

## Data Generation for PROP Contribution Analysis

### Methodology for Capturing Contribution

We used two primary methods for data generation: questionnaires and informal discussion.

- Questionnaires usually included a mix of open questions and rating scales to gather a mix of data that can be used to measure progress over time and in-depth data about the experiences of different participants in the project
- Informal roundtable discussions were used to capture the open-ended discussion about the experience of doing research
- Activity-based discussion, e.g. visual prompts and creative methods, such as map-making
- Questionnaires were also used to capture the experience of mentors and the project team

These methods were used to capture experience and baseline markers for change over time. The use of several of these methods produced additional benefits in terms of relationship building and trust. Participants enjoyed the opportunity to share their experiences as a group. This fostered trust and reflexivity within the research training, mentorship and project management processes. The quality of these relationships is important for the production of new knowledge and the sharing of research evidence (CR – more here).

Secondary data sources include: the practitioner-research projects and meeting minutes

- Practitioner-research projects including: research pro-forma, research proposals, presentations (research design and their KE event presentations), and final research reports (including draft versions and reviewer comments)
- Meeting minutes from the Steering Group, Project Team and Partners' Meeting

Analysis of secondary data sources, particularly the materials produced as part of the practitioner reports could lead to new conclusions about the production of research in practice. There may be useful details here, particularly around the partnership working between VOCAL and Midlothian Council. In addition, there are different levels of collaboration/support between mentors and practitioners. This could be explored further through the analysis of the documents produced.

### Strategies for Data Generation

The following is a list of data generation strategies, the evidence they produced and some of the strengths and limitations of each method.

Strategy	Description	Strengths/Limitations	Provides evidence about:
Criteria for Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A list of objectives which are used as</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A useful baseline to measure success of</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Expectations of practice</li></ul>

Activities	<p>markers for success at a project level and individual level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conducted with Steering Group and Practitioner-Researchers</li> </ul>	<p>the overall project as well as individual research projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We still need follow up on these</li> <li>The criteria were not revisited – we did not capture iterative revisions of these criteria</li> <li>Steering group members likely completed these in their role as partners</li> <li>Mentors did not complete these objectives (although some of this material is captured in the first mentor questionnaire)</li> </ul>	<p>organisations, the project team, and practitioner-researchers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Markers of success for the overall PROP project and individual research projects</li> </ul>
Evaluations of Research Training Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Captures general feedback with an open question field</li> <li>Captures scale of event performance in six categories: (1) organisation, (2) content and relevance, (3) format and timing, (4) supporting materials, (5) overall relevance and (6) venue and catering</li> <li>Standard questionnaire for each of the 6 training events</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowed for on-going development and improvement of research training events</li> <li>Allows for comparison across events, which showcases strengths and weakness of different training modules</li> <li>Open questions highlights strengths and weakness of particular aspects of the event, e.g. particular presentations, format or timing issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design and content of research training events</li> <li>Interim reflections from practitioners about research training, and by proxy the research process</li> </ul>
Roundtable Discussion at Research Training Events	<p>Informal discussions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Format and content of the training event</li> <li>Research process</li> <li>Work/research/life balance</li> <li>Direction/objectives of the PROP project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowed for clarification and synthesis of training material</li> <li>Fostered positive working relationships amongst practitioners and between practitioners and the PROP team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenges and opportunities of practitioner-research</li> <li>Multiple roles/perspectives of practitioner-researchers</li> <li>The barriers / supports for research training</li> </ul>
Evaluations of Knowledge Exchange Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Captures scale of event performance in six categories: (1) organisation, (2) content and relevance, (3) format and timing, (4) supporting materials, (5) overall relevance and (6) venue and catering</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlights benefits of the event for participants</li> <li>Provides insight into expectations for PROP events – can feed into development of next KE event</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Event performance</li> <li>Strengths and weaknesses of the event</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides specific feedback on participants' expectations of the event</li> </ul>		
Evidence in policy/practice exercise at October KE event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A KE activity designed to explore participant perspectives on research and evidence</li> <li>Participants added their comments to small cards – we hung these from a clothes line to showcase the different perspectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides insight into view/use of research in practice/policy settings</li> <li>Not necessarily connected to the PROP projects</li> <li>Focused more on evidence rather than research – no clear definition of evidence (or research)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Captures the rationale for using research in practice/policy</li> </ul>
Mentor Status Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open-format questions</li> <li>Three questionnaires over the course of the programme (2 completed to date)</li> <li>Key issues: expectations, criteria for success, format/timing of mentorship meetings, challenges/opportunities of practitioner-research, and distance to practice-setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides details about the process of mentorship, the perceived strengths and weaknesses of practitioner-research and the expectations of mentors</li> <li>Gives some insight into different mentorships arrangements – more here would be useful</li> <li>Not all mentors completed the questionnaires</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptive detail about the mentorship process</li> <li>Some insight into the strengths of different mentorship arrangements</li> <li>Supports development of a model for PR mentorship</li> </ul>
Mentor Discussions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two open discussions about the mentorship process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depth of qualitative material</li> <li>Relationship building</li> <li>Not all mentors could attend</li> <li>(Might be missing notes from meeting 1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depth to the descriptive detail about the mentorships process</li> </ul>
Research methods questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline measure of familiarity with key aspects of research process, e.g. interviews, focus, groups, etc.</li> <li>Additional questions about background and confidence with research and use of research in organisation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear whether practitioners included their recent experiences with research training</li> <li>Provides some organisational context for research use as well as personal experience with research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline for practitioner knowledge of research</li> <li>Organisational use of research</li> </ul>
Capacity and Confidence with Research Questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures changes in knowledge and confidence with research against a simple 4-part scale: yes, a little bit, no, no sure</li> <li>Uses open questions to capture factors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measurements may be slightly vague and lead to inaccuracies</li> <li>The focus on change is central to the logic model of the PROP project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in knowledge and confidence of research</li> <li>Time spent on research</li> </ul>

	<p>which support/hinder changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asks open questions about engagement</li> <li>• Asks closes questions about reflective practice</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement with colleagues / older people</li> </ul>
Impact and Contribution of Practitioner-Research Programme Questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions follow the Morton's model of contribution: (1) inputs, (2) activities/ outputs, (3) engagement/involvement, (4) awareness/reaction, (5) capacity/ knowledge/skills, (6) changes in behaviour/practices, (7) contribution</li> </ul> <p>The questionnaire asks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What did you bring?</li> <li>• What did you do?</li> <li>• What did you learn?</li> <li>• What did you share?</li> <li>• How did you change?</li> <li>• What was the impact?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Captures the activities of each practitioner / research project</li> <li>• Uses Contribution Analysis as a tool to generate data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacities, activities, engagement and changes for each practitioner</li> </ul>