
The Promoting Psychological Well-Being Globally Project: Approach to Data Collection and Analysis

2

Bonnie K. Nastasi and Amanda P. Borja

Introduction

The *Promoting Psychological Well-Being Globally (PPWBG)* project aimed to develop definitions of psychological well-being and psychologically healthy schools and communities, based on the perspectives of key stakeholders (teacher, student, school, community) within participating countries. The project represents a first step in understanding the psychological health of individuals and schools/communities from a sociocultural perspective and, subsequently, a first step in developing culturally relevant programs that promote the well-being of students through individual and ecological change. In order to avoid imposing Western-based notions of mental health, and embedded in Nastasi, Moore, and Varjas's (2004) *participatory culture-specific intervention model* (PCSIM; see Chap. 1; Fig. 1.1), international collaborators conducted formative research with local teachers, parents, school administrators and service providers, and students about conceptions of psychological health for children and adolescents. Given the need to represent the child's voice in research (Nastasi, 2014), the current handbook draws from this formative database and highlights the child's perspectives about psychological well-being. This chapter details the project's general methodology,

including participant demographics, recruitment strategies, project instruments and materials, and procedures for data collection, transcription, translation, and analysis.

Project Objectives

The *PPWBG* project aimed to understand definitions of psychological well-being as perceived by key stakeholders within participating countries. Using focus groups and ecomaps (individual graphic depictions of stress and support networks; Hartman, 1978; Nastasi, Jayasena, Summerville, & Borja, 2011), research partners were asked to collect emic perspectives of the factors that influence youth well-being at each locale so that practical and collaborative decisions about programming could be made with relevant stakeholders. Although youth participants were never directly asked to define the term *psychological well-being* (with the exception of youth in Boston, USA), participants shared their views about the various factors that contribute to the youth's sense of psychological health and wellness and depicted in the study's conceptual model (see Chap. 1; Fig. 1.3). Specifically, youth participants presented their phenomenology about culturally relevant competencies, developmentally and contextually relevant stressors and supports, strategies for coping with stress, and reactions to support. When integrated with etic knowledge of youth well-being, participant responses addressed the

B. K. Nastasi (✉) · A. P. Borja
Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, USA
e-mail: bnastasi@tulane.edu

following research questions: (a) *What is psychological well-being?* (b) *What is a psychologically healthy environment (e.g., home, school, community, society)?* (c) *What factors influence psychological well-being of children and adolescents?* (d) *What are the roles of schools, families, communities, and societies in promoting psychological well-being?* (e) *What are effective ways to promote psychological well-being of children and adolescents in schools?*

Thus, the current handbook is a representation and interpretation of this formative data, focusing primarily on child and adolescent perspectives, although some partners incorporated adult perspectives as part of their triangulation process (i.e., Estonia & Tanzania).

Negotiating Partnerships Across National Boundaries

Research partners were identified through the network of school psychology professionals associated with the International School Psychology Association (ISPA). The project was conceived during an ISPA annual meeting as a research partnership to investigate psychological well-being across national boundaries. Recognizing the potential cultural stigma and negative perceptions of “mental health,” the participants in this initial meeting decided on the use of the term “psychological well-being” to represent the focus of the research. Moreover, in recognition of the cultural and contextual variations in definitions and terminology and reluctance to adopt Western definitions of mental health constructs, the participants agreed on the use of qualitative research methods that would permit a more inductive investigation of the domain of psychological well-being. This initiative began with a few partners primarily from Europe and the United States. As the project developed, additional partners joined the effort until the project encompassed 14 sites from 12 countries across the globe. With minimal funding (mostly small grants to lead investigator and first author of this chapter and to partially cover local costs of participating sites or local funding to site-specific researchers), partners agreed to

volunteer their time and local resources to complete site-specific data collection and analysis.

