

Sense-making strategies and help-seeking behaviours associated with the use and provision of urgent care services: a mixed methods study

NIHR HS&DR 14/19/16

Joanne Turnbull¹, Gemma McKenna¹, Jane Prichard¹, Anne Rogers², Robert Crouch³,
Andrew Lennon⁴, Catherine Pope¹

¹ Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

² NIHR CLAHRC Wessex, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

³ Emergency Department, University Hospital **Southampton** NHS Foundation Trust (**UHS**), Southampton, UK

⁴ Southern Headquarters, **South** Central Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (**SCAS**), Winchester, UK

Corresponding author: Joanne Turnbull, Lecturer, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, Building 67, Highfield, Southampton, SO17 1BJ. Tel: 023 8059 7940;
j.c.turnbull@soton.ac.uk

Keywords: Urgent care; help-seeking; service delivery and organisation; patient/professional behaviours

Competing interests: Catherine Pope reports grants from NIHR HSDR, during the conduct of the study; personal fees from UK HEIs, personal fees from Norwegian Centre for e health, personal fees from Macmillan, McGraw Hill, Wiley, personal fees from ALCS, grants from HEE Wessex, grants from Health Foundation, other from UHS NHS FT, other from NIHR CRN, outside the submitted work; and Member and Deputy Director NIHR CLAHRC Wessex.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Turnbull *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

Important

A 'first look' scientific summary is created from the original author-supplied summary once the normal NIHR Journals Library peer and editorial review processes are complete. The summary has undergone full peer and editorial review as documented at NIHR Journals Library website and may undergo rewrite during the publication process. The order of authors was correct at editorial sign-off stage.

A final version (which has undergone a rigorous copy-edit and proofreading) will publish as part of a fuller account of the research in a forthcoming issue of the Health Services and Delivery Research journal.

Any queries about this 'first look' version of the scientific summary should be addressed to the NIHR Journals Library Editorial Office – journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The research reported in this 'first look' scientific summary was funded by the HS&DR programme or one of its predecessor programmes (NIHR Service Delivery and Organisation programme, or Health Services Research programme) as project number 14/19/16. For more information visit <https://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hsdr/141916/#/>

The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HS&DR editors have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' work and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments however; they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this scientific summary.

This 'first look' scientific summary 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 and Social Care. 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 and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Turnbull *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

Background

English NHS policy has focussed on the ways that urgent care service provision can reduce emergency department attendances and better support self-care. The proliferation of different services has created a complex urgent care landscape for people to navigate and previous research largely predates this expansion in services offered.

Objectives

Our study aimed to identify sense-making strategies and help-seeking behaviours which explain the utilization of urgent care services. We set the following objectives:

1. To describe how patients, the public, service providers and commissioners define and make sense of the urgent care landscape.
2. To explain how sense-making influences help-seeking strategies and patients' choices in accessing and navigating available urgent (and emergency) care services
3. To analyse the 'work' (activities and effort) for patients involved in understanding, navigating and choosing to utilize urgent care
4. To explain urgent care utilization and identify potentially modifiable factors in urgent care patient decision making

Methods

The study used a mixed methods sequential design consisting of three integrated work packages. The first work package comprised a literature review and four citizens' panels with service users and healthcare professionals. The second work package used serial qualitative interviews to examine the role of sense-making in patient help-seeking strategies accessing and navigating available urgent (and emergency) care services and to identify and describe the 'work' for people of navigating and using urgent care. In Work Package 3 we integrated our analyses of these data to construct a conceptual model of urgent care help-

seeking behaviour that explains urgent care utilization and identifies potentially modifiable factors that affect urgent care patient decision making.

A structured review of the published literature from 1990 was undertaken with the primary aim of generating meanings and definitions of urgent care from multiple perspectives. Documentary research methods were used to identify and compare policy and service provider literature conveying definitions of urgent and unscheduled care. Search terms incorporated patient decision making, knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, expectations and experiences related to conceptualisations of urgent and emergency care and we included urgent care (e.g. GP out-of-hours; NHS Direct; Walk-in centres; minor injuries units, NHS 111) and emergency care where focus is about the use of ED or ambulance service for 'non-urgent' or 'primary care' reasons. Key information about the content of the papers was summarised in tables and included papers were critically appraisal process against the questions in the CASP checklists. Relevant literature was synthesised using a narrative, theme based approach.

Four citizen panels were convened to deliberate on urgent and emergency care, and develop agreed definitions of urgent care. Our 'citizens' were drawn from 1) East European communities 2) a wider general population 3) health professionals and 4) members of Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). We purposively sampled to represent a range of different perspectives and to include public, provider and policy-maker perspectives. In total, 41 participants took part in the panels. The commissioner's panel consisted of 3 participants and the other panels had between 12 and 14 participants. Public panel members ranged in age from 18 years to 75+ years. Panels entailed face-to-face deliberation over 4-6 hours in a single day. The research team prepared a set of and activities to facilitate discussion. Two members of the research team attended each panel to facilitate the discussion. Data generated were recorded as contemporaneous notes and audio recordings, as written material generated in the panels. All notes and transcripts were digitised and anonymised.

