160 Characters is a collaboration between The SHM Foundation and UCL Institute for Global Health
The 160 Characters Project aims to develop a participatory, interdisciplinary methodology for evaluating and scaling-up the ‘Khuluma’ intervention that provides peer-to-peer psychosocial support groups via text message to adolescents living with HIV (ALWHIV) in South Africa.

In adolescents, aged 10 to 19 years old, HIV is the leading cause of death in Africa and the second leading cause of death of adolescents globally. ALWHIV are at increased risk of mental health problems, which can in turn lead to poor health outcomes such as poor medical adherence. Given the large number of adolescents living with HIV and the 50% increase in adolescent HIV-related deaths between 2005 and 2012, there is an urgent need to:

- Understand the barriers to accessing HIV services and adhering to Anti-Retroviral Treatment (ART) for ALWHIV;
- Understand the mental health and wellbeing needs of adolescents living with HIV;
- To develop approaches to provide ongoing support that is immediate and accessible to all HIV positive adolescents; and,
- To innovate interdisciplinary, participatory methods for evaluating these complex interventions where adolescents are at the centre of the research cycle.

The SHM Foundation has developed a promising solution in the Khuluma model – a psychosocial support intervention that provides closed, peer-to-peer support groups to ALWHIV via text message. Launched in 2013, Khuluma has supported 160 adolescents in Cape Town and Pretoria, generated more than 60,000 text messages, and recorded increased social support and self-reported medical adherence, and decreased internalised stigma.

It is clear that linguistic and socio-cultural methods are important in picking up on the nuances of the message data; however the sheer volume of messages necessitate the use of ‘big data’ methods. Hence, the 160 Characters Project brings together the interdisciplinary insights of adolescent service users, medical science, social science, implementation science, literature and technology to ‘crack’ the Khuluma text message data.

The project is a collaboration between The SHM Foundation and UCL Institute for Global Health with participation from the Desmond Tutu HIV Foundation, STEMA, Superbeing Labs and Rocket.Chat.

It is led by a core research team based in London including Dr Geordan Shannon, Anna Kydd and Nikita Simpson; who are supported by an interdisciplinary board of advisors including Chair, Prof. Maurice Biriotti, Prof. Sarah Fidler, Prof. Linda-Gail Bekker, Prof. Susanne Kord, and Ursule Kajokaite.

Insights from STEMA have come from Des Tan, Hector Durham, Mikaela Patrick and Nicole Minckas. Insights from Rocket.Chat have come from Isabella Russell.

Insights from the wider SHM team have come from Esmé Nicholson, Cassandre Greenberg and Yasmine Uddin.

However, at the core of the project is the participatory voice of Khuluma’s adolescent Peer Mentors – particularly Desmond, Andani and Given, who are supported by a South African research team including Malebo Ngobeni, Tebogo Konkobe and Dr Millicent Atujuna.

Illustration for the project, and in this report, is by Maggie Li.

160 Characters has been funded by the Small Grant scheme from UCL Grand Challenges Adolescent Lives.

The team would like to thank all those who have participated in the 160 Characters workshops, and the participants who bring the Khuluma data to life.
Adolescents living with HIV aren’t accessing services or adhering to their medication

In recent years, AIDS has become the leading cause of death among adolescents in Africa. In 2015, adolescents accounted for 37% of new HIV infections, with young women aged 15-24 years having the highest HIV incidence rates globally.\(^5\)

In South Africa, over 15% of young women and 5% of young men aged 15-24 are infected with HIV.\(^6\) ART has dramatically improved survival, and can significantly reduce the risk of onward transmission.\(^7\)

However, the proportion of ALWHIV on ART is much lower than the South African population average.\(^8\)

Adolescents living with HIV don’t get the support they need

Adolescence and early adulthood are critical periods in the development of mental disorders; it is estimated that 75% of all mental illness emerges before the age of 25.\(^9\)

ALWHIV are at increased risk of mental health problems, with psychological stressors of the negative side effects of ART, stigma, fear of rejection or being perceived as different, the absence of symptoms, anxiety around morbidity and mortality, and poor patient-provider communication.\(^10\)

