

# **anveṣak**

**A bi-annual journal**

**VOL. 51, No. 1 (I) July - December 2021**



**Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research**

Thaltej Road, Ahmedabad - 380 054, India

<b>Introduction : Issues of Infrastructure Development in India</b> Jayshree Shah	<b>1-16</b>
<b>Irrigation Infrastructure in India : Nature of Development and Consequences</b> A.S.Patel, H.P. Trivedi	<b>17-30</b>
<b>Development Management in H.M. Metropolitan Periphery : A Case of and Turush Chandra Western Ahmedabad</b> Shivanand Swamy, V.P.Bharadwaj	<b>31-44</b>
<b>Estimate of Marginal Propensity to Consume in the Indian Economy -An Econometric Exercise</b> M. Upendra Venkateswarlu	<b>45-59</b>
<b>Changes in the Trend and Structure of Fiscal Expenditure in Gujarat</b> Archana R. Dholakia	<b>60-71</b>
<b>Law of Proportionate Effect- An Empirical Testing</b> Kuldip Kaur	<b>72-86</b>
<b>An Exploration on the Suitability and Acceptability of "The Surveyplanet" App as a Tool for collecting Qualitative Data during an Online Survey</b> Abhishek Dikshit	<b>87-95</b>
<b>Book Review</b>	
<b>Economic Reform in Europe and the Former Soviet Union : Implications for International Food Markets</b> S.N.Joshi	<b>96-104</b>
<b>Cooperative Management of Natural Resources</b> Anita Arya	<b>105-102</b>
<b>State and Poor : Public Policy and Political Development in India and the United States</b> Rohit Shukla	<b>102-120</b>

## **An Exploration On The Suitability And Acceptability Of "The Surveyplanet" App As A Tool For Collecting Qualitative Data During An Online Survey**

**Dr. Abhishek Dikshit**

Associate Professor

A.E.S' Anekant Institute of Management Studies (AIMS), Baramati

### **Abstract**

Advances in data collection apps open up new avenues for directing qualitative research. "SurveyPlanet", an innovative online survey platform, has several distinguishing categories that increase its possible application to "qualitative" and "mixed-methods" investigators. Despite the investigation into the usage of data gathering apps in research, few studies have looked into the perspectives of both investigators and contributors on the use of apps and other online survey platforms. Furthermore, information on the assistance and problems of using "SurveyPlanet" as a "data collection method" is scarce. To enhance understanding of its appropriateness for "qualitative and mixed-methods" investigators, the researcher investigates the viability and suitability of using "SurveyPlanet" to gather "qualitative" discussion statistics in a doctoral exploration background in this study. He interviewed 26 Ph.D. program guides via "online qualitative interviews" about their "SurveyPlanet" familiarities while simultaneously recording investigator observations. Despite some technical difficulties, most participants rated "SurveyPlanet" higher than other interrogating means such as "face-to-face", telephone, and extra online survey "services, platforms, and products". The judgments indicate "SurveyPlanet"'s practicability as an instrument for qualitative data gathering due to its comparative "ease of use", "cost-effectiveness", "data management features", and "security" selections. Additional investigation into the usefulness of "SurveyPlanet" is suggested to analytically evaluate and headway novelties in "online methods".

**Keywords:** "SurveyPlanet", Qualitative Investigation, Data Collection Tools, Online Surveys

### **Background**

Because of the necessity to involve numerous "stakeholder groups" & interconnect with "geographically" detached persons in backgrounds with restricted "resources", a study on advances and innovations in data collection online methods is especially important in many research contexts (Brayda & Boyce, 2014). However, keeping up with rapidly changing research data collection apps can be difficult for researchers (Gul et al., 2020). As a result, the possible usefulness of "online platforms" as investigation "tools" may go unnoticed & unutilized. Given the noteworthy possibility of "online" research data collection apps to support qualitative data collection (Kaushal, R. 2020, pp. 69-71), more investigation into contributor and investigator insights and involvements with "online" approaches and exact apps are needed. When discussing these online methods, they are frequently discussed in conjunction with other Internet research data collection apps such as "instant messaging services" or "online focus groups" (Gul et al., 2020). It has been observed that online platforms that use "Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) apps" are highly valued by researchers (Kevin, B. 2005). "Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) apps" differ significantly from both asynchronous and synchronous online interviewing methods in that they permit for "real-time interaction" with "sound, video, and, in some cases, written text" (Nayak et. al., 2019). As a result, such apps mimic aspects of

in-person interviews while providing exclusive benefits, tests, and reflections. Notwithstanding benefits like suitability and interactivity, "qualitative" investigators have raised several "ethical, practical, and interactional" concerns about the usage of "VoIP apps like Skype" (Oakley et. al., 2019).

