



**Qualitative Analysis Plan**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Content** | **Further Description** |
| **Study Name** | (Process Evaluation of) STASH: Sexually Transmitted Infections and Sexual Health | An exploratory study to test ‘STASH’, a peer-led intervention to prevent and reduce STI transmission and improve sexual health in secondary schools |
| **Qualitative Researcher Details** | Dr Carrie Purcell (Study Research Fellow)Dr Kirstin Mitchell (Study co-PI)  | Data collection (observation, single/paired/group interviews, baseline/follow-up QR free text); qualitative data analysis (stage 1 and 2)Data collection (observation, single/paired/group interviews); qualitative data analysis (stage 2)  |
| **Full Study Objectives**  [**bold** = most relevant to QuAP]  | [As per Full STASH Protocol v1.3 230617]  | 1. **Finalise the design of a school-based STI prevention intervention, in which influential peer supporters use online social networks and face-to-face interactions to influence norms, knowledge, competence and behaviour and promote use of sexual health services.**2. **Assess the recruitment and retention of peer supporters, as well as feasibility, and acceptability of the intervention among peer supporters, participants and key stakeholders.****3. Assess the fidelity and reach of intervention delivery by trainers and peer supporters, including barriers to, and facilitators of, successful implementation.****4. Refine and test the logic model and theoretical basis of the intervention.****5. Enhance understanding of the potential of social media, when used by influential peers, to diffuse norm change and facilitate social support for healthy sexual behaviour.**6. Determine key trial design parameters for a possible future large-scale trial, including recruitment and retention rates and strategies, outcome measures, intra-cluster correlation and sample size.7. Determine the key components of a future cost effectiveness analysis and tested data collection methods.8. **Established whether pre-set progression criteria are met and a larger scale trial is warranted.** If criteria met, we will design the protocol for an RCT, including identification of required structures, resources and partnerships.  |
| **Process Evaluation Objectives (6 schools)** *[Learning from the Pilot will also be incorporated as appropriate – the ways in which this has been done are captured in intervention development write-up]*  | [As per Full STASH Protocol v1.3 230617]  | * Assess the intervention in terms of implementation, mechanisms of impact, and context. This includes assessing:
	+ fidelity (ie. quality of programme delivery)
	+ acceptability (including relevance to target group and perceived impact)
	+ exposure to intervention components
	+ reach
	+ contextual factors including barriers to and facilitators of implementation
	+ recruitment and retention
	+ researcher reflections on the process of implementation
* In doing this, to contribute to understanding of the overall feasibility of the intervention
* Identify which components are most important to the success of the intervention; exploring components that did and did not work (and for whom), and reasons why
* Test and contribute to evaluating the programme theory (theory testing)
* Contribute to understanding of how intermediate outcomes have or have not been met/achieved
 |
| **Process Evaluation Research Questions** **(6 schools)**  | [As per Full STASH Protocol v1.3 230617]  | 1. Is it feasible to implement the STASH intervention?
2. What are the barriers and facilitators to implementing STASH (including local and broader contextual factors)?
3. Is the STASH intervention acceptable to the target group and key stakeholders?
4. What is the reach of STASH across the target group?
5. Are the preconditions and mechanisms outlined in the programme theory appropriate/sound?
6. In practice, did the intervention address intermediate outcomes? How might this be explained?
 |
| **Method of Data Collection: Qualitative**(4 case study schools only) |  | Structured observations: 4x Peer Supporter recruitment meeting (1 per school) 4x 2-day Peer Supporter training (1 per school)8x Peer Supporter follow-up sessions (2 per school) Interviews: 3x Trainers 8-12 Teachers (2-3 per school) 6-16 Peer Supporters in pairs/groups (2-4 pairs/groups per case study school)6-16 non-Peer Supporter S4s in pairs/groups (2-4 pairs/groups per case study school) |
| **Mixed methods** (data collection tools generating both qualitative and quantitative data; all schools) |  | 100 (approx.) PS Training evaluation forms (1 per PS for 6 schools) 6x Teacher/ accompanying staff evaluation forms (1 per training, 6 schools) 18-54x Fieldworker observation forms (peer nomination, baseline, endline; 3-9 per school, 6 schools – number tbc) 48x Trainer observation forms (recruitment, training, follow up; 8 per school, 6 schools) Project monitoring data Facebook activity data  |
| **Data Produced**  | Completed qualitative observation forms; student/teacher evaluation forms; and FW/Trainer observation forms (hard copy Word docs) Audio recorded data in WMA/MP3 formatProject monitoring data (various sources) Facebook activity data (online data) | Written observational data transcribed directly into Word documents (ready for import into Nvivo)Signed consent forms (Word documents) will also be collected for each participant in the qualitative data collection. Individual/paired/group interviews will be audio recorded (to ensure an accurate record). Audio recordings will be fully transcribed and anonymised by a professional transcriber.  Anonymised monitoring data for all schools to be entered in Project Monitoring Log (tailored Excel file) over course of fieldwork.Anonymised counts of Facebook activity to be retrieved via STASH Trainer account by member of STASH research team, collated in tailored Excel file.  |
| **Data Management**  | Data capture: | Observational data captured in writing or transcribed directly (via laptop) into structured observation forms tailored to each session. Interviews audio recorded on hand held digital recorder. Mixed method student/teacher evaluation, and Trainer/Fieldworker observation data captured on tailored forms (Word documents) and entered into tailored Excel files. Project Monitoring Data / Facebook Activity Data captured via tailored Excel files.  |