Poor mental health has been proven to decrease adherence to ART.\(^11\) Despite biomedical advancements in treatment, psychosocial needs of ALWHIV are not adequately addressed.\(^12\)

There is not a culture of using mental health services in Sub-Saharan Africa, meaning that often ALWHIV have no one to whom they can talk.\(^13\)

Digital Social Support Groups offer a solution

The World Health Organisation\(^14\) recommends treating common mental disorders such as depression with basic psychosocial support. Support group therapy has proven an effective means for reducing stigma, and improving both mental health and ART adherence outcomes in Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs).\(^15\)

However, psychosocial treatment, including support group therapies, are restricted in these settings.\(^16\) When they do exist there are many barriers to attendance including lack of knowledge, time constraints, lack of transport, stigma and discrimination.\(^17\)

Digital support groups are a feasible alternative. Online peer-to-peer communication is popular among young people and may improve mental health by providing social support.\(^18,19\) They are effective in high resource settings, but have not yet been studied in LMICs.

Texting requires different mental and social processes than face to face or voice, and it is less formal and obtrusive than other written modes of psychosocial support.\(^20\)

Scholars have developed a number of text-based methods of analysis, largely using qualitative methods, to analyse online social support groups, including thematic analysis, sociological coding analysis, conversational analysis, and digital ethnographic methods for understanding online and text based community building.\(^21,22,23\)

However, there is a lack of consensus as to what is different about online support group interactions, how online communities are built, and how this might be leveraged to benefit mental health.\(^24\)
Khuluma is a mobile phone support initiative to address the mental health and wellbeing needs of HIV positive adolescents in South Africa. The Khuluma platform leverages the power of small groups to facilitate interactive, closed support groups.

The ‘Khuluma’ model delivers psychosocial support to ALWHIV in South Africa through closed peer-to-peer support groups of 10-15 participants via text message. Mixed-gender groups are managed by a trained facilitator and mentors.

Khuluma Mentors are ex-participants who are trained and employed to provide psychosocial support to their peers. Khuluma is peer-led, meaning participants can give and receive advice in a safe, anonymous and moderated space.

Since 2013, the Foundation has worked with over 160 adolescents in Pretoria and Cape Town, generated over 60,000 messages, and built strong partnerships with universities, technical companies and non-governmental organisations in South Africa.

---

**How does Khuluma work?**

Adolescents are recruited at different clinics.

They are then assigned a support group with 10-15 other members and a facilitator.

The support groups run for three months.

Participants discuss topics such as medication, relationships, sexual health and school.

Guest speakers such as a doctor, nutritionist, psychologist or careers adviser join the talk.

Adolescents meet in person and find ways to continue to stay in touch.
Khuluma participants each send, on average, 6 messages per day sometimes discussing their hopes, dreams and fears; but also sometimes just checking in and saying hello.

The 60 000+ text messages generated by the Khuluma text message corpus is the closest we can come to accessing what adolescents are saying to each other in private spaces within ethical constraints, in order to better understand their experience of living with HIV and their mental health.

Understanding these mental health needs has the potential to design more appropriate interventions and policies for adolescent populations.

The 160 Characters Project aims to develop an interdisciplinary arts, health and humanities methodology for understanding the attitudes of adolescents towards their own health via the analysis of text message data captured by a peer-to-peer mobile phone psychosocial support group intervention; and, subsequently, to develop strategies, techniques and solutions to serve their needs.
Our Methodology

The Six Voices Framework

The project began at a workshop in 2017 hosted by The SHM Foundation and UCL Institute for Global Health, where we asked: can we create a different way of looking at the Khuluma text messages? The outcome of this workshop was the realisation that no one methodology is enough to analyse the data, and also the development of the ‘six voices’ framework. Each of these ‘six voices’ represent a member of the research team, who bring together the insights of adolescent service users, medical science, literature, social science, implementation science and technology, to develop a participatory, interdisciplinary methodology.

The six voices represent:

**Social Science**
The ethnographic voice of anthropologists who are able to contextualise adolescent experiences and text message data in contemporary culture and history.

