

Part I

Methodological issues

Cambridge University Press
978-1-904-67192-3 — Mental Health Outcome Measures
Edited by Graham Thornicroft , Michelle Tansella
Excerpt
[More Information](#)

CHAPTER 1

Measures of outcomes that are valued by service users

Thomas Kabir and Til Wykes

This book has many chapters on outcome assessments, from the global functioning scales to more specific and detailed measures for use in service evaluation as well as in measuring treatment outcome. So we suspect that the reader will be asking a number of questions before dipping into this first chapter, specifically on measures of outcome that are valued by service users. These we are sure will include:

- Will this chapter examine new measures of outcome that are not covered by other chapters?
- Will any new measures look radically different from those already described in other chapters?
- Why is there a chapter on outcomes that are valued by service users?

The answers to the first two questions are: yes, but not many; and probably not. But it is the answer to the last question which is key. A chapter has been specifically allocated to this topic because such measures are important in evaluations of mental healthcare. Many professionals will consider that this is just a focus on what is politically correct and that service users' experiences are not generally that helpful or, more often, that their clinical carers usually know best. We have some sympathy with the view that when healthcare resources are scarce there is a need to measure outcomes that reflect the performance of services and that this is sometimes at variance with service users' views. Service users may not be interested in symptom remission, patient throughput or even the assessment of their global functioning. They may be more interested in their definition of recovery or simply their happiness and sometimes these aspirations may lie outside the remit of mental health service provision.

But even with this understanding of different perspectives, we believe that the pendulum has swung too far and for too long in the direction of outcomes which may not be relevant to service users, may not be appropriately measured even if they are relevant, or may just be the opposite of what service users would expect of a mental health service. In this chapter we try to rebalance the field by introducing or describing outcome measures

that are accepted by service users, and show how methods involving service users can be used to develop new, relevant and acceptable measures of outcome that reflect the purpose of services. It is also important that we have measures of what service users expect from services, as their models of appropriate care will undoubtedly affect the take-up of services, especially novel ones. Assessments compared from different perspectives can also provide new insights into how services might improve as well as how new treatments or types of care can be organised. This chapter may overlap with some others in this volume in its description of measures but, crucially, it highlights the need for good measures of satisfaction, service outcome and quality of life that reflect the mental health service user's experience.

What constitutes a user-valued measure?

The answer to this question is simple. A user-valued measure is one that is recognised as such by a majority of service users. A user-valued measure is one which reflects the values and experiences of a majority of service users. To use an analogy, to be a user-valued outcome measure, it would have to pass a 'Turing Test'. A majority of service users would have to be able to say from looking at the measure that it did indeed make sense and evaluate human factors that were important to them. In other words, the majority of service users that the measure applies to have to believe that the scale has been constructed *by people* who have an understanding of their situation.

But this is not the only criterion that we are going to use to judge a measure as worthy of being called a user-valued measure. Clearly, the instrument also needs to be useful in understanding services and therefore we want to know whether it can be used in different settings, with different groups of service users and in different types of mental health organisation. We would like to see evidence not only that the measure is being used in the academic literature but also that it is being used in mental health service assessment. In other words, our aspiration is to see user-valued measures used in routine practice.

Fitzpatrick *et al* (1998) propose eight essential properties of a patient-based outcome measure. These are shown in Table 1.1. One kind of measure which is clearly user valued is the method designed by Diana Rose and called user-focused monitoring (UFM) (Rose *et al*, 1998). This is a general method of involving service users in producing a schedule of assessment that is grounded in their views within a particular service setting. The questions therefore vary between services rather than being generally appropriate. So although this method is one of the best for producing a measure with user value, it does not fulfil the criteria we have set out, as each UFM measure will be service specific and therefore it would not be 'appropriate' (see Table 1.1) for the measure to be generalised.

This book concentrates on outcome measures and these are normally used in evaluations of treatments or services. We therefore need to be certain

OUTCOMES THAT ARE VALUED BY SERVICE USERS

Table 1.1 Essential properties of an outcome measure

Property	
Appropriateness	Is the content of the instrument appropriate to the question that the clinical trial is intended to address?
Reliability	Does the instrument produce results that are reproducible and internally consistent?
Validity	Does the instrument measure what it claims to measure?
Responsiveness	Does the instrument detect changes over time that matter to patients?
Precision	How precise are the scores of the instrument?
Interpretability	How interpretable are the scores of the instrument?
Acceptability	Is the instrument acceptable to the patients?
Feasibility	Is the instrument easy to administer and process?

