

UCSF

UC San Francisco Previously Published Works

Title

How empowering is hospital care for older people with advanced disease? Barriers and facilitators from a cross-national ethnography in England, Ireland and the USA.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7z0680sh>

Journal

Age and Ageing, 46(2)

Authors

Selman, Lucy
Daveson, Barbara
Smith, Melinda
et al.

Publication Date

2017-03-01

DOI

10.1093/ageing/afw193

Peer reviewed

How empowering is hospital care for older people with advanced disease? Barriers and facilitators from a cross-national ethnography in England, Ireland and the USA

LUCY ELLEN SELMAN^{1,2}, BARBARA A. DAVESON¹, MELINDA SMITH¹, BRIDGET JOHNSTON³, KAREN RYAN⁴, R. SEAN MORRISON⁵, CATY PANNELL¹, REGINA McQUILLAN⁶, SUZANNE DE WOLF-LINDER¹, STEVEN Z. PANTILAT⁷, LARA KLASS¹, DIANE MEIER⁵, CHARLES NORMAND³, IRENE J. HIGGINSON¹

¹Department of Palliative Care, Policy and Rehabilitation, King's College London, Cicely Saunders Institute, London SE5 9PJ, UK

²Bristol Randomised Controlled Trials Collaboration, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 2PS, UK

³Centre of Health Policy and Management School of Medicine, Trinity College, University of Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

⁴Mater Misericordiae University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland

⁵Brookdale Department of Geriatrics and Palliative Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

⁶Beaumont Hospital, Dublin, Ireland

⁷School of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

Address correspondence to: L. E. Selman. Tel: +44 207 848 5566; Fax +44 207 848 5517. Email: lucy.selman@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract

Background: patient empowerment, through which patients become self-determining agents with some control over their health and healthcare, is a common theme across health policies globally. Most care for older people is in the acute setting, but there is little evidence to inform the delivery of empowering hospital care.

Objective: we aimed to explore challenges to and facilitators of empowerment among older people with advanced disease in hospital, and the impact of palliative care.

Methods: we conducted an ethnography in six hospitals in England, Ireland and the USA. The ethnography involved: interviews with patients aged ≥65, informal caregivers, specialist palliative care (SPC) staff and other clinicians who cared for older adults with advanced disease, and fieldwork. Data were analysed using directed thematic analysis.

Results: analysis of 91 interviews and 340 h of observational data revealed substantial challenges to empowerment: poor communication and information provision, combined with routinised and fragmented inpatient care, restricted patients' self-efficacy, self-management, choice and decision-making. Information and knowledge were often necessary for empowerment, but not sufficient: empowerment depended on patient-centredness being enacted at an organisational and staff level. SPC facilitated empowerment by prioritising patient-centred care, tailored communication and information provision, and the support of other clinicians.

Conclusions: empowering older people in the acute setting requires changes throughout the health system. Facilitators of empowerment include excellent staff–patient communication, patient-centred, relational care, an organisational focus on patient experience rather than throughput, and appropriate access to SPC. Findings have relevance for many high- and middle-income countries with a growing population of older patients with advanced disease.

Keywords: *empowerment, inpatients, hospitals, aged, palliative care, older people*

Background

Patient empowerment is now embedded within healthcare policy globally [1–4]. Tools to measure patient empowerment have been developed [5], and there is evidence it is associated with more cost-effective use of health services [6], healthier behaviours [7], and improved quality of life and clinical outcomes [8]. Consequently, patient empowerment may help health systems cope with the growing burden of chronic disease [9].

Patient empowerment is often poorly defined [10], but theoretical and empirical research has identified its specific features. Empowerment is a process through which patients become self-determining agents with some control over their own health and healthcare, rather than being passive recipients of healthcare [11]. Empowered patients exhibit self-efficacy (confidence in their ability to exert control) and engage with clinicians, make decisions and manage their illness in line with their preferences and values [8]. Properly defined, patient empowerment is determined by the patient, not the clinician: empowerment relates to the extent to which patients' decision-making and engagement meet their own preferences and values [10, 12], not an externally stipulated level of engagement or type of decision-making involvement, as is sometimes suggested [13].

Current research on empowerment has focussed on community-based interventions [8], not acute care settings. Yet hospitals are the primary location of care for the growing population of older patients, many of whom have long-term conditions, multiple comorbidities and complex needs [14]. We aimed to identify and explore challenges to and facilitators of empowerment for older adults with progressive, life-limiting disease in inpatient settings in England, Ireland and the USA. Empowerment is a core principle of palliative care, which prioritises attention to patients' preferred level of involvement in decision-making. As a secondary aim, we therefore explored the impact of inpatient specialist palliative care (SPC) involvement on patient empowerment.

Methods

Design

As part of a study examining end of life care, we conducted an international ethnography in London (England), Dublin (Ireland) and San Francisco (USA). We conducted in-depth interviews with patients with advanced disease, family caregivers, SPC staff and other health professionals caring for older adults with advanced disease in hospital settings, and fieldwork (participant and general observation and collection of artefacts).

