

## eCHOing Interview Guide

*“We, in eCHOing, believe in the “recovery of cultural heritage through higher education and open innovation.”*

*“We need to listen to our stakeholders”* Dr. George Papaioannou

Based on Aksel Tjora's theory, which is based on SDI (stepwise-deductive-inductive method), this interview guide will consist of some specific questions about Open Innovation and cooperation between cultural organizations (CHOs) and institutions working with higher education (HEIs). According to Tjora, the reason why such an approach could contribute positively to the project is that such a model provides *"a good starting point for systematics and progress in a qualitative research project, not least the possibility of planning a step-by-step plan with various milestones along the way"*. This is described in more detail in Tjora's book called "Qualitative Research Methods". (Tjora, 2021, p 20)

An interview guide based on this concept allows in-depth interviews to retrieve more concrete and pointed information than through a survey. A phenomenological approach will help to ensure that the human needs and experiences of the interviewees are brought to light. The challenges with surveys are that you do not get the complete results as the feedback is text-based. Based on the Norwegian feedback on the survey regarding questions about OI, it would be useful to interview more museum employees and employees in higher education about what they really think about OI. This is based on the fact that much of the foundation of eCHOing lies in work through OI. It will also be interesting to go more in depth about the problems caused by Covid-19, based on the feedback received through the survey.

An in-depth interview with a deductive-inductive approach will ensure that even more complete results are obtained, which in turn can be encoded using Nvivo. Then you can ensure that your findings are validated through an analytical operation. This will help anchor the needs of the various CHOs and HEIs more scientifically through applying the method. A pilot interview will be conducted before the actual round of interviews begins. This will help to ensure that the interview guide is adapted and, if necessary, wording of questions changed. The challenge is that you have a certain amount of information, but you want to avoid asking the same questions that were asked in the survey. An alternative is to ask some main questions that can be followed up with sub-questions. Below are some of the questions from the survey about OI and cooperation between CHOs and HEIs. The deductive bit, i.e. what we already know, should not govern the inductive part of the interview where the interviewees get to express their needs and wishes. One method that could be used is "grounded theory" where interviewees are freely allowed to speak without there being any questions that steer the conversation in the direction towards OI and cooperation. This is a challenging process where you can direct the interviewees towards what you want to get answers to, but that you let the interviewees have the talk time afterwards. Grounded theory can provide many good answers that can create an even more total understanding of what one wants to find out. The choice of method depends a lot on what information you already have. When the starting point for an interview comes from the results of a survey, you can see the benefit of using SDI for reasons of time spent as a starting point. It may be an option to use grounded theory later in the process with some selected key people who have not already been interviewed, as it can yield results beyond what was revealed through SDI.

These are points that a pilot interview will help define further. Some interviewees prefer open-ended questions, while some want to get it more pointed. Tjora points out in her book that research on the corona pandemic benefits more from using qualitative studies. It can help ensure that complex psychological, cultural and social factors affected by lockdowns, isolation and uncertainty can be mapped in a more meaningful way than through bar charts. (Tjora, 2021, p 45)

Language barriers are an important factor to bear in such a process. One needs to make use of the form of communication that allows interviewees to express their full meaning with all words and phrases that correspond to what they want to convey. English is a language that many master, but which many also lack the complete understanding of. You can probably better put your feelings into words in the language you have as your mother tongue.

## **Thoughts on relevant questions**

Based on these questions, it will be useful to allow the interviewees to explain in even more detail on "the whys", i.e. why. Through a slightly more critical angle on the questions, you will be able to get answers that give more "meat on the bone". Here, it may be that some slightly large questions with subsections will be enough to meet the need for information. One needs to identify if the interviewee has completed the survey before one chooses amongst the first questions. One tip could be to explain the different Open Innovation activities to the ones who haven't completed the survey, or if they do not remember the content of the survey. Examples of questions are posted below, but this is a semi structured guide, and it can be adjusted with other questions. The key is to use this type of questions in order to unlock the most useful information for the project:

### **1. Which questions from the survey were the most challenging to answer?**

Subsections/follow-up questions:

What does Open Innovation mean to you and which Open Innovation activities would be best suited for your institution?

(Hackathon, Maker movement, Crowdfunding, Social media, Digital games, Researcher`s night, Training course, Citizen science event)

Sub-points: Collaborative culture, innovation, sustainability, forward-looking, eCHOing, webinar

**2. In your view, who is responsible for solving challenges that arise during crises?**

Subsections: Covid, war, access to museums/institutions, dissemination.

**3. How did the lockdown affect your organization's cultural heritage dissemination**

Sub-points: Did you have to close completely?

Could you let in any visitors?

Could you share the collection or parts of the collection digitally?

**4. What do you feel will be the solution to ensure that lockdown of society does not compromise cultural heritage and access to it?**

Subsections: Digitalisation, more frequent collaboration between museums/institutions and schools, anchoring cultural heritage in education?

**5. What does your organization need to ensure that cultural heritage becomes relevant in the future?**

Sub-points: Humanities vs sciences, why should young people choose a profession in the field of cultural heritage dissemination? Who can contribute to your organization?

**6. Why do you think OI is a term that many people don't have a complete understanding of?**

Sub-points: Open and innovative, unstructured, working without frameworks, who should teach young people about OI, who should teach experienced communicators about new ways of working.

**7. In your opinion, why hasn't a more formal collaboration been established between CHOs and HEIs regarding OI?**

Sub-points: Economy, collaborative culture, time pressure and different expectations.

**Mapping**

Question	Name of the AP
A short description of your organization, staff numbers and main goals.	
What are your main end-users? Audience type of public, who do you appeal to with your work?	
If you were to collaborate with a small group of students from eCHOing which type of Open Innovation would you be interested in?	
Any particular ideas and needs we need to consider for such a collaboration?	
Name and email of the person we can contact for such a collaboration!	
Comments	