

Qualitative Research Writing Workshop  
Health Research and Social Development Forum/ University of  
Edinburgh  
3<sup>rd</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> April, 2016  
Dhulikhel Mountain Resort, Kavre

---

**Facilitators:**

- Alice Street (University of Edinburgh)
- Jamie Cross (University of Edinburgh)

*Notes taken by Rekha Khatri (RK)*

**Day 1 (3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2016)**

**THE WRITING PROCESS**

**Introduction to the workshop by RK:**

- Introduction/ Background of RECOUP based workshop: built as a part of capacity building of individuals and institutions in qualitative research in Nepal
- Built within the Wellcome trust grant received by Dr. Ian Harper for the project, Understanding TB control: ethics, technologies and programme
- Contents covered in first and second workshop; this is last in the series of three workshops which will focus on writing, and will be facilitated by Alice and Jamie

**Introduction to the workshop by Alice (AS) and Jamie (JC):**

AS and JC introduced themselves

AS-medical anthropologist at University of Edinburgh; experiences of working in Papua New guinea; experiences of conducting these kind of workshops

JC- economic anthropologist; University of Edinburgh; experiences of working in India; experiences of conducting these kinds of workshops

About the workshop:

- This writing retreat is focused on academic writing.
- Finish a draft academic article; the point is to feel comfortable with the idea of writing; not thinking it is very difficult
- Not a exotic thing; not very different thing from what you have been doing
- Sessions: break down writing sessions; combined with peer feedback; group discussion
- Collaboration on writing

- Break this writing process thing; go through what an article is, what you structure is

AS: First two days very intensive; a lot from Jamie and I; second two days will be about writing and preparing to write; structured writing sessions; peer feedback and sessions with Jamie and I

**Introduction from participants:**

AS: Tell us about yourself; your research, what you do; what you would like to learn from here; your personal goal for the workshop; reflections on experiences of writing

Sudeepa (SK): Research manager-Health Service Delivery at HERD; doing operational and implementation researches; had attended writing workshop earlier organized by Union; it was quantitative and we could come up with a manuscript; expectation would be to coming up with an article but I also understand that this is writing from qualitative data; so expecting to learn about getting the principles right

Anju Bhatta (AB): qualitative research team member at HERD; menstrual hygiene projects; haven't written any paper till date; would be able to write a good paper

Pravin Paudel (PP): involvement in HR project; to write a good paper

Prabin Shrestha (PS): involvement in TB program; get basic ideas about writing the paper

Sanjay Sharma (SS): ICIMOD; area of research interest is migration; a little more than 5 years; papers based on qualitative research and secondary data; doing large scale quantitative research; in-depth interviews of various stakeholders, translated and coding

Expectation: writing something out of the data, and creating a path/direction for writing

Jasmine Lama (JL): Implementation research manager at Possible Health; ANC project; mental health; mixed methods; not taken any workshop; took few writing classes in grad school; different ways of doing qualitative research; interacting with everyone; how we can work in a limited resource centre

Obindra Chand (OC): Nepal and Malawi project; different maternal and child health project, looking at foreign aid; qualitative and ethnographic one; in-depth studying of four Maternal and Child Health projects; interested in cross cultural understanding of health, hospital ethnography

Amrita Limbu (AL): Social Science Baha (SSB); migration, impact of earthquake; expectation is to improve writing

Sambriddhi Kharel (SKh): SSB; research looking at marginalized groups, caste based group and resistance

Abriti Arjyal: HERD; qualitative health research; reproductive health, immunization; expecting to get more ideas, get to know how we can write academic article

Shophika Regmi (SR): HERD; Family Planning project; three interventions/pilots; doing monitoring and evaluation of those interventions; writing about one of them; its mixed method; writing a good paper

Machhindra Basnet (MB): new to HERD but not to qualitative research; 5 and half years of doing qualitative research; menstrual hygiene projects; planning to write from one of those projects; expecting to learn how we write structured papers

Prasansa Subba (PSB): TPO; PRIME; multi national project; integrated mental health care in primary health care centres; maternal depression; planning to write on earthquake: coping strategies on earthquake; novice in academic writing

Ruja Pokhrel (RP): TPO Nepal; EMERALD study; cross country research study; perception of policy makers and planners; produce a good research paper

Regina Basnet (RB): INF; need assessment of palliative care; learning some skills to write qualitative papers

### *Summarizing the session*

JC: people are doing qualitative research; motivations is to develop professional skills; writing is to make knowledge more widely available; making it available to larger group of people

AS: enjoyed reading the research summary all of you had written; it made us realize how much valuable research is being done; we do have experiences of writing the article; helping all of us learn

### **Introducing the sessions:**

Broad sense of what you have done; where your articles might be positioned; different kinds of journals; what different kinds of requirements; how we write; how we use our time

Tomorrow: findings to an argument; a lot of writing as analysis and get to an argument; move on to incorporate literature; making sure the article speaks to a body of literature; searches and reviews; what your contribution is to that particular field

Most articles are about making incremental changes

How to develop argument and incorporating literature;

Day 3: to develop literature; to develop a plan to incorporate to all what you have done

Day 4: short one to one sessions with Jamie and Alice; peer reviews;

Other days will be writing.

### **ACTIVITY: Writing your findings**

What have we found out and who would be interested in it? Very easy to get bogged down in the detail of our research data. But we usually have a sense of what we have found out and what contribution it might make to the field of research or policy. We want to record these initial thoughts so that we can keep hold of them and keep coming back to them throughout the week. They might change, or you might decide to limit the number of findings you focus on for this particular article, but something for us all to return to throughout the week. What have we found out and who would be interested in it? Very easy to get bogged down in the detail of our research data. But we usually have a sense of what we have found out and what contribution it might make to the field of research or policy. We want to record these initial thoughts so that we can keep hold of them and keep coming back to them throughout the week. They might change, or you might decide to limit the number of findings you focus on for this particular article, but something for us all to return to throughout the week.

AS: Write your findings on top of your head. This is a short exercise-what would we say to someone we had just met who asked us what we found out.

- Begin with the first impressions of your findings;
- Were you surprised by any of your findings?
- Did any particular responses, discussions or events stick in your mind? Why?
- Were there particular issues that came up again and again?
- Were there notable similarities or differences between the responses or practices of different research participants?
- Did you find out that your research was actually about something different from what you set out to do?