|  | Data storage: | Researcher copies of qualitative data collection consent forms (signed and dated by participant and researcher, with a copy given to the participant) will be filed securely at the SPHSU.All interview recordings will be transferred from the recording device to a locked shared STASH project folder (only accessible to the project team) on the Glasgow University network drive. Anonymised interview transcripts, typed up structured quali observation notes, and Nvivo files will be stored in a different folder in the same network drive. All interviews will be deleted from the audio recorder as soon as they are uploaded to the GU network drive. Hard copy completed evaluation and Trainer/Fieldworker observation forms will be stored securely at the SPHSU, and input data stored in the STASH project folder, along with the project monitoring log (none of which contains sensitive data). Data will be archived in line with the STASH Data Management Plan, Glasgow University guidance on data archiving and the MRC’s ‘Personal Information in Medical Research’ guidance document. |
|  | Anonymisation process: | All personal information such as names, school names and locations are anonymised throughout all written data (with schools allocated a non-identifying code, and strict data protection policies are followed as outlined in the University of Glasgow’s data protection policy (<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/dpfoioffice/policiesandprocedures/dpa-policy/>). Professional transcribers (with an existing relationship with the SPHSU) are presented with transcription guidelines, to support them in the correct transcription methods, and anonymisation is checked by the STASH team on receipt of transcribed data. |
| **Stopping data collection** | Defining and recognising data saturation | *Data collection and analysis is reviewed at weekly PEG meetings and regular process evaluation subgroup meetings. Within these the team will assess the data currently collected to identify whether the point of saturation is reached. Should this not have been reached within planned data collection (as outlined above), the team will continue data collection until data saturation has been reached. Saturation is defined as the point at which no new findings are found to emerge from any new data collected.*  |
| **Methods of Analysis: Stage 1 (Independent analyses)**  | Qualitative data: | Stage 1a) Thematic analysis of qualitative data (interview transcripts, observational data) will begin with focused coding around the PE aims and programme theory, and so will address issues including fidelity, acceptability, exposure, reach, contextual factors, recruitment/retention, and overall feasibility (see above). This approach is outlined in the STASH Feasibility Study Process Evaluation Coding Framework (v1.0), developed during the Pilot and subsequently revised by CP, in consultation with the PE sub-group. Qualitative observation guides and interview topic guides are structured around the PE aims/RQs (see above) and programme theory, to ensure the necessary data are captured, while also allowing for the emergence of issues not anticipated by the research team. All coding will be conducted by CP. Stage 1b): From this descriptive stage the data will be interpreted further to establish key findings and develop potential explanations around these. Analysis will seek to capture both positive as well as negative views on the intervention. Contradictory findings and complexities will be discussed in an iterative process with the PE subgroup, and the broadest possible range of potential explanations considered, as per the expertise of the group and available literature. Evidence for potential explanations will be built through the accumulation of data as per the PE Framework.  |
|  | Mixed method data | Narrative summaries will be produced of the key contributions of each source of mixed method data (training evaluation data, Trainer/Fieldworker observations data, PML data; free text baseline/follow-up QR responses) following analysis in Excel. Quantifiable components of these will also be analysed in Excel for numerical counts and simple descriptive statistics.  |
| **Methods of analysis: Stage 2 (Data integration)**  | Integrative analysis: | Following independent analyses, integration of each strand of data – qualitative, mixed method, and quantitative (as relevant to the PE) - will be undertaken, to ascertain how they best address the PE aims/RQs (including feeding into the programme theory), in an approach informed by the Framework method. Key findings from each strand will be positioned in one single matrix for each of the PE components/research questions (fidelity, acceptability etc). Analysis will be subject to further interpretation by the PE subgroup. In doing so, analysis will address complementary findings from each strand of data and, via an iterative process, draw out key synergistic/triangulated contributions (that is, where multiple sources create a holistic picture of the issue in question). The resulting findings will be reviewed alongside/with reference to the STASH logic model, and the programme theory revised as appropriate to the findings.  |
|  | Supporting software: | Nvivo 11 will be used to facilitate qualitative data management and analysis. Excel will be used for mixed-method data management and analysis.  |
| **Quality assessment of Analysis** | Debriefing and analysis review | Those conducting qualitative analysis will meet regularly to discuss their progress on coding and the interpretive stage of qualitative analysis with the TMG and PE sub-group. This facilitates discussion of uncertainties as to how to analyse certain passages, and to review the progress of analysis and ensure it remains focused. This process also aids in ensuring the reliability of the coding framework.  |
|  | Peer review | The analysis conducted will feed into the final funding report in which the PE subgroup, Trial Management Group, and Trial Steering Committee will have the opportunity to provide further comments on the analysis, as will reviewers of the final NIHR report. This will contribute to the submission of findings for publication in peer reviewed journals. |
| **Handling missing data / withdrawals** | Case by case | Should any participants in the qualitative research wish to withdraw their interview data, or any data go missing for whatever reason, this will be handled on a case by case basis with input from the wider STASH team and TMG. In the case of individuals who wish to withdraw from the study, any data which has already been collected from them will be destroyed. If any data were to go missing, we would not seek to impute it. We would also investigate how/why it has gone missing and assess whether a breach of protocol or security risk has occurred.  |
| **SIGNATURES**  | Dr Kirstin Mitchell (Study co-PI)  | xxxx 20th June 2018 |
| Dr Carrie Purcell (Study Research Fellow)  | xxxx 19th June 2018 |