Adapted from Fitzpatrick *et al* (1998) and Gilbody *et al* (2003).

that the information is accurate; that is, if we repeated the evaluation we would gain similar results. These psychometric qualities of any instrument therefore also need to be available for a measure to begin to be used in routine practice. The usual list includes: validity, reliability and, crucially, sensitivity to change over time. The reason for the importance of psychometric data is highlighted in a report of the outcome measures used in 300 trials randomly selected from the Cochrane database of trials in schizophrenia (Marshall *et al*, 2000). The review showed that outcome measures that were developed for a specific study and did not have adequately published reliability and validity data were more likely to conclude that the new treatment was superior to a control treatment. When pharmacological and non-pharmacological studies were independently assessed, the non-pharmacological treatments fared the worst, with nearly twice the chance of a report of clinical significance if an unpublished rather than a published scale had been used. Overall, the authors concluded that in more than one-third of all studies in this area the claims for clinical significance could not have been made if published scales had been used. Although this was a report of studies of schizophrenia, we assume that similar results would have been found for other disorders. The fact that the problems seemed to be amplified in the non-pharmacological area is of great importance to service users, who tend to prefer these sorts of treatments to medication alone. For service users, the diversion of resources into therapies which would not have been found to be useful if rigorously assessed scales had been used is a further reason to ensure that all studies use such scales.

It might be expected that this chapter would describe a set of outcomes with a specific user value attached to them. However, this is not possible, as there have been few investigations of what types of outcome measure are acceptable and have value. The approach that we have taken is to investigate those measures to which service users have contributed in any way, as these are likely to have value; we also point out ones that users may value but

where they have not been involved in their development. One clear research agenda would be to investigate the value expert service users (i.e. those with experience of the disorder or service) would consider as an outcome worth measuring.

It should be noted, however, that a measure need not be constructed exclusively by people with experience of using mental health services for it to be a user-valued outcome measure. It is not good scientific practice for the validity of any measure to be dependent on the background of those who constructed it. It is only necessary that the majority of service users are able to say that the outcome measure does indeed measure factors that are important to them.

In what types of study would user-valued measures be relevant?

It is not controversial to suggest that service users' views are important in assessing the value of services. Hence, most user-valued measures of outcome have come from the field of service satisfaction. But we believe that user-valued measures could be used to understand treatment outcome, including side-effects in randomised controlled trials.

Which treatments are included in guidance for healthcare in the UK is determined by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), which makes its judgements on the basis of the evidence from high-quality controlled trials. These are nearly always studies where the primary outcome is symptoms and the secondary outcomes are those of interest to the clinicians. Often the only information in the evidence base about whether service users value the treatment is their decision to opt out of the study, that is the drop-out rate. Given that most decisions about treatments are based on the balance of outcomes, surely it would be helpful to allow service users to state their choice? For instance, although efficacy is based on symptom reduction, the severity of side-effects may make it unlikely that the treatment will be prolonged. An outcome measure which shows this balance might provide clearer information to the healthcare professionals and service providers about the likely effectiveness of treatments.

There is a further reason for introducing user-valued measures, and that is the acceptance of the term 'recovery' rather than 'cure' in the mental health literature (Davidson *et al*, 2005). The acceptance of new terms will change the measurement field to include issues of balance in the service user's life between a number of competing choices; one specific measure is unlikely to reflect this complex world view. For example, consider someone who is on antipsychotic medication which has reduced their clinical symptoms to the point where they might clinically be considered to have recovered but this person has experienced significant medication-related side-effects, including weight gain, which has led to a negative self-image and social withdrawal,

and drowsiness, which has impaired their ability to carry out his usual occupation. It is unlikely that a single outcome measure would capture all the information that is pertinent to this service user's situation.

