Report 2: July 2022

Community-Based Research Capacity Building Project: Online Training in Research Knowledge and Skills (February – March 2022 and May – June 2022)

Authors: Lara Momesso, MIDEX (Migration, Diaspora and Exile) Research Centre, University of Central Lancashire; Pat Cox and Caroline Blunt, Research Consultants and Affiliate Members of MIDEX (Migration, Diaspora and Exile) Research Centre, University of Central Lancashire; Suhir Abuhajar; Samara Atassi; Runda Gaafer; Reem Gahalla; Ahlam Hasan; Mohammad Issa.

Contents: Report Sections and Page Numbers

Acknowledgements

Summary

The UCLan research team proposal to run training in research knowledge and skills for local refugees in Lancashire (Community-Based Research Capacity Building project) in order to begin building research capacity in refugee communities in Lancashire, was made to the Acting Board of the Lancashire Refugee Council (hereafter LRC) at their online meeting on 13th October 2020, together with the proposal for a Scoping Review (Report 1). Two of the research team who attended this meeting committed to training a small group of local refugees in research knowledge and skills, aiming to start a process of expanding research capacity in local refugee communities which would endure after completion of the Scoping Review.

Due to the delayed start of the Scoping Review (Report 1) recruitment to the online research training began in January 2022. Applicants were interviewed by two of the research team; eight applicants – fewer than the number applying - were selected. Sessions were agreed with participants at two x two hours weekly for four weeks starting in the third week of February (after schools' half-term holiday). An additional essential four hours training addressing researcher responsibilities according to General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), as required by the Data Protection Act (2018), was arranged by our partners at Lancashire County Council.

The second stage – co-researching with members of the UCLan team on the Scoping Review itself and contributing to report writing - began during the third week in May, running at two hours weekly for seven weeks. Six of the original eight course participants committed to this second stage. Feedback has been gathered at the end of the first stage through action research interviews with participants, and at the end of the second stage through an action research focus group discussion. Evaluation of the initial training, and of the co-researching stage, is broadly very positive, with thoughtful and thought-provoking comments for the UCLan research team to consider.

Introduction

As noted above (Summary), the proposal to build community research capacity through research training for a small group of local refugees was first put to the LRC Acting Board on 13th October 2020 by two members of the UCLan research team, and accepted by the Acting Board later that autumn. From that point onwards, the proposal was developed into a more detailed plan of training, supported by relevant readings and eventually undertaken in two separate and distinct stages in 2022.

In 2018 one of the current UCLan research team had undertaken an extensive assessment of community integration across seven areas of Lancashire on behalf of the County Council, with a large number of some of the re-settled Syrian refugees (Blunt, 2018). Because of this earlier work and report, she was approached about researching to ascertain support within the county for an LRC, and she consequently included two colleagues, together forming the UCLan research team, two of whom are responsible for developing the plan for the Scoping Review (Report 1) and that for the Community-based Research Capacity Building project, both proposals being accepted by the Acting Board of LRC in autumn 2020.

One member of the UCLan research team previously had worked in a community research project elsewhere in the north of England, during which local young people were trained to become co-researchers on this project (Cox, 2012), and she bought this experience to shared team thinking about building community capacity for research among refugee communities in Lancashire, alongside the Scoping Review (Report 1).

The start of both interlinked projects - Scoping Review and Community-based Research Capacity Building – was delayed, in most part due to the Covid 19 upheaval, resulting in a majority of university staff working from home, and consequent impacting upon their workloads (see also Report 1). Therefore the online research training began in February 2022. Two of the UCLan research team, in consultation with the research lead, refined the community research capacity building proposal, clarifying the purpose and focus of the research training, and agreeing a second stage of co-researching. The purpose and focus comprised: developing, and - in relation to course participants educated at university level – extending, their research knowledge and skills, in order to begin building research capacity in local refugee communities. The opportunity to become co-researchers, co-working with members of the research team on the Scoping Review – the second stage - would follow the initial training. Completion of the initial training would be acknowledged by the University

of Central Lancashire with a specially-designed certificate; two of the UCLan research team members also providing an open-ended promise of references for any future course or job applications.

The training would be delivered online, ensuring that refugees from across Lancashire county would be able to attend. It was planned that part of each session would be recorded and saved to a shared drive; thus course participants would be able to access material between sessions where they wished to do so. There would be a specific action research component, in that each participant would be asked to agree to an interview at the end of the first stage (research knowledge and skills training) with interview questions encouraging reflection on their experiences of training; those who continued to become co-researchers would be asked to agree to another interview or focus group to reflect on their experiences at the end of the co-researching process. The UCLan research team always were committed to the principle that any co-researchers would be listed as co-authors on reports for Lancashire County Council, voluntary organisations and faith groups; and listed as participant authors (Back, 2019) in dissemination events for UCLan and any possible publications, if they wished to be so listed.

The team also agreed the number to be recruited – maximum 8 – and completed all Ethics forms required by the university for participants in the planned training course. More detail of the two stages: research training and co-researching can be found below at sections: Part 1 February – March 2022 Sessions: Participants; Content; Feedback, and Part 2 May – June 2022 Sessions: Participants; Content; Feedback, pages 10 and 15.

Context: Lancashire county

Like many other areas of the UK, Lancashire county is composed of both internal and external migrant peoples and their current descendants (Portes and DeWind, 2008). Both in the twentieth century and more recently, individuals, families and groups fleeing war, famine, drought and persecution in their own nations - refugees and people seeking asylum, and known collectively as sanctuary seekers – have been, and are, arriving in Lancashire, and making new lives in the county.

The Community-based Research Capacity Building project and this report are situated within both the earlier established and ongoing initiatives in several parts of the county by statutory services, voluntary groups and by faith organisations, all aiming to improve the lives of, and opportunities for, refugee and sanctuary-seeking individuals, families and groups. While it is not possible to list all current initiatives here, there are four designated Cities of Sanctuary in Lancashire: Blackburn with Darwen, Burnley, Lancaster & Morecambe and Preston and currently more than 200 voluntary groups and faith organisations across the county. Two Sanctuary Lancashire conferences (2017 and 2018) were co-organised by, and supported by, a number of voluntary groups, faith organisations and by Lancashire County Council Refugee Integration Team, raising awareness of local ongoing and developing support services for sanctuary seekers. In 2018 many refugees from Syria were sent to Lancashire through the Syrian Vulnerable Persons' Re-settlement Scheme (SVPRS) and re-settled here. Since summer 2021 there has been emergency resettlement of refugees arriving from Afghanistan; in 2022 women, children and young people fleeing the war in Ukraine are being found homes in Lancashire.

The UCLan research team hope that the learnings about research for individuals in local refugee communities from both the initial training and the co-researching, and the learnings for our team about both the training and co-researching stages of this research capacity building project will contribute positively to Lancashire's current and future initiatives in supporting people seeking sanctuary, and in opening up and developing opportunities for them, and for their descendants.

Context: Research with refugees

In thinking about and practising co-researching with members of communities – co-researching sometimes also overlapping with action research (Fine, 2018; Martin et al, 2019) – researchers are responding to the imperative that research should contribute to influencing or improving practice and policies at local levels.

Briefly: action research describes circular processes of acting, researching, reflecting on action, acting again: individuals and groups both can reflect on their own practices: see for example, Greenwood and Levin (2003). Co-researching is considered to be a more equitable research approach than many, centralising as it does engaging with people in their own communities and being described as research 'with', rather than research 'on': for example, Green (2008); Cox (2012); Banks et al (2017).

