

BEYOND MEASURE

SCALING QUALITATIVE RESEARCH FOR POLICY INTERVENTION



**International conference organized by
Aarhus University & SoNAR-Global
5-6 April 2022, Sandbjerg Manor, Denmark**



Acknowledgements

The organizers gratefully acknowledge financial support by:

- The European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 825671
- The Carlsberg Foundation, Grant no. CF22-0002
- Aarhus University Research Foundation, Grant no. AUFF-T-2022-FLS-1 -14

This report was prepared by
Jens Kjærulff
Jens Seeberg
Aarhus, June 2022

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Contents.....	3
Background.....	4
Objectives	5
Welcome address	5
Qualitative Research and Scaling: Country Presentations.....	6
Scaling Research for Urban Governance	10
Roundtable Discussion.....	11
Plenary discussion	14
Group work: Synthesis.....	15
Conclusion	16
Appendix A: List of Participants	18
Appendix B: Roundtable Panellists.....	19
Appendix 3: Organizing Committee.....	20
Appendix 4: Programme.....	21

Background

This document reports on the meeting “Beyond Measure: Scaling Qualitative Research for Policy Intervention”, which took place on April 5-6, 2022 at Sandbjerg Manor in Denmark. The workshop was part work package (WP) 7 of the project “SoNAR-Global (S-G): A Global Social Sciences Network for Infectious Threats and Antimicrobial Resistance”, funded by the European Commission. WP7 focused on vulnerability during the coronavirus pandemic.

SoNAR-Global (S-G) is a global consortium led by social scientists specializing in emerging infectious diseases (EID) and antimicrobial resistance (AMR). It works to build a sustainable international social science network to engage the active participation of social sciences in the governance of prevention and response to infectious threats and AMR and promote complementarity and synergy. As such, SoNAR-Global aims to become an integral part of emergency response, partnering with major international and regional institutions, to lead activities through a program that builds governance from the ground up. SoNAR-Global specifically seeks to provide actionable insights to local stakeholders, academic communities, and European policy makers, to scale up case definitions of vulnerability where possible, and to develop a global strategy for scaling-up tools for Vulnerability Assessment and Community Engagement (VA-CE).

The aim of the workshop was to bring together SoNAR-Global partners and other relevant specialists to compare and discuss policy implications of SoNAR-Global research in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, with a special focus on scaling of findings and/or approaches. Apart from SoNAR-Global partners, the workshop included participants involved in similar research projects, such as the project “How Democracies Cope with COVID19” (HOPE Project) based in Denmark, as well as experts with expertise in policy translation within relevant fields.

The COVID-19 pandemic has developed differently and has given rise to different policy responses across countries. Such variation reflects differences in e.g., local demographics and social make-up, cultural outlooks, distribution of economic resources, trajectories of political history, and relative degree of trust in governing institutions. By bringing together social scientists and other specialists with insights from various European countries and beyond with an in-depth understanding of the social dynamics of pandemic vulnerabilities, as well as of the kinds of community engagement that can be mobilized to address such vulnerabilities, the workshop provided a unique opportunity for

exploration and reflection, and for discussing the challenges entailed in providing actionable insights enabling translation of qualitative research into policy, when appropriate.

Objectives

1. To review experiences with scaling up social science health research based on ethnography for policy intervention at national and global levels.
2. To prepare a position paper on scaling up ethnographically informed social science health research based on objective 1.
3. To identify future research activities of global health relevance based on the two above-mentioned objectives.

Welcome address

In his opening address, professor Jens Seeberg noted that while ambitions of scaling qualitative research for policy intervention are familiar, the participants present at the conference were collectively well positioned to move this agenda forward due to the extensive expertise and research effort on the topic represented by the group. Alluding to the conference title, "Beyond Measure", Seeberg pointed out that by conventional measures, countries such as the United Kingdom and the USA should have been among those best positioned to respond to and mitigate the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic. As it turned out, however, these countries' relatively poor performance in such regard indicated the need to move beyond conventional measures. Seeberg quoted the recently retired director of the US National Institutes of Health, Dr Francis Collins, who, when reflecting on the role of NIH had said: "Maybe we underinvested in research on human behaviour. I never imagined a year ago, when those vaccines were just proving to be fantastically safe and effective, that we would still have 60 million people [in the United States] who had not taken advantage of them because of misinformation and disinformation that somehow dominated all of the ways in which people were getting their answers." Seeberg's address thus served to make the premise of the workshop concrete: that a better appreciation of context and social factors can make a critical difference in the handling of pandemics, and that qualitative social science research can contribute important insights towards this aim, if adequately funded.

