Report on
MICRODIS Training Workshop Meeting
(WP6.1)

May 19-23, 2008

Hanoi School of Public Health, Hanoi, Vietnam

Prepared by:

Health Research Center for Crisis and Disaster (HRCCD)
Faculty of Public Health, University of Indonesia
Kampus Universitas Indonesia, Depok
Jawa Barat, Indonesia

Executive Summary

The MICRODIS survey coordinator training workshop was held from May 19-23, 2008 at Hanoi School of Public Health, Hanoi, Vietnam. There were 26 people actively involved in this workshop, coming from several MICRODIS country partner in Asia (India, Indonesia, & Philippine) and Europe (Belgium Netherlands, & UK).

This workshop is the starting point to move on the next phase of MICRODIS activity. MICRODIS will start the preparation and implementation of working in the field for each site on June 2008 and ended on December 2008. This 5 days workshop was aimed to (1) give a refresher view on qualitative and quantitative method to have similar idea of the kind of method that will be use by MICRODIS, (2) give a quick overview of software that used by epidemiologist, (3) to facilitated discussions to exchange idea between sites.

This semi-training workshop was valuable and fruitful, the results accomplished was beyond expectation. It was reflected on many important issues on the questionnaire development and field work strategy were discussed and settled between each partner, thematic group, and coordination team. Furthermore, the material given during the training sessions was also reviving the participant's remembrance regarding qualitative and quantitative approach in order to enrich the discussion on the method that will be use by MICRODIS and on how the method would be applicable to each site. The workshop was closed by the Epi Info training session.

It was decided in this workshop that MICRODIS will employ both quantitative and qualitative approach in data collection activity. The quantitative approach will be conducted by distributing MICRODIS questionnaires to the selected household in every sites of study (population based study), while the qualitative approach will be completed through Focus Group Discussion, disaster narratives, life history, social mapping, and Key Informant Interviews.

There are still a long process should be accomplished before MICRODIS is ready to implement the field work, however this workshop has been an important stepping stone to get the same idea on how to conduct the community survey using qualitative and quantitative approach among country partners.

List of Participants

No	PARTICIPANT	INSTITUTION	COUNTRY
1	Debarati Guha-Sapir	Université Catholique de Louvain	Belgium
2	Olivier le Polain	Université Catholique de Louvain	Belgium
3	Laura Irvine	Université Catholique de Louvain	Belgium
4	Suyin Jamoralin	Citizen Disaster Response Center	Philippines
5	Tomas Talledo	Citizen Disaster Response Center	Philippines
6	Mondastri Korib Sudaryo	University of Indonesia	Indonesia
7	Eko Setyo Pambudi	University of Indonesia	Indonesia
8	Meidy Farenti Prameswari	University of Indonesia	Indonesia
9	Shishir Ranjan Dash	Voluntary Health Association India	India
10	Pooran Chand Joshi	University of Delhi	India
11	Vinay Kumar Srivastava	University of Delhi	India
12	Ivy Das Gupta	Jadavpur University	India
13	Sabari Bandyopadhyay	Jadavpur University	India
14	Tim Wind	HealthNet International	Netherlands
15	Tran Huu Tuan	University of Hue	Vietnam
16	Ha Van Nhu	Hanoi School of Public Health	Vietnam
17	La Ngoc Quang	Hanoi School of Public Health	Vietnam
18	Le Thanh Ha	Hanoi School of Public Health	Vietnam
19	Tran Thi Tuyet Hanh	Hanoi School of Public Health	Vietnam
20	Do Thi Hanh Trang	Hanoi School of Public Health	Vietnam
21	Nguyen Trang Nhung	Hanoi School of Public Health	Vietnam
22	Nguyen Huu Thang	Hanoi School of Public Health	Vietnam
23	Maria Teresa Sharon C. Linog	Xavier University	Philippines
24	Chona R. Eschavez	Xavier University	Philippines
25	Terry Cannon	University of Greenwich	United Kingdom
26	Supriya Sadanand Akerkar	University of Northumbria	United Kingdom

TRAINING WORKSHOP FOR SURVEY COORDINATORS

May 19-23, 2008
Hanoi, Vietnam

REVISED AGENDA

DAY 1 – Monday May 19th, 2008

8:30 – 9:00 – registration

9:00 – 9:30 – welcome/introductions by HSPH Host Coordinator Dr. Nhu and Project Coordinator Prof. Guha-Sapir

- Outline of the agenda for the week

9:30 – 10:30 – **Session 1 - Basics of Household Surveys**
Session 1 Leaders: Prof. Guha-Sapir, Université catholique de Louvain/CRED & Prof. Srivastava, University of Delhi

- Objective of surveys
- Sampling – Explanations by Dr. Ivy Das Gupta, Jadavpur University
- Calculating sample sizes (with exercise using MICRODIS site data)
- Determination of sample size design (i.e. stratified, random, cluster, etc.)
- Data requirements for each type of design

10:30 – 11:00 – Tea/Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30 – **Session 1 - Basics of Household Surveys** continued

