- Good but I look forward for more conceptual things rather than just letting us work on ourself.

#### **Day 6: 4<sup>th</sup> January, 2014**

##### **Session on sharing write up from yesterday in pairs:**

The group read the notes and shared the feedback:

Ian: Rekha and I read each other's notes.

Feedback: difference in approach; writing in same set of notes related to labs and bio safety;

IH: thickly descriptive and individual perceptions; overly specific

RK: listing all the labs where we visited; categorizing these labs; overly generalizing

By talking through writing, from particular to general, there are comparative points; governmental and other labs

OC: Vikas has lucidly written.

VP: location of mental health in secondary school text; Obindra ji has written about broader international and national context; gave him feedback (break down long sentences)

RT: Used NSI data on retention of nurses; factors affecting the retention of nurses: Smita has written about all topics; she could have been descriptive

SS: Rita started with context and I liked what she wrote.

DG: Nawaraj Sir had tabulated; wrote on prescription of drugs; tried writing about how many people use how many time used the word 'prescription' and analyzed

SNK: Nagendra ji started with descriptions; how people have understood misuse; could have been explained further

NB: interesting issues; other health workers also prescribe drugs in absence of psychiatric; how patients are given medicines

NU: Dristy wrote about procurement in detail; what do we explore further; she had written about analytical paragraph

Feedback: she could have written about procurement process; also she could give a description about context as Jeevan and Ian had shown

Sudip B: sumitra didn't have topic; she had focussed on migrant workers and HIV; stigma and discrimination from community, hospitals etc

Sumitra: Sudip ji had written about stigma and discrimination in hospitals, family and community; differences

KD: Sudeepa ji had written about behaviour of health workers in HIV setting; the topic gave a message; I learnt about how the writing could be done in different way; it is summarized and there are quotes

SK: Kapil Sir wrote about access to diagnostics ; it was like abstract; second and third paragraph were description; fourth paragraph was comparative and analytic; linkage with GF; I wasn't clear about the linkages; It depends on audiences for whom it is written.

Kishore: Bharat wrote focussing on three points. Thematic sections: used quotations; lengthy; it could have been summarized

Bharat: Kishore sir had summarized. TB background, perceptions; he has compared between patients's experiences on discrimination and linked that with education of patients.

Anit: Exposure to mass media by Sudeep; clear description with quotes; no research design

Sudeep: case studies of refugees related to psychiatry; it was in the format of report; title could have been specific; he could have been selective in background information; “qualitative analysis” not clear

Amrita: Himalaya: structured writing; flow; deductive writing

HK: Amrita: selection of topic and evidences to support why people are doing what they are not supposed to do legally

JS: different styles of writing; people have tried to summarize; multiple voices; different perceptions; using quotes for back up; descriptive method; comparative method; “writing for whom”; thematic sections; explanations; how to include background information

### **Session on Use of Software in qualitative data management and analysis: Demonstration of Atlas.ti by Rekha**

RK demonstrated how files are uploaded in Atlas.ti software, how codes are entered and the coding process is done. She also demonstrated how the software brings together all the coded material in one single file from all the transcripts.

Talked about the pros and cons of software use from her experiences; helpful to get a sense of what data are there under one particular code or theme but it fragments data from the context; inter-linkages missing; in multi country study, it was difficult to understand data from other country

DG: tried using this software; lost in different functions

NU: Started using Atlas.ti but left half way because of following problems:

1. Reading in computer was difficult; cursor up down; visibility problem
2. Does not allow group analysis; group reflections does not get reflected; we use flip charts in room
3. Below 100 is manageable with paper and pencil methods; why bother?
4. It dissects data; you don't know where it comes from
5. Time consuming
6. Relevance of its support?

HK: does it enable you to share and network in other computers?