Setting

The study reported here was conducted in 2012–2014 in six urban university hospitals, three in England (two of

which were part of the same administrative trust), two in Ireland and one in the USA. The study was component 2 of International Access, Rights and Empowerment (IARE), a mixed-methods study examining palliative care for older people; further details regarding IARE are available at <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/lsm/research/divisions/cicelysaunders/research/studies/buildcare/iare.aspx>. We selected these countries as all face the challenges of an ageing population and have integrated palliative care within their health systems, yet do so via different approaches to the provision of healthcare. They are also committed to patient empowerment as a cornerstone of healthcare [2–4]. Please see Appendix 1 in the supplementary data available in *Age and Ageing* online on the journal website for details of the participating hospitals <http://www.ageing.oxfordjournals.org/>. Ethical approvals were obtained [NRES: 12/L0/0044; Ireland: 1/378/1456; 12/07; USA: 13-1099].

Participants and sampling

Participants were the following: patients, unpaid caregivers (family members or close friends), SPC staff and other hospital clinicians who cared for older adults with advanced disease but whose substantive role was to provide a service other than palliative care. Eligible patients were English-speaking, ≥ 65 years, hospitalised for ≥ 24 h, receiving SPC and able to complete an interview. Patients in England and Ireland were recruited consecutively through component 1 of the IARE study, which had the same eligibility criteria. Each patient who participated in the survey was invited for interview, until data saturation. Purposive sampling (by patient age, diagnosis and gender), guided by a sampling frame, was used in the USA as the larger survey was not conducted in San Francisco.

Eligible caregivers were English-speaking, cared for a patient ≥ 65 years who had been hospitalised for ≥ 24 h and was receiving SPC, and were able to complete an interview. Patients interviewed were asked if they wished to nominate an unpaid caregiver for interview; if so, the caregiver was also invited to participate. In addition, caregivers of patients who were too unwell to take part or did not speak English were also interviewed; these were identified by clinical staff and researchers.

Theoretical sampling, on the basis of emerging findings and the research question, was used to select staff to invite for participant observation and/or interview, ethnographic artefacts and locations for general observation. Palliative care staff of different professions were approached initially, followed by other staff who cared for older patients with advanced disease, who may have different perspectives on patient empowerment. Clinical members of the project team based at the participating sites introduced researchers to potential staff participants via email or face to face. In line with ethnographic methods, the artefacts collected were man-made objects which provided information about the

culture of their creators and users and were relevant to the study aims.

Data collection continued until data saturation [15], i.e. no new themes were emerging from the data and the research team judged a rich account of patient empowerment at each of the sites to have been obtained.

Data collection

Experienced qualitative researchers (M.R.S., B.J. and L.E.S.) collected the data. Interviews were guided by semi-structured interview schedules (Box 1), and were face to face, except one caregiver interview conducted by telephone as this was more convenient for her. Interviews were audio

Table 1. Characteristics of the 26 patients and 32 unpaid caregivers interviewed for the study

	England	Ireland	USA	All countries
Patients, <i>n</i>	10	10	6	26
Sex (male/female)	4/6	7/3	3/3	14/12
Age: years; median (range)	70 (65–85)	70 (65–82)	74 (67–81)	70 (65–85)
Marital or spousal status				
Married or with a partner	2	4	4	10
Widowed	4	3	1	8
Divorced or separated	3	1	1	5
Single	1	2	0	3
Living situation				
Alone	5	5	1	11
With spouse and/or children, with others	5	5	5	15
Has a primary caregiver (yes/no)	9/1	6/4	6/0	21/5
Diagnosis group				
Cancer	7	9	4	20
Lung and respiratory	1	2	0	3
Breast	0	1	1	2
Genitourinary	2	3	1	6
Digestive	1	2	2	5
Other	3	1	0	4
Non-cancer	3	1	2	6
Education				
Did not go to school or pre-primary	0	3	0	3
Primary	0	2	0	2
Secondary or higher	10	5	6	21
Race				
White	9	10	3	22
Black	0	0	0	0
All other races	1	0	3	4
Religious (yes/no) ^a	5/5	8/2	3/2	16/9
Financial hardship				
Living comfortably on present income	5	3	4	12
Coping on present income	3	5	1	9
Difficult or very difficult on present income	2	2	1	5
Unpaid caregivers, <i>n</i>	10	11	11	32
Sex (male/female)	5/5	4/7	1/10	10/22
Age: years; median (range) ^b	61 (23–68)	52 (30–63)	54 (34–84)	53 (23–84)
Relationship to patient				
Spouse or partner	2	4	5	11
Son or daughter	6	5	5	16
Brother, sister or other relative	0	2	1	3
Friend or neighbour	2	0	0	2
Working status				
Working	4	7	4	15
Student or unemployed	1	4	1	6
Pensioned	5	0	6	11
Race				
White	9	11	4	24
Black	1	0	1	2
All other races	0	0	6	6
Religious (yes/no) ^b	3/6	6/5	10/1	19/12

^aData missing for one participant in the USA (preferred not to say).