Both co-researching and action research are particularly relevant to researching with refugees and people seeking asylum; co-researching emphasises more equal partnerships in researching and joint working in co-producing research knowledge which is grounded in experiences. It is already clear to many researchers that 'do no harm' in relation to researching with refugees and people seeking sanctuary - Pittaway et al (2010); Hugman et al (2011) – is not sufficient to address power differences between researchers and vulnerable people, and that 'do no harm' does not put anything back into sanctuary seeking communities from which experiences and knowledge have been taken.

Planning, Resources, Early Stages.

Autumn 2020 – December 2021

During the intervening months following the approval of the Scoping Review Community-based Research Capacity Building project in autumn 2020, the research team prepared and submitted necessary documentation for the university's rigorous ethical approval process. Some of this documentation was returned twice for re-drafting, with a final scrutiny taking place in autumn 2021.

December 2021 – mid February 2022

Once the required university permissions and final ethical approvals had been granted in December 2021, the research team arranged a meeting with key LCC personnel in January 2022. This was followed by two meetings with members of the LRC Acting Board (one daytime, one evening, so everyone could attend one of them), in order to refresh the Acting Board's memories of the Scoping Review and the Community-based Research Capacity Building outlines, answer questions of detail, and discuss a provisional timeline for both projects.

Forms and information were emailed to everyone who expressed an interest in the training. Interviews were arranged and undertaken in January and early February; eight participants were selected.

Concurrently with processing applications for training and undertaking interviews, the research team liaised with our partners at LCC who arranged for course participants to join essential specialist training being provided for LCC staff addressing GDPR requirements according to the Data Protection Act, 2018, and which dovetailed with the UCLan online training sessions.

Also taking place concurrently were discussions and decisions about the detail of course and individual session content, and selecting background readings to accompany each session. Two team members prepared a Course Handbook which included: a welcome note/introduction; the aims of the training course; a short (research-related) biography of each research team member; detailed listing of all the sessions; a list of additional readings on aspects of research practice and theory for optional further study. A reflective journal was designed and made available, so that each participant could choose to note, session by session, anything which provoked interest (copies as Appendices 1 and 2).

Part 1 February – March 2022 Sessions: Participants; Content; Feedback

The group of eight participants consisted of five women and three men. The two research team members responsible for planning and delivering the training knew the educational backgrounds of course participants only if it had come up in earlier meetings, or if participants themselves had mentioned it in interviews. It emerged gradually during sessions – and later in a couple of the action research interviews – that a majority of the group were university educated - undergraduate and postgraduate - but this did not necessarily mean that they all had learnt about research processes and practices in great depth; or that earlier learning had included a range of research approaches and methods.

Throughout the course we emphasised researching in and with communities, asking participants to think about how what was being presented might resonate (or not) with their own experiences of 'being researched' and of 'being a researcher' – singly or as part of a team - in their own community/communities, where some of them had had this experience.

In the first session we introduced two images: one of an iceberg and one of an ascending staircase. The iceberg image we used to describe research processes and the 'arc' of a research project: most research processes – designing a project; planning; meetings with funders; preparing resources; forms required for ethical approval; data analysis; writing reports for funders - are invisible to almost everyone, apart from the research team members themselves. The only visible parts are actions such as undertaking interviews, focus groups, surveys. Once a project is underway, any unanticipated issues internal to the project or external to it, often are seen and responded to by research team members only.

The ascending staircase image, also introduced in the first session, was to illustrate progression in research learnings; that everyone – including ourselves – begins at the bottom step; that movement 'upwards' – understanding and learning - is never smooth or consistent. We referred to both images reasonably regularly throughout this first stage and it appeared that they had some 'cut through' as both were mentioned in one of the action research interviews.

From the first session onwards, our training emphasised the person of researcher; their responsibilities towards the individuals and communities involved in their projects; and the knowledge that they apply in their research; how they go about their research. This principle

was clearly understood and assisted participants in engaging with unfamiliar research terminology. Issues of the self of the researcher linked with group discussions about who 'gets researched'; and who becomes a researcher.

Session topics: Reflecting on, and learning from, experience; 'Good' quality research; Rapport v Objectivity; Community-based research; Research ethics and GDPR; Interviewing and facilitating a focus group; GDPR training(LCC); Data analysis and communicating research; Reflecting and reviewing.

For all sessions we planned a mixture of powerpoint presentations, discussions, comments and questions. Sometimes part of a planned presentation or discussion was rolled over to the next session if letting a discussion continue was more important.

Where possible, weekly readings (scanned and uploaded to the shared drive) were selected to be relevant to course participants' experiences and knowledge. For example, an extract from the introduction to Jim Al-Khalili's book 'Pathfinders: The Golden Age of Arabic Science' ((2012) was provided, to demonstrate that many 'histories' of research written in the global north do not include the contributions of Arabic philosophers, doctors and natural scientists to modern understandings of the natural and the social worlds. For the session 'Being a community-based researcher', extracts from writings by Paolo Freire (1972), Roger Green (2008) and Bob Holman were presented or made available, to illustrate three of the different approaches to undertaking research in communities, whether or not the researcher belongs to or lives in those communities. These differing approaches to researching in communities were also re-visited briefly in the session where ethical issues in research were addressed.

The research team proposed an additional optional session towards the end of the course, where the each of the three UCLan researchers briefly presented an individual research project we had undertaken previously, using it to illustrate one aspect of research practice, such as considering ethical issues in writing up. This was well-attended and a few commented positively on it as an addition to the planned programme.

For the final session participants had been asked to prepare a short presentation about a topic they would like to research at some future time, and applying learnings from the previous online sessions. We in the UCLan team informed the participants in advance that we would not comment on any of the presentations; that group members should give feedback to one another. There was complete group engagement with this exercise, including encouraging

and nuanced feedback provided to one another. Some comments in the action research interviews indicate that this was a helpful learning experience for a couple of group members.

Part 1: Action Research Interviews

The majority of these interviews took place during the week of the final training session, or in the following week. This means that while memories of the course, and of particular sessions, were quite recent, learnings may not have been fully processed and absorbed.

Six of the eight course participants agreed to be interviewed; five interviews were completed. Responses are summarised, and organised into themes.

The majority of the group has previous experience of researching; either as part of another person or team's project; or commissioning research on behalf of an employer; or undertaking smaller-scale or more extensive local projects themselves, where they had perceived need . Most research described had been undertaken in refugee communities; two members had researched within different disciplines (as in, different to the social sciences).

A lesser theme of previous experiences of 'being researched' emerged; of being a research subject in others' projects and of answering others' research questions. At various times this had been experienced negatively, being asked to repeat one's 'story', while endeavouring to build new lives.

Having been a refugee oneself was considered by a couple of participants to be important when researching in refugee communities; for others in the group this was not considered as important as researchers' attitudes towards, and their engagement with, the individuals and groups among whom research was being undertaken.

Concerning the training, there was consistent feedback – both from participants with greater experience of researching, and from those with less – that they had not realised previously how much thinking, planning, and 'invisible' work goes into research; how much there is to do before beginning a project. Researchers' awareness of self and their responsibilities towards others were mentioned as significant learning, as was the level of detail required, the imperative to be aware of ethical issues throughout a project, and to have a paper trail.

There was unanimous feedback about the worth and value of the course as a whole. The advance preparation by the UCLan team was noted and much appreciated, as was the content,

including the emphasis on the researcher's self. It also was considered to require hard work, and the weekly supply of background readings drew positive comments. The majority of the participants interviewed thought that the course would be very valuable to others.

