FINDINGS FROM DEDOOSE

I have used Dedoose to visualize the data we collected so far. I was able to do the following:

- Import interview transcripts and code them with pillar codes
- Create Pillar Application charts, which showed that the top 3 important pillars were the 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd}, and 6\textsuperscript{th} pillar. The least important pillars were the 10\textsuperscript{th} and 8\textsuperscript{th} pillar
- Create Pillar Co-Occurrence charts, which showed a new perspective in the relationship between pillars and how their combination creates a stronger strategy in best practices
- Export the visualized data into spreadsheets to create better visuals via Tableau
- Create Word Clouds based on the pillars of the R.E.S.I.L.I.E.N.C.E. model

After trying out Dedoose for a while, I continued to use it to discover new findings for our research.
I edited the Pillar Word Cloud by changing its alignment and its colors, but I noticed a few things:

- For some reason, the 6th pillar was not present and the 4th pillar is simply named as “Stakeholders”
- However, I’m not sure how to edit this.
- It seems that Dedoose can only create word clouds of the pillar codes.
I decided to add and code our Best Practices notes from the Atlantic City Conference to see if anything has changed.

Top 3 Pillars Mentioned:
- 2nd Pillar from 323 mentions to 332
- 3rd Pillar from 315 mentions to 323
- 6th Pillar from 307 mentions to 318

The Least Pillars Mentioned:
- 10th Pillar from 99 mentions to 107
- 8th Pillar from 105 mentions to 114

The frequency of these pillars remain the same.
- **Co-Occurrences**
  - 2nd Pillar from 689 co-occurrences to **700**
  - Pillar 3 from 654 co-occurrences to **670**
  - Pillar 6 from 599 co-occurrences to **617**
- **Top 4 pairs of pillars**
  - Pillars 4 and 6 from 168 co-occurrences to **175**
  - Pillars 2 and 3 from 148 co-occurrences to **150**
  - Pillars 3 and 9 from 135 co-occurrences to **137**
  - Pillars 2 and 7 from 116 co-occurrences to **119**
- Again, the frequency of co-occurrences among these pillars remains the same
NEW FINDING: PILLAR PRESENCE

- Dedoose can also determine which codes are present in each source of media or descriptor.
- This can be useful in determining which pillars of the R.E.S.I.L.I.E.N.C.E model are mentioned by each interviewee.
  - The 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 6th, and 7th Pillars are mentioned in all 31 interviews
  - The 9th Pillar is mentioned in 30 interviews
  - The 5th and 8th pillar were mentioned in 29 interviews
  - The 1st Pillar was mentioned in 28 interviews
  - The 10th Pillar was mentioned in 27 interviews
I added the case studies of mass casualty attacks as descriptors

First, I created a set and added each pillar as a field

Then I added each case study we’ve analyzed so far: the Sri Lanka case study, the Christchurch case study, and the Jeffersontown study.

For each descriptor, I added the number points each study scored for each pillar.

Could this be a useful way to visualize comparisons between case studies of mass casualty attacks and their effectiveness in building resilience?
CASE STUDY VISUALIZATIONS

CASE STUDIES:

PILLAR 1 Count:
- Christchurch: 2
- Jeffersontown: 4
- Sri Lanka Easter Attacks: 8

PILLAR 2 Count:
- Christchurch: 5
- Jeffersontown: 2
- Sri Lanka Easter Attacks: 5

PILLAR 3 Count:
- Christchurch: 2
- Jeffersontown: 1
- Sri Lanka Easter Attacks: 3

PILLAR 4 Count:
- Christchurch: 3
- Jeffersontown: 3
- Sri Lanka Easter Attacks: 0

PILLAR 5 Count:
- Christchurch: 2
- Jeffersontown: 8
- Sri Lanka Easter Attacks: 0

PILLAR 6 Count:
- Christchurch: 3
- Jeffersontown: 4
- Sri Lanka Easter Attacks: 10
SUMMARY OF NEW FINDINGS

- Despite adding in conference notes, the 2nd pillar remains as the most significant pillar of the R.E.S.I.L.I.E.N.C.E. model with the most mentions and co-occurrences. The same can be said about the 3rd and 6th pillar.
  - Additionally, the 10th pillar remains as the least mentioned pillar and the 8th pillar remains with the least co-occurrences.
- The presence of each pillar can determine which pillars were mentioned or not by every interviewee, visualizing their frequency.
  - This further shows that the 8th and 10th pillar are the least frequently mentioned.
- We can use Dedoose to compare case studies of mass casualty attacks by visualizing the number of points they scored per pillar. This can show how effective they are in building resilience against targeted violence.
  - According to the pie charts, the Jefferson case study has the most number of points per pillar and total number of points, showing that it is the most effective case study out of the three.