- Questionnaire design using MICRODIS examples
- Study design

12:30 – 13:30 – Lunch

13:30 – 15:00 – **Session 2 - Focus Group Discussions**
Session 2 Leaders: Prof. P. C. Joshi, University of Delhi & Supriya Akerkar, Northumbria University

- **Quantitative, Qualitative and Participatory** *Presentation by Prof. Srivastava*
- Theory of Focus Group Discussions

15:00 – 15:30 – Tea/Coffee Break

15:30 – 17:00 – **Session 2 - Focus Group Discussions** continued

- Demonstration of focus group discussion

DAY 2 – Tuesday May 20th, 2008

9:00 – 10:30 – **Session 3 - Questionnaire Design**

Session 3 Leaders: Prof. Srivastava & Prof. Guha-Sapir

- Coding, Data collection, entry and validation, cross-checking
- Questionnaire review, presentation by Tim Wind

10:30 – 11:00 – Tea/Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30 – **Session 3 - Questionnaire Design** continued

12:30 – 13:30 – Lunch

13:30 – 15:00 – **Session 4 - Key Informant Interviews**

Session 4 Leader: Prof. Srivastava, University of Delhi

- Methods and Theory of Key Informant Interviews

15:00 – 15:30 – Tea/Coffee Break

15:30 – 17:00 – **Session 4 - Key Informant Interviews** continued

- Demonstration of key informant interview
-

DAY 3 – Wednesday May 21st, 2008

9:00 – 10:30 – **Session 5 - Guidelines and Comments**

Session 5 Leaders: Prof. Srivastava & Tim Wind

- Presentation: review of the guidelines by Tim Wind, HealthNetTPO
- Comments and questions, how to use the guidelines
- **Terry Cannon: FGD 5 points and discussion**

10:30 – 11:00 – Tea/Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30 – **Session 5 - Thematic Questionnaire Review**

- Thematic group members review their questionnaires
- Comments and suggestions, site focus, review from Tim
- Issues to be discussed: standardization across sites (how a question can be common and coded across all sites), what kind of validation questions to include in their questionnaires, what kind of coding structures will you use for the questions, identifying questions which are common thematic core questions which should be done in all sites and those which are optional depending on the site or focus, identify the kind of ideas that would require focus group discussions or other qualitative methods (not more than 6-7 preferablly).

12:30 – 13:30 – Lunch

13:30 – 15:00 – **Session 6 - Questionnaire Review continuation**

Session 6 Leader: Prof. Guha-Sapir

15:00 – 15:30 – Tea/Coffee Break

15:30 – 17:00 – **Session 6 - Unresolved Issues**

- presentation of each thematic group and discussion
- unresolved issues

- presentation of timeline, questionnaire framework, plan

DAY 4 – Thursday May 22nd, 2008

9:00 – 10:30 – **Session 7 - Life History and Disaster Narratives**
Session 7 Leader: Prof. Srivastava

10:30 – 11:00 – Tea/Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30 – **Session 8 - Social mapping and demonstration of social mapping**
Session 8 Leader: Dr. Terry Cannon, University of Greenwich

12:30 – 13:30 – Lunch

13:30 – 15:00 **- Session 9 - Mixed Thematic Group Questionnaire Review**
Session 9 Leader: Prof. Srivastava
- mixing of thematic groups for additional feedback

15:00 – 15:30 – Tea/Coffee Break

15:30 – 17:00 – **Session 9 - Questionnaire Review Presentations**
- presentations of the progress of each thematic group (20 min each)
- Standardizing coding in questionnaires (Eko's document)

DAY 5 – Friday May 23rd, 2008

9:00 – 10:30 – **Session 10 - Management of Qualitative Data**
Session Leader: Prof. PC Joshi, University of Delhi & Prof. Srivastava
- grounded theory presentation by Prof. Tomas Talledo, CDRC/University of the Philippines

10:30 – 11:00 – Tea/Coffee Break

11:00 – 12:30 – **Session 10 - Management of Qualitative Data** continued
- Wrap up comments and gratitude from the Coordination Team and the Host Coordination Team

12:30 – 13:30 – Lunch

13:30 – 15:00 – **Session 11 - Epi Info Training**
Session Leader: Eko Setyo Pambudi, University of Indonesia
- Computer lab session for all to learn or practice how to use Epi Info software using questions from the MICRODIS surveys

15:00 – 15:30 – Tea/Coffee Break

15:30 – 17:00 – **Session 11 - Epi Info Training** continued

DAY 1

Monday May 19th, 2008

Welcome by Dr. Ang, Dean of HSPH and Deputy Director of the MICRODIS Project
Welcome by D. Guha-Sapir, Director of the MICRODIS Project

