PROJECT REPORT | **1963**

Regional Technical Workshop, Lusaka, Zambia

17-19 June 2008 • Workshop Report

Russell, S. • Grellier, R. • Hüsken, S.M.C.

Sida

NORWEGIAN MINISTRY
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

WorldFish
C E N T E R

Regional Technical Workshop, Lusaka, Zambia 17-19 June 2008

Workshop report

Russell, S., Grellier, R. and Hüsken, S.M.C.

Fisheries and HIV/AIDS in Africa: Investing in Sustainable Solutions

This publication should be cited as:

Russell, S., Grellier, R. and Hüsken, S.M.C. (2008). Regional Technical Workshop, Lusaka, Zambia, 17-19 June 2008. Workshop report. Regional Programme Fisheries and HIV/AIDS in Africa: Investing in Sustainable Solutions. The WorldFish Center. Project Report 1963.

Authors' affiliations:
S. Russell: Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia, UK.
R. Grellier: Options Alliance, South Africa.
S.M.C. Hüsken: The WorldFish Center Zambia.

Cover design: Vizual Solution

Acknowledgements
The facilitators, Steven Russell and Rachel Grellier, are grateful for all the time and effort that the participants invested in the workshop. Their enthusiasm and contributions made the workshop a success. Thank you to Saskia Husken and Margaret Mweene for the efficient organisation and coordination of the workshop, and to the participants for all their preparations, presentations and insightful comments. We enjoyed ourselves immensely and we hope that we can meet again.

Steve Russell, Rachel Grellier, Saskia Husken
1st July 2008

Fisheries and HIV and AIDS in Africa: Investing in sustainable solutions
Report

1. Workshop Objectives and Expected Outputs

The main purpose of the workshop was to bring together partners on the programme to share ideas and current research proposals, to strengthen these research proposals by taking into account cross cutting issues such as ethics and gender, and to determine arrangements for ongoing collaborative support.

More specifically the workshop aimed to:

1. Provide an interactive environment that would enable participants to exchange and learn about others' research themes, questions and methodology, and, from these exchanges:
   - derive ideas about research design, methods and ethics that can feed into their own research protocols
   - Ensure that each partner can see how their work relates to others' proposals, and how their proposed research contributes to the overall programme objectives.

2. Identify specific areas for each partner to develop or strengthen their foreseen research, focusing on fine-tuning specific research questions, design and methods, and the policy relevance of their outputs.

3. Examine the potential for mixed method approaches and complementarities between different methods and data.

4. Discuss the main ethical issues and procedures for partners' research and where relevant identify the need for clear statements about ethical procedures.

5. Support each partner in refinements of their foreseen research outputs and methodology.

6. Identify each partner's requirements for ongoing support with their research after the workshop, and feasible ways of delivering that support from other partners in the programme.

7. Provide some general guidance and training on qualitative research design, methods and qualitative data analysis

8. Provide some general guidance and training on participatory research methods.

WorldFish Center Technical Workshop   17th - 19th June 2008
Fisheries and HIV and AIDS in Africa: Investing in sustainable solutions
Report

2. Workshop Agenda

The original agenda is set out in Appendix A. In practice the workshop occasionally deviated from the agenda in order to accommodate specific needs or new demands, but in general the sessions set out below were followed. The agenda aimed to facilitate a participatory approach to allow each group / participant to exchange ideas and also focus on the development of their own research priorities and plans. It included sessions for interactive work in small groups, plenary discussions, and some 'workshop' formats: in the latter facilitators delivered material on previous research in Uganda, interviewing techniques and qualitative research, in preparation for practical exercises.

3. Sessions and notes

Day 1

The workshop began with introductions (see also Appendix B) and a general overview of the programme's objectives and scope (see also Appendix C1). Partners then presented their research proposals, focusing on the main aim, objectives and methods. The presentations helped the facilitators and other partners appreciate the breadth and common elements of partners' work and some time was allocated to discussion and sharing ideas in plenary. Some key points emerging in this first session included:

- Is encouraging business and related transactions necessarily a good way of reducing vulnerability to HIV? Might it increase vulnerability?
- How can teams measure vulnerability? The level of capital possessed or available to female fish traders is one key factor, and also the different interactions and transactions in which female-traders engage, and the places where these interactions take place, will be important.
- Men need to be included in research and analysis as well as women.
- The need for getting balance between allocating time and resources to (a) doing research on vulnerability, and (b) engaging with numerous stakeholders to ask about and develop ideas for interventions. Need to engage with stakeholders and get them involved in business ideas and planning. Early involvement of stakeholders is important.
- To save money, fish traders travel using lifts from passing vehicles and do not stay in hotels.
- Are fishing communities willing or capable of providing HIV-related services?
- Fisherfolk do not necessarily eat fish products – they often prefer to sell them.
- Which types of fish should be selected for nutritional analysis?
- How do we define a 'fishing community'?
- How do we unpack 'vulnerability'?