RK: It doesn't; the files can be merged later but we can't work in a single document at one time like google docs

IH: very expensive

JS: software use and its pros and cons; software can be used in bigger research projects

RT: merging files can be done in the software

JS: previous example; what falls in which code is determined by ourselves; we have to code as well but at the same time we might be missing context; different coders might code it differently because we talked about the individual meanings that we derive from the data

Vikas: NVIVO

Links with Endnotes; relationship buttons allows to link themes; bars, diagrams;

NVIVO links the transcript through the output; it allows to write as well; some people write about contexts

Drag and drop: sometimes it goes in other section and this creates troubles

### **Lunch break**

Post lunch: participants continued working on their own data.

### **Last session: Approaches to qualitative data analysis**

#### **Power point presentation by JS**

Techniques:

- Documentation of data collection process
- Organization/categorization of the data
- Connection of the data to show one concept may influence another: we constantly do it in different way as we keep thinking
- Validation by comparing and evaluating alternative explanations, disconfirming evidence and searching for negative cases
- Representing the account: writing

Case based research:

- Cases may be 'individuals', organizations, institutions or events
- Data may come from diverse sources
- Depth over breadth, foregrounds context
- Intensive investigation to help identify phenomena, themes, concepts or principles

Types of cases:

- Extreme (or anomalous) cases: describes a very unusual person or situation in order to better understand it
- Paradigmatic case: exemplifies certain overarching principles or helps illustrate patterns that may be common
- Critical case: theory development

Writing case studies:

Analysis: what, why, how, so what?

Narrative analysis:

How do participants tell the story in a particular way?

Narration as a piece; not as themes because it means different things to different people

HK: how do we reflect what the person is analyzing?

JS: we present as the participants say;

Ethnographic writing

- Focus on lived experience
- Writing down what did you learn/observe as a thick description
- Focus on details

Grounded theory:

- Why: apply systematic way of data analysis
- How: unify data collection with analysis
- What does it mean to put data first; theory last
- Coding; memos; using matrix, flow charts and conceptual mapping; typology and taxonomy

RT: I want to know about theory. How do we know what theory to base on?

JS: when we think about research idea, there is a theory in it; it's just a matter of borrowing theory to understand it or being aware of the theory that is embedded in it already; there is a body of theory in social sciences and the ideas are looked from that body; it is difficult to talk about all those theory here

IH: your and your organizational ideological positions; relationship of theory and writing is complicated; you can apply different theoretical relationships to data;

The best way to approach qualitative data is grounded approach. Don't apply too much of theory in data (overdoing theory); we are interested in empirical data rather than generating theory

IH: good ethnography always challenges abstractions; it's a kind of grounded theory

NU: we are using narration as data collection method in focus group discussions.

Feedback for the day:

- Rekha ji's explanation about utilisation of software is good.

- Last session was informative and useful too.
- The last session was very much useful!
- Interaction and guidelines on practical things being given by Dr. Jeevan-eye opening and very useful
- Short session on softwares was good however much exercise would have been better.
- Making the participants brainstorm for writing helped.
- Very good session from Jeevan sir, liked it! Hope to get tomorrow from you as well.
- Liked the insight on the use of softwares in qualitative research by Rekha, its uses and limitations
- Fantastic
- Enjoyed warm up session with exciting participants; good information about ATLAS software; good exercise of writing but “mind” and “body” into “festive mood” for the evening party; approach to qualitative data analysis session was really great and exciting
- Today’s session was both practical and theoretical
- Liked Rekha ji’s presentation; studying data is good for analysis
- Good wrap up session in the end
- Nice resumption of coding; not sure why we spent time on Atlas.ti
- Discussion and writing task in our own research has helped us in making sense of our own data. I find the time given to us to work on the data very valuable. The facilitator’s involvement and feedback provided in every step is much appreciated.
- It was a good day, had chance to plunge in the data; the summary and theoretical connections of the work done was the best part of the day.
- Learned so much about how to describe and analyze data; gained different knowledge from different participants’ method for analyzing data
- How to identify the issues and how to analyze the data linking with other issues
- Know basic knowledge about Atlas.ti

### **Day 7: 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2014**

#### **First session: Working on our own data**

Tea break

Discussion:

- Lessons learned:
- What would you do differently?
- How do you plan to move forward?