### **"Surveyplanet" As A Research Tool**

The ability of "SurveyPlanet" to steadily "record and store" meetings without the use of "third-party software" is a noteworthy benefit. This "feature" is particularly significant in an investigation, where extremely subtle statistics must be safeguarded (Sara & Linda, 2021). The likelihood that "VoIP" apps like "SurveyPlanet" can advance the "qualitative data collection" know-hows of investigators and contributors has yet to be validated. Subjective evaluations of interview data quality have yet to be investigated. According to Wright, "participants' experiences and assessments of the process have received far less attention" (Kevin, B. 2005). The researcher recognizes the need to overcome impediments to improving "interview quality" and investigating original exploration uses. "SurveyPlanet" research evaluating its utility as a "platform" for "qualitative data collection" can inform choices around its potential "application" as well as approaches for overcoming "context- or platform "exact problems to upkeep "positive" collaborations amongst investigators & survey contributors.

### **Method**

For this study, Ph.D. program guides were chosen. Initially, the researcher intended to invite between 10 and 32 Ph.D. program guides registered with a renowned top public Maharashtra university to join in "two to four focus groups", which would be "held in-person or virtually". The preliminary course was aided by Research Centers affiliated with the chosen university and was followed by a "snowball" approach involving participating Ph.D. guides. Because the initial request for participation process was slow, there were insufficient participants for "focus groups". As a consequence, the researcher modified his strategy. To retain the Ph.D. program guides for data collection, the researcher began to consider "virtual one-on-one interviews". The researcher predicted that by by means of "online" research data collection "software", he would be competent to repeat the know-how of "face-to-face interviews" (Swoboda et. al., 1997). The researcher also expected that by using apps, he would be able to broaden his geographical reach by expanding his request strategy beyond Maharashtra, India (Sara & Linda, 2021). Previously, the researcher had asked 22 Ph.D. program guides "to participate in three focus groups (two in-person and one virtual, conducted using "SurveyPlanet")" as part of a related research project. It gave him cause to trust that "SurveyPlanet" could be a viable technique for collecting "interview-based data". The selected "University's Higher Research Ethics Committee" also "reapproved" the reread request for the participation plan. Furthermore, the researcher raised the token recompense to probable contributors to return the "time spent on the interview", & he endorsed the "study nationally" through an extensively spread "university e-newsletter" of a chosen university. Before the interview, the researcher got "written informed consent" from all contributors and collected demographic data via SurveyMonkey. The researchers "interviewed the participants" through "SurveyPlanet". All meetings were "audio and videotaped", & contributors "verbally" confirmed their approval proceeding to the "interviews". The "interviews" centered on how contributors perceived the use of survey and data analytic software. The participants were then asked to rank order various tools based on their preferences. Finally, "four open-ended questions" about their "SurveyPlanet"" know-how were posed to contributors. A "5-point Likert-type response format" was used in it to rate important "technical" features of "SurveyPlanet"" ("video quality, sound quality, and live feed lags") (Brayda & Boyce, 2014). For referencing and confidentiality purposes, each participant was given a unique identifier. All "interview" records were skillfully transliterated "verbatim by a third-party

Vol. 51, No.1 July –Dec 2021

provider" to support laborious investigations (Gul et. al, 2020). The investigator also assessed their familiarities by "conducting" each "interview" using a homogeneous "assessment form" ("Supplementary Table 1"). The investigator compiled "demographic survey" responses & "calculated descriptive statistics" for the "sample". The researcher self-reliantly "analyzed the four open-ended responses" using "content analysis" & "qualitative" narratives, consulting with the researcher to deliberate and "cross-compare" understandings. Using Microsoft Excel software, responses on a "Likert-type scale" were examined, and "descriptive statistics" were generated.

## Results

The researcher conducted "SurveyPlanet" interviews with 26 Ph.D. program guides between March and August of this year 2021. The interviews ranged in length from 60 to 102 minutes (M = 76 minutes; SD = 20 minutes). The "majority" of the contributors were "females" concerning the "ages" of 45 and 54. The "majority" of the participants earned their degrees more than 22 years ago. The "majority" of respondents were from key Indian towns, but there were a few from local and distant areas as well. The "demographics of the contributors" are shown in "Table 1". The "findings" are separated into two subdivisions that reflect the key benefits and drawbacks of "SurveyPlanet" as professed by investigators and contributors. "Table 2" displays the "ratings" for "video quality, sound quality, and lag" given by investigators and contributors.