^bData missing for one participant in England (preferred not to say). Education was assessed with ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education); race was assessed in accordance with Ethnic group statistics: a guide for the collection and classification of ethnicity data [16] in England and Ireland; and Guidance for industry: collection of race and ethnicity data in clinical trials [17] in the USA.

Box 1. Interview schedule

Participant group	Topics in interview schedule
Patients	Overall impressions of hospital care, Engagement in care (e.g. preparation for palliative care consultations), How they access information, How clinicians convey information, Information availability and adequacy in hospital, Preferences regarding involvement in clinical decision-making and extent to which these have been met, Advice received from clinicians and how easy it has been to follow, Independence and dependence in hospital setting, Meaning of empowerment, What makes them feel empowered/disempowered in hospital, How empowering and disempowering palliative care has been
Unpaid caregivers	Account of patient's time in the hospital, Experience of care in the hospital, Experiences accessing care (including inpatient SPC) here compared with other settings, Experience of the hospital system, Barriers to accessing care, What has worked well in hospital, What has not worked so well/could be improved
SPC providers	Summary of career to date, training, patients worked with and role, Organisation and delivery of SPC in the hospital, Referral processes and their adequacy, Barriers and facilitators of accessing SPC, Meaning of patient empowerment, How care empowers/disempowers patients
Hospital clinicians who care for older adults with advanced disease but are not specialists in palliative care	Summary of career to date, training, patients worked with and role, Understanding of and training in palliative care, Experiences of working with the SPC team, Referral processes and their adequacy, Barriers and facilitators of accessing SPC, Meaning of patient empowerment, How care empowers/disempowers patients

SPC = specialist palliative care

recorded and transcribed by a professional transcriber, except for one staff interview in which detailed notes were taken as the participant preferred not to be recorded. Patients and caregivers were interviewed separately. Informed consent was obtained prior to interview.

Participant observation was conducted by following and observing SPC and other staff caring for patients with advanced disease. Researchers had minimal contact with patients and were introduced to them as researchers working in the hospital. General observation was conducted in multidisciplinary meetings and wards providing care for this population, by agreement of the ward managers and other clinical leads. All observation was recorded in detailed field notes, anonymised prior to analysis. Artefacts were anonymised and scanned.

Analysis

Interview transcripts and fieldwork data (field notes and artefacts) were imported into NVivo v10.0 for analysis. Directed thematic analysis [18], concurrent with data collection, was used to identify instances and reports of challenges to and facilitators of patient empowerment. Data analysis occurred in four steps: (i) *Analysis by site*: using deductive and inductive line-by-line coding, coding frames were constructed for each of the five data sets (patient, caregiver, SPC and other staff interviews, plus fieldwork data). Deductive coding was informed by Aujoulat et al.'s conception of empowerment as involving both taking control of disease/treatment and relinquishing control so as to integrate illness [19]. This reflects the therapeutic needs of our population [20]. (ii) *Narrative summaries* were produced for each data set at each site and tabulated alongside themes

and sub-themes, identifying challenges and facilitators. (iii) *Integration of site-level findings*: country-level findings were compared and synthesised: themes across data sets were charted by site, categorised and tabulated to summarise cross-site findings. (iv) *A cross-site narrative summary* was developed, drawing out the main findings and highlighting similarities and differences. Illustrative data extracts were tagged using ID codes (Box 2).

Triangulation and deviant case analyses were used to enrich findings, inform sampling and enhance credibility. Regular meetings to discuss data collection, sampling and emerging findings and refine analysis enhanced reflexivity and ensured consistency.

Results

Participants, observations and artefacts

Twenty-six patients and 32 caregivers were interviewed (Table 1). There were 25 patient–carer dyads interviewed; 1 patient nominated 2 carers who both participated; 6 carers participated on their own. Thirty-three staff were interviewed: 11 doctors, 15 nurses and 7 from other professions. Most (66%) had ≥10 years of experience. Please see Appendix 2 in the supplementary data available in *Age and Ageing* online on the journal website for details of staff participants <http://www.ageing.oxfordjournals.org/>. Of note, 340 h of observational data and 50 artefacts were collected (including consult lists, leaflets for hospital users, quality assessment documentation and photos of wards). Please see Appendix 3 in the supplementary data available in *Age and Ageing* online on the journal website for details of the observational data <http://www.ageing.oxfordjournals.org/>. The project team judged that saturation had been reached.