Session 1 - Basics of Household Surveys

Chairperson: Prof. Guha-Sapir & Prof. Srivastava

- **Presentation by D. Guha-Sapir :**
- Importance of providing country-specific feedback during the workshop
- Budgets need to be in order, economize where you can and it's possible that all will be audited in 2009
- Research team Responsibilities
  - Recruiting, training, monitoring and supervising the survey in that country
  - Quality of data will suffer if these tasks are outsourced
- Events should have happened within the last 12 months
- Impact areas need to be well-defined
- Use tools/approaches appropriate to your research area, not just a basic tool that all agree on. This needs to be catered to the site, which means the appropriate adaptations have to occur.
- Questionnaire size reduction into the thematic core and thematic extended
- Household questionnaires are not the only method to collect data, use focus groups, key informants, hospital records, lab reports, etc.
- If you cannot estimate expected prevalence for a variable of interest then use a different method
- Don't try to resolve everything here in Hanoi - country groups will adapt the questionnaires to their specific situations. Many group members are missing and ALL the group leaders are missing, so there will be no final decisions made here.
- Contact other group leaders to ensure you are doing their parts correctly (during the adaptation and during the surveys/training when needed)
- Coordination team can arrange direct survey and data support for country teams if needed
  - Need advanced notice
  - Identify where support is needed
  - Appropriate person will be identified
- MICRODIS survey will consist of one questionnaire that incorporates the MICRODIS CORE, THEMATIC CORE and then an extended version (depending on the issue of focus)

- **Presentation by V.K. Srivastava on Household Surveys :**
- We should know very well the definition of household and other important terms (head of the household, etc.)
- The length should be under one hour
- People get tired, responses can be affected and some people will quit half way through
- Training is essential to making sure the questionnaires are given in the same way
- Outline the benefits of household data collection
- Discussion of sample size designs

- **Ivy Das Gupta presents an example and explanation of how to calculate a sample :**
- Probability proportional to size explanation
  - It gives a probability (i.e., random, representative) sample.

- It assures that those in larger sites have the higher probability of getting into the sample compared to the smaller sites.
- It is most useful when the sampling units vary considerably in size eg. No. of households in different villages.

- PPS sampling is often used in cluster sampling, where we select clusters (groups of sampling units, eg. Villages, households etc.) of varying sizes.
- This method also facilitates planning for field work because a pre-determined number of respondents are interviewed in each unit selected, and staff can be allocated accordingly.
- Steps for using PPS (see presentation)
- Using Cochran Formula to determine samples
- Sample size calculation using the example of Murshidabad of West Bengal in India
  - Step by step calculations with all the data necessary

Further Discussion

- Should we separate affected and non affected so that we have a control case
- It is important to do this, YES
- Who should be the main respondent in the household? Should we alternate between genders?
- Dr. Linog can give a step-by-step instruction with how she calculated her sample for Southern Leyte, with using the recentness of the disaster as a criteria for selection
- Recentness should be a criteria, we need the disasters to be recent to eliminate recall bias
- We need to focus on the questionnaires more during the workshop
- Should have more time in the agenda to work in groups and in mixed groups to revise the questionnaires and come up with the thematic cores. The agenda will be adapted to suit this need
- Concerning the sample size estimation, Mondastri K.S. proposed that in addition to estimating the sample size based on proportion of population affected by disaster using PPS cluster selection (as presented by Ivy D.G.), calculating the minimal sample size needed to estimate prevalence of certain outcomes of interest or to test particular relevant hypothesis in affected and non-affected areas is also necessary.

Session 2 - Focus Group Discussions

Chairperson: Prof. P. C. Joshi, University of Delhi & Supriya S. Akerkar, University of Northumbria

Agenda session:

- **Quantitative, Qualitative and Participatory** *Presentation by V.K. Srivastava*
- Theory of Focus Group Discussions
- Demonstration of focus group discussion

Issues to be highlighted:

a. Qualitative and quantitative method both are complimentary it has to be integrated.
b. Terry C. commented on the interrelationship between qualitative, quantitative and participatory. People can give much more honest answers if they trust you. Participatory approach increases that level of trust.
c. Terry C. also mentioned that need very careful note for each site on how question is supported by FGD. FGD should have degree of comparability in it, so comparison between sites can be done.

Simulation on Focus Group Discussion *Moderated by Supriya S. Akerkar*

Focus Group Discussion simulation was conducted to give illustration to the audience about the situation of FGD in the field. Shishir R.D. was voluntarily acted as the facilitator and Laura I. was appointed to be the Recorder. There were 6 HSPH's students who are willing to be the member of the FGD.

- **Presentation by P. C. Joshi: things to consider to conduct Focus Group Discussion:**

- Situational analysis
- Recruitment: 1 facilitator & 1 note taker.
- Should consider the language barrier between the facilitator and the group. Solution to reduce the negative effect on language barrier:
    a. Recruit local person and trained them to be the facilitator OR
    b. Bring from university, facilitator that speaks the language
- Physical arrangements
- Developing of discussion guide (1 specific idea)
- Selecting participants of FGD :
    a. Enable different perspective, shared characteristic & shared experience.
    b. It is recommended 4 FGD per sites (dominant socio-economic group, marginalized group, NGO representatives, and government officials group). However, there is a justification.
    c. Should recognize the condition regarding gender issues in the area study. E.g. sensitive topic that can be dynamic with only women and without men.
- Size of Group = 6-7 participants
- Duration of FGD : 90 minutes, it should be shorter but if people are enjoying, then it should go on
- Selecting venue of FGD (no hierarchy or constraining relationships & neutral places – no political, religious obstacles). Should be careful in choosing location to conduct FGD, to avoid crowd and preserved the quality of FGD. Another consideration on the transportation allowance to a venue and meal.

