



REPORT ON TRAINING WORKSHOP FOR BASELINE DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND PRE-TEST EXERCISE

GENDER INCLUSIVE VACCINE ECOSYSTEM – ENHANCING DISTRIBUTION AND DELIVERY SYSTEM FOR NEWCASTLE DISEASE (NCD) AND CONTAGIOUS CAPRINE PLEUROPNEUMONIA (CCPP) VACCINE AMONG SMALL HOLDER FARMERS IN MAKUENI



22nd – 26th OCTOBER 2019

FORT HOTEL, WOTE TOWN, MAKUENI COUNTY

Preamble

The GIVE project team organized a five day data collection training workshop that involved a pre-test exercise of the qualitative and quantitative tools to be used in the baseline survey. The purpose of the workshop was to: introduce the survey tools to the project team, train the team on administration of the tools to ensure uniformity in data collection, review and validate the final baseline study tools, prepare the project team for the baseline survey and plan for the baseline data collection exercise.

The data collection tools covered in the training were: the household questionnaire, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide, Key Informant Interview (KII) guide and the In-depth Interview (IDI) guide. The informed consent forms accompanying the various data collection tools were also covered in the training. Focusing on one tool at a time, participants were taken through each question and its corresponding response options, where applicable. Team members also participated in role plays and a mock FGD session. The exercise provided participants with an opportunity to get acquainted with all the questions in the tools, assess the framing, flow and the sequence of the questions, assess the ease of comprehension of the questions and accuracy of translations and identify redundant and repeated questions. The accuracy of the skip patterns was also determined. Following the exercise, repetitions, redundancies and other discrepancies in the tools were identified and corrections made after deliberations in the plenary.

The corrected tools were then subjected to a pre-test exercise conducted within Mbuvo area in Kathonzweni ward, Makueni County. The pre-test exercise involved all 15 GIVE project team members working in pairs, with the help of one community mobilizer. A total of Ten (10) questionnaires were administered during the pre-test exercise to chicken rearing households in Mbuvo area. In addition, two FGD sessions of 12 participants each were also conducted in the area. All challenges encountered and discrepancies identified following the pre-test exercise were noted and addressed on the last day of the workshop. As a way forward, it was agreed that the updated version of the household survey tool be uploaded in the Survey123 data collection software in readiness for the baseline survey.

DAY ONE (TUESDAY 21st OCT 2019)

The training workshop commenced at 9.00 Am with a word of prayer and introductory remarks by Prof. Salome Bukachi.

Workshop Objectives - Salome Bukachi

The PI (Prof. Salome Bukachi) gave a brief overview of the GIVE project, reiterating that it is a 3 year study that seeks to investigate the barriers to access and use of Newcastle Disease (ND) and Contagious Caprine Pleuropneumonia (CCPP) vaccines among small holder women farmers in Makueni County. The PI informed the project team that permission to shift focus from Peste des Petits Ruminants (PPR) to Contagious Caprine Pleuropneumonia (CCPP) among small ruminants has been granted by the IDRC hence the need to effect this throughout the project documentation and study tools.

The workshop objectives were to: introduce the qualitative and quantitative tools to the project team, train the team on administration of the tools to ensure uniformity in their administration, review the tools and validate the final version, prepare the project team for the baseline survey and plan for the data collection exercise. To ensure that all specific objectives of the GIVE project are adequately covered in the survey tools, the PI assigned some team members the task of identifying questions in the tools that address each of the five specific objectives of the study.

Gender Integration in Value Chain Analysis – Dr. Dalmas Omia

Dr. Dalmas Omia gave a presentation on gender integration in the poultry value chain analysis, using a case of a *Cereal value chain* study conducted in South Sudan as an example. The presentation highlighted the roles of different actors in cereal the value chain with regard to who undertakes the various activities along the value chain, who makes the decision and who has the responsibility. Dr. Omia also displayed a sample *Poultry value chain*; highlighting the roles of upstream and downstream players in the different stages along the value chain. Dr. Omia emphasized on the need for the GIVE project team to consider conducting a poultry value chain analysis in Makueni County to establish who carries out specific roles in the chicken value chain from the time the chicken is slaughtered and dressed to the time it is sold off *i.e.* who arrests the chicken, who dresses the chicken, who transports the chicken among other tasks.

