

Parental Satisfaction, Service Quality and Outcomes

Professor Alys Young

Social Research with Deaf People programme

University of Manchester

alys.young@manchester.ac.uk

- General considerations when thinking about satisfaction, quality and outcomes
- Specific details about a parent self report instrument
- Some results

Why are we interested in this triad?

- We know early detection is not enough, we need quality early intervention – but what is quality?
- A shift from population level questions to context level concerns:
 - Not: does EHDI deliver gains for deaf children?
 - But: what works for which families in which circumstances?

Why are we interested in this triad?

- As parents become a greater part of the intervention team
- As practice shifts ever more to family centred concerns
- New questions arise about
 - What is success in families' terms?
 - What is a good outcome for whom?

But

- Understanding and measuring satisfaction, quality and outcome is a problem...
- Whether as practitioner, researcher, parent – or all three...

Satisfaction

- Satisfaction is constrained by
- Knowledge
- Expectations
- Who we 'are'

Quality

- **Quality as structure**
 - Standards
 - Training/skills
 - Service elements
 - Best practice
- **Quality as process**
 - How services are provided
 - How professionals behave
 - Preferred underpinning philosophies (FCP; IC)

BUT...

- Subjective elements of appraisal will interact with both quality as structure and quality as process
- Beliefs, values, culture, priorities, previous life experience, expectations, social ecology
- They will cause us to vary in:
 - What we define as relevant, important, significant
 - How much we are satisfied
 - Perceived impact
 - How we interpret advice and support

Outcomes

- To be measured (providing we know the tool we measure with actually measures what we think it does...)
- But whose outcomes and what kind of outcomes are given importance?
- Can different sorts of outcome be correctly interpreted and recognised?

Developing a parent-report quality assessment instrument

- Allow us to have descriptions of input – both structures and processes
- Allow us a window into the relevance/meaningfulness of the input
- Allow us to see how perception changes with time
- Allow us to take into consideration parents' personal dispositions

MVOS

(Young, Gascon-Ramos, Campbell, Bamford, 2009)

- My Views on Services
- Written questionnaire
- 6 monthly repeat instrument
- 4 parts
- Designed for research but being adapted for practice
- Freely available

The 'who'

- a description of the **structure** of professional services (including the amount)
- evaluated according to **timeliness**
- and **availability**

Which professionals work with you?

1. Have you, as a parent, had any direct contact with specialised services in the past 6 months regarding your deaf child?

Yes

No

Who have you
and your child
had contact with?

If yes, how many hours
of support per week,
month or year do you
and/or your child get
from professionals?

Please,
tick if you
were
offered
this
service

Please
tick if
offered
BUT
refused it
at the
time

Please,
tick if you
would like
to have
contact
with this
service

Please,
tick if
you feel
it is/was
hard to
get this
service

Audiologist	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ENT consultant	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Audiological physician	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Genetic counsellor	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health visitor	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educational audiologist	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teacher of the deaf	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Speech and language therapist	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Social worker	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Support worker who is deaf	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deaf role model	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Signing support	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> h	<input type="checkbox"/> week	<input type="checkbox"/> month	<input type="checkbox"/> year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 'what'

- the **content** of intervention
- evaluated according to
 - importance
 - quantity
 - satisfaction

Content of intervention (22 items)

What do services provide you with?

	How important is this for you now?				How much are you getting of this?				How satisfied are you with this?						
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	Very much
1. Information about available services	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	1	2	3	4	5		
2. Information about deaf children's needs and potential	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	1	2	3	4	5		
3. Information about deafness	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	1	2	3	4	5		
4. Information about how to communicate with my deaf child	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	1	2	3	4	5		
5. Knowledge about how to play with and enjoy my deaf child	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	1	2	3	4	5		
6. Knowledge about how deaf children grow up	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	1	2	3	4	5		
7. Help to encourage my child communication skills	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	1	2	3	4	5		
8. Comprehensive assessments (e.g. language, development, hearing)	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	Nothing	Not Enough	Enough	Too Much	1	2	3	4	5		

The 'how' of intervention

- the **process** of the intervention
- evaluated according to
 - extent
 - and importance

18 items

To what extent are professional services...

Not at all	To a very small extent	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a fairly great extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

To what extent are professional services...

