RECOUP partners from Cambridge, Edinburgh and Kenya came together over nine days (from the 17th till the 25th of April) in a workshop on undertaking qualitative educational research in poor communities in the Kenyan context. This was the second of such workshops, the first having been held in Delhi in November 2006, and the next to be held in Accra in May 2007.

The main aim of this workshop was to orient Kenyan researchers with the intellectual and practical implications of the qualitative research to be undertaken in the qualitative sub-projects in Theme 1 (human and social outcomes of education for the poor) and Theme 3 (partnerships and the delivery of schooling for the poor). The workshop consisted of 20 different sessions, ranging from discussions around what is good pro-poor qualitative research to a critical engagement with the strengths and weaknesses of selected research methods. Sessions were devoted to collecting and analysing life histories, photography, semi-structured interviews, and ethnographic fieldwork, all of which will be used for data collection purposes in the different sub-projects. The workshop also provided opportunities for members of the RECOUP team to discuss the intellectual foundations of the various sub-projects and to chart the future direction of the qualitative research work to be undertaken in Kenya.

Another noteworthy aspect of this workshop was a day long visit to two of the four Kenyan research sites (see photo of part of Nyeri town where the research will be carried out). All participants visited a rural and an urban setting. This visit was extremely useful in helping us all to develop a shared appreciation of the implications of the particular features of these sites (such as issues of logistics and distance from the capital, layout of the village, patterns of in- and out-migration) and also provided opportunities for practising various research skills, such as observations, and more importantly, how to record these observations.
The workshop developed a climate of trust and openness, which allowed researchers with varying backgrounds and research experiences to articulate concerns, practice research skills and clarify doubts in a relaxed and productive fashion. All the sessions were interactive and activity based, drawing on the skills and experiences of all the participants.

The workshop received positive evaluations, being rated as “highly relevant”, fostering “participatory and interactive learning”, and “friendly and easy”. Indeed, there were suggestions for taking this learning forward through various other opportunities and these are being discussed.
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KENYA QUALITATIVE RESEARCH SKILLS WORKSHOP: An overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Morning (Session I) (starting at 9:30am)</th>
<th>Lunch Break</th>
<th>Afternoon (Session II) (wrapping up by 4:30-5:00pm)</th>
<th>Post Session Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 17/4 Day 1</td>
<td>SESSION 1 RECOUP- overview of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td>SESSION 3 Discussions on the workshop design and expectations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SESSION 2 Presentations by the Kenyan team</td>
<td></td>
<td>SESSION 4 Qualitative Poverty Research</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wednesday 18/4 Day 2 | SESSION 5 Community scoping  
  - Household Census  
  - Participatory Rural Approaches | | SESSION 6 Ethnographic fieldwork: informal conversations, observation and field notes | Task 1 Fieldwork task |
| Thursday 19/4 Day 3 | SESSION 7 Debriefing for Task 1 | | SESSION 9 Semi-Structured: Individual interviews | Task 2 |
| | SESSION 8 Continuation of ethnographic fieldwork: issues around Recording and Translation | | | |
| Friday 20/4 Day 4 | | | PARTICIPANTS UNDERTAKE TASK 2 & VISIT TO FIELD SITE | |

Note: Task 1 and Task 2 are specific to the programme and are not detailed in the table.
| Sat 21/4 Day 5 | **SESSION 10**  
Debriefing for Task 2  
Developing a Coding frame | SESSION 11  
Narratives of success  
SESSION 12  
Life history and Oral history | Task 3  
Related to life history |
|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| **Sun 22/4 Day 6** | **SESSION 13**  
Debriefing for Task 3  
SESSION 14  
Using Photography in Educational Research | **SESSION 15**  
Data Analysis II (Atlas-ti) | |
| **Mon 23/4 Day 7** | **SESSION 16**  
Youth, Gender and Citizenship | **SESSION 17**  
Disability, Poverty and Education | |
| **Tues 24/4 Day 8** | **SESSION 18**  
Health and Fertility | **SESSION 19**  
Public Private Partnerships  
**SESSION 20**  
Issues regarding Publishing  
**Wrap up** | |
EVALUATION OF THE KENYA WORKSHOP
(Based on the Q that participants were invited to complete)

Total number of respondents: 11

IN YOUR VIEW, WHAT WAS THE BEST THING ABOUT THE WORKSHOP?

• An in-depth interrogation of the various concepts that are central to the project
• It was participatory and interactive learning
• The interaction that care and humbleness of every participant, especially the facilitators. The debates which had a good flow
• Learning in-depth about qualitative research.
• The participatory and simplicity mode of delivery mode utilised.
• Understanding the sub-projects, as interrelation within the overall project
• Learning qualitative techniques on analysis despite being a quantitative researcher
• Refining the huge concepts in terms of understanding the project
• The content and the mode of presentation. It was quite clear that a great deal of work/effort had gone into the preparation of the presentations
• Dissemination of the information very interesting. I always kept a track
• Mood friendly and easy

II) WHAT ARE YOUR SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT?