*The participants immersed themselves in writing out their findings.*

#### **ACTIVITY: Contribution to the field**

- What are the big questions or problems that your research addresses?
- Who would be interested?
  - Academic community
  - Policy community
  - Practice community
- What debates are you hoping to intervene in?

You need another people to be interested in this; what significant does this made; What kinds of debates you are hoping to contribute

We are going to leap from findings to contribution by describing our findings to the person next to us; to which field. If there is particular field of practice that you want to contribute, please mention.

AS shared her experience from Papua New Guinea. Study in a hospital about how people got to provincial hospital from remote areas; lot of death rates; they need a reason for this; patients are arriving late; what was already assumed was the reasons of arriving late was because of traditional systems and people took medical services as last resort; people getting to hospitals despite referral systems not because of it; not beliefs that are holding people back, but transportation infrastructure to support the referral system

Possible contributions: to argue that people aren't being referred at first visit as against the assumption that people are less reluctant to access services; health systems depend on non-health infrastructure; affects the kinds of interventions that might be made to reduce time to teaching hospital. Do health workers need to be trained to make referrals more quickly? Problem of dependence on the return visit if antibiotics/antimalarials have not worked

*After the participants worked in pair by explaining their findings, they presented each other's work to the group.*

### **Sharing session:**

AS asked the participants to share about each other's work.

SS: I think it would be useful if the other person could also give feedback while explaining about the research.

AS: Give your version of other's project.

RK: PSB's work on earthquake is about coping strategies used by people after the earthquake. The study was done in 3 districts after four months of the earthquake. She found differences in coping based on age, caste group, and gender. Young males were found to be engaged more in smoking, alcohol consumption. Women were mostly forming groups and sharing their problems. In high caste families, elderly people were found to be engaged more in religions activity. There were also negative coping strategies; for example, suicidal ideation among those who have lost their family or property; feelings of survivor's guilt;

Possible contribution: Checklists used for assessing mental health and designing of interventions are very much western ideas; this study could possibly contribute to take account of local cultural factors in designing interventions.

PSB: RK's work is ethnographic work; TB labs in different parts of the country; visited the health facilities; observed labs and interacted with health workers; introduction of genexpert; how the health workers are perceiving new technologies in the facilities; what is their contribution of the technologies; relationship between workers; basic TB test done in every health facilities; advanced test done in Kathmandu;

They found that lab workers are not quite happy with the existing arrangements; they feel that the lab is not getting enough recognition for the work they are doing; fewer opportunities to travel outside;

Not enough time to discuss further on contribution

RP:

- Regina's research focused on evaluation of rural staff support programme; 69 shopkeepers in 7 districts; her findings into four categories
- Positive aspects; negative aspects; changes in the programme; what community expects
- Through the hospitals, doctors are providing general treatment; after the programme; doctors are available 24 hours
- Respondents perceive that hospitals are not cleaned; not good services; longer waiting hours;
- They prefer other clinics than district hospital.
- Respondents compared this programme with the programme supported by Swiss government which provided free medicines and allowances to patients; they expect similar things now as well
- They want more doctors; renowned doctors; foreign doctors

Contribution: AS suggested thinking about the broader effects of development programmes; comparison between two projects

RB:

- Ruja's study is on mental health integration; sites: Chitwan and Kathmandu; interviews
- Few barriers: budgeting was low; lack of HR, they were not well trained; in government health system, people are more interested to get allowances rather than skills from the training
- Bit of confusion whether mental health was integrated in policy

AS: You could see trainings as means of resources.

PS:

- Pravin's research is Empowering district level managers to improve performance
- They do the annual planning, targets
- Regular support from the district office; review of the planning, reward and performance improvement plan
- Intervention was: Performance Based Management System (PBMS) was first done in Doti
- Guidelines was revised and implemented for a year; endline study was conducted
- Findings: Evaluation system has been fair and transparent; Supervision was supported
- Revision of guidelines; PBMS system should be linked with other existing systems of the governmentt like promotion

Contribution: AS suggested that possible contribution could be towards health management; middle managers and their roles

PP:

- Prabin's study on MDR treatment and counseling; MDR treatment is limited in few parts of the country;
- Problems faced by patients; have to move away from the family; socio economic problems; psychosocial issues
- Intervention: providing counseling; providing health education
- Counseling was beneficial for the treatment; patients were able to share the problems; what they want
- Train health workers, enable their capacity; increase and improve the patient's allowances; vocational trainings; integrate in the health system

AS: differences between reports and articles: Jamie would discuss later; how have academics talked about counseling etc could be the focus

AB:

- Sudeepa's research is about TB-HIV collaboration
- Interviewed focal persons at NCASC and NTC
- Policy about DOTS center should refer to VCT centers and vice-versa; NCASC and NTC should work together to implement this; it is written but not practiced
- Issues from central level to grass root level

AS: what field might this fit it? There are lots of areas.

SK: implementation of policy makers; targeting the policy makers and their attitudes

SK:

- Anju's study is about nutrition; multi sectoral coordination; Multi Sector Nutrition Plan (MSNP); focus on nutrition program should be beyond health
- Interviews done from central level to VDC level with different stakeholders

AA:

- Very difficult to understand Sanjay's research as it is a very different field
- Identifying gap among the migrant and climate change stakeholders on how migration has affected the migration and vice versa
- Because of flood, people migrate and send remittances
- Migrant stakeholders understood migration as gulf countries
- Climate change stakeholders: migration as internal; more aware of migration issues

SS:

- Abriti's study is about vaccination; very difficult for me to understand
- It was a rapid assessment

- WHO introduced three vaccine combinations; Nepal government went ahead and changed the vaccine schedule; the assumption was that before the GoN changed the schedule; the health workers would be trained but they were not
- Understand the perceptions of vaccine providers; community beneficiaries
- HW said that they have been doing it and it wouldn't be difficult for them to administer the change
- Beneficiaries weren't communicated about the changes; schedules; and why it is being done.
- In my opinion, the government intervention wouldn't matter much. If I were more aware, I would probably ask the government to reschedule to what is more effective.