After the morning coffee break Steve made a presentation on the standard log frame hierarchy (goal, purpose, outputs, activities), and then partners broke up into thematic groups (fish traders and vulnerability; mobility and migration; nutrition) and developed a more detailed set of proposed knowledge outputs / questions and a research purpose (see

WorldFish Center Technical Workshop   17th - 19th June 2008
Fisheries and HIV and AIDS in Africa: Investing in sustainable solutions
Report

also Appendix C2). Partners returned and presented their newly developed outputs in plenary (see Appendix D for details). Facilitators felt that the quality of presentations, new outputs and discussions had been high and the work productive.

After lunch Rachel and Nite gave a presentation on their experience of doing research on fishing communities and HIV in Uganda (see also Appendix C3). Some key issues arising from the presentation included:

- the importance of early engagement with policy stakeholders, and analysis of where research results would best be linked into policy frameworks and meetings;
- how the findings finally fed into policy;
- Ethical dilemmas around taking up the valuable time of people when doing research, and whether direct benefits should be provided.

The final session of the day allowed people to move back into their small groups to discuss key concepts relevant to their work, notably definitions and indicators of *vulnerability*, and of *mobility and migration*.

- Vulnerability was defined as exposure to risk and exposure to shock which has an adverse effect on a person's well being.
- Mobility was defined as 'frequent mobility from fixed point of reference, and distinguished from migration although there was some overlap (a Venn diagram of this overlap was presented). Migration was defined as more extended movement. The distinction appeared to be related to duration and also the frequent return to a fixed point.

One group (nutrition) focused on research design, for example the need to use a value chain approach, different criteria for identifying types of fish to be selected for analysis, ways of measuring nutritional content, and sharing ideas across countries to ensure common ideas and understandings. Facilitators felt that the session was useful in terms of getting partners to learn from each other and develop consistent ideas and designs across partners.

Day 2
Day two started with presentations from a Ugandan and the Malawian participants about their research proposals, as they had been delayed (due to flight delays) and arrived late on Day 1. Then participants broke into small groups to work on methods and activities in the morning: each group was given a table template to fill in, in which each method was listed, and for each method the corresponding research output was specified, and details entered about sampling and sub-questions to be examined. Each group then drew the table in large scale on flip chart paper, and pinned their poster to a wall in the workshop room. Participants could then circulate freely and discuss each others' posters, and add critical yet constructive comments onto the posters using post-its.

In the afternoon the session on Engaging with Policy makers and Stakeholders began with a presentation by Saskia (Appendix C4) on the overall key priority issues that the programme is addressing which are pertinent to policy makers. Participants then broke into country groups to develop a list of key stakeholders with whom they need to

(continue to) engage, how to engage and with what key messages. In plenary the groups presented and discussed their ideas.

The final session on Day 2 was a role play exercise to practice interviewing and demonstrate good and bad practice during field work. This was a lot of fun and there was some very good acting from participants. A handout was provided on the Principles and Practice of good interviewing (see also Appendix C5).

Day 3
The first session was on Analysing Qualitative data, beginning with a presentation by Steve (see Appendix C6). Participants were grouped in pairs to do several practical exercises in analysing the qualitative transcripts provided on handouts.

After coffee there was a session on ethics. Small groups first discussed key ethical issues and some devised consent forms. In plenary the Malawi group presented a very thorough consent form that set the scene for a stimulating discussion about:
- The language used in informing participants – should terms such as HIV, vulnerability etc…be used or should the language be more general and use everyday language?
- The need to obtain appointments for in depth interviews.
- The use of incentives, refreshments or payments when doing our research: some participants argued that using some sort of payment / reward had become common practice and was unavoidable. If a participant makes a request for refreshments during an interview or focus group discussion (FGD), and after consent has been given, then refreshments should be given. In fact for a FGD refreshments are probably a good thing and polite.

A handout on Ethics was provided with additional information (see also Appendix C7).

After lunch, time was allowed for participants to work out and type up their refined research outlines and instruments. The final session entailed a brainstorm on partnerships for mentoring and support amongst partners. Current and future roles of the WorldFish Center, ODG and the respective partners were discussed. An additional session was facilitated by the Project Accountant of WorldFish Zambia, to assist partners in the upcoming financial reporting under their contracts.

Finally, there were farewells using a ling piece of string to link up with each other and consolidate the network made.

