Author’s response to reviews

Title: Facilitating Non-tokenistic User involvement in Research. An Ethnographic Analysis from a Rehabilitation Research Project.

Authors:

Grace Inga Romsland (graceinga.romsland@sunnaas.no)
Kate Louise Milosavljevic (katemi@oslomet.no)
Tone Andreassen (toaa@oslomet.no)

Version: 2 Date: 02 May 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear reviewers and editors

We are very pleased with the good guidance from reviewers and editors and time to improve the manuscript. In the following we briefly describe what we have done.

We have marked comprehensive rewrites, extensions, and the moving of text, with yellow markings, but we don’t submit the track changes.

There has been many track changes throughout the manuscript after work on the text and several rounds of copyediting, which have improved the manuscript, but these track changes make it difficult to read. Because of the changes throughout, all such small changes are not marked. Changing ‘user’ with ‘collaborator’ throughout the manuscript is for example not marked.

Also the abstract and summary have changes due to the re-writing of the manuscript, but these are not marked.

We have mainly followed the setup from reviewer 5:

i. Consistency of terminology:

1.) The terms tokenism, collaborative arena, representational artefacts and language games requested are presented early in the Background section (item 1 from reviewer 5), see pages 3-4, along with
2.) Information about the collaborators, which is also desirable early in the article (item 2 from reviewer 5). We have also re-written the descriptions of the study in the method section, which also clarifies the users’ background.

3.) We agree in item 3 and ‘users’ etc. is now consistency changed to collaborators. When healthcare users are generally referred to and it is not appropriate to use ‘collaborators’, we prefer to use 'service users' to enhance consistency.

4.) In the previous draft we gave fictitious names to anonymise both collaborators and researchers, but this did not come out clearly. Now everybody has got a code instead of fictitious names. Those belonging to the research group are mentioned R+number and those belonging to the collaborator group are mentioned C+number. Presentation of participants with these codes, explaining who they are referring, is offered at page 7. These codes also clarify who is talking or acting. This applies to both previous pages 15-16 and elsewhere (item 4 from reviewer 5).

5.) We have clarified and specified the terms artefact, arena and continuing feature at previous pages 15-16, now page 12, and stories as language games and artefacts on previous lines 383-384, now page 19. The terms are firstly presented in the beginning of the article, so the use of the terms and why they are used on the same phenomenon, should be clearer and more consistent.

6.) We have added more examples connected to ‘promoting group dynamics’ related to previous lines 398-399, see pages 20, and to ‘visual techniques’ related to previous line 266, see page 14.

ii. Methods/empirical

The method chapter has great rewritings to clarify the methodological basis and the starting point for the analysis.

1) We have clarified to greater detail the number of researchers involved for this analysis, the collaborators role and that data was recorded throughout the project period.

2) Who were usually present and the number of audio recordings are specified. We have emphasised what was done to avoid the research group being in the majority.

3) Observations and use of different documents are described. We have described how documents influenced the data collection. At all, we have a more thorough description of the ethnographic research method

4) What are memos (previous ‘short memos’) is explained at page 8.

5) Evaluation of using meeting minutes as data source is done, see page 8.
6) The amount of the honorarium paid to users is described at page 12.

7) See also item 4 on consistencies. The fictitious names are now changed with a code. The codes are explained to bring it clear that both collaborators and researchers are anonymised and part of the study.

Additionally:

Emphasised at several places in the paper that the study is from a Norwegian context

Added a list of specific successful methodologies in the discussion chapter

Corrected points on specific lines (pointed out by reviewer 5).