In his presentation, Dr. Omia noted that there are bound to be power dynamics during the implementation of the study; even among the GIVE project team members, given the number of people and institutions involved. Some of the power dynamics that are likely to play out include:

- ✓ Household level context, thus the need to:
 - ◆ Establish who constitutes the household
 - ◆ Break down the household structure in terms of roles of each household member with regard to chicken and/or small ruminant production
- ✓ Individual level context, thus the need to:
 - ◆ Focus on the daily life of the woman in a household
 - ◆ Analyze a typical day
 - ◆ Compare the 24 hour clock for the women and men in the same household. This information will help pick out the best time to carry out the study or the intervention without inconveniencing or overburdening the study subjects.

Following this discussion, Dr. Omia proposed a paper on “*Gender differentials in poultry production*” that would detail the role of different players in the poultry value chain.

Given the nature of the GIVE research study, the need to adopt an all inclusive approach in its implementation was emphasized, otherwise the men may still retain control over chicken and young ruminants even after the project intervention.

Following the presentation, participants identified a number of power dynamics that are likely to play out in the poultry production chain at the community level. For instance,

- ◆ Increase in chicken production or commercialization of the venture by women farmers is likely to attract the men into the venture - who may eventually take over.
- ◆ Men may not take over the chicken production exercise, but may strategically position themselves in the venture once it starts realizing handsome returns.
- ◆ Men may avoid engaging in activities that are deemed lowly by society; like cleaning the chicken house for instance.
- ◆ Men may regard the decision making power over women as an entitlement and may decide to control access to production inputs and resources arising from poultry production.

A number of concerns were also raised on the concept of poultry productivity and women empowerment. Participants noted that an increase in poultry production will likely be achieved with additional inputs and labour intensification among the women farmers. This in essence increases the number of working hours for the women, which is a form of disempowerment.

The extra hours of labour put in to increase chicken production by the women small holder farmers may not be compensated for by the men who in most cases have full access and decision making powers over use of family resources.

On the concerns raised, participants were informed that:

- ◆ The fact that men may take over the poultry production from women should not stop the project from going on and empowering the small holder women farmers, instead the project should strive to engage and involve the men from the outset to enable them understand, support and allow their spouses to take part in the study.
- ◆ In most cases, men have control over use of family resources and may not pay for the extra labour and time that women may put into the chicken rearing venture since it may not be considered as productive work that warrants payment but as reproductive work that is normally assigned to women.

Review of the Quantitative Tool - Dr. Judith Chemuliti

The GIVE project team with facilitation from Dr. Judith Chemuliti reviewed the quantitative tool (household questionnaire) in totality by going through each question in the questionnaire. The purpose of the exercise was to familiarize the team with the survey tool, check the flow, order and sequencing of the questions, confirm the accuracy of the skip patterns, probe for possible responses to questions that need answer codes and identify questions that are unclear, sensitive, require significant explanation, or make respondents uncomfortable. During the exercise, a number of errors were identified in the tool, discussed in plenary and corrected based on team members' suggestions. Suggestions made on specific questions in the questionnaire were as follows:

On **Identification and household characteristics**, the anomalies identified and corrected included:

- ◆ Question 13 - rephrased to ask about "occupation" and not "what do you do"
- ◆ Question 14 – Age was captured in "complete years" and not just "years"
- ◆ Questions 13, 14 and 15 – Similar information was also sought for the spouse as well.

On **production characteristics**, the revisions made included:

- ◆ Question 18 - Deleted and the same question moved to the consent form.
- ◆ Question 19 - Modified to include both chicken and chicks.
- ◆ Questions 21, 22 and 23 – The statement “indicate all that apply” was added to the three questions.
- ◆ Question 22 - Option 3 was redundant and therefore deleted Question 25 – The statement “in the house” was deleted from the question
- ◆ A new question on “who constructed the poultry house” was introduced after Question 25
- ◆ Question 28 – The statement “if no, skip to Question 30” was added
- ◆ Question 30 –Rephrased to read “do you mostly confine any of your chicken during the day?”
- ◆ A new question on who makes decisions on the tasks mentioned on Question 31 was introduced.
- ◆ Question 31 - Tasks mentioned on the table were broken down to make it easier to accurately capture who does specific tasks in relation to poultry production.