4. Evaluations by participants

At the end of the workshop an evaluation form was given to participants so that they could provide anonymous feedback and comments on the overall quality of the workshop and whether it had been useful and interesting. The evaluations were overwhelmingly positive (Tables 1 and 2), demonstrating that the workshop had largely achieved its

objectives. All participants are to be congratulated on making the workshop such a useful and interesting forum for discussion and taking the research projects forward.

Table 1: Summary of evaluations scores for questions 1-5

Evaluation sheet number Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Average (n=13)	Adjusted average[a] (n=12)
1. The majority of workshop sessions were interesting	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.3	4.3
2. The majority of workshop sessions were useful	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4.2	4.3
3. The workshop has assisted me to develop my research aims and objectives	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	3	2	4.2	4.4
4. The workshop has assisted me to develop ideas for my research methods / activities	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	3	3	4.2	4.3
5. The workshop has enabled me to learn something new about designing or doing research	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	1	4.4	4.7

[a] Just for interest, the adjusted average removes the last evaluation (13) which gave a very low score for question 5

Note on scores: 1= strongly disagree with the statement; 5 = strongly agree with the statement

Table 2: Summary of evaluation comments for other questions

Which session was most useful?	Qualitative data analysis (6 responses out of 13)
	Developing our methods and activities (3 / 13)
	Developing our proposed research outputs and purpose
	Group discussions - in country or by theme
	All
	Interview role-play
Which session was most interesting?	Ethics (4 responses out of 13)
	Interview role-play (2 / 13)
	Working in groups, exchanging ideas (2 / 13)
	Qualitative data analysis (2 / 13)
	Developing our methods and activities
	Developing our proposed research outputs and purpose
	All
Which session was least useful?	None (9 responses out of 13)
	All useful
	Ethics
	Interview role-play
Which session was least interesting?	None (8 responses out of 13)
	All interesting
	Ethics
	Qualitative data analysis
How could we have done things	Provide materials before the session

better?	There was too little time for participants to present their ideas or comments in plenary
	Allocating more time for each session
	No answer
	The period of the (*cannot read word*) was too short
	The emerging lessons after discussion to be consolidated / summarised
	I wish this meeting had been done months back to develop protocols
	Give out more practical examples

The overall comments on the evaluation forms were as follows:

- Very useful workshop and well presented
- Quite an interesting and informative workshop
- The workshop has enabled some participants to 'take-off' in relation to their fieldwork
- It was generally good, although there has not been enough time to talk about certain topics.
- The workshop has been so helpful and I believe will also help modifications and designs of the study with regard to what other countries will be doing.
- It was a very useful workshop and has equipped me with relevant skills to implement the project more effectively and efficiently
- A great meeting – a good chance to harmonize research activities
- Good workshop

Appendix A: Agenda

Day 1: Tuesday 17th June		
8:00–10:00	**Chair: Saskia** **1. Introductions:** **- Introductions of facilitators and participants.** **- Introductions to the workshop**: review of the programme's objectives and scope, and the workshop objectives (outputs), agenda and organization. **2. Partners' components;** first exchange of ideas relating to the research proposals / agendas. A short presentation by each partner (3 mins each) on their research proposal and priorities: their main aim, objectives and methods; and what they will do with their findings. **Each partner has prepared a simple 'poster' or one PowerPoint slide**. Brief questions / feedback to each partner from the floor. At end, allocate the participants to three 'small groups' or 'clusters' based on three of the programme's four focus areas: mobility, market chain and nutritional impact which can most productively share ideas. A facilitator (Saskia, Rachel, Steve) allocated to each cluster.	Plenary
10:00	Coffee	
10:30–12.30	**Chair: Steve** **3. Revisit research purpose, outputs / objectives and questions** Brief (10-15 min) presentation by Steve on the standard hierarchy of a narrative summary in a logical framework (goal, purpose, outputs, activities). Individuals work on: their research purpose, outputs/objectives and questions, to ensure that they have a clear vision of the outputs expected from their work, and how their purpose and objectives relate to the overall programme. Facilitators circulate to support. In small groups (by theme or mixed theme) each participant presents their narrative summary to the small group and gets feedback. Each participant ends the session with a clear(er) vision of their research purpose, scope and objectives.	Plenary Individual participants Small groups
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch	
13.30 – 15.00	**Chair: Rachel** **4. Researching HIV and fisheries: lessons from Uganda** (i) Presentation (15-20 mins) by Nite and Rachel on previous research in Uganda that used PRA techniques among other	Workshop / plenary

