# Supplementary file: Data analysis

## Example 1: Analysis of Observational Fieldnotes: Remote London Sessions

## August 2021 (between workshops and film rough cut)

11 sessions have been observed (including Session 0 - taster session) by ET and FJ who wrote detailed fieldnotes for each session. We summarised the fieldnotes from each session on a spreadsheet. ET has also been part of the Whatsapp group and has noted how this works in conjunction with the workshops. ET has also attended the artists group meetings which has added further insights. Now that the main workshops have finished and the film is being put together, ET has reviewed the fieldnotes and summaries, and synthesised these into points or questions that it might be useful to consider for the online training package or next delivery of workshops.

1) People do actually participate online

* Most (sometimes all) participants engage in all parts of the workshops, including movement, vocal exercises, singing and breakout room discussions.
* We have noticed that participating is a much more pleasant experience than observing. Some sounds that are abrasive (due to the technology and sound delays) when just listening and typing notes are less noticeable when joining in. Examples of this from fieldnotes: ‘Does the cacophonous noise bother them like it bothers me? Should participants be on mute?’ in contrast to ‘It’s lovely when you get into it.’ ‘A great session with really good energy’.
* Some participants who seemed less likely to join have done so. For example, a very softly spoken man with dysphasia whose wife supported him in the earlier sessions was noted to be singing along in later sessions. Another man who spent early sessions with his head resting on his hand, not appearing to join in, was noted to be dancing along in later sessions. A man who explained he did not want to use his camera initially as he felt self-conscious showing his face after his stroke, has shown himself in later sessions and been a very active participant.

2) Ambassadors have a key role, and could probably do even more.

* The core group of ambassadors is primed immediately before each session about what is going to happen, and they are asked to act as role models and encourage others. They may be asked to ask a question, so that others feel they can ask questions too. They may be asked to pick out individual participants to highlight their dances and show their appreciation. The ambassadors also ask the artists for clarification questions and give their feedback when something is not clear to them, offering a participants’ perspective. Lucinda tells the ambassadors ‘the more you raise your voice, the more other people will raise their own voice’.
* In the room there are 2 ambassadors, along with the artists. They are able to model all aspect of the workshops, and this brings real authenticity as they have also experienced stroke or brain injuries and have to work around / with their disabilities. As the programme went on I was struck by how powerful it is to watch J dancing or P singing. In the final sessions P took the lead for a short time, leading the vocals and inspiring and motivating the participants. Could there be more of this? It seems there is scope to give them an even stronger voice and empower their leadership.

3) Sensitive, creative facilitation.

* [Artist] is excellent at remembering who contributed which ideas and pointing this out so that participants can recognise their contributions as the work develops. She gets to know who people are very quickly, uses their names and brings them into the group even from a distance.
* Even having observed all the sessions, there are behind the scenes mysteries that I don’t understand. For example, how is the libretto developed? How are the participants’ contributions recorded and selected for the pieces? (I was taking their discussions down verbatim while taking notes in breakout groups, and wondered how all this would be captured.)
* [Artist] also seems to have a sense of the power of metaphor to unify people in their shared experiences. She enables them to connect the metaphor, their experiences, and their words and movements. The metaphor is strong! ET was also seeing spirals everywhere and singing the spiral song in the shower. Something powerful about linking movements with thoughts, feelings and intentions and this came across in participant interview.

4) How to prioritise components of the session?

* The breakout groups were amazing. People got into very deep conversations quickly, but they didn’t last long and I wondered how the content was captured (one participant was to take notes and feedback but this may have lost some of the richness).
* Participants seem to value the movement work, particularly when paired with different types of background music.
* People really seem to enjoy singing, and sometimes start singing their own songs or mentioning the music they like. Call and response works well on zoom. [Artist] is skilled at facilitating this.
* Some discussion about whether sessions are too long / too short / should have breaks or not. We can explore participants’ perspectives in interviews.
* Informal opportunities for people to chat. People often chatted through the breaktime, or stayed and chatted at the end of the session but had to stop when the zoom was cut off. It seems there is potential to give people more opportunity to mingle to help them to build their community, but this would require someone from RL staying to keep the zoom open. We could explore this topic in interviews too.

5) Practical and technical issues

* Before the session starts there often seem to be technical issues and tense moments, but once participants have entered things go fairly smoothly.
* When the session starts late participants can be lost from the waiting room.
* On-screen participants requested the words they would need to say and sing in advance of sessions. (I think in real life they would get print outs, so this is new for online.)
* Communication between the real room and the online room can be problematic. Questions or comments from the online room can be missed. Comment about it being like watching the Big Brother house – we can hear any whispers between the people in the real room as they have mics on.
* Session where artists were also in own homes worked well. ‘We’re all at home together today’. Felt more intimate, more like the artists were talking directly to us. What are the benefits of the blended approach? Sometimes the experiences the artists are having with tech can be a distraction, e.g. when they can’t see the participants.
* Most tech issues have been ironed out as the groups have gone on. The main problem was wrong faces popping up at wrong times. Is gallery view better than pinning?
* People understand there will be tech issues. Lucinda says ‘let’s embrace the flaws in the technology’, which is a good approach or reducing the tension and frustration it can bring.

