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- Why including them?
  - A few thoughts
- Methodological difficulties
  - A current research as an example
  - Who are the relevant stakeholders?
  - How to select a representative sample of them?
  - How to collect their opinions, advices?
  - How to reach consensus in face of conflicting advices arising from different groups of stakeholders?
Why involving stakeholders?

- Ethical reasons: how to conduct research without implying those who
  - Should benefit from the intervention
  - Could lose something due to it
  - Will have to pay for it

- Pragmatic reasons
  - Implying also those who may promote its large scale implementation in the future
  - // participatory ergonomics
Why involving stakeholders?

- Three possible levels of involvement
  - Selective and informal contacts in order to
    - fine tune needs assessment, better identify the problem, the possible solutions
    - find the most appropriate application setting
    - increase the probability of being funded
    - ..... 
  - Formal information exchange during a research program for sake of...

  - Formal participation when the research aims at changing organisation, procedures, currently used by those stakeholders
The research project

Context: A more active policy of return to work for workers on long term sickness absence requires more interprofessional cooperation and better communication.

Study objective: How to promote, at a system level (country), a better collaboration and communication between GPs, OPs, and social insurance physicians (SIPs)?

Study supported by the Belgian Federal Public Service for Employment, Labour and Social dialogue.
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Which stakeholders?
Who are the project stakeholders?

- Obviously general practitioners, occupational health physicians, social insurance physicians
- But also ....
  - Users ....patients’ associations
  - Public authorities (if regulations changes considered)
  - Employers and trade unions (if labour regulations changes considered)
How to select the ‘appropriate’ stakeholders?

- Distinction to be made between
  - Active practitioners in the various professional groups
  - Official representatives from these groups

- Two-phases study
  - Phase 1 (2010–11): collecting opinions and proposals at the practitioners (GPs, OPs, SIPs) level
  - Phase 2 (2012): selecting representatives from the various groups of stakeholders to examine and validate proposals drawn from phase 1
Qualitative design involving

- Collecting perceptions, opinions and proposals for improvement *separately in each professional group* using the “nominal group” technique;
- Analysing and interpreting the data collected with the help of a review committee including experts from the three physician populations (GPs, OPs, SIPs)

Study conducted between June 2010 and March 2011
### Participation to nominal groups meetings (n = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>French-speaking region</th>
<th>Dutch-speaking region</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General practitioners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1:</td>
<td>13 participants</td>
<td>11 participants</td>
<td>42 GPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2:</td>
<td>7 participants</td>
<td>11 participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Health physicians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1:</td>
<td>9 participants</td>
<td>7 participant</td>
<td>16 OPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance physicians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>9 participants</td>
<td>7 participants</td>
<td>16 SIPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Interprofessional collaboration

2.1 Need for concertation, shared decision-making

Indices / catégorie professionnelle / régime linguistique - Index / beroepscategorie / taalstelsel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GP FR</th>
<th>GP NL</th>
<th>OP FR</th>
<th>OP NL</th>
<th>SIP FR</th>
<th>SIP NL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indices / professional categories</strong></td>
<td>22,0%</td>
<td>49,5%</td>
<td>13,3%</td>
<td>10,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Need for information exchange

Indices / catégorie professionnelle / régime linguistique - Index / beroepscategorie / taalstelsel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GP FR</th>
<th>GP NL</th>
<th>OP FR</th>
<th>OP NL</th>
<th>SIP FR</th>
<th>SIP NL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indices / professional categories</strong></td>
<td>14,7%</td>
<td>15,7%</td>
<td>14,0%</td>
<td>18,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>27,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Physicians responsabilisation, sensibilisation

Indices / catégorie professionnelle / régime linguistique - Index / beroepscategorie / taalstelsel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GP FR</th>
<th>GP NL</th>
<th>OP FR</th>
<th>OP NL</th>
<th>SIP FR</th>
<th>SIP NL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indices / professional categories</strong></td>
<td>0,6%</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>23,7%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study methodology – Phase 2

- Consensus reaching methodology: Delphi survey

- Agreement scoring on Likert scale: fully agree, rather agree, rather disagree, fully disagree, being not concerned

- Open boxes to add comments, suggestions

- Consensus criterion: \( \geq 80\% \) (fully or rather agree)
Study methodology – How to select the right stakeholders?

- Comprehensiveness: not forgetting relevant groups!
  - Workers compensation companies
  - FPS Labour and Employment but also FPS Public Health
  - Sickness insurance administration

- Expertise and representativeness: ensuring a good balance between
  - Scientific associations / Professional groups trade unions
  - Politically oriented bodies, i.e. socialist, christian–democrat, and liberal trade unions
  - The two cultural communities: Flemish– and French–speaking

- Topic oriented personal interest (already known or asked)
# Results (1st tour Delphi)

Invited: 70 / Accepted: 61 / Answered: 47 (77%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participant</td>
<td>participant</td>
<td>participant/invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family physicians (GP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup. Health physicians (OP)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance physicians (SIP)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work compensation (WC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities (PA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions (TU)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers federations (EF)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens patient (CP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47/61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results (1st tour Delphi)

- Consensus (80%+)
  - questions Q1, Q2, Q10, Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15
  - Great, but are we sure that each proposal may be validated as such?

- No consensus
  - questions Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9, Q11
  - How to take into account the voting profile and the comments made by the participants
Q1 – Do you think that SIPs also should be allowed to ask for a visit by the OP during the sick leave period?

Only 9 against out of 47! 6 gave comments.
Q8 – Do you think that the OP should transmit the GP a summary description of the patient work activities?

15 / 45 disagree; 13 with comments
Q8 – GPs votes

8 / 9 in favour
Q8: Patients associations votes

1 pro / 1 against
Q8 – Trade unionists votes

- Fully agree: 2
- Rather agree: 1
- Rather disagree: 1

3 pro / 1 against
Q8 – OPs votes

- Fully agree: 1 response
- Rather agree: 3 responses
- Rather disagree: 3 responses
- Fully disagree: 2 responses

4 pro / 5 against
Q8 – Do you think that the OP should transmit the MG a summary description of the patient work activities?

Comments:
- Impossible, not realistic (3 OPs)
- Workload !! (2 OPs, 1 Employer, 1 public authorities)
- It’s employer responsibility! (2 OPs)
- Must remain based on informal contacts between OP and GP (1 OP)
- GPs not competent to use this info (1 OP)
- Ok but not on a systematic basis (1 WC, 1 public authorities, 1 GP)
Involving stakeholders – what are the main challenges?

- Finding people who are true representatives of a group, an association, an institution, and not speaking only for themselves
- Raising those people interest enough to ensure an effective participation
- Balancing the invited stakeholders between all the groups concerned by a given project
- Identifying the subtle factors concealed behind a “rather” agree or “rather” disagree vote
- Being creative to give ground to compromise solutions or solutions (yes …if…)
Thank you for your attention!
Merci pour votre attention!
Dank u voor uw aandacht!
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