

Lecture Transcript

Module Name	Mental Health in the Community		
Week 5	Implementation in Health Care		
Topic	Implementation Outcomes (Part 4 of 4)		
Lecturer	Dr. Zarnie Khadjesari	Department	School of Health Sciences , UEA

Slide 1

Slide 2

Slide 3

Slide 4

In this final part, we will have a look at pragmatic implementation outcome instruments, how they were devised, and some good examples.

Slide 5

As mentioned in the previous section of this presentation, pragmatic measures were originally assessed by the number of items or questions in an instrument. In 2013, Glasgow and colleagues suggested that to usefully inform the assessment of implementation determinants, mechanisms, processes, strategies, and outcomes, measures must be both psychometrically sound and pragmatic.

Slide 6

Powell and colleagues conducted a concept mapping exercise which asks stakeholders to conceptualise the domains that comprise the pragmatic measure construct. This exercise was informed by the findings of a systematic review which found 47 criteria to be grouped into four categories. These were acceptable, compatible, easy, and useful.

Slide 7

Researchers have since gone on to develop a pragmatic rating scale, which includes 11 items or questions that fall under these four categories, and these have a six-point rating system assigned to each of them.

Slide 8

Here's an example of three pragmatic implementation outcome instruments. The first assesses acceptability, the second: appropriateness, and the third: feasibility. This is a generic measure. In other words, it can be used to assess the acceptability, appropriateness, and feasibility of any evidence-based intervention or practice. You can customise it by entering the name of your intervention or practice into the brackets. So, for example, if your evidence-based intervention is a smartphone app,

the acceptability instrument would read: 'the app meets my approval', 'the app is appealing to me', 'I like the app', 'I welcome the app'. Participants respond to the statement by selecting one of five options. 'Completely disagree', 'Disagree', 'Neither agree nor disagree', 'Agree', 'Completely agree'.

These are validated instruments with both reliability and validity data to support their use. They are pragmatic instruments as each instrument only includes four items or questions each. The authors of this paper note that acceptability, appropriateness, and feasibility are hypothesised to be associated with adoption. As such, it may be useful to use all three instruments depending on the aims of your research.

Slide 9

To support researchers and evaluators with the identification of validated implementation outcome instruments, research groups have set up online repositories of implementation outcome instruments. So I'm going to talk about three of these. The first is an online repository developed by the Society of Implementation Research Collaboration, or SIRC for short. They use the findings of their systematic reviews of implementation outcome instruments used in mental health settings, to populate the repository.

Their systematic reviews identify implementation outcome instruments that assess all of the 39 consolidated framework for implementation research constructs. So it's a useful resource for a comprehensive source of instruments. One downside to this repository is it's only available to fee paying members of the society. However, instruments are listed in the open access publications. The Grid Enabled Measures database, also referred to as GEM, is another online repository of implementation outcome instruments. This repository relies on crowd-sourcing, where instrument developers proactively add their publication to the repository. Unlike the SIRC repository, any measure can be added to this repository without any validation dataset. This is something to bear in mind.

Slide 10

The final repository I want to mention is one that was launched in 2021 by King's College London and the University of East Anglia. Similar to the SIRC repository, our repository is based on the findings of the systematic review of implementation outcome instruments in physical health settings.

The repository allows you to search for instruments to assess the implementation outcome used in Procter's taxonomy; to view a summary of the instrument; the number of items; the country of application; and the level of analysis, for example, patient, provider, organisation; to consider the methodological quality of the psychometric studies included in the repository; to consider the instrument quality

based on the ConPsy checklist; and to view the usability rating of the instrument. And where permission is granted, the repository provides access to both the psychometric study and the published instrument.

Slide 11

In summary, we have looked at how pragmatic measures have been developed and used as a means of validating implementation outcomes. There are several repositories that can help researchers, healthcare professionals, and other evaluators identify validated implementation outcome instruments, such as those available from SIRC, GEM, and the implementation outcome repository created by King's College London and the University of East Anglia.

Slide 12

Slide 13

Slide 14

Slide 15

Slide 16
