WG FINAL COGNITIVE REPORT FOR KENYA.

A. Interviewers:

1) How many interviewers?

A total of six experienced interviewers were engaged for the study.

2) What were the criteria for selecting interviewers?

The interviewers were selected on the basis of their educational qualification, working experience, their availability, fluency in both English and local language, ethnicity spread and to the exercise.

3) How much interviewing experience did they have?

All the researchers hold a wealth of knowledge and experience in research, survey taking and other related survey work such as data analysis and report writing. Most of them had participated in various household and establishment-based surveys conducted by CBS such as the 2003 Kenya Demographic and Health Survey, the 2004 WHO survey and the on-going Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey, among others. Others have wide and varied experiences dating as far back as the 1999 Kenya Population and Housing Census. Two of them had been engaged as language translators for the recently completed Kenya National Literacy Pilot Survey.

4) What is their educational level?

The team comprises of university and college graduates with varying areas of specialization, but mainly in the area of Economics, law, sociology and Applied Statistics.

5) Are the interviewers students? If so, in what field? (e.g. survey research, epidemiology)

There were no students among the team although some are waiting to join post-graduate courses.

6) What languages do they speak?

The main languages spoken by the interviewers are English and Swahili although they can speak and write well in their local languages (kamba, kikuyu and luhya).

7) What is the interviewer ages, gender?

The ages of the interviewers ranged from 18 years to 46, with equitable gender mix (three of each sex). Details of their ages and gender are given below.

Michael Munene- Male, age 46 years
Flora Bidha-Female,age 37 years
Sarah Kimani-female, age 29years
Winifred Kambua-female, age 28years
Stephen Ngungi-Male, age 28 years
Brian Munene-Male, age 18years

B. Respondents:

1) How many interviews were conducted?

A total of 108 Interviews were conducted (54 self reporting and 54 proxy reporting).

2) How were respondents recruited?

A variety of considerations were used to recruit the respondents- including the type of disability that the respondents had, specific characteristics of the respondent such as the gender, age, ethnicity, and economic status of respondents. Selection of respondents was principally purposive and largely guided by their background characteristics outlined above. The final sample ensured that there was a fair mix of those with disability and without disability. Respondents were identified friends of people who had certain types of disability,   and through conducts with institutions for persons with disabilities. Before going out in the field, interviewers prepared a list of potential respondents who had certain types of disabilities and contacted them either by phone or making appointments through their respective places of work. Managers of Disability institutions assisted a lot in identifying eligible respondents within the centre for interviews. Other recruitment methods include tracking demographic characteristics of respondents.

3) Did you track respondent characteristics (such as type of disability, gender, SES, race/ethnicity) throughout the course of interviews? If so, how did you do this?

Yes. Respondents were tracked through a checklist of key demographic characteristics of respondents which include such variables as gender, sex, type of disability, geographical location, etc. This tracking system used to (i) monitor new recruits into the sample (ii) ensure that there was reasonable diversity/spread in the final sample selection, (iii) meet the characteristic requirement of the final

sample and (iv) reduce inter-household and other demographic related effects which could bias the results.

4) **Provide demographic profile of respondents (Mr Ngugi is currently preparing the tabulation programs and we will forward to you in due course the final tabulations. (I noted too in your last email that you are also working on the tabulations and appreciate it very much if you could share with us your results).**

C. Questionnaire:

1) **Did you make any changes to the questionnaire by adding or deleting questions to suit your country? If so, what were those changes?**

Yes even though the changes/modifications were fairly minimal. The most notable change was on the translation of the questionnaire from English which was the source language into four other languages (Kiswahili, kamba, luhya and kikuyu). These are the most and widely spoken languages in Kenya and demand a sizable share of the population. Criteria for choosing the languages of translations were based on those parameters. Interviews were conducted in the languages the respondents were comfortable with.

Major modifications were done on the cover page (to include the identification details, the start and end time of the interview, name of the interviewer, and supervisor) and the last page (to include, occupation codes based on ISIC). Extra variables were added to the background characteristics part of the questionnaire to include respondent's school attendance, educational attainment, occupation and family gross income.

D. Translations:

1) **In what languages were the interviews conducted?**

The interviews were mainly conducted in English but occasionally, the interviwer would use other languages (Kiswahili, kamba, kikuyu, and luhya) to explain or clarify an issue.

2) **How were the translations created? What was the process?**

The questionnaires were translated using the guidelines given in the manual. The process involved formation of teams by language where each team was required to pull out critical concepts and formed general impressions on critical aspects for translation. A central consideration was the underlying ideas and meaning in both the original and the translated versions. Each team collectively discussed and translated the specific critical areas from English version into their respective ethnic languages. The final versions were checked for consistency in both

meaning and ideas, and where discrepancy was noted; a process of reconciliation was initiated until a final agreement was collectively arrived at by the team.