#### **Group 1:**

Anit:

- Importance of reflection: need to read and re-read; further planning for data; challenging to bring data
- Induction and deduction: commissioned research and other research
- Importance of Team work: varied perspectives
- New methods of data collection and analysis: photovoice for example
- Sample size
- Merits and demerits of softwares
- Importance of resources: man power, time, cost
- Learning never ceases.

To do differently:

- Revisit research objectives
- Ensure sharing of study
- As per lessons learnt

Plan to move forward:

- Further analysis of data
- Explore possible uses of findings
- Identify research gaps and plan accordingly

## **Group 2:**

Amrita:

Lessons learnt:

- follow analysis process: because of report writing deadline, we don't read the data importantly
- use of Matrix; cross tabulation
- Organize data by themes
- Use of fieldnotes as data
- Other methods of analysis
- Reflecting data all along
- Analysis starts with data collection/design
- Analytical presentation of data collection

What we would do differently:

- Reflection all along
- Keep in mind for whom you are writing
- Write fieldnotes the same day
- Include narratives in report
- Use/change data collection method: VP: look for more and thick descriptive data

- Follow a sequential case study approach: mala banaye jastai approach
- Re-read interviews; identify gaps in data and follow up for next interview

Move ahead:

- Identify gaps in data
- Start writing from beginning
- Group discussion on data
- Use of software: does it give more scientific sense to data for international journals?

IH: that's not. Need to explain what we do exactly;

### **Group 3:**

Bharat:

Lessons learnt:

- Coding process
- Keeping in mind about the audience
- Data collection technique (in-depth): realization of in-depth
- Theme identification
- Writing of context
- There is no standard steps for analysing qualitative data: people have different approach
- Importance and application of reflexivity
- Case study
- Atlas.ti (pros and cons)
- Qualitative research is not easy.

What would we do differently?

- Use of indexing; line numbers
- Using excel to organize data
- Including Reflection in analysis
- In-depth data collection

Moving forward:

- Negotiation with donors on timeline and research design

### **Group 4:**

Sudeep Uprety

Lessons learnt:

- Hadn't practised what we learnt about qualitative research in college

- Realization of diminishing rigour
- Different ways of doing research by different participants
- Importance of reflexivity
- New techniques: Indexing, line numbers, file names, matrix, software
- Writing as thinking
- Data management/ storage
- More use of field notes
- Going back to research questions
- Designing research

What would we do differently?

- Being more prepared (understanding context)
- Reading more in-depth
- Organizing information
- Writing as analysis
- Emphasis in thickness

Planning to move forward

- Following up-what was learnt
- Making more systematic-linking with literature
- Linking research question and data
- Strengthening information on ongoing research

### **General discussions:**

SNK: I am inspired about writing certain aspect of the research.

IH: how many of you are going to feedback to the organization? It is institutional issue.

HK: we can feed back on what we learnt. We won't be able to negotiate on the timeline of research. I can share it with team and apply on myself.

AL: We write proposals as well and we can build time in proposals

IH: reflection time in proposals

RT: I and Dr. Jo discussed on timeline. If we have next research project, we can discuss on timeline.

NU: We will go and share the training with our colleagues. We are going in the writing process and we will apply the learning from here on.

OC: negotiations form a part of research timeline and funding. It is much of a structural issue.

Recently we had post field session on research which was beneficial for the donors as well.

HK: There are issues of internal management as well. But we will use these learning in available spaces and opportunities.