How important is this for
you now?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
1. Flexible in arranging meetings that take into account your family's availability.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
2. Adapting to your needs (e.g. reconsidering what they had planned to do with you on a particular meeting to meet your needs).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
3. Trusting you as the 'expert' on your child.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
4. Providing enough time to talk (so you don't feel rushed)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
5. Working together with you in designing and deciding the support you want for your child and family.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
6. Taking into account your family's culture and lifestyle when working out support plans.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important

The impact...

- the overall **impact** of the intervention
- in terms of
 - child
 - family
 - and **parent** themselves

6 items

Has the support made a difference?

Overall, how much have professional services made a difference for:

	Not at all					Very much				
Your child	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Your family (partner, siblings...)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Yourself as a person	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Has this difference been positive for:

Your child	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Your family (partner, siblings...)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Your self as a person	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Other instruments

- Short form TEIQue [Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire] (Petrides and Furnham,2001)
 - Enables control for ‘disposition’ [not ‘ability’]
 - Emotional self-efficacy
 - Well being, emotionality, self control, sociability

Examples from TEIQue

- ‘I generally hope for the best’
- ‘I can handle stress without getting too nervous’
- ‘It’s easy for me to adjust to new conditions’
- ‘It’s hard for me to enjoy life’

Instrument properties

Content of Intervention: Scale development

- Two subscales to measure content of support with good reliability were identified:
 - Supporting a deaf child ($\alpha=0.87$)
 - Supporting parents ($\alpha=0.86$)
- Inter-scale correlation was high ($r=0.75$)
- Test-retest correlations were also high after:
 - 6 month ($\rho=0.88$; $r=0.682$)
 - 12 months ($\rho=0.595$; $r=0.817$)

Examples from sub scales

- “Supporting a deaf child”
 - Information about how to communicate with my deaf child
 - Confidence building in parenting a deaf child
 - Knowledge about how to play with and enjoy my deaf child
- “Supporting parents”
 - Help to understand how professional support systems work
 - Emotional support for you and your family
 - Advocacy (making my needs known)

Process of intervention: scale development

- Content validity – based on review of Family Centred Practice
- Reliability: High internal consistency ($\alpha=0.93$)
- All 18 statements necessary to achieve such a high level
- Reliability did not improve with deletion of any statements
- Suggests high construct validity for Family Centred Practice Scale

Some results??

(Gascon-Ramos, Campbell and Young, 2010)

Questionnaire returns

- At entry – 82 (82 mothers and 72 partners)
- 6 months later – 52
- 12 months later – 23

Demographic Data - Children

- Median age of ID: 1.9 months old
- Mean age entering the study: 11.7 months old
- 40% moderate; 21% severe; 39% profound
- Children with other needs: 23 (27.4%)

Perceived Importance of Content of EI

How important is this for
you now?

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
1. Information about available services				
2. Information about deaf children's needs and potential				
3. Information about deafness				

- Ratings of importance for both sub scales were high
 - Supporting Deaf Child were rated as important or very important (mean 3.5; SD 0.52; n=73)
 - Supporting Parents took a second place (mean 2.95; SD 0.59; n=73)
- BUT Intervention that equips parents to support their deaf child is consistently rated as more important than content that addresses their personal support.
- Differences between ratings of importance in both subscales were statistically significant (paired $t = 12.03$; $p < 0.001$) and highly correlated ($r = 0.75$; $p < 0.001$).

Did length of involvement with EI change perceptions of importance?

- Comparisons made between:
 - At entry and 6 months later
 - 6 months and 12 months
- High importance persisted on both sub scales
- No statistically significant differences on either sub scale between ratings at different time points, or in the relationship between the 2 sub scales
- Initial appraisals of the importance of content of intervention at 6mths is best predictor of perceived importance subsequently, over and above any differences associated with child characteristics (e.g. degree of deafness).

Did trait emotional intelligence make a difference?

- Mothers' TEIQue **did not** correlate significantly with ratings of perceived importance of content of intervention (overall, nor on either sub scale)

	SDC		SP	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Global Trait EI	0.05	0.62	0.11	0.34
Well being	0.07	0.49	0.13	0.24
Self-control	0.14	0.20	0.15	0.18
Emotionality	-0.01	0.92	0.04	0.69
Sociability	-0.03	0.73	-0.02	0.86

- Disposition does not mediate appraisals of importance of content

Did educational background matter?

