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Background

Growing interest in ‘real time’ methods of finding out about the impact of change

Partnership developed to explore ways of doing this:

- GCPH; NHS Health Scotland (sponsors)
- GSA, Institute of Design Innovation
- MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow
Why establish means of real-time data collection?

- **Rapid social change**
  (austerity, labour market changes, welfare reforms)
  - impact on health and wellbeing

- **Increased uncertainty**
  - social impacts difficult to predict and plan for

- **Responsiveness of services**
  - who/how; responding/adapting; indirect effects; helpful interventions

- ‘Live’ views – no benefit of hindsight
Why focus on ‘lived experience’?

- Democratic - citizens’ voices more influential
- Rounded view of range of policy issues – cumulative effect
- Understand how range of policy issues come together for one person / family
- Inform policy and research agendas which reflect public concerns
- Build engagement and influence
Repeated collection of real time data may be particularly useful in illuminating the frequent, routine and mundane lived experiences that are often hard to capture accurately through retrospective interviews but crucial to understanding how people actually experience the context in which they live.
What we set out to achieve

- Develop a means of:
  - Capturing lived experiences/views
  - Collecting, interpreting and sharing data in ‘real-time’

- Is it possible?
- What would it look like?
- Can it be representative?
- Can it be done ‘at scale’?
- Can it inform decision making?
Design and development

(Jan 2014 – April 2015)
Co-creation of RHRN approach

Workshop Part 1

- 50 stakeholders/policy makers
- Explore potential research questions and gaps within current data sources
- Informed question themes
Co-creation of RHRN approach

Workshop Part 2

- over 150 members of public (16-75 yrs; socio-economic mix)
- co-develop study design and tools
- Informed system design
Question delivery

Choice of participation methods

- Text Message
- Email
- Postal
Themed question set – 4 parts

Question 1
Is Glasgow a good place to grow old?

(please circle one answer)
A) Yes
B) In some ways
C) No
D) Not sure

If you answered A or B in Q1:
In what ways do you think Glasgow is a good place to grow old?

(please answer in the space below)

If you answered C in Q1:
Why do you think Glasgow is not a good place to grow old?

(please answer in the space below)

If you answered D in Q1:
Why are you not sure if Glasgow is a good place to grow old?

(please answer in the space below)

Question 2

Question 3

For all:
Do you have any ideas for improving Glasgow for older people?

(please answer in the space below)

Question 4

For all:
In 25 years, about one-fifth of people in Glasgow will be over 65. What impact do you think this will have?

(please answer in the space below)

Please tell us the date Completed
(dd/mm/yyyy): [ ] [ ] [ ]

You are finished.
Thank you!
System design

- Bespoke RHRN IT system development (to facilitate study design)
- Issue and answer of questions (text + email participants)
- Record responses
- Share results and findings summaries
Question development

➡️ Pre-developed ‘bank’ prompted by project themes (identified during workshops)

➡️ Stakeholder panel formed for topical issues

➡️ Current news stories / calendar events
Sampling and recruitment

- Stratified random probability sample
- Quota sample
Pop-up Recruitment

Add yourself to our map to tell us your favourite place in our fantastic city!
RHRN pilot study

- 6-month pilot
- 5th May – 27th October 2015
- 26 questions
Evaluation

- Recruitment/retention/characteristics of participants/weekly response rates...
  - *RHRN recording data*

- Community researchers’ views
  - 2 evaluation questions
  - *Telephone interviews*

- Decision-makers’ views
  - *workshop (relevance, utility, and quality of data gathered, added value, timeliness)*
What we learned
Recruitment

Stratified random sample

- Total addresses (n=400)
  - Ineligible addresses (n=63)
  - Eligible addresses (n=337)
    - Refusals (implicit & explicit) (n=280)
      - Recruited (n=57; 17%)

Quota sample

- 7 pop ups
  - Total approaches (n=736)
    - Ineligible addresses (n=334)
    - Eligible addresses (n=402)
      - Refusals (n=279)
      - Recruited (n=123; 31%)

Total = 180
Retention

- Both samples
- Quota sample
- Random sample

Started removing persistent non-responders: June 23rd

Stopped removing persistent non-responders/end of CR recruitment: July 21st

Number of Community researchers

- Both samples: Initial count 151, final count 128
- Quota sample: Initial count 60, final count 83
- Random sample: Initial count 0, final count 45
Weekly question response rates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder requests</th>
<th>Question ‘bank’</th>
<th>Topical/current news</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People (population)</td>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Blood donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Budget 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums and art galleries</td>
<td>Project questions (evaluation)</td>
<td>Quality of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Games</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Smoking in cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Money worries</td>
<td>Refugee crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-cigarettes</td>
<td>Your feedback (evaluation)</td>
<td>Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking ban</td>
<td>Public services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (child-friendly city)</td>
<td>Credit and finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living in Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recording data

Baseline demographic data
- Age, gender, ethnicity, education, employment status, household type, income, benefits, internet access

Comparisons:
- Between samples; Glasgow population (Census 2011)
Recording data

- **Age & Gender of CRs**
  - similar to general population (census comparison)

- **Education**
  - More in quota sample with degree-level qualification (census comparison)
  - Less in both samples with no qualifications (census comparison)

- **Responses to questions**
  - Higher among older + more qualified CRs
What Community Researchers thought

- **Satisfaction with frequency/format of questions**
  - engagement with RHRN
  - part of the weekly routine

- **Views on topics**
  - thought-provoking
  - some promoted self-discovery

"it keeps me motivated...if it was a more extended period, I would probably lose interest"

"..diversity of topics was quite interesting, maybe it made you stop and think a little bit about things"

"sometimes I discover I actually have opinions on these matters"
What Community Researchers thought

**Perceived value of participating in RHRN**
- sense of inclusion in community matters
- opportunity to have voices heard/be influential

"I like that I am doing something for my community and that answering these questions could possibly help improve it".

"you feel as if you’ve got a bit of responsibility to think about questions and answer them honestly – I think it makes you feel involved and part of something"
On-going participation
- majority positive
- potential to inform decision-making = key driver

“it would encourage me to continue...if you answer questions, then they have to be, not an end product, but of some use”

“I would like to think the answers I am giving are of use to someone and hopefully this information will be put to good use”
What decision-makers thought

- Relevance of data obtained
  - potential for generating different forms of data appreciated
  - findings summaries engaging, provide qualitative insights, useful in identifying key themes
  - preference for in-depth qualitative data/open questions
  - themed questions - data evolving over time

- Weaknesses of RHRN data
  - high level summaries of data: small sample size, short responses, weekly analysis/turnaround.
What decision-makers thought

.Utility of RHRN data

- doesn’t need to be weekly
- potential to overcome time lags in data generation
- many uses alongside traditional data collection
- Limitations: bias; small random sample not representative; analysis by participant characteristics; high level findings only.

.Value of real-time data

- can help raise profile of issues sooner/plug gaps in evidence
- If not representative, need to provide deeper qualitative insights into people’s experiences
Summary

➡️ Key aim met
- to test the feasibility of establishing a dynamic longitudinal panel to collect and disseminate data in near to ‘real time’

➡️ Appetite for real-time evidence generation

➡️ Limitations and learning points
Next steps

- Learning from pilot > discussions on next stage

- Focus on qualitative data collection

- More in-depth understanding: can we analyse and use that in real time?
⇒ Questions?
⇒ Comments?