Professor David Napier concentrated his introductory remarks on reminding participants of some basic goals and challenges for qualitative research when engaging in scaling efforts. A main goal remains to bring lived experience to the level of evidence where it can be brought to bear on decisions, evaluation, and action. Napier revisited his own efforts and challenges in the context of a traditional mixed methods approach focused on household-based vulnerability surveys, which had formed a point of departure for his teams' ethnographic work, using Myanmar as a case in point. An integrated approach had allowed the team to assess and further develop standardized case definitions, which in turn provided a point of departure for policy recommendations. Napier stressed the importance of the integrated approach for the ethnographic component to be scaled and brought to bear in a wider context of decision-making and action. He used this as a point of departure to discuss problems of a more general nature that face researchers when attempting to scale their findings, such as the dilemma of the need for complex and compounding accounts, against the need to also deliver clear and effective recommendations.

Dr Anna Volkmann offered reflections on the concept of "vulnerability". While invoked extensively, Volkmann reminded participants of the concept's distinct methodological trajectory in the context of the workshop. Vulnerability Assessment (VA) comprises a very specific approach, yet "vulnerability" is also fraught with connotations that potentially could side-track discussions. Volkmann also reflected more briefly on other dimensions of methodology and core concepts, such as the notion of "case definition". Lastly, she reiterated the conference's central focus, the problem of research translation and scaling.

Qualitative Research and Scaling: Country Presentations

Country presentations in this section were framed in terms of the following four questions of strategic importance for multi-scalar policy engagement:

1. What are the intrinsic strengths and weaknesses of detailed qualitative research in relation to scaling up and policy translation?
2. What are the scope and limitations of such research in relation to policy translation and scaling up?

3. What are the ethical implications and obligations embedded in translation of vulnerability analysis to policy?
4. What are the strategic implications of 1-3 above for research-to-policy translation and scaling at national and global levels?

Presentations by S-G partners covered France, Malta, Germany, and Slovenia, whereas a presentation on Denmark was based on the HOPE project.

FRANCE (Benedetta Lana presenting for Tamara Giles-Vernick)

A main discussion point in the presentation on France was the notion of “scaling”. Acknowledging the common conception of scaling as a linear and unidirectional exercise, where the relevance of specific findings is amplified in terms of larger sets of quantitative data, the presentation outlined an alternative approach to scaling vulnerability assessment and community engagement in Paris. This was pursued by qualitative researchers of the Institut Pasteur, where collaboration across sectors is central. This approach allowed for an appreciation of the diverse factors contributing to experiences of vulnerability during the Covid-19 pandemic and fostered co-development of mitigating initiatives. On this basis the French team of researchers had also developed a set of indicators for social isolation and resilience beyond demographic factors with a view to linking such indicators to wider sets of quantitative data.

MALTA (Gisella Orsini & Maurice Said)

The presentation on Malta was based on interviews with a wide range of differently positioned people, including e.g., asylum seekers, the elderly, single mothers, students, mental health patients and people with disabilities and people, whose work and social situation had been critically affected by lock downs. This created an understanding of vulnerability on the broadest feasible basis, with a view to uncover new or emerging conceptions of vulnerability. Not being formally acknowledged as vulnerable could itself make people feel (more) vulnerable, since this entailed an exclusion from eligibility for Government schemes of financial support put in place to compensate the effects of lockdowns. What constituted evidence in the context of vulnerability was also a focus for reflection in the Malta presentation.

GERMANY (Zeliha Öcek)

The presentation on Germany resembled that on Malta in terms of its aiming for a wide demographic spread but also included people with expert knowledge, e.g. related to migration, poverty, local communities and psychiatric disease. The team had drafted a set of recommendations that were presented to these experts to comment on in an online forum, thereby creating a feedback mechanism during the development of recommendations. To establish such feedback mechanism was itself a recommendation. The presentation concluded by highlighting the importance of keeping parties to vulnerability assessment and community engagement continuously informed and involved in the process of developing research-to-policy translation and scaling.