Insert Table 1 and Table 2 Here

### Benefits Of Using "Surveyplanet"

Overall, researchers and participants agreed that "SurveyPlanet" was a good way to conduct qualitative interviews. In comparison to "in-person interviews", phone calls, or other online surveys "platforms", the majority of participants (79%) chose "SurveyPlanet". As interviewee participants, Ph.D. program guides frequently mentioned the following benefits of using "SurveyPlanet" for "qualitative" interviews, "reflecting impersonal, technical, and logistical considerations: (1) rapport, (2) convenience, (3) simplicity, and (4) user-friendliness" are all important considerations.

Many participants (79%) thought "SurveyPlanet" was useful for establishing and keeping a bond with the investigator, particularly when likened to "nonvisual" research data collection "mediums" such as the "phone or e-mail". Participants frequently cited the "ability to see the researcher and respond to nonverbal cues" as a vital part of creating bonds, "building" relational networks, or toting "a personal touch" (Q1). Investigators too frequently acknowledged the "ability to respond to nonverbal cues such as facial expressions and gestures" as significant for easing "engagement, building trust, and promoting natural, relaxed conversation". In several "cases", investigators found that "being able to see the caller and respond to body language" eased a "lively and engaging" conversation, mainly when contributors were acquainted with "online-survey technology". This, according to the investigators, enabled the collection of a large amount of data. Some participants (54%) mentioned "SurveyPlanet"'s "screen and file-sharing options" as significant benefits that eased "greater engagement" & reinforced "rapport". As the "current study" required contributors to "view and evaluate" a sequence of "screening tools", they found the "ability to view PowerPoint slides in real-time" to be very beneficial. Although many contributors favored "SurveyPlanet" to "asynchronous telephone or e-mail interviews", some specified that they would have favored "meet in person if possible" due to nearness, but saw "SurveyPlanet" as "the next best thing" (Q13) given "time constraints, geographical distance, and other logistical considerations". Contributors who favored "face-to-face interviews" stated a "strong interest" in & "trust" in "digital apps". "I might come in and talk face to face, but I'm old school and I like face to face things, and this is the closest thing I can get to face to face," one participant said.

Accessibility, timeliness, and cost-effectiveness are all advantages of using Ph.D. program guides. Convenience was frequently cited as a key advantage of "SurveyPlanet" by participants, principally in terms of "access to geographically remote participants, cost-effectiveness, and time effectiveness". Given their distant locality, hectic work schedules, and the possibility of "noisy or distracting" "working environments", more than "half" of the contributors (66 percent) identified "time effectiveness" as a major advantage ("time is a precious moment for everybody... if this works, go this way," Q8). Contributors also cited "reduced travel expenses" and "the lack of up-front setup costs for basic plans" as crucial assistances of "SurveyPlanet". Likewise, as advantages of "using" "SurveyPlanet" for data collection, investigators recognized "increased flexibility in when and where interviews can be conducted", as well as "cost savings from reduced or eliminated travel or venue hire expenses". "SurveyPlanet"'s potential for "greater reach" in employing contributors from local and distant areas (countrywide and internationally) was also documented as a noteworthy benefit over old-style "face-to-face methods" by the respondent Ph.D. program guides. The ability to engage formerly unreachable contributors can increase investigation by widening the extensiveness of viewpoints embodied, thereby maximizing investigation energy when inadequate funds are accessible, according to Ph.D. program guides (e.g., "time, money").

For qualitative interviews, more than "half" of the contributors (66 percent) quoted "SurveyPlanet"'s "simplicity and user-friendliness" as vital benefits over "webinars and other web conferencing platforms" such as "Skype". As vital "platform" strengths, contributors mentioned "SurveyPlanet"'s "ease of connection, intuitive functionality (simplicity), and robust but simple privacy and security options (including the ability to manage user and call metadata, secure webinar options, and secure recording on local devices or remote servers)". Many participants compared the "ease with which they securely logged into" "SurveyPlanet" "using a standard username" to their problematic familiarities "logging into Skype". "Yeah, it seemed a little easier to connect than Skype, which we use a lot at the practice and there's always a problem with passwords and everything else. It can be a nightmare at times, but overall, it's a pretty good system". (Q12) "SurveyPlanet appears to be a lot simpler and easier to use than Skype... I had a lot more trouble getting Skype to work... like you have to be registered and logged in and all that, whereas here I didn't have to do as much logging in. (Q11)". "As we will see in the following section", investigators & contributors initially writhed to "connect". Prior independent testing of the system, according to one participant, "may be a way of developing familiarity and competency with the technology and thus learning how to overcome technical difficulties during recorded interviews". "I went on last night just to make sure everything was in working order and to test the sound... So, yeah, very straightforward... It all went off without a hitch. No, there will be no difficulties. (Q4) Zero's challenges"