JL:

- Obindra was working in a multi-country study.
- How is foreign aid delivered and channelized in Maternal and Child Health?
- Comparison is analytic between 2 countries: young democracy, donor based; cultural similarity; high MMR
- Policy level to show changes and recommendation
- There has been increase in MCH funding. Increase in target based data collection; consortium based development projects; why is there increase in target oriented data collection and if it is being used?
- They are looking at four projects by going back to literature, observations; interviews; participating in trainings; How the projects are being practically implemented

AS: emergence of target culture in health and development sector; that form of knowledge through M and E could be contribution

OC:

- Jasmine's study is about group ANC check ups;
- This project is implementing Community Health Workers (CHW); they call it as CHW leaders who are SLC graduates; individual based counseling not effective; counseling pregnant women in groups; 14 VDCs of Achham district; counseling is more focused on importance of ANC check up, nutrition and delivery; increase institutional delivery rates; one of the development goals
- One of her target is whether this project is making any difference in the experience of MCH; to have comparative insights they are doing FGD between who receives and who doesn't receives
- Whether institutional delivery is increasing or not; it is increasing and the awareness level particularly in food habits and nutrition

**AS summarizing the session before lunch:**

Most of you are confident about the research aims, methods, findings; struggled a bit in the contribution



Contribution to policy makers;

for academic articles, the audience could be larger; there could be researchers, academic interested to learn

Much broader range of people including who are working in other countries; people would be interested to learn

How we can move in expanding the audience? How the implications might be greater than just the policy recommendations; for example about health management etc; it could be for management in general as well.

Identifying a field for an article is important to expand and scale the impact of the project.

### **LUNCH BREAK**

*Continuation of previous session:*

MB:

- Shophika's study: Four pilots study; NHSSP implemented the pilot; to enhance the IUCD insertion and removal capacity of health workers; qualitative and quantitative
- Category of service providers: Visiting providers; qualified ANMs with skilled birth capacity
- They are taking observation notes; KII with SBAs, health facility incharge, DHO staff, exit client interview
- Visiting Providers also interviewed
- Most of the Skilled Birth Attendants who are coached by VPs; some were found to be confident while some were not comfortable
- It was found that frequent coaching, supervision and monitoring was required
- IUCD acceptance low in Ramechhap
- Infrastructure issues after Earthquake: lack of confidential spaces

SR:

- Machhindra's study on Menstrual hygiene management practices; Sindhuli and Udaypur
- Class 9 and 10 students; formative research for intervention
- They assess the menstrual hygiene practices
- 3-4 categories of people: adolescent girls, boys
- Is the school doing enough?
- Majority of the girls are using cotton cloths; those girls are nearby market are using sanitary pads but only when going to school; the girls using cotton cloths do not change while at school
- Girls have good knowledge about cloths needing to be dried in sunlight
- Boys: they are supporting girls;
- School teachers: one of them did not touch the girls while she gave the pad

- Families: untouchability practices more in Brahmin, chhetri; not allowing to go to kitchen; not touching plants
- Schools do not have enough facilities; not enough toilets; after the earthquake, temporary toilets

AS: infrastructure is something that could be focused on

AL:

- Sambriddhi ji's research about caste based discrimination; qualitative study; interviews observations; group interviews
- Research focuses if discrimination is gendered
- Dalit use low caste to identify themselves; dalits themselves commonly use low jaat
- Men are more commonly using dalit term compared to women because of their mobility
- Younger generation are using the term dalit
- Because of day to day activities, women report more caste based discrimination
- No outright resistance to discrimination
- Implication for policy, advocacy, and practice; although discrimination is in private sphere, they have ramifications in the policy sphere

SKh:

- Amrita's Research on post EQ post need assessment; part of long term research
- Large research question: the impact of the earthquake; coping strategies; aid flow
- Overall, there is uncertainty because they haven't received money from government.
- There is agency in the people; they tried avenues of new employment; lot migrated;
- Heavy migration indicating disaster induced migration
- How people have started their own shops
- Contribution: journal for disaster; migration impacted by disaster; policy community: National Reconstruction Authority building framework for reconstruction
- For some NGOs: what are some of the new questions?

Tracy Ghale (TG) (describing her own research):

- How did people with disability (PWD) cope with the quake? PWDs in pre-quake situation as well; how opportunities do not come easily
- Sindhupalchowk, gorkha, kavre and nuwakot
- PWDs have tougher times: running away, diverse range of abilities; physical, vision, hearing,
- Diverse experiences
- Male and female PWDs very different experience in general. Increases that vulnerability; increasing the chances of being marginalized
- Male PWDs were more educated; higher chances of getting married; female PWDs didn't want others to be burdened and therefore they don't get married
- Disability card distribution; PWD categorization; there is no clarity in the policy levels
- PWD perspective in the reconstruction; friendly infrastructure

AS: Since you have compartmentalized your findings; you could focus on one area of the article. The term PWD may not necessarily represent the all kind of disabilities or you could focus on the gender differences

### **SESSION: Journal and Audience**

Really important to think of an audience before writing; what kind of debates you contribute

Different types of journals:

Broad journals: broader debates

Topic specific journals: problems focused; particular disease [what particular journals we need to focus on?]

How the research in Nepal would be of interest to other countries facing similar situation

Regional Journals: South Asia Research (development issues); interested in comparison between countries in S Asia

Getting to know the journal:

Journal Scope:

Journal requirements:

Journal conversations:

Really good idea to know about the journal; aims and scope; they are all available in internet

Journal publishes its requirements: author guidelines; prescriptive

Journal conversations: to follow what kinds of articles are being published is useful

Global Public Health example:

Development and Change

Other journals to explore: SSM

You don't have to write only empirical article.

There are different kinds of articles they publish: from secondary data

Peer reviewed original research articles

Peer reviewed short reports of research findings

Submitted or invited commentaries and responses debating

Special issues bringing together collections of papers on a particular theme

Editor of the journal will see if it fits in the scope; then asks for peer review

SS: we could share the resources between different organizations

AS: the wellcome trust outputs need to be open access.

RK: why are journals not open access?

AS: because they are private companies; but increasingly there is a greater push towards journals being open access

TG: How do I know the impact factor of the journals?

AS: in the front page; don't worry too much about the impact factor.

Journals need content; the kinds of topic specific journals; broad journals are extremely competitive.

But if you want to publish into topic specific, there are higher chances.

Don't be scared of rejection. Remember that the journals need you and want your research.

Different kinds of articles: examples from Ian, Alice and Jamie

Activity: Break into two groups. Each group go through the pre-circulated articles. Look at the way in which the article is structured. What different content is in each section? Write a plan of the structure on the flip chart. Identify the parts you would find it easy, and those you would find challenging.