Box 2. Conventions used to assign data ID codes

ID element	Convention
Location code	L = London; D = Dublin; SF = San Francisco
Participant code	P = patient; UC = unpaid caregiver; G = generalist end of life care provider (provides care for older adults with advanced disease but is not a specialist in palliative care); SPC = specialist palliative care provider; D = doctor; N = nurse; O = allied health or another type of staff other than a physician or nurse (e.g. chaplain, social worker, therapist)
Observational data code	PO = participant observation; MDT = multidisciplinary observation; GO = general observation
Number	Consecutive numbers assigned for each participant interviewed, by city and participant group. Observational data are dated rather than numbered

Findings

Three interrelated themes capture the cross-site findings: Staff–patient communication and information provision; Hospital environment, systems and resources; and Attitudes to patient involvement and the tone of care. Please see Appendices 4–6 in the supplementary data available in *Age and Ageing* online on the journal website for challenges to and facilitators of empowerment by site and data set <http://www.ageing.oxfordjournals.org/>.

Staff–patient communication and information provision*Clinicians' inadequate communication skills and deprioritisation of relational care hinder patients' self-management*

At all sites, a lack of information from staff and poor communication with staff, particularly regarding end of life issues, prevented patients from taking a more active role in managing their disease and treatment, making decisions and planning for the future: 'The whole journey... we've felt in the dark... there's been no long-term plan, no guided plan, no information actually specifically provided for us' (LUC07). Poor continuity and coordination of care ('Trying to treat people like pieces of metal in a factory' (LP08)) was evident and made communication difficult. Researchers documented the large numbers of staff entering and leaving patients' rooms/berths, with many patients unsure of their role and which teams they represented. A caregiver remarked: 'What is lacking is continuity and a place that you can... anchor your questions... There was information from the pathologist, general medicine, surgery and three different ICUs [intensive care units] on three different occasions and with a new nurse every twelve hours... we're talking 120 nurses in the time he was there' (SFUC10). Patients at all three sites feared burdening staff or for cultural reasons did not want to ask for help ('I'm from the old school. We didn't ask for things, they were either given to you or you did without them' (DP06)), so if information and support were not provided proactively by staff then patients often missed out. Information provision needed to be tailored to the individual: one patient in London did not want full information ('If I need more information I could get it, but I'm happy with what information I've got' (LP01)), and

in Dublin some patients and families preferred to use euphemisms than communicate directly regarding diagnosis and prognosis ('They talk about the lump, the bump, the shadow' (DSPCN01)). In San Francisco, staff reported that a lack of translators hindered communication with patients and families.

Poor communication and information provision was related both to inadequate communication skills among some healthcare professionals ('The staff have been very anxious when they've someone dying on the ward; they'd be afraid of what questions family would ask' (DGN05)), and the extent to which staff prioritised providing relational care in busy inpatient environments: 'Every moment, they are prioritising how to use their time most wisely' (SFGD03). Primary doctors, SPC providers and nurses alike reported that nurses and SPC staff generally had more time and inclination than other doctors to establish relationships with patients and discuss their wishes: 'I hate to say this, but my relationship with patients is far more superficial than it was when I was a medical student.. it's amazing what [the nurse practitioners] know that I have no clue' (SFGD03). Some staff avoided, delegated or deprioritised conversations with patients with advanced illness owing to personal discomfort discussing death and dying or because, in the curative culture of hospital care, death is perceived as a failure: 'I think they sort of feel they've failed, so it's sort of like they don't want to talk to you' (LUC04). The emphasis on curative care and devaluing of communication were reportedly reflected in medical education: 'Their model of training is very much "treat, treat, treat"' (DGN03); '[Spending time on communication] is not rewarded [or] seen as valuable because it doesn't fit in with the ACGME [Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education] guidelines' (SFGD03).

In the USA, health financing and reimbursement disincentivise good communication

In San Francisco, health financing and reimbursement compounded the problem, preventing good staff–patient communication: 'Right now with our fee-for-service payment system, if you do procedures, you do something with a patient, you get reimbursed more heavily than if you just talk to them' (SFGD01). A perceived consequence was clinicians valuing and prioritising interventionist care over

relational care, and lucrative care being placed at the top of the hospital hierarchy: ‘The specialties that are going to make a lot of money for the hospital, the hospital has to treat them better at some level because that’s where the revenue is... Orthopaedics, neurosurgery’ (SFSPCD01).

Open, tailored communication facilitates collaborative healthcare and decision-making

Conversely, effective staff–patient communication in line with patient wishes universally supported empowerment by enabling collaborative relationships and facilitating informed decision-making. A patient described what good communication looked like: ‘They come in and they sit down... and oftentimes they will put communication before medical [issues]. It is more total. They want to know the intimacies of you’ (SFP01). In London, practices promoting open communication were evident and appreciated by patients: ‘One of the good things now is you can actually see your notes... at one time they stayed secret even though it concerned you and your illness and your body’ (LP09). Staff across the sites valued communication skills training: ‘It gave us a language to be able to speak, because before, you might have been sort of thinking oh, how am I going to approach this, do I use this word...? People felt very uncomfortable’ (DGN03). Palliative care specialists were recognised as experts in communication and patient and family involvement, ‘explaining things very gently so that patients really understand, removing any jargon and removing complex medical words... checking understanding as well’ (LGN05). The SPC teams’ education and support of staff from other specialities played an important role in enabling good staff–patient communication: ‘They are present as a coach... a support network... It is very positive from a learning, experiential standpoint’ (SFGD01).

