

Informing the development of NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) quality standards through secondary analysis of qualitative narrative interviews on patients' experiences

Sue Ziebland,^{1*} Louise Locock,¹ Ray Fitzpatrick,² Tim Stokes,^{3,4,5} Glenn Robert,⁶ Norma O'Flynn,⁷ Kristina Bennert,^{1,8} Sara Ryan,¹ Victoria Thomas⁹ and Angela Martin¹

¹Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

²Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

³National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, Manchester, UK

⁴Department of Health Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

⁵Primary Care Clinical Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

⁶National Nursing Research Unit, Florence Nightingale School of Nursing and Midwifery, King's College London, London, UK

⁷National Clinical Guideline Centre, London, UK

⁸School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁹Patient and Public Involvement Programme, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, London, UK

*Corresponding author

Declared competing interests of authors: Norma O'Flynn is seconded to the National Clinical Guideline Centre which is funded by NICE to develop clinical guidelines. Tim Stokes does occasional work for pharmaceutical companies on the work of NICE and primary care; any honoraria received are paid directly to the University of Birmingham. Ray Fitzpatrick is a member of the NIHR Journals Board.

Disclaimer: this report contains transcripts of interviews conducted in the course of the research, or similar, and contains language that may offend some readers.

Published November 2014

DOI: 10.3310/hsdr02450

Scientific summary

Informing development of NICE quality standards

Health Services and Delivery Research 2014; Vol. 2: No. 45

DOI: 10.3310/hsdr02450

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background

This proposal was submitted to the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Service Delivery and Organisation's call for proposals for secondary research studies. We wanted to explore whether or not an archive of qualitative, narrative interviews covering over 60 health issues could be used to inform the development of National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) clinical guidelines (CGs) and quality standards (Qs). At the time of the application, the NICE process for Qs was still emerging, and it was not clear which topics would be selected for Qs during the 2011–12 timetable. We felt reasonably confident that we would have data to contribute to at least four of the Qs that would be developed during the 18 months of the project.

The team of applicants was assembled to include members of the Health Experiences Research Group (HERG) in Oxford, a clinical director at the National Clinical Guideline Centre (NCGC) and a consultant clinical adviser for Qs at NICE, an expert in organisational research and service implementation and a leading researcher on patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) and patient-reported experience measures (PREMs).

Objectives

1. To conduct qualitative secondary analysis (of collections of narrative interviews) to identify common, core components of patients' experiences of the NHS.
2. To test these candidate components with (i) further purposive sampling of the interview collections and (ii) a series of focus groups with users.
3. To embed the project alongside the development of NICE CGs and Qs.
4. To inform the development of measurement tools on patients' experiences.
5. To develop and share resources and skills for secondary analysis of qualitative health research.

Methods

We used qualitative, thematic methods to analyse collections of interviews from the HERG archive; reports were written on four of these to feed into NICE product development (objective 1). At the time the study began, the HERG archive contained over 60 collections of interviews on a wide variety of topics. Interviews had been collected by experienced social scientist researchers using a combination of open-narrative and semistructured interview techniques. Interviews had all been copyrighted to the University of Oxford for use in research, teaching, broadcasting and publications.

One member of the team interviewed HERG and NICE/NCGC colleagues about their views of the process of reporting the secondary analyses to the NICE teams, including ideas about the barriers to including these secondary analyses in NICE product development (objective 3).

The qualitative secondary analyses were also used to compare which aspects of patients' experiences were important to people facing different health issues and to test these findings in another two health conditions and in a series of focus groups, chosen to include participants who we believed to be under-represented in the HERG collections (objective 2).

Dissemination of the findings included publishing a selection of interview extracts on a website, discussing the findings (in particular the focus groups examining the reach of the core components) with PROMs and PREMs researchers, and holding a workshop on qualitative secondary analysis to share skills and inform future training courses (objectives 4 and 5).

Results (research findings)

We analysed interview collections on experiences of myocardial infarction (MI), rheumatoid arthritis (RA), asthma, and diabetes in young people. We prepared reports on each of these four health issues, covering the aspects of care that were described as important to the people we had interviewed. Some aspects of care (e.g. being taken seriously when presenting with health concerns, taking time to answer questions, involvement in decisions) were described as important in all of the collections, while other aspects of care (e.g. building confidence, providing rapid access to specialist services, demonstrating how to use treatment devices, acknowledging uncertainties about treatment outcomes) were raised as important in only one or more of the collections. Two further collections, on experiences of autism and experiences of fertility problems, were included in the next stage of the analysis. This analysis drew attention to the particular importance of good communication for people with autism and of empathy from staff for people dealing with fertility problems.

The results from the six secondary analyses were then examined in a modified framework analysis to identify a set of eight common core components of good health care. These were:

- involving me in decisions about my care
- having a friendly and caring attitude
- having some understanding of how my life is affected
- letting me see the same health professional
- guiding me through difficult conversations
- taking time to answer my questions and explain things well
- pointing me towards further support
- efficient sharing of my health information across services.

The next stage of the project involved testing these components in a series of focus groups with participants who we knew to be under-represented in the HERG interview collections. We conducted groups that were composed of people with learning disabilities, Irish Travellers, illegal-drug users (some of whom were also homeless), young men, recent immigrants in manual occupations and older people. We also ran an online discussion group so that people with limiting chronic conditions could take part without the need for them to leave home. The groups were all run during the early part of 2013 and used a similar format, although it was necessary to adapt the groups to allow for group characteristics such as attention span and literacy. Each group started with a discussion of what was important when dealing with health care and a sorting task involving discussion of the core components and any other aspects of care that the people in the group thought were important. This raised a few issues that were not easily subsumed under other categories.