How those articles differ from what we have been writing

Structure of article:

FCHVs Group:

- Abstract: concept of volunteerism; summarizes the entire article
- Background: global to national, local context; social aspect to FCHV volunteerism; concise literature review; thematic literature review within the group; general discussions on the idea of volunteerism; introduction to the FCHV programme
- Aims/Objectives of the study: research questions
- Methods: data collection process, tools, timeframe, social mapping, sampling process, data recording, consent, data analysis: who were involved, transcription/ translation, thematic framework, charting and indexing
- Ethics: written consent, right to withdraw, confidentiality
- Results: Different themes emerged from data; quotes of participants have complimented findings, quotes were anonymized, diverse perspectives of respondents in each themes

- Discussion: theme based discussion, analysis from other literature, looked at findings with reference to other literature, data validity through other literature, comparison from other studies, strengths and limitations
- Conclusion: conclusion and recommendation

Foreign aid paper:

- Abstract: clear summary, lays out structure
- Background: Identifies a problem; issue +question: Overview of health sector; funding environment (SWAP), fact checking references, combines policy and literature review, political context, historical context
- Methods: ethics, timeframe, interview, sampling
- Results: Thematic headings, summary level (difference between working paper and academic article)
- Discussion: Bigger context, academic arguments, contribution

COFFEE BREAK

**Session: How do we write?**

JC: To encourage everyone to reflect on every work they have done; Think about what kind of writing what one wants to do;

Turn to your neighbor; List the different kind of long form, non fiction

What is the same and different about an academic article?

Key similarities:

Ruja: Methodology; we write about data collection process; describing everything

PSB: Overall structure: introduction, methods, findings, discussion [similar]; the general framework is the particular order; organizing structure

JC: some articles do not fit into the structure

SK: the programme implementation paper; tightly focused

Differences:

Engagement with the literature

SK: depends on the donors

JC: review of previous interventions? Literature?

TG: in competitive proposal writing, there is literature

JC: Discussion was distinctive in both the pre-circulated articles.

Part of the challenge is to pick out the key themes and connect it broadly

There are no “templates” to flow. But there are examples of good practice.

Think about somebody whose work you like, and follow their strategies;

“Good artists borrow and great artists steal.”

Figuring out how somebody has constructed sentences; How to focus or shift to different kinds of writing

JC shared grading structure or direction at University of Edinburgh.

Publishable quality?

Insight: how you add to your discussion; what is it that you are bringing from your piece of work that is unique to your piece of research

RK: Is it always possible to get new things?

JC: even if you found same thing in different parts of the world, that could be an insight; original insight.

You have got to make a case that they should publish your piece or fund your proposals.

Remember journals also need people

JC shares about his example of submitting his first article in Contributions to Indian Sociology.

There is nothing different from writing all kinds of other articles.

“1% inspiration and 99% perspiration”

JC: How do we write? How did you write those other pieces of work? How many of you might have worked in that logical frame? Or last minute?

For the reports:

Amrita: getting the easier things first; objectives, methods

Sudeepa: we first start with the methodology, and finish the introductions later

JC: how do we sustain the demands over a long period of time? How do we do it again and again? To accommodate obligations and other works?

All of us are trying to achieve sustainability—

How do we make time to write?

Trying to help foster series of practices—to make writing a part of everyday work

Everybody has different strategies—they have different skills, ways and styles, deadlines

Rather than see people burn out, keep writing part of our everyday work; find strategies for writing that work for us; intensive bursts; not burn out

All depend on breaking writing down into manageable tasks: breaking article into specific parts

Using shorter burst of time to write effectively;

You can find different types of time; incremental constant time to work on; always helpful

Really focused tasks; used to achieve a lot

Short tasks and longer opportunities for writing

RK: Anxiety about putting the literature review and your data together

JC: we will use literature research; learn to search, filter out

Month long period of literature review: use that as example to discuss more

It doesn't necessarily mean you have to read all them up.

SK: how do you know how to write discussion? People do it different; first read and write; or write and look for similar thing

JC: different kind of strategies; different kind of journal requirements;

**ACTIVITY:** Look at your summaries; what sections have you already begun to write in the summary? Background? Problem? Methodology? Make notes on what sections you have already sketched out. How do they need to be filled out?

Hour glass structure: Broader introduction; keep it tight on your research and results and then speak to wider audience

## DAY 2: 4<sup>TH</sup> April, 2016

### DEVELOPING AN ARGUMENT

Recap by AS: what we did yesterday; looking through our research findings and also discussing on the pre-circulated articles; the kind of articles we are looking at have broadly similar structures

- Background (write last. Need to know focus of article)
- Methods (most straightforward)
- Findings/Results (need to keep reworking in relation to discussion)
- Discussion (comparison with literature-use to reframe the findings/results)
- Findings/Results: broken down into thematic sub-headings. Different kinds of findings; e.g. about different people, different topic

Very few concrete examples; not huge number of observations or quotations, instead author has summarized; drawn on 1-2 quotations to illuminate the issues

AS showed her piece of incomplete writing as an example; Underneath each section, putting data together; and developing a bit of discussion

Writing process is not linear

#### **ACTIVITY: Think about your themes, and make a spider diagram.**

Could organize it around concepts, themes or chronology

In a piece of paper, make a spider web or chart out what themes could there be from your study:

AS went to every individual and discuss their work with them.

COFFEE BREAK

AS: There could be shifts into what we were thinking about sections

**ACTIVITY:** Write the headings that you identified as themes in the spider web; pull the data from your interviews, observations [quotations, descriptions] and put it beneath the headings

AS went around, and spoke to everyone on their work

#### **LUNCH BREAK**

#### **KEYWORDS**

JC divided the group into two; and asked the group members to look through the key words of pre-circulated articles; how did they get from themes to keywords? Think about the contribution of the article to the field

Discussion: Keywords being used for:



- General tag for results
- Most used words
- Fields
- Global conventions/documents
- Concept
- Country focus
- Meta tags for themes
- Reflect title

**ACTIVITY:** Write key Words from your studies. Think of at least 5 keywords and discuss with the person next to you. Discuss your key words in the group and write it in the flipchart without repeating.

In a flip chart, participants write the keywords used in the article and put it up on wall.