Hospital environment, systems and resources

Busy, routinised inpatient care restricts patients’ choice and control

Hospitals are ‘bewildering’ (SFP06) places, ‘where it’s all about getting patients in, getting them treated, getting them out’ (DGN03), and staff are ‘running, running all day’ (DGO06). Inpatient care follows institutionalised routines, ‘a fixed pathway that the patient is on...: op day; post-op day, this is what you do; day two post-op, this is what you do’ (LSPCN05), which conflict with the needs of patients with advanced disease (‘Things happen... it’s not a linear process at all’ (LSPCN05)). Patients with comorbidities were perceived as a poor fit with the hospital system owing to the complex and time-consuming nature of their care: ‘[Non-SPC doctor] remarked that the more complex the illness, the less forward people are to fixing it: “They fix one problem but then find 10 others, [so] people often don’t go and visit them at all. Nothing is done for the people who are most in need”’ (LGPO, 13 May 2014). In San Francisco, the use of highly technological interventions

such as high flow nasal cannula was reportedly routine in the ICU. This impacted on empowerment by restricting patients to specific wards, in which nurses had not received palliative care training, and limiting discharge options: ‘[Patients] can’t leave the hospital because they have that technology in place, because they can’t be transported. And even if they could, there’s nowhere that would be able to provide it other than here’ (SFSPCD01). At all sites, a lack of space and privacy impacted on patient empowerment by preventing therapeutic communication: ‘To be told that information in a ward with six other people with curtains around... was quite horrific’ (DUC08).

Patients’ lack of control and choice at discharge

Observations of team meetings and patient care across the sites highlighted an institutional emphasis on freeing up beds as quickly as possible, which could be depersonalising for patients: ‘They want to get you out within four hours and whether you should be out of casualty in four hours or not doesn’t matter... they shove you on any ward’ (LUC04); ‘To really pay attention to what the issues are and the problems are, that’s going to get in the way of their goal of... ‘let’s discharge everybody by 11 o’clock”’ (SFSPCN04). Experiences of discharge demonstrated patients’ and families’ lack of power: ‘It’s as if you’ve fallen off the end of a chute... It feels as if they don’t care about you anymore, and you’re shoved out the door’ (LP08). Patient wishes were just one of several factors taken into account in planning discharge: ‘It is a kind of a three way process. [One,] it is what the patient wants... Two, it is the needs required to care for the patient safely and then three, the insurance and financial piece’ (SFGO07). In the USA, the private insurance model curtailed empowerment by restricting treatment choices and access to care for patients with limited insurance.

Continuous, flexible care provides patients with choice and facilitates communication

Strategies to counter the fragmentation of care, such as staff rostering to support continuous care and having a key contact person to signpost and organise care, were supportive of patient empowerment. Nurses played an important role in maintaining continuity: ‘keeping track of the big picture of what’s going on with that patient... as the different residents rotate through’ (SFGN02). Flexibility in care was also important; for example, in London patients could choose to be seen in the SPC clinic or at home, providing the patient with some control. Appropriate referral to SPC contributed to empowerment by providing access to specialists in care coordination: ‘The palliative team were there the next day... making arrangements in terms of social workers, making assessments... Whenever I called, they were pretty much instantly available... Oh my God, I can’t tell you the difference that makes in helping you cope with everything’ (LUC07).

Attitudes to patient involvement and the tone of care

Simplistic attitudes to patient involvement disempower patients by depersonalising care

The way staff approached patient involvement could be disempowering for patients. A simplistic over-emphasis of patient autonomy by clinicians was described by SPC staff in San Francisco: 'In the US... you really, really get it hammered into you that autonomy is the dominant principle that you want to really respect' (SFSPCD01). This was perceived to result in patients and families having to make difficult clinical decisions (e.g. regarding withdrawing aggressive treatment) with little guidance or support from their clinicians: 'I feel like we give people too many options... I feel exhausted just hearing everything... We ask too much of families' (SFSPCO03). One patient in London exemplified the need for decision-making involvement to be individualised rather than prescriptive, reporting that, for him, 'You feel less in control and have less confidence when... medical practitioners are coming and asking you what you would like for your care' (LP05).

Patient-centred, holistic care empowers patients to participate in their care

Across the sites, observational and interview data demonstrated how a patient-centred, holistic approach empowered patients by putting their perspectives, wishes and needs in relation to decision-making and information provision at the heart of care: 'You are consulted and your decisions are valid, and... your own perspective on your illness' (LUC07). A commitment to patient-centred care at an organisational and individual clinician level provided patients with the power to participate in their healthcare by legitimising a focus on patients as whole people rather than as mere illnesses or recipients of treatment. Regular, non-hierarchical and interdisciplinary meetings created the time and space for staff to explore patients' psychosocial concerns and end of life issues, helping to ensure care was holistic: 'We have a meeting every week where we discuss our patients... everyone – from the therapies, nursing, doctors – [is] there. Everyone has an opinion to be voiced and you're allowed to voice it' (LGD04).

