The Population Council

ISN 1632
PD-AAL 037

Contract No. DPE-0632-00-1029-00

Project No. 932-0632

Project Title: Family Planning
Operations Research in Asia

Six (6) Month Progress Report

For the Period: October 1, 1981 - March 31, 1982

FAMILY PLANNING OPERATIONS RESEARCH IN ASIA

First Bi-Annual Report
October 1, 1981 - March 31, 1982

Contract No. DPE - 0632-00-1029-00

I. Background

On September 30, 1981, AID awarded a contract to the Population Council "to improve the efficiency and acceptability of family planning programs in Asia through operations research and the dissemination and applications of these research findings." Covering a period of three years from September 30, 1981 through September 29, 1984, the Operations Research (O.R.) Project is designed :

1. To foster within the Asian region family planning research which has direct implications for program management;

2. To improve the capabilities of researchers to design, implement, and disseminate the findings from research studies.

Four activities are supported under the contract :

1. Technical workshops of two kinds :

   A. Workshops of one week duration to review current

knowledge in family planning operations research areas and develop draft proposals that respond to the needs of the countries within the region.

B. Workshops of 2-3 days duration to review current problems and progress of research projects in data collection, data analysis, and presentation of results.

2. Awards for family planning operations research studies in Asia.

3. Technical Assistance to country family planning programs and to USAID Missions for review of research needs and help in designing, implementing, and analyzing research findings.

4. Dissemination of research findings through workshops, seminars, conferences, and publications.

The following Population Council professional staff participate in the O.R. Project :

Project Role	Staff	Location	Person Months Per Year
Project Manager	Barnett Baron, Ph.D. Senior Representative South and East Asia	Bangkok	2 p/m
Principal Investigator	Andrew A. Fisher, Sc.D. Associate	Bangkok	12 p/m
Senior Technical Co-Investigator	John Stoeckel, Ph.D. Associate	Bangkok	4 p/m
Senior Technical Co-Investigator	John Laing, Ph.D. Associate	Manila	4 p/m
Research and Admin. Assistant	Jean Baker, M.P.H. Research and Admin. Assistant	Bangkok	3 p/m
New York Liaison	Margaret McEvoy, Dr.P.H. Associate	New York	1 p/m
Consultant	James Phillips, Ph.D. Associate	Dacca	-----
Consultant	Richard Sturgis, Ph.D. Associate	Jakarta	-----
Consultant	E.G.P. Haran, Ph. D. Associate	Surabaya	-----

Fisher arrived in Bangkok September 12, 1981. All Population Council staff associated with the O.R. Project were available for work as of September 29, 1981, when the contract was signed with AID.

II. Project Activities -- 9/29/81 - 3/31/82

A. Project Planning. On October 13, 1981, Baron met in Washington with Clinton, Gillespie, Bailey and Chen to discuss the terms of reference for the project and illustrative activities the Asia Operations Research Project should encompass. Subsequently, from October 19-23, Baron, Fisher, Stoeckel, Laing, and Baker met in Bangkok to design a workplan for the first year's activities. The workplan was submitted to AID November 12 and discussed in Washington at a meeting attended by Baron, McEvoy, Gillespie, Shelton and Bailey on December 7. On November 4 Fisher sent letters to all USAID Missions within the Asian region explaining the purposes of the O.R. Project and the activities planned for the first 12 months.

B. Technical Assistance. During the six months period, Project staff provided O.R. technical assistance to USAID Missions and family planning organizations within the region. A summary of staff travel and the purpose of country visits is given in Appendix A. Fisher visited Sri Lanka November 15-18 to meet with Government officials and others about initiating operations research studies. Two potential research studies were identified and proposals are being developed. Fisher also visited Indonesia November 29 - December 5 and together with Sturgis (time not charged to this contract) met with BKKBN officials and private family planning organizations. Several research study ideas were discussed and at least two proposals are being developed. Sturgis

is providing follow-up assistance. Fisher visited Bangladesh January 26-29 to informally review two study proposals. Phillips (time not charged to this contract) provides follow-up assistance in Dacca. At the request of the USAID India Mission, Laing visited India for 20 days during February and participated with other Population Council staff in a Population Sector Analysis. A comprehensive draft report was submitted to USAID/Delhi in early April. At the request of the USAID Nepal Mission, Stoeckel spent the week of March 15-20 in Kathmandu where he designed the evaluation plan for the Ex-Servicemen's family planning Project. Fisher visited Nepal March 29 - April 8 to work with the Mission, the Population Commission, and the FP/MCH Project on data collection for the Ex-Servicemen's Project. In Thailand, Baron, Fisher, and Stoeckel meet frequently with Government officials and others concerning family planning research. Stoeckel and Fisher helped the Population and Community Development Association of Thailand with the study design, sampling framework and questionnaire construction for an experimental family planning project in the Northeast Province. Baron has held discussions with researchers at Chiang Mai University about possible research activities. The USAID India, Pakistan and Bangladesh Missions have indicated in correspondence that they may seek Population Council technical assistance in the future.

