Notes on Corrado et al. (2020) - Participatory action research with older adults: a critical interpretive synthesis

En mycket bra genomgång av forskning inom området. Även om den fokuserar på PAR så tar den upp mycket kloka saker som även gäller public involvement av det inte lika radikala slaget.

In this review, PAR is used as an umbrella term encompassing research approaches, such as, community-based participatory research, action research, and appreciative inquiry, which embody goals of engaging community members as co-researchers to guide personal and social change (Cargo & Mercer, 2008; Minkler, 2010).

Syftar de metoder vi använder till att “embody goals of engaging community members as co-researchers to guide personal and social change”? Jag vet inte om det är så riktigt. Får en känsla av att det i denna forskning är ett större fokus på “community” såväl som på “social change”.

#### Objective

The purpose of this CIS [critical interpretive synthesis] was to critically evaluate the use of PAR with older adults. The key guiding question was: How are older adults meaningfully involved within each phase of the PAR process and what does their involvement entail? The central aim of a CIS is to critically engage with the data on a subject to describe the current way a topic, or in this case a research approach, is being addressed, to critically consider the strengths and limitations of current approaches, and to mark out ways forward in improving a body of research (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006). Given this focus, a CIS, as opposed to a systematic review, was selected. [e414]

#### Metoden

Following CIS guidelines set out by Dixon-Woods and colleagues (2006), we aimed to critically question the dominant tendencies in this particular area of research, discuss what is missing, and suggest ways to move forward (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006). As such, a CIS involves both inductive analysis and interpretation in an “iterative, interactive, dynamic and recursive” process (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006, p. 9) that is flexible and allows for further development and refinement of the research question, depending on what the researchers identify in the articles (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006). This review was therefore conducted iteratively, where steps were re-visited at multiple points in time, involving a literature search and selection, data extraction, and synthesis. [p. e414]

##### Databaser sökta i

CINAHL, MEDLINE,EMBASE, PsycINFO, AMED, Sociological Abstracts, and Scopus [e415]

#### Söktermer

Participatory action research; participatory research; action research; community-based participatory research; CBPR; community-based research; collaborative research; transformative research; feminist participatory research; and critical participatory action research

Older adults; seniors; elderly; elders; elderly people; aging; aging adults; old people; aged; third aged; and fourth aged

#### Slutsats: One factor that may explain why academic researchers have tended to not fully involve older adults as prominent partners is the current funding environment, whereby academics often require a defined research topic to obtain funding

One factor that may explain why academic researchers have tended to not fully involve older adults as prominent partners is the current funding environment, whereby academics often require a defined research topic to obtain funding (Frisby et al., 2005; Hall & Tandon, 2017). These requirements unfortunately limit the possibilities of an emergent research design that ensures that the research priorities chosen matter to the community (Hall & Tandon, 2017). To ensure that older adults are able to shape the purpose and scope of PAR projects, there is a clear need for funding agencies to create alternative funding structures, such as planning grants for initial stages and tiered funding connected to meeting outcomes demonstrating successful partnerships (Cargo & Mercer, 2008). Such strategies would support researchers in collaborating with older adults in cycles of reflection and action that enable older adults to contribute to PAR projects so that the project’s goals and objectives are optimally relevant to them (Hall & Tandon, 2017). [p. e423]

#### Slutsats: The pressure to publish makes it difficult for academic researchers to ensure that the research priorities chosen matter to the community, to involve older adults throughout the various research phases, and to involve older adults when implementing the findings in a way that encourages tangible change in the community

Unfortunately, the pressure to publish makes it difficult for academic researchers to integrate the time and processes required to ensure that the research priorities chosen matter to the community, to involve older adults throughout the various research phases, and to involve older adults when implementing the findings in a way that encourages tangible change in the community. [p. e423]

#### Slutsats: Greater alignment is needed between the ethics guidelines of institutional review boards and the goals of PAR so that older adults can be involved as co-researchers

In addition, ethical guidelines may hinder academic researchers from meaningfully involving older adults. The emphasis on individual rights and protections embedded in the guidelines used by many ethics review boards at academic institutions may present as barriers to more collective participatory processes (Cargo & Mercer, 2008). For example, research ethics boards often want participants to sign consent forms when a project begins, which could position the older adults as participants rather than as co-researchers in an equitable partnership (Hand, Laliberte Rudman, McGrath, Donnelly, & Sands, 2019). Although obtaining consent to share information is important for academic researchers who wish to publish and present research findings, it is clear that greater alignment is needed between the ethics guidelines of institutional review boards and the goals of PAR so that older adults can be involved as co-researchers (Hand et al., 2019; Frisby et al., 2005). Specifically, researchers should engage in ongoing dialogue with research ethics boards when conducting PAR so that all parties can discuss the methodology to ensure that the institution’s ethics procedures are not working against the researchers’ implementation of PAR (Hand et al., 2019). [p. e424]