

Female Genital Mutilation in the UK - where are We, where Do We Go Next? Involving Communities in Setting the Research Agenda

Dixon et al. (2018)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-018-0103-5>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

female genital mutilation

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Europe - United Kingdom

Why was it conducted at all?

Research on the effects of FGM on women and communities in England is limited. In particular, we know little of affected communities' knowledge and understanding of these new legal changes, and how this might impact on people's willingness to go to their doctor. nor do we know how health professionals are responding to these changes.

What was the objective?

to identify research and service priorities to support communities affected by female genital mutilation

What was the outcome?

a list of 4 research areas

How long did the research prioritization take?

2015 - 2016

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

focus group; workshop

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: 4 focus groups: participants were asked to discuss the questions what aspects of FGM they thought we should research and what questions they thought needed to be asked, or answered, what would be a useful resource, and how to ensure that resources were useful, believable, relevant and acceptable, what the future needs were for communities affected by FGM and the professionals working with them, and what barriers and facilitators there were to achieve these aims. Step 2: workshop: participants were asked to consider and discuss what research and service uncertainties and priorities could support progress towards the aim

Which stakeholders took part?

Women from communities affected by FGM, members of community groups, people working in clinical services, multi-agency team workers, legal and ethics experts, members of charitable organizations, academics and researchers.

How were stakeholders recruited?

No information provided.

Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?

Stakeholders were mere participants of the research prioritization process; they were not actively involved in the process.