

Effective and meaningful engagement of older people in health care interventions using co-methodologies: an integrative literature review
Fiona Cowdell, Emily Taylor, Michael Sykes, Judith Dyson

Citation

Fiona Cowdell, Emily Taylor, Michael Sykes, Judith Dyson. Effective and meaningful engagement of older people in health care interventions using co-methodologies: an integrative literature review. PROSPERO 2017 CRD42017059867 Available from:
https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42017059867

Review question

How can older people most effectively and most meaningfully be engaged in health care intervention design, development or delivery using co-methodologies? Objectives • To identify strategies that are effective in engaging older people in health care interventions using co-methodologies • To identify strategies that are meaningful in engaging older people in health care interventions using co-methodologies • To inform development of guidance for best practice in engaging older people in future health-related co-methodological working

Searches

Databases: CINAHL, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, ASSIA

Limiters: English language and published since 2007

Types of study to be included

Inclusion: peer-reviewed empirical research of any design and theoretical papers Exclusion: non-peer-reviewed articles, editorials and discursive (opinion) papers, protocols, theses

Condition or domain being studied

Design, development and delivery of health care interventions

Participants/population

Inclusion: older people as defined as such by the authors (e.g. older, elder, senior)

Exclusion: children, young people, younger adults, adults in midlife

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Inclusion: explicit use of co-methodologies (including co-design, co-production and co-creation) or participatory research, participatory design

Exclusion: literature focusing on engagement, involvement or consultation of service users without specific reference to 'co-' or 'participatory' methodologies

Comparator(s)/control

Not applicable.

Main outcome(s)

a. Effective engagement in co-methodologies – are the aims of using co-methodological processes achieved?

b. Meaningful engagement in co-methodologies – does the engagement of older people have significance or purpose from the perspectives of all involved?

Additional outcome(s)

None

Data extraction (selection and coding)

- Title review by two researchers with discrepancies resolved by discussion and if needed review by a third researcher
- Abstract review by two researchers with discrepancies resolved by discussion and if needed review by a third researcher
- Full text review by two researchers with discrepancies resolved by discussion and if needed review by a third researcher
- Reference lists of the full texts of the articles retained after screening will be searched for additional relevant articles

Data extraction divided equally between the four authors

At each stage we will sample decisions to ensure consistency and agreement between authors

A data extraction spreadsheet will be completed for the empirical studies and a narrative summary will be produced for the theoretical papers.

Data to be extracted from empirical studies:

- Citation details
- Co-methodology used
- Aims: stated aim of study and stated aim of co-methodology
- Theory: co-methodological theory used
- Participants: who involved (all actors – older people, researchers, others) and who led
- Preparation for co-working (e.g. 'co' aspects of set-up, training)
- Co-procedure used, including materials, mode of interaction, where, number of times and duration
- Tailoring of interaction to different participants
- Modification of co-process during use
- Lessons learned from use of co-methodology

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

Risk of bias assessment is not applicable.

The quality of individual studies will be assessed as part of the analysis:

- Reviewer assessment of effectiveness at meeting aim of co-methodology – to include consideration of:
 - o methodological rigour in terms of how the co-methodology processes and procedures relate to the stated aim for using a co-methodological approach and the claims made on that basis
 - o clarity of articulation of what happened in practice including transparency regarding how the co-methods were implemented and adjusted in relationship with all actors involved
 - o credibility of the reporting of the nature of interactions and relationships between all actors involved
- Reviewer assessment of meaningfulness of use of co-methodology – to include consideration of:
 - o conceptual rigour in terms of the clarity of the co-methodological concept/theoretical perspective
 - o authenticity of the representation of the perspectives/experiences of all actors involved in the co-methodological process in regard to its purpose and significance
 - o credibility of the reporting of how participants/stakeholders' knowledge/understanding changed as part of the co-methodological process.

Strategy for data synthesis

The review will follow the integrative review method, which allows research conducted using a range of methodologies, including non-experimental research, as well as theoretical papers, to be analysed and synthesised (Whittemore and Knafl 2005). This method integrates conceptual findings rather than aggregating data.

The steps we will undertake are:

1. Problem identification
2. Literature search
3. Data evaluation
4. Data analysis
5. Presentation

This systematic approach will be used to summarise the literature reviewed, critically analyse the congruence between the co-design/participation learning and outcomes of different studies, integrate themes across studies, and present new interpretations that develop concepts relating to the principles and best practice in use of co-methodologies.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

None planned

Contact details for further information

Dr Taylor
emily.taylor@bcu.ac.uk

Organisational affiliation of the review

Birmingham City University

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Professor Fiona Cowdell. Birmingham City University & Centre of Evidence Based Dermatology, University of Nottingham

Dr Emily Taylor. Birmingham City University

Mr Michael Sykes. Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University

Dr Judith Dyson. University of Hull & Hull York Medical School

Type and method of review

Other

Anticipated or actual start date

01 April 2017

Anticipated completion date

31 July 2017

Funding sources/sponsors

None

Conflicts of interest

None known

Language

English

Country

England

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Delivery of Health Care; Humans

Date of registration in PROSPERO

21 March 2017

Date of first submission

Stage of review at time of this submission

Stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	No
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.

The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add publication details in due course.

Versions

21 March 2017

PROSPERO

This information has been provided by the named contact for this review. CRD has accepted this information in good faith and registered the review in PROSPERO. The registrant confirms that the information supplied for this submission is accurate and complete. CRD bears no responsibility or liability for the content of this registration record, any associated files or external websites.