SLOVENIA (Uršula Lipovec Čebren)

Qualitative research provides a possibility to reach a range of people who are otherwise easily neglected, such as illegal migrants, homeless people, sex-workers, and drug users. It was pointed out how this focus on an “invisible” segment enhanced the Slovenian research team’s appreciation of the interconnections between dimensions which can mutually re-enforce vulnerability, e.g., related to health, economics, governance and/or communication. It was also noted how, in Slovenia at large, vulnerability is widely perceived in individualized terms, and the team stressed the importance of countering such assumptions by bringing the said interconnectedness to the awareness of a wider audience. Unexpected resiliencies were also highlighted as a finding. Coping strategies acquired from vulnerable living prior to the pandemic, e.g., in contexts of precarious work, in some instances gained new relevance and could be shared in the context of the pandemic.

DENMARK (Mette Terp Højbye & Jens Seeberg)

The presentation on Denmark suggested to replace the attention on vulnerable groups with axes of vulnerability in order to reduce the risk of further stigmatization. Based on ethnographic engagement in nine different contexts during the pandemic, the presentation played with different ways of presenting qualitative findings in ways that would be recognizable by an audience more used to quantitative research. The presentation stressed the interconnectedness and multidimensionality of vulnerabilities and suggested 9 different types of vulnerability, with biological and institutional (hospital) vulnerability being given priority at the expense of heightened social and psychological vulnerability, especially for youth, the elderly, and people with prior mental health challenges. Shifting the focus from groups to vulnerability axes worked to illustrate their dynamic interconnections.

Cross-cutting Issues – The Four Questions

Intrinsic strengths and weaknesses of qualitative research for policy translation: Ideally, the strength of qualitative social science approaches such as open-ended interviews and ethnographic fieldwork is the ability to “meet people on their terms”, allowing researchers a level of in-depth understanding not granted by other approaches. Often, researchers also uncover dimensions proving to be of significance, which were not anticipated. Most S-G partners reported how this approach allowed them a greater degree of access to marginalized people, who had often proven particularly vulnerable to the Covid-19 situation. The approach allowed researchers to bring to light contextual factors and hidden knowledge that impinge or are brought to bear on Covid-19 related situations. These include cultural outlook, language or IT literacy problems, or patterns of coping already established through familiar circumstances of hardship. Bringing such contextual factors to light enabled the development of deeper explorations and explanatory pursuits, allowing for research on causal relations and producing data with a high degree of internal validity.

As for weaknesses, qualitative research is relatively time consuming, labour intensive and requires high degrees of specialization, e.g., in terms of languages spoken among target populations. The strength of this approach in terms of its in-depth focus on context can also be a weakness due to limited generalizability of contextualized findings.

Scope and limitations in relation to policy translation and scaling up: Ethnographic research has the capacity in relation to policy translation to amplify the voices of marginalized and vulnerable populations with specific needs during crises such as the Covid-19 pandemic. Such research may also impart the political system a better understanding of the real-life consequences of its decisions, as well as structural barriers. Moreover, it can boost the involvement of stakeholders, including CBOs.

As for limitations, qualitative research findings may be hard to effectively communicate to policy and administrative audiences, either because such findings may be considered subjective, or because they are more accustomed to taking numbers seriously rather than novel concepts. The kind of implementation strategies that logically might ensue from qualitative research findings could also pose a limitation, as these could require novel inter-sectorial collaborations, involving a wide range of sometimes unconventional stakeholders.

Ethical implications and obligations embedded in translating

vulnerability analysis to policy: As noted, qualitative approaches allow researchers to “meet people on their own terms”. An ethical implication of this is that wider exposure of those terms can be a sensitive matter. They may result in disclosure of illicit survival strategies or other “sensitive secrets”. The process of scaling-up findings may also involve an erasure of the fine-grained experiences of research participants, potentially resulting in misrepresentation or misuse of findings. Qualitative research therefore entails a balancing act between an ethical obligation to address existing vulnerabilities and a risk of producing new ones.