Part 1: Research Team Reflections

The two members of the research team planning, organising and delivering the training met twice weekly to review sessions and firm up plans for the following ones. This regular contact also assisted with reflecting on process, in addition to content.

A major reflection is that the course was too short. Another two x two hour sessions would have enabled us to develop participants' understanding and knowledge of the usefulness and applicability of quantitative methods, where appropriate, including surveys. More input in the first stage on quantitative approaches would have been a better grounding for co-working on the Scoping Review and analysing data there. There was insufficient time for full debate of all issues engendered by the teaching and overall we experienced the course as compressed.

It emerged during this first phase of training, and in a few of the action research interviews, that most of the group are university educated - undergraduate and some postgraduate - but had not necessarily had much input around research processes and methods, or had been taught research within a discipline other than the social sciences. This may have meant that the habit of learning through being taught and then undertaking follow-up reading was already familiar for some of the group, but possibly not for others. However, all were committed and enthusiastic, and very willing to engage with new ideas and practices.

As the course progressed we became relaxed about not completing all planned material in one session; as participants became more confident with us and with one another there was a slightly increased level of their contribution.

If we were to repeat this training for another small group, in addition to extending it, we would devise a selection strategy that does not depend solely on interviews; perhaps requesting a personal statement might be a way forward. We would like also to explore other forms of accreditation.

Were we to repeat the course, we definitely would include the 'prepare a ppt presentation' session; it proved useful in consolidating and demonstrating learnings, although we would set

this up as a longer session. We would include a 'mop up' session, for final questions and comments. And the whole course would be very similar to this one, in size, in underpinning principles, outline, content, and in our approach.

Part 2 May – June 2022 Sessions: Participants and Content

There was a time lapse between the first and second stages of the training; the first stage ending during the third week in March, and the second stage beginning during the third week in May. This was due mainly to delay in launching the surveys for the Scoping Review, following discovery that there were inaccuracies in some of the translations which needed correcting before the survey went live (Report 1). In addition, Ramadan began just over a fortnight following the end of the first stage of training, followed by Eid al-Fitr at the start of May; in Lancashire spring school holidays ran for two weeks in April. We felt it was not appropriate to recommence sessions until we knew that all participants would be able to consider evening attendance.

Six of the original eight course participants – five women and one man - committed to attending this stage of the course, which ran for seven weeks at two hours per session. This stage was extended beyond the original plan because, during discussions in the early sessions, the whole group concluded that the survey should be kept open during Refugee Week, from 20th – 24th June, (see also Report 1) in order to maximise uptake.

Because of GDPR requirements relating to confidentiality, we shared with our co-researchers in the first meeting the plan that each week we would select extracts from survey data – having first removed any identifying details – and that we would undertake analysis together in the group meetings.

These sessions could not be planned too far in advance, as their content depended on what data, how much data, and from which group/s (statutory sector; voluntary organisations and faith groups; sanctuary seekers), had been uploaded that particular week. Instead sessions were planned week-by-week. Each week we (re)emphasised confidentiality of discussions and analysis; no sharing or discussion of survey findings outside of the course, whether of qualitative or quantitative data.

In the first session, statutory sector data from free text answers to one of the questions was examined in some depth. These particular responses were very brief and it took a while for co-researchers to realise that even within a few words of data, several different meanings can be possible. This learning was quickly absorbed and applied in analysing data in the weeks that followed.

Each week free text answers from one of the three respondent groups – statutory sector; voluntary organisations and faith groups; sanctuary seekers - to different questions were displayed onscreen, and as co-researchers debated the implications, their conclusions were summarised at the side of the screen in real time and saved, meaning that there was a week-by-week record of co-researchers' discussions and agreements.

Apart from the first week's group analysis of minimal data, the content of two other sessions are noteworthy. The first is a presentation of numerical data with which our co-researchers engaged eagerly, swiftly understanding how numerical data can be presented – and mis-represented, or taken out of context - in order to support or undermine particular viewpoints or particular outcomes. The second is a session where we displayed some free text responses which were negative in tone and content, these giving rise to a very intense discussion in the group that week.

We discussed and prepared reflective notes each week, which were shared early in the following week's session and uploaded to the shared drive. We used these notes to remind our co-researchers what they had achieved and learned in the previous week's session and, as everyone had access to the shared drive, we encouraged them to add their own reflections whenever they could.

In the final session we introduced an outline for the report on the Scoping Review, aiming for group discussion and joint writing about the strengths and limitations of using surveys as a research method. In this week too, the final activity, the action research focus group, took place, reviewing not only this second stage of co-researching experiences but where co-researchers chose to so reflect, some of their earlier experiences.

Part 2: Action Research Focus Group

A theme running through the weekly sessions, and picked up again in the focus group was surprise and astonishment at the close attention paid to details of words and sentences in the data analysis process. Not only how it is possible to extract much meaning from a few words, but that researchers pay such close attention to what is said or written. For a couple of co-researchers with both previous experience of 'being researched' and of researching, this was a significant and valuable discovery.

And this in-depth approach to, and consideration of, research data was being applied in various activities, such as reading research articles, reviewing others' work and opening up a number of possibilities in looking more widely around oneself.

In this second stage co-researchers had realised that the perfect research project does not exist. There appears to be an implicit assumption for a few that, in relation to the Scoping Review, familiar methods such as interviews and focus groups would have resulted in more data and better data than has the survey, despite learnings about how much even very limited responses can reveal (see Report 1).

There was discussion about some of the survey responses which they had analysed during the sessions; assertions that researchers must listen to and acknowledge negative comments, even when that might arouse emotions and compromise neutrality; the importance of thinking about who wrote/spoke the negative comments; what it is they need. And how preparation for research projects using interviews, focus groups or surveys must include consideration of how to persuade possible participants to engage.

Another theme was the benefit or strength in analysing data in a group or team; the value of listening to differing opinions; the resulting agreed group analyses were considered by one of our co-researchers to be more powerful than one person's view alone.

As the focus group drew to a close, co-researchers present expressed their deep appreciation of both stages of the training; how interesting it had been; how much they had learned. In particular, that this course in research knowledge and skills would be a very good start for community members wishing to enter higher education.

Part 2: Research Team Reflections

Both the action research interviews and action research focus group discussion capture course participants'/co-researchers' responses close to the end of each training stage, so they are initial reactions rather than considered reflections after any learnings have been integrated into their research practice.

Following re-reading of notes from the Action Research interviews and Action Research Focus Group, it appears that the practice of reflecting on research still feels unfamiliar to

some co-researchers at present, although individual responses from within the focus group are lengthier and generally more considered than in the interviews.

As we noted above at Research Team Reflections Part 1, additional sessions in stage 1 on quantitative research methods would have laid stronger foundations for analysing the scoping review data.

Even reviewing this extended second stage, we recognise that there is so much more we might have achieved with more time, although the focus group feedback about the worth and value to our co-researchers themselves, and their views about its worth to others as yet unknown, is very welcome and appreciated by us. We certainly would consider running another second stage course with a small group of no more than eight, provided we had taken them through stage 1 learnings first.

Next Steps

As is usual with any research project funded through a university, the UCLan team and co-researchers have committed ourselves to two dissemination events for the university in late September. From early September we will start joint planning for a jointly agreed and co-presented format. There will be one dissemination presentation at UClan in Preston, the other at UCLan Burnley.

The UCLan research team and co-researchers are willing to make joint contributions to any dissemination events which might be organised by the Acting Board of the LRC or by LCC, in the coming months, from mid-September onwards.