**Medical Science**
The clinical and epidemiological voice of healthcare professionals and clinicians allowing us to understand the aetiology of HIV and its co-morbid mental health issues.

**Literature**
The linguistic and literary voice of academics who are able to conduct a close textual reading of text message data.

**Service Users**
The participatory perspective of adolescents themselves who are living with HIV and have participated in Project Khuluma.

**Implementors**
The voice of community healthcare workers, programme managers and evaluators who can speak to the practical aspects of the programme.

**Technology**
The voice of those who will be developing future Khuluma technology, who can speak to the programming and specifics of the model.
In 2018, facilitated by the UCL Adolescent Lives Grand Challenges Grant, we refined the Six Voices Framework, which represents a world-first contribution to HIV and mental health research in LMICs.

The London Workshop

In preparation for this workshop, we asked the 18 workshop participants to take a look at two extracts of data; one randomly chosen extract of one page; and one set of data generated over the course of a three month support group.

We asked participants to reflect on how they would approach the data from their disciplinary perspective; and what they thought constituted an effective interaction.

We conducted individual interviews with each of the participants; and analysed the results, before presenting them back in a workshop.

The Pretoria Workshop

The purpose of our Pretoria workshop was to collaborate with Khuluma’s adolescent Peer Mentors to understand what they think works best, and why, and to hear their ideas about how we can make a better service in the future.

The two day workshop involved short individual presentations about who participants are and where they see themselves in Khuluma, acting out their visions and hopes for Khuluma in the future using their career aspirations/interests, a craft workshop of the adolescents’ ideal future Khuluma, and an in-depth analysis of text message data.

The workshop included 10 Peer Mentors and two Pretoria-based Project Coordinators.

The Peer Mentors identified the main purpose of the Khuluma project as being three-fold.

First, Khuluma was seen as a support, a home, a place of belonging, and a group that fostered acceptance.

Second, Khuluma was important for education, and balanced medical information against social activities and fun topics.

Third, Khuluma fostered respect, by facilitating an environment that valued the individual, their thoughts and fears, and a space where their opinions were listened to.

In the words of one Peer Mentor, the most important aspect of Khuluma is that it promotes self-confidence: “self-confidence leads to self-management.”

Much of the value of Khuluma was not derived from HIV-focused or medical care. Khuluma groups were seen to provide respect, value, reasons for taking medication, social support and education.

It was perceived as different to medical discourse, which some participants thought was too focused on fear (this meant that some felt they were going to die, and so thought: what’s the point of taking medication?). The current medical system often made them feel small in front of doctors.

Through Khuluma, they found that a sense of hope and positive role models was what makes people want to comply with medical treatment. The Peer Mentors were extremely motivated to expand Khuluma and help others.
Analysis showed that the different ‘voices’ took different approaches to the text:

- Literature is interested in how communication doesn’t work more than how it does work; the comic events that lead to resolution, or the tragic events that lead to miscommunication.
- Medical Science is interested in the hard end points like change to immunological states; these correlate with soft end points like self-reported adherence.
- Social Scientists look at the individual voices and how they contribute to and are shaped by broader social issues; they think about how best to build social dynamics in order to meet, often measurable, outcomes.
- Technologists who focus on design look at how we might replicate effective interactions in real life through technology; mathematicians take a naïve approach and build systems from the data based on mathematical language.
- Implementation Scientists think about where this intervention fits into the health system – what does it provide that other services don’t?
- Participants see the potential to change attitudes towards HIV through sharing personal experiences and building self-confidence.

Indeed, they asked different questions of the text; that were somewhat complementary.
We realised that the different voices approached the text on two different scales. The first is the scale at which they approached the actual data set – did they look at an extract, or at the whole corpus of text messages? The second is the scale at which they assessed the intervention – did they only think about the 160 Khuluma participants, or did they think about the applicability to adolescents all over the world?

When these two scales are graphed, we realised that each of the voices fall into one of four quadrants.