Semi-structured qualitative interviews were used to examine sense-making, how the respondents accessed and navigated services, and to identify and describe the 'work' entailed in navigating and using urgent care. Three purposively selected groups of service

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Turnbull *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

users and public were chosen to reflect a diversity and range of experiences of urgent care need and service use. Participants were sampled from a geographical area served by a single NHS 111 provider which covers four counties (Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Hampshire and Buckinghamshire) that are diverse in their geographic and demographic characteristics. Two groups were chosen to reflect populations with known high use of emergency care (people aged 75+ years and those aged 18-26 years) and a third group, people from the East and Central European community, was chosen as a group that were growing in the local context and could be vulnerable because of lack of familiarity with NHS. A first interview examined attitudes and beliefs about urgent care and services, and a second interview was conducted between 6 and 12 months after this to examine interviewees experiences of using urgent care services in the intervening months (if at all). The topic guide for the first interview was developed informed by the literature review and the citizens' panels' analysis, the second interview topic guide was informed by the analyses of interview 1.

Data analysis began alongside data collection. We undertook initial thematic analysis following the stages described by Braun and Clarke (2006), familiarizing ourselves with the data, generating initial codes and categories and then identifying themes. To facilitate analysis and discussion amongst the team, grids and matrices were used to chart and compare the data and we used 'data clinics' to share and interpret data collectively, building narrative and interpretive summaries. We drew on the Framework Analysis approach looking across cases and exploring similarities and differences (paying attention to contradictory cases). These analyses were informed by conceptual ideas drawn from previous research and theorising. We synthesised the findings from the literature review, citizens' panels and qualitative interviews to develop a conceptual model.

Research findings

The literature review suggests that there is some consensus between policy and provider perspectives regarding the physiological factors that feature in conceptualisations of urgent care. However the terms urgent and emergency are far from clear in the policy literature. The terms lack specificity or consistency in meaning and messages across documents which

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Turnbull *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

note that and as a result people are confused about which services to use. Urgency is often defined in relational terms - in relation to emergency care. Service users' conceptualisations of different services are shaped by perceptions of availability, accessibility and acceptability

Our exploration of sense-making about urgent and emergency care confirmed that the boundaries between urgent and emergency care are ill-defined and there is considerable confusion about the appropriate use of the many different services on offer. The general public, healthcare professionals and service commissioners share this confusion. The term urgent care is often used interchangeably with emergency care. People found it difficult to articulate the differences between urgent and emergency care but they had strong moral views on what deserves 'emergency' care and they made fewer moral judgements about the 'misuse' of urgent care services.

We constructed a typology that distinguishes three related, but distinct, types of work that takes place at both the individual level and at the social network level in relation to urgent care sense-making and help-seeking. *Illness work* involves interpretation and decision making about: the meaning and the severity of symptoms, the management of physical symptoms and psychological states and the assessment and management of possible risks. Two key prompts to urgent care help-seeking are 'pain' and 'anxiety' and together these drive decisions about help-seeking. In addition reassurance - '*making sure nothing is wrong*' was a reason for urgent care help-seeking. Illness work was often carried out across social networks and there were some differences between groups in relation to how they used weak and strong ties within these networks. Help-seeking was guided by *moral work* – the legitimisation and sanctioning work done by service users. Service users were keen to portray themselves as responsible users of services and here too social networks played a key role in influencing decision making. *Navigation work* concerned choosing and accessing of services and relied on prior knowledge and experience of what was available, accessible and acceptable. Convenience was a key reason people why chose the ED rather than other services.

From these empirical data we developed a model of urgent care sense-making and help-seeking behaviour to help us understand urgent care service use. This emphasises that

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Turnbull *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

work informs the interaction between what we think and feel about illness and the need to seek care (sense-making) and action – the decisions we take and how we use urgent care (help-seeking). Deciding to act involves balancing different types of work and while there may be strong motivation to be a ‘legitimate’ user of a particular service, this can be ‘traded off’ against what is most accessible or convenient at a particular time or in a specific context.

Conclusions

This understanding of the work entailed in urgent care help-seeking helps to alert us to factors that could potentially be modified to alter sense-making and help-seeking. A clearer acknowledgement of the importance of pain as a reason for seeking urgent (and emergency) care, and better advice about managing pain symptoms could help service users understand when to seek help. Much of the policy surrounding urgent and emergency care is predicated on the notion that ‘urgent’ sits neatly between emergency and routine however, service users in particular, struggle to distinguish it from emergency or routine care in this way. Clarity in what different urgent care services ‘are for’ would help service users but relational definitions of urgent care (that contrast it with emergency care) are less helpful. Service users legitimate their own use of particular services and people’s moral reasoning is unlikely to be modifiable. Different population groups have different experiences and knowledge and so may require different support to navigate access to services. That said, more standardisation of what services offer and opening times could help all service users know what is available and when. Rather than solely focussing on individual sense-making future policy and provision should attend to the social and temporal contexts that impact on help-seeking, such as why people find it more difficult to manage pain at night, and how different social networks and the ties within them shape service use.

Future research

Further co-design work could be undertaken with patients and publics to develop and test definitions of urgent care. Our proposed model is requires further testing, notably to quantify

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Turnbull *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This ‘first look’ scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.

relationships between sense-making and help-seeking and to identify and predict causal relationships. A whole-systems approach to considering integration across a wider network services will also be key to explaining the complex relationships between demand, access and the provision of urgent health care.

Funding

The National Institute for Health Research Health Services and Delivery Research Programme (reference 14/19/16).

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Turnbull *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts 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.