SPC providers were observed empowering patients by acting as patient advocates, and emphasised in interviews their role in ensuring treatment was in line with patient goals: 'I'm the patient's advocate... if somebody is suffering I have a responsibility and a duty to help alleviate that suffering' (DSPCN03). Delays or barriers to accessing palliative care—for example, due to clinicians' perception that referral to SPC was 'a bit of failure' (LSPCN02) or 'a demonstration of.. hopelessness' (SFGD04)—prevented patients accessing the SPC teams' patient-centred approach. Failures in patient-centredness also occurred due to factors outside clinicians' control, with negative consequences for patients: 'Somebody who is palliative care, they don't

necessarily always get the attention they need, because the nurse is taking handover for her five [patients] or she is transferring them, or if we are short-staffed...'. (LGN02).

Specific interventions at the sites supported empowerment by facilitating patient-centred care. In London, 'dignity ambassadors' throughout the hospital trust promoted 'dignity and respect for patients and carers... troubleshoot[ing] to challenge poor practice' (LSPCPO 14.08.13). In San Francisco, photo cards, whiteboards and leaflets (please see Appendix 7 in the supplementary data available in *Age and Ageing* online on the journal website for an example <http://www.ageing.oxfordjournals.org/>) were used to personalise care and inform patients, families and staff: '[We have] photo cards to give to people so that they can see what we look like. We have whiteboards in the room. We write our names and goals... [get] the medical intervention and plan all... in one spot for people to visualise' (SFGO07). In Dublin, staff reported that quality improvement initiatives focussed on promoting patient-centredness in end of life care had system-wide benefits.

Discussion

This study, the first cross-national examination of the empowerment of older patients in hospital settings, identifies significant challenges to patient empowerment. Across the sites, patients' participation in their care and self-management of their illness and treatment depended on communication, information and support tailored to their preferences, but hospital staff did not always meet their needs for relationship and information. Challenges in this area included poor communication skills among some clinicians, fragmented care and a deprioritisation of relational care. Yet while information and knowledge were for many patients necessary for empowerment, we found that they were not sufficient: fully participating in healthcare requires the power to do so [21]. In our ethnography, the power to participate depended on the principles of patient-centredness being enacted in the organisations, on the wards and by frontline staff. Efforts to support patient empowerment therefore cannot come from clinicians alone; the health system often prevents staff from providing the good-quality care they would like to give [22], and staff can be disempowered by the structures and cultures of the organisations in which they work. The way institutional routines and priorities disempower patients was particularly evident in relation to discharge. In the USA, health financing and reimbursement further restricted access to certain types of care and support, challenging patients' sense of self-efficacy. Across the sites, SPC made a positive difference to empowerment by being patient-centred and holistic, focussing on communication and information provision, coordinating a myriad of service providers, and training and supporting other staff. While there were examples of excellent communication skills among non-SPC staff, overall SPC staff were better at communicating and prioritising relational care. This is likely to be due to staff training, the philosophy or culture associated with specific specialisms, and organisational expectations of staff

(including time allocation), as well as individual staff factors. Our finding that good staff–patient communication and information provision were fundamental supports other studies of patient empowerment and involvement highlighting the importance of trusting, therapeutic relationships with staff, having enough time during consultations and acquiring knowledge [10, 17, 23]. We found a minority of patients did not want full information or to play an active role in decision-making; this aligns with other studies [24]. These patients may participate in care through discussions with clinicians and receiving information in line with their wishes rather than by directing decision-making [25]. Empowerment in this context means patients exercising their right not to be involved in decision-making; this should be recognised in models of shared decision-making. We also found that over-emphasising autonomy in clinical care could actually disempower patients by forcing unwanted decision-making on them and their families: upholding the principle of self-determination does not mean that patients and families should be left alone to decide what is best for them [10].

Our finding that continuity and coordination of care were poor concurs with Rothman and Wagner’s description of chronic disease care as a ‘poorly connected string’ of clinician–patient encounters [26]. The current organisational structure of hospitals, which emphasises medical specialisations and is oriented towards acute care, is unsuitable for patients with advanced or chronic disease [27]. Yet to say that hospitals are not the ‘right place’ for older people is wrong-headed; it is the hospital environment that should be changed, not the patient group [28]. Facilitators of empowerment identified in this study support the Institute of Medicine’s model of effective care as a collaborative process involving clear patient-provider communication, training and support to enable self-management, and coordinated, sustained follow-up [29]. Palliative care is central to translating this model [30], yet access to SPC is variable [31, 32]. The initiatives seen at the sites that are supportive of patient empowerment, such as the photo cards and leaflets used in San Francisco, could contribute to an empowerment tool kit for hospitals, subject to further research.

