FISEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Patient Education and Counseling

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pateducou



#### Patient Education

# Words or graphics to present a Discrete Choice Experiment: Does it matter?



Jorien Veldwijk <sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Mattijs S. Lambooij <sup>a</sup>, Janine A. van Til <sup>c</sup>, Catharina G.M. Groothuis-Oudshoorn <sup>c</sup>, Henriëtte A. Smit <sup>b</sup>, G. Ardine de Wit <sup>a,b</sup>

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 2 December 2014
Received in revised form 2 June 2015
Accepted 6 June 2015

Keywords:
Discrete choice experiment
Conjoint analysis
Framing
Graphics
Icons
Attributes

#### ABSTRACT

*Objective*: To test whether presenting attribute levels in words or graphics generates different results with respect to attribute level interpretation, relative importance and participation probabilities. *Methods*: Parents of 959 newborns completed a DCE questionnaire that contained two versions of the same nine choice tasks in which the attribute levels were presented in words or graphics. Five attributes related to the decision of parents to vaccinate their newborn against rotavirus were included. Mixedlogit models were conducted to estimate the relative importance of the attribute levels.

*Results:* Respondents who started with the choice tasks in words produced the most consistent answer patterns. All respondents significantly preferred words to graphics. Part-worth utilities and the relative importance of the attribute levels differed based on the words and graphics data, resulting in different probabilities to participate in vaccination.

*Conclusions:* Words were preferred over graphics, resulted in higher choice consistency, and showed more valid attribute level estimates. Graphics did not improve respondents' understanding of the attribute levels.

*Practice implications:* Future research on the use of either words or graphics is recommended in order to establish guidelines on how to develop a valid presentation method for attribute levels in the choice tasks of a DCE.

© 2015 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

#### 1. Introduction

There is an ongoing discussion about the complexity of choice tasks in health-related Discrete Choice Experiments (DCEs) and the extent to which respondents are capable of completing those choice tasks as intended by researchers [1–4]. At the same time, there has been an increase in the use of DCEs within the public health and health care research setting [5,6]. Those DCEs aim to elicit respondents' preferences in order to advise on the development of preventive programs, medical therapies and/or policy measures [7–9]. Since DCEs are used for policymaking, the accuracy and validity of the measured (i.e., stated) preferences

E-mail address: Jorien. Veldwijk@rivm.nl~(J.~Veldwijk).

is essential. It is therefore vital that respondents understand the medical and/or health related information that is included, in order to make accurate choices that reflect their true preferences. The validity of a DCE is at risk if respondents do not fully understand how to complete the DCE, because they lack understanding of the attribute levels (i.e., program or health product characteristics such as the level of vaccine effectiveness) within the DCE.

There is great diversity in the way health information is translated into attribute levels are how they are explained to respondents and how choice tasks are presented in DCEs on prevention or health related topics [6]. Some researchers have pointed-out that the use of graphics or icons might help to make choice tasks easier and therefore improve respondents' understanding of the concepts in question [10–12]. Although there is no empirical evidence within the literature to support this assumption, these suggestions probably stem from the large amount of research on improving risk communication to enhance shared and informed decision making as well as self-management [13–23].

a Centre for Nutrition, Prevention and Health Services, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, The Netherlands

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Health Technology and Services Research, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author at: National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Center for Nutrition, Prevention and Health Services, PO Box 1 (internal postal code 101), 3720 BA, Bilthoven, The Netherlands. Tel.: +31 0 302742586: fax: +31 0 302744407.

Those studies showed that individuals in general but specifically individuals with a lower educational level and/or health literacy have greater difficulties with risk and health information displayed in words or numbers compared to graphics [13,17,24]. This is of particular importance for DCEs within the public health and health care setting, because individuals with a low educational level and health literacy use public health and/or health care interventions relatively more often [25,26]. Studies investigating the validity of and preferences for communicating health related information showed that the use of icons or graphics might be helpful, if designed properly [13,15,16,18-20,22]. Currently, evidence on the effectiveness of depicting attribute levels using graphics within a DCE context is lacking. Pending such evidence, graphics are used under the assumption that individuals will be able to correctly decipher the actual numerical information captured in the graphics, to interpret the information and to reveal their preferences accordingly.

This study empirically tested whether DCE results with respect to attribute level interpretation, relative importance and participation probabilities differ when either words or graphics are used to present attribute levels in the choice tasks. Specifically, it was tested whether those results differ among respondents with a different educational level and health literacy status.

#### 2. Methods

#### 2.1. Subject of the Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) and participant recruitment

A DCE on parental preferences for rotavirus vaccination among newborns was used as a case for this study, details and results of this study are described elsewhere [27]. A random sample of 2500 parents of newborn babies aged six weeks was selected from a national vaccination register (Praeventis) to receive the DCE questionnaire [27]. The Institutional Review Board of the University Medical Centre Utrecht concluded that formal testing by a medical ethical committee was not necessary, as parents were only required to complete an anonymous questionnaire once, which is in accordance with the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki.

#### 2.2. Attributes, levels and choice task presentation

Attributes and levels were identified based on previously published literature [28-35], interviews with experts (i.e., a pediatrician with specific interest in rotavirus infections and a scientist with specific interest in vaccination behavior), and four group interviews with in total 28 parents of newborns. Five attributes were selected for this DCE (Fig. 1). A professional

€140

20 20 50

Attributes Level 1 Level 3 Level 2 Vaccine effectiveness: The percentage of children that will be protected against a rotavirus infection when vaccinated 55% 95% Frequency of severe side effects: The number of vaccinated children that will suffer from intussusception due to vaccination. Intussusception is an acute condition in which part of the bowel telescopes into another adjacent part of the bowel, resulting in obstruction\*. 1 in 1,000,000 1 in 10,000 1 in 100,000 **Protection duration:** The number of years that the vaccine protects against a rotavirus infection 3 years 6 years Location of vaccine administration: Within the Netherlands all vaccines in the NIP are administrated at a child welfare center, The GP office was included because the rotavirus vaccine may not become part of the NIP; in that case it is likely that this vaccine is administrated here. Child welfare center General practitioner

€30

Fig. 1. All attributes in levels as described in the questionnaire in words and graphics. See references list (53).

Out-of-pocket costs: Parents may have to pay (part) of the vaccine costs out-of-pocket €0

### Download English Version:

## https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6152859

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6152859

<u>Daneshyari.com</u>