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Methodology
- Qualitative interview with participants (n=14)
  - 6 to 10 weeks after the dialogue
- Evaluation questionnaires (n=38)
  - At the end of workshop
  - Thematic analysis and data triangulation for complementarity

Results

Positive Aspects
- Learning new knowledge about road safety & personal behavior awareness
- Creation of post-workshop collaborations
- Opportunities to learn from one another during deliberations
- Experience and lessons learned by other countries in road security
- The use of pictures for sensibilisation

Negative Aspects
- Limited presence of political figures
- Vast amount of information in a short time-frame & not enough time for debate after presentations
- Homogenous workgroups instead of disparate groups of actors
- Lack of commitment for the action plan and follow-up committee. They were not expecting to take decisions

Suggestions
- Start a dialogue between each group of stakeholders before the workshop (ex: police, CSOs) to allow a preliminary collaboration
- Plan time for different stakeholders to present what they do in road security to foster participation and collaboration
- Offer capacity-building activities after workshop for those who want to use knowledge in their activities (ex: youth leader or driving instructor)

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

1) Evaluate content, organization and the workshop process
2) Measure participants’ “intention to use research”
3) Highlight changes observed by participants in their practices
4) Propose recommendations to improve KT workshops

Participants
- 60 stakeholders (police departments, health professionals, CSO, driving schools, researchers, etc)

Workshop Agenda
- Duration: 1 day
- 5 researcher’s presentations
- Workgroups & deliberations to suggest recommendations for road security

Who can do what and when?

Participants were distributed in advance and revised by KT experts in order to improve their accessibility

Emphasis on participants’ involvement for developing an action plan during the workshop

Context
- Partnership: Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), National Police & University Hospital Center

Recommendations
- Engage a knowledge broker to conduct the follow-up, write final report and organize subsequent workshops
- Improve the process of the plenary deliberations. What are the best ways to develop an action plan?
- Encourage policymakers to attend by showing them the research’s utility and dialogue objective many weeks before workshop
- Clarify dialogue objective (develop recommendations) & importance of KT at the opening of the workshop
- Assure a continuous KT process: use mass medias, radio spots, theaters, sketches or social media to diffuse research results

Propose measures to reduce road accidents and their consequences

“Those dialogues allow research evidence to be considered together with the views, experiences and tacit knowledge of those who will be involved in, or affected by, future decisions about a high-priority issue.”

(Lavis, Boyko, Oxman, Lovin & Fretheim, 2009)