A standard protocol for data collection and analysis (as described in this chapter) was developed by the lead investigator and distributed to research partners to insure consistent procedures across sites. Interested parties were asked to complete a letter of agreement to follow the standard protocol, to secure agreement from local schools or other agencies to participate in data collection, to secure approval from their local institutional (university, school system, agency) research review board or oversight committee/agent, and to translate all materials into local language. Copies of agreements and translated materials were provided to the lead investigator in order to secure approval from her University Institutional Review Board (IRB; across the project, Walden University and Tulane University) for the multisite project. When necessary, procedural variations were negotiated, although these proved to be minimal. For example, consent procedures that are standard in US institutions were employed when possible. That is, researchers at each site were responsible for securing informed consent from participating adults (e.g., teachers, parents) and from parents for child and adolescent participants and assent from child and adolescent participants. Two sites initially applied for waiver of parental consent based on existing standard protocol in the country. Although the US-based IRBs approved the waiver, these sites failed to complete the project and are not included in this report. In addition, procedures for securing oral consent were instituted for participants who were not literate (e.g., the consent was read to them, and the oral consent was documented on the form by a witness).

Research Partners, Sites, and Participants

The *PPWBG* project grew out of a collaborative endeavor of school and educational psychologists from several countries, developed by the International Initiatives Committee

(chair, first author), a joint effort of the ISPA and Society for the Study of School Psychology (SSSP). School psychology colleagues from 14 cities in 12 countries participated as research partners, collecting data from at least one partnered school in their regions: Brazil (Manaus; Chap. 3), Estonia (Tallinn; Chap. 4), Greece (Athens; Chap. 5), India (Mumbai; Chap. 6), Italy (Padua; Chap. 7), Mexico (Xalapa; Chap. 8), Romania (Bucharest; Chap. 10), Russia (Samara; Chap. 11), Slovakia (Kocise; Chap. 12), Sri Lanka (Negombo; Chap. 13), Tanzania (Arusha; Chap. 14), and three US sites—Boston, Massachusetts (Chap. 15); Mayaguez, Puerto Rico (Chap. 9); New Orleans, Louisiana (Chap. 16). Partners were asked to recruit between 48 and 64 student participants, with a minimum of 16 students per level (i.e., primary, middle, secondary). Although four of our partnered sites were not able to meet the minimum participant requirement (see Table 2.1), their children's views were still included, as their phenomenology provided a baseline for understanding culture-specific competencies, stressors, supports, and coping strategies. Altogether, focus group and ecomap data were collected from over 800 students worldwide (see Table 2.1). However, some sites analyzed data from only a subset of their youth participants (e.g., USA—Boston and USA—New Orleans) or else included supplemental focus group, interview, and/or survey data from adult participant groups (e.g., Tanzania). Table 2.1 includes demographics from all youth participants, as focus group data from these students were used to identify cross-cultural patterns of stress and support (Chap. 17). Ancillary or subsets of demographic data are described only in relevant chapters.

Participant Recruitment

Sampling for this project was purposive and criterion-based, which is consistent with the purpose of qualitative research (i.e., to uncover patterns of cultural constructions; Creswell, 2009;

Nastasi & Schensul, 2005). Thus, researchers targeted only school-aged children in primary (grades K–5 or 6; ages 5–11 or 12), middle (grades 6–8 or 9; ages 12–13 or 14), and secondary school (grades 9–12 or 13; ages 14–17 or 18). Although the target sample size was at least 48 students, research partners were authorized to recruit additional students as needed to capture a representative and diverse distribution of the local youth population and/or to achieve data saturation. Partners were asked to consider demographic variables that were most representative of their regions, including culture, ethnicity, race, religion, socioeconomic status, and gender, to name a few.

Parent/legal guardian consent forms for student participation were distributed to the site-specific target population children attending the partnered school or agency. Although all children were encouraged to participate, written consent from the child's parent or legal guardian was required for participation in the project. However, oral consent was permitted for parents who were unable to read or write, provided that complete information about the project and its risks and benefits were shared, and the option to withdraw from the project at any time was made explicit. Student assent to participate also was garnered at the outset of data collection, although the type of assent (written or verbal) varied by age. That is, primary school students engaged in an oral assent process, whereas middle and secondary school students engaged in a written assent process.