Ethical Issues

a. Inform Consent: written vs verbal taped consent. If the informant refused or hesitate to put their signature in the consent, due to illiterate or other reason, then verbal taped consent can be the least disturbing solution.
b. Permission to record (voice and or video recorder). The facilitator will not record until the consent is signed (written or verbal).
c. Should be mention that : anonymity will be assured, no wrong answer, the objective of the FGD, the importance of respondent to the study, what is the benefit for the respondent in giving such information.

Idea to modify the workshop schedule to have extra time on the questionnaire development.

H.V. Nhu proposed for extra time on the questionnaire. He said that the communication among partners has been so much better than before, still it's not enough to discuss such important issue like questionnaire over emails. He proposed to reduce some part of workshop agenda like workshop on Epi Info.

D. Guha-Sapir responded positively on H.V. Nhu's idea and decided that there will be some time to be reserved to resolve the questionnaires. D. Guha-Sapir also stressed the importance of Epi Info training. Laura will distribute the adjusted agenda on the next morning.

Consensus to use Epi Info on data entry software for MICRODIS data.

Session 3 - Questionnaire Design

Chairperson: Prof. Srivastava, University of Delhi & Prof. Guha-Sapir, University Catholique de Louvain

Opening from D. Guha-Sapir :

- readjusting the agenda to spend more time on the household questionnaire
- D. Guha-Sapir shares the plans for the work group session and discusses the methodology for the work group session. She also suggests theme specific group meetings on Wednesday (session 5 and 6)

Discussion on the Questionnaire Design, lead by V.K. Srivastava

- Three things to consider in a questionnaire: general, culturally specific, how to administered
- Each questions should be discussed in terms of which question is relevant for the research objectives, for the community which being studied and for individual.
- This is generic questionnaire which is administered as a schedule. Each question should be asked and filled.
- Translation of the questionnaire to other languages must be careful and wording.
- Make questions culturally specific, language specific.
- Issues of translation and back translation may be important, piloting the questionnaire. Local experience should be considered
- Each question should be very clear and specific. No ambivalent and abstract questions.
- Avoid leading questions
- Structure of questionnaire: one page describes objectives of this work why questions should be collected. Email and address of people carried out this research.
- Answers should be short looking because questionnaire is administered and answered in the absence of the investigator.

Session 4 - Key Informant Interviews

Chairperson: Prof. V.K. Srivastava, University of Delhi

Presentation by V.K. Srivastava on Key Informant Interviews Method

- The key informant is the person who knows about their culture and for the reasons of their own is willing to share their knowledge with us.
- They are mutually chosen because they are different – because they are deviants – not in a negative sense – but are cynical or marginal to their society.
- They are able to distinguish between positive and negative aspects of the culture – and their ability to do snowball sampling process – that is they enable you to go to certain people – who may not be cynical of their culture but are useful for information.
- Key informants provide information on past of the communities, contemporary institutions and their roles, and norms, values and experiences of people

Discussion :

- Who could be selected as Key informant?

Categories of Key informants could be based on age, women, lower classes, and can be chosen as we are planning to study the impact. A key informant should not be reticent, or not able to give the information that you need. They are not chosen through random process, those who are ready to share, collect and collaborate can be the key informant. In Anthropological surveys there are always 3-4 key informants. Key informant method has evolved in Anthropological schools, but they can be used by others – and MICRODIS could think about it.

- How many questions should be ask to a Key Informant?
We could ask key informants questions from social, economic, health impact – with interview guide, starting with some key questions. Not more than six questions should be selected for key informants.

- Can we use the person from FGD as key informant?
In FGD as well as in Key respondent interview the foci may remain the same. In FGD, we are trying to develop a group view- while in key informants – we choose them because their knowledge or understanding. However the respondents in FGD are not chosen because of their knowledge but because of their shared characteristic – common strata; or experience.

- Giving money to the respondent?
There are also other issues to be considered – such as giving money to the respondent and how do we deal with them. All good research guidelines say that money should not be given but that they should be adequately compensated – but what this compensation is – is not defined. Possibly small gifts in kind and not in terms of money could be given.

D. Guha-Sapir suggested that no money should be given – and interviews should not be collected by giving monetary incentive – this is like buying your interviewers and is bad research – the validity of the findings of such research will be questioned, if done so.

Key informant interview : A Practical Mock Exercise

Key informant interview simulation was conducted to give illustration to the audience about the situation of key informant interview in the field. Terry Canon acted as the interviewer and a female student who has personal experience in floods was act as the key informant.