VP: We will share with team and with upcoming researchers as well. Will also talk about importance of qualitative research within RCT to the project co-ordinators

AM: will reflect the learning wherever there is opportunity

SS: There is research happening in another project and i will be a part of it. Will share about the learning with the team and will have to report to the co-ordinators about this workshop

Post Lunch:

RK: We tried creating a group after the first RECOUP. We had couple of meeting and a facebook group as well. The meetings were mainly about updates of what we were doing but we couldn't quite take the group forward. It could be because there was no felt need, or the group didn't match the expectations of the participants or there were other issues. I also thought that there was issue of ownership about the group. We at HERD particularly didn't want to be project that we were only responsible for it and tried to pass that message across but that somehow didn't work. In this session, we would like to discuss about what you all think of taking forward the group henceforth. Do you all think there is at all need of a group of qualitative researchers? If yes, what can this group focus on? How do we take it forward? We would like to hear about your thoughts and ideas on it.

OC: we need to have a product for meetings; focussing on ongoing work may be once in a twice month; it might take some years but will be helpful in learning; four minds are better than one mind;

RK: Could you be a bit specific about "ongoing"?

OC: We had to pull people for "tea break" here in workshop; when people work on their own data, there was intensity.

When we meet, we need to have a product in hand to discuss about it.

NU: two things; let's engage people in social events and discuss; when people are filtered and committed; then we can start reading club; sharing and learning group; facebook is important

HK: bringing in products might be difficult; we can agree on the principle of being in touch; facebook is important; we can click pictures of fieldnotes and put it up on facebook;

RT: we had discussed yesterday. We can share research articles. Dissemination; paper; we can include information of papers; conference calls

NU: sharing and discussion forum; it should be able to raise discussion; we need to be clear on our objective of group;

VP: Post RECOUP I; depends on logistics and resources; we can organize a day where we invite a qualitative researcher to share his or her experiences; we can make themes; we can have four gatherings in a year

Kishore: lot of trying last time; we should analyze why it didn't work; difficulty of ownership; institutional spirit of HERD; it is not being internalized by the organization of other participants; if another organization can make that effort to call for meetings; I understand the objective of the group as learning objective but there should be ownership from all the organizations.

IH: the forum could be for different things; it could be an open discussion forum on research and health issues; could be journal club; could be a paper presentation; the best way is to share the responsibility and move it around;

Can we commit it to now?

NU: sharing responsibility means also cost related; then we have to think

KD: we should make it very simple; it should not be burden for anybody

Sudeepa: If there is a structure, then there is pressure for organizers and people; we can make it less structured; be informal meetings

DG: It could be burden for us; if it is about building skills for researchers, then it's fine; what do we get extra from this group? It should not be only about getting another's ideas on our work. I will come to such meetings only if I see there is value to it.

IH: We can be learning and be critical of others' work; department seminars in my department is such an important of organizational culture; we all are busy but we attend

DG: how do we develop that culture? I would be interested in learning NVIVO; ethnographic skills etc

IH's example of being a student; we set up an email group in SOAS; anthropology email list--biggest group; it came from our perceived needs; initially we had to drive it but now it runs itself, it was started 15 years back

IH: if we can ask for people who come here to give papers and then we can discuss on that;

KD: we can add bit by bit in every meetings

Sudeep: sometimes the interest level phases out after the workshop; we should be able to further that interest in qualitative research to keep the group going; we can form this habit of following up the learning from the workshop

NU: I have been part of two such networks; national mental health network and now there are twenty people; PH D students group

If we can commit from at least three organizations, then it can move forward.

Anit: Those who have workstation in Kathmandu, it is easier for them; we can introduce our friends here

SCB: the objective of the group?

Organization and individual? Are we interested as an individual or organization? Depends on the organization's nature of work

Depends on commitment: are we really committed to take this thing forward? Ideas are great but do they continue?

More discussion required on objective?

Are we really acknowledging the group members to learn from one another?

Don't keep higher expectations; learning from what did work and what didn't work

Suggestion: You need to advocate within institution for institution commitment. You need to go back and reflect in your institution for its commitment.

We can start with our own seminars. We can build on that eventually.

IH: setting up independent email group; signing up for facebook people; seminars can be rotating

SCB: Let's agree on the next seminar; let's invite people to talk; let's see how it goes; don't confine it to yourself only

IH: Let's learn from Martin chautari.