Common Keywords between two groups: Nepal, disaster

Discussion on the keywords to see about their relevance; some words like 'perception' only were thought of vague

### **Session: Incorporating the literature**

JC: how to identify different kind of resources,

Reference list that might be common; crowd sourcing reference

Google Scholar:

To save citations

Export citations to bibliographic storage systems? Endnote, Zotero, few of them

**ACTIVITY:** Look back at the two pre-circulated articles; when and in what context have people cited; give page number to identify in what kind of context the literature is being cited; five kinds of examples; why is it being cited

### GROUP PRESENTATION

Obindra: divided ourselves into two groups [introduction and background; discussion]

Literature cited for:

1. Historical context/ general scenario
2. To Highlight established fact
3. Statistics/evidence
4. Drawing linkage between global and national context
5. Cross-site comparisons
6. Citing authors (paraphrase)

7. Definitions: for conceptual clarity
8. Cite study results from other papers

Group two: Tracy

1. The Economist: to provide a context in the Background
2. Health aid effectiveness in Nepal; international aid in the health sector
3. Used to say there is a gap; justifying the need for this study
4. Social welfare council (act): background; how foreign contributions are overseen by the SWC
5. Nepal Government: second long term health plan
6. Use of data by transparency International

Group 3: Prabin

1. To generate supporting background
2. To identify gaps in evidence
3. Compare/address opinions and arguments
4. To present similar and contrasting findings
5. To support own findings/ argument

Important to look at how contrasting findings are also taken

Group 4: Pravin

1. To set up a context about the CHW
2. To show the gap in the existing literature
3. Locating the findings in the wider literature

JC: What is an acceptable reference?

Everything is acceptable as long as you cite it.

RK: Can newspaper be cited?

JC: Depends on who to cite; for example, opinion pieces written by Bill gates could be important and cited; articles written by my mother may not be relevant

SKh: But one should be careful as to not cite from Blogs, Wikipedia

JC: Blogs can be cited as opinion pieces with proper referencing

But one needs to be careful about your authority as an author; not to damaging your reputation by referencing from not so relevant places, for e.g. Wikipedia

### **How to search effectively:**

- Use your keywords:

- Searching through online repositories
- Set parameters: [date range, region, discipline]
- After coffee, we will search in google scholar with our keywords.
- Be systematic, cross-reference: helps being efficient, manage work, helps to be organized
- Best places for articles: the list of references at the end of the article
- Use existing databases
- World Bank's Knowledge repository; Published and commissioned articles by the WB

JC to set up a computer with access to UoE library for the participants to be able to access articles from journals which are not open access

Tips:

- Use inverted commas for key words as a phrase: "CHW"
- Use cite key
- Consistency in citing article; follow journal requirements
- Save or export the citation: endnote, Mendeley

COFFEE BREAK

ACTIVITY: Literature Review

- Gather 5-10 references from Google Scholar
- A previous study in your field (by date, region, discipline/ method, journal)
- Key references (definition, conceptual, methodological)

The key point is to search and save your literature.

JC: created RECOUP Nepal group in Mendeley and demonstrated how to use it. The participants could search and save their literature in this group which could be useful for other members as well.

He demonstrated the advanced search options in google scholar.

People searching in google scholar; JC went around and worked with them individually

**ACTIVITY:**

- Work with a specific database: Pub Med, JSTOR, Science Direct
- Gather at least 5-10 references

Lack of previous research is a plus not minus. After thorough systematic search in databases, you could make a case of dearth of literature; adding credibility to your claim of dearth of literature

Doing it in small periods of time

Could use combination of key words; use phrase in inverted commas

*The participants searched for literature. The slow internet caused problems in searching, however.*

### Day 3: 5<sup>th</sup> April, 2016

#### STRUCTURE

JC: Energizer [plane stupid]

Talked about today's session; time table up for one to one sessions with Jamie and Alice

JC introduced HERD's director, Dr. Sushil Chandra Baral (SCB)

SCB: emphasizing the importance of peer learning; the kind of training we are doing;

We want to promote research with quality; introducing Qualitative Research Movement Nepal; discussing with peers about the kind of research we are doing; organizational commitment to help young professionals to engage more in research

Dream about promoting research; it's everybody's dreams now

#### **Session: Literature review: structured writing activity**

JC: We will try to build up on literature review we did yesterday.

He showed example from his Social Science and Medicine paper; how literature was organized and how it is written in the paper

Combine and synthesize different kind of materials

ACTIVITY: Describe your literature review; explain where you searched; what you searched for; what you were looking for; what you found

Save your search and organize your materials: could be in a word document; bibliographic references

ACTIVITY: Read your articles

*Simultaneous one to one sessions with JC*

LUNCH BREAK

#### **Session: How we are reading**

AS: How are we reading and using them? What are our experiences of reading? Are there differences in reading different types of articles? How are we bringing the literature into our writing?

Getting the relationship between your findings and others' findings

ACTIVITY: Discuss in pairs about your experiences of searching for articles and reading them. What are the similarities and differences you felt?

AS: Bringing the group together; facilitating group discussion

SS: similarities: the lack of literature in our respective areas;

AS: finding the article is difficult; anxiety about if you are missing it or if it is not there;

Because you are doing operational research, it is possible that you are not finding lot of literature; may be you need to broaden the scope of searching

SK: some components that we are trying to look; there were articles

MB: enjoyed reading; cross cultural similarities; different kind of findings

AS: use of quotes, vignettes that speak to your areas as well

JL: challenging; reading methodology section is difficult

AS: Just as writing is not a linear process; reading is also not; sometimes you scan or browse the articles, and read it later; it takes a lot of energy to read;

Sometimes reading the methods section is interesting to read later, to compare findings; to see how the authors came to these findings using those methods

RK: When you are reading, sometimes you are stuck in middle; you can't progress; or you forget what you have read; difficulty in understanding what the article is trying to say

AS: PhD seminar once a week where we used to discuss readings; kept aside two days to read assuming that I have to read it twice; first reading is about big picture; write a summary about what the key argument about the article; then you know where you missed or things alike;

The first reading is what they were trying to do; the second time is about you; what you are going to take away from that article

RK: we discussed about how the literature were cited for various purposes to give background, to compare findings; to clarify certain concepts

AS: how to read through second time; either as factual, contextual information; or for comparison for your research; you might also borrow ideas from article;

FCHV article as moral behavior concept; you could draw on it;

How same concept could be used for comparison; you would want to paraphrase in your article

SS: highlighted sections in pdf; see how much of those could be used in my article

RK: highlighting, printing and underlining or writing notes in the margins

AS: we have to capture the ideas; sometimes in the comment box; put it as little notes in the paper you are writing;

Sometimes you may end up with lots of ideas you don't know where to put; so it is important to see in which section of the article the idea fits in

AS: shifting the focus of the article because of the readings?

SS: what if I find 100 articles and how do I select it?

JL: sometimes if the article speaks to you; their reference list is important.

