

## About the KT Theories Access Database

Title of CIHR grant to conduct this work:

Identification, Concept and Bibliometric Analyses of Knowledge Translation Theories/Frameworks

The following is the list of investigators involved in this project (in alphabetical order)

|                    |                    |                      |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Davies, Barbara    | Harlos, Karen      | Pomey, Marie-Pascale |
| Driedger, Michelle | Harrison, Margaret | Stacey, Dawn         |
| Eccles, Martin     | Lauzon, Sylvie     | Straus, Sharon       |
| Foy, Rob           | Legare, France     | Tetroe, Jacqueline   |
| Gifford, Wendy     | Logan, Jo          | Wensing, Michel      |
| Godin, Gaston      | Martino, Rosemary  | Zwarenstein, Merrick |
| Graham, Ian        | Mcgowan, Jessie    |                      |
| Grimshaw, Jeremy   | O'Connor, Annette  |                      |

Key research staff on the project are:

|                 |                 |                  |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Ammerman, Darcy | Bird, Madeleine | Robinson, Nicole |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|

### Why did we develop this Access Database?

The purpose of our research was to conduct a focused search for conceptual models, frameworks, and grand theories of knowledge transfer (planned change); to undertake a theory analysis of the identified models/theories to determine their strengths and limitations and to determine similarities and differences between them; to determine the extent to which each theory has been used and/or tested and the contexts and populations in which it has been used and/or tested; and to produce a users-guide to the theories (theories catalogue, synthesis of theory analysis).

There is an interesting contradiction in implementation research. While many implementation trials are uninformed by theory, at the same time, there would appear to be an alarming number of theories extant in the peer reviewed literature. We identified relevant theories and “unpacked” their concepts so as to be able to find the commonalities between them as well as to identify the full range of components thought to be important for successful implementation.

To do this, we conducted a focused literature search of: health sciences, social sciences, management, education literature (over 4,000 hits); internet, hand searching of the journals *Science Communication*; *Knowledge, Technology and Policy*. We developed inclusion criteria to identify planned action theories and then extracted data from each theory as we determined the origins; examined the meaning; judged the logical consistency; defined the degree of generalizability and parsimony and testability. We conducted an analysis of the concepts found in each theory and used that to develop a set of action categories that form the phases of planned action. As a result, we identified 31 planned action theories that formed the basis of our analyses.

Practitioners interested in implementing change in their setting can view our database to get an overview of theories, find one that suits their purpose, discover the common components of planned action theories and be enabled to use theory to guide their future implementation endeavours.