C. Research Proposals. Eight research proposals, in various stages of development, were submitted to the Population Council's regional office in Bangkok. One of these, submitted by the Population

and Community Development Association of Thailand has been approved for funding by AID. A list of all proposals received is provided in Appendix B. Seven other preliminary proposals were also sent to the Council for comment. In addition, six draft research proposals were developed by participants at the first Operations Research Workshop held in March. It is expected that several of these will be submitted formally within the next few months to the Council or to USAIDs for funding consideration.

D. Research Grants. On December 4, 1981, the Population Council submitted to AID the first complete and favorably reviewed research proposal. During the last week in March, 1982, AID approved the proposal for funding at a level of U.S.$ 52,710. The study will be implemented over an eighteen month period by the Population and Community Development Association of Thailand. The study is designed to test the extent to which family planning acceptance can be increased through the provision of developmental, income generating inputs. Three different levels of assistance to farmers in the Northeast Province will be evaluated in terms of increased contraceptive prevalence. Each level differs in the amount of investment made available to farmers. A separate control area, where no assistance is provided, will also be included in the study design. Interest has been expressed in Nepal and Sri Lanka in undertaking similar studies.

E. Research Workshop. From March 22-27, 1982, the first workshop on family operations research methodology was held in Bangkok. Fourteen participants from five countries (Thailand, Nepal, Indonesia, Sri Lanka

and the Philippines) attended. A list of participants is given in Appendix C. The primary objective was to have each participant or group of participants from a country develop a technically sound research proposal that could be implemented in their home country. Four faculty members (Fisher, Stoeckel, Laing and Bailey) provided individual assistance so that proposals could be developed to a level of sophistication commensurate with the participants' past experience and understanding of the research process. Methodological issues were covered in presentations, discussions and in a 98 page Research Handbook written by Fisher and given to all participants. For each point on the "Outline for Preparing a Research Proposal," the Handbook provides a discussion followed by examples and a section on "What To Do." The workshop schedule and the outline for preparing a proposal are given in Appendix D. By the end of the workshop, six draft research proposals were prepared on the following topics :

1. THAILAND "A Study to Determine the Effect on DMPA Acceptance of Different Pricing Levels"

2. SRI LANKA "An Experimental Study to Involve Ayurvedic Physicians in Family Planning Service Delivery"

3. INDONESIA "A Study to Determine the Factors Associated with the Use of Traditional Contraceptive Methods and the Use Effectiveness of These Methods"

4. NEPAL "A Comparative Analysis of the Organization and Performance of Laproscopy Sterilization Camps in Nepal"

5. PHILIPPINES "The Introduction and Evaluation of a Sterilization IEC Package for Rural Women of Maguindanao."

6. PHILIPPINES "Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness of Metro Manila Outreach Program"

The participants verbatim comments evaluating the workshop are shown in Appendix E. In a pre- and post-workshop knowledge test the mean percentage of correct responses rose from 49 percent to 64 percent.

F. Dissemination of Research. Population Council staff in Bangkok and New York have collected a large body of literature on cost-effectiveness in family planning. The literature will be reviewed and a brief section on cost-effectiveness methods will be prepared for the second draft of O.R. Research Handbook. The Population Council also has responded to requests from individual researchers in Sri Lanka and Indonesia for copies of research reports on IUDs and on methodological issues involved in multi-variate analysis.

III. Comments on the First Six Months Activities

On the basis of the first six months experience with the Project, it seems clear that there is considerable interest in Family Planning Operations Research among USAID Missions as well as national F.P. and health institutions. Requests for technical assistance relating to research concerns are likely to increase in the future, particularly as new study proposals are received. Experience to date suggests that most proposals require substantial and numerous revisions before they can be considered methodologically acceptable. Also, it seems apparent that several USAID Missions have a backlog of research concerns for which they seek technical assistance.

The research workshop has proved to be an excellent mechanism for assisting researchers in the development of study proposals.* The key factors affecting the success of the workshop seem to be : 1) A high ratio of faculty to participants that allows maximum attention to individual needs; 2) The use of a clearly written instructional Research Handbook that can serve to guide participants during the workshop and assist them later when they return home; 3) The development of a specific study protocol through a step-by-step process; and 4) The type of participants selected to attend the workshop.

---

* Note : Some participants in the first workshop suggested that a longer period of time might be more effective. Consideration is now being given to increasing the amount of time devoted to sampling and methodological questions, but we plan to retain the six day format for the second workshop in September 1982.

While the Population Council has a high degree of control over the first four factors, the selection of participants ultimately remains the prerogative of the institution to which a workshop invitation is sent -- most often the director of a national family planning organization. Typically, participants tend to be mid-level officials who have heavy administrative responsibilities coupled with some role in family planning research.

This situation poses something of a dilemma for the O.R. Project. Since the individuals most likely to attend the workshops or submit unsolicited proposals usually are not in a position to approve large intervention studies, or command the personnel resources required for such studies, most proposals received to date have been limited to small scale evaluations of on-going program activities or exploratory/diagnostic studies of a particular family planning problem situation. Such smaller studies can, of course, be quite valuable, and indeed, all USAID Population Officers as well as UNFPA Country Coordinators contacted during the past six months have indicated that they would like to see a few good evaluations done of existing program efforts and a few good diagnostic studies completed on current problem situations. At the same time, it is recognized by the Population Council and others that longitudinal, intervention studies (of the type recently approved for funding in Thailand) offer the best opportunity to manipulate the components of service delivery and evaluate the effect on contraceptive prevalence.

