

Appendix 12

Evaluation Methods – Semi-Structured Interviews

A total of 30 semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposeful sample of clinicians (n=23) across the three teams along with team managers (n=3), project officers (n=2) in each AHS and senior community health managers (n=2) (Table 1). Qualitative research methods were chosen as the most appropriate method to seek understanding of the key issues from multiple perspectives and within the current context that the services are operating [1].

Clinicians were purposefully sampled to include:

- Those who participated in an interview at baseline
- A range of health professional types (enrolled and registered nurses, allied health professionals)
- Clinicians located at each community health centre (team 1)
- A range of experience

In the team 1 following the analysis of the first 5 interviews which were with clinicians positive about the project, the selection process changed to purposefully sample low adopters or those less positive about the project. This was done through snowballing and sampling based on comments given in the clinician survey.

Table 1. Number of interview by team and participant type

	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Total
Clinicians	9	9	5	23
Team Managers	1	1	1	3
Project Officers	1	1 (team 2 and 3)	-	2
Senior CH Managers	1	1 (team 2 and 3)	-	2
Total	12	12	6	30

Prior to conducting each interview, participants were sent a one page questionnaire to complete covering key topics to be explored in the interview. The rationale for doing this was to enable staff to think through issues to be covered in the interview beforehand. This enabled the interviews to focus in more detail at the specific responses of participants, providing richer information. Participants were given the opportunity to read an information sheet and ask questions before giving informed consent to take part in a confidential face to face interview at a time and place convenient to them. Most interviews took place in the community health centre or hospital where participants worked. Interviews lasted 20-75 minutes and were conducted by an Evaluation Officer who had not been involved in the project implementation and was not known to the participants. The interviews aimed to explore the extent to which clinicians implemented the risk factor management models, the acceptability of the approach, the barriers and enablers that affected it and implications for sustainability (Topic guide, Table 2).

Table 2. Interview topic guide for clinicians, team managers, project officers and senior managers

Clinicians	Managers / Project Officers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General impression of project ▪ Case example – last client with a risk factor ▪ Feasibility of risk factor screening ▪ Barriers/enablers risk factor screening ▪ Feasibility of risk factor intervention ▪ Case example – comfortable to address ▪ Case example – not comfortable to address ▪ Perceived effectiveness ▪ Barriers/enablers to risk factor intervention ▪ Change in approach to RFM ▪ Continuation of RFM as part of role ▪ Support for continuation of RFM ▪ Project benefits (personal and professional) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General impression of project ▪ Feasibility of risk factor screening/intervention ▪ Barriers/enablers RFM ▪ Congruence with core business of the team and organisation ▪ Process of project implementation (degree of consultation and model adaptation to suit team) ▪ Change in team/service approach to RFM ▪ Continuation of RFM as part of team/service role ▪ Support for continuation of RFM ▪ Project benefits and costs (personal / teams and service)

RFM: Risk Factor Management

Interviews were audio-taped with participants' permission and transcribed verbatim for thematic analysis of the content. The project leader read the transcripts, identified and coded themes using NVivo 7.0 software. This was done using an iterative thematic approach based on repeated reading of the transcripts and coding of issues of interest to the evaluation objectives.[1] The Project Leader discussed key themes identified with the Evaluation Officer. Key findings were presented and confirmed through feedback sessions held with teams and managers.

References

1. Patton M: *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. 3rd Edition edition. California: Sage; 2002.