**OBJECT OF ANALYSIS**

**WHAT AM I LOOKING AT?**

- Medical Science
- Technology
- Participatory
- Literature
- Social Sciences

**IMPLICATIONS**

**WHAT AM I ASKING?**

- How can we measure the hard and soft outcomes of the model?
- How can we describe systems that might be used to approach the data?
- What are the social, political and economic factors that impact the efficacy of the model?
- I thought about how the model could be implemented at scale
- Khuluma supports young people like me... we should go worldwide to help other people like us
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Thematic Analysis

Analysis showed that there are five key thematic concerns that arose when the workshop participants analysed the data. These include self & identity; relationships & responsibility; community & acknowledgement; society & influences; and HIV. Insights from each of these thematic areas were summarised and visually presented in tables. These tables were analysed by both the workshop participants and an independent analyst.
### Self & Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MACHOS</td>
<td>There is a lot of machismo, tough guy speak, in contrast to the weakness of their disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>There is a lot of machismo, tough guy speak, in contrast to the weakness of their disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>It’s great they’re talking about hopes and dreams, but sometimes it feels utopian, giving them false hope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Sometimes I think it would be useful if they had a chance to be more slow and thoughtful in their responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATORY</td>
<td>No matter how many adherence clubs we have, there will always be a moment where these kids are alone. This group is in the right place at the right time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPLICIT</td>
<td>It’s like being a ‘mystery shopper’ reading this data, providing the kinds of insights we can’t get elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Insights

- Support groups provide ALWHIV with an alternative space where they can make meaningful connections with others who face the same problems as they do.
- The groups work best when participants are sharing experiences, rather than when a direct question related to HIV is posed.
- It is precisely the fact that these groups are removed from the anxiety and stigma of their relationships and day to day interactions inflected by their status, that makes this a space where they can explore new identities.
- Individuals can pose their problems to the group to collectively problem solve. It’s like in the groups they have an alternate subjectivity or sense of self.
- We are in a relationship to ourselves and must communicate to ourselves. Honesty and self-acceptance mean increased confidence to be ourselves, and to reveal our HIV status.
- The text messages are an unsolicited source of data on what they think is important.
- It’s like in the groups they have an alternate subjectivity or sense of self.
### Relationships & Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Participatory</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Medical Science</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be easier for them to build relationships if the group was as homogenous as possible.</td>
<td>Little phrases are really important in the process of building relationships and acknowledging one another.</td>
<td>Empathy is important; we don’t want others to feel the same pain as we did.</td>
<td>The participants can easily convince each other to do things, even though they don’t know each other well.</td>
<td>We can learn a lot from how conversations evolve in content, emotional ties, comradery and care.</td>
<td>They build relationships by checking in on each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants make ‘bids’ to the group to be acknowledged or recognised.</td>
<td>Participants feel that they have the responsibility to respond, relate and show empathy – often in the form of a shared experience or statement rather than specific follow up.</td>
<td>Being listened to and responded to is important, to trust in the group and in yourself.</td>
<td>There seems to be a base level of trust in the group.</td>
<td>In hospitals, they’re always getting shouted. These are different kinds of relationships.</td>
<td>There is a lot of fear about not having good relationships in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Insights

- Very quickly after the groups launch, it is clear that participants build a set of unsaid rules of communication that underpin the relationships they form with each other. These relationships are built through ‘checking in’, comradery and care such that participants are ‘acknowledged’ in a particular way.
- Participants also police each other’s behaviour, such that when someone fails to respond, incites conflict or does not display empathy, other participants are critical.
- Conversations are not directly effective, meaning they are not always specific dialogue related to a topic brought up by the facilitator; sometimes conversations even get stuck and seem to be ineffective. However, the ‘swirling’ of the conversation, or numerous miscommunications, are important to the eventual resolution of issues or collective problem solving.
- Some participants have indicated that simply reading the conversation and having the option to participate is sufficient to increasing feelings of support and decreasing feelings of stigma. One participant indicated that this is analogous to the fact that sometimes you go to a café to meet someone, and other times you go just to hear others talking.
## Community & Acknowledgement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>It's useful to think about other kinds of communities these adolescents participate in and how this contrasts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Lack of physical presence is a double-edged sword; they can speak about whatever they want because it's anonymous, but there is no guarantee of acknowledgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Khumula will forever be my home; I have a sense of belonging and belonging is being acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Because this space is anonymous, participants can air issues they wouldn’t otherwise discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Science</td>
<td>The content of the groups isn’t often about HIV; adolescents don’t have to talk about HIV to feel supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>It’s clear from the heartbreaking conversations that they don’t have support from anywhere else, but I worry that this group isn’t enough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| This space is bigger than the sum of its parts. |
| The use of nicknames adds the sense that you’re not talking to real people; there aren’t the same consequences as real life. |
| It’s good because it is positive and future focused, not motivated through fear. |
| The community is similar – there is comfort in that whoever is here is like me and with me. |
| Physical support groups are burdensome; this medium is a good alternative, but can it create the same sense of community? |
| I think they’re behind the curve in their use of social media as a community. |