It is also our intention to publish from this capacity building project, involving all co-researchers who wish to work with us on this next stage, later in autumn 2022 into early 2023. In all publications we will acknowledge the support of the MIDEX Research Centre at the University of Central Lancashire, and our partners at Lancashire County Council.

Recommendations and Conclusion

All co-researchers completing the first and the second research capacity building training stages are capable of critical analysis of research practice and processes, and of translating their learnings from these stages into their future research practice. However, these learnings are best consolidated in research settings where they can access further support within experienced groups or teams who are committed to researching collaboratively, and where they can develop their expertise. A future LRC might provide these settings.

It is possible (Report 1) that a future LRC could undertake its own research across the county, building on the research capacity that already exists in Lancashire and developing it further, in addition to providing opportunities for interested sanctuary seekers to become involved. If it chooses to undertake its own research, the LRC could be making a distinctive contribution to research with refugees in Lancashire, and perhaps be influencing research with refugees elsewhere in the north-west and beyond.

We in the UCLan research team have always thought of, and tried to remember to emphasise, that this project has been to support research capacity building in refugee communities in Lancashire; we hope that this training has provided support which has been useful.

And at some point during the second stage, one of our co-researchers commented that refugees and people seeking asylum are never asked what they want. We noted above – Context: Research with refugees - that 'do no harm' does not put anything back into sanctuary seeking communities from which experiences and knowledge have been taken. Researchers putting something back into sanctuary seeking communities, something that these communities have asked for and would value, needs to become a minimum expectation of researchers in future community-based researching.

References

Al-Khalili, J. (2012) *Pathfinders: The Golden Age of Arabic Science,* Penguin, London

Back, L. (2019) Les Back on Migrants: Interview with Dave Edmonds for *Social Science Bites*, London UK;

Banks, S., Herrington, T., Carter, C. (2017) Pathways to co-impact; Action research and community organising, *Educational Action Research*, 25, 4, 541-559;

Blunt, C (2018) Community Integration Assessment: Story of, Window on, Toolkit for, Community Integration, *Report for Lancashire County Council*, October 2018;

Executive summary available at: https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/909485/refugee-befriending-service-community-integration-assessment-executive-summary.pdf

Cox, P. (2012) Complexity science: Understanding research processes and improving research practice, *Journal of Social Service Research*, 38, 5, 582-590;

Fine, M. (2018) *Just research in contentious times: Widening the methodological imagination,* Teachers College Press, New York and London;

Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Penguin, London;

Green, R. (2008) Bringing about social change: The role of community research. In: Cox P., Geisen, T., Green, R.(eds, 2008) *Qualitative Research and Social Change: European Contexts,* Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire UK;

Greenwood, D.J. and Levin, M. (2003) Reconstructing the relationships between universities and society. In: Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds, 2003) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks CA;

Hugman R., Pittaway, E., Bartolomei, L. (2011) When 'do no harm' is not enough: The ethics of research with refugees and other vulnerable groups, *British Journal of Social Work,* 41, 7, 1271-1287;

Pittaway, E., Bartolomei, L, Hugman, R. (2010) 'Stop stealing our stories': The ethics of research with vulnerable groups, *Journal of Human Rights*, 2, 2, 229–251;

Portes, A. and DeWind, J. (eds, 2008) *Rethinking Migration: New Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives,* Berghahn Books, New York and Oxford.

Community Based Research Capacity Building Project
Research training, experience, and two-way learning

Research Training Handbook

Pat Cox, Caroline Blunt & Lara Momesso

February 2022

Welcome

A small team of researchers at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan) has been asked by Lancashire County Council (LCC) to support the building of researcher capacity in the Sanctuary Seeking population in Lancashire. This has come about in relation to a proposed Lancashire Refugee Council (LRC) which hopes, among other things, to be able to provide and disseminate research that can benefit this community in Lancashire. The UCLan team are involved in the Migration, Diaspora and Exile (MIDEX) Research Centre at UCLan and their work has shown them that people with experience of seeking refuge have not always had a positive experience of being involved in research (due to many different factors), and is looking to learn from, and enable others to learn from, this project for future research. The Project therefore aims to: offer certificated training in research to refugees, so that Sanctuary Seekers will be in a better position to do their own research and evaluate others' research; offer the opportunity for participants to gain research experience in a small team; and, at the same time, participate in research *about* this training and experience so that insights gained, and lessons learned can be shared more widely to promote good research practice.

By this point, you will have received a copy of the project Information Pack which details all 4 potential aspects of the Capacity Building project.

This Handbook focuses on the 1ˢᵗ part, the **Research Training**, giving you:

- **aims of the training;**
- **a little about your trainers;**
- **training/ study tips;**
- **a topic guide;**
- **resources and readings if you would like to read and study further**

We hope that this information is helpful.

Pat Cox   patcox948@gmail.com
Caroline Blunt caroline@carolineblunt.org
Lara Momesso lmomesso@uclan.ac.uk

February 2022

Aims of the training

The overall aim of the project to support development of Researcher Capacity within Lancashire's Sanctuary Seeker population.

What does this mean and why might it be important?

to tell untold stories or challenge something about academic theory. If you have been involved in any research either as *researcher* or *participant,* perhaps you recognise what sort of aim the research had or whether it achieved what it said it would do? There are criticisms of some research: that it doesn't find out what really matters to Sanctuary Seekers and/or doesn't take great enough care of Sanctuary Seekers during the process. Instead of feeling like *participants* in meaningful research or 'knowledge production', Sanctuary Seekers have expressed that they can feel like *subjects or, worse, objects in experimental studies.* Whilst this can happen to other people in the community, not just Sanctuary Seekers, there can be particular factors affecting whether Sanctuary Seekers challenge research they did not like, their feeling of power to refuse to be involved or their resources to follow up on You may have had experience of *being a researcher* and/or you may have had experience of *being a research participant or 'subject' in someone else's research.* Have you been involved in deciding the questions that might be asked in an interview, questionnaire, or survey, or have you been on the 'other side of the table', responding to questions?

There is much research undertaken about and with Sanctuary Seekers. Research comes in many forms, uses a variety of methods, and can have a variety of aims. Some of it makes a difference to Sanctuary Seekers' lives, and some of it ends up on dusty shelves and the participants never hear anything more about it. Some of it is designed to make a difference to policies affecting Sanctuary Seekers whilst other research is aiming research they were involved in. For example, from our experience as researchers, an Asylum Seeker may feel it will affect their case negatively if they do not agree or ask too many questions. Some critics say that it makes a difference if there are Sanctuary Seekers involved in designing and doing the research; that this leads to more sensitivity to how research is carried out, particularly if it is with a Sanctuary Seeker's own ethnic or geographic community. There is debate about what differences this can make and it is important to be aware of pros and cons. The point is, research can make a positive impact and be a learning experience for all involved, or it can negatively affect trust and interest in research.

Lancashire County Council (LCC) has commissioned this training to support the growth of 'community based researcher capacity' among the Sanctuary Seeking population in Lancashire. This is so that Sanctuary Seekers within Lancashire can be:

- better placed/ empowered/ enabled both to design and undertake research themselves about issues that matter to the community *and*
- better placed/ empowered/ enabled to evaluate invitations and requests to be involved in research that from universities, government departments, charities or individuals.

As you have registered for this training, we are presuming that you are interested in research. You do not have to have experience of research, either as a *researcher* or *participant*, to do this training with us; interest in, enthusiasm for and concern about 'good' research in and with your community, is enough. As a relatively short period of training, it cannot cover everything in depth and anyway, research involves continuous learning and reflecting. In our experience, all projects have their own challenges and glitches, and the aim is to offer you a springboard or foundation to do and evaluate, 'good' community-based research.