Strategic implications for research-to-policy translation and scaling: There was a consensus among workshop participants on the need for a self-reflective stance. Scholars engaging their research in crisis mitigation need to carefully hold up their knowledge about vulnerabilities against knowledge about solutions; what factors will research(ers) realistically be able to influence? how well do research findings match policy needs? When developing recommendations, specific recommendations should be the goal, and recommendations should focus on existing agendas, actors, and needs. It should also be an aim to establish mechanisms for horizontal knowledge sharing and to work with those willing, whether organizations, policymakers, or politicians. Furthermore, it should be an aim to bridge the divide between qualitative and quantitative approaches when collaborating toward policy development.

Scaling Research for Urban Governance

This session comprised two on-screen presentations.

ROME (Maria Vaccaro)

Dr Vaccaro described how her team of researchers had collaborated with different local stakeholders in the city of Rome and been able to uncover new forms of vulnerability emerging in the context of Covid-19. She pointed to an inter-connectedness between vulnerabilities: those directly related to the pandemic in terms of getting sick from Covid-19, and vulnerabilities resulting more indirectly from lock-down measures, such as exacerbated social isolation, suspension of regular controls and monitoring of chronic health conditions, negative economic impact with ensuing negative life-style consequences and adverse health impact. In terms of lessons learned, Dr Vaccaro stressed that if pandemic vulnerability proved to be multi-dimensional, interventions must be multidimensional too. The sharing of knowledge and

experiences between stakeholders is critical, as is the ability to incorporate lessons learnt into expedient revisions of policies. Dr Vaccaro suggested that these lessons may have come across with greater force and clarity because of the context of urban governance in which she and her team operated, a point to bear in mind more widely when scaling policy for future pandemic scenarios.

PARIS (Léa Filoche)

Madame Léa Filoche, *Adjointe à la maire de Paris en charge des solidarités, de la lutte contre les inégalités et l'exclusion*, had recorded a video specifically for the workshop on the case of Paris. The Deputy Mayor told of her office's work with solidarity in the struggle against inequalities and exclusion, and how this work had been affected and developed in the context of the Covid-19 crisis. Madame Filoche described how the lockdowns had profoundly altered some sectors of activity in Paris. Sectors of employment related to cultural and sporting events, along with tourism, catering, and the hotel industry, all normally provide many primarily low-skilled jobs. Madame Filoche explained how many people employed in these sectors had sought the social facilities that her office would support; facilities, which under normal circumstances were geared to a rather different group of users. To handle these circumstances, an "observatory" had been set up to monitor the situation, aiming to better understand and manage the extended effects of the pandemic at local levels. In the context of this observatory, SoNAR-Global team of the Pasteur Institute had been collaborating with the mayor's office. Madame Filoche expressed her deep appreciation of this collaboration and stressed the need both for the continued improvement of methods and analyses in this work, and for a wider sharing of knowledge in this domain across municipal administrations both within France and in Europe more widely.

Roundtable Discussion

A roundtable, chaired by Professor David Napier, was designed to foster reflection on the workshop's key objective of addressing how to approach the translation (scaling) of qualitative research into policy intervention considering the country presentations provided earlier. The panellists were invited to identify one or two key challenges that perhaps had not been sufficiently addressed by S_G partners, and to reflect on one or more of the following issues:

1. Strengths and weaknesses of qualitative research in

relation to scaling up for policy translation.

2. Scope and limitations of policy translation when using and/or scaling such research.
3. Ethical implications and obligations embedded in using sensitive research for policy.
4. Strategic implications for research-to-policy translation and scaling at national and global levels.

Michel Dückers, highlighted the ability to achieve in-depth understandings of local situation as a great strength of qualitative research. He called for modesty and careful reflection regarding what research can realistically influence, also in terms of the limited capabilities of collaborating partners. Moreover, he stressed the importance of a continuous dialogue between qualitative and quantitative methods, and with stakeholders such as policy officials, practitioners and people affected by potential policy interventions. He argued that while S-G partners by now have achieved considerable insights in terms of Covid-19 related vulnerabilities, they do not yet sufficiently know the domain of implementation, which is equally important when bringing research to bear in practical terms.

