



Tabular summary of findings from a review of reported impacts of public involvement in research from PiiAF study group's evidence review

Summary

About:	<i>This resource provides a brief summary of the impacts of public involvement in research found in our evidence review</i>
What:	<i>The resource summarises the findings from our evidence review. The summary of impacts is divided into those on the research (e.g. on ethics and recruitment) and those on people (e.g. on members of public-involved and academic researchers)</i>
Who:	<i>For project teams who would like to consider the range of impacts that can be expected from public involvement in research</i>
How:	<i>Use the summary to facilitate the identification and discussion of expected impacts within the project team</i>

Introduction

Our review identified a range of impacts that may result from public involvement in health and social care research. A summary of impacts of involvement on research is given in table 1 and impacts on people in table 2. Project teams should consider the ways in which potentially divergent expectations of public involvement impact might be acknowledged and addressed in order to maximise its benefits. The impacts in the table below should be considered to be generally positive unless otherwise stated.

Table 1: Overview of public involvement Impacts on Research:

Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Identifying topics for research ▶ Shaping the research agenda ▶ Initiating research projects ▶ Making research more fundable and speeding up research
Research Design and Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Research more relevant, useful and accessible ▶ Appropriateness and reliability of tools and timing of their use improved ▶ Negative impacts: potential scientific and ethical conflict in protocol design, can lead to tokenistic nature of public involvement and possible power struggles between researchers and members of the public
Ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Improving the consent process by producing clearer, more accessible information ▶ Enhancing the ethical acceptability of research
Recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Increased participation and response rates ▶ Credibility of project and researchers was increased ▶ Ensured recruitment procedures were sensitive to the needs of participants ▶ Improved access to participants and ability to engage seldom heard groups ▶ Negative impact seen in potential reductions in recruitment rates or biases in recruitment
Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The quality and relevance of responses and data was improved

Public Involvement Impact Assessment Framework (PiiAF)

Collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Negative impacts on data collected seen in shared experiences between peer interviewers and interviewees which limited probing in interviews; and potential for members of public-involved to unduly influence responses in focus groups
Analysis of Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Can check the validity of analysis, for example by correcting researchers' misinterpretations ▶ Identify themes that researchers might otherwise have missed or that may be more relevant to members of the public ▶ Greater sense of ownership over the results and thus increase the likelihood of action being taken in response to the findings
Writing Up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Make reports more hard-hitting, accessible and useful to the target audience ▶ Final research report benefited from being grounded in public's experiences ▶ Improved the way in which results have been described in reports
Dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Make the findings more accessible and the messages more powerful ▶ Helped with the dissemination and implementation of research findings due to dedication and influence of users to the community ▶ Encourages new ways of sharing results ▶ Negative impact when research findings were disseminated before the academic papers were published therefore jeopardising academic publication
Time and Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Negative impacts may include increased time and cost due to the practical aspects of planning and managing public involvement in research ▶ Increased timescale and expenditure for building up relationships and the potential for conflicting time frames

Table 2: Overview of public involvement Impacts on People

Public Involved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Increased knowledge and skills ▶ Personal and financial rewards ▶ Negative impacts include potential personal and emotional costs and financial losses; feeling excluded or lacking clarity about role or contribution
Researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Fresh insights into the issues of the study ▶ Better understanding of and relationships with the community ▶ Potentially enhanced career benefits and positive challenges to beliefs and attitudes ▶ Negative impacts on demands made on researchers and resources; loss of power and changes in working practices
Research participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The research process might be seen to be more acceptable, user-friendly and sensitive ▶ Participants may be more willing to talk and raise issues and be more willing share their true experiences and views ▶ Public-involved may be seen as sources of hope and inspiration ▶ Negative impacts if participants feel that sharing issues with peer interviewers is inappropriate and could lead to tensions
Wider community involved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Enhanced relationships between communities and professionals leading to enhanced credibility and recognition ▶ Increased awareness of health issues within communities ▶ Research might be more accountable to communities; increased potential for change and feelings of ownership over the research ▶ Negative impacts if involvement is not representative so that seldom heard groups remain so
Communi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Community organisations might benefit from increased recognition and attract new members

Public Involvement Impact Assessment Framework (PiiAF)

ty organisat ions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Negative impacts on community organisation might include additional expenses
Funders	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Enhanced relevance of funded research to the public▶ Increased transparency and accountability of funding organisations
Policy makers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▶ Potentially increase the perception that policy changes are legitimate▶ Negative impacts may include increasing the uncertainty of policy making when different viewpoints call for different policy responses