The training offers a *Certificate of successful completion* issued by UCLan to those participants who attend all training sessions and who can demonstrate practical and reflective competence, by way of a very short practice focus group or interview. This is not an exam. Rather, it will be an exercise assessed by a) the group by way of constructive feedback and b) yourself by way of constructive reflection. More details will be given to you about this, during the course. On page 12 of this handbook is an example preparation sheet you can use and we will guide you through this during the course.

About the trainers

The Community Based Capacity Building project is being undertaken by a team at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan): Lara Momesso has responsibility for oversight and overall management of the project, whilst Pat Cox and Caroline Blunt have developed, and will be your trainers for, this course.

Pat Cox

I'm a research consultant and Affiliate Member of the MIDEX (Migration, Diaspora and Exile) Research Centre at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan). Previously I worked at UCLan for several years as a senior member of research staff; before that I was a social worker and team leader. In recent research I've explored experiences and issues in the lives of children, young people and their families, focussing particularly on their experiences of migration. I favour qualitative research approaches; talking to people and asking questions for better understandings of their experiences and situations.

I believe that research belongs in communities, not only in universities. And that it's the responsibility of researchers like me, who trained in universities, to support communities in designing and undertaking and publishing their own research, so that communities elsewhere can learn to do likewise. Some years ago I co-trained a group of young people aged 13-15 (not the young people normally chosen for such projects) in doing research, supporting them in undertaking surveys, interviews and focus groups in their own communities.

Caroline Blunt

Caroline's career has spanned the Voluntary sector, public sector, University Sector and freelance work. Over 25 years, this has included working as an advisor with the Citizens Advice Bureaux, managing a Primary Care health practice set up to meet the needs of people who are homeless and vulnerably housed, contributing to research projects at Goldsmiths College London, University of Kent and the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan), lecturing in Sociology at UCLan and undertaking a number of freelance research projects with and about community-based initiatives. In her research in and with communities to date, she adopts qualitative research approaches including interviewing and focus groups.

A recent project is a [Community Integration Assessment](#) carried out in 2018 for Lancashire County Council in relation to the experiences and aspirations of Resettled Syrian refuges. Caroline's particular interests have long been firstly in relation to the idea of 'home' and how people, including migrants and refugees make and re-make 'home' in practical and

emotional ways and secondly, how research methods can be used ethically and creatively, to make sense of this.

Lara Momesso

I'm a senior lecturer in Asia Pacific Studies at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLan), Co-Deputy Director of the Centre of Migration Diaspora and Exile (MIDEX) and Co-Director of the Northern Institute of Taiwan Studies (NorITS) at UCLan. My research interests include marriage migration across the Taiwan Strait and in East Asia, gender and family formation in contemporary Chinese societies, migrant political participation, migration and emotions, through applying qualitative research approaches in my research.

My research on marriage migration is shaped by more than ten years of engaging with migrant communities and civic organisations all around Taiwan, and partly in China. In 2015, I cycled around Taiwan for a month with the aim of meeting migrants whose voices and stories usually would not be heard, and documenting their experiences. The photographs of my bike tour and various other works were displayed at the PR1 Gallery at UCLan in occasion of the Look 19 Photography Biennial - Brilliant City Exhibition in 2019.

What if I am unhappy or if there is a problem?

If you are unhappy at any point about the research, please feel free to let us know by contacting Lara Momesso in the first instance at: LMomesso@uclan.ac.uk and she will try to help you. If you remain unhappy or have a complaint which you feel you cannot come to us with, then please contact the University's Research Governance Unit at OfficerForEthics@uclan.ac.uk . The UCLan Ethics approval number for this project is: **BAHSS2 0161 which should be quoted in any correspondence.**

Format and Expectations of this training

This training will take place over 4 weeks, between the week **beginning Tuesday 22nd February and ending Wednesday 16th March**.

The training is composed of 4 hours contact time each week with your trainers, Pat and Caroline and then we suggest 2 hours of independent study and reflection time. The online training sessions with Pat and Caroline will be held as follows:

Week	Date	Time	Link to access session
Week 1	Tuesday 22nd February	11am – 1pm	
	Wednesday 23rd February	6pm – 8pm	
Week 2	Tuesday 1st March	11am – 1pm	
	Wednesday 2nd March	6pm – 8pm	
Week 3	Tuesday 8th March	11am – 1pm	
	Wednesday 9th March	6pm – 8pm	
	Thursday 10th March	10am - 12.30pm	GDPR online training (LCC)
	Friday 11th March	10am - 12.30pm	GDPR online training (LCC)
Week 4	Tuesday 15th March	11am – 1pm	
	Wednesday 16th February	6pm – 8pm	

It is very important that participants attend all sessions to complete the training.

In addition, an externally provided learning resource and assessment related to GDPR (General Data Protection Regulations) makes up part of this course. These GDPR sessions (organised by LCC) take place online on Thursday 10th March and Friday 11th March from 10 am – 12.30 am, on both days. Please note that these GDPR sessions are in addition to our online training for that week, and they are a requirement for completing the training course.

Training and Study Support

The training sessions will be composed of topic presentations and group discussion to develop and support learning. This handbook identifies the topics that will be included; for each session and topic there will be two or three readings that you can access to support your learning and also a few powerpoint slides, which you can re-read at anytime.

At the end of the handbook is a short list of books that we recommend, should you like to read further. A useful glossary of research terms or words is also included. Please do ask us for further resources if you would like to study a topic in greater depth. It is not necessary to buy any books to complete this training, however.

Over the course of the training, we will build up a shared file of resources for you to access. For example, power point topic presentations, short readings and anything else that may be useful. This will be accessible at the following shared drive:

You may have completed many courses before; or perhaps this is your first course; or it may be a long time since you last studied. Whichever is the case for you, we recognise that doing a new course can feel daunting and all of us can worry about our ability to understand or to concentrate on something new. This is quite normal. There may be new words, ideas, challenging discussions and sometimes content that triggers an uncomfortable experience or memory. We hope that, as a group, we can recognise that each participant will have their own learning journey and will have their own experience of the training.

To support your learning journey, we suggest the following:

- Try to set aside at least 10 minutes before a training session, to leave the responsibilities and/or stresses of the day aside. This can help you to focus on the session;
- Have a glass of water beside you during training sessions;
- Keeping a reflective journal during the training is a helpful learning aid. For example, choose a notebook in which you can write down both notes from training sessions, and ideas and reflections in between. Questions or thoughts might pop into your head between training sessions and having a notebook will mean you can record them. This reflective journal is for you only to see and keep, so it contains as much or as little as you want to write, and doesn't have to be neat. We are providing a separate guide to keeping a reflective journal, which contains some prompts that you may find useful;.
- Please ask questions, because saying 'I don't know' or 'I don't understand that' can lead to better understanding and knowledge. And if you have a question, there's a very good chance that another group member wants to know more about the same thing that you do.

Training Topics Week by Week

Session 1: Tues 22nd Feb	Reflecting on, and learning from, experience
Session 2: Weds 23rd Feb	'Good' quality research
Session 3: Tues 1st March	Rapport v Objectivity
Session 4: Weds 2nd Match	Community-based researchers
Session 5: Tues 8th March	Research ethics and General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Session 6: Weds 9th March	Interviewing and facilitating a focus group
Additional sessions: Thursday 9th & Friday 10th March	GDPR online training (LCC)
Session 7: Tues 15th March	Data analysis and communicating research
Session 8: Weds 16th March	Reflecting and Reviewing

1. Reflecting on, and learning from. experience

The purpose of this topic is to introduce you to the training and connect your own experience and life-learning with the idea of research or 'knowledge production'.