On **chicken diseases, vaccines and vaccinations**, the revisions made included:

- ◆ Question 33 – was left open ended to allow respondents to choose all diseases that apply.
- ◆ A new question that probes about NCD - if not given as an answer in question 33 was introduced after question 33.
- ◆ Question 38 - A statement “if not experienced NCD, skip to” was added
- ◆ Question 39 – Another option “treat with herbal remedies’ was introduced
- ◆ Questions 39 and 40 – The statement “Tick all that apply” was introduced
- ◆ Question 40 – Instruction to skip to question 55 was added for respondents who reported not vaccinating chicken
- ◆ Question 42 – The word “Normally” was highlighted by bolding for emphasis
- ◆ Question 42. Options like husband, wife and another HH member were introduced. Also, the word “Normally” was replaced with “Mainly”.
- ◆ A question on the location of the Agro-vet was added after Question 44.

On **vaccines and vaccination**, the revisions made included:

- ◆ Question 50 - Rephrased and the options “yes” or “no” introduced
- ◆ A new question on who mixes the vaccines was introduced after Question 50 for those whose answer to question 50 was “no”.
- ◆ Question 55 – An element of ranking from the most to least important was introduced

On **Institutional factors**, the revisions made included:

- ◆ Question 62 – The options “field days” and “farmer demonstrations” were combined and another option “from groups” introduced.

On Markets and Marketing, the revisions made included:

- ◆ Question 66 – The word “pressing” in option 1 was deleted
- ◆ Question 66 and 67 – The word “your” was introduced in the questions
- ◆ Question 68 – A skip option (to Question 69) was introduced
- ◆ New questions on who decides what to sell, who keeps the money from the sale, who can access and spend the money and what the money is used for, were introduced.
- ◆ Question 69 – the word “majors” was deleted
- ◆ Question 70 – the word “access” was deleted
- ◆ An account of how cash from sale of livestock is spent and another one on sharing the money from the sale with husband were introduced after Question 71.

On cooperatives and group memberships, the revisions made included:

- ◆ Question 96 – An option “others, please specify” was added
- ◆ Question 97 - Option 4 on crop farming was deleted
- ◆ Question 98 – The question “what are the challenges faced by cooperatives?” was rephrased.
- ◆ Question 101 – Questions rephrased to indicate whether the listed groups in question 101 were registered or not.
- ◆ A new question that sought information on how belonging to a group helps members access the NCD vaccine was introduced after 104.
- ◆ Question 105 – Was rephrased and the options revised.
- ◆ Question 102 and 103 – Deleted since they were repetitive.
- ◆ Question 106 – Split into two parts to have “access” and “use” separately
- ◆ Additional questions on challenges of belonging to a cooperative and if belonging to a group makes it easier to access NCD vaccine for the women were also added.
- ◆ For those who reported not belonging to a cooperative, a new question on “why they do not” was introduced
- ◆ The entire **Section 9** was moved forward and merged with **Section 5**

Besides the tool itself, questions were raised on the data collection procedure and administration of the tool. These included:

1. Who should be interviewed in a typical household?
2. How should enumerators treat polygamous families when administering the household questionnaire?
3. Should all households that keep chicken be interviewed or should the study focus on only those households that keep chicken as their main sources of income?
4. Since this is a self administered questionnaire, should enumerators allow respondents to fill in the questionnaire by themselves?

Following the queries, it was agreed that:

- ◆ At the household level, the respondents to be interviewed should either be the husband or wife.
- ◆ The type of household (monogamous or polygamous) being interviewed be captured in the tool.
- ◆ The “ward” is of greater importance in the study and should therefore be captured in the questionnaire instead of the “division” as the administrative unit of study.
- ◆ The aspect of chicken keeping should be introduced in the consent form. This will allow for exclusion of respondents from household that do not keep chicken right at the start of the study.
- ◆ For purposes of the baseline survey, all households that keep chicken should be included but enumerators should ensure they capture the main source of income for each household interviewed.
- ◆ Given that one of the GIVE project’s objective is to establish the respondents’ knowledge of poultry management, reading out the options provided to the respondents when administering the tool amounts to leading the respondent towards survey answers. In addition, the questionnaire must be administered by the enumerator and should not be given to the respondent to self administer.

A number of observations were also made on the process of administration of the tool. These included the need to:

- ◆ Simplify the language used while interacting with the respondents.
- ◆ Agree on the framing of some questions in Swahili or Kamba by the enumerators to enable respondents understand the questions clearly.
- ◆ Ensure enumerators internalize and are conversant with the questions so as to make it easier to engage the respondent during the interview.