WorldFish Center Technical Workshop   17th - 19th June 2008
Fisheries and HIV and AIDS in Africa: Investing in sustainable solutions
Report

	methods. This would briefly cover objectives, design and methods but would focus on (a) lessons and difficulties of putting the research methods into practice, and (b) the way in which the work was used by policy-makers, and how this link to policymakers and policy was achieved. (ii) Questions and discussion (20 mins): on doing PRA; good and bad practice; strengths and weaknesses of their design and PRA data; power relations in research and interviews. (iii) Brainstorm on principles and practice of good interviewing (20 mins) (iv) In sub-groups discuss and develop several questions or themes that participants might use in some of their research interviews. Sub-groups allow participants to support each other.	Small groups
15.00	Tea / coffee	
15.15 – 17.00	**Chair: Steve** **5. Working on areas that need development 1: research theory and research design** Brief (20 min) presentation by a facilitator on the central role of theory to research, using examples from participants' proposals to illustrate types of concept or theory being used; and brief presentation on the distinction between research design and research method, using examples from partner's proposals.	Plenary
	Participants may then work on *either* theory *or* research design, or both, depending on their priorities (or they may still need to go back and continue work on developing their research purpose, objectives and questions if these were not resolved before lunch)). Theory: Using their research proposals and purpose and objectives, each participant considers and lists the key concepts that are relevant to their research objectives / questions (e.g. notably vulnerability, gender relations, institutional capacity, social and economic impact). Participants then define the key concepts and consider the implications for their research: - What indicators will they use to measure or explore the concept? - Using what methods? - Are they aiming to test a theory or build conceptual understanding? Where relevant, participants may be able to draw a conceptual framework that can guide their research thinking and questions. Assistance from circulating facilitators.	Individual participants

WorldFish Center Technical Workshop   17th - 19th June 2008
Fisheries and HIV and AIDS in Africa: Investing in sustainable solutions
Report

	Research design: If some participants remain concerned about their research design, they can think through, refine and summarise their research design (units of analysis, sampling, target groups, key comparisons etc.), with assistance from circulating facilitators. In particular participants may want to develop further their ideas about sampling and the target groups for their research.	
	Merge into small groups (either by country or research focus area) to present theory and research design issues and get feedback.	Small groups
	End day 1: summary of the day, any feedback on the day and the agenda for tomorrow	Plenary

Day 2: Wednesday 18th June		
8:00 – 10:00	**Chair: Rachel** **1. Introduction to day 2**	Plenary
	2. Working on areas that need development 2: research methods Each participant thinks about their research methods / instruments in more detail: * this could still be on the details of sampling (continuing from research design), for example population groups to be questioned * or participants can start drafting details for specific research instruments (key sections and questions in a structured or semi-structured interview schedule, themes to be explored in focus group discussions). Each participant will then *construct a 'methods/ activities table'* (building on the original activities table in the proposal form) that lists each method and shows how each method/activity will generate data for certain research outputs / objectives, the sample/target group for that method, and some of the key questions / themes to be explored using the method. A template table will be provided. Assistance from circulating facilitators. Also consider the feasibility of doing the activities listed.	Individual participants
	Merge into small groups for informal presentations of the draft research methods tables developed and feedback.	Small groups
10:00	Coffee	
10:30– 12.00	**Chair: Saskia** **3. Continue with small group discussions on research methods and finalise each participant's methods/activities table.**	Small groups
	4. Present methods / activities tables to plenary (perhaps each small group selects one for presentation)	Plenary

	5. Working on areas that need development 3: relevance to policy and practice and engagement with research users Brief (10-15 min) presentation by Saskia on the policy debates and issues which the programme aims to address. Key types of research user and policy stakeholder.	Plenary
	Each small group considers and lists the main users of their research (government and NGO, policy-makers and practitioners etc.) and their strategy to engage with these different users and disseminate their research findings.	Small groups
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch	
13.30 – 15.15	**Chair: Steve** **5. Develop / redesign a summary research poster** Each participant will develop a more advanced poster that sets out their proposal's research purpose and outputs; research design and their research methods / activities table; key concepts informing the research and any diagrams to illustrate a theoretical framework; and research users / policy stakeholders.	Individual participants
	6. Poster exhibition Workshop participants then have the opportunity to circulate around the room to read proposals and ask questions or provide feedback to other participants. There will also be space by each poster for participants to write comments or suggestions.	Plenary
15.15	Tea / coffee	
15.30 – 17.00	**Chair: Steve** **6. The art of interviewing** Continue from session 4 on Day 1 in which we will have covered principles of interviewing, questions of positionality and power, etc.	Small groups
	In groups design some semi-structured or structured interview role plays. Use interview questions / themes from participant's own research. Sub-groups act out their interviews to plenary and obtain feedback. Reflections on the relevance of this session to participant's research / activities.	Plenary