AS: If you found out that some people are citing somebody frequently, then you may know that you are missing.

If there is journal that is something important to topic, then looking through their various issues, searching through people's name

OC: lots of literature; trying to limit myself in recent 5 years literature

AS: huge amount of literature in genexpert but not in social sciences discipline; limiting timeframe is one way to do so

Abstract are important for prioritization; gives sense of if something is speaking to you.

Prasansa: went through an article but it was so quantitative that found it difficult to understand

Alice: you could say that it is a limitation that the idea is only approached quantitatively and saying that qualitative aspect is necessary; don't feel that you have to understand everything; may be focus on key findings and not worry about methods

RK: Sometimes, the article cites some other authors whose idea in the paper could be useful to us as well. Do we get the original article, or we could use, "so and so as cited in..."?

AS: Best is to get the original article.

**ACTIVITY:** Discuss with the person next to you about if your contribution of what you had thought in the first day has changed over the course of these three days; reflection in pairs

**ACTIVITY:** Bring everything you have done into a structure; it will form a skeleton of your article

Participants work on refining the structure.

**ACTIVITY:** Peer feedback

Share the skeleton of your article in pairs; read them and provide feedback to each other

AS: wrapping up the session; explaining tomorrow's sessions on writing

## Day 4: 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2016

### WRITING

*Notes written by Abriti Arjyal (AA)*

Energizer: Robinson says

#### **Structured Writing Activity (JC)**

Read back yesterday's feedback on the topic, have a look at it, if the feedback are relevant or not. (5 min)

Look at the structure and decide what left to be done and make a plan on what section you will be working and structuring today (5min)

Whatever you have planned, start writing. Write at least 2-3 sentences regarding the actual context in 5 min.

Have a walk with partner till the restaurant and talk about the plan. After that, everyone wrote on their paper for 30 min

Again have a walk till the reception and discuss about next writing plan with partner. After which everyone came and started writing for 25 min.

One to one discussion

#### **COFFEE BREAK**

Energizer: counting the butterflies

Writing: reading article or writing a methodological section or any part

Email a section to Alice which she will print out during the lunch break

Everyone started writing.

#### **LUNCH BREAK**

*Notes by RK*

#### **ACTIVITY: Working in group (Group Feedback)**

Small groups of 4. Read the other 3 people's sections (what they have written this morning). Discuss each person's section and where they fit in the overall structure. Provide feedback, collectively troubleshoot, and share obstacles and strategies.

AS had printed the sections written by the participants in the morning and divided them into groups of four; the participants read one another's work and provided feedback collectively to one another; AS moved to the groups and supported them

COFFEE BREAK

ACTIVITY: Incorporate feedback from group sessions into the section, incorporate section back into the article

ACTIVITY: Make writing plan for the next day (which sections you will work on)

Go back to the list of references and update; start making some notes about how the literature talks to your different sections of your article; introduction, methods, discussion etc

### Day 5: 7<sup>th</sup> April, 2016

#### WRITING

Structured Writing:

ACTIVITY: Find one section of the article that you are having trouble with. Just tackle that section for 40 minutes.

From your reference list, identify two articles and incorporate it into your writing.

Read one article; to find comparative article that addresses the topic

Read the article, make a few notes, put those notes into discussion

Use the reading technique; put aside what your main argument is

Similarities between your article and the literature

Different methods

Different historical context

Different socio-political culture; different kind of policy and intervention

Write one or two sentence about how your research contributes to the knowledge

COFFEE BREAK:

JC: switch the article; make notes and incorporate in your paper

Participants read the article they selected and write their paper

Then, they gave their papers to RK to print off.

*Simultaneous one to one sessions with Jamie while other participants were writing*

**LUNCH BREAK**



### **ACTIVITY: Peer feedback**

Work in the same pair that you worked in Day 2. Read each other's paper and provide suggestions on:

What could be improved? How could this paper be made better?

- Is it sharply-focused?
- Is it consistently clear?
- Is it well-structured?
- Does it engage with wider literature?
- Is it clear what the argument is?
- Is it clear what the findings are?
- Does it meet an excellent scholarly standard in use of sources?
- Is it excellently presented and referenced?

Read your own paper. How would you evaluate your own work?

Provide feedbacks to each other. Agree on three points.

Write a note to self about the three things you need to do to improve your paper.

### **SESSION: Group discussion and reflections of the day (AS and JC)**

AS and JC asked the group to share their notes to self.

Sanjay:

1. Trying to find articles
2. I need to jot the readings; give them a concrete shape
3. I wasn't sure of what exactly I wanted to do; I talked to different people about my research and I need to work on suggestions provided by everyone; work for clarity

Tracy:

1. Been reading literature on disaster and disability; may be should have some theory on disaster for theoretical consideration;
2. Spoke to different people; there is intersectionality; there was a feeling that there is too much; how and where to put findings; gender could be an overarching theme

Prasansa:

1. Plan to work to further work on my article; go back to transcripts and extract some more information
2. Conceptual framework; have to review and section my findings according to theory
3. Lots of gaps in my methods and fill up

Ruja:

1. Go back to literature for background
2. Rewrite my finding section
3. Brainstorm the discussion points

Machhindra:

1. Have missed some context to the introduction
2. Methods section: need to work on to incorporate theoretical considerations
3. Need more of analysis

Anju:

1. Introduction part: linking up literature, add more literature on MSNP, multi-sectoral bodies
2. Methodology part: have to shorten the methodology part
3. Write the rationale for district selection (study sites)

Prabin:

1. Getting comments from colleagues; shaping up the writing; in the background section, link up some terms; sequence it
2. Methodology: it seems jumbled up and rearrange the methodology part
3. Discussion: look more at literature and support it

Amrita:

1. Focus more on broader literature; focus on specific issues such as migration, post earthquake
2. Could add immediate responses of earthquake
3. Findings from other countries to discussion section

Pravin:

1. Clarifying the methodology section
2. Finding the literature to fit the background section
3. support or contradict my findings

Jasmine:

1. Do need to talk more about institutional delivery for setting the context
2. literature review
3. Finding section

Obindra:

1. To work on the overall structure; paying more attention on consistency
2. Conceptual clarity and operational definition
3. Balance...arguing about qualitative part without bashing quantitative data; focusing on what it does not tell

Abriti:

1. Key terms were not correct to search literature
2. Findings are there-link it up and concrete theme
3. Discussion part

Rejina:

1. Structure of the paper
2. Methodology part: add rationale
3. Literature review

Sudeepa:

1. Trying to put two papers into one
2. Might have to revisit the paper
3. Background and discussion need to be clearer

Shophika:

1. Introduction: few descriptions about context in Nepal; there can be other related programmes to support the background
2. Methods: need more explanation
3. Findings: need to include quantitative part and bring it together

Summarizing the session:

JC: some people worked more on findings; where they were in the beginning of week

Many of you really have seemed to have affected by literature; helped to rethink the focus of paper, keywords, conceptual theoretical questions

Engagement with the literature; pushed your papers to a different kind of place

Reminds me of the importance of engaging with wider body of literature; reshaped the original focus of paper

AS: clarifying the focus of the paper; justifying your paper; setting up the justification in the focus of your paper

Justifying the topic and methods

Cutting down; as economical as possible to make your point

JC: How many of you are thinking of changing your keywords?