Whatsapp group / what happens outside the sessions

* Lots of discussions seem to happen outside the sessions between artists and participants. Some participants seek extra support from artists. One problem with this is about boundaries. Everyone’s phone number is visible on the whatsapp group and people call artists for a long time at any time. Another problem is that people don’t all get the same information at the same time, which can lead to different levels of understand of plans.
* Sub-groups / the favoured few? Some participants went on a trip to an art gallery with RL, and made a video which was shown in a workshop. I wondered if everyone had been given the same opportunity to attend. It felt to me like there was a bit of a clique or sub-group, and I wondered if any of the participants felt that way.
* Whatsapp is a very busy repository with lots of videos, photos, poems and voice recordings being uploaded by participants. It’s an important part of their participation.
* It can be complicated for people to understand and can increase carer burden for those supporting partners etc to manage all the tech (zoom, whatsapp, email, website)
* Whatsapp comments highlight how much support some members need, e.g. frequently thinking the workshop is on the wrong day.
* Do we need ground rules about how to use the whatsapp group? On one occasion Lucinda intervened when a participant was asking another lots of questions about her physio and where she lived. Should RL manage the group interactions, or leave the group to manage this themselves but with guidance about expectations? (Lots of other everyday whatsapp groups can have tricky dynamics too!)
* Sketchbooks – some people not sure how to use these but others really appreciating them and using a lot.
* Question of what to do with all the content. Is it shared ‘in the moment’ or to be used in the end product? Participant I interviewed wanted it all to be used to help stroke patients, but there is so much! Do expectations need to be managed, so people are told not everything will be used / how it might be used? (Part of ground rules / group agreement?)
* What to do if someone seems to need help or support? Eg participant on Whatsapp who had found spiral metaphor triggering, and who posted her reflections thinking she was sending them privately to her therapist?

Understanding the bigger picture / grand plan

* Is it the intention that people gradually see how the process unfolds, or that they should understand this from the start?
* Would the participant have dropped out if he and his wife knew the plan?
* Would it be more empowering if people had a better understanding of the plan, or is this my therapy bias?
* Whilst the work feels collaborative it is full of surprises! Did people know they would break for summer? Did they know it would become a film?

Additional Questions:

* Does this work as well for people with brain injury as those who have had a stroke? Lots of the talk is about the sudden event of the stroke, but a participant I spoke to at the start of the sessions had had his brain injury long term and it was more chronic and changing.
* -How many of the participants are new to RL? In interviews we can explore differences in the experiences of those who have already done a traditional or online RL programme.
* Lots of different terms seem a bit confusing: Rosetta Life, Stroke Odysseys, Brain Odysseys, Brain Waves... I’m not sure what the differences are so not sure what participants make of it!

## Example 2: Data analysis of interviews

Following line by line coding of each transcript, interview content was summarised and things that mattered to the participants (objects of concern) were summarised as meaning units. The below table shows examples of this.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participant** | **Summary of interview / objects of concern** | **Meaning Units (related theme number)** | **Final themes** |
| Jade | * Found out via the stroke association. * Expected it to be in a group singing and dancing. * Was motivated to do it because of poor memory after stroke 1 year ago. * Feeling lost, no friends. * Didn’t have many expectations but enjoyed joining every week * People are similar but in lots of different ways – makes me feel normal * Just being in a group helps * Didn’t realise how many people had strokes. Not alone. * Easier to overcome shyness at home online * No major obstacles to meeting online – enjoyed it every week * Enjoyed the film: can remember me in it. It felt good to notice myself in it. * Didn’t really grasp what was going on and still don’t really understand spiral idea, but enjoyed it. * Would have liked to know plan but enjoyed meeting anyway. * Went along not really understanding what was going on. * Just got in my mind that I had to meet up with people. * I’d lost myself and when I’m involved with meetings with other people its bringing me back * Sense of belonging to something * You can meet lovely people online * Enjoyed regularity of weekly meetings * Lonely and isolated – grasping any opportunities | * I was lonely, isolated, lost (1) * Online was good – better for overcoming shyness at home (2) * Regular weekly groups good (3) * Being part of something with people in similar situations+++ (2) * Didn’t really know what was going on but enjoyed it anyway (2, 3, 4) * Found out via another group (Stroke association) (4) | 1. A critical need to address loneliness and isolation. 2. What people valued: meeting and mixing, moving and making. 3. Barriers and facilitators to online delivery: Making connections. 4. Support and resources needed. |
| Ernest | * Found out about it at peer support group * Difficult stroke story including covid issues, isolation and depression * RL benefits, interaction, performing adding to recovery, movement increases flexibility * Online better than being at home isolated with TV. Gives impression of being with others. * Didn’t feel confident about contributing, didn’t want to let others down, surprised was able * Watching the film projected to a better future * All components were good. Breakout could be longer but attention spans might be too short * Movement was the highlight, surprised self with dancing, it was fun. | * Covid impact: isolation and depression (1) * Movement helps flexibility (2) * Interacting and performing aids recovery (2) * Online helps with isolation, gives impression of being with others (2) * Spirals poem and metaphor helped, and liked others’ interpretations (2) * Group helped recovery – being with others who have had a stroke is valuable (2) * Film was positive (2) * Increase awareness of stroke: Important for others to know how low you can get (1) * Grew confidence (2) * Breakout groups were a bit short (3) * Online v in person, intertwining both would be good (3) * Online option should continue (3) |