• Have more practical activities
• It was excellent
• Should last longer
• More time allocation
• Practicals- practical sessions required
• Reduction in the number of days
• More practical activities
• We definitely needed more time in terms of duration i.e., more days
• Less lecturing on some topics. Could have been good- e.g. Challenge participants to speak out their minds

III) PLEASE RATE THE STRUCTURE OF THE WORKSHOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Fair 2</th>
<th>Average 3</th>
<th>Good 4</th>
<th>Excellent 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay out of the day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV) PLEASE RATE THE CONTENT OF THE WORKSHOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Fair 2</th>
<th>Average 3</th>
<th>Good 4</th>
<th>Excellent 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How relevant was the workshop to your needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the presentations accessible?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the discussions in the sessions useful?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did we cover enough topics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did we cover research issues in enough depth?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments:
• In general, the workshop was successful learning experience, as well as a capacity development opportunity
• Its good that the presentation were a challenge. That is what learning is meant to be
• More topics needed more discussions
• Facilitators well done. You did your best
• Practical aspect of the methods was limited
• Need more practical sessions on each method e.g., interview and photography
• Thank you for thinking about our country and especially the area of disability which is always overlooked
• Very informative I have gained a lot of valuable information I did not have before

PLEASE RATE THE STYLE OF THE WORKSHOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Fair 2</th>
<th>Average 3</th>
<th>Good 4</th>
<th>Excellent 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel that you had enough opportunities to participate?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the handouts useful?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who would you rate the quality of the questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments:
• Considering most senior researchers are doctors and professors I felt a little limited especially where facts where needed
• Wonderful teachers
• Some questions looked complex for a beginner
• It was beyond my expectations and useful
• The processes of learning adopted were not only excellent but also democratic

PLEASE NOTE THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS THAT YOU HAVE LEARNT IN THIS WORKSHOP

High spirited team work
Relationship between literature, projects and research process
Detailed field notes teaching and writing
Photo analysis by researcher-visa-photographer

Methods of data collection
Observations- head and field notes making
A bit of data analysis e.g., coding, listening to voices- because I had not done data analysis before

The whole conceptualisation of the project
The mode of presentation – detailed, humorous, probing
The importance of team work in achievement of different and sometimes related objectives/goals

**More information about the project**
**More research methods within qualitative research**

In-depth understanding of RECOUP
Introduction to qualitative analysis
A bit of Indian culture

Project/sub-project detail and interrelation
Depth in some methods (observations, photography) and new methods (life history)
Researching with the disabled

**Additional research methods**
**Relationship between the project sub-themes**
**Direction of the sub-theme on fertility**

The difference between qualitative and quantitative
Interviewing skills
Recording and use of tape recorder

**Relation between poverty and disability**
**Interviewing techniques**
**Qualitative and quantitative research approaches**

A researcher is an instrument
Importance in taking time to design the research
The new in depth knowledge in purposive research that was new to me

Qualitative data analysis approaches
The interrelationship between the various sub-projects
Models of understanding the concept of disability

**IS THERE ANY FURTHER TRAINING THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO HAVE AFTER THIS WORKSHOP? IF SO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHICH ASPECTS YOU WOULD LIKE IT TO ADDRESS:**

- Qualitative data analysis
- Endnote use- literature review
- Yes- data analysis, report writing and dissemination
- Qualitative data analysis using computer packages
- Yes. Need to learn more on qualitative data analysis using a computer
• What is Alats-ti?
• Participatory techniques for community study
• Computer data analysis
• Photography and more practical assignments
• Practicals = photography
• Practical skills
• Qualitative data analysis using the computer

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY FURTHER COMMENTS THAT YOU MIGHT WISH TO ADD:

• Kudos guys you are excellent. Just admire how resourceful you are. Thanks for giving out to us what you know wholeheartedly- will miss you all
• Enjoyed the workshop it was very participatory
• Lets have more workshops of similar nature to enable us to acquire all the necessary skills ad knowledge in qualitative research
• Impressed by the facilitators participatory approach during their individual sessions I felt a part of the workshop
• It would have been better if we did practise in real after every session to enhance what is expected of us
• Bravo!!
• Thank you for initiating the workshop. I hope that you will come again and hold another
• The workshop was a success

Kenya workshop – participants list

Participants from Kenya

Violet Gatwiri Ribu
Purity Mumbi Njagi
Violet Khalayi Wawire
Hadija Warimi Juma
Zachariah Kweyu Samson
Dr. Rachdel W. Kamau- Kawgethe
Ndiritu John K
Francis Likoye Malenya
Sara Jerop Ruto
Paul Kuria Wainaina
Fatuma N Chege

**UK Participants**
Chris
Roger
Madeleine
Shaila
Nidhi