The production of user-valued measures

The majority of outcome measures are produced through a process of item generation, item testing, scale feasibility testing and further work on the psychometrics. What need to be added to this list are those extra items that service users would most notice about a scale, regardless of the content. Some of these have been described by Fitzpatrick *et al* (1998). Of prime importance is the acceptability of the scale to service users, which includes the length of time needed to complete it and whether there is a chance for them to add their own context to their answers. Scales that are administered within an interview do give some time for service users to reflect on their answers (although this does depend on the skills of the interviewer). Scales with fixed items that are completed by self-report are unlikely to reflect the key issues for an individual. It is vital in this latter case to ensure that the items chosen and the categories for the answers allow service users to give an accurate rendition of their perspective. For this, they need to be involved in the production of the scale items and category assembly. Below we provide a brief description of the continuum of involvement in the outcome measures we have reviewed. This is based on a continuum adopted by a UK Department of Health funded patient involvement group called INVOLVE (www.invo.org.uk). However, we recognise that this system is too simple to distinguish some subtleties in service user involvement. In our opinion the best possible measures would be those:

- where service users had been closely involved in the development as full partners
- which have been rigorously tested for their psychometric properties (especially sensitivity to change)
- which have been tested in a variety of service settings in a variety of countries.

The few such measures on the market are described below. First, though, we describe the methods used to develop user-valued measures, as this will allow researchers to carry out similar exercises where there are gaps in the field.

Derived without user involvement

Even if a measure is derived without their involvement, the end result may still be valued by service users. It does seem unlikely that this could happen but there are some measures that have been produced with no

consultation with service users which are valued. These include quality-of-life measures and some service-satisfaction measures. These scales were produced through the traditional route, by clinicians working with academics. The feasibility of the scales was tested with service users but they were not involved in item generation. An example of such a scale is the Working Alliance Inventory (WAI; Hovrath & Greenberg, 1989). The scale can be said to be user-valued partly because of its subsequent usage and because 'some of the definitions used include the client's experience of the relationship with the therapist as being helpful in achieving goals' (Tracey *et al*, 1989). There are two versions of this scale, one for the patient and one for the counsellor. The 36 items contained in both versions of the scale were generated by consulting seven experts in the field of working alliance and 21 randomly selected psychologists. The WAI was piloted using 29 graduate students in a 'counselling psychology program engaged in a peer counselling task' (Hovrath & Greenberg, 1989). This outcome measure was specifically chosen as an outcome in one study of motivational interviewing (Hayward *et al*, 2009).

Consultation

Consultation can take various forms, from representation on steering groups to surveys of service users. This can further be refined by looking at the level of representation, through service users' voluntary organisations or through representation of service user experts. Consultation does not imply that the research team (where the power lies) will accept the advice given. Outcome measures derived in this way may or may not be valued by service users – usually this has not been tested – but do show some involvement and so are more likely to be valued by service users than those measures developed with no user involvement.

Representatives of services users were involved in the development of the Carers' and Users' Expectation of Service – User Version (CUES-U; Lelliott *et al*, 2001; Blenkiron *et al*, 2003). This scale was the result of a collaboration between two Royal Colleges, the University of East Anglia, and an organisation representing service users and carers (then called National Schizophrenia Fellowship, now called Rethink). Domains that were important to service users were identified in two ways. The first was by carrying out a comprehensive literature search, including a search of the 'grey literature' and unpublished material. The second was by carrying out focus group interviews with service users. The development of the scale was also informed by the establishment of an advisory group of service users. Once the large number of domains that were important to service users was identified, then the domains were 'grouped into the smallest number of items without losing definition or meaning' (Lelliott *et al*, 2001). The scale was field tested using nearly 450 service users from across the UK.

The final scale is self-rated and consists of 17 items, split into three sections. The items concern: where you live; money; help with finances;

OUTCOMES THAT ARE VALUED BY SERVICE USERS

how you spend your day; family and friends; social life; information and advice; access to mental health services; choice of mental health services; relationships with mental health workers; consultation and control; advocacy; stigma and discrimination; medication; access to physical health services; relationships with physical health workers; and other issues (anything else that the service user would like to raise which has not been covered by the other 16 items). The paper reporting the development of the scale notes that service users 'appear to place less emphasis on symptom reduction than they do on improvements in other areas of their lives' (Lelliott *et al*, 2001). A slightly different level of consultation took place to produce the Camberwell Assessment of Need (CAN) (Phelan *et al*, 1995, see <http://www.iop.kcl.ac.uk/virtual/?path=/hsr/prism/can/>).