Instruments and Materials

Given our interest in culture-specific and cross-cultural constructions of well-being, qualitative tools were employed as the primary means of data collection. Specifically, data were collected in two formats (described in detail in data collection section): (a) grade-level-specific (primary, middle, or secondary school) and gender-specific or mixed-gender focus groups, and (b) egocentric ecomaps and related written or oral narratives

Table 2.1 Youth demographic information: Number of participants by site, grade level, gender, and data collection method

	Primary school				Middle school				Secondary school				Total	
	Females		Males		Females		Males		Females		Males			
	FG	ECO	FG	ECO	FG	ECO	FG	ECO	FG	ECO	FG	ECO	FG	ECO
Brazil—Manaus	10	10	13	13	9	9	8	8	8	8	7	7	55	55
Estonia—Tallinn	14	13	16	15	6	6	8	5	7	7	6	6	57	52
Greece—Athens	14	13	12	12	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	49	48
India—Mumbai	–	–	–	–	–	6	–	–	38	16	–	–	38	22
Italy—Padua	16	16	16	16	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	64	64
Mexico—Xalapa	29	24	13	13	12	5	18	6	–	14	–	17	72	79
Romania—Bucharest	16	16	16	16	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	64	63
Russia—Samara	12	12	12	12	–	–	–	–	6	17	–	4	30	45
Slovak Republic—Kocise	13	12	13	13	8	7	8	8	8	7	8	8	58	55
Sri Lanka—Negombo	–	–	–	–	40	37	44	47	54	40	20	9	158	133
Tanzania—Arusha	13	15	12	13	–	–	–	–	18	18	19	19	62	65
The USA—Boston, Massachusetts	7	5	8	5	4	4	5	5	15	11	4	4	43	34
The USA—Mayaguez, Puerto Rico	2	2	4	4	7	1	9	2	10	3	9	4	41	16
The USA—New Orleans, Louisiana	24	24	18	18	–	–	–	–	24	24	20	20	86	86

FG focus groups, *ECO* ecomaps
Total *N* for FGs=877; total *N* for ECOs=817. *Ns* for FGs and ECOs are shown in alternating columns, respectively. Only ecomaps that were complete and clear were used for analyses. For four sites (Mexico; Russia; Tanzania; Puerto Rico), *ns* for ecomaps were greater than *ns* for focus groups. Dashes (–) indicate that data were not collected for respective groups.

about stressors and supports within the child's self-identified social network (Borja, 2013). In addition, each participant completed a demographic questionnaire. Any modifications made to standard procedures are presented in respective chapters.

Although protocols were initially written in American English, focus group and ecomap discussions were implemented in the participant's language of origin, requiring research partners to engage in a translation process that ensured conceptual equivalence between the English protocols and the translated material (Erkut, 2010). As such, research partners were asked to use a back translation technique with, at a minimum, two teams of language proficient professionals and experts in the topic of psychological well-being. In this way, one team was able to translate the protocols from English to the participants' language of origin, and another team was able to translate from the language of origin to English. Specific translation procedures are discussed in each chapter.

Other materials necessary to complete the project included (a) a private, quiet venue conducive to small group discussions and individual interviews for ecomaps; (b) chairs enough for participants and the research team; (c) a notepad and writing utensils or a computer to transcribe conversations on-site; (d) an audio recorder, in the event that participants' parents consented for their children to participate in audio-recorded sessions; (e) a presentation board (chalkboard, dry erase board, or easel pad) to record key ideas and promote on-site member checks; (f) construction paper or other large-sized paper for ecomap drawings; (g) pencils, markers, and crayons for use during drawings; and (h) if possible, snacks for participants.

Data Collection

The data collection process was completed in three to four phases: process preparation, data collection, data transcription, and where applicable, data translation. The following section describes each phase in detail.

