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2. AIMS/OBJECTIVES

The seminars aimed to:

1. Develop heuristic overviews of the plethora of theories recently introduced into the IPE field
2. Compare/contrast these theories and establish consensus on which should take priority in future research.
3. Evolve prioritised key theories in IPE through discussion of potential applications in interprofessional education and research.
4. Emphasise theoretical underpinnings of interprofessional education and research to improve the quality of research and practice in this area and other interdisciplinary contexts.
5. Bring together expertise in educators/researchers from a range of health and social care (HSC), education and psychosocial disciplines, to create a forum through which researchers debate and develop the research evidence base surrounding IPE.
6. Encourage cross fertilisation of ideas, and improve communications between practitioners/researchers within HSC and other disciplines (specifically those of sociology, psychology, education).
7. Encourage new collaborations/networks between HSC, education, psychology and social science disciplines.
3. PUBLICITY

The series targeted researchers (including doctoral students), curriculum developers/teachers/facilitators of IPE and HSC practitioners. The seminars were hosted at four locations nationally to maximise participation. Bursaries were offered to students and HSC practitioners to cover accommodation/transport costs. Publicity initiatives included:

- Each seminar host recruiting local HSC practitioners.
- Participants from previous seminars being invited to subsequent seminars.
- Participants recommended other participants.
- Adverts on each host university’s intranet.
- Colleagues encouraged their doctoral students to attend and adverts appeared within the CAIPE doctoral network.
- The interim outcomes of the seminar series were presented at conferences and flyers distributed at these events.
- A web site (http://ihcs.bournemouth.ac.uk/etipec/who.html) was developed.

4. PROGRAMME OF EVENTS.

Four one-day events were held over 20 months with keynote presentations, group work and discussion planned and coordinated by a convener group. A wiki space facilitated cooperation across institutions, enabling data sharing and knowledge transfer (http://evolvingipetheory.wikispaces.com/). Seminars were videoed/podcasted where possible and data collected by:-

- End of seminar participant questionnaires.
- Convener group meeting notes and reflections.
- Results of seminar small group activities.

These sources were analysed to develop future seminars, consolidate the learning and identify emergent key themes.

**SEMINAR 1: Theoretical perspectives on IPE: plethora and priorities** *(Huddersfield University, 15/01/2008)*

Seminar 1 compared and contrasted relevant theories and explored criteria with which to prioritise these theories. The key note presentations were perspectives from

- Social and dynamic psychology: (C.Dickinson; M.Hind)
- Sociology: (M.Miers; A.Borthwick; M.Hammick; E.Carr)
- Education: (S.Hean; C.O’Halloran; D.Craddock)

Group work established points of commonality and discrepancies between theories, considered their practical value and applicable contexts.
**SEMINAR 2: Theoretical perspectives on IPE: prioritised theories from social psychology** (Newcastle University, 28/06/2008)

The seminar discussed the application of theory to address current/future challenges facing the workforce (professionalisation, collaboration and transition). Two keynote presentations followed:

- The current and future contribution of the contact hypothesis and theories of social identity to IPE practice: John Carpenter (University of Bristol, UK);
- Psychodynamics and IPE curriculum development: Ann Scott (University of Westminster, UK)

Small groups explored how each theory applied to their own IPE context.


The seminar consolidated discussion of themes identified in previous seminars with key note presentations from:

- Current contributions and future potential of educational theories to IPE practice Philip Clark (Rhode Island University, USA),
- An introduction to activity theory and a review of its application in IPE. Sarah Hean (University of Bournemouth), including recorded interview with Yrjo Engestrom (University of Helsinki, Finland)

Small groups then explored how Clark’s transtheoretical model applied to their IPE context and discussed the use of the activity triangle within the IPE curriculum.

**SEMINAR 4: A symposium: Where have we been and where to now?** (Bournemouth University, 27/06/09)

The symposium summarised key messages of the past three seminars. Practical applications of theory were identified as a particular challenge. Participants individually reflected on how they were now doing things differently, which theories they were using and how these were enacted. In a group exercise, participants identified key ways in which theory could be translated into practice: the priority participants placed on these was developed using nominal group technique.

5. PARTICIPANTS

Participants were described as open minded and open to new approaches. The majority were academic educationists¹/researchers; many had a dual role in practice.

¹ In this area, practitioners of two types: academics working as educators/curriculum developers/facilitators and delivering IPE within the University and practice settings are viewed as one form of practitioner. HSC practitioners are a second type of practitioner. Both benefit from a sound theoretical knowledge to articulate their practice.
6. WHAT LEVEL OF DEMAND WAS THERE FOR PARTICIPATION?
Seminar attendance ranged from 22 to 31 participants (Table 1). Doctoral students were well represented given the low numbers in the field. Recruitment from participants in practice was disappointing and may reflect the focus on IPE rather than interprofessional practice.

Table 1: Demography of seminar attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Participant type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Representatives from practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Representatives from practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Representatives from practice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Representatives from practice</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. HOW WERE THE SPECIFIED OBJECTIVES MET THROUGH THE SEMINARS?

Achieving objectives 1, 2, 3, 4
Participants saw a clearer classification and synthesis of current IPE-relevant theories as a key outcome, so theory might have dimensions like time, people, agency and application at macro, meso and micro levels. Other key findings include:

- Although an aim had been to prioritise/establish consensus on key theories in the field, it is now recognized that no single theory can fit all IPE contexts. A tool box approach to theory application is required.
- There is a need to differentiate between theories that apply to IPE and those relevant to interprofessional practice.
- In prioritising key theories, others including complexity theory, had been sidelined.
- Prioritised theories were selected because of practical application and visibility: this can lead to neglect of less accessible theorists (e.g. Bourdieu).
- Educational theories received the most attention: theories focusing on social aspects of learning were of particular interest.
- There is a need to develop theory originating from IPE experience specifically.
- Theories are not mutually exclusive and overlap exists between them.
Achieving objectives 5 & 6
See sections four and six

Achieving objective 7
A collaborative wall exercise (seminar four) listed potential collaborative projects, including:-
- Exploring the barriers to theory.
- Mapping links between IPE theories.
- Exploring the bridge between IPE and IPP.
- Championing the use of psychodynamics in IPE.

8. FEEDBACK FROM PARTICIPANTS
Participants identified that the series had:-
- Developed a sustainable community with a committed interest in theory.
- Been of value to doctoral students in the field.
- Encouraged and increased self reflection on their own contexts and practice.
- Made theories more accessible.
- Enabled different professionals to interact and exchange perspectives.

9. HAVE ANY ACTIVITIES ARISEN AS A RESULT OF PARTICIPATION IN THE SEMINARS?
Conferences presentations


Peer reviewed papers
Book chapters


Papers in progress


- Barr, H. DVD and paper on theoretical perspectives in IPE, piloted as distance learning programme, Niigata University, Japan.

Research proposals


Ongoing activities

- Workshop proposal ‘Evolving theory in IPE’ Hean, S., Craddock, D., Hammick, M., Barr, H. Submitted to *Altogether Better Health V, Australia*, 2010

- Proposal for an Association for Medical Education in Europe Guide for selected theories and their application to IPE.