- **YES:** Mothers with fewer qualifications rated the importance of content relating to supporting them more highly than those with higher qualifications. [Supporting Parents sub scale ($F=4.23$; $p=0.008$)]
- Ratings on the SDC sub scale not affected by education

	SDC		SP	
	Median	SD	Mean	SD
No qualifications	3.8	0.2	3.3.	0.7
High school	3.6	0.2	3.1	0.5
Higher education certificate	3.7	0.3	3.2	0.4
Higher education degree, NVQ 6 +	3.7	0.5	2.7	0.5

Parents' Satisfaction with Content of EI

	How satisfied are you with this?				
	Not at all	1	2	3	4
1. Information about available services	1	2	3	4	5
2. Information about deaf children's needs and potential	1	2	3	4	5
3. Information about deafness	1	2	3	4	5

- Parents' satisfaction scores on the Supporting a Deaf Child subscale were higher (mean 3.4, SD 0.9) than on the Supporting Parents subscale (mean 3.1, SD 0.8)
- The difference is statistically significant ($t = 3.24$, $df = 55$, $p = 0.002$).
- Result not affected by age of child, degree of hearing loss, disability.

Does length of involvement make a difference?

- Comparing at entry with 6 mths later and 12 months later
- Satisfaction scores do increase over time
 - Not statistically significant for the SDC subscale
 - Is statistically significant for the SP subscale

SDC	r	p	T	df	p
At entry *6 m	0.68	0.001*	1.35	41	0.185
At entry *12 m	0.64	0.006*	-0.82	16	0.425
At entry (mean 3.5; SD 1.0) 6 months (mean 3.3; SD 0.9) 12 months (mean 3.5; SD 0.9)					

SP	r	p	t	df	p
At entry *6 m	0.68	0.001*	-0.39	33	0.699
At entry *12 m	0.57	0.028*	-3.44	14	0.004*
At entry (mean 3.1; SD 0.8) 6 months (mean 3.1; SD 0.8) 12 months (mean 3.5; SD 0.7)					

The impact of well being

• Mother's self-perceived wellbeing is correlated with satisfaction scores on both subscales

- [Factor analysis demonstrating a statistically significant association with content]

	SDC		SP	
	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Global Trait EI	0.125	0.30	0.197	0.13
Well being	0.243	0.04*	0.300	0.01*
Self-control	0.171	0.15	0.185	0.15
Emotionality	0.130	0.27	0.153	0.23
Sociability	-0.08	0.51	0.086	0.51

[But mother's educational background does not affect satisfaction scores on either sub scale nor globally].

Conclusions - results

- All content is important and its perceived importance increases over time
- But that which is perceived to be specific to the 'difference' of the deaf child is more significant in the early stages regardless of maternal disposition and child specific characteristics
- initial appraisals of the importance of content of intervention were the best predictor of appraisals 6 months later, over and above any differences associated with child characteristics (e.g. degree of deafness).
- Importance attributed to 'specialist content' not affected by maternal education.
- But importance attributed to personal support was affected by maternal education – those with fewer qualifications attributed greater importance.

Conclusions cont.

- Significant higher satisfaction ratings were associated with content of intervention linked to supporting a deaf child, in comparison with that supporting parents.
- Satisfaction with content associated with supporting parents did increase with length of involvement in intervention
- Unlike in ratings of the importance of content of intervention, maternal well being is consistently associated with satisfaction of content of intervention

Take home messages...

- Beware of satisfaction?
- Quality is a dynamic concept – as much about uptake as input
- Build in the ‘problems’ and the ‘messiness’ when designing parent report measures

Collaborators

- Dr Maria Gascon-Ramos
 - Dr Malcolm Campbell
 - Professor John Bamford
-
- Funded by a grant from the Big Lottery Foundation UK.

References

Young, A.M., Gascon-Ramos, M., Campbell, M. Bamford, J. (2009) The Design and Validation of a Parent-Report Questionnaire for Assessing the Characteristics and Quality of Early Intervention Over Time. The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education 14, 422-435. Free full text: <http://jdsde.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/14/4/422>

Gascon-Ramos, M., Campbell, M., Bamford, J., Young, A.M. (2010). Influences on parental evaluation of the content of early intervention following early identification of deafness: a study about parents' preferences and satisfaction. Child: Care, Health and Development 36 (6), 868-877.

Petrides, K.V., Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. European Journal of Personality 15, 425-448.

To register to access a copy of the MVOS:

<http://www.nursing.manchester.ac.uk/research/researchgroups/socialwork/sord/>