Participants noted that:

- ◆ The household questionnaire lacked aspects of nutrition, hence the need for their inclusion in the tool.
- ◆ Questions relating to objectives 2 and 4 were well covered in the questionnaire.

- ◆ Questions on factors hindering women from owning and using livestock were well covered in the tool.
- ◆ The tool did not address all the five specific objectives conclusively. Part of objective 3 was not captured while not much was tackled on gender based violence under objective 5.
- ◆ Having been granted the go ahead, there was need to replace PPR with CCPP in the whole document.
- ◆ There was need for additional questions on awareness of NCD and CCPP vaccines among households in the questionnaire.
- ◆ Questions on productivity were not adequately captured in the tool

Following the gaps identified, team members were assigned different tasks aimed at improving the questionnaire:

- ◆ *Mercy Mbithe & Winnie Kimani* – Tasked to come up with questions on nutrition that would be included in the questionnaire. The two were to look into aspects of household consumption and sale of poultry and poultry products and any other food that households purchased from proceeds of poultry and its products.
- ◆ *Dr. Dalmas Omia* – Tasked to develop a product sale form in consultation with Dr. Judith Chemiliti;
- ◆ *Lydia Nyaboke* - tasked to compare two versions (earlier and current) of the questionnaire and find out if any questions were missing from the current tool.
- ◆ *Dr. Kennedy Ogolla and Dr. Judith Chemuliti* - were asked to address the symptoms of CCPP as those contained in the tool were in reference to PPR.
- ◆ *Alex Nzjoki and Abel Simiyu* - were asked to identify gender aspects that were missing from the questionnaire. In addition, they were to look at usage of income from sale of chicken products.
- ◆ *Prof. Kennedy Waweru and Dr. Kennedy Ogolla* – Tasked with tracking and effecting the suggested changes on the final tool in readiness for the pre-test exercise.

DAY TWO: (Wednesday 23rd October 2019)

The second day of the workshop commenced with a recap of the previous day's work and feedback from members on the different tasks that had been assigned to them. On the adequacy of the questions to address the 5 specific objectives of the study, participants were informed that:

- ◆ A total of 18 questions addressed Objective One
- ◆ 12 questions addressed Objective Two
- ◆ 8 questions addressed Objective Three
- ◆ 5 questions addressed Objective Four; though most were phrased in a general manner
- ◆ 16 questions addressed Objective Five
- ◆ 18 questions addressed aspects of cooperatives and groups
- ◆ A total of 5 questions were reportedly missing from the most current questionnaire.

In addition:

- ◆ A number of questions on household nutrition were developed by Mercy and Winnie and shared with the core team to be considered for inclusion in the tool;
- ◆ Correct symptoms of CCPP were provided as options in Question 96 following the switch from PPR to CCPP by Dr. Kennedy Ogolla.

Qualitative Tools (IDI, KII and FGD) - Dr. Dalmis Omia

Dr. Omia took participants through each of the qualitative tools (IDI, KII and FGD guides). Participants were informed that in qualitative studies, focus is mostly on the conversations and therefore every effort should be made to ensure that the respondent is at ease during the interview.

Participants were also reminded to:

- ◆ Be very attentive when interacting with and administering qualitative tools since the process involves a lot of probing.
- ◆ Always conduct a proper introduction of oneself and what the study is all about before commencing the interview or FGD sessions.
- ◆ Remember that the purpose of the introduction is not to market oneself with big titles but to let the respondent know what the interview or FGD exercise is all about.
- ◆ Ensure that each person in the FGD consents and signs the informed consent form to take part in the exercise as this information will be required at the publication level.

- ◆ Ensure that consent to use electronic gadgets such as voice recorders, video recorders among other gadgets is also sought and received before such gadgets are used.
- ◆ Ensure that photographs of the session are only taken after informed consent has been sought and obtained from participants;
- ◆ Respondents are informed that participation in the study is purely voluntary and that they are at liberty to withdraw at any point in time.
- ◆ Inform interviewees or FGD participants of the approximate time that the exercise is likely to take before commencing the exercise.

In-depth Interview (IDI) guide

Participants were taken through the IDI guide and informed that the questions appearing on the extreme right column of the tool were complementary to the focus area questions appearing on the left hand side. The complimentary questions aid the interviewer in probing. Participants were reminded to be extremely attentive when conducting in-depth interviews since the responses obtained will inform the level of probing and the quality of information obtained. To conduct a successful interview, the enumerators were reminded of the need to be fully conversant with the tool before administering it to respondents.

