

Appendix I: Research engagement and perceived applicability

This appendix tests whether practitioners who engage more with the academic literature find it less applicable to their operational contexts: if engagement bred disillusion, perceived applicability should be lower among respondents who consume research most. We correlated two consumption measures (keeping up with recent academic research, Q22; frequency of reading scientific articles, Q19) with five attitude and obstacle measures (trust in peer-reviewed results and perceived concreteness, Q22; perceived low applicability, methodological difficulty, and language barrier as obstacles, Q23), using Spearman correlations with Benjamini–Hochberg correction across the ten tests.

None of the associations is statistically significant (all absolute $p \leq .18$; smallest raw $p = .093$; all adjusted $p \geq .78$). Descriptively, frequent readers of scientific articles (categories 4–5, $n = 39$) and rare readers (categories 1–2, $n = 33$) are nearly indistinguishable: 46% versus 47% find academic results sufficiently concrete for their institution’s activity, and 58% versus 55% rate low applicability as a moderate or major obstacle; only trust trends higher among frequent readers (77% versus 63%, not significant).

Table I1. Spearman correlations between research consumption and trust, perceived applicability, and reported obstacles ($n = 87–91$), with raw and Benjamini–Hochberg-corrected p -values.

Consumption measure	Outcome	n	ρ	p (raw)	p (BH)
Frequency of reading scientific articles	Trust in peer-reviewed results	91	.18	.093	.784
Frequency of reading scientific articles	Methodological difficulty (obstacle)	87	–.12	.283	.784
Keeps up with recent academic research	Trust in peer-reviewed results	91	.11	.319	.784
Keeps up with recent academic research	Low perceived applicability (obstacle)	87	.09	.389	.784
Frequency of reading scientific articles	Results sufficiently concrete for institution	91	.08	.469	.784
Frequency of reading scientific articles	Language barrier (obstacle)	87	–.06	.570	.784
Keeps up with recent academic research	Language barrier (obstacle)	87	.05	.677	.784
Frequency of reading scientific articles	Low perceived applicability (obstacle)	87	.04	.700	.784
Keeps up with recent academic research	Results sufficiently concrete for institution	91	.04	.706	.784
Keeps up with recent academic research	Methodological difficulty (obstacle)	87	.01	.925	.925

These results are exploratory. At these sample sizes ($n = 87\text{--}91$), correlations below approximately $p = .30$ are not reliably detectable, and the design is cross-sectional: respondents who found research inapplicable may have stopped reading it, which would mask a negative association. Within these limits, the data show no sign that engagement breeds disillusion, nor that exposure alone improves perceived applicability. Analysis scripts and full results are provided with the replication materials.