Process Preparation

Preparation for data collection was necessary to ensure the seamless facilitation of focus groups and interviews. First, research partners were asked to create one or more data collection teams comprised of at least one facilitator and a transcriber/co-facilitator. If feasible, researchers were asked to involve at least one other person as a separate transcriber (note taker) and/or co-facilitator, and if possible, additional transcribers were encouraged to participate so as to prevent the loss of data. (If site-specific investigators chose to use audiotaping, they were encouraged to use this only as backup for written transcription completed during the session.) Other preparation procedures included: (a) familiarization with questions and procedures; (b) assignment of team members' roles and responsibilities; (c) preparation of all materials; and (d) follow-up with participating agencies or schools to confirm time and place. Site-specific preparation procedures are discussed in relevant chapters.

Data Collection Methods

Although data collection activities (focus group and ecomaps) were designed to be conducted in 48 hours or less, research partners maintained authority to extend activities in response to contextual demands, cultural needs, and/or developmental considerations. Regardless of the number of sessions, groups were generally small and homogenous, with approximately 6–8 students of similar age levels (i.e., ages 6–8, 9–11, 12–14, 15–17) and genders. However, some partners assembled larger group sizes or mixed-gender focus groups. Specific modifications are indicated in respective chapters.

Demographic Questionnaire Demographic data were collected using a brief questionnaire in the context of focus groups in either written or oral form. As shown in Appendix 2.H, the demographic questionnaire included questions about gender, age, ethnic origin, religion, language, parental education and occupation, family income, family

status (married, divorced, etc.), and household size and composition. Both students and parents were asked to respond to the same set of questions and to ensure complete and accurate data. If parent data were missing, then child report served as the primary source of demographic information.

Focus Group Procedures To build rapport and encourage students' comfort with the focus group process, discussions always started with brief introductions among the research team and participants. In addition to names and grade levels, site research teams sometimes included other introductory questions or engaging activities. After introductions, researchers engaged in an informed assent process that included (a) a description of the study, (b) its purpose, (c) the researchers in charge and their contact information, (d) the limits of confidentiality (i.e., confidential unless information shared indicates imminent danger of participants or others), (e) the study's risks and benefits, and (f) the option to opt out of the process at any time. Participants also were offered the chance to ask questions about the study. Although this speech was not standardized, researchers were asked to use their consent forms as the basis for the introductory discussion. Focus group protocols (Appendices 2.A–2.D) include sample introductory speeches for discussions with students, parents, teachers, and administrative and health provider staff. With the exception of primary school students, all students signed a written assent form if they agreed to participate. Primary school students were asked for oral assent.

To promote respectful and engaging group discussions, research facilitators also established group rules/expectations before asking questions (see Appendices 2.A–2.D), including, but not limited to (a) respecting each other's opinions; (b) listening to others' thoughts; (c) waiting to speak; (d) allowing others a chance to share; and (e) refraining from criticizing others' ideas despite disagreeing with them. If possible, researchers were asked to engage students in identifying appropriate expectations and to use students' vernacular so as to promote culturally acceptable standards.

Focus group protocols for students, parents, teachers, and administrative and service provider staff are presented in Appendices 2.A, 2.B, 2.C, and 2.D, respectively. Although listed questions were generally asked in the order presented, researchers were allowed to ask questions in a sequence that maintained the flow of the discussion, making sure to return to questions that were previously skipped. Guidelines for facilitating group discussions in order to maintain respectful, engaging, and rich discussion were provided to all research partners (see Appendix 2.E). Consistent with the ecological foundation of the project and with the semi-structured nature of focus groups, this broad-based approach allowed partners the freedom to implement the protocol in a manner that reflected their personal styles, the cultural nuances of their respective regions, and their participants' developmental levels.

Ecomap Procedures Ecomap drawings and accompanying narratives (elicited via a set of questions; see Appendix 2.F) were conducted as an extension of the focus group activities so that (a) participants could generate detailed ideas about relevant social supports, stressors, and reactions to stress and support in both graphic and verbal forms (Driessnack, 2005); (b) the likelihood of generating thick descriptions was increased; and (c) data trustworthiness could be established through data triangulation (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Nastasi & Schensul, 2005). The ecomap is relatively novel in research with children (Baumgartner, Burnett, DiCarlo, & Buchanan, 2012; Borja, 2013; Rempel, Neufeld, & Kushner, 2007; Summerville, 2013) but through our prior work in using ecomaps as an intervention tool (Nastasi et al. 2010), we recognized its potential as a data collection tool, especially as a mechanism for expression in graphic and verbal formats. Through these ecomaps, participants were given the opportunity to describe their network members and the quality of each of their relationships such as *stress*, *support*, or *both* stress and support (*ambivalent*) and to detail the emotions they experience in association with each actor/context. In addition, they were asked to generate a stress- and a support-related story (narrative)

to generate additional data and encourage rich descriptions. The ecomap protocol was designed to elicit written responses to questions and written narratives; when deemed necessary (e.g., for participants who were not literate), researchers could elicit and record children's oral responses. The activity was designed to be conducted in a small group format (i.e., the focus group), with children working individually; when deemed appropriate, researchers could work individually with children (e.g., to collect oral narratives).

Given the novelty of the ecomap procedures for most children and to ensure understanding of the constructs, sessions were designed to be partially instructional (see Appendix 2.F). Through the use of modeling, visual displays, and verbal instructions, researchers taught students about the components of the ecomap prior to engaging in the drawing activity. Researchers prompted students to think broadly about individuals and spaces in different ecological settings (e.g., home, neighborhood, school) and then provided examples of symbols that students could use to represent these units. At the center of these drawings, students were asked to represent themselves. Researchers also encouraged students to develop their own unique ecomaps rather than copy models that were provided or compare to other group members. As depicted in the site-specific chapters, children and adolescents included not only individual persons but also groups, organizations, activities, events, objects, contexts, and pets in their ecomaps.

Relationship quality symbols also were indicated. Students were asked to use three variations of lines to indicate the valence (stress, support, and ambivalent) associated with each actor and/or context in their networks. As shown in the sample ecomap (Appendix 2.F), *solid lines* denoted supportive relationships; *disconnected crosses* symbolized stressful relationships; and the presence of both *solid lines* and *crosses* indicated ambivalent relationships. These lines were drawn from the ecomap center to each network member. Participants were allowed to use different types of lines to indicate the valence of the relationship as long as they provided a legend.

After completing their drawings, participants were asked to label their network members and to indicate any feelings associated with each member and the reasons that each relationship was supportive, stressful, or ambivalent (see Appendix 2.F). When that was completed, researchers asked students to narrate stories to depict stress and support using two identified relationships, one that was stressful or ambivalent and one that was supportive or ambivalent. As indicated in Appendix 2.F, participants were asked to describe a time that was stressful or supportive to them in an identified stressful or supportive relationship, respectively. If a student identified only one type of relationship across their network members, that student was asked to describe two instances in which they felt support or stress with two separate individuals. If a student's ecomap contained only ambivalent relationships, that student was asked to describe a stressful occurrence in relation to one member and a supportive story in relation to another.

Ecomap drawings, explanations, and narratives were completely participant-centered. That is, researchers were asked to refrain from providing prompts about what students could include in their drawings, other than those set forth in the guidelines (see Appendix 2.F). However, adaptations to the ecomap procedures were permitted to meet cultural, developmental, and feasibility demands; any such adaptations are indicated in respective chapters.¹

Data Transcription

The key to qualitative data collection is using a method that is sensitive enough to capture participants' authentic phenomenology while minimizing researcher inference (Creswell, 2009). As such, transcriptions of participants' voices needed to reflect participants' vernacular and, as much as possible, exact ideas. Thus, gain-

¹ An early childhood version of the ecomap was subsequently developed for students in Kindergarten to Grade 2 (see Chapter 16). Copies of this protocol can be obtained from the first author.

ing consent to audio record was ideal, as it allowed for focus group note takers to transcribe verbatim, both during and after sessions. It also allowed for a review process that helped to fill gaps and ensure accuracy. If sessions were not audio recorded, note takers repeated their recorded responses to participants to ensure the accuracy of researcher interpretation (i.e., a form of ongoing member checking). Because all final transcriptions needed to be de-identified, recorded in electronic text, and transmitted electronically to the principal investigator (PI), note takers were encouraged to use laptop computers as their transcription tool during each session when possible.

