

**CLIENT PERCEPTIONS: A USEFUL
MEASURE OF COORDINATION OF
HEALTH CARE**

**CLARE FRANCES MCGUINNESS
BMed (Newcastle) FRACGP MAE**

**A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
of the Australian National University**

February 2001

DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work. The research was conducted within a large trial for which the National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health were employed as evaluators. The Chief Investigator of this evaluation was Dr Beverly Sibthorpe, who was also the chair of my supervisory panel. The trial managers were responsible for collecting the majority of the data used in this thesis, and much of this was cleaned and assembled by members of the local evaluation team. I was responsible for entering, cleaning and assembling all data derived from the Client Perceptions of Coordination Questionnaire.

.....
Clare Frances McGuiness

**National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health
Australian National University
Canberra**

February 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my supervisory panel, Drs Beverly Sibthorpe and Dorothy Broom and Professor Bob Douglas for support and guidance in research practice. The local evaluation team for the Care Plus Coordinated Care Trial provided a constant sounding board and motivation to unravel the meanings of client perceptions of coordination. This group were: Ms Robyn Attewell, Dr Ross Bailie, Dr Jim Butler, Ms Karen Gardner, Ms Jean Hardy, Ms Patricia Healy, Professor Charles McGilchrist and Dr Craig Veitch. I am also indebted to staff from Robert Barnett and Associates Pty Ltd, in particular Michael Tyler, for help in forms design.

The Care Plus Trial was managed by a large team comprising staff of Care Plus Pty Ltd, the ACT Division of General Practice and ACT Department of Health and Community Care. As evaluators for the trial, we were active participants with them in designing, monitoring and reviewing the trial at all stages. For this we relied on the support and collaboration of all these colleagues.

The study was funded through an ANU scholarship and a grant from the Australian Department of Health and Aged Care for some development work on the CPCQ during 1996. Their funding of the evaluation of the trials in general provided an invaluable setting in which to conduct my research.

I am also grateful to staff at Tuggeranong Square Medical Practice, Team Care, Brisbane and Linked Care, Sydney and study participants in three cities for their involvement.

ABSTRACT

Despite the many interventions and trials aimed at improving coordination of health care, there is currently no accepted measurement of coordination. My professional interests and an opportunity provided by the Care Plus (Coordinated Care) Trial in the ACT led me to consider client perceptions as a potentially appropriate measure. My research question is “can coordination of health care be usefully measured through client perceptions?”

I addressed this question by developing and testing an instrument to measure perceptions of coordination called the Client Perceptions of Coordination Questionnaire (CPCQ). In the thesis I describe the processes of developing the instrument, testing it through use in several studies and considering how useful such an instrument may be for health services research. In addition to the Coordinated Care Trial, I conducted two validation studies - in a chronic pain population and a general practice sample.

In Part 1 of the results I demonstrate good face, content and discriminant validity, and reliability of the instrument. Psychometric analysis of the CPCQ did not support scaling, and identified areas where the instrument could be improved. Nevertheless the underlying construct of client perception of coordination as a measure is entirely new, and it is therefore worthwhile to explore its associations with other health outcome data. In Part 2 I use a single item from the CPCQ, “how often did you feel the care you received was well-coordinated?” to explore this construct. I explore the influences upon client perceptions of coordination, and examine its associations with service utilisation and health outcome data.

The construct of ‘perceived coordination’, and the capacity of the CPCQ to measure it accurately show considerable promise as measures of health care. Consistent trends were found that suggested coordination was a complex construct, and that a stronger theoretical base was needed to interpret this complexity. Theory is the first of the ‘phases’ of instrument development, and so I revisit these in order to summarise the strengths and weaknesses of the current CPCQ. Overall, the perceptions of coordination have surprisingly plausible associations with other health data, the effort to improve the instrument should be worthwhile for a wide range of health service evaluation and research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 A BACKGROUND TO MEASURING COORDINATION

Coordination on the “Health Agenda”.....	1
A measure of coordination.....	2
The Research Questions.....	5
Summary.....	6

CHAPTER 2 FOUNDATIONS FOR THE CPCQ

Introduction.....	7
What is coordinated care?.....	8
Components of coordination.....	15
Measurement of coordination.....	18
Lessons from patient satisfaction research.....	26
Summary.....	30

CHAPTER 3 DEVISING THE CPCQ

Introduction.....	32
Aspects of instrument development.....	33
Processes of devising the CPCQ.....	46
The final version for use in the Care Plus Trial.....	51
Summary.....	54

CHAPTER 4 STUDIES FOR TESTING THE CPCQ

Introduction.....	56
Care Plus Trial.....	58
General Practice Audit.....	63
Chronic Pain Study.....	66
Summary.....	69

PART 1 TESTING THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE CPCPQ

CHAPTER 5 COMPREHENSION, RELIABILITY AND TRANSFERABILITY

Introduction.....	73
Comprehension.....	74
Completion analysis.....	76
Alternative forms reliability of Impact Study data.....	85
Transferability – Comparison of two chronically ill populations.....	89
Summary.....	88