With this topic, the aim is to explore:

- How do we view the world?
- Why and how might our view of the world be relevant to research?
- Different ways of viewing the world, and different ways of doing research?
- How do we know what we know and find out about and understand about things?
- What is research?
- What is 'knowledge production'?
- How is knowledge valued or given value?
- Does knowledge change? How and why?

To support this topic, think of something you know about or know how to do. This can be anything, from making a meal, knowing how to get round the locality in which you live or being able to tell an old story. Ask yourself questions about this knowledge, for example, how did you come to know this?

2. 'Good' quality research

The purpose of this topic is to introduce you to how the quality of research is assessed or judged.

With this topic we will explore:

- What makes high quality knowledge or research or research 'good'?
- Measures or criteria of quality used in research: validity, reliability and generalisability
- Are these the only, or the correct, or the best measures of quality?

To support this topic, reflect either on an everyday example of something you know about or something you know how to do or a piece of research you have read. Brainstorm on how you assess or judge if it is high quality or 'good' knowledge?

3. Rapport versus objectivity

The purpose of this topic is to explore further some of the criteria that have been used to assess the quality of research, particularly in terms of *how* the knowledge is gained or produced.

With this topic we will explore:

- The terms 'objectivity' and 'impartiality' used in research
- The connection of 'objectivity' to validity, reliability and generalisability
- How objectivity is (supposedly) achieved in research
- Is objectivity something to aim for or is it over-rated?
- A brief history of rapport versus objectivity in research: feminist and other critiques.

- Rapport and relationship in research: pros and cons.
- Open, closed and leading questions in relation to objectivity and rapport

To support this topic, reflect on either an experience of being involved in research or any interview situation you have experienced (e.g. job interview). How would you describe the approach your interviewer took? Did they try to put you at your ease, make you feel comfortable, was there 'small talk' before the questions? Was it a formal or informal experience? How did their approach affect you and the answers you gave? Were there any surprising (positive or negative) consequences for you?

4. 'Community-Based Researchers'

The purpose of this topic is to introduce you to the idea of 'community-based research' and being a 'community-based researcher'. The previous topics have prepared us to explore some important issues that can affect community-based research and community-based researchers.

With this topic we will explore:

- What is meant by 'community-based research' and being a 'community-based researcher'. What is meant by 'community'?
- Is 'community-based research' different from other research? What might make 'community-based research' different?
- Advantages and disadvantages, strengths and challenges of community-based research

To support this topic, consider what you understand by the term 'community'. Does it always have warm comforting feelings associated with it or does it sometimes come with less positive feelings? Imagine that you are wanting to do research with a group to which you already belong. What could make research easy, positive and of high quality because you are already part of this group? What could make research difficult, negative and possibly of lower quality because you are already part of this group?

5. Research Ethics and General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)

This purpose of this topic is to offer you an overview of the most important ethical principles for research and an understanding of data protection terms, principles and regulations. An externally provided assessment of your understanding of GDPR will be offered and completion of this is necessary to complete this training.

With this topic we will explore:

- What are research ethics and why might they be important?
- 'Do no harm', 'Informed consent', confidentiality, anonymity and other key ethical notions and matters of debate
- Ethics in community-based research – special or different issues?
- 'Regulatory' and situational ethics
- Principles of GDPR and Data Protection in Community-based research
- Consequences of unethical research and data breaches

To support this topic, write and reflect on your own ethical principles. Iimagine that you have been asked to be a participant in someone else's research. Brainstorm on how you would ideally like to be treated in that research by the researcher and how you would like the researcher to treat or care for the words, answers you share with them. Then put yourself in the position of researcher for that same project and brainstorm on any issues that might make keeping to those principles challenging at any point.

6. Interviewing and facilitating a focus group

This topic introduces you to the practice of doing a research interview and running a focus group.

This topic will explore:

- Quantitative and/ or qualitative research methods
- Interviews as research method: what, why, when, how?
- Structured versus unstructured interviews
- Focus groups as research method: what, why, when, how?
- Focus groups as sources of data and opportunities for group/ cultural observation or focus group as both 'topic' and 'resource'
- Planning for an interview or focus group: assessment guide

To support this topic, critically reflect on any experience of interviews or group discussions that you have been involved in running or as participant. What worked; or did not work?

7. Data analysis and communicating research

This topic introduces you to what you might do with all the 'data' you have collected or gathered from research and what you might think about in terms of communicating or disseminating the results or outcome of the research.

In this topic we will explore:

- Handling data: storage and processing

- Quantitative and qualitative analysis of data
- Communicating and sharing research results and outcomes.

8 Reflecting and Reviewing

In this session we'll be looking back at the different aspects of research we've addressed during the training course.

To prepare for this session we ask you just to look through the readings, the powerpoint slides and any notes you might have made during the group discussions and ask yourselves:

1.Which research ideas and terminology am I comfortable with, and feel I have some understanding of?

2.Which ideas about researching would I like to have repeated, or explained in more detail?

3. Is there a question or questions I'd like to ask about any of the ideas or terminology we looked at during the course?

So if there's something that fits with points 2 or 3, please come prepared with your comment or question, and we'll do our best to respond.

Assessment Guidance

To demonstrate your competence in practising research and reflecting on it, we would like to you choose a research topic of interest to you and then decide whether you would do an interview or a focus group to find out about it.

Once you have decided on a focus group/ interview, we would like you to come up with 1 or 2 questions or prompts that you would use in that situation. We will ask you to talk through your mini project with the training group for 5 minutes and then with the group, have a go at posing the focus group question/ prompt or the interview question as if it was a real interview/ focus group. We will then have a group reflection on the exercise, offering constructive feedback for your learning.

The following form has been created to support your mini project planning:

Topic of research:
Chosen research method (focus group or interview):
Sample questions/ prompts for the participant(s): 1.   2.
Self-reflection on experience:
Notes from group feedback:

Further optional reading/resources

Al-Khalili J. (2012) Pathfinders: The Golden Age of Arabic Science, London, Penguin Books

Blaikie, N. & Priest, J. (2017) Social Research: Paradigms in Action, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Crotty, M., (2003) The Foundations of Social Research. Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process, London, Sage Publications.

de Sousa Santos, B. (2018) The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South, Durham and London, Duke University Press.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds, 2003, 2nd edn*) The Landscape of Qualitative Research, CA, Sage Publications.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds, 2003, 2nd edn*) Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry, CA, Sage Publications.

Denzin N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S (eds, 2003 2nd edn*) Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials, CA, Sage Publications.

Gane, N. & Back, L. (2013) C. Wright Mills 50 Years On: The Promise and Craft of Sociology Revisited. In: Theory Culture & Society, 29, 7-8, 399-421.

Goldacre, B. (2009) Bad Science, London, Harper Perennial.

Goldacre, B. (2012) Big Pharma: How Medicine is Broken and How We Can Fix It, London, Fourth Estate.

Harding, S. (1991) Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Henry, M. G. (2003) 'Where are you *really* from?' Representation, identity and power in the fieldwork experiences of a South Asian Diasporic. In: Qualitative Research, 3, 2, 229-242;

Kvale, S. (1996*) Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing, CA, Sage Publications.

Kuhn, T. (1970, 2nd edn) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Ledwith, M (2020, 3rd edn) Community Development: A Critical and Radical Approach, Bristol, Policy Press.