### **Difficulties Of "Using Surveyplanet"**

Even though the "majority" of contributors preferred "SurveyPlanet" as their favorite "interview" technique, the subsequent issues were recognized as "platform challenges", replicating problems with "call connection and audio or video reliability and quality".

Regardless of ruling "SurveyPlanet" to be spontaneous & accessible, the "majority" of contributors (89 percent) "experienced some trouble joining the session". "Low Internet bandwidth, obsolete hardware, and/or limited webcam and/or microphone functionality" were all common "technical" issues. These challenges were mostly felt by participants rather than researchers, most likely due to differences in "SurveyPlanet" familiarity or "access" to dependable, "high-speed Internet". Contributors frequently voiced "frustration" when undergoing "technical" problems, particularly when the problems continued for some "minutes". These dissatisfactions were characteristically related to contributors' apparent "technical abilities" ("I'm just not good at audio, that's all," Q15) or

"contemporary technological demands" ("You've gotta be a computer genius these days, haven't you?" Q8). Despite momentous worries in linking with contributors, these problems did not seem to have a "long-term" influence on investigators' & contributors' contentment with the "technical quality of the call", as specified by "ratings" of "sound quality, video quality, and lags in a live feed". Rather, investigators revealed that the lengthy joint problem-solving process involved in the technical difficulties frequently resulted in unintended benefits in terms of rapport building. After a long period of "resolving" numerous problems at the beginning of the "session", one contributor observed, "We did it. That was just a practice run for someone else" (Q8). A different contributor termed the "interview as a learning experience and expressed gratitude to the researcher for the opportunity to learn": "It's all good learning... you know, it's all stuff that, you know, it's good to know because this is what everyone does." "So, thank you for the opportunity" (Q15).

After overcoming the early "technical difficulties" in "connecting the call", some contributors (25%) testified "video or audio quality" concerns "during the interview". These occurrences could have been instigated by an untrustworthy "Internet connection" or the usage of "older machines or mobile devices", causing "dropped calls, lost call connections, or lag". Two contributors informed "audio muffling", though "poor audio quality" was uncommon: "There were a couple of spots where it felt a little shaky. Muffled. (Q3) The sound gets a little muffled now and then, but I don't mind. What you were saying was still audible to me. (P1)" "Interruptions" were "occasionally" produced by "insufficient home or office setup" on the part of the contributor. Amongst the "setup issues" were "poor webcam functionality, software incompatibility, low device battery, and audio issues (e.g., the sound could not be heard without the use of headphones)". Contributors who stated these problems were inclined to "fault the problem" on their dearth of "SurveyPlanet" know-how rather than on the "technology" itself. As an instance: "The technology was fine; it was just a lack of computers that worked with audio and visual and worked, which was my fault, not SurveyPlanet's... Everything was coming to an end. (Q2)"

## Discussion

"SurveyPlanet" showed promise as a "qualitative data collection tool" that could supplement or spread "qualitative" investigators' present operational choices. Assumed the variety of "user experiences and capacities", as well as the ongoing modernizations in "digital apps" (Thunberg & Arnell, 2021), the researcher encourages investigators to employ "digital and online data collection" approaches that comprise an assessment of investigator and contributor understandings. This investigation can then be used to notify the upcoming use of "online survey apps" in terms of "contextual appropriateness, user satisfaction, and data integrity and quality". Although the researcher did not openly associate "interviews conducted using VoIP apps" with "face-to-face interviews" (Uhrenfeldt et al., 2007), notwithstanding a "high" occurrence of "technical issues", he did not "experience" any trouble informing "rapport" with contributors to the degree informed in the earlier study into "Skype interviewing". This outcome proposes that "SurveyPlanet" is "spontaneous and user-friendly on first use", creating it theoretically appropriate for use with a varied choice of contributors in a range of situations. Even though contributors met with "technical difficulties", numerous contributors credited these problems to their skill to "use technology" efficiently rather than the "SurveyPlanet" "platform's usability". Investigating "how and to what extent" contributors' "digital literacy" affects "digital qualitative data collection" could be a convenient possibility for upcoming investigation. While maximum contributors labeled "SurveyPlanet" as "spontaneous and user-friendly", the researcher trusts that providing more statistics about founding "call connections" and "equipment setup" preceding arranged meetings could progress those contributors' involvements with the "SurveyPlanet" "platform" (Vehovar & Manfreda, 2008). A "written instruction sheet" or "checklist" drawing