CHAPTER 6 CONTENT VALIDITY AND SCALE CONSTRUCTION

Introduction.....	96
Impact Study.....	97
Intra-instrument correlations.....	102
Free text comments.....	104
Principal components analysis.....	104
Sub-scale construction.....	109
Summary.....	116

CHAPTER 7 CONSTRUCT AND CRITERION VALIDITY

Introduction.....	118
Discriminant construct validity.....	119
Concurrent criterion validity.....	126
Summary.....	130

PART 2 CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF ‘CLIENT PERCEIVED COORDINATION’

CHAPTER 8 CONCURRENT CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF THE SINGLE ITEM MEASURE

Introduction.....	133
Demographic characteristics.....	135
Multiple providers.....	137

Clinical variables prompting need for coordination.....	141
Independent predictors of perceived coordination.....	147
Summary.....	152

CHAPTER 9 USING LONGITUDINAL DATA IN VALIDITY TESTING

Introduction.....	154
Sensitivity to change of the single item measure.....	155
Association of perceived coordination and change in health outcomes.....	156
Association of perceived coordination and service utilisation.....	159
Summary.....	163

CHAPTER 10 REVISION AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CPCQ

Introduction.....	165
Testing reliability and validity.....	166
Strengths and weaknesses of the CPCQ.....	170
Issues for further research.....	171
Instrument modification.....	180
Summary.....	182

CHAPTER 11 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary and Conclusions.....	184
-------------------------------------	------------

APPENDICES.....	188
------------------------	------------

REFERENCES.....	215
------------------------	------------

LIST OF TABLES, FIGURES AND APPENDICES

CHAPTER 2 FOUNDATIONS FOR THE CPCQ

Table 2.1 Dimensions of satisfaction instruments in primary care settings.....	25
---	-----------

CHAPTER 3 DEVISING THE CPCQ

Figure 3.1 The refining process from ideas to an instrument.....	35
Table 3.1 Age and gender of respondents by pilot study site (% only).....	48
Table 3.2 Quality of responses to CPCQ in first round of pilot test.....	49
Table 3.3 Items not retained in the CPCQ after pilot testing	50
Table 3.4 Content of items and response options of CPCQ.....	53

CHAPTER 4 STUDIES FOR TESTING THE CPCQ

Table 4.1 Time line of data collection for devising and testing the CPCQ.....	58
Table 4.2 Completion rates for CPCQ in Care Plus Trial	62
Table 4.3 Characteristics of clients in each study	64
Table 4.4 Use of individual study data in different tests of reliability or validity, and where reported	68

PART 1 TESTING THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE CPCPQ

CHAPTER 5 COMPREHENSION, RELIABILITY AND TRANSFERABILITY

Table 5.1 Demographic characteristics by response status, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 1271).....	74
Table 5.2 Clinical parameters according to response status, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 1271).....	76
Table 5.3 Comprehension of items in the overall section of the CPCQ, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 1193).....	78
Table 5.4 Comprehension of items in the GP section of the CPCQ, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 1193).....	79

Figure 5.1 Envisaged progression through items in the section about a client-nominated provider	81
Table 5.5 Comprehension of items in the client-nominated provider section of the CPCQ, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 1193).....	81
Table 5.6 Comprehension of items in the carer section of the CPCQ, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 1193).....	81
Table 5.7 Alternate forms reliability for similarly worded items in CPCQ and Impact Questionnaire.....	86
Table 5.8 Reliability of items substantially changed between the CPCQ and Impact Questionnaire.....	88
Table 5.9 Responses to items in the CPCQ (% only), Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 888) and General Practice Audit (n= 80).....	90
Table 5.10 Responses to items about enablement in the CPCQ (% only), Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 888) and General Practice Audit (n= 80).....	91
Table 5.11 Summary measures of responses to CPCQ items in two studies.....	92
Figure 5.2 Mean score of responses to CPCQ items, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 888) and General Practice Audit (n = 80).....	93

CHAPTER 6 CONTENT VALIDITY AND SCALE CONSTRUCTION

Table 6.1 Mean score (ranking) of items in Impact Study (n = 98).....	100
Table 6.2 Correlation of items with global coordination item, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 869).....	103
Table 6.3 Factor loadings of 25 perceptual items from the CPCQ, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 279).....	107
Table 6.4 Distribution of scale scores, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 888).....	110
Table 6.5 Internal consistency reliability of scale scores of the CPCQ, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 888).....	110
Table 6.6 Correlation among scale scores of the CPCQ, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 587).....	111
Table 6.7 Item-scale correlation matrix for CPCQ items and scales, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 587).....	113