<u>Things need to be consider during key informant interview:</u>

a. Introduction: self introduction and MICRODIS introduction – what is MICRODIS and what is MICRODIS doing in the field
b. Ask the key informant to sign the inform consent and permission to record the interview
c. The interview is like a tree – branches are some of the issues – researcher could follow the different branches depending upon the which issue/branch you want to go in detail
d. The interview should be tape recorded and confidentiality should be mentioned. The key informant need to jot down – some words – and all verbal and non verbal actions which happened during this interview. This needs to be done immediately after the interview.
e. All interviews may be taken in local language – or transcribed in the language of the place but needs to be translated in English for the sake of interviews.

Session 5 – Guidelines and Comments

Chairperson: Prof. Srivastava, University of Delhi & Tim Wind, HealthNetTPO

- **Presentation: review of the guidelines by Tim Wind**
- **Terry Cannon: FGD 5 points and discussion**

Tim Wind then pointed out that consensus is needed for coding "yes" and "no". He then discussed

- Ethical considerations
- Common code book
- Level of missing value
- Missing data
- Quantitative univariate and multivariate statistical tests
- Structural equation modeling
- Household surveys

The session was continued with the presentation by Terry Cannon on "MICRODIS Core Module"
Terry C. discussed that :

- Opportunity to collect narratives be open ended especially about risks /hazards
- People do not fit into our pre-determined ideas of risks and disasters.
- Recurrent hazards can be explored through narratives. We can use it to get ideas of disaster causes which are not easily found in the questionnaires- participatory methods should be better

Mondastri K.S. remarked that what is important in a guideline or a manual is the practical things for real research implementation in the field. In these practicalities, many consensuses are needed. The theoretical aspects should be kept as minimal as possible.

Tim W. then discussed

- Complementation of quantitative and qualitative methods
- Translation of instruments where qualitative method meets quantitative method. The participants reached at a consensus that traditional way of translation will take place where the main idea of the question will be taken care of.
- Also discussion was about sample drop out. Mondastri K.S. proposed to calculate the refusal rate while M.T. Sharon added that we should also ask why people refuses to answer. According to P.C. P.C. Joshi we should finalize the question and if it takes three hours then people would go away.
- Also it was discussed about the respondent. P.C.Joshi proposed that half of the respondent should be from female headed family and rest should be from male headed family. Half of the respondents should be women. We can consult other family members if the respondent does not know some information.
    - Need to find out what people's own priorities are, it may or may not be flood.
    - They may not be the same as ours as outsiders who come in with the focus on "disaster"
    - This will improve links to control households
    - Do we talk about hazards or disasters?
    - We need their definition of occupation
    - Does the questionnaire capture the Household members who are living there as a result of disaster?
    - Who will be respondent in a household

P.C. Joshi also discussed general practicalities .e.g. currency conversion. He proposes to use wage rate as a proxy for equivalence in income and the unit of measurement all in metric. He also pointed out that in the economic survey time to recovery as a key issue is missing.

Session 6 – Thematic Questionnaire Review

- Thematic group member review their questionnaires
- Comments and suggestions, site focus, review from Tim Wind
- Issues to be discussed: standardization across sites (how a question can be common and coded across all sites), what kind of validation questions to include in their questionnaires, what kind of coding structures will you use for the questions, identifying questions which are common thematic core questions which should be done in all sites and those which are optional depending on the site or focus, identify the kind of ideas that would require focus group discussions or other participatory methods (not more than 6-7 preferably).

Session 7 – Thematic Group Report Back

Chairperson: Prof. Debarati Guha-Sapir. University Catholique de Louvain

Objectives

- comments and suggestions, site focus
- thematic group members review their questionnaires
- issues to be discussed: standardization across sites (hoe a question can be common and coded across all sites), what kind of validation questions to include in their questionnaires, what kind of coding structures will you use for the questions, identifying questions which are common thematic core questions which should be done in all sites and those which are optional depending on the site or focus into the extended, identify the kind of ideas that would require focus group discussions or other qualitative methods (not more than 6-7 preferably)

HEALTH GROUP

- conceptual model overview
- 4 main health core parameters
- Mondastri K.S. proposed 2 alternatives of essential/core of subjects/indicators/issues within each core parameters; i.e. the short and long list of core subjects. The selected core subjects would lead to core questions
- Group agreed to select 4 core subjects, i.e. mortality, morbidity, accessibility to health care services, environmental (watsan)
- discussion – acute disease – interesting to know immediately after the event and at the time of the survey
- Finally, 16 questions were chosen by the group → see presentation note and indicated questions for the Health Core

ECONOMIC GROUP

- 10-15 questions
- discussion on narrative of experiences of disasters → this can go into an FGD
- add cost of treatment to illness section in the HWG core
- Add contribution of member to household to the HWG
- some questions are overlap with other questionnaires
- socio-economic status indicators by the UN which are global will be good for the MICRODIS core
- SES, loans, occupation, valuation of damages, non-monetized valuation, consumption patterns are the main topics
- Damages, loss of services/materials/etc., damages on production, livestock, infrastructure
- Temporary displacement, migration and their costs