AC: There are some terms that you didn't know that they are there in the literature; include more keywords

AS: working title; how many people have been working in the title? Brainstorm the title; helps you focus the article

### **Session: Reflections on what we have learnt**

Shophika: always struggled with discussion; feel more confident about it

Sudeepa: more on literature searches; managing the literature; really helpful; Mendeley; the process we followed ; taking small bits

Regina: finding related to literature; giving rationale

Abriti: hour glass; searching for literature; Used to think: Writing reports is a mess; why I am not so organized; I now realize that it is not just me; writing is not a linear process

Obindra: In the second workshop; we used iterativeness; writing is not a linear process; I realized when we searched the keywords; what does it mean to put five keywords to your paper? How it travels through academia; writing as analysis you are time and again analyzing;

Jasmine: the peer review and going through everybody's papers; When the professors in graduate school said be more focused, I used to think but I have so much to say; now realize that when you want to say so much, you are confusing people; messy writer (process of everybody; organized chaos)

Pravin: knew about the structure; what goes in those sections; I learnt about how keywords are arranged; knew little about writing; there are so many ways of writing,

Amrita: we used to conduct literature review; important to narrow down for reasons of relevance; I hardly used literature review for conclusion and discussion; guide on structuring was important

Sambriddhi: been successful in demystifying process; writing in small bursts; normalizing the writing activity; gives people the confidence; importance of journals you want to write for; process of literature search was very helpful; integrated literature into findings section

Prabin: writing is about reading again and again; trying to identify the problems; cycle of reading and writing; importance of literature review for background and findings section

Anju: I had been downloading so many literature; could not interpret these literature in my reports; have learnt how to write and interpret it; writing discussion, how to compare with which level of literature; I am a bit clear about discussion; learnt about mendeley

Macchindra: struggle with the keywords; I never keep track of whatever we did; we should be our first reviewer; always struggled with discussion section; have confidence now

Ruja: how to search the literature through keywords; how to read the literature and summarize it; writing should be done in a regular basis; spare some time for writing; bit scared to write the discussion; more confident on that part

Prasansa: I was scared to come here; normalized the whole process of writing; it is not a monster; so accustomed to present our findings but learnt to make an argument about it; I had never thought of using keywords to search literature;

Tracy: whole environment of the workshop; non-judgmental; good feedback; changed my approach to writing; piece by piece; going back and forth between different sections of the paper; helped to refine; peer review process was helpful

Sanjay: peer review and genuine feedbacks; the fear that I had was I may not be getting much out of it; there can be various ways to do things; wrote it in a structured way earlier from introduction section; all those sections came down to becoming one; managing stuff; looking at literature; managing how to manage your work and literature

AS: This helped us learn about what people have learnt; easier to plan for tomorrow

JC: Been writing one article from 2011 to figure out later that there are two papers; share piece of writing in group; how important the peer community is

AS: Tomorrow we can discuss about how to take what you learnt and how to build on that; how you could reproduce these conditions in workshop; how could you set up support groups in your organization

Any suggestions for tomorrow:

JC: some of the rules/good practice around co-authorship

Good practice of the data being used

Process of submitting articles to journal

Good practice on referencing and citation

Career opportunities for researchers

Just to reflect on titles; the challenge of integrating our work

Returning back to question of why we write? Collective motivation?

Day 6: 8<sup>th</sup> April, 2016

Preparing for Submission

**ACTIVITY: Structured writing**

Walk and think; share with your partners

Spend 40 minutes writing; whenever you are stuck; break down your goals in small sections

ACTIVITY: Think about your title; share it with your partners; okay to have more than one title; write it in the paper and put it up on the board on top of your summary

COFFEE BREAK

AS picked up few titles to discuss them

Sanjay: good title; what the focus of the project is (labour migration) clear; constellation of keywords being brought together; stakeholder narratives (AS added from Nepal); you need to indicate how your specific study findings relate to broader level

Conventional: main headings to indicate larger level; subtopic for specific

Prasansa: great title; your main title could indicate broader idea; subtitle indicates the argument and focus of the article

Amrita: lots of discussion on it; the main idea seems livelihood; so may be put it up in the main title

JC:

- Referencing
- Authorship
- Group ownership of data
- Careers

References and referencing:

It is important to know about the guide for authors; example from SSM;

AS: we talked about identifying journal; they have aims and scope; please make use of journals website; guidelines of different kinds

Read through reference list to check if there are any errors

Example from RECOUP Nepal group; could change the citation style in Mendeley; automatically formatting

PS: no page numbers in the paper?

JC: could be a pre-publication version

AS: increasingly journals are putting up things online first because the article takes so longer to get published and accessed

Authorship/ Co-authorship:

A guide: How to handle authorship disputes: a guide for new researchers

How to identify the ordering;

Rule of thumb: alphabetical order; if contributed equally

Or based on the contribution to the article

AS: academic articles having a footnote that specifies the role of members

PS: there are lot of co-authors in my paper; they haven't given their contributions; obliged to keep their names because they are bosses

JC: should be demanding with your bosses; generous with juniors

AS shared her example: post-doc; edited a journal focusing on hospital ethnography; my mentor expected to be part of author; I changed it in final version putting my name first and sent it to him for review; couldn't talk about it; working out diplomatic sessions

AS: acknowledgement section before getting them a draft;

Rights and acknowledgements: people who paid for the work; people can also trace the money (who funded) if there is bias; acknowledge the data source; datasets; access to library archives or other resources;

RK: If you change university, do you still have right to the data?

JC: Yes, because I am the PI. Its important for the institutions to be acknowledged but the data is owned by the individual.