CHAPTER 7**CONSTRUCT AND CRITERION VALIDITY**

Table 7.1	Response to items according to chronic pain (% only), Care Plus Trial baseline and Chronic Pain Study (n = 856).....	120
Table 7.2	Enablement items according to chronic pain (% only), Care Plus Trial baseline and Chronic Pain Study (n = 856).....	121
Table 7.3	Summary of different responses to CPCQ items according to clinical condition (n = 811).....	123
Table 7.4	Client – GP concordance for CPCQ items during the Care Plus Trial, negative/positive/tied ranks (p value).....	127
Table 7.5	Distribution of matched responses to items common to CPCQ and GPCQ, Care Plus Trial baseline, (number/%)	128
Table 7.6	Mean scores (ranking) of items common to CPCQ and GPCQ, Care Plus Trial administrations.....	130

PART 2**CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF ‘CLIENT PERCEIVED COORDINATION’****CHAPTER 8 CONCURRENT CONSTRUCT VALIDITY OF THE SINGLE ITEM MEASURE**

Table 8.1	Perceived coordination according to time with GP, Care Plus Trial baseline (n/row %).....	136
Table 8.2	Perceived coordination according to whether multiple providers were seen at baseline, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 1193).....	137
Table 8.3	Perceived coordination according to factors in recruitment, Care Plus Trial baseline (n/row %).....	139
Table 8.4	Factors in recruitment according to perceived coordination, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 795).....	141
Table 8.5	Measures of clinical severity (mean score) according to perceived coordination, Care Plus Trial baseline	142
Figure 8.1	Association between perceived coordination and self-rated health, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 869).....	143
Figure 8.2	Handicap and social support scores (mean) according to perceived Coordination, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 869).....	146
Table 8.6	Predictors of perceived coordination, backwards stepwise logistic regression model, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 583).....	150

CHAPTER 9

USING LONGITUDINAL DATA IN VALIDITY TESTING

Table 9.1	Change in perceived coordination over two years, Care Plus Trial baseline to trial end (n = 592).....	156
Table 9.2	Change in key health and well-being indicators (adjusted for minimal change), Care Plus Trial baseline to trial end	157
Table 9.3	Change in key health and well-being indicators by perceived coordination, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 599).....	159
Table 9.4	Mean monthly number of services (adjusted for time in trial) by perceived coordination, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 838).....	161
Table 9.5	Mean monthly number of services, adjusted for time in trial, by perceived coordination, Care Plus Trial end (n = 604).....	162

CHAPTER 10

REVISION AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CPCQ

Figure 10.1	SF36 domain scores according to adjusted categories of perceived coordination, Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 869).....	174
--------------------	---	------------

APPENDICES

Appendix 3.1	Reports arising from the Care Plus Trial Evaluation.....	188
Appendix 3.2	Quality of responses to CPCQ in second round pilot test	189
Appendix 3.3	Test-retest reliability of items retained in the CPCQ from pilot.....	190
Appendix 3.4	List of external reviewers, January 1997.....	191
Appendix 4.1	Health Status Questionnaire (HSQ).....	192
Appendix 4.2	Care/Well-being Questionnaire (SF36).....	196
Appendix 4.3	Your Health Your Life (YHYL).....	200
Appendix 4.4	General Practitioners Perceptions of Coordination Questionnaire (GPCQ).....	203
Appendix 4.5	Impact Questionnaire.....	208
Appendix 7.1	Responses to CPCQ according to diagnosis of hypertension (% only), Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 799).....	210
Appendix 7.2	Responses to CPCQ items according to diagnosis of depression (% only), Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 799).....	211

Appendix 8.1 Selected demographic characteristics by perceived coordination	
(n/row %), Care Plus Trial baseline (n = 869).....	212

Appendix 8.2 SF36 domain and summary scores (mean/standard deviation)	
according to perceived coordination, Care Plus Trial baseline....	214

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACT	Australian Capital Territory
ACTDGP	ACT Division of General Practice
ACTHCC	ACT Department of Health and Community Care
CCT	Coordinated Care Trial/s
CHF	Consumers Health Forum
COAD	Chronic Obstructive Airways Disease
COAG	Council of Australian Governments
CPCQ	Client Perceptions of Coordination Questionnaire
CPS	Chronic Pain Study
CPT	Care Plus Trial
DHFS	Commonwealth Department of Health and Family Services
DVA	Department of Veteran Affairs
GP	General Practitioner
GPA	General Practice Audit
GPCQ	General Practitioners Perceptions of Coordination Questionnaire
HIC	Health Insurance Commission
HSQ	Health Status Questionnaire
IHD	Ischaemic Heart Disease
LHS	London Handicap Scale
MBS	Medical Benefits Schedule
MOS74	Medical Outcomes Study 74 item version
NSW	New South Wales
PCA	Principal Components Analysis
RACGP	Royal Australian College of General Practitioners
SF36	Medical Outcomes Study, Short Form –36
VAS	Visual Analogue Scale
YHYL	Your Health/Your Life Questionnaire