Jyoti Joshi took leverage in her experience working with the International Centre for Anti-microbial Resistance Solutions (ICARS). Dr Joshi stressed the need for a common language between researchers and policy makers. Qualitative research, she argued, is complex to translate into something that will appeal to non-researchers. In contrast, the numbers generated by quantitative research appear more familiar and intelligible to a wider audience. Qualitative and quantitative approaches do not compete, but researchers can become better at bringing qualitative research to bear in contexts such as the Covid-19 crisis. She highlighted how community engagement can be greatly enhanced via qualitative approaches. In this regard, she cautioned against the divide between the academy and implementation sector. She advised that this divide must be bridged, and that each researcher must strive to better communicate relevant findings to e.g., journalists and politicians. In this context she also pointed out that scaling may not only focus on politicians as target audience. Translation of qualitative research can also be target institutions such as think-tanks and foundations, which focus on or fund relevant initiatives.

Charlotte Ersbøll also advocated for a common language and pointed out that one way in which qualitative research can achieve this is by qualifying political action. She referred to the

Cities Changing Diabetes project and the approach taken in this context to make policy makers realize the need for a broad approach. By developing exemplary case stories based on qualitative research, they were able to convince politicians of how experiences of loneliness were related to a prevalent lack of proper treatment of diabetes. They were able to qualify the argument that diabetes was more than just a biomedical problem and that treating diabetes properly had much to do with socio-economic circumstances that politicians need to take seriously too. Ms Ersbøll also pointed to the potential for expanding target audiences for qualitative findings beyond government context, e.g., in corporate contexts.

Emi Michael approached the issue of translation and scaling by summarising her work with developing qualitative indicators as measures of impact in terms of health and inclusivity. Dr Michael highlighted how there is often a tendency to think of scale in terms of large numbers of people, whereas in terms of initiatives promoting health and inclusion her experience pointed to often smaller and more specialized projects, which had a longer-lasting impact. The kind of indicators she was developing for the Impact Unit of the journal *The Economist* help politicians and others appreciate such more complex dimensions of impact. Based on a combined quantitative and qualitative approach, the indicators suggest not only what a given problem is from a quantitative perspective, but also why it may exist based on qualitative data. The indicators allow for an exploration of the dynamics of health and inclusivity problems, the interaction of such dynamics, and they ideally yield a better understanding of how more dynamically to implement change in specific environments.

Sharon Abramowitz pointed to a range of potential problems to be aware of when wanting to engage qualitative research for purposes of harm-mitigation. She mentioned the difficulties entailed in achieving the effects desired when setting out to help. Dr Abramowitz highlighted how the most successful examples of community engagement informed by qualitative research was those instances where communities had been involved in co-producing recommendations with researchers from the outset. Even so, researchers should still be prepared to encounter scepticism when working with governing institutions. In this context she also alerted the audience to be aware of competition, which in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic included analysis of social media that seemingly address similar issues but without a solid empirical basis.

Peter Iversen, a health economist, offered his perspectives on the prejudices about what data do and do not do. Iversen

remarked that the numbers, rows, and columns he had seen in some presentations in the morning had “made him feel extremely comfortable”. Dr Iversen’s point, based on his experience with municipal governance in Denmark, was that people have habits in terms of the formatting or appearance of information, and such appearances in their own right can make a critical difference in terms of how information is received. He pointed to the importance of targeting the intended audience for scaled-up qualitative research with information carefully calibrated for this particular audience. Dr Iversen also stressed that while information provided should not be “perfect”, the timing of its delivery was important, and where possible it should be feasible to incorporate such information easily into already existing administrative procedures and political agendas.

Plenary discussion

Andreas Roepstorff started the plenary discussion by reflecting on some of the roundtable remarks on the significance of data-reception and social media. Prof. Roepstorff took a point of departure in a summary of the approach to this matter in the HOPE project. Part of the HOPE focus was on how media output on Covid-19 were being received among policy makers and in the public sphere. This focus covered quantitative data and social media output on Covid 19, but also came to comprise attention to how the HOPE project’s own findings were received among policy makers. Roepstorff suggested a general need for a feedback component in the conception of scaling research to policy whereby researchers are made more keenly aware of how use of data can affect the conditions under study. As he put it: “ideally, you need to be in a situation where you can look at the implications [of policy translation] and bring that into the analysis”. Another participant put it this way: “We need to stop worrying about the unintended consequences of making policy recommendations. At worst, there *will* be unintended consequences, but then you *learn*, and can adjust”.

