

0.1 CEPEH Qualatative Feedback

```
knitr::opts_chunk$set(  
  echo = FALSE,  
  message = TRUE,  
  warning = TRUE  
)  
library(tidyverse) #for various data manipulation tasks  
library(tidytext) #for text mining specifically, main package in  
↪ book  
library(stringr) #for various text operations  
library(gutenbergr) #to access full-text books that are in the  
↪ public domain  
library(scales) # for visualising percentages  
library(readtext) # for reading in txt files  
library(wordcloud) # for creating wordclouds  
  
library(syuzhet)
```

The focus group discussions provided a lot of feedback for how the participants experienced their interactions with the chatbots, and how the CEPEH team can improve them, improve the design and development processes, and improve uptake and sharing.

One method of analysing this data is with use of text mining and data manipulation, creating word clouds, sentiment analysis, and using a model which can distinguish the unique themes in text, and highlights for us what text is used to create these themes.

Therefore, we have created a model to allow efficient and intelligent analysis of this open/free focus group data.

0.2 Tokenising

Firstly, we tokenised the words from the FGDs. A Token is “a meaningful unit of text, most often a word, that we are interested in using for further analysis”. For each word we give it a property that we can call upon later.

The data manipulation for this included removing punctuation, converting to lower-case, and setting word type to word (and not such types as “characters”, “ngrams”, “sentences”, “lines” etc)

0.2.1 Stop words

The model then removed words with meaningless function. These are called stop words. Words like “the”, “of” and “to” are the most frequent words found, technically, but are of little interest to us.


We also created a custom list of stop words for CEPEH. We know participants may mention other objects, and the list was as followed: found; chatbot; chatbots; presentation.

The data was ready for analysis by the model. We ordered it to find the most frequent words.


```
## # A tibble: 384 x 3
## # Groups:   doc_id [1]
##   doc_id word          n
##   <fct> <chr>        <int>
## 1 1      information    11
## 2 1      helpful        8
## 3 1      understand     8
## 4 1      idea           7
## 5 1      ideas           7
## 6 1      workshop        7
## 7 1      beginning        6
## 8 1      dont            6
## 9 1      medical          6
## 10 1     technology        6
## # ... with 374 more rows
```

0.3 Plotting word frequencies - bar graphs

With this information a Bar graph of top words from the participants in the FGD can be rendered.



and after some modifications, a graph of the top 35 words is produced, with better aesthetics. The most frequent words present in focus group discussions after using the 4 chatbots, are in the Figure below.




Although the frequency is not high for each word, we are able to get a general picture of the sentiments, intensities, and concerns which would be immediately occurring when plotted.

0.3.1 Normalised frequency

A better way to understand this data is to normalise the frequency of occurrences in accordance with the source text. The raw text had 2827 words in total. Therefore we can mutate the ratios to reflect this.

Plotting normalised frequency


Now we can plot, for example, the 20 most frequent words when normalised by the source text.



In summary, this understanding of frequent words can help to understand common concurrences and extrapolate to a larger audience. If scope and impact of CEPEH chatbots increased we can understand the type of themes and trends may occur, based on such FGD analysis.

0.4 Word clouds

To visualise the most frequent words in another format, below is a word cloud which presents the word size to indicate the frequency- words that occur more often being displayed in a larger font size. This has a normalised data frequency in accordance to the FGD source document analysed.



quent in one text compared to the other.

0.5 Sentiment analysis

What is the sentiment of all participants? What is types of emotional words are being used? The preparation of these words has some use in understanding the frequencies, but their emotional valence are not compared. The table above has the word *‘helpful’* which has a positive connotation, however there are 386 words, with many having several occurrences.

```
##      max(total_score) min(total_score)
```

```
## 1                38                38
```

negative	positive	total_score
24	62	38