A slightly different level of consultation took place to produce the Camberwell Assessment of Need (CAN)⁹ (see <http://www.iop.kcl.ac.uk/virtual/?path=/hsr/prism/can/>). This measure reflects the needs (both met and unmet) of people in touch with high-support services. Although the development of the items was based on consultation between clinicians and researchers, the development team also included a survey of service users about the importance of the items that were proposed to make up the scale. All the proposed items were judged to be at least moderately important but there was no opportunity for service users to contribute new items or to suggest ways in which the scale should be promoted, including the anchoring of the scale. However, at least we can be clear that this measure does include moderately important items and so has some value to service users.

Service users were also involved in a consultative way in the development Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMS; see <http://phi.uhce.ox.ac.uk/home.php>). Continuity-of-care measures where service users were certainly consulted include the CONNECT (Ware *et al*, 2003) and ACSS–MH (Durbin *et al*, 2004) measures.

Contribution

This term is used to denote that service users have been consulted and that their views have been taken into account. This differs from consultation, where views may be sought but need not have had any effect on the research. This terminology is taken from Sweeney & Morgan (2009), who specifically point out that 'contribution' is where some commitment to service user involvement has been agreed (unlike in consultation) but that the role is limited. For instance, it may mean only that a service user has been employed as a researcher on a project which has already been designed.

The CUES–U measure is likely to be one in which service users and carers were both consulted and made a contribution. The measure itself was in part constructed using focus groups of service users. The scale also contains a number of items, such as 'stigma and discrimination' and 'medication', which are commonly reported by service users as being important to them.

It can therefore be said that, to a reasonable degree, the CUES–U measure does indeed take into account the views of service users and carers.

A similar process was undertaken in the development of the Accommodation and Enabling Scale for Eating Disorders (AESED; Sepulveda *et al.*, 2009). Two expert carers were involved in screening items for use in this questionnaire.

Partnership

Again, there is a continuum of involvement in measures that have been developed in partnership with service users. In some partnerships the academic researcher takes the lead but in others service users lead the research and develop the measures through new methodologies or participatory research.

The first measures we highlight here are those where service users took part as either paid or voluntary researchers. One example of this sort of development is a measure of the outcome of cognitive–behavioural therapy for people with psychosis (CBTp), called Choice of Outcome in CBT for psychoses, or CHOICE (Greenwood *et al.*, 2010). The study team included a paid service user researcher, who was involved in the design of the study. The first step in the measure development was that topics for exploration were identified by CBTp experts and these were then discussed in service user focus groups, which were jointly led and analysed by a service user and a clinical researcher. Focus group participants then took part in a ‘Delphi exercise’ to work towards a consensus on the items that needed to be included. This produced a total of 26 items. An acceptability study with 15 further service users provided information on whether the questionnaire was understandable; these users also commented on different possible formats. The measure was then given to 152 further service users before and after they had received CBTp as part of a standard clinic. Reliability, validity and sensitivity were measured. The final measure covers both recovery-oriented items, such as general distress and quality of life, as well as CBTp-specific ones, such as psychosis-specific distress. There are data relating to its psychometric properties and therefore this is a measure which holds great promise for what is now a burgeoning area, not only in research studies but also in the provision of CBTp in routine care.

Another method of including service users has been developed from a health economics method called conjoint analysis, which allows service users specifically to influence the weighting of items in a scale. One measure that utilises this approach is the Older Person’s Utility Scale for Social Care (OPUS; Netten *et al.*, 2002). This scale measures key outcomes for social care. The research team included service users at different stages. At the first stage, ‘experts’ in social care, from social care policy-makers to care managers, were consulted about the topics that might be included. At the second stage, 356 older people were consulted about their preferences in relation to 27

OUTCOMES THAT ARE VALUED BY SERVICE USERS

different scenarios covering five different domains; these had been piloted in consultation with older people. In this part of the project, older people were given two descriptions which differed on two key domains, for example where personal safety was maximised in one but social participation reduced, compared with another where personal safety was reduced but social participation was increased. Each of the scenarios reflected different levels of unmet need in each of the five domains. This part of the development also included 58 people who indicated additional preferences on the basis of how much money they would pay for their choice. The results of these preference decisions were analysed using conjoint analysis, which produced weights for the different domains. There was a clear ranking by both the older people and those who were using services of the domains from least to most important: personal safety, food, and control over daily life, social participation and personal care. This method, by giving weights to the items, allows a score to be produced which can reflect, adequately, the importance of each item rather than each item contributing the same amount to the total score. Further testing showed that the scale was both reliable and valid.