SOCIAL GROUP
- difficult process
- questionnaire model
- SWG core
- Coping (30 questions)
- Social support

Comments
- Too lengthy social theme core questions (i.e. occupy 8 pages) would be so much burdensome for the respondents, interviewers and researchers, especially in other groups, i.e. Health and Social groups
- Mondastri K.S. proposed that we should limit the optimal interview time. The whole questions in a questionnaire will be optimally asked for about 1 (one) hour. Not more than 1/3 of one hour (20 minutes) used for all MICRODIS and thematic core questions
- Think about Europe, some areas done apply
- Definition of social capital must be understood and clear, applicable to all sites
- Keep in mind the conclusions that the group wants to draw (for all groups)
- Also keep in mind the other groups have to conduct these other thematic cores
- Don't make compromises to produce bad science but this is too long when thinking of the other groups who have cut their questions
- The lack of justification of results of asking these questions sometimes appears
- Limit yourself to main areas

- **Presentation by D. Guha Sapir on the practical implementation plan and training outline, with timeline**
- We have a good idea of where we are going
- keep this in mind -- be innovated, not just reusing existing tools
- try to discuss and come up with what you think would be a rapid assessment tool
- need to be more realistic and pragmatic based on past literature
- President of Vietnam's speech about climate change and natural disaster in the news last night - disasters in top of political agenda
- 6-8 weeks maximum, produce a timeline for the surveys for each site
- we accept them at coordination centre, compare timelines and respond depending on the other timelines and how our surge capacity is looking
- It is a mandatory for each country attending this workshop to submit a mission report to the coordination team
- IWG role in the project for year 2 – Terry C. acting as an advisor for qualitative methods and disaster management lecturer at institutions (more details later)

- **D. Guha-Sapir give thanks to H.V. Nhu and the HSPH team, V.K. Srivastava and all the participants**

Session 8 - Life History and Disaster Narratives

Chairperson: Prof. Srivastava, University of Delhi

- **Presentation by V.K. Srivastava on Life History and Narratives**

- Life history can be done as a pre questionnaire phase to provide insight about sight specific information, or as a post questionnaire phase to provide material of the interpretation of data
- P.C. Joshi thinks that since the majority of researches in MICRODIS are quantitative person it would be critical to understand the qualitative approach. He proposed that in each sites to asked school children to write an essay regarding the disaster, and provide reward for the 3 big best. For Junior high: to draw flood, volcano or whatever → Fulfilling one of WP in MICRODIS → Awareness of generation.
- To do life history near the disaster sites.
    - Researchers have to see life history from their perspective. To do that will need long time. Focus life history on disaster. Skills on the interviewer might be a challenge.
    - Regarding number: it is difficult to state. It all depends upon the time availability for study. How many people are working for MICRODIS. 2-3 life histories/narrative would be insightful. With snowball sampling methods → who experience the most, who severed the most, etc.
    - Many hypotheses emerged from this approach.

The above points should be taken in to consider whether the narrative will be done by MICRODIS as well.

- Narrative inquiry: especially useful in explorations of the issues in social change, causality and social identity. This is a simple part of life history. Can be produced without being in to a long time of observation.
- Disaster narrative → this narrative is like any other narrative except that it is a “thick description” of a disastrous situation or extreme event that an affected person or a group of persons provides. “Thick Description” is a detail description, it cover each of every aspect that relevant to the disaster and its effect to the people → verbalization of disaster.
- Life history has its own strength and weaknesses. The weaknesses can be mitigated.
- When a research observing other, the other will also observing the researcher. We should consider what people would think in “the back stage”. As a researcher we should demeanor their self. Slanks should be avoided. Do not smoke. Learn to ability to listen. Be full attention to other people who is talking. Keep formal.

Session 9 - Social Mapping and Demonstration of Social Mapping

Chairperson: Dr. Terry Cannon, University of Greenwich

- **Presentation by Terry Canon on Community Mapping**

1. Community mapping : A group of people draw a map of their community and what is important in it. Can do several layers of basic information and vulnerabilities, risks and hazards, resources and sources of resilence. The goal is to empower people to think about risks and risk reduction. E.g. VCA Toolbox

- Benefit for MICRODIS: a. source of information on disaster narratives, b. building trust, c. understanding the situation better.
- This mapping could identify what was really needed by the community, so the intervention would bring direct benefit to them.

- **Discussion**

Mondastri K.S.: Who to interpret the community mapping which is very much contradicting with the official mapping. What is the map capturing?

Terry C.: Community map might be not accurate. The accuracy depend on the skills one who drawing it and the representative of distance on their perspective. Distance doesn't matter. The important thing what the people wants to show you what they really want.
The map will be capturing: What is there, what the risks, what was happened it the last disaster, which house destroyed, what the capacity of the people to resistance.