## Insights

- This community is unique because it is a HIV related space that is positive and future focused, compared to spaces that are inflected with fear.
- The use of nicknames adds the sense that the space is removed from ‘real life’ and doesn’t have the same consequences, allowing participants to be experimental in their interactions and share more than what they might do when interacting face to face.
- The lack of physical presence is a double-edged sword, in the sense that though they are able to express what they feel like because it is anonymous, there is no guarantee that someone will reply or acknowledge their expression. By contrast, face to face interaction is not purely verbal but contains infinite gestures and non-verbal cues that act as forms of acknowledgement.
### Society & Influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Science</th>
<th>Medical Science</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Participatory</th>
<th>Insights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending to mental health and wellbeing is usually secondary in South African society.</td>
<td>There is a lot about the ‘vibes’ they get from society – both positive and negative.</td>
<td>You are the master of your virus; it should not control you. HIV doesn’t define who you are and we can do the same things as HIV negative people.</td>
<td>This shows how much social stigma is internalised by adolescents.</td>
<td>The language adolescents use in the groups is shaped by the communities they participate in. This indicates the extent to which social stigma is internalised by the adolescents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home, adolescents also don’t always get the support they need.</td>
<td>We can compare these conversations to other conversations in society to work out what is unique about Khuluma.</td>
<td>It’s important to do community service beyond people living with HIV like in hospitals and orphanages.</td>
<td>Doctors can’t take responsibility for this dimension of living with HIV, so adolescents don’t get enough support.</td>
<td>The discourse built within the groups is constructed to counter these negative feelings of stigma. Indeed, participants make bold assertions about how they value themselves beyond their status, about their capacities, abilities and place within society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are very influenced by the church; a lot of the phrases sound like they’re straight from a sermon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to know more about how their language is formed; from what societal media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Insights
- The language adolescents use in the groups is shaped by the communities they participate in. This indicates the extent to which social stigma is internalised by the adolescents.
- The discourse built within the groups is constructed to counter these negative feelings of stigma. Indeed, participants make bold assertions about how they value themselves beyond their status, about their capacities, abilities and place within society.
HIV

| Social Science | The focus on HIV and the outcomes associated with it are not well defined in the groups. |
| Technology     | They seem convinced that their lives will change if they take their medication. |
| Participatory  | You should choose how to live; life is not different to those with HIV negative people. |
| Implementation | Attending to the mental health and wellbeing of adolescents living with HIV is not done at all elsewhere. |
| Medical Science| I’m surprised at how little they mention HIV. |
| Literature     | They don’t talk much about HIV. Relationships is the most important topic. |

The link between social support, self-esteem, adherence behaviour and healthy adolescents is clear.

Participants associated weakness, foolishness and stupidity with HIV and medication.

Normalising HIV; we are normal people living a normal life.

There seems to be a trade off between HIV knowledge and support. But do adolescents even care about HIV knowledge?

Even if the conversation does not even mention HIV, is this still an effective mean of interaction and support?

Their conversations about HIV/AIDS seem quite self-contradictory.