It seems clear that over the remaining period of the O.R. Project, some mechanism must be considered that encourages and assists experimental intervention studies while at the same time fulfills the expressed desire by USAID Missions and others for evaluative and exploratory studies. At least two possible mechanism can be considered :

1) Most evaluative or exploratory studies can be linked with a subsequent study phase that would involve an experimental intervention. Researchers can be encouraged to build into their study proposals a plan for initiating an experimental intervention based on the findings from the first phase evaluative/exploratory part of the research. The Nepal, Indonesia, and IEC Philippine proposals developed at the recent workshop all contain this two phase approach to research.

2) A second possible mechanism for encouraging experimental intervention studies might be to conduct in-country research workshops instead of regional ones of the type recently held in Bangkok. In-country workshops would provide an opportunity for approximately 15 participants from a single country to focus on one or possibly two current problem areas and design several research approaches directed at the same problem. One approach might be an exploratory survey, another might be an evaluation of an existing program activity

directed at the problem, while a third might be an experimental intervention. In-country workshops also provide the opportunity to include a few high level program administrators whose approval and support of a research effort is usually essential. Finally, through an in-country workshop it might be possible to have participants design a single experimental approach to a particular problem and then replicate the experiment in several areas of the country.

APPENDIX A

Project Staff Travel from 9/29/81 through 3/31/82

Staff Member	Travel From	Travel To	Dates	Purpose
B. Baron	New York	Washington	Oct. 13	Consultation with AID on O.R. Project
B. Baron J. Laing	New York Manila	Bangkok Bangkok	Oct. 19-23 Oct. 19-23	Design O.R. Workplan for first year
A. Fisher	Bangkok	Sri Lanka	Nov. 15-18	Assist with development of research proposals
A. Fisher	Bangkok	Indonesia	Nov. 29 - Dec. 5	Assist with development of research proposals
B. Baron/ M. McEvoy	New York	Washington	Dec. 7	Consultation with AID
J. Laing	Manila	India	Feb.	Technical Assistance to USAID Mission for review of population activities
A. Fisher	Bangkok	Bangladesh	Jan. 26-29	Assist with development of research proposals
J. Stoeckel	Bangkok	Nepal	Mar. 15-20	Technical Assistance to USAID Mission for project evaluation
J. Laing	Manila	Bangkok	Mar. 20-27	Assist with first O.R. research workshop
A. Fisher	Bangkok	Nepal	Mar. 29 - Apr. 8	Technical Assistance to USAID Mission for project evaluation.

APPENDIX B

Research Proposals Received 9/29/81 - 3/31/82

	Title or Description of Proposal	Applicant Name and Country	Date Received	Comments
1)	"Increasing Family Planning through Development Programs in Northeastern Thailand"	Population and Community Development Association THAILAND	Oct. 1981	Favorably reviewed and approved for funding March 1982
2)	"Contraceptive Failure in Chiang Mai"	Faculty of Medicine, chiang Mai University THAILAND	Nov. 21,'81	Substantial elaboration and revisions requested second draft not yet submitted
3)	"Family Planning Program Effectiveness in Java and Bali"	Budi Soeradji, Bureau of Census, INDONESIA	Nov. 1981	Revisions requested, second draft not yet submitted
4)	"Determinants of a Real Variation in Contraceptive Practice in Bangladesh"	Muklisur Rahman, ICDDR, B BANGLADESH	Jan. 1, '82	Proposal rejected in present form as not meeting O.R. requirements
5)	"Impact of Development Programs on Fertility Behavior"	Mosleh Uddin Dacca University BANGLADESH	Jan. 4, '82	Proposal rejected as not meeting O.R. requirements
6)	"Contraceptive Use and Health Service Utilization"	J. Akbar & U. Rob ICDDR, B BANGLADESH	Jan. 26, '82	Revisions requested, second draft not yet submitted
7)	"Operations Research on the IUD"	D. Abeywickrema Family Planning Assn. SRI LANKA	Feb. 3, '82	Revisions requested, second draft not yet submitted
8)	"Management Translation of Population Research in Bangladesh"	Alimullah Miyan Center for Pop. Management and Research, Dacca Univ. BANGLADESH	Mar. 9, '82	Proposal rejected as not meeting O.R. requirements

Family Planning Operations Research Workshop
Participants and Resource Personnel
March 22-27, 1982

Participants

Indonesia :

Mr. Hertono Broto
Statistical Division
Faculty of Public Health
University of Indonesia
Jl. Proklamasi No. 16
Jakarta, Indonesia

Mrs. Azwini Kartoyo
Demography Institute
P.O. Box 427
Salemba Raya 4
Jakarta, Indonesia

Mr. Rachmat Santoso
BKKBN
Jl. Let. Jen. Haryono M.T.
P.O. Box 186
Jakarta, Indonesia

Nepal :

Mr. Hem B. Hamal
Chief of IEC Division
FP/MCH Project
Ramshapath
Kathmandu, Nepal

Mr. Madan Kumar Sharma
Family Planning Officer
Evaluation Division
FP/MCH Project
P.O. Box 820
Kathmandu, Nepal