It was suggested that the ethnography of policy processes, a sub-field of anthropological specialization, could be incorporated as part of the endeavour when aiming to develop policy recommendations. A related point concerned the diversity of ambitions that may impinge in practical contexts of governance. As one participant put it, “We tend to assume that everyone wants the same as we do. We need instead to adopt a multi stakeholder perspective. Sometimes gains in terms of health might be a co-benefit of something else”. Several participants offered

examples in this regard.

A fair amount of attention was also devoted to the theme of marginalization. Existing patterns of marginalization tend to delimit the kinds of qualitative input that polity may be receptive to. Among other examples, Denmark was mentioned, where media and policy attention related to Covid-19 was hard to direct towards ethnic minorities' needs, as this topic receives limited positive interest in Danish mainstream media and polity.

A recurring point was the need to carefully tailor qualitative data translation by way of clearly delimited messages to policy makers to create more forceful messages. As one remarked, researchers tend to prioritize complex accounts to provide a fuller picture. They need instead to deliver a powerful message by keeping things clear and simple. This also concerns the background of recipients. As one participant put it, "People are in politics for different reasons. Different things will trigger what they care about. So, find your people - who cares about your thing". This point was also argued in the context of collaborating with local organizations, often driven by the passion of particular individuals.

Group work: Synthesis

The Group Work session aimed to help collectively synthesize and develop reflections on scaling qualitative research for policy intervention. Each group was asked to engage with two themes: One task was to develop guiding principles for translation of ethnography into policy; the other task was to address the question of what SoNAR-Global should seek to scale, and why.

The first group highlighted "factor analysis" as an important guiding principle. As an example, they highlighted three domains - the individual level, the systems level, and the underlying level - in terms of which to think of factors. In factor analysis as envisioned here, factors from all levels should be considered simultaneously as a guiding principle when translating research into policy to capture the interrelatedness of factors. Such analysis should also accommodate the fact of multiplicity in pandemic contexts (yet a guiding principle), e.g., in terms of vulnerability, types of engagement and mitigating action. Another guiding principle defined the prioritization of efficiency in ways which also take a wider moral economy into consideration rather than thinking about translating endeavours exclusively in terms of state-level policy. This perspective encompasses the domain of research, here considered a public

good.

The second group highlighted the importance of a holistic approach to translation as a guiding principle and emphasized “engagement and ownership” when translating ethnography into policy. They noted that policy itself can be a domain of vulnerability in pandemic contexts, so fostering engagement and ownership through the translation of research can make an important difference. This group distinguished between “scaling out” in terms of expanding the geographical reach, “scaling up” in terms of institutional layers, and “scaling deep” in terms of addressing long term structural, relational issues and dynamics. This distinction helped define what to scale and why. The group also proposed that qualitative researchers may be better able to contribute to mitigating harm by asking the right questions to readjust the *focus* of interventions rather than seeing the task as one of scaling solutions.

The third group highlighted the translation process as one that itself needed to be objectified as a guiding principle for translation. They argued that the success of translation must be measured in terms of intended effects, which can only be monitored and adjusted if the process is part of the qualitative research focus. The group conceived of this as an iterative process, where a variety of dimensions could become subjected to more detailed scrutiny, ranging from the reception of research substance and prose among the target audience; to considering the empowering potential of translation. Does translation of research into policy, at the end of the day, empower those whom our research concerns?

Conclusion

The two-day workshop on “Beyond Measure” enabled participants to share experiences within this specialized domain of expertise, and to systematically address the objectives during and beyond the meeting. The combination of bringing researchers and stakeholders together with a comprehensive international dataset as a common focus point enabled in-depth discussions and reflections that could not have been achieved otherwise.

The workshop also provided an eminent opportunity for S-G partners to receive feedback on WP7 by eminent experts in policy translation, while exploring comparative potentials both across participating countries and relative to similar research done elsewhere.

In terms of immediately actionable initiatives emanating

from the workshop, it was agreed that a position paper should be developed on the topic of scaling qualitative research for policy intervention to be submitted for publication in continuation of the workshop.

S-G members will have access to participate in the development of a new research infrastructure (ISIDORE) targeting the coordination and integration of pandemic related research across Europe, as well as work towards coordinating other new research initiatives extending topically from the workshop.