Insights

- Adolescents don’t bring up HIV directly very often, of their own volition. When facilitators ask direct questions about HIV and HIV knowledge, participants aren’t as engaged as when they are discussing other topics.
- Conversations directly about HIV tend to be less effective and incite less engagement than other topics such as relationships, sex, alcohol and nutrition.
- The stigma of living with HIV manifests in all interactions, but speaking about the issues associated with it without speaking directly allows adolescents to have a new attitude towards the virus.
### Understanding Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If this is a free flowing space, there are too many restrictions e.g. participants have to speak English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The participants don’t always understand what they’re meant to be doing there, and the facilitator doesn’t pick up on everything.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a temporal tension in chat platforms between constant communication and the ability to respond later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator sometimes misses the point of the conversations, or uses different assumptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We need some people to set the pace, define the rules and lead the group dynamics; facilitation is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We know when to have fun and when to be serious but topics need to be of interest to adolescents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was one member who got pushy, but the other participants were quick to reprimand them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going off topic isn’t very useful, but maybe it’s a part of natural group dynamics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer mentors are better at engaging the groups than facilitators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator is simultaneously part of the fabric, but also separate to the group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They quickly form a common language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep conversations run parallel to superficial ones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Insights

- There were a number of suggestions as to what constitutes an effective interaction in the Khuluma groups; and on how the Khuluma model could be improved. Notably, the voices agreed that adolescents are quick to form their own language, and understand the ‘rules’ of social interaction that govern the groups. They also noted that peer mentors are better at facilitating than facilitators themselves.
Thematic Analysis

The adolescent-led text message analysis identified the following:

1. **Effective text interactions involved:**
   - Clear facilitation/facilitators, ground rules
   - Humour: sense of sympathy and belonging
   - Participants drawn-in by interesting topic and dynamic group

2. **Ineffective text interactions involved:**
   - Mixture of SMS/slang/non-English - difficult for participants to understand
   - Threats, negativity, rudeness
   - Less active facilitation/facilitator
   - Interrupting, not responding to questions

3. **Topics that work included:**
   - Sex, events, leisure activities/interests, TV
   - Future-oriented: “what do you want to be when you grow up?”
   - Conversation needs to open your mind, to think
   - Challenge to use socially-inspired topics and infuse with education

4. **Groups were most effectively activated through:**
   - Facilitator(s) setting positive dynamic
   - Individual participation
   - Finding common ground/interests
   - Adopting a method to start fruitful conversations and questions in an attractive way
   - Using what teenagers like, plus add information
The interdisciplinary workshop held in August 2018 brought up a number of interesting findings, but also a number of pressing questions for each of the voices.

The workshop participants were asked to indicate what they would do next - what issues or questions would they explore and which methods would they use to do so?

1. Literature might focus on the bigger thing that comes from the conversation, as Tolstoy said an effective conversation is “When you are able to express what you think and understand what another thinks, and you can take this somewhere else.” We should look at both what is present and what is absent.

2. Medical Science might look at the hard end points and map these back onto the text data to prove effectiveness.

3. Social Scientists might map the virtual care environment to understand how the space works.

4. Technologists might look at the quality of the conversation, and think about how best to organise the groups such that urgent and reflective conversations can happen in parallel. Mathematicians want to sink their teeth into the data, conducting a naïve analysis.

5. Implementation Scientists might look at how a methodology can be built that improves predictability of conversations, improves facilitation and improves efficacy of conversation with respect to particular behavioural outcomes. This is how we would get to scale.

6. Participants want to build the Mentor Programme, because people who are living with HIV are better at giving advice. They want to focus on scaling up the programme to their peers, particularly in disadvantaged areas.

The core team hope to secure funding to pursue in-depth analysis of the data corpus from each of the ‘six voices’. This would involve identifying specific methodologies within each voice, and allowing experts to apply them to the data. Critically, this would involve a Participatory Action Research Cycle whereby the Khuluma Mentors will be asked to reflect on, validate and add to insights generated by the other five voices.

Indeed, the ultimate aim of the 160 Characters Project is to develop an interdisciplinary methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of online communities and digital support groups globally. In the long term, it will involve adapting and implementing the methodology to other existing online communities in partnership with governments, NGOs and national health services that use different platforms such as Facebook, forums, chat rooms, Whatsapp, or other bespoke mobile applications to meet the mental health and wellbeing needs of vulnerable populations.