Mr. Gorkarna P. Regmi
Demographer
Evaluation Division
FP/MCH Project
P.O. Box 820
Kathmandu, Nepal

Philippines:

Mrs. Maria Victoria Silva
Population Center Foundation
P.O. Box 2065
Makati, Metro Manila 3117
Philippines

Mr. Ramon Dela Fuente
POPCOM Regional Officer
c/o Ladaub Residence
Circuit Road, Rosary Heights
Cotabato City, Philippines

Mrs. Aida Rita Santiago
POPCOM Planning Division
P.O. Box 1841
Makati, Metro Manila 3117
Philippines

Sri Lanka :

Captain Eardley Diaz
Deputy Director, Projects
Community Development
Services
No. 62-64 Cotta Road
Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

Mr. Nagalingam Pugendran
Population Division
Ministry of Plan Implementation
Church Lane, Kokuvil West
Kokuvil, Sri Lanka

Mr. Dayaratna Palihakkara
Population Division
Ministry of Plan Implementation
No. 340, Old Tangalle Road
Kotuwegoda, Matara
Sri Lanka

Thailand :

Dr. Pramote Choodam
Director
Klaeng District Hospital
Klaeng District
Rayong

Mrs. Sumalee Permpangpun
Research and Evaluation Unit
Family Health Division
Ministry of Public Health
Devaves Palace
Bangkok

Faculty :

Dr. John Laing
Population Institute
P.O. Box 479
Manila, Philippines

Dr. Jerald Bailey
Agency for International
Development (AID)
Washington, D.C. 20523
U.S.A.

Dr. Barnett Baron
Dr. Andrew Fisher
Dr. John Stoeckel
The Population Council
P.O. Box 11-1213
Bangkok 11
Thailand

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE FOR

FAMILY PLANNING OPERATIONS RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

(March 22-27, 1982)

Monday -- March 22

8:15 - 9:30	Introduction of workshop participants and staff
9:30 - 10:15	Objectives of workshop and review of Handbook
10:15 - 10:30	TEA BREAK
10:30 - 11:00	Pretest assessment
11:00 - 12:15	Discussion of country family planning operations research needs
12:15 - 1:15	LUNCH
1:15 - 2:30	Identifying, Defining and Justifying the importance of a family planning operations research problem
2:30 - 4:30	Small group work identifying, defining and justifying a family planning operations research problem
4:30 - 5:15	Presentations by one small group to another small group on problem situation identified, defined and justified
5:15 - 6:15	SOCIAL HOUR

Tuesday -- March 23

8:15 - 10:00	Ultimate study objectives, immediate objectives and research hypotheses
10:00 - 10:15	TEA BREAK
10:15 - 12:15	Small group work on study objectives and hypotheses
12:15 - 1:15	LUNCH
1:15 - 2:15	Operational definitions of concepts and variables
2:15 - 5:00	Small group work on operational definitions and finishing research proposal through Section V of the Outline

Wednesday -- March 24

8:15 - 10:15	Small group reports on : 1. Identification and definition of problem situation 2. Justification of importance of problem 3. Objectives of the proposed study 4. Hypotheses for the research study 5. Operational definitions
10:15 - 10:30	TEA BREAK
10:30 - 12:15	Study Design : 1. Types of research studies 2. Selection of study area and study population
12:15 - 1:15	LUNCH
1:15 - 2:15	Data collection procedures
2:15 - 5:00	Small group work on selection of research design, selection of study area and population, selection of data collection procedures
7:00 - ???	DINNER AT TRAINING CENTER

Thursday -- March 25

8:15 - 10:15	Confidentiality of information, quality control checks, tabulation of data, analysis of data
10:15 - 10:30	TEA BREAK
10:30 - 12:15	Small group work on informed consent form, quality control procedures, tabulation and analysis plans
12:15 - 1:15	LUNCH
1:15 - 2:15	Further issues on study design
2:15 - 4:15	Small group work on study design

Friday -- March 26

8:15 - 9:30	Assumptions of the study, study budget, reporting of findings, study work schedule
9:30 - 12:15	Small group work on assumptions of the study, budgets, reporting plans and time schedule
12:15 - 1:15	LUNCH
1:15 - 3:00	Small group work to finish proposals
3:00 - 5:00	PRESENTATIONS OF PROPOSALS TO PANEL

Saturday -- March 27

8:15 - 9:15	Further issues in family planning research
9:15 - 10:30	Revise proposals and submit final copy for typing
10:30 - 11:30	Course evaluation and posttest
11:30 - 12:15	Closing ceremony and presentation of certificates
12:15 - 1:15	LUNCH

OUTLINE FOR PREPARING A RESEARCH PROPOSAL

I. Abstract of the Research Study (Pages 1-3)

A. What is the problem situation that requires a research study?

B. What are the main study objectives?

C. What are the major expected implications?

D. Who will conduct the study?

E. When will the study be conducted?

F. Where will the study be conducted?

G. What methods will be used to collect data?

H. What methods will be used to analyze the data?

I. What resources are required to conduct the study?

II. Problem Identification and Definition (Pages 4-19)

A. Problem identification -- the discrepency between <u>what is</u> and what <u>should be</u>.

B. Problem definition -- what is already known about the problem from a literature review or other sources?

1. The incidence and prevalence of the problem.
2. The geographical areas affected by the problem.
3. The population groups affected by the problem.
4. The probable reasons for the problem.
5. The possible solutions to the problem.
6. The major unanswered questions about the problem.