Appendix A: List of Participants

Sharon Abramowitz (University College London) UK
Jean-Paul Baldacchino (University of Malta) MALTA
Uršula Lipovec Čebtron (University of Ljubljana) SLOVENIA
Michel Dückers (Netherlands Institute for Health Services Research) NETHERLANDS
Charlotte Ersbøll (Hansen & Ersbøll Agenda) DENMARK
Paul Grohma (Medical University of Vienna) AUSTRIA
Mette Terp Høybye (Aarhus University) DENMARK
Peter Iversen (Steno Diabetes Center) DENMARK
Jyoti Joshi (International Centre for Antimicrobial Resistance Solutions) DENMARK
Jens Kjaerulff (Aarhus University) DENMARK
Benedetta Lana (Institut Pasteur) FRANCE
Emi Michael (The Economist Impact Unit) UK
David Napier (University College London) UK
Gisella Orsini (University of Malta) MALTA
Jacob Osborne (Netherlands Institute for Health Services Research) NETHERLANDS
Andreas Roepstorff (Aarhus University) DENMARK
Maurice Said (University of Malta) MALTA
Jens Seeberg (Aarhus University) DENMARK
Anna Volkmann (University College London) UK
Ivana Vrkić (Aarhus University) DENMARK
Zeliha Öcek (Ludwig-Maximilians-University) GERMANY

Virtual participation

Léa Filoche (Adjointe à la maire de Paris) FRANCE
Tamara Giles-Vernick (Institut Pasteur) FRANCE
Ketty Vaccaro (Censis Foundation, Rome) ITALY

Appendix B: Roundtable Panellists

Sharon Abramowitz (University College London) UK

Michel Dückers (Netherlands Institute for Health Services
Research) NETHERLANDS

Charlotte Ersbøll (Hansen & Ersbøll Agenda) DENMARK

Peter Iversen (Steno Diabetes Center) DENMARK

Jyoti Joshi (International Centre for Antimicrobial Resistance
Solutions) DENMARK

Emi Michael (The Economist Impact Unit) UK

David Napier (University College London) UK

Andreas Roepstorff (Aarhus University) DENMARK

Appendix 3: Organizing Committee

David Napier, Director, UCL Science, Medicine and
Society Network, University College London

Anna-Maria Volkmann, UCL Research Lead Cities
Changing Diabetes, University College London

Tamara Giles-Vernick, Director of Research, Head,
Anthropology & Ecology of Disease Emergence, Unit (U5) Institut
Pasteur, Paris

Jens Seeberg, Director, Centre for Biosocial Inquiries,
Aarhus University (Chair)

Jens Kjaerulff, Research Assistant, Dept. of Anthropology,
Aarhus University (Secretary)

Appendix 4: Programme

4 April

- 15:00-19:00 Arrival
19:00- Dinner

5 April

- 9:00-10:00 Welcome and presentation of the programme
Jens Seeberg, Anna-Maria Volkmann, A. David Napier
- 10:00-11:00 Qualitative research and scaling:
Vulnerabilities during the Corona pandemic.
Chair Anna Maria Volkmann
France: Tamara Giles-Vernick & Benedetta Lana; Malta: Jean-Paul Baldacchino; Germany: Zeliha Öcek
- 11:00-11:15 BREAK
- 11:15:12:00 (cont.)
Slovenia: Uršula Lipovec Čebren; Denmark: Mette Terp Høybye & Jens Seeberg
- 12:00-13:30 LUNCH (until 13:00) and optional fresh air
- 13:30-14:00 Scaling research for urban governance
Chair Jens Seeberg
Ketty Maria Vaccaro, Director of Research, Head, Health and welfare area, Censis Foundation (online)
Léa Filoche, Adjointe à la maire de Paris en charge des solidarités, de la lutte contre les inégalités et l'exclusion (video)
- 14:00-15:30 Roundtable: Scaling
Facilitator: A. David Napier & Andreas Roepstorff
Participants: Michel Dückers, Sharon Abramowitz, Emi Michael, Peter Iversen, Jyoti Joshi, Charlotte Ersbøll
- 15:30-16:00 Break
- 16:00-16:30 Observations from the roundtable and plenary discussion

A. David Napier and Andreas Roepstorff

16:30-19:00 Networking and informal activities

19:00- Dinner

6 April

9:00-11:00 Group work: Identifying strategic elements of scaling up qualitative research

11:00-12:00 Plenary – next steps

12:00-12:15 Vote of Thanks

12:15-13:30 Lunch, followed by departure