

## Profiles and questions in the SAGE ONLINE survey

### 1. Searching for research

Listed below are eight different scenarios reflecting how a policymaker went about locating research to inform the development of a policy document.

Research includes both academic and grey literature resources.

Please rate, on the 1-9 scale, the **extent to which each scenario represents a *limited, moderate, or extensive*** strategy for searching for research.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Limited			Moderate			Extensive		

Profile	Rating out of 9
<p>1. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Searched grey literature sources (e.g., OpenGREY, ProQuest International, WHO)</li> <li>• Consulted experts and/or librarians to identify relevant research</li> <li>• Used search engines (e.g., Google)</li> <li>• Examined reference lists of articles or EndNote database</li> </ul>	
<p>2. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Searched academic literature databases (e.g., Medline, Cochrane Library) or libraries</li> <li>• Used research that was already on hand</li> <li>• Used search engines (e.g., Google)</li> <li>• Examined reference lists of articles or EndNote database</li> </ul>	
<p>3. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used research that was already on hand or given by others</li> <li>• Consulted experts and/or librarians to identify relevant research</li> <li>• Examined reference lists of articles or EndNote database</li> </ul>	
<p>4. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Searched academic literature databases (e.g., Medline, Cochrane Library) or libraries</li> <li>• Searched grey literature sources (e.g., OpenGREY, ProQuest International, WHO)</li> <li>• Examined reference lists of articles or EndNote database</li> </ul>	
<p>5. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Searched academic literature databases (e.g., Medline, Cochrane Library) or libraries</li> <li>• Consulted experts and/or librarians to identify relevant research</li> <li>• Used search engines (e.g., Google)</li> </ul>	
<p>6. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Searched grey literature sources (e.g., OpenGREY, ProQuest International, WHO)</li> <li>• Used research that was already on hand</li> <li>• Used search engines (e.g., Google)</li> </ul>	
<p>7. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Searched academic literature databases (e.g., Medline, Cochrane Library)</li> </ul>	

or libraries	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Searched grey literature sources (e.g., OpenGREY, ProQuest International, WHO)</li><li>• Used research that was already on hand</li><li>• Consulted experts and/or librarians to identify relevant research</li></ul>	
8. The policymaker...	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Did not undertake any of the aforementioned search strategies</li></ul>	

## 2. Research obtained and used

Listed below are eight different scenarios reflecting the types of research a policymaker may obtain when developing a policy document.

Please rate, on the 1-9 scale below, the **extent to which each scenario represents a *limited, moderate, or extensive* accessing of available research.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Limited			Moderate			Extensive		

Profile	Rating out of 9
1. The policymaker found... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematic reviews and/or meta-analyses</li> <li>• Primary research and/or theoretical articles</li> <li>• Books and/or technical monographs</li> <li>• Unpublished research and/or conference resources</li> <li>• Internal policies, evaluations, or data</li> <li>• Policies, evaluations, or data from external organisations or registries</li> <li>• Recent research from the above categories</li> </ul>	
2. The policymaker accessed... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary research and/or theoretical articles</li> <li>• Policies, evaluations, or data from external organisations or registries</li> <li>• Recent research from the above categories</li> </ul>	
3. The policymaker accessed... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Books and/or technical monographs</li> <li>• Internal policies, evaluations, or data</li> <li>• Recent research from the above categories</li> </ul>	
4. The policymaker accessed... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematic reviews and/or meta-analyses</li> <li>• Unpublished research and/or conference resources</li> <li>• Recent research from the above categories</li> </ul>	
5. The policymaker accessed ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unpublished research and/or conference resources</li> <li>• Internal policies, evaluations, or data</li> <li>• Policies, evaluations, or data from external organisations or registries</li> <li>• Dated research from the above categories</li> </ul>	
6. The policymaker accessed ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematic reviews and/or meta-analyses</li> <li>• Books and/or technical monographs</li> <li>• Policies, evaluations, or data from external organisations or registries</li> <li>• Dated research from the above categories</li> </ul>	
7. The policymaker accessed ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematic reviews and/or meta-analyses</li> <li>• Primary research and/or theoretical articles</li> <li>• Internal policies, evaluations, or data</li> <li>• Dated research from the above categories</li> </ul>	
8. The policymaker accessed ...	