"common technical difficulties", for example, might be helpful to contributors, as might a "SurveyPlanet" "user guide". Such approaches might aid lessen the "time spent attempting to establish a call connection" with contributors & "improve the contributor experience", especially for those contributors who are uncertain of "how to use such technology".

We propose that encouraging participant preparation, such as through participation in a "practice session", may "improve the interview experience" by improving contributors' "online-survey proficiency and confidence". Investigators benefit significantly from the skill to firmly record "SurveyPlanet" and "interviews" in terms of "data management and security" (Thunberg & Arnell, 2021). "Individual sessions" are not "recorded by default" in "SurveyPlanet" if the "user" has beforehand allowed the "setting for automatic recording" in their "user profile". "SurveyPlanet" has lately allowed a "feature", which is presently in "beta", that reminds contributors to deliver an agreement. In terms of "recording storage", "SurveyPlanet" allows "users" to "save recordings" directly on the "host's local device" using the "local recording option", or on "SurveyPlanet"'s "cloud" by means of the "Cloud Recording option", which is only accessible to "paying customers". "Preferences" for "recording and location" can be organized in the "desktop or mobile versions" of the "SurveyPlanet" "application". Nevertheless, when using a "web browser" to "access" "SurveyPlanet", the "recording location option" is "currently unavailable". Unlike earlier studies of "web conferencing apps" (Nayak & Narayan, 2019), the researcher did not "encounter any security or privacy issues" as a consequence of "program features" such as the "ability" to request contributors "selectively and control" the sharing of "meeting access information". Given this, investigators who use "SurveyPlanet"'s "platform" to record "individual or focus group interviews" ought to be mindful that they and their organizations are accountable for informing "attendees" that the meeting will be "recorded" & earning suitable contributor consensus previous to the meeting's "start" (Uhrenfeldt et. al, 2007).

#### LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study used a comparatively "small sample" of "Ph.D. guides" with a "high level of education and professional experience" and required a "pre-interview assessment" of contributors' awareness of "SurveyPlanet" (Oakley et al.,2019). As a result, the researcher was inept to decide whether contributors' "level of comfort and self-perceptions of their ability to use the technology" amplified or diminished meaningfully "after using SurveyPlanet". This is important since the researcher revealed that 89 percent of contributors had some "difficulty joining the session". A reference line assessment of contributors' standpoints could be involved in a forthcoming investigation to see if "confidence levels" improve after interrelating with the "platform". In this study, sample's "professional background" most probably prejudiced "how Ph.D. Guides approached the task of the interview", as well as "how they handled technical setbacks" (Kaushal, R. 2020, pg. 212), which may have swayed their "SurveyPlanet" know-how. The researcher is inept to "make claims about the degree of consensus or dissent" concerning benefits & detriments amongst the "sample" because he measured contributors' skills and insights of "SurveyPlanet" through discrete "interviews". Forthcoming investigation in this expanse could look into "using OFG methods to examine user perceptions and experiences with SurveyPlanet" & alike emergent "online-survey apps". This study could deliver more "insight" into "SurveyPlanet"'s "usability in multiparty synchronous online interaction" & inspect changes in "data quality", as well as procedural concerns in "sampling and survey invitations", such as the variances amongst "one-on-one and group interview sessions". Furthermore, contrasting the difficulties & assistances of "using SurveyPlanet" for numerous contributors "simultaneously versus one-on-one interactions" could be informative.

#### Conclusions



The researcher and his team in this study praised "SurveyPlanet" technology for its "convenience, ease of use, security, interactivity, unique features (e.g., screen sharing, video record option), and ability to facilitate personal connections between users". When related to other frequently used "VoIP apps", these outcomes propose that "SurveyPlanet" may be an exceptional "platform" for meeting "qualitative" interview data. Although early "difficulties" in "forming the call" were shared, they did not seem to influence the contributor's or the investigator's sensitivity to the "quality and experience of the interview". According to the researcher, providing written instructions "before the interview and/or practice sessions" could reduce the occurrence of technical difficulties. To the top of his understanding, this is the "first study to look into the suitability of SurveyPlanet for qualitative data collection", as well as one of the first to look into the know-hows of "app-based web conferencing technology" from the viewpoints of both investigators and contributors. More investigation is desirable to make knowledgeable choices about in what way such "technology can be used to complement and supplement present qualitative methods". "SurveyPlanet" and similar apps, on the other hand, are probable to make noteworthy aids to the "conduct of qualitative research" in the prospect, given their capability to deliver better "flexibility" and widen contribution while upholding "data quality".