This study has both strengths and limitations. One of the strengths is the triangulation of multiple data sources to give a comprehensive picture of empowerment among patients with advanced disease. The observational and interview data complemented each other, with the former providing instances of empowering/disempowering care, and the latter enabling in-depth exploration of challenges to and facilitators of empowerment. However, we only interviewed patients receiving SPC, and challenges to empowerment faced by those not accessing SPC might be different from and perhaps more extensive than those we identified. As we recruited SPC staff to understand patient empowerment in advanced disease, it is possible that they were biased towards reporting the benefits of SPC, although the ways in which access to SPC could empower patients were also born out in patient, caregiver and generalist staff interviews and in observational data. Purposive sampling could have

been used at all sites rather than embedding patient recruitment in the larger survey in Ireland and England. While we achieved diversity in terms of patients’ marital status and living situation, our sample was predominantly white and had cancer. This reflects the palliative care population at the participating sites, but should be taken into account in judging the transferability of findings. Finally, we focussed on how hospital care empowers patients, not how patients empower themselves; this is an important topic for future research.

Across three high-income countries, there are significant, system-wide challenges to inpatient empowerment, including poor communication skills among clinicians, fragmented care and a deprioritisation of relational care. While information and knowledge are often necessary for empowerment, they are not sufficient: empowerment depends on patient-centredness being enacted in organisations and by staff. Facilitators of empowerment include improving staff–patient communication, prioritising patient-centred, relational care and ensuring appropriate access to SPC.

Key points

- In hospitals in three high-income countries, the empowerment of older people is threatened by poor communication skills among clinicians, fragmented care and a deprioritisation of relational care.
- Information and knowledge are often necessary for empowerment, but they are not sufficient.
- Empowering older people in the acute setting requires changes throughout the health system.
- Empowerment depends on good staff-patient communication, patient-centred care, an organisational focus on patient experience rather than throughput, and appropriate access to palliative care.

Supplementary data

Supplementary data mentioned in the text are available to subscribers in *Age and Ageing* online.

Acknowledgements

We thank all of the staff, patients and their carers who contributed to the study, the service user advisory group who advised on recruitment and study documentation, and Dr Katherine Bristowe for her helpful comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript. BuildCARE members: Emma Bennett, Francesca Cooper, Barbara A. Daveson, Susanne de Wolf-Linder, Mendwas Dzingina, Clare Ellis-Smith, Catherine J. Evans, Taja Ferguson, Lesley Henson, Irene J. Higginson, Bridget Johnston, Paramjote Kaler, Pauline Kane, Lara Klass, Peter Lawlor, Paul McCrone, Regina McQuillan, Diane Meier, Susan Molony, Sean Morrison, Fliss E. Murtagh, Charles Normand, Caty Pannell, Steve

Pantilat, Anastasia Reison, Karen Ryan, Lucy E. Selman, Melinda Smith, Katy Tobin, Rowena Vohora and Gao Wei. The Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRC) South London is part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), and is a partnership between King's Health Partners, St. George's, University London, and St. George's Healthcare NHS Trust.

Authors' contributions

B.A.D., I.J.H., C.N., P.L., S.M., D.M., R.S.M. and K.R. conceived the study. B.A.D. and I.J.H. oversaw the research internationally. C.N., K.R., R.S.M., S.Z.P., L.E.S., B.A.D. and I.H. oversaw the research at each site. L.E.S., B.A.D., M.S., B.J., L.K., K.T., C.P., S.dW-L., P.K. and S.Z.P. collected, managed and/or checked data. L.E.S., B.A.D., M.S., B.J., C.P., L.K. and K.R. analysed data. L.E.S. was responsible for cross-country analysis and conceived the idea for the paper. L.E.S. led on writing the paper, with input from all authors.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This work was supported by Cicely Saunders International and the Atlantic Philanthropies (Grant 191219). The funders had no role in the design, execution, analysis and interpretation of data, or writing of the manuscript. BuildCARE is led by King's College London, Cicely Saunders Institute, Department of Palliative Care, Policy and Rehabilitation, UK. CI: Higginson. Grant leads: Higginson, McCrone, Normand, Lawlor, Meier, Morrison. Project Coordinator/PI: Daveson. Study arm PIs: Pantilat, Selman, Normand, Ryan, McQuillan, Morrison, Daveson. We thank all collaborators. This report is an independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research & Care Funding scheme. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health.