The focus groups confirmed that the original set of core components were also important aspects of health care to members of these groups. In interpreting differences in priorities between individuals, it was very evident that the participants drew on their own experiences of (ill) health, caring and interactions with health services, and that these experiences clearly affected what they regarded as most important and also what they thought were 'basic', 'good' and 'aspirational' aspects of care. Seen in this light, it is understandable that the young men we talked to (a generally healthy group) were not at all concerned about seeing the same doctor, whereas this was quite important to the people with long-term conditions (LTCs). Experiences of care also affected how confident people were that certain aspects of care were indeed 'fundamental' and could be taken for granted. This applied to both the trust that people put in

their doctors' specialist training (and consequent interchangeability) and their confidence that the health system would share information appropriately across services. Older adults and those with LTCs were more aware, for example, that health professionals might sometimes be uncertain about what was the best treatment and that there would sometimes be a lack of good evidence about what treatments were effective.

For objective 3, we considered how the reports on the first four secondary analyses were received by the NICE teams. Intended to contribute to NICE CG and QS development, the asthma report highlighted several issues, but only the importance of proper inhaler training contributed to a quality statement. Three of the CG/QS teams (ST segment elevation myocardial infarction, diabetes type 1 and RA) felt that there was unlikely to be any value in considering their respective reports; one of the others found that it did not add anything to the (reasonably extensive) review of the qualitative literature that they had conducted (secondary prevention of MI).

There was a lack of fit between the focus of the topics under review and the data available in the HERG archive – sometimes the material concerned experiences that happened too long ago or were too tangential to the quite focused clinical topics. A co-investigator in knowledge transfer interviewed the HERG researchers and the members of the NICE/National Collaborating Centre (NCC) teams to help us to identify reasons why the reports seemed to have little impact on the NICE products. Reasons included uncertainty about the status of the material, further exacerbated by some confusion about the various HERG products (which include peer-reviewed papers, a website including peer-reviewed summaries of approximately 25 topics per condition and the targeted secondary analysis reports which were not publicly available).

Objective 4 was to inform the development of measurement tools; we presented findings to a group of researchers (experts in PROMs and PREMs) who helped us to think about the implications of our work, both for developing questionnaires and for interpreting responses and explaining differences between populations.

We organised a workshop for objective 5 which helped us to clarify gaps in the methods literature and training provision for secondary analysis of qualitative data. We have developed a course to help fill this gap, the first of which will be run as part of the HERG qualitative research training programme in 2014.

Conclusions

We compared the perspectives about what is most valued in health care between people with different health conditions. There was considerable agreement about which aspects were important, even among groups whose views are rarely included in health research, who we interviewed in focus groups in an attempt to challenge the reach of our eight core components. By including people from 'seldom heard' groups, we found that the different experiences of health-care relationships varied enormously and affected their views about what aspects of care might be considered 'fundamental'.

With regard to the NICE CG and QS development process, the usual source of evidence is published qualitative or quantitative research. Unpublished secondary analysis of qualitative data did not fit the usual criteria for evidence. The asthma report was the only report that can be seen as having directly contributed to a QS and was written by the primary researcher at a point when the data were still very familiar. Writing one extra report at this stage is a relatively efficient use of a primary researcher's time and suggests to us that when the HERG researcher is preparing or updating the topic summaries they might, as part of their analysis, write a brief report on the aspects of care that are particular and important to patients with this condition. In collaboration with NICE, the interview collections could be mapped to the guidelines and QS programme. A targeted analysis on the precise topic of a guideline might seem efficient

in theory but there may not be a good match of data available – the strengths and limitations of any specific data set need to be decided on a case-by-case basis. We suggest that targeted secondary analysis has more potential when the qualitative literature is sparse, unclear or contradictory.

Funding

Funding for this study was provided by the Health Services and Delivery Research programme of the National Institute for Health Research.

Health Services and Delivery Research

ISSN 2050-4349 (Print)

ISSN 2050-4357 (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk

The full HS&DR archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hsdr. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Services and Delivery Research* journal

Reports are published in *Health Services and Delivery Research* (HS&DR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HS&DR programme or programmes which preceded the HS&DR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

HS&DR programme

The Health Services and Delivery Research (HS&DR) programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was established to fund a broad range of research. It combines the strengths and contributions of two previous NIHR research programmes: the Health Services Research (HSR) programme and the Service Delivery and Organisation (SDO) programme, which were merged in January 2012.

The HS&DR programme aims to produce rigorous and relevant evidence on the quality, access and organisation of health services including costs and outcomes, as well as research on implementation. The programme will enhance the strategic focus on research that matters to the NHS and is keen to support ambitious evaluative research to improve health services.

For more information about the HS&DR programme please visit the website: <http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hsdr/>

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HS&DR programme or one of its proceeding programmes as project number 10/1011/19. The contractual start date was in November 2011. The final report began editorial review in October 2013 and was accepted for publication in March 2014. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HS&DR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2014. This work was produced by Ziebland *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Health Services and Delivery Research Editor-in-Chief

Professor Ray Fitzpatrick Professor of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Oxford, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the HTA Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Professor Aileen Clarke Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of NETSCC, HTA, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Elaine McColl Director, Newcastle Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Faculty of Education, University of Winchester, UK

Professor Jane Norman Professor of Maternal and Fetal Health, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board:
www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk