VOICEUP
YOUNG PEOPLE'S VOICE IN RESEARCH

GET-IT Glossary

Participants

7 VoiceUp members took part aged: 14, 16, 17 18, 18, 23, 24

3 males, 4 females

Method

We split into 2 groups (a four and a three). Each group was facilitated by a member of the Public Programmes Team. The task was explained to them and they were initially asked to spontaneously say any research terms they could think of.

Participants were given an iPad to look at the current Get-It glossary and allowed to look at the terms, they were also given a pack of 30 relatively common research terms and asked to sort them into:

- Ones they recognised and knew what they meant
- Ones they recognised but didn't know what they meant
- Ones they had not heard of before

The groups then discussed the terms and their importance, who might know them already and who might need to know them.

Feedback

1. **Design**

- Looks like Wikipedia, very technical
- Look at the colour scheme, grey looks more professional or make more colourful/friendly.
- Needs more images.
- Change font type –Times New Roman is old fashioned
- Some weren't sure about the monkey - suggests that you are a bit dumb if you don't get the definition!
- Allow embedding into websites so can hover over the definition
- Accessibility

2. **Layout**

- Preference is to keep as one glossary for everyone, rather than having separate young person's one

- Some debate about the need for age splits and which age splits are required. Some felt that age splits are discriminatory and could make people feel bad if they didn't understand the younger person's version.
- Others felt it was useful to look at pre and post GCSE (i.e. 15 and below and 16+) as there seems to be a considerable difference in knowledge levels amongst these groups.
- Why not look at a basic and advanced definition structure with clear examples to help people put it into context.
- Give examples of where you might use the glossary/word

3. Results

Group 1 results	
General terms that should be defined	Less common terms – important to know what they are
Protocol	Qualitative study
Bias	Quantitative study
Research	Intervention
Ethics	Cohort
Guidelines	Cost-effectiveness
Study	P-value
Analysis	Feasibility
Sample	Statistically significant
Variables	Abstract
Reliability	Outcomes
	Phase 1/2/3 trial

Group 2 Results
Placebo
Protocol
Feasibility
Bias
Outcomes
Average
Ethics
Variables
Randomised study
Blinding
Analysis
Phase 1/2/3 trial

Overlap words – words selected by both groups
Protocol
Feasibility
Bias
Outcomes
Ethics
Variables
Analysis
Phase 1/2/3 trial

Additional observations

- There was a lot of discussion about whether terms should be included on the top 10 list because they was fundamental to understanding the basics of research or because they were complex and so more likely to be looked up. Both groups felt there was a need for both of these words and so struggled to pin down their words to just 10.
- There is bias in the method we used as we provided a list of research terms, however as not all the group had been exposed to research terms before we felt this would be the fairest way to do this.