AS: I might be PI on the project; generating the end of the project; good practice to be included as authors; if you are interested to write the article; you could discuss with project leads even after the project is over

RK: I was working on a project at Social Science Baha but even after moving to HERD, I was part of writing up from previous project.

Journals and journal submission:

Signing up to a journal, creating an account; uploading your papers

Expect to hear from editors

Different journals have different standards; editor's check if the papers meet the standards

If it gets out for peer review; 1-12 months to get back; you get few time to make changes

It's important to write response letters about the changes you make it in the manuscript.

You don't have to agree to everything what the reviewer's say; you could make your point; important to explain why you stand your ground

The peer reviewers do it without pay; people can make mistakes; they are of different quality

Cover letter while submitting the revised version: explaining is necessary; what recommendations you take or not, and why

Editor is the one who makes the decision. Editors will also be academics

RK: About asking editors if they will be interested to receive a paper in certain topic

JC: I would discourage it; they are doing several things; receive several mails a day

AS: They will direct to aims and scope of journals, which explains clearly about the nature of the papers they accept.

JC: some journals will ask you to send reviewer's names; don't be tempted to put your friend's name; put somebody whom you have cited; they may have concrete suggestions; it's about their field as well; you don't have to know them personally

RK: Do you have to pay for publishing?

AS: If you want your articles in the open access...but generally, institutions have the arrangement. So, in general, you will never have to pay for publishing your work.

### **Careers and opportunities:**

Between us, we supervise 15 students for PhD; helped students write their grants, helped get funding

Very carefully about if people would like to do PhD; never to do a PhD unless somebody pays it

Application process: different countries have different systems

Several Programmes:

Process of application: email to potential supervisor;

Identifying a supervisor is just as important as the institution; making sure that the person is really interested in your topic and areas; it's great to supervise people who have similar interest areas

Follow funding deadlines; around January



Programme starts in September

Formal application process: application you make to the institution

Brief statement about your project

Funding application: requires a more detail about your projects

You will get feedback from your prospective supervisor. It's always worthwhile to prepare a draft in advance before contacting your supervisor.

You can apply at multiple institutions.

Jasmine: Can you get funding for next semester?

JC: Working on developing funding grants for one of my students for next semester

Jasmine: How would you align your supervisor and your areas of work?

JC: May be particular approach of taking the methodology or theoretical framing

Jasmine: Is it important for you to have experience to pursue PhD?

JC: PhD is a doctoral training; it does not have to be experience based

It is important to know that PhD is incredibly difficult, personally and professionally; research studies change; they take different lives

Phd grant in larger projects; or you come up with your deadlines

AS: If you contact your potential supervisors, people are aware of the kind of work that you are doing. When people are developing their grants, they accommodate.

Jasmine: Do supervisors reply? How long is the time to wait?

JC: two weeks mostly

PSB: You see conflict of interest in the papers, what does that mean?

JC: If your research is being funded by GlaxoSmithKline, you may want to say that; which has a direct stake in the field;

PSB: Indicating the author's details; what details do I give? As a student or institutional affiliation?

AS: who supported the research; who has some kind of input to the article

Why do we write?

What reasons could be there for you to keep working?

SS: when I started writing; the fascinating thing for me that there was information scattered but not consolidated.

Been writing for 5-6 years, been applying for a conference; felt was focusing on quantity of papers rather than quality; always grapple with the question of what benefits of writing?

JC: If you think of a journalist who travels to different side of country, they come back to their office and write; it is published and people read it; but the next day they are being used to wrap samosas

May be the piece of writing adds to pool of knowledge; Sometime, they felt they have contributed to society in a positive way; keeping hold of that early motivation is important

Jasmine: I write because it makes me very happy. Inquisitive in nature; help find me community with whom I can interact and be part of; sometimes feel it is a very different world

S Kharel: making meaning to what you write; even if one person reads, that is important; intrinsic motivation; how it can be a transformative process

AS: huge satisfaction come writing with integrity; it gives you confidence; people will judge it and value it; personally satisfying

Jasmine: discouraging to know about people who do different work other than their interests; because they are not being funded

RK: part of the business because funding determines which areas to be researched on to a larger extent; these issues are layered and one can hope that they will be sometimes doing what they like and sometimes doing things they have to do

JC: continue to do research in the hope that you will be able to do what you want to do

AS: It's important to know people are also interested in it; identifying keywords is an important exercise to understand who may be interested

SS: when you give yourself a break from writing; you go to reading and reading again, this is helping me to get boosted

Obindra: not only to show that you are interested in something; create community; imagined community could be academic community; to show their visibility

JC: the idea of imagined communities is important; this room is a testament to the kind of community that is present in Nepal

It really doesn't matter how many people have read; JC shared his example of doing lecture to 150 and 350 students; he said that at least few people in the class might be gaining of what we are teaching; it is that motivation

AS and JC: Thank you to all for making these incredibly experiences; learnt from you about your research; felt motivated to help you out; thank you for bearing with us early on when you didn't know how it is coming together.

Taking things forward: SCB

Setting the context

Where do you end your research?

OC: Research project or research?

JL: probably when I lose interest; may be you can never stop researching

Research aiming to change or influence something;

Relationship between research and policy

What influences your research matter?

- Institutional aim/objectives
- Research environment: internal, external
- Resources
- Time
- Research type
- Employment
- Researcher's motivation

3 phases of RECOUP workshop: a milestone in itself

Phase 1

Phase 2

Phase 3

Challenges faced to run a successful research is a everyday business.

How can we be more strategic

How can we work together from now onwards to work as a group? Can we influence back in your institution?

JL: very careful about the kind of organization I chose; Possible Health spoke to me; all have been researchers and there is communication; a very good research and communication team

Institutional collaboration: speaking to your managers

Sanjay: the place I work is very bureaucratic; peer review is very less in Nepal; this could be a way forward; we don't have group of researchers, where we can share things and learn from one another

RK: Taking things back to institutions and practice what we have learnt here requires extraordinary amount of dedication and sincerity amidst our demands of everyday life and work; before creating formal systems, we could discuss informally about what we have learnt, engage with people at work gradually and then things could be formalized

SCB: we all should lead; requires implementation arrangement;

Want to allocate some resources for it; let's say for two years; link up to your institutions always

If we all are committed; let's form this group; make ToR

Individual and institution, both; will remain the members of the group

RK: Thank you all for being available for this workshop and being part of this shared learning experience. It was a great week of working together and learning. Will get back to you with the workshop notes and details of the participants

End of workshop