

topics within psychiatry. The process and depth of research collaboration can vary and is not always described adequately.

**Objectives:** The objective is to describe the collaborative methods and the experiences of experts by experience and academic researchers in a research project on patients’ experiences of remote care in psychiatric settings during and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Methods:** We describe our collaborative methods and experiences using the INVOLVE key features ([www.involve.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.involve.nihr.ac.uk)).

**Results:** Collaboration started with an open discussion on research aims and role definitions. Collaborative methods included teaching and training sessions on interview methodologies, collaboratively writing and evaluating documents for ethical approval and research permission, collaboratively planning the recruitment process, preparation, and conducting research interviews and analysis. On-line and in-person meetings have been essential for an an-going dialogue and reflection. The methods and experiences are described in more detail in Table 1.

Openness and building trust have been important and time was needed to achieve these. All academic researchers had been actively working with experts by experience in the clinical settings before the research project. The collaboration in the current study has emphasized the need for active involvement of experts with experience throughout the research process. For the experts by experience, the project has provided new insight into academic research and given them confidence in their ability to participate meaningfully in a collaborative study project. The academic researchers valued the sense of significance of the research topic and shared decision-making that the collaboration has brought into the project.

**Image:**

Table 1 Methods and experiences of the co-research according to the INVOLVE key features.

Involve Key Feature	Establishing ground rules	Ongoing dialogue	Joint ownership of key discussions	Commitment to relationship building	Opportunities for personal growth and development	Flexibility	Valuing and evaluating the impact of co-produced research	Continuous reflection
Method	Open discussion on roles and aims before the project started	Frequent meetings and contact during the process	Meetings including everyone when difficulties occur, open discussion on possibilities	Frequent meetings during planning and conducting research, leaving spaces for open discussion	Co-presentations, learning by doing	Size and roles in the research team make it possible to share and take turns in roles	Stopping to reflect what we have done and officially acknowledging everyone’s contribution	Frequent meetings and contact during the process, reflections after conducted interviews.
Experience	Important for building trust and role clarification “what is expected of me”	Adding meaning/units to the research process.	Possibility to reflect and discuss were important especially when difficulties occurred	COVID-19 restrictions allowed only on line meetings in the beginning made relationship building more difficult but with time we have been able to build trust.	Realizing own capability to conduct interviews, learning from the collaboration.	The research does not depend only on one person, flexibility with events in private life.	Emphasis on the research process and continuous learning.	Especially with difficulties in recruitment reflection has given sense of importance and to continue with the project.

**Conclusions:** Collaborative research needs time to build trust and to clearly define the roles of participants, from the opening stage of the process. Continuous learning during the research process is emphasized. Since different research methodologies arise from various theoretical backgrounds, we suggest adding a topic on research theory to the INVOLVE key features.

**Disclosure of Interest:** None Declared

**EPV0891**

**Two Sides of the Same Coin? A Comparison between Internet-based and Paper-based Data Collection for Autism Quotient and Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale**

D. Sönmez\*, Y. Abidi and T. R. Jordan

Psychology, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Türkiye

\*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2024.1499

**Introduction:** The utilization of internet-based data collection in mental health research has gained popularity for its convenience and affordability. However, concerns often arise regarding the validity and reliability of data collected via the internet. The Autism Spectrum Quotient (AQ) is a self-report questionnaire to measure the traits associated with autism spectrum disorder (Baron-Cohen *et al.* J Autism Dev Disord, 2001; 31 5-17) and the online usage of AQ is common and conducted with large numbers of participants across many studies. However, the effect of using internet-based data collection for AQ rather than conventional paper-based procedures is unknown.

**Objectives:** To address this issue, we conducted a study comparing the effectiveness of internet-based and paper-based data collection procedures for both the AQ and Depression Anxiety Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21, Lovibond & Lovibond, Behav Res Ther 1995; 33 335–343), which is also a prevalent mental health measurement in the literature and often used for online data collection (Zlomke, Comput Hum Behav 2009; 25 841-843). In addition, to compare internet-based and paper-based methods more fully, we included another variable (type of supervision) where a researcher was either present or absent during the completion of the questionnaires.

**Methods:** A power analysis was conducted, and a minimum of 90 participants were needed to reach a medium effect size of .30 with an adequate power of .80 at  $\alpha = .05$ . Accordingly, 96 participants were used and randomly assigned across 4 data collection groups: internet-based (supervision, no supervision) and paper-based (supervision, no supervision). In addition to a Demographic Form, AQ, and DASS-21 were used to obtain the data. Three independent variables were used in the current study: type of presentation (internet-based and paper-based) and type of supervision as between factors, and type of assessment as a within factor.

**Results:** Using a 2 x 2 x 2 mixed design ANOVA, no significant main effects were found for any independent variables (all  $p > .33$ ) or interaction (all  $ps > .17$ ).

**Conclusions:** The results of using AQ and DASS-21 were not altered by using internet-based or paper-based data collection procedures, suggesting that both methodologies are equally valid for this purpose. Moreover, these effects were also unaffected by the presence or absence of a researcher during data collection, suggesting that supervision by an authoritative figure does not alter the responses made.

**Disclosure of Interest:** None Declared