Day 3: Thursday 19th June		
8:00 – 10:00	**Chair: Steve** **1. Introduction to day 3** **2. Analysing qualitative data** A presentation (30 min) by Steve on the basic principles of analysing qualitative data. Then an interactive / practical session in which participants will analyse and comment on a piece of qualitative data. End with reflections on the relevance of this session to their research proposals: e.g. do they need to tape interviews and get full transcripts?	Plenary
10.15	Coffee	
10.45 – 12.30	**Chair: Steve** **4. Ethical considerations for our research** Brief (10-15 min) presentation by a facilitator on the importance of ethical standards and procedures for all research involving human subjects, especially vulnerable people. In small groups, and with their methods table to hand, participants discuss the ethical issues which their research must address, and how they may tackle any ethical dilemmas. Key areas for discussion will be around informed consent, anonymity, the dangers of revealing people's HIV status. Each small group develops a poster which contains a statement on their strategy for following ethical procedures / guidelines, and the tasks they will follow through (e.g. draft information and consent form).	Plenary Small groups
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch	
13.30 – 15.15	**3. Your priority issues** Opportunity for each participant to spend time on their priority issues, such as continue to write-up and complete their refined research proposals; meet with facilitators to talk through specific issues; exchange ideas with other participants; work on research instruments	Individuals
15.15	Tea / coffee	
15.30 – 17.00	**Chair: Saskia** **5. Identify partnerships for future mentoring and support** **6. Financial reporting under contract** (additional session for contracted partners only). End workshop.	Plenary

WorldFish Center Technical Workshop   17th - 19th June 2008
Fisheries and HIV and AIDS in Africa: Investing in sustainable solutions
Report

Appendix B: List of Participants

Country:	Name:	Institution:	Email:
Malawi	Mr. Joseph Nagoli	WorldFish Center Malawi	j.nagoli@cgiar.org
Malawi	Dr. Patrick Kambewa	Chancellor College	pkambewa@chanco.unima.mw
Malawi	Mr. Owen Nkhoma	Bunda College	onkhoma@chanco.unima.mw onkhoma@yahoo.com
Mozambique	Mr. Antonio Mazive	World Vision International	Antonio_mazive@wvi.org
Malawi	Mr. Essau Mwendo Phiri	World Vision International	essau_mwendo@wvi.org
Uganda	Dr. Nite Tanzarn	Makerere University (Faculty of Social Sciences)	ntanzarn@ss.mak.ac.ug tanzarn@yahoo.org.uk
Uganda	Dr. Margaret Kabahenda	Makerere University (Dept. Food Science and Technology)	mkabahenda@agric.mak.ac.ug mkabahenda@yahoo.com
DRC	Mr. Simon Mutala	WorldFish Center DRC	s.mutala@cgiar.org
DRC	Professeur Bienvenu Kalunga Mawazo	Open University (Lubumbashi)	kalunga_mawazo@yahoo.fr
DRC	Dr. Winnie Mujinga	Clinique Universitaire (University of Lubumbashi)	mujingawin@yahoo.fr
DRC	Mr. Patrice Ilunga	World Vision International	patrice_ilunga@wvi.org
Zambia	Dr. Isaac Malasha	WorldFish Center Zambia	i.malasha@cgiar.org
Zambia	Mr. Alphart Lungu	WorldFish consultant	alphartlungu@yahoo.com
Zambia	Ms. Chipo Phiri	Kenneth Kaunda Children of Africa Foundation (KKF)	chipophiri@yahoo.co.uk
Zambia	Dr. Drinah Banda Nyirenda	University of Zambia	bandanyirenda@yahoo.com
Zambia	Ms. Twambo Hachibamba	University of Zambia	twambohachi@yahoo.com thachibamba@unza.zm
Zambia	Dr. Dorothy Chilima	WorldFish Center Zambia	d.chilima@cgiar.org

WorldFish Center Technical Workshop   17th - 19th June 2008
Fisheries and HIV and AIDS in Africa: Investing in sustainable solutions
Report

Appendices in Zip-folders:

Zip-folder 1: Presentations and handouts

C1: Programme scope and objectives

C2: Logical framework hierarchy and exercise

C3: Researching HIV and Fisheries: Lessons from Uganda

C4: Relevance to policy and practice and engagement with research users

C5: Principles and Practice of interviewing

C6: Analysing qualitative data

C7: Ethics

Zip-folder 2: Partner Outputs from the workshop (outputs, methods, ethical considerations, etc.)