Mason, J. (2002 2nd edn) Qualitative Researching, London, Sage

Pittaway, E, Bartolomei, L, Hugman, R (2010) 'Stop stealing our stories': The ethics of research with vulnerable groups. In: Journal of Human Rights Practice, 2, 2, 229- 251

Plummer, K. (2001 2nd edn) Documents of Life: An Invitation to a Critical Humanism, Sage Publications, London.

Prior, L. (2003) Using Documents in Social Research, London, Sage Publications.

Seale, C. (ed, 1998*) Researching Society and Culture, London, Sage Publications. .

Seale, C (2006)   Quality in qualitative research. In: Seale, C., Silverman, D., Gubrium, J. F. Gobo, G. (2006, eds) Qualitative Research Practice, London, Sage, 379 - 389.

*More recent editions of these 5 books are available. .

A GLOSSARY OF TERMS CONNECTED TO RESEARCH

Taken from: Seale, C. (ed) 1998, Researching Society and Culture, London, Sage (pp 325-330).

Glossary

Action theory: social theory in which action, its purposive nature and its meaning to people, is taken to be of central importance. Action theory is often associated with the name of Max Weber, who developed the interpretive tradition in social science.

Androcentrism: ideas or methods of research which prioritize men's views of the world, excluding the experience of women.

Career: used, primarily, by symbolic interactionists and ethnographers to describe a person's progress through a social setting, as where marijuana users progress through various stages in learning how to experience the drug, or mental patients pass through a series of institutional settings.

Census: a count of the characteristics of every member of a given population (as opposed to a survey of a selected sample from that population).

Coding: this is done when observations or responses to a questionnaire or interview are collected into groups which are like one another, and a symbol is assigned as a name for the group. Data may be 'coded' as they are collected, as where respondents are forced to reply to fixed-choice questions. Alternatively, the coding of qualitative data can form a part of theory building.

Comparative method: the comparison of people's experiences of different types of social structure or social setting in terms of historical points in time, or across cultures at a single point in time. This is an approach which can shed light on the particular arrangements of both sides of the comparison.

Connotation: used in semiotics to indicate the interpretive meanings of signs, which may be ideological. Thus a picture of a soldier saluting a flag connotes nationhood and patriotism as well as the more straightforward things such as 'soldier' and 'flag' that it denotes.

Contingency table: a table of numbers in which the relationship between two variables is shown. Contingency tables can usefully be broken down into rows and columns. Percentages placed in the cells of the table, giving the proportion which each cell contributes to the sum of particular rows or columns, are often helpful in detecting the strength and direction of relationships.

Cultural scripts or texts: terms used by those concerned to analyse cultural objects, such as pictures, films, sports events, fashions, food styles, to indicate that these can be viewed as containing messages in a manner comparable to a piece of written text.

Data: is the plural of datum, which refers to a record of an observation. Data can be numerical (and hence quantitative) or consist of words or images (hence qualitative). A distinction is sometimes made between naturally occurring data - such as tape recordings of conversations that would have occurred whether a researcher was present or not - and data generated in research settings, as in interviews or on questionnaires. Quantitative data are often arranged in a data matrix for ease of analysis.

Deconstruction: is an approach to social analysis that undermines claims to authority by exposing rhetorical strategies used by social actors, including the authors of research reports themselves. It has been promoted in particular by the post-modernist Derrida.

Determinism: is the view that everything that happens is caused. When applied to human action, it suggests that our perception of having a free will is an illusion, and , 1 that the task of social research is to expose the true causes of action.

Discourse: has come to refer, under the influence of Foucault, to systems of know ledge and their associated practices. More narrowly, it is used by discourse analysts to refer to particular systems of language, with a characteristic terminology and underlying knowledge base, such as medical talk, psychological language, or the language of democratic politics.

Elaboration paradigm: a structured approach to the exploration of causal relation- ships between variables through the examination of contingency tables. By intro ducing third variables to bivariate tabulations, arguments about causal direction arwl spuriousness are tested. The logic of this approach underlies most multivariate statis tical analysis.

Empiricism: the view that knowledge is derived from sensory experience, for example visual observation. More loosely, it is often used to describe research that contains little in the way of reflection or theory, preferring to report 'facts' as they appear to be.

Epistemology: refers to the philosophical theory of knowledge, consisting of attempts to answer questions about how we can know what we know, and whether this knowledge is reliable or not. Debates about the adequacy of empiricism, for example, are epistemological debates.

Essentialism: is now increasingly used in order to explain why anti-essentialism is preferable, though in more purely philosophical discussion the term has greatet? usefulness. Amongst social and cultural researchers, anti-essentialism involves the rejection of a scientific quest for universal essences, such as the discovery of a universal psychological makeup, or generally applicable sex differences, in preference for a view that human 'nature' is a social construction.

Ethnocentrism: refers to the practice of judging a different society by the standards and values of one's own. This is seen, particularly by ethnographers, as inhibiting understanding of other ways of life.

Ethnomethodology: involves the examination of the ways in which people produce orderly social interaction on a routine, everyday basis. It provides the theoretical underpinning for conversation analysis.

Facticity: is the process whereby certain perceptions or phenomena achieve the status

of uncontroversial fact. Phenomenological analysis attempts to reduce facticity, as does the method of deconstruction, by exposing the social practices which generate it.

Frequency distribution: a count of the number of times each value of a single variable occurs. Thus, the proportion of the population fitting into each of six categories of social class may be given as a frequency distribution. The distribution can be presented in a variety of ways, including for example a raw count, percentages or a pie chart.

Functionalism: is an approach to explaining social phenomena in terms of their contribution to a social totality. Thus, for example, crime is explained as necessary for marking the boundary of acceptable behaviour, reinforcing social order. Prominent functionalists include Durkheim and Parsons.

Grounded theory: a term coined by Glaser and Strauss to describe the type of theory produced by their methods of ethnographic data collection and analysis. The approach emphasizes the systematic discovery of theory from data, by using methods of constant comparison and theoretical sampling, so that theories remain grounded in observations of the social world, rather than being generated in the abstract. This they propose as an inductive alternative to hypothetico-deductive approaches.

Hypothetico-deduction: is the view that science proceeds by deriving hypotheses from theories, which are then tested for truth or falsity by observation and experimentation. It is the opposite of induction, which proposes that theories can be derived from observations.

Idealism: often opposed to realism, this term describes the view that the world exists only in people's minds.

Interpretivism: refers to approaches emphasizing the meaningful nature of people's participation in social and cultural life. The methods of natural science are seen as inappropriate for such investigation. Researchers working within this tradition analyse the meanings people confer upon their own and others' actions.

Intersubjectivity: the common-sense, shared meanings constructed by people in their interactions with each other and used as an everyday resource to interpret the meaning of elements of social and cultural life.

Linguistic repertoire: a term used in discourse analysis to refer to the resources (discourses, intersubjective meanings, etc.) on which people draw in order to construct accounts.

Marginality: Used to describe the typical position of the ethnographer, who exists on the margins of the social world being studied, in that he or she is neither a full participant nor a full observer. Also used to describe groups of people living outside mainstream culture.

Measures of central tendency: statistics such as the mean, median or mode which in various ways indicate the central point in a frequency distribution.

Methodology: concerns the theoretical, political and philosophical roots and implications of particular research methods or academic disciplines. Researchers may adopt particular methodological positions which establish how they go about studying a phenomenon.

Multivariate analysis: analysis of the relationships between three or more variables (as opposed to bivariate analysis, which involves two variables, or univariate analysis which involves one).

Naturalists: take the view that the methods of the natural sciences are appropriate to the study of the social and cultural world. This should be distinguished from another meaning of the term *naturalism* which is sometimes used to refer to the claim of ethnographers to collect naturally occurring data.