Laura I.: Community map help researcher get the perception of problems in community. Compare the community map to the official map. Example the community will probably draw water source further than it actually is compare to the official map → this can show that in the community perspective that the water source is far away from them.

2. Institution (Power) Mapping.

- Various ways to show power relationships. E.g. There will be difference between maps that developed by women and man in the community that powered by man.
- There will be a surprised fact that researcher could find the the mapping. E.g. A consistent "cricket club" showed in a hurricane disaster institution mapping.
- Benefits and drawbacks of methods: a. engages people, b. may be sensitive, c. may take a while to understand it due to scale.

- **Discussion:**

- **When the mapping should take place ideally?**
Terry C. Proposed to do at the start before the survey. Actually it is ideal to do it before the questionnaire development. It will give sense of where you are. How many , minimum 1 and show different layers (if the researcher could manage to do such a thing). After you have 1 map consist of different layers, then the researcher should separate every layers. If the time is available, you can ask each social group to draw a map only on layer

- **Much of this done in the Asian country not in Europe? Why?**
Terry C. answered that he was glad when MICRODIS involve European country, so that he could propose this approach in the European country. No body does that. He's looking forward for Europe to use the PRA methods. Asia will be the lessons learn for Europe regarding this matter.

- **What should we do to interpret different mapping?**
Terry C. answered you should do agenda analysis for a number of resources from FGD to know why the difference occupied. To identify is it a problem or only a matter of perception. This map provide data about their perception then you will have explanation about these perception when come back to do the FGD.

Session 10 - Mixed Thematic Group Questionnaire Review

Groups Discussion

During this session, the participants were divided in to three mixed thematic groups focused in one main thematic in each group (Health, Social and Economic). This arrangement was to re-discuss the thematic core questionnaires and to identify what other thematic group think about each of thematic core questionnaires that has been developed in the previous day.

Since the facilitator of discussion in each mixed thematic group was lead by the representative of the main focused thematic, the other participants with different background of expertise were incapable to optimally express their idea.

After the discussion, the representative of each mixed thematic groups should present the result in the panel meeting.

Session 11 – Mixed Thematic Group Report Back

Chairperson: Prof. Srivastava, University of Delhi

Groups have discussed their core questionnaires and other issues with other members of different thematic groups.

HEALTH WORK GROUP, presented by Mondastri K.S.:

- perhaps use standardize form for classification of disease
- will keep water and sanitation in one section
- think about the reason the medical access was disrupted
- discussion of health seeking treatment being in the core
- maybe there is one structure of question that can be agreed upon
- level of analysis
- health group proposed household, but that every household is represented by one respondent
- this will be easier for analysis
- there are many questions in health which require data at the individual level
- general questions are fine by household but the detailed questions will be done on an individual level
- The cultural reference will be different depending on the country and the theme
- V.K. Srivastava – missing and dead distinction in columns, perhaps people can't seek medical aid because they are stuck in their houses (have no boat and they are flooded, etc), one column for water and one for sanitation – keep them separate
- If there is only one responding then perhaps the format will change in the questionnaire

ECONOMIC WORK GROUP, presented by Tomas Talledo:

- There are 12 questions in the economic core questionnaire
- Economic core will include lists and damage to road, electricity, etc
- Temporary displacement can be included in the MICRODIS core, if not it will go in the economic core
- Migration, insurance, and aquaculture perhaps should be in extended part because it's not applicable to all sites.
- difficult to measure the contribution of family members in non-monetized
- must be gender-segregated data
- actual costs and estimated costs should be separated
- There are columns for where the aid is coming from, make sure there is support from the families (there is an 'other' option)
- Should be about 10-15 minutes in total

SOCIAL WORK GROUP, presented by Chona R. Eschavez:

- There are 8 pages, for each component there are a series of questions and if one question is removed the reliability of the data will change. It was questioned by other participant is it possible to take out a chapter if it's not possible to reduce it? Length and number of questions should be considered
- The main categories (social protection, social capital, etc.)
- Individual and communal coping: Gender issue
- Techniques on how to ask a questions is a problem

- Prompted and unprompted question for the 'narrative'
- Translation and training needs to be very cautious during this section
- Received social support – terms should be clarified
- Making sure that all have the 5 scales or that the 5 scales are put together and the 2 scales are put together
- Received social support, mortgage question and micro-finance – perhaps will be move to social extended
- Social capital – gender difference should be taken into consideration, full scale to 1-5 instead of 1-2
- Can one respondent give answers for the rest of the household?
- Food question needs to be in the MICRODIS core
- Add a column to trace if someone sold something, and who
- Core has to be smaller, not consist of the main aspect or time for the questionnaire