Data Translation

All finalized transcripts were written in, or translated to, English. Similar to the process of protocol translation, transcripts were translated using a back translation technique, such that at least two independent teams of translators were able to translate the document into English and then back again to the language of origin. PIs for each site were asked to work closely with the language expert (if not the PI) to ensure that meanings were accurately reflected, especially with regard to any technical terms, and to ensure that culture-specific vocabulary was used. Because a key objective of this project was to reflect culture-specific language, accurate translation was critical to achieving this objective.

Data Analysis

Data analysis entailed a tripartite coding procedure consisting of (a) a deductive coding process that organized statements into the broad constructs of interest (culturally valued competencies, stressors, supports, and coping); (b) an inductive coding process that clustered deductively coded statements into culture-specific themes; and (c) a pattern analysis of inductive codes

across deductive categories. The present section describes the procedures involved at each of the three stages.

Stage 1: Deductive Coding

Focus group and ecomap narrative data were first coded according to the etic constructs that were of primary interest to this project, that is, culturally valued competencies, stressors, supports, reactions to stress, and reactions to support (see Table 2.2). An additional *not applicable* (N/A) deductive code was incorporated to reflect responses that were irrelevant to the current project.

To ensure uniformity of deductive codes, the lead investigator's research team in New Orleans deductively coded all student focus group and ecomap story data.² Each coder independently coded all transcripts and then later discussed the codes with other members of the team (teams ranged from 2 to 4 individuals). In the event that team members disagreed about codes, a discussion about each member's rationale ensued, in an effort to reach consensus. If teams were unable to agree about the identified codes, then the narrative was categorized as N/A. All finalized codes ultimately met with consensus within teams.

Because the focus group questions and ecomap stories were designed in alignment with the targeted constructs, all responses to a specific question were coded as at least one of the constructs. In this way, statements were not decontextualized, and extraneous information supporting the main ideas was maintained. Box 2.1 provides an example of this process. As illustrated, by keeping all narrative text together, the full story of the children's interactions and ideas are clearer.

² The one exception was the Mexico data, which was coded by the research team at Georgia State University. The lead investigator of that team had been previously trained in the coding scheme and procedures.

Table 2.2 Deductive coding scheme used to identify statements as reflecting the targeted construct

CODE	Descriptor	Definition
COMP-ROLE	Valued competencies may be in the context of a specific role, for example, student, son/daughter, and friend, or generally, as a child	Any reference to competencies valued in the culture, and sometimes described in the context of a specific role, for example, student, parent, and friend. Conceptualized on a continuum, it can also be reference to culturally unacceptable behaviors, characteristics, etc.
STRESS	Stress/stressor	Any reference to sources that elicit distress for the child. The key idea is that <i>the child</i> perceives the thought, person, object, etc. as a stressor. If the object is thought to impede education, hinder development, or be a risk factor but the child does not perceive it as a stressor, then <i>do not code</i> as stressor.
SUPP	Support/social resource	Any reference to resources or sources of social support available in the child's sociocultural environments that can facilitate coping and address psychological problems or provide some type of help or support. Includes both informal social supports (e.g., family, peers, teachers, pets, religious deities) and formal supports or professional services (e.g., from school counselor, psychiatrist). Also includes sources of support indicated on ecomaps. When coding ecomaps, sources of support can be people, places, animals, events, and other child-identified ideas.
RE-STRESS	Reaction to stress	Any reference to how an individual responds to or copes with stress or problems; can include emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses. Encompasses coping strategies but is meant to be broader category to capture also immediate reactions that may or may not be attempts to cope.
RE-SUPP	Reaction to support/resource	Any reference to how an individual responds to support or help from others; can include emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses.
N/A	Not applicable	Identifies any statement that is not applicable to the present coding scheme; also identifies statements that were unable to be coded due to coder disagreement.