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Primary research and/or theoretical articles</li><li>• Books and/or technical monographs</li><li>• Unpublished research and/or conference resources</li><li>• Dated research from the above categories</li></ul> |  |
|--|--|

### 3. Appraising the relevance of research

Listed below are eight different scenarios reflecting how a policy maker went about assessing the applicability of research to the current policy question

Please rate, on the 1-9 scale below, the **extent to which each scenario represents a *limited, moderate, or extensive* appraisal of research relevance.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Limited			Moderate			Extensive		

Profile	Rating out of 9
<p>1. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether research recommendations were actionable and/or feasible</li> <li>Assessed whether research was compatible with his/her OR the organisation's values, knowledge, or experience</li> <li>Consulted experts to assess relevance</li> <li>Undertook these actions as part of a pre-specified strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>2. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether the research was applicable to the policy context or policy issue</li> <li>Assessed whether the research was consistent with previous research on the issue</li> <li>Consulted experts to assess relevance</li> <li>Undertook these actions as part of a pre-specified strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>3. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether the research was consistent with previous research on the issue</li> <li>Assessed whether research was compatible with his/her OR the organisation's values, knowledge, or experience</li> <li>Undertook these actions as part of a pre-specified strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>4. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether the research was applicable to the policy context or policy issue</li> <li>Assessed whether research recommendations were actionable and/or feasible</li> <li>Undertook these actions as part of a pre-specified strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>5. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether the research was applicable to the policy context or policy issue</li> <li>Assessed whether research was compatible with his/her OR the organisation's values, knowledge, or experience</li> <li>Consulted experts to assess relevance</li> <li>Undertook these actions as part of an ad-hoc or intuitive strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>6. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether research recommendations were actionable and/or feasible</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessed whether the research was consistent with previous research on the issue</li> <li>• Consulted experts to assess relevance</li> <li>• Undertook these actions as part of an ad-hoc or intuitive strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>7. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessed whether the research was applicable to the policy context or policy issue</li> <li>• Assessed whether research recommendations were actionable and/or feasible</li> <li>• Assessed whether the research was consistent with previous research on the issue</li> <li>• Assessed whether research was compatible with his/her OR the organisation's values, knowledge, or experience</li> <li>• Undertook these actions as part of an ad-hoc or intuitive strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>8. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not undertake any of the above-mentioned actions to assess relevance</li> <li>• Assessment of relevance was part of an ad-hoc or intuitive strategy</li> </ul>	

#### 4. Appraising the quality of research

Listed below are eight different scenarios reflecting how a policy maker went about assessing the credibility, validity, or rigour of research and its conclusions

Please rate, on the 1-9 scale below, the **extent to which each scenario represents a *limited, moderate, or extensive appraisal of research quality.***

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Limited			Moderate			Extensive		

Profile	Rating out of 9
<p>1. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether the research design or conclusions were valid</li> <li>Evaluated whether the research design or conclusions were described clearly and comprehensively</li> <li>Assessed the credibility of the source of the research</li> <li>Checked whether the research cited, or was referenced in other high-quality research or policy documents</li> <li>Consulted experts to assess quality</li> <li>Assessed the level of evidence of the research</li> <li>Undertook these strategies as part of a pre-specified strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>2. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed the credibility of the source of the research</li> <li>Assessed the level of evidence of the research</li> <li>Undertook these strategies as part of a pre-specified strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>3. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluated whether the research design or conclusions were described clearly and comprehensively</li> <li>Consulted experts to assess quality</li> <li>Undertook these strategies as part of a pre-specified strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>4. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether the research design or conclusions were valid</li> <li>Checked whether the research cited, or was referenced in other high-quality research or policy documents</li> <li>Undertook these strategies as part of a pre-specified strategy</li> </ul>	
<p>5. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Checked whether the research cited, or was referenced in other high-quality research or policy documents</li> <li>Consulted experts to assess quality</li> <li>Assessed the level of evidence of the research</li> <li>Undertook these actions as part of an ad-hoc or intuitive approach</li> </ul>	
<p>6. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessed whether the research design or conclusions were valid</li> <li>Evaluated whether the research design or conclusions were described clearly and comprehensively</li> <li>Assessed the level of evidence of the research</li> <li>Undertook these actions as part of an ad-hoc or intuitive approach</li> </ul>	