III. Justification for Selecting the Research Problem (Pages 20-22)

A. Is the problem a current and timely one?

B. Does the problem affect a large population?

C. Does the problem affect special population groups?

D. Does the problem relate to a practical situation?

E. Does the problem have broad social, economic, or health implications?

F. Is the problem seen as important by many people?

IV. Objectives and Hypotheses of the Research Study (Pages 23-32)

A. What are the ultimate objectives of the research study?

1. Improve health and wellbeing of a population
2. Influence policy decisions
3. Improve service delivery programs

B. What are the immediate objectives?

1. Who will do
2. How much of what
3. To whom
4. When
5. Where
6. And for what purpose

C. What are the specific study hypotheses?

1. What relationships are expect among the variables being studied?
2. Can the direction of the relationship be specified?
3. Under what conditions will the relationship exist?
4. Is there an explanation for the expected relationship?

V. Operational Definitions of Concepts and Variables (Pages 33-38)

VI. Study Design (Pages 39-86)

A. What type of study design will you select?

1. Non-experimental design
2. Quasi-experimental design
3. Experimental design

B. How will the study area and study population be selected?

1. Purposeful selection of area and population
2. Sample selection
3. Complete enumeration of population within a geographical area.

C. How will data be collected?

1. Structured interviews

a. How will interviewers be selected, trained and supervised?

b. How will questionnaire be pretested?

c. Will questionnaire be pre-coded?

2. Mailed questionnaire

3. Service statistics

4. Census data

5. Participant observation

D. How will confidentiality of information be maintained?

E. What data quality control checks will be instituted?

1. Re-interview of proportion of respondents

2. Field supervision of data collection

3. Statistical checks for consistency of response

4. Probing to be sure response is correct

F. How will data be tabulated?

1. Hand tabulation of data

2. Machine sorting and counting

3. Computer tabulation

G. What is the plan for data analysis?

1. Central tendency of the data

2. Variance

3. Relationships

4. Differences

5. Cost analysis

VII. Limitations of The Study (Pages 87-88)

A. What are the major limitations of the study design?

1. Small sample

2. Poor quality of data

3. No control group

B. Are there special situational aspects that might influence the study?

VIII. Resources and Facilities Available for the Study (Page 89)

IX. Resources and Facilities Required for the Study -- Study Budget (Pages 90-92)

A. Salaries and benefits of researchers, consultants, interviewers and others

B. Materials, supplies and equipment needed

C. Building rental

D. Travel and petrol

E. Computer

F. Report printing and distribution

G. Miscellaneous items and costs

X. Reporting of Research Findings (Pages 93-94)

A. Interim reports of progress

B. Publications

C. Seminars, workshops and conference

D. Discussions with policy makers

XI. Research Study Work Schedule (Pages 95-96)

A. Planning phase

B. Pilot studies

C. Drawing sample

D. Preparing questionnaire

E. Pretesting questionnaire

F. Selecting and training interviewers

G. Baseline surveys

H. Data collection

I. Data processing

J. Data analysis

K. Report writing

L. Dissemination of research findings

XII. Appendices (Page 97)

A. Bio-data on principal investigators

B. Information on institutional affiliation of researchers

C. Sample of questionnaire

D. Informed consent form

E. Other information relating to the study

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Family Planning Operations Research Methodology

Bangkok, Thailand, March 22-27, 1982

Question: 1. WERE THE OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP CLEAR TO YOU? IF NOT, PLEASE MAKE SUGGESTIONS.

Response:

- Yes.
- Yes, clear.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, very clear.
- Yes, the objectives of the workshop clear to me.
- Clear for me.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Very clear.
- Yes, it was clear.
- Yes, because it helped us to design research studies in the field of family planning program as well as it aims at organization of such workshops in the future too.
- The objective of the workshop was made clear from the letter sent to us at home.

Question: 2. DID THE COURSE MEET YOUR EXPECTATION. IF NOT, WHAT DID YOU EXPECT?

Response:

- Higher than my expectation.
- Yes, the course meet to my expectation.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, except on study design, need more explanation and example.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, very much.
- Yes, probably more than I expected to bring back home.
- Yes.
- My answers below will show this.
- Yes, to a large extent.
- Yes, by providing me a simple and systematic procedure for developing an operation research study proposal.
- It met more than my expectations. I am perfectly happy with the course.

Question: 3. WILL THIS WORKSHOP HELP YOU DO BETTER FAMILY PLANNING RESEARCH? IF NOT, DESCRIBE WHY NOT.

Response:

- Yes.
- Yes, it will help.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- I think this workshop very help to me do better family planning research, especially on methodology research.
- Yes, I think help me better.
- I am sure that it will.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Actually, the workshop could help me in helping proponents improve on their proposals.
- Yes.
- It, certainly, will help.
- It will certainly help me. It has quite stimulated me to write other proposals for the use in future.

