

# Explorations in Consultation of the Public and Health Professionals on Priority Setting in an Inner London Health District

Bowling et al. (1993)

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(93\)90138-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(93)90138-T)

## **For which topic were research priorities identified?**

public health

## **In which location was the research priority setting conducted?**

Europe - United Kingdom

## **Why was it conducted at all?**

Studies published so far raise a number of methodological issues about how and whether a local community can be effectively consulted. Several methods of obtaining the public's views have been used, and include public panels, focus groups, rapid appraisal, postal questionnaires and interview surveys. The best method of exploring public opinion on this complex issue has not been resolved.

## **What was the objective?**

to explore the health service values of members of the local community in a series of public consultation exercises, and to assess the representativeness of the views expressed, and to compare the public's priorities with those of all hospital consultants, general practitioners and public health doctors

## **What was the outcome?**

a ranking list of 16 research topics

## **How long did the research prioritization take?**

No information provided.

## **Which methods were used to identify research priorities?**

group discussion; survey

## **How were the priorities for research identified exactly?**

Step 1: survey: participants were asked to prioritize from a range of 16 health services/areas and treatments in relation to their opinion of the needs of people living in City and Hackney. Step 2: semi-structured group discussions: after survey completed

## **Which stakeholders took part?**

Local community, public, general practitioners, consultants, public health doctors. Participants: 350 people from 27 community groups and tenants' associations and a random sample of 454 people registered with general practitioners; consisting of 121 general practitioners, 197 consultants and 7 public health doctors.

## **How were stakeholders recruited?**

The researchers negotiated with each community group to attend one of their routine meetings, or at times when members would be on the premises. The survey was sent via post to a random sample of practitioners.

## **Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?**

Stakeholders were mere participants of the research prioritization process; they were not actively involved in the process.