During the training, participants observed that some key questions such as household chicken consumption, aspects of cooperatives, vaccination and frequency of vaccinations were lacking from the IDI tool.

Following the discussion, participants were informed that:

- ◆ The in-depth interviews will only be conducted with respondents who exhibit some specific characteristics (*e. g.* the laggards or innovators) that may be of interest to the study, hence the need to tailor the tool for the individual respondent.
- ◆ The need to add or delete some questions from the IDI tool will therefore be dependent on the specific respondent and the kind of information required.

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) Guide

Participants were also taken through the FGD guide by Dr. Omia. This exercise was meant to acquaint team members with the FGD tool, train participants on conducting FGD sessions, check on the soundness and flow of the questions and identify any anomalies that may need to be corrected.

Participants were informed that FGD sessions should have at least 6 – 12 participants; though the smaller the number the better the conversation. When conducting FGD sessions, participants were reminded of the need to:

- ◆ Note the difference in opinion among participants
- ◆ Capture every detail as much as possible when taking down the notes
- ◆ Build on key points that emerge during the discussion to trigger in-depth discussions
- ◆ Be attentive during the conversation and always steer the conversation in the right direction if it deviates.
- ◆ Try as much as possible to actively engage each participant in the FGD session
- ◆ Allow differences of opinion to play out in the discussion and give a chance to all including those with contrary opinion to air their views.

On livestock diseases, participants were reminded that most respondents are likely to give the symptoms of the disease and not the name of the disease, hence the need to probe further and ensure the local names given in reference to the diseases are captured.

Following the exercise, team members observed that:

- ◆ The term “control” as used in the FGD guide was much of a compound word that needed to be broken down into different nodes in the tool.
- ◆ Questions on what households do with the infected birds and why they do it were missing from the tool.
- ◆ There was need to add more probe questions on aspects of vaccination, so as to obtain more comprehensive information on vaccinations from the respondents.
- ◆ There was need to re-order the questions on aspects of vaccination; starting with vaccine awareness, then frequency of vaccinations and lastly what informs the decision to vaccinate.
- ◆ Sheep occur in most questions related to vaccines and vaccinations yet the available vaccine against CCPP is only applicable to goats.

Suggestions were made to add a number of questions on aspects of vaccines, vaccinations and vaccinators. The proposed questions included:

- ◆ How regularly do they vaccinate their livestock?
- ◆ What challenges do they encounter with regards to vaccines?

- ◆ What is the nature of vaccine packaging and is it ideal?
- ◆ What are the issues surrounding vaccine and the practice of vaccination within Makeni County?
- ◆ What are the issues around access and distribution of vaccines?
- ◆ What are the issues around community vaccinators and what challenges do they face?
- ◆ What are the perceptions around community vaccinators?
- ◆ How easy is it to use vaccines?
- ◆ How effective are the vaccines?

DAY THREE (Thursday 24th Oct 2019)

Household questionnaire administration - Role Plays (Team exercise)

The third day of the workshop was dedicated to role plays in which team members were paired for purposes of practicing with the household questionnaire. The goal of this exercise was to ensure that team members are well acquainted with the questionnaire and had a clear and consistent understanding of each question. The exercise also provided a chance for the team members to identify discrepancies or anomalies and collectively address them.

The exercise was conducted in Swahili language thus allowing participants to test the flow and wording of the questions, the accuracy of the translations and the ease with which the question is understood. The exercise also provided the team with the chance to check the accuracy of the skip questions, clarity of instructions in the tool and the approximate duration of time required to administer the tool.

Following the role play, it was observed that:

- ◆ Enumerators need to interact more with the tool to internalize it prior to conducting the household survey.
- ◆ The pattern of most skip questions was inconsistent but this was reportedly as a result of the continuous revision of the tool.
- ◆ The prompt to take a photo of the chicken house (if present) needed to be moved to the end of the tool to avoid disrupting the interview midway.

- ◆ The question that sought to establish the willingness of the respondent to participate in future project activities be rephrased and the element of time (3 years) deleted.
- ◆ The exercise took about 1 hour on average.