Service user researchers have also led teams in the development of measures. One of these is a new participatory model based on UFM methodology and constructed by the Service User Research Enterprise (SURE) at the Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London. In this method, the service user leads the research project. The process falls into five stages:

- production of a topic guide
- pilot and then full focus groups to generate specific domains
- expert panels to comment on the item form and completeness
- feasibility study to test comprehensibility and acceptability of the measure
- formal psychometric testing including reliability, validity and sensitivity to change.

Two measures of value to service users have been developed using this method. The first is a measure of continuity of care which is thought to be important by service planners and policy-makers (CONTINU-UM; Rose *et al*, 2009). This is a measure of the perceptions of continuity of service users (which differ from service providers' and policy-makers' perceptions of continuity). The second measure developed using this method records service users' perceptions of the in-patient environment and is called VOICE. Both measures have been or will be used as a main outcome in studies investigating service and treatment changes.

The Empowerment Scale is another example of an outcome measure which has been designed using a participation action research method. The scale was developed by a defined partnership between researchers and a consumer research advisory board comprising service users and one of the researchers (Rogers *et al*, 1997).

Gaps in the market

Few service user outcome measures have been reported in the literature. It is unsurprising, then, that there are many ‘gaps in the market’. Some areas where no or few service user outcome measures have been developed are:

- outcome measures specific to forensic settings
- outcome measures specifically for children and adolescents
- disorder-specific outcome measures, including:
 - anxiety, depression, obsessive–compulsive disorder, bipolar disorder, eating disorders
 - psychosis
 - personality disorders
- medication side-effects
- outcome measures adapted for specific groups (e.g. different ethnic groups).

In addition, to the best of our knowledge, none of the service user outcome measures reviewed in this chapter has been validated for any language other than English. There are some outcome measures produced by service users that are specific to particular local mental health services in specific countries but there are few that have been developed for routine use for particular kinds of service, other than in-patient settings. An exception is the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services Satisfaction Scale (CAMHSSS; Ayton *et al.*, 2007).

In relation to the lack of disorder-specific outcome measures, it can be argued that disorders such as depression are clinically defined, for example in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM)*, and so subsequently the notion of ‘outcome’ is also clinically defined to a significant degree. But this approach is likely to be narrow from the perspective of service users. Even if the symptoms and severity of depression have not changed, it is still possible that the service user may have adapted to the circumstances and recovered a level of functioning that he or she had not had previously. This is likely to be an outcome which is valued by the service user but might be missed using one of the traditional outcome measures currently in use.

There has also been a lack of attention to certain groups such as Black and minority ethnic groups. It is not at all clear that service users will agree on what outcomes they value. Given the current interest in the effects of psychiatric services and psychiatric treatments on different cultural groups, an exploration of the differences between participating groups is essential and would add a different dimension to a user-valued measure.

Although the CUES–U scale does include medication as an item, medication (and its side-effects) is a domain that is not generally found in outcome scales that are in common use. These types of scale are essential in deriving the value of medication (or other therapies). Service users may value different aspects of treatment; for example, a medication which frequently produces some side-effects may be more acceptable than a medication that

OUTCOMES THAT ARE VALUED BY SERVICE USERS

produces infrequent but more serious side-effects. This type of knowledge might enable drug development to proceed in a more productive manner, with new drugs not being discarded so early in development.

Conclusion

Despite our searches it has been difficult to discover many measures for which we are reasonably certain there is evidence that users value the outcomes they record. But our searches did throw up a number of methods for deriving such measures. Individual scale items, with preference weightings from conjoint analysis, can be derived using the participatory method developed by the team at SURE. We consider this type of method perhaps the zenith of what is available.

However, user-valued outcome measures can also be constructed with service users being used as active and equal collaborators in the process. This can be carried out in a number of different ways, for example by employing researchers who also have experience of using mental health services or by collaboration with a service user organisation, as was done in the production of the CUES-U scale. User-valued outcomes may also be derived simply by researchers being willing to engage fully with and take into account the views of a relatively large number of service users, as was the case for the Empowerment Scale (Rogers *et al*, 1997).

