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Focus of Quality of Care Efforts
NCI Research Priority*

- NCI supports research focused on facilitating: measurement, monitoring, and improvement of patient-centered cancer care with an aim to minimize the cancer burden
  
  - Major area of emphasis: communication between patients/family and members of health care delivery teams

http://outcomes.cancer.gov/areas/pcc

* Activities led by DCCPS: ORB & HCIRB
NCI Monograph

Highlights:

• Conceptualization of patient-centered communication into six key functions
• Discussion of mediators and moderators of the link between communication and patient health outcomes
• Identification of priorities for future research

Patient-Centered Communication Functions

- Responding to Emotions
- Exchanging Information
- Managing Uncertainty
- Making Decisions
- Enabling Patient Self-Management
- Fostering Healing Relationships
- Health Outcomes
HINTS 2008: Measures of PCC

• How often doctors/nurses/other health professionals give you the chance to ask all the health-related questions you had?

• How often did they give the attention you needed to your feelings and emotions?

• How often did they involve you in decisions about your health care as much as you wanted?

• How often did they make sure you understood the things you needed to do to take care of your health?

• How often did they help you deal with feelings of uncertainty about your health or health care?

• How often did you feel you could rely on health care providers to take care of your health care needs?

• Time frame: past 12 months; Response options: never, sometimes, usually, always
Frequency of PCC Items
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Frequency of PCC Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings and Emotions</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Questions: 14%
- Feelings and Emotions: 24%
- Decision Making: 21%
- Next Steps: 13%
- Uncertainty: 27%
- Reliance: 16%
**Frequency of PCC Items**

**Weighted N: 24 million-50 million**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Weighted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings and Emotions</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patient-Centered Communication

- Six PCC items were combined into a PCC scale
  - weighted mean: 75.9 (range: 0-100)
  - unweighted mean: 78.0, sd: 22.3
  - PCA: single factor explained 66% of item variance, loadings > 0.7
  - Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.90$
Correlates of PCC

- Linear Regression Analysis
  - Dependent variable: PCC scale
  - Independent variables:
    - Age, gender, race/ethnicity
    - education, income,
    - employment and marital status,
    - cancer history, health status
    - health insurance, immigrant status,
    - regular provider, # of visits
Age and PCC

P = 0.02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Adj, wtd PCC Score (0-100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender, Health Status, and PCC

- Male: 74.8  
- Female: 77.4  
- Poor/Fair: 71.9  
- Good: 74.4  
- Very good/Excellent: 79.2

P-values:
- Gender: P < 0.01
- Health Status: P < 0.001

Adjusted, wtd PCC Score (0-100)

Gender

- Male
- Female

Health Status

- Poor/Fair
- Good
- Very good/Excellent
Regular Provider, Insurance, and PCC

P < 0.001

P < 0.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adj., wtd PCC Score (0-100)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Provider</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Impact of PCC

• Ratings of Care
  – Overall, how would you rate the quality of health care you received in the past 12 months?
    • Poor
    • Fair
    • Good
    • Very good
    • Excellent
PCC and Ratings of Care

P < 0.001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings of Care</th>
<th>Adj., PCC Score (0-100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Impact of PCC

- Self-efficacy/empowerment
  - Overall, how confident are you that you could get health-related advice or information if you needed it?
  - Overall, how confident are you about your ability to take good care of your health?

- Not at all confident, a little confident, somewhat confident, very confident, completely confident
PCC and Information Self-efficacy

Confidence in getting health-related advice/information

Adj., PCC Score (0-100)

Not at All
A little
Somewhat
Very
Completely

P < 0.001
PCC and Health Self-efficacy

P < 0.001

Confidence in taking care of health

Adj. PCC Score (0-100)

Not at All: 49.4
A little: 56.6
Somewhat: 69.4
Very: 79.9
Completely: 87.9
Summary

• A (non-trivial) minority of U.S. residents report very low levels of patient-centered communication experiences

• Individuals with less access to care are at higher risk for low PCC experiences – double jeopardy?
Summary

- Patient-centered communication is likely to result in consumers who are not only
  - more satisfied with their care
  - but also
  - better prepared to play an active role in their health and health care
Conclusion

• Surveillance vehicles such as HINTS can play a critical role in informing health policy and facilitating care delivery by monitoring over time the impact of system wide changes that might be implemented to improve the quality of patient-centered care in the U.S.