Mock Focus Group Discussion (FGD) Session:

The GIVE project team conducted a mock focus group discussion in the afternoon of day three and went through the entire tool. The exercise lasted about two hours and involved 12 project team members - 8 acting as respondents, 1 as a facilitator and 3 as note takers. The areas of emphasis during the mock FGD session included:

- ◆ The process and technique of introducing the study to the FGD discussants.
- ◆ The informed consent seeking process (both for participation in the study and for use of electronic gadgets like voice recorders and cameras during the session).
- ◆ Clarity and soundness of the questions in the FGD guide and how easily they are understood by the discussants.
- ◆ The accuracy of translating the questions on the FGD tool to Swahili and Kamba.
- ◆ Ability of the facilitator to always remain focused and steer the discussion back on track if and when it veers off. .
- ◆ Note taking and ability to accurately capture as much detail of the conversation as possible including the non verbal communications.

Following the exercise, participants were reminded that:

- ◆ The research team should not be too academic or formal when interacting or conducting the FGD sessions.
- ◆ Some phrases or words are best captured exactly as they are said even if it is done in the local language.
- ◆ The voice recorders should never be regarded as substitute for note taking.
- ◆ The note taker needs to record all the discussion to greater details and never try to summarize the conversation.
- ◆ The research team needs to be careful not to give false promise to respondents.
- ◆ The facilitator should always make sure that all participants are given a chance to contribute to the discussion.
- ◆ The note taker needs to record all the discussion to as much detail as possible and never try to summarize.

DAY FOUR (Friday 25th October 2019)

Pre-Test Exercise (Quantitative tool)

Day four was dedicated to a pre-test exercise in which all team members took part in the field work. With the help of a local guide (Ms. Susan Mwikali), the team visited several homes within Mbuvo area in Kathonzweni ward, Makueni County and administered the questionnaire on chicken rearing households. Team members were paired for the pre-test exercise.



Figure 1. A respondent taking part in the pre-test exercise at Mbuvo in Kathonzweni ward

Following the field work, a total of 10 questionnaires were administered with each exercise taking approximately one hour. During the exercise, photographs of chicken houses (for those households that owned them) were taken with the respondent's consent. The chicken houses varied widely in design, size and type of material used as shown in Figure 2 below:



Figure 2. A range of chicken houses in some of the homesteads visited within Mbuvo area

Focus Group Discussion (FGD) Sessions:

Two FGD sessions of 12 participants each were also held during the pre-test exercise. The sessions were also conducted within Mbuvo area in Kathonzweni ward, Makueni County. During the session, notes were taken and the conversation recorded using voice recorders. The two sessions were

conducted simultaneously in the local language (Kamba). The sessions were facilitated by Mercy Mbithe and George Mwendwa, respectively, with each FGD session lasting about one hour.



Figure 3. A Focus group discussion session in progress at Mbuvo in Kathonzweni ward, Makueni County

DAY 5 (Saturday 26th October 2019)

Feedback from the Pre-test Exercise

Following the pre-test exercise, participants reported that the respondents were generally receptive and willingly participated in the study.

Some of the **challenges** encountered included:

- ◆ Instances where some respondents did not understand Kiswahili hence the need for interpreters during such exercises.
- ◆ Some of the enumerators were not conversant with signs and symptoms of various chicken and small ruminant diseases making it difficult to tell with certainty the disease being referred to by the respondents who opt to describe the diseases by their symptoms.

Following the issues arising, it was agreed that:

- ◆ There is need to train the enumerators and the project team members on different livestock diseases, their signs and symptoms as well as vaccines and other drugs used in the treatment of poultry and small ruminants diseases.
- ◆ There is need for the research team to familiarize with the Kamba and Swahili names used to refer to common livestock diseases with particular emphasis on CCPP and NCD in the area.
- ◆ Enumerators need to ensure that they capture the local names of the different livestock diseases as pronounced by respondents during the study.
- ◆ There is need to flag out some of the emerging issues that could then be investigated further – e.g. the reports of carrying vaccines in flasks - a conventional method of packaging and transportation of vaccines which came out in one of the FGD sessions is a case that needs to be explored further. .

It was also observed that:

- ◆ There is no standard description for a household as it varies highly from region to region.
- ◆ Some of the responses given by respondents during the interview may keep changing in the course of the interview hence the need to probe and make the necessary corrections.
- ◆ There was need to agree on a uniform way of framing the questions in Swahili or Kamba for ease of understanding by the respondents.
- ◆ A uniform translation of some words to Swahili and Kamba should be adopted.
- ◆ There is always need to alert the respondents when transitioning from one section of the tool to another.

