

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Name of your approach to assess societal impact</b>   | <b>Case study (mixed-methods + participatory approach)</b><br>Theresa Allweiss (KHSB, Berlin, Germany)   |
| <b>Approach description</b><br>Please summarize your approach and its application context/options in a few sentences or bullet points.                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of a participatory health research consortium was assessed</li> <li>• Every sub-project, the coordination unit, and the consortium as a whole assessed impact with a combination of different methods (e. g. focus group, survey, document analysis)</li> <li>• there was an overall structured process and every unit used impact mapping as a visualization und reflecion tool</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Concepts used in the approach</b><br>Please insert definitions for key concepts and components.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition impact: „Impact is recognised as the many forms of change that occur with, within and for those who are engaging in the research as well as those changes that occur across the wider complex socio-ecological system or set of systems in which PHR is taking place. It occurs throughout the research process and continues after it is completed.“ (ICPHR, 2020)</li> <li>• Following this definition, we were looking for changes at different levels, and emphasized (among others) on the role of empowerment processes, the development of individual competences in all persons involved, as well as on changes in and between the groups of people and organizations involved</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Key challenges</b><br>Please write down what you are struggling with concerning the application of your approach.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An exploratory or partly structured approach may cause uncertainty and is often more complex than highly pre-structured/pre-defined approaches</li> <li>• The wide definition of impact made it sometimes difficult to focus, and to identify indicators – mainly in the beginning of the process</li> <li>• We started with the impact assessment at the beginning of our 2<sup>nd</sup> funding period – so we could not apply pre-post comparison methods</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Visualization and narratives</b><br>Please add short information on whether and how you use visualization, narratives or other boundary objects in your approach. | Impact mapping as reflection method: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the process we used impact mappings in a participatory way (which means that many of the different persons involved in the research were also involved in the impact mapping)</li> <li>• The mappings were structured with questions regarding             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identification of impact and impact pathways</li> <li>○ Demonstrating and describing impact</li> <li>○ Supporting further impact</li> </ul> </li> </ul> Impact narratives as presentation of results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the presentation of results we used so-called impact narratives (comprehensive descriptions with links to supporting documents, evidence and sources)</li> </ul> |
| <b>Strengths and weaknesses</b><br>From your own perspective: What would you consider as strengths and weakness of your approach?                                    | + <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The multi-method and participatory approach enabled a multifaceted view on impact; thus, unexpected effects and differing judgements of effects could be discovered</li> <li>• The (qualitative) narrative approach made it possible to show pathways and to describe complex relationships</li> </ul> - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• uncertainty about cause-effect relationships</li> <li>• time-consuming</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Learn more</b>  | The impact narratives are published online:<br><a href="http://partkommplus.de/wirkungen">http://partkommplus.de/wirkungen</a> (unfortunately, only in German language)  |