Question: 4. WAS THE COURSE CONTENT PRACTICAL IN TERMS OF THE WORK YOU DO?

Response:

- Yes, very much.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, of course.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, t'is course would definitely be useful to me. Though, generally I do not really prepare big scale proposals, in my review of proposals submitted, the additional knowledge I gained could be very helpful.
- Yes.
- Of course.
- Being a non-research oriented IEC man, I would definitely say the content was simplified and its practicability is enhanced.

Question: 5. WAS THE RESEARCH HANDBOOK USED DURING THE WORKSHOP HELPFUL? PLEASE COMMENT ON HOW THE HANDBOOK SHOULD BE IMPROVED?

Response:

- Yes. Should have more on (1) more annexes about how many ways OR on FP could be done within the cycle of FP service, (2) contributions of OR, FP to the National FP, and examples of that.
- Yes, this book is clear enough and systematically arrange. I am very pleased with the examples.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- The research handbook is very systematically and need more example on study design and statistical test.
- Yes, but I think you can improve more details about study design.
- Yes, the research handbook used very much for me because I don't good in English but the course content practice in my work so it help me to clear in course.
- To a certain extent, it was very helpful in terms of fine-tuning an idea we had in mind. It is strong in concept development, however, it would be very helpful if as an appendix - study design models in terms of a fuller more meaty description as well as common statistical tools and explanation of these, can be incorporated.
- Yes. There was less jargon. For one not sufficiently trained in research methodology, the handbook was particularly helpful and practical.
- Yes.
- Very helpful. However, I think a lot of improvement could still be done such as including possibly all kinds of examples or varying their types.
- Yes, it was. But I feel that some portion of it are oversimplified which might mislead sometimes. Sampling design portion needs somewhat more elaboration.
- It was.
- It was very useful during the entire workshop and will continue to be useful in future at home. I suggest to further elaborate difficult concepts. There is a danger, operations research might be oversimplified.

Question: 6. WAS THE WORKSHOP TOO SIMPLE AND EASY FOR YOU? PLEASE COMMENT.

Response:

- Yes, but it has given a very deep understanding and realistic one.
- Not so simple and easy, because there are some notes that very important to construct the proposal into perfect.
- No.
- Yes.
- Part of the workshop is not difficult because related with my job and quite often we do the same thing (make questionnaire, dummy tables etc.).
- The workshop not too simple and easy because from this workshop can improve my knowledge deeper about operational research design.
- No, the workshop wasn't too simple although I work in this field because some detail, I don't know or think when I work.
- It is simple but due to the time constraints a participant faces in the workshop, it has been very challenging.
- It was neither easy nor simple.
- No.
- The workshop, I think is not too simple and easy nor is it too difficult. Of course, it made us work so hard, but I think it part of it.
- Fairly O.K. was familiar to most of the concept. Gained experience in certain new areas.
- Yes.
- It was not too simple for me neither it was too difficult.

Question: 7. WAS THE WORKSHOP TOO DIFFICULT? WHAT ASPECTS WERE DIFFICULT. PLEASE COMMENT.

Response:

- No.
- No, the supervisor has arrange in such a way that in the first feeling of difficulties they could help to make clear.
- Yes, in the sense that the statistical lectures were too short.
- Yes, statistical part.
- Generally not, except in testing hypothesis and statistical test.

Response: (7)

- The workshop not too difficult, but I think you have to give more explain about analyse.
- No.
- No, I feel that it was designed specifically for non-researchers involved in operations.
- No.
- Yes, statistical part.
- Not really difficult but not stressed well. I felt that in some aspects, it has been assumed that participants were very familiar with the subject matter.
- Fairly O.K.
- It was alright.
- It was not difficult at all.

Question: 8. WHAT SUBJECT AREAS DID YOU FEEL WERE MOST CONFUSING?

Response:

- Identification v.s. definition.
- None of them because in the handbook there are many examples to face.
- The lectures on statistics should have been more detailed and gradual.
- Identification.
- No.
- None.
- Selection of study area and study population but didn't much.
- None.
- For the "instant" statistician, the measurement instruments.
- Statistical part.
- Not confusing, but not given the right emphasis, the analysis portion. I felt that a researcher should know basics of analysis techniques and not always rely on statisticians who may not always be around.
- None.
- None of those included in the handbook.
- Research design, validity and statistical significance was a bit difficult for me.

Question: 9. WERE THERE SUBJECT AREAS THAT YOU FELT COULD BE ELIMINATED? WHAT AREAS?

Response:

- No.
- No, one.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- None.
- No, there weren't.
- None.
- Keep all.
- No.
- I don't think any subject area should be eliminated.
- Areas covered are fairly important.
- I don't think so.
- No.

Question: 10. WERE THERE SUBJECT AREAS THAT YOU FELT SHOULD HAVE BEEN COVERED IN MORE DETAIL? WHAT AREAS?

Response:

- Discussion of F.P. programme's research needs should be given more detail.
- Statistical subject areas.
- Statistics.
- Statistics.
- Study design and sampling design.
- I felt should have been covered in more detail on study design and analyze.
- Analysis of data.
- Yes, for non researchers - the methodology portion.
- No.
- Selection of research design, selection of data collection procedures.
- Analysis. Other research design techniques.
- Sampling design, plan of analysis.
- No necessity to go in detail since each participant has had a fair opportunity to raise the questions in order to make himself clear about any idea.
- As mentioned in question #8.