<p>7. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessed whether the research design or conclusions were valid</li> <li>• Assessed the credibility of the source of the research</li> <li>• Consulted experts to assess quality</li> <li>• Undertook these actions as part of an ad-hoc or intuitive approach</li> </ul>	
<p>8. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluated whether the research design or conclusions were described clearly and comprehensively</li> <li>• Assessed the credibility of the source of the research</li> <li>• Checked whether the research cited, or was referenced in other high-quality research or policy documents</li> <li>• Undertook these actions as part of an ad-hoc or intuitive approach</li> </ul>	



## 5. Generating new research and/or analyses

Listed below are eight different scenarios reflecting a policymaker's plans or intentions to commission or undertake new research, evaluations, or analyses to inform the current and/or future policy.

Please rate, on the 1-9 scale below, the **extent to which each scenario represents a *limited, moderate, or extensive* strategy for generating new research.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Limited			Moderate			Extensive		

Profile	Rating out of 9
<p>1. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentioned thorough research generation activities</li> <li>• Mentioned less intensive research activities (e.g., advisory groups, formalised meetings).</li> <li>• Had uncertain intentions to generate or commission this new research</li> <li>• Advocated for future research to be undertaken</li> </ul>	
<p>2. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentioned less intensive research activities (e.g., advisory groups, formalised meetings).</li> <li>• However, had no intentions to generate or commission this new research</li> <li>• Advocated for future research to be undertaken</li> </ul>	
<p>3. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentioned thorough research generation activities</li> <li>• However, had no intentions to generate or commission this new research</li> <li>• Advocated for future research to be undertaken</li> </ul>	
<p>4. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had explicit intentions to generate or commission new research</li> <li>• However, did not mention any specific research generation activities</li> <li>• Advocated for future research to be undertaken</li> </ul>	
<p>5. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentioned thorough research generation activities</li> <li>• Mentioned less intensive research activities (e.g., advisory groups, formalised meetings).</li> <li>• Had explicit intentions to generate or commission this new research</li> </ul>	
<p>6. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentioned less intensive research activities (e.g., advisory groups, formalised meetings).</li> <li>• However, had no intentions to generate or commission this new research</li> </ul>	
<p>7. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mentioned thorough research generation activities</li> <li>• However, had no intentions to generate or commission this new research</li> <li>• Consulted experts and/or librarians to identify relevant research</li> </ul>	
<p>8. The policymaker...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not mention any specific research generation activities</li> <li>• Had uncertain intentions to generate or commission new research</li> </ul>	



## 6. Interacting with researchers

Listed below are eight different scenarios reflecting how a policy maker went about interacting with researchers to inform the development of the current policy

Please rate, on the 1-9 scale below, the **extent to which each scenario represents a *limited, moderate, or extensive* strategy for interacting with researchers.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Limited			Moderate			Extensive		

Profile	Rating out of 9
1. The policymaker... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged in thorough collaborative activities with researchers</li> <li>• Engaged in sporadic contact with other researchers</li> <li>• Actively initiated these interaction activities</li> </ul>	
2. The policymaker... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged in sporadic contact with researchers</li> <li>• Actively initiated these interaction activities</li> </ul>	
3. The policymaker... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged in thorough collaborative activities with researchers</li> <li>• Engaged in less intensive interactions with other researchers</li> <li>• Actively initiated these interaction activities</li> </ul>	
4. The policymaker... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged in less intensive interactions with researchers</li> <li>• Actively initiated these interaction activities</li> </ul>	
5. The policymaker... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged in thorough collaborative activities with researchers</li> <li>• Engaged in less intensive interactions with other researchers</li> <li>• Engaged in sporadic contact with other researchers</li> <li>• Did NOT pre-plan or actively initiate these interaction efforts</li> </ul>	
6. The policymaker... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged in less intensive interactions with other researchers</li> <li>• Engaged in sporadic contact with other researchers</li> <li>• Did NOT pre-plan or actively initiate these interaction efforts</li> </ul>	
7. The policymaker... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged in thorough collaborative activities with researchers</li> <li>• Did NOT pre-plan or actively initiate these interaction efforts</li> </ul>	
8. The policymaker... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did NOT mention any specific interaction activities with researchers</li> <li>• Did NOT pre-plan or actively initiate any particular interactions</li> </ul>	