References

1. All Party Parliamentary Groups on Global Health; HIV/AIDS; Population Development and Reproductive Health; Global Tuberculosis; and Patient and Public Involvement in Health and Social Care. Patient Empowerment: For Better Quality, More Sustainable Health Services Globally. UK All Party Parliamentary Groups, London, 2014.
2. Department of Health (Ireland). Healthy Ireland: A Framework for Improved Health and Wellbeing 2013–2025. Department of Health, Dublin, 2013.
3. Department of Health (UK) Government Response to the Consultation 'Liberating the NHS: No Decision About Me, Without Me'. Department of Health, London, 2012.
4. Institute of Medicine. Partnering with Patients to Drive Shared Decisions, Better Value, and Care Improvement. Washington, DC: 2013.
5. Barr PJ, Scholl I, Bravo P, Faber MJ, Elwyn G, McAllister M. Assessment of patient empowerment—a systematic review of measures. *PLoS ONE* 2015; 10: e0126553.
6. Hamar G, Rula E, Coberley C, Pope J, Larkin S. Long-term impact of a chronic disease management program on hospital utilization and cost in an Australian population with heart disease or diabetes. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2015; 15: 174.
7. Koelen M, Lindstrom B. Making healthy choices easy choices: the role of empowerment. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2005; 59 (Suppl. 1):S10–S6.
8. Chen Y-C, Li I-C. Effectiveness of interventions using empowerment concept for patients with chronic disease: a systematic review. *JBI Library Syst Rev* 2009; 7: 1179–233.
9. Cosgrove D, Fisher M, Gabow P, et al. Discussion paper. A CEO checklist for high-value healthcare. Washington (DC), 2012. <http://nam.edu/perspectives/>.
10. Aujoulat I, d'Hoore W, Deccache A. Patient empowerment in theory and practice: polysemy or cacophony? *Patient Educ Couns* 2007; 66: 13–20 [Review].
11. McAllister M, Dunn G, Payne K, Davies L, Todd C. Patient empowerment: the need to consider it as a measurable patient-reported outcome for chronic conditions. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2012; 12: 157.
12. Salmon P, Hall GM. Patient empowerment and control: a psychological discourse in the service of medicine. *Soc Sci Med* 2003; 57: 1969–80.
13. Johnson M. The shifting landscape of health care: toward a model of health care empowerment. *Am J Public Health* 2011; 101: 265–70.
14. Royal College of Physicians Hospitals on the Edge? The Time for Action. London, 2012.
15. Glaser BG The Discovery of Grounded Theory : Strategies for Qualitative Research. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1967.
16. Office for National Statistics Ethnic group statistics: A guide for the collection and classification of ethnicity data. Norwich, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO), 2003.
17. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Guidance for Industry Collection of Race and Ethnicity Data in Clinical Trials. Rockville, MD: Food and Drug Administration. Available at: <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm126396.pdf> Accessed 16.10.2016.
18. Hsieh HF, Shannon SE. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qual Health Res* 2005; 15: 1277–88. [10.1177/1049732305276687].
19. Aujoulat I, Marcolongo R, Bonadiman L, Deccache A. Reconsidering patient empowerment in chronic illness: a critique of models of self-efficacy and bodily control. *Soc Sci Med* (1982) 2008; 66: 1228–39.
20. Forbes DA. Enhancing mastery and sense of coherence: important determinants of health in older adults. *Geriatr Nurs* 2001; 22: 29–32.
21. Joseph-Williams N, Elwyn G, Edwards A. Knowledge is not power for patients: a systematic review and thematic synthesis of patient-reported barriers and facilitators to shared decision making. *Patient Educ Couns* 2014; 94: 291–309.

22. Lown BA, Rosen J, Marttila J. An agenda for improving compassionate care: a survey shows about half of patients say such care is missing. *Health Aff* 2011; 30: 1772–8.
23. Bastiaens H, Van Royen P, Pavlic DR, Raposo V, Baker R. Older people's preferences for involvement in their own care: a qualitative study in primary health care in 11 European countries. *Patient Educ Couns* 2007; 68: 33–42.
24. Leydon GM, Boulton M, Moynihan C *et al.* Cancer patients' information needs and information seeking behaviour: in depth interview study. *BMJ* 2000; 320: 909–13.
25. Ekdahl AW, Andersson L, Friedrichsen M. "They do what they think is the best for me." Frail elderly patients' preferences for participation in their care during hospitalization. *Patient Educ Couns* 2010; 80: 233–40.
26. Rothman AA, Wagner EH. Chronic illness management: what is the role of primary care? *Ann Intern Med* 2003; 138: 256–61.
27. American Geriatrics Society Expert Panel on the Care of Older Adults with M. Patient-centered care for older adults with multiple chronic conditions: a stepwise approach from the American Geriatrics Society. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012; 60: 1957–68.
28. Tadd W, Hillman A, Calnan S, Calnan M, Bayer T, Read S. Right place - wrong person: dignity in the acute care of older people. *Qual Ageing Older Adults* 2011; 12: 33–43.
29. Institute of Medicine Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington D.C, 2001.
30. Temel JS, Greer JA, Muzikansky A *et al.* Early palliative care for patients with metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. *N. Eng. J. Med.* 2010; 363: 733. [10.1056/NEJMoa1000678].
31. Dixon J, King D, Matosevic T, Clark M, Knapp M Equity in the Provision of Palliative Care in the UK: Review of Evidence. London, 2015.
32. Morrison RS, Augustin R, Souvanna P, Meier DE. America's care of serious illness: a state-by-state report card on access to palliative care in our nation's hospitals. *J Palliat Med* 2011; 14: 1094–6.

Received 20 April 2016; accepted in revised form 12 August 2016