Question: 11. DID YOU GET A SATISFACTORY CHANCE TO CONTRIBUTE YOUR IDEAS? IF NOT, PLEASE MAKE SUGGESTIONS.

Response:

- Yes.
- Yes, I satisfy.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, I got a satisfactory chance to contribute my ideas.
- Yes, however there should be a greater time allotted for an exchange of ideas between delegates of various countries. We were too concerned with our own studies that very little interaction in terms of substantial ideas and experiences took place.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- ---
- Yes.
- Yes, I got.
- I participated maximum in my group, however my contribution was not significant in a larger group.

Question: 12. DID YOU GET SATISFACTORY ANSWERS TO YOUR QUESTIONS? PLEASE COMMENT.

Response:

- Yes, all are perfected.
- Yes, I satisfy.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, I get satisfactory.
- Yes, the trainers were all extremely accommodating.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Of course, because I'm not the type who's going to stop probing and clearing my point unless I get a satisfactory answer.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.

Question: 13. WOULD YOU HAVE PREFERRED MORE LECTURE SESSIONS, LESS LECTURE SESSIONS OR WERE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE TIME DEVOTED TO LECTURES?

Response:

- All are already appropriated.
- I prefer less lecture sessions, but more discussions about experiences in research conducted by the participants.
- I would prefer if more lecture sessions could be included.
- I am satisfied with the time devoted lectures.
- Generally satisfied with the time, more lecture in statistical sessions.
- Generally I was satisfied with the time.
- I would have preferred more lecture sessions.
- I was quite satisfied. More lectures on methodology could have been helpful and more trainer-group interaction could have been effected.
- Very satisfied with the schedule.
- I would prefer if more lecture sessions could be included.
- I think the lecture sessions were just enough but they could have been scheduled in a way time wherein participants will not get a chance to "sleep".
- Just about right.
- Not more than the time devoted.
- I am satisfied with the time devoted to lecture.

Question: 14. DID YOU FEEL THAT THE TRAINERS WERE HELPFUL? PLEASE COMMENT ON HOW YOU THINK THE TRAINERS COULD IMPROVE THE WAY THE COURSE WAS RUN?

Response:

- Yes, all are perfected.
- Yes, I feel so, helpful in the contribution of developing the proposal.
- The trainers were very helpful but I consider that the second and third trainers were too fast in putting over their subjects.
- Yes.
- Yes, because we can contact them every time and they are always in the group.
- I feel that the trainers were helpful. I think if you have library the trainer can be more improved knowledge.
- Yes, the trainers were helpful.

Response: (14)

- Yes, very much so. However, it may have been useful if a trainer can spend more time with a work time, determine the teams weakness and strength and build on that information to plan out a more direct strategy for assistance.
- Yes, Andy, particularly, made it possible for the participants to feel at ease. There was nothing heavy or formal about the proceedings - a plus factor.
- Yes.
- I think the trainers were great. They were very helpful and constructive.
- They were very much helpful especially when the small-work group were formed.
- Yes, they were.
- Trainers should prepare a lot of visual materials to illustrate/support their lecture if at all possible.

Question: 15. WHAT ASPECTS OF THE WORKSHOP WERE PARTICULARLY WELL DONE?

Response:

- 1) Knowledge and affecting Domain on OR.
  2) Making us feel well and seem like we are from one family having to face to same fate.
  3) Good or better attitude on OR research on FP.
- Summing the components of all the aspects to build the proposal.
- The Andy Fisher lectures were very clear, precise and well done.
- In this workshop every subject was well done.
- ---
- All aspects, except study design.
- ---
- Sessions devoted to concept definition and elaboration were particularly well done. Sessions on methodology were also well done. However, due to the objectives of this workshop, explanations done on it were cursory. It would have been worthwhile if some more hours were spent on it.
- The scheduling of activities; lecturettes; the use of visual aids; the food! However, some participants are not particularly crazy about HOT food.
- The Andrew Fisher lecture were very clear.
- I think the first parts were particularly worth mentioning here. However, in general those topics covered by Dr. Fisher were explained so well. Congratulations and more power to you.

Response: (15)
- Almost all the aspects.
- Almost all.
- Group work and proposal writing.

Question: 16. WHAT ASPECTS OF THE WORKSHOP COULD BE IMPROVED?

Response:
- Try to lay out the FP system they are going on (broad view) in each 5 countries, first in order to make all class understand what are the reasons behind their presentations.
- Statistical aspect/analysis.
- The lectures of the second and third trainers should be more detailed.
- ---
- ---
- Aspects of the workshop could be improved on study design and analyze.
- Good for my idea.
- Since methodology is a very significant aspect of the study, more time should be devoted to it and lectures be designed to address participant needs. It might be worthwhile to lengthen the workshop to 1½ - 2 weeks.
- Perhaps, something could be done to do inter-country projects where different people can pool talent and resources. This could be in addition to an in-country proposal.
- 1) Study design.
  2) Data collection procedures.
- ---
- ---
- All were fair.
- By inviting a panel of experts and presenting their own experience in the one of research in developing countries.