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Need to be define the definition of household
- Need consensus from the thematic work groups on who will be the most suitable respondents for their questionnaires (mother/father/head of household) and the composition of respondents (proposed by the Social group 50% male & 50% female)
- P.C. Joshi emphasized again that the length of interview would be about one hour and maximum about 1/3 of one hour will be used for all core questions (MICRODIS core and thematic core questions).
- Mondastri K.S. addressed that the 8 pages of Social core questions will be a hard burden for other groups, especially for Health group. Other group, e.g. Health group will miss many opportunities to explore more the specific health aspects in the extended thematic questions, since the thematic core questions (put in the earlier sections in the questionnaire) had already been too lengthy and exhaustive. This situation would jeopardize the health data quality at the end.
- The use of terms : have to adapt the terms applicable to local without loosing the context
- Overlapping questions among work groups should be manage accordingly
- Additional pages on the questionnaire for the interviewer to able to take notes
- Laura stated in order to be fair with all thematic groups, the thematic core questions should be kept quite short

DAY 5
Friday May 23rd, 2008

Session 12 - Management of Qualitative Data

Leader: Prof. PC Joshi, University of Delhi & Prof.V.K. Srivastava, University of Delhi

- **Presentation by V.K. Srivastava on the Qualitative Data Management and Analysis**
- ∂ Due to the complexity and not readily convertible to standard measurable units, the qualitative data analysis approach is different compare to the quantitative data analysis.
- ∂ impact of disaster in communities – and is measured in terms of SHE with the use of several tools (interview schedule, FGD and KII guides), use both quantitative and qualitative approaches will be used; interpret numbers and substantiate impressions
- ∂ Narrative and Performance Analysis – how people tell the story; done from written texts
- ∂ Discourse Analysis – close study of conversation of people – needs active recording
- ∂ When we adopt the questionnaire to local setting, we conduct FGDs or informal conversation with the locals or just listen to what people are saying.
- ∂ Variety of interpretations with the various ways of analyzing data from different disciplines.
- ∂ Qualitative Research is visualization of data but we are really after the meaning because that is what we are after.

- **Presentation by P. C. Joshi - Qualitative Data Analysis**

Analytical Phases

- Recording – text based, jotting book, tape-recorded (if permissible), expanded notebook, transcribed and translated into English (left margin for coding and right margin for the 1st level of analysis
- Immersion in the data – reading and re-reading to discover relationship and relevance of statements, look at use of words that describe phenomenon or concept, quotations and statements people use that are relevant to the research, data reduction
- Generating categories and themes – difficult, complex and fun, demands heightened awareness and attention, skill in identifying salient themes, recurring ideas and language, pattern and belief, discover domains and relationships, deductive and inductive ways of generating themes and patterns,
- Coding – the formal representation of analytical thinking, textual data is continuously coded, abbreviation of key words, color dots or numbers, computer software (Goffer, ethnograph, nudist)
- Offering interpretation – reading, and reading, immersion; this is different from analysis, this is telling the story; it is attaching significance to the findings, offering explanations
- Searching for alternative understanding – negative instances of the searched patterns through analysis, searching for other plausible analysis

- **Presentation by Tomas Talledo on Grounded Theory**
- ∂ Qualitative data – transcripts of interviews, field notes, observations of behavior
- ∂ Researcher has no pre-conceived theories of explanation
- ∂ The theoretical explanation is arrived at inductively or rather than chose beforehand (a priori)

Questions/Clarifications/Comments from the Floor

- how qualitative approach enriches the findings and empowers communities
- much of the problem for the social questionnaire was we were also after defining social constructs
- tensions due to disciplinary backgrounds
- health and economics will enrich and deepen the data that they have gathered if they make use of the qualitative approach

- conditions in the place in conducting a survey (presence of the chief and Rs cannot give honest answers)
- you can never know if the quantitative data given to you is “honest” or “true”; the same will apply for the qualitative data but the researchers have more checks regarding the data’s ‘validity”

Session 13 - Epi Info Training

Leader: Eko Setyo Pambudi, University of Indonesia

The training took place at the HSPH’s computer laboratory. There was a mismatch between the training materials prepared by the session leader with the software available in the computer laboratory. The training material was prepared for Epi Info Dos version version while the software that available in the computer was Epi Info Windows version. Actually there’s no different with the function between these two, but the display and the working process of data entry template development is so much different. The problems can be quickly solved by collaboration between the session leader and statistician from HSPH who was more familiar with the Epi Info for Windows. After coffee break, it was planned to be the continuation session of Epi Info training, the data entry process. However this plan can not be proceed due to error in the Epi Info software in all computers.

To conclude, at the beginning the training was not having a smooth start, but in general it was a full of life training and all participants had successfully develop their template as assigned; unfortunately the training material could not be finished due to technical error.

Interactive Discussion during the Epi Info

Need to be followed up:

a. Supriya S.A. will expand the qualitative research guidelines based on the presentation and discussion in the workshop.
b. M.T. Sharon will send the guidelines to the social working group, might cover what we are talking about here.
c. Tim W. will share to all partner members the article on Walk About.
d. Tim W. will compiling Data Quality Assurance guideline sent by Eko S.P. with his Quantitative research guideline.
e. Meidy F.P. will do the Workshop Report
f. Each country partner attending the workshop must submit a mission report to the coordination team.