3) **Were the translated questionnaires tested?**

Yes. Sample interviews were conducted in Kiswahili, kikuyu, kamba and luhya during pre-testing of the translations but the final test was conducted in English. In a few cases however, other languages were used to explain or clarify some issues.

4) **What types of problems arose regarding the translations?**

The problems that arose during translation came from the fact that it was hard to find the exact English translation to the respective ethnic language. For example, some English words would require constructing complete sentences in the respective languages to bring out the exact meaning/ideas of the word .Our ethnic vocabularies are not rich in words like English. For example, there was no direct local language translation for proxy and so, in carrying out the proxy interviews, interviewers had to explain to the respondents what proxy means. i.e. they were required to give their views on the other person's state of particular disability (vision, hearing etc). For some of the medical terms, there were no precise local words for them .Words like glaucoma, Multiple Sclerosis (MS) and Muscular Dystrophy (MD).

5) **Did you have to make any changes to the English questionnaire in order to create a meaningful translation?**

In some cases the question "why did you answer that way?" had to be rephrased to suit the respondent understanding. This was because the respondent misinterpreted the question to imply that his response was being doubted. In this case, the interviewer used the respondent's answer to rephrase the question. For example "Why did you say you have some difficulty seeing, even if wearing glasses .In the case of interviewers dealing with person with total disability, a different approach was used? Many of the WHO questions didn't work particularly well as other questions.

6) **Did you make any changes to the translated version throughout the interviews because you found a problem in the translation? If so, what was the problem?**

Few changes were made to the translated questionnaires. In the Kiswahili questionnaires, interviewers made a few changes in the proxy questionnaire of the translated version to completely suit the level of understanding of the respondent so that the question could be answered correctly and mostly allowing them to be flexible. For example, in the luhya translation, the proxy section, the language

had to be toned down further to make it informal and polite. If the question were to be asked as originally formulated, it would appear harsh to the respondents.

E. Data Quality:

1) Are there any concerns about the quality of the data? If so, what are they?

The instrument was by any standards bulky. Some of the respondents lost track of the questions and became impatient, even demanding to know the number of pages left. Some opted to respond quickly so as to finish the interview while some of the responses given by the respondents were based on their literal interpretation of the questions and may have brought in some element of subjectivity.

2) 2. Are there any questions, in particular, that you do not believe generated good data?

Yes. We belief the following questions didn't yield good responses. Explanations are given after each question.

a) (VS VISION)- Majority of respondents understood this question to comprise two parts and hence most respondents would give two responses. Some respondents would concentrate in answering the last part – "I do not wear glasses". On the part of reading the options to the respondents, a respondent wanted an explanation on the **extent to "some"** was it very little or little and how much was a lot. Respondents felt that a "NO or YES" response would have been much easier.

b) (**VSWHY) -**This question did not go well with some respondents as they felt that their responses were being doubted by the interviewers. We had to reformulate the question.

c) (**VS FAR)-** In answering this question, majority of respondents were thinking along the lines of how well they knew the person other than on the issue being investigated. Do you have difficulty hearing what is said in a conversation with one other person…..?

d) (**HSCROWD)** in a crowded room. Most respondents wanted to know how much noise was coming from the crowd.

e) (**STEN)** "**Do you have difficulty concentrating on doing something for ten minutes?"** The responses given are fairly subjective. Most respondents said that their concentration dependent on whether the topic of discussion is about something   they like, enjoy doing or whether boring.

f) **(CSSOLUT)** "Do you have difficulty finding solutions to problems in day to day life?" Some respondents asked for life examples of the problems sought for, while others felt that their responses depended on the magnitude of the problem. They argued that some problems were easy to solve while others were hard to find solutions. Majority wanted to know if +the question made specific reference to how hard or easy the problem was to deal with. One respondent said that she has a lot of difficulties since she did not have a job to help her solve her many problems in life

3) In the interviewer debriefing, what kinds of problems did interviewers describe?

One of the things noted by the interviewers was that the respondents were getting impatient as the interviews were too long. Although some respondents were impatient with the duration the interviews took, they still provided answers to the questions posed.

4) **In looking over the final data in the excel spreadsheet, did you identify any potential data quality problems? Were there any problems of missing data? If so, what were the problems?** No. Some quality time was given to filed editing, office editing and data capture. However, some few data capture problems were noted during the running of frequency tables but have since been rectified and resubmitted to WG secretariat.

F. Findings (to follow later)

G. I suggest you consider creating a separate item on Lessons and Experiences learned.