Naturalizing: is the process whereby matters which are in fact socially constructed and were once fluid and changeable come to be perceived as a part of the natural order and therefore fixed, inevitable and right. Social researchers often wish to denaturalize phenomena (such as sexual identity for example) by exposing the human processes whereby they are constructed.

Paradigms (Kuhnian): the overall conception and way of working shared by workers within a particular discipline or research area. In this view, paradigm shifts occur from time to time as scientific communities experience revolutions of thought.

Participant observation: used to describe the method most commonly adopted by ethnographers, whereby the researcher participates in the life of a community or group, while making observations of members' behaviour.

Positivism: in its looser sense has come to mean an approach to social enquiry that emphasizes the discovery of laws of society, often involving an empiricist commitment to naturalism and quantitative methods. The word has become almost a term of abuse amongst social and cultural researchers, losing its philosophical connotations where its meaning is both more complex and precise.

Post-modernism: a social movement or fashion amongst intellectuals centring around a rejection of modernist values of rationality, progress and a conception of social science as a search for over-arching explanations of human nature or the social and cultural world. By contrast, post-modernists celebrate the fall of such oppressive 'grand narratives', emphasizing the fragmented and dispersed nature of contemporary experience.

Randomized controlled trial: an experimental method whereby subjects are randomly allocated to either a group receiving a 'treatment' or another which acts as a 'control', so that the effects of the treatment can be established. The method is effective in ruling out spurious causation.

Reactivity: the reactions of people being studied to the presence of an observer, seen by some to be a source of bias, in that behaviour may become artificial as a result.

Realism: is the view that a reality exists independently of our thoughts or beliefs. The language of research is seen to refer to this reality, rather than purely constructing it,

though more subtle realists recognize constructive properties in language as well. The term is also used to characterize an approach to art and literature analysing the accuracy with which these reflect social life.

Reductionism: the identification of a basic explanation for a complex phenomenon. Thus sexual identity may be explained by reference to genetic determinants alone, or social life explained in terms of economic relations alone.

Reflexivity: in its broad meaning this is used to refer to the capacity of researchers to reflect upon their actions and values during research, whether in producing data or writing accounts. More narrowly, ethnomethodologists use the term to describe a property of language, which reflects upon actions to make them appear orderly.

Regression: a statistical technique for using the values of one variable to predict the values of another, based on information about their relationship, often given in a scattergram. Multiple regression involves the prediction of an interval-level variable from the values of two or more other variables. Logistic regression does this too, but predicts the values of nominal or ordinal variables.

Relativism: can be epistemological (or 'conceptual'), cultural or moral. The first of these involves the rejection of absolute standards for judging truth. The second suggests that different cultures define phenomena in different ways, so that the perspective of one culture cannot be used to understand that of another. The third implies that perceptions of good and evil are matters of social agreement rather than having universal validity.

Reliability: the capacity of a measuring device, or indeed of a whole research study, to produce the same results if used on different occasions with the same object of study. Reliability enhances confidence in validity, but is insufficient on its own to show validity, since some measurement strategies can produce consistently wrong results.

Replication: is closely linked with reliability, involving the repetition of a study to see if the same results are obtained on both occasions. (The term has a narrower meaning within the context of the elaboration paradigm.)

Rhetoric: the linguistic strategies used by speakers or authors of text to convey particular impressions or reinforce specific interpretations, most commonly in support of the authority of the text to speak the truth.

Sampling: the selection of units of analysis (for example, people or institutions) for study. Sampling can involve attempts to statistically represent a population, in which case a variety of random methods are available. Alternatively, sampling can be opportunistic, or formed by emerging theoretical concerns of a researcher.

Secondary analysis: analysis of data by researchers unconnected with the original purposes of the data collection, as where academic researchers use data sets gathered as a part of government social surveys.

Social constructionism: the view that the phenomena of the social and cultural world and their meanings are created in human social interaction. Taken further, social constructionism can be applied to phenomena ordinarily thought to constitute the natural world, at which point the perspective verges on relativism. The approach often, though not exclusively, draws on idealist philosophical orientations.

Social facts: regularities of social life that appear to have an independent existence, acting to determine or constrain human behaviour. Norms of conduct or religious rules are examples. The concept is of particular importance in relation to functional-ism and positivism.

Social structure: ordered interrelationships that are characteristic of particular societies, such as its class structure or system of economic or political relations.

Statistical inference: the generalization of findings from a sample to the broader population from which the sample has been randomly drawn. A variety of statistical tests, such as the chi-square, help in estimating the level of probability that such inferences about the population are true, given the sample size. This is expressed as the statistical significance of the finding.

Structuralism: the view that behind the social and cultural realities we perceive, such as clothes or food fashions, kinship organization and even language itself, deep structures exist which, through combinations of their elements, produce the surface complexity of the relevant phenomena.

Validity: at its most simple this refers to the truth status of research reports. However, a great variety of techniques for establishing the validity of measuring devices and research designs has been established, both for quantitative and qualitative research. More broadly, the status of research as truth is the subject of considerable philosophical controversy, lying at the heart of the debate about post-modernism.

Variables: qualities on which units of analysis vary. Thus, if a person is the unit of analysis in, say, a social survey, examples of variables might be their social class/ gender, attitudes to politics, and so on. Variables can be measured at a variety of levels, according to which they can be subjected to specific mathematical operations. In considering relationships between variables it is important to define which is a causal (or independent) variable, and which is an effect (dependent) variable.

Appendix 2: Reflective Journal

Reflective Journal

Introduction

Why keep a reflective journal?

1. For noticing (Morgan, 1989) effects and affects during training sessions and between training sessions. For example:

    What's been the effect on me of learning that? How did today's discussion affect me?

    Or: an unfamiliar term mentioned in a session might not become clear until we're in an entirely different situation, like doing the washing up.

    Or: a topic discussed in a sessions may start a new train of thought, or bring back memories of previous learnings.

2. No-one's memory is perfect and it's always good to have some notes to look back on. And: if you think you'll want to be involved in the Action Research component of the training, you may choose to refer to your reflective journal during the interview or focus group.

3. A reflective journal might include: notes on the training sessions, our experiences, our feelings, our values and our unconscious biases. It can help us to understand our own part in research processes (Henry, 2003), that is: what happens when I do research with another person or a group? What's my impact on them – and what's their impact on me….?

    These reflective journals are private; for own individual use. We (Pat and Caroline) won't ask to see them, or ask anyone to share anything from them. If one person wants to read out something from their journal to the whole group that's a personal choice, and does not mean that anyone else need feel pressurised to share.

What might I write about? Some suggestions…

My reactions, thoughts and feelings – as close as possible to having completed a training session, and maybe again a few days afterwards.

How does what I heard fit with what I think about research? Or: doesn't it fit at all?

Something surprising? Or: something that made me say: 'That's what I've been thinking forever…'?

A note or notes to follow up on an idea, or an article or book chapter that's been mentioned;

A note to look something up, just because 'to me that sounds interesting…'

And: anything that I don't want to forget.

On the next page is a table of the training session titles, with a framework of prompt questions (adapted from Lefevre, 2018). We recommend using these prompt questions for the first two sessions, just to get started on keeping a reflective journal. After that, either stick with these questions if they're useful; or, use them and add some of your own; or, develop your own questions and/or framework.

If anything here isn't clear, or you have questions, please email us at:

patcox948@gmail.com and caroline@carolineblunt.org

With best wishes for your learnings and reflections, Pat and Caroline.