

**David Li Tang, France Bouthillier**  
**School of Information Studies, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada**  
**Pierre Pluye, Roland Grad**  
**Department of Family Medicine, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada**  
**Carol Repchinsky**  
**Canadian Pharmacists Association, Ottawa, Canada**

## **The Development of a User Feedback Management Process: A Participatory Action Research Project**

**Abstract:** This poster presents a methodological overview of a doctoral project in progress, which aims to identify the factors involved in the development and implementation of a user feedback management process for the Canadian Pharmacists Association. It invites discussion on using participatory action research for the project.

**Résumé :** Cette affiche présente un aperçu de la méthodologie d'une recherche doctorale en cours, qui vise à identifier les facteurs impliqués dans le développement et la mise en œuvre d'un processus de gestion des commentaires des utilisateurs de l'information fournie par l'Association des pharmaciens du Canada. Elle discute l'utilisation de la recherche-action participative.

**Introduction:** The Canadian Pharmacists Association (CPhA) publishes e-Therapeutics<sup>®</sup>, an online therapeutic information resource. As a subscriber and member service, the CPhA sent weekly email alerts of pieces of therapeutic information selected from e-Therapeutics<sup>®</sup> to over 6,500 pharmacists. Information users can, concomitant to reading a message, provide feedback comments about the distributed information via a Web form. Volumes of feedback are being received continuously. Making good use of that feedback requires a systematic process to be developed and successfully implemented, and understanding the various factors involved in this organizational undertaking is crucial to its success.

To break down this challenge, three gaps were identified through review of literature: first, clinicians' feedback comments have not been studied in terms of the usefulness to the information provider; second, no existing process can meet CPhA's need for feedback management; and third, the factors that take part in the development and implementation of a user feedback management process are not yet completely identified and understood. Accordingly, three groups of research questions are posed, focusing respectively on the feedback comments, the process for making use of the feedback, and the organizational factors involved in the development and implementation of the process.

**Methodology:** The rationale for using PAR is that (a) it will meet both the researcher's interest in knowledge (research findings) and the participant's desire for practical insight (solutions) (Ospina et al. 2008), and (b) action research in collaboration with practitioners will help reach empirically generalizable propositions about the organization (Argyris and Schön 1978).

The research design is a single organizational qualitative case study, and its scope is defined by the organizational boundary of CPhA. The advantage of this design is that it ensures internal validity by integrating action and academic research, as the research is conducted exactly when and where the initiative of systematic feedback management takes place.

At the same time, the principles of PAR are respected throughout the project (Macaulay et al. 1997; Potvin et al. 2003; Reason and Bradbury 2006), namely:

- (1) The research and action components are closely integrated;
- (2) The researcher and the stakeholder are equal partners in the project;
- (3) The produced work aims to be sustainable into the future.

**Poster layout:** There will be two sections on the poster. The left section (1/3 width) will provide background information about the project, such as the stakeholder, the problem statement, and a feedback comment example. Then on the right section (2/3 width), a table will lay out the complete research design as well as any findings and outcomes, as illustrated below. A poster is ideal for presenting the whole research design in one table.

User feedback	Feedback management process	Organizational factors (concerning the development and implementation of the process)
Gap 1 in the literature	Gap 2 in the literature	Gap 3 in the literature
Research questions	Research questions	Research questions
Methods & data	Methods & data	Methods & data
Findings	Findings & outcomes	Findings & outcomes

**Contributions:** This poster demonstrates (a) how PAR is used to address a real-world problem and to have an impact on the stakeholder organization, and (b) that PAR can be a suitable approach to studying information use at the organization level, as opposed to the social and individual levels (Saracevic and Kantor, 1997).

## References

- Argyris, Chris, and Donald A. Schön. 1978. *Organizational learning*. Reading, Mass. ; Don Mills, Ont.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Macaulay, A. C., G. Paradis, L. Potvin, E. J. Cross, C. Saad-Haddad, A. McComber, S. Desrosiers, R. Kirby, L. T. Montour, D. L. Lamping, N. Leduc, and M. Rivard. 1997. The Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project: Intervention, evaluation, and baseline results of a diabetes primary prevention program with a native community in Canada. *Preventive Medicine* 26 (6):779-790.
- Ospina, Sonia, Jennifer Dodge, Erica Gabrielle Foldy, and Amparo Hofmann-Pinilla. 2008. Taking the action turn: lessons from bringing participation to qualitative research. In *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*, edited by P. Reason and H. Bradbury. Los Angeles ; London: SAGE.
- Potvin, L., M. Cargo, A. M. McComber, T. Delormier, and A. C. Macaulay. 2003. Implementing participatory intervention and research in communities: Lessons from the Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project in Canada. *Social Science and Medicine* 56 (6):1295-1305.
- Reason, Peter, and Hilary Bradbury. 2006. *Handbook of action research: The concise paperback edition*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Saracevic, T., and P. B. Kantor. 1997. Studying the value of library and information services. Part I. Establishing a theoretical framework. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 48 (5): 527-542.