Box 2.1. Deductively Coded Excerpt from Focus Group Transcript

Ok fine, but how do you express this feeling? /ALL RE-SUPP/

1. When you are in a positive mood, you think best, you have hopes and you feel you can make it...

2. I just need a sunny day or a few nice words by a friend /SUPP/ and I feel better, I'm more light-hearted.

3. And moreover, people in a positive attitude are able to convey this feeling even when outside there's a storm.

4. Living your life with a positive attitude means having a lot of energy to be used, and conveying your optimism to others, making this world a better place, making things better.

5. A positive attitude can be conveyed by talking, by showing that you are happy.

6. Talking with each other is the most important thing, but also conveying your affection.

7. Yeah, being there for each other.

Note: All student statements in response to the presented question are broadly coded in

relation to that targeted construct. In this case, the question assesses children's reactions to support, so the responses are all coded as /ALL RE-SUPP/. However, some statements may have reflected other constructs (e.g., see code SUPP), even within the context of the targeted construct. In those instances, statements were coded as appropriate and highlighted so that they stood out from the rest of the statements.

After all transcripts were deductively coded, a *coding summary sheet* was completed for each country. This sheet contained a written summary of the status of their coded documents as well as any questions or comments that research partners needed to address. This document was attached to each country's coded documents, and electronic access to the documents was provided through a privately shared folder on a cloud database.

Stage 2: Inductively Derived Culture-Specific Themes

Given the primacy of culture and context in the understanding of psychological well-being, research partners were tasked with inductively coding their respective focus group and ecomap narratives. At this stage, research partners were asked to create at least two teams of independent coders to be able to identify specific themes related to each deductive code. These themes were inductively derived from the students' narratives and were single-statement summaries of stories that conveyed similar ideas (see Box 2.2 for a sample). As much as possible, students' words were used as the single-statement summaries, and research partners were asked to cluster all relevant narratives with each theme. In this way, full stories and emic-derived contextual information were maintained. Appendix 2.G provides the framework that coding teams used to inductively code their transcripts at stage 2.

Box 2.2. Excerpt of Inductively Coded Transcript

What is expected of children as students at this school in Negombo, Sri Lanka? When applicable, include explanations of the cultural context as perceived by the group that help to explain these expectations.

A prevalent theme, this group of males shared that students are expected to **"study"** ("does homework") in order to (a) "learn about society" and (b) "cultivate good habits."

This group of males noted that students are expected to **"be obedient to teachers."**

This group of males expressed that students are expected to be **"role models"** for others and **"bring credit to school."**

This group of males expressed that students their age are expected to **"be fruitful to country,"** i.e., to be productive citizens. "To be person who is benevolent to country."

This group of males noted that students their age are expected to be **cooperative/get along well with their peers** ("[does not] Fights with others").

Note: The bolded statements reflect the single-statement themes that summarized the relevant narratives. As much as possible, researchers were encouraged to use students' language as the single-statement themes. Additionally, as part of the stage 3 process of analysis, research partners were asked to weave student narratives and school and cultural context that helped to bring life to the identified patterns. Thus, student stories were retained when they helped to explain the single-statement themes. Narratives derived from other deductive codes also were incorporated to describe possible connections between various deductive codes, for example, stress narratives were frequently associated with narratives about competencies.

International Handbook of Psychological Well-Being in
Children and Adolescents
Bridging the Gaps Between Theory, Research, and
Practice

Nastasi, B.K.; Borja, A.P. (Eds.)

2016, XXIV, 336 p. 25 illus., 7 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-4939-2832-3