Most of the scales covered in this chapter are new and so it is unclear at present how widely they will be used. In the UK, the National Institute for Health Research's Mental Health Research Network (<http://www.mhrn.info>) has commissioned a library of outcome measures that are valued by service users. We hope that this resource will be used by clinical researchers.

In conclusion, there are a growing number of validated user-valued outcome scales that have been reported in the literature. Very simply, by definition, these measure the things are likely to be important to service users. This is possibly one of the strongest reasons why researchers should use such scales and construct new scales where there are none.

References

- Ayton, A. K., Mooney, M. P., Sillifant, K., *et al* (2007) The development of the child and adolescent versions of the Verona Service Satisfaction Scale (CAMHSSS). *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, **42**, 892–901.
- Blenkiron, P., Mo, K. H., Cuzen, J., *et al* (2003) Involving service users in their mental care: the CUES project. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, **27**, 334–338.
- Davidson, L., Harding, C. & Spaniol, L. (2005) *Recovery from Severe Mental Illnesses: Research Evidence and Implications for Practice*. Boston University Centre for Psychiatric Rehabilitation.
- Durbin, J., Goering, P., Streiner, D. L., *et al* (2004) Continuity of care: validation of a new self-report measure for individuals using mental health services. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research*, **31**, 279–296.

- Fitzpatrick, R., Davey, C., Buxton, M. J., *et al* (1998) Evaluating patient-based outcome measures for use in clinical trials. *Health Technology Assessment*, **2**, i–74.
- Gilbody, S. O., House, A. & Sheldon, T. (2003) *Outcomes Measurement in Psychiatry: A Critical Review of Outcomes Measurement in Psychiatric Research and Practice*. NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York
- Greenwood, K. E., Sweeney, A., Williams, S., *et al* (2010) CHOICE of Outcome INCbt for psychoses (CHOICE): the development of a new service-user led outcome measure of CBT for psychosis. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, **36**, 126–135.
- Hayward, P., David, A., Green, N., *et al* (2009) Promoting therapeutic alliance in clozapine users: an exploratory randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Schizophrenia and Related Psychoses*, **3**, 127–132.
- Hovrath, A. & Greenberg, L. (1989) Development and validation of the Working Alliance Inventory. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, **36**, 223–233.
- Lelliott, P., Beevor, A., Hogman, G., *et al* (2001) Carers' and users' expectations of services – User version (CUES-U): a new instrument to measure the experience of users of mental health services. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **179**, 67–72.
- Marshall, M., Lockwood, A., Bradley, C., *et al* (2000) Unpublished rating scales: a major source of bias in randomised controlled trials of treatments for schizophrenia. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **176**, 249–252.
- Netten, A., Ryan, M., Smith, P., *et al* (2002) *The Development of a Measure of Social Care Outcome for Older People*. Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU).
- Phelan, M., Slade, M., Thornicroft, G., *et al* (1995) The Camberwell Assessment of Need: the validity and reliability of an instrument to assess the needs of people with severe mental illness. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **167**, 589–595.
- Rogers, E. S., Chamberlin, J., Ellison, M. L., *et al* (1997) A consumer-constructed scale to measure empowerment among users of mental health services. *Psychiatric Services*, **48**, 1042–1047.
- Rose, D., Lindley, P., Ford, R., *et al* (1998) *In Our Experience: User-Focused Monitoring of Mental Health Services in Kensington & Chelsea and Westminster Health Authority*. Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health.
- Rose, D., Sweeney, A., Leese, M., *et al* (2009) Developing a user-generated measure of continuity of care: brief report. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, **119**, 320–324.
- Sepulveda, A. R., Kyriacou, O. & Treasure, J. (2009) Development and validation of the Accommodation and Enabling Scale for Eating Disorders (AESSED) for caregivers in eating disorders. *BMC Health Services Research*, **9**, 171–184.
- Sweeney, A. & Morgan, L. (2009) Levels and stages. In *Handbook of Service User Involvement in Mental Health Research* (eds J. Wallcraft, B. Schrank & M. Amering), pp. 25–35. Wiley/World Psychiatric Association.
- Tracey, T. & Kokotovic, A. (1989) Factor structure of the Working Alliance Inventory. Psychological Assessment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, **1**, 207–210.
- Ware, N. C., Dickey, B., Tugenberg, T., *et al* (2003) CONNECT: a measure of continuity of care in mental health services. *Mental Health Services Research*, **5**, 209–221.