Feedback collection:

Writing retreat/workshop in a year's time:

IH: we come up with a draft paper is the idea; do you have suggestions for it?

NU: should be similar to this workshop to work on our own data; progress has to be monitored by facilitator; we should be able to plunge in to writing; precirculation of theoretical part

Our quarterly meeting could be used to discuss the ideas.

IH: it's gone really well running and learning.

OC: you have taken daily feedback; what was your expectation out of the workshop and did we turn out to be?

IH: anxious how it would work; it has worked very well; we came committed to work; started sharing our data and it was great.

SCB: Where will the success of this workshop reflect? It is important to think about that.

RK: Thank you all for bringing in your experiences and enthusiasm to the workshop because that made it great.

#### Feedback on Overall Workshop:

- The facilitation of Jeevan Sir was excellent and I very much appreciate his involvement with the group as a whole as well as individual participants.
- Although Ian spoke very little, whenever he did speak, there was something to be learnt.
- I leave this workshop more confused about my research data, but the confusion stems from the clarity in my understanding of qualitative research.
- Sharing experiences of all the participants was an excellent way of learning
- Thank you to Rekha ji for excellent co-ordination and management of the workshop
- Since the workshop is of a week long and it also extends for longer period, group/team building exercise would be welcome.
- The workshop went well in terms of management of logistics.
- Content wise-could have added research experiences of facilitators
- Sharing research ideas with teams was useful.
- Hope the movement gathers pace.
- Learnt from sharing of works/vies of participants with proper facilitation of facilitators: some new methods, techniques and tools; some new scale/scope of work in qualitative research; principles of qualitative data management and analysis
- Could meet significant number of colleagues involved in somehow related fields and idea of keeping the group alive and broader is a good initiation
- Well done HERD for taking initiation to run such a fruitful workshop. It's very good to learn about the different way if analysing qualitative data. If it is possible, it would be great if theory could be included. Hope to write more about write up in coming workshop.
- All the three facilitators (Jeevan Sir, Rekha ji and Ian) were great. Three Cheers!! Sessions on hands on practice sharing was also good which reflected real scenarios. However, some sessions on theories or principles should add some impact. Plus, some illustrations on researches carried out at international level would also have been good.
- The training was very useful for researchers especially those learning and new in this field. It definitely helped sharpen my research analysis skills.
- Punctuality and the modules of each session well arranged so that we did not feel it was exhaustive; However, I do feel that since the content of the training was specific 'analysis', it could be conducted with a day or two less (about 5 days).
- Flow of programme, high involvement of participants are appreciable
- Working on our own data and skill development process of seminar can be considered one of the good achievements
- I opine use of software can be given more emphasis in next session (which may help to manage things).
- Overall programme remained significantly fruitful. The programme helped to recall previous academic literature and let us to be socialized with the literature in practical manner.

- Due to lack of proper raw data to move ahead along with the training objective, made me bit uncomfortable but I understood the methodology of qualitative research.
- Training was informative, interactive and result oriented.
- What went well? Good interactive sessions; good hands on experience on data coding and analysis; good facilitation; experience sharing from different people helped us learn
- Could be improved: More in-depth sessions on the use of software for data analysis as it seems to be useful for handling large sample sizes (despite the cons mentioned)
- What went well? Diverse team, clear vision and objective; good and committed effort from organisers (Dr. Ian especially); experiences from various people was the best part
- What could be improved? It could have been more structured.
- What went well? Participation from different research organizations and their sharing; nice and active participants; session on “what next” useful-good discussion came out
- Improvement area: Facilitators seemed less interested in delivering the techniques as we expected; more discussion on technique and process of analysis needed
- I found the method of the seven day workshop very interesting; learnt a lot from different ways of learning and facilitating
- It could have been better if some ‘learning methods’ were used rather than only group discussions and idea sharing. Training on software can be useful next time.