Following the pre-test exercise, a number of corrections were suggested and effected on the quantitative tool. These included:

- ◆ Question 22. An option on “remittances from relatives or friends” was added
- ◆ Question 30 – The term ”usually” was included in the question
- ◆ Question 36 – the words “who is responsible” were deleted from the question
- ◆ Question 62 – The rider “skip to 63” was provided for respondents who choose the option “no knowledge of vaccine”
- ◆ Question 77 - A rider “skip to 78” was introduced.

- ◆ Question 77 - The phrase “last six months’ was introduced in the question to eliminate recall bias.
- ◆ Question 81 - A statement “where one can sell or buy chicken” was introduced and the question moved to appear immediately after Question 78.
- ◆ Question 68, 69 and 70 – The word “eggs” were introduced alongside milk
- ◆ Question 89 – rephrased to read better
- ◆ Question 104 – The term “livestock” was replaced with “chicken”

Focus Group Discussion Sessions

Though the FGD sessions during the pre-test exercise were slightly shorter than a conventional FGD, a lot of information on livestock and vaccines came out of the sessions. Following the FGD sessions, it was established that:

- ◆ Newcastle disease is described in different ways with some people referring to the various symptoms in reference to the disease. However, “*Mavoi*” was the most common local name for Newcastle disease in the area.
- ◆ The three common livestock diseases that emerged strongly among participants were *Mavoi*, paralysis and pneumonia.
- ◆ Newcastle was said to be airborne, while some community members mentioned dirty environment as a cause of the disease.
- ◆ Use of herbal remedies in the treatment of various chicken diseases was a common practice among members of Mbuvo area.
- ◆ Goat diseases were referred to using different names including “Asthma”.
- ◆ Not many people used vaccines because of the cost implications, poor quality and the notion that the vaccines do not work.
- ◆ Many active women groups exist within Mbuvo area and this was attributed to their good management system.
- ◆ However, there were difficulties among participants in understand the concept of cooperatives and differentiating this from women groups

Following the pre-test FGD session, it was agreed that:

- ◆ There is need to rephrase some of the questions for clarity.

Progress of Masters' Students and Way Forward

The three masters' students in the study gave updates on their progress:

1. Abel Simiyu – University of Nairobi

Informed the team that his proposal and the tools were ready and that he has already submitted the proposal and was awaiting defense.

2. Lydia Nyaboke – Cooperative University of Kenya

She informed the team that she was yet to finalize her proposal. She promised to have the proposal ready in two weeks time.

3. Shelmith Wanjiru – University of Nairobi

The team was informed that she had completed the proposal and was working on the FGD guide. She was scheduled to defend the proposal on the 7th of November 2019.

The Principal Investigator (Prof. Salome Bukachi) gave closing remarks and informed the participants that the corrections suggested on the baseline tools will be effected in a week's time after which the field based project team members will be notified to commence the field work.

She also informed the team that planning and logistics for the baseline survey is underway and that the pre-test exercise will be followed by a value chain analysis (by November 2019) and a baseline study by the 1st week of December 2019.

List of Training Workshop Attendants

No.	Name	Role	Institution
1	Prof. Salome Bukachi	Principal Investigator	UON
2	Dr. Judith Chemuliti	Co-PI	KALRO
3	Prof. Isaac Nyamongo	Co-PI	CUK
4	Prof. Kennedy Waweru	Researcher	CUK
5	Dr. Dalmas Omia	PI - Alternate	UON
6	Dr. Lucy Kiganane	PI- Alternate	CUK
7	Dr. Kennedy Ogola	Researcher	KALRO
8	Dr. Obadia Okinda	Researcher	CUK
9	Douglas Anyona	Project Manager	UON
10	Mercy Mbithe	Research Assistant	UON
11	Winnie Kimani	Research Assistant	KALRO
12	Alex Kitwa Nzioki	Research Assistant	CUK
13	Shelmith Wanjiru	Masters Student	UON
14	Lydia Nyaboke Barongo	Masters Student	CUK
15	Abel Simiyu	Masters Student	UON
16	Gideon Kinabei	Driver	KALRO
17	Susan Mwikali	Community mobilizer	Makueni