Question: 17. DID YOU LIKE THE FORMAT OF THE WORKSHOP, PARTICULARLY THE WORK WITHIN SMALL GROUPS? PLEASE COMMENT AND MAKE SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT.

Response:
- Yes, very few chance to exchange the idea from different countries but these may be caused from private behaviors and habit.
- Yes, I do! This workshop is planned to provide a proposal according to each country, so that the system you have planned is quite adequate.
- Yes.

Response: (17)

- Yes, I like format of the workshop and small groups.
- Yes.
- Yes, I like, but I think not all participants can be satisfied of their ideas.
- Something I didn't like, particularly the work should include another country in some hour because we can change idea more than within country.
- I feel that the tandem of a researcher and program managers is very productive.
- Yes, but groupings were, functionally and restrictively, by country, leaving little opportunity for others to indulge in informal interaction.
- Yes, one lecturer must work with the groups all the time.
- ---
- Yes, the idea of small group work is very useful.
- Yes, I liked, but it would have been better if each participant could have been asked to develop his own proposal so that he may end up with a greater confidence by the end of workshop.
- Small group session was very much useful.

Question: 18. WAS THE LENGTH OF THE COURSE TOO SHORT, TOO LONG OR JUST RIGHT? PLEASE COMMENT.

Response:

- Optimum.
- Just right if all of the participants came from the adequate discipline.
- The course was too short.
- The course was too short.
- If possible make a longer (2 more days) for more explanation on study design and statistical test.
- I think enough.
- I think it just right.
- ---
- Just right. However, many of the participants are making their first trip to Bangkok, and can't say too much about the city. Since no provision was made to include some social outings.
- The course was too short.
- Just right.

Response: (18)

- If all the participants have some prior experience in operational research, the length of the course is just about right.
- Just right.
- Just right for the subject matter cannot be prolonged more than a week.

Question: 19. DO YOU FEEL THAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF RESEARCH WAS INCREASED BY THE WORKSHOP OR DID YOU ALREADY KNOW ABOUT MOST OF THE SUBJECTS COVERED BEFORE YOU CAME?

Response:

- Yes, very much.
- Yes, I do feel.
- Yes, I know practically nothing of the subject before I came.
- My understanding of research were increased.
- I know some subjects already, but after the workshop my research knowledge become better.
- I feel that my understanding of research was increased by the workshop, because not all the subjects covered before I came.
- Yes, I do.
- ---
- I feel more confident and comfortable with new insights on research.
- I felt that my understanding of research was increased.
- Generally, my knowledge has been increased, though I generally know something about the subject matters.
- Substantially.
- Certainly increased.
- It almost gave me a refresher course and helped increase my knowledge and interest.

Question: 20. IN YOUR OPINION, HOW CAN FUTURE WORKSHOPS BE IMPROVED?

Response:

- 1) Selection of participants, he (she) should have high "internal drive" commitment to FP rather than just for fun or something else.
  2) At least, each country should have the FP system in another country for the sake of understanding in presentation.
  3) Should summarize the epidemiological view of FP's acceptors.

Response: (20)

- 4) Adding at least already done proposal for participant to see what it looks like (in methodology of writing).
- Each participant must do the exercise of his/her own until they understand, and not in team.
- Improvement is possible if the course is extended for a period of ten (10) days or so.
- We must have to field trip include this workshop.
- More exercise and discussion between participants.
- I think you can give into the participant a long time before their come to the workshop.
- No comment.
- ---
- Yes, take the cue from #18. Perhaps, compressing the workshop to just under 6 days is weary for most, expecially the non-English speaking participants.
- This workshop can be extended at least for 10 days.
- I think participants could be given some chance to relax and probably be given the chance to see Bangkok or any other place for that matter.
- ---
- By asking (enabling) each participant to develop his own project rather than a project developed by the group (as suggested in point 17).
- 1) This is about the right size. Please do not increase the number of participants.
  2) Leave participants a lot of flexibility in terms of applying their own ideas.

Question: 21. OTHER COMMENTS.

Response:

- The course is so excellent that I feel very happy to have an opportunity to come and join. My commitment mind to the FP programme can be matched with the fact and reality and technological procedure. My contribution to the course is I will certainly propose some important idea (research) soon for the sake of the people's benefit.
- Please make intervention to all groups without waiting to be asked. I am sure that all of the teams will very please to get it. The supervisors are very good, don't miss one of them for the future training. Accommodation, supplies of materials, lunch and others were perfectly arranged. Thanks a lot.

Response: (21)

- I am deeply grateful for this opportunity afforded to me. The attitudes of the lecturers leave nothing to be desired. In short, they were excellent.
- All the teachings are well done.
- Another training, specially on report writing and data analyzing is needed to help the researchers.
- ---
- ---
- ---
- Program managers can especially benefit in workshops such as this since they can really come to grips with problem areas in operation that can be looked into and possibly to come up with appropriate instruments to solve them. Thanks.
- All lectures were clear and done well.
- ---
- ---
- Considering the above point and point 17, 2/3 days should be added to the workshop's six day program.
- I would like to suggest to organise in country such workshops with selected people who we should urge to take participation in operations research in family planning program development and program effectiveness.