## References

1. Brayda, W. C., & Boyce, T. D. (2014). So you Want to Interview Me?: Navigating "Sensitive" Qualitative Research Interviewing. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 318–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691401300115>
2. Gul, Madeeha & Shera, Muhammad Azeem & Shahzad, Syed Khuram & Rahman, Habib. (2020). A survey on emergent usability attributes to enhance the usefulness of websites and mobile applications. 1-5. 10.1109/ICEET48479.2020.9048205
3. Kaushal, Rishabh (2020) User identity linkage data collection dataset biases method control and application [Doctoral Thesis. Department of Computer Science and Engineering. Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology, Delhi (IIIT-Delhi)] In IIT-Delhi Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/308938>
4. Kevin B. Wright, Researching Internet-Based Populations: Advantages and Disadvantages of Online Survey Research, Online Questionnaire Authoring Software Packages, and Web Survey Services, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, Volume 10, Issue 3, 1 April 2005, JCMC1034, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00259.x>
5. Nayak, Mudavath & K A, Narayan. (2019). Strengths and Weaknesses of Online Surveys. 24. 31-38. 10.9790/0837-2405053138.
6. Oakley-Girvan, I., Lavista, J. M., Miller, Y., Davis, S., Acle, C., Hancock, J., & Nelson, L. M. (2019). Evaluation of a Mobile Device Survey System for Behavioral Risk Factors (SHAPE): App Development and Usability Study. *JMIR formative research*, 3(1), e10246. <https://doi.org/10.2196/10246>
7. Sara Thunberg & Linda Arnell (2021) Pioneering the use of technologies in qualitative research – A research review of the use of digital interviews, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2021.1935565
8. Swoboda, W. J., Mühlberger, N., Weitkunat, R., & Schneeweiß, S. (1997). Internet Surveys by Direct Mailing: An Innovative Way of Collecting Data. *Social Science Computer Review*, 15(3), 242–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089443939701500302>

9. Thunberg, Sara & Arnell, Linda. (2021). Pioneering the use of technologies in qualitative research – A research review of the use of digital interviews. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 10.1080/13645579.2021.1935565.
10. Uhrenfeldt, L., Paterson, B., & Hall, E. O. C. (2007). Using Videorecording to Enhance the Development of Novice Researchers' Interviewing Skills. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 36–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690700600104>
11. Vehovar, V. & Manfreda, K. (2008). Overview: online surveys. In *The SAGE handbook of online research methods* (pp. 176-194). SAGE Publications, Ltd, <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857020055>

## TABLES

<b>Table 1: Participant Demographics</b>			
<b>S#</b>	<b>Characteristic</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>
1	Female	26	100
2	Age (years)		
	Less than 35	13	28.9
	36-45	12	22.6
	45-54	21	78.7
3	Years since graduation		
	Less than 5 years	11	16.4
	5-10 years	12	22.6
	11-20 years	13	28.8
	Over 20 years	20	72.4
4	<u>Location<sup>a</sup></u>		
	Major cities	21	78.9
	Inner/outer regional	13	28.7

<b>Table 2: Investigator (n=2) and Contributor (n=26) Rating of Video Quality, Sound Quality and Lag.</b>					
<b>S#</b>	<b>Quality<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Investigator Rating<sup>b</sup></b>		<b>Contributor Rating<sup>b</sup></b>	
		<b>Median</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Range</b>
1	Sound	4.1	3.5-5.5	5.1	3.5-5.5
2	Video	5.2	1.5-5.5	5.2	4.5-5.5
3	Lag	1.3	1.5-5.5	1.4	1.5-5.5
<sup>a</sup> “Sound” refers to ability to hear contributors; “video” refers to ability to see contributors; and “lag” refers to frequency of lags in live feed, audio, or video delay.					
<sup>b</sup> Specific qualities were rated using a 5 point Likert –type scale (sound/video quality: able to see or hear: 1= none of the time to 5=all of the time; Lag experienced: 1= none of the time to 5=all of the time.					