



NHS health trainers: a review of emerging evaluation evidence

Journal:	<i>Critical Public Health</i>
Manuscript ID:	CCPH-2010-0055.R2
Manuscript Type:	Paper
Keywords:	Health, Evaluation, Evidence

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

NHS health trainers: a review of emerging evaluation evidence

Authors:

Pamela Attree¹

School of Health and Medicine
Division of Health Research
Bowland Tower East
Lancaster University
Lancaster LA1 4YT
Tel. 01524 594103
E mail: p.attree@lancaster.ac.uk

Stephen Clayton²
Sakthi Karunanithi³
Shilpa Nayak³
Jennie Popay⁴
Donald Read³

¹ Senior Research Associate, School of Health and Medicine, Division of Health Research, Bowland Tower East, Lancaster University.

² University Teacher, Department of Health Inequalities and Social Determinants of Health, Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, University of Liverpool.

³ Specialist Registrar in Public Health, North West School of Public Health, Mersey Deanery, Liverpool.

⁴ Professor of Sociology and Public Health, School of Health and Medicine, Division of Health Research, Bowland Tower East, Lancaster University.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by NHS Cumbria, Liverpool NHS Primary Care Trust, North Lancashire NHS Teaching Primary Care Trust, NHS Sefton and NHS Wirral. We would like to thank Professor Margaret Whitehead and Dr. Barbara Hanratty of the University of Liverpool, and Dr. Sara Mallinson of Lancaster University for their contributions to the scoping work and the discussions which have shaped our thinking about this paper. No conflicts of interest have been identified.

NHS health trainers: a review of emerging evaluation evidence

Abstract

Recent years have seen a change in focus in UK public health policies towards an emphasis on individual lifestyle choices. As part of this shift, NHS health trainers were introduced in disadvantaged communities in England, to provide peer support to people 'at risk' of developing lifestyle-related health problems and to help them to self manage their behaviour. Concerns have been expressed, however, about the strength of the evidence supporting the initiative.

This paper outlines a number of gaps between the theory and rhetoric underpinning the NHS health trainer initiative, and the reality in practice. The paper critiques the evaluation evidence, questions the assumption that engaging lay people in health promotion activities in place of health professionals is necessarily a preferable option, identifies inconsistencies in the evidence supporting individually-based health improvement initiatives, and suggests that interventions which target deprived areas but neglect the social determinants of health may be limited in their effectiveness.

Keywords: health, evaluation, evidence

Introduction

Recent years have seen significant reforms in UK public health policies which one commentator has characterised as a shift from a public to a private conception of public health (Hunter 2005), and another as neglecting the need to address both individual and wider determinants of health (Trayers and Lawlor 2007). This shift moves the focus of public health policies away from factors that affect individual health that are (largely) outside the control of the individual (poverty, employment, education etc.) and focuses instead on the role of individual lifestyle choices as the key to promoting better public health (Hunter *et al* 2010). As part of this shift, the UK government's 2004 White Paper *Choosing health: making healthy choices easier*, signalled the intention to introduce NHS health trainers into disadvantaged areas of England, to provide one-to-one support to encourage people in 'at risk' groups to make healthier lifestyle choices (Department of Health 2004). Launched in 2005 in twelve pilot sites, a commitment was made by the government to establish the initiative in Spearhead Group Primary Care Trusts (the fifth of areas with the worst health and deprivation indicators compared to England) from April 2006 and throughout the country from 2007 (Department of Health 2004).

Focused on providing 'advice from next door' to people within disadvantaged communities 'at risk' of developing health problems and supporting them to set behavioural goals and to self manage their behaviour, it was anticipated that one of the

1
2
3 outcomes of the initiative would be to reduce health inequalities (Department of Health
4
5 2008a, 2008b).
6
7
8
9

10
11 The evidence base supporting the introduction of health trainers is not clearly
12 defined and is, at best, limited (Gould 2009). The main body of research that appears to
13 have influenced the introduction of the scheme is drawn from a range of programmes
14 across the world involving trained lay people, such as community health workers, lay
15 health workers or advisors typically involved in providing primary health care to local
16 populations (Oxford Policy Management 2002, Visram and Drinkwater 2005, Zhang and
17 Unschuld 2008). Although we do not wish to explore the usefulness of this evidence as a
18 base for the health trainer initiative, a key point about this evidence needs emphasising.
19
20 Much of this evidence relates to providing basic health care in situations where little or
21 no formal health services exist or are unavailable to the majority of the population. In
22 contrast, health trainers' role is to provide advice and motivation for their clients.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In this paper, we outline and unpack the underlying theory of change or
40 programme logic of NHS health trainer programme to explore the assumptions
41 underpinning the programme. We then examine this theory and rhetoric in the light of the
42 available evaluation evidence, and contextualise these findings within some of the wider
43 critiques of individual behavioural approaches to health improvement. We conclude by
44 asking to what extent the NHS health trainer initiative is able to improve health outcomes
45 and reduce health inequalities in disadvantaged communities without the support of
46 efforts to tackle more macro-level structural inequalities.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THEORY and RHETORIC

The programme logic underpinning the NHS health trainer scheme

Social interventions, such as the NHS health trainer initiative, can be viewed as having an underlying programme logic or theory of change (Whitehead 2007). Often not explicitly stated, this theory (or theories) links the definition of the problem to the proposed outcomes of the programme that will address the problem. In this section, we unpack the underlying programme logic of the health trainer initiative to examine how the programme defined the 'problem' it was designed to address and how it proposed (theoretically) to address this perceived 'problem'. In a following section, we describe the limitations of the evaluation evidence and examine the extent to which it evaluates the initiative in terms of these logic models.

The logic models invoked in the health trainer initiative are underpinned by three perceived problems, which are then addressed by the theory of change embedded in the initiative. The first perceived problem is that people living in more deprived areas or from more vulnerable groups have more risky health behaviours and make 'poorer' health choices. This leads to the theory that targeting of the initiative, and thus the provision of advice, education, and signposting to services, in more deprived areas and on 'harder to reach' populations, will be of more benefit to those who most need the service, and thereby have the potential to reduce health inequalities.

1
2
3 The second perceived problem is that 'harder to reach' individuals, that is those
4 from disadvantaged areas or belonging to vulnerable groups, do not access mainstream
5 health services in sufficient numbers, and ignore, do not trust, or do not believe in
6 existing health promotion efforts. The theory of change here is that individuals who are
7 from these areas/groups, who understand the experiences and concerns of the target
8 individuals and have a shared interest in improving their health, will be able to effect
9 change. From this perspective, a non-health professional drawn from the local area is a
10 more acceptable source of information and better able to engage with clients from harder
11 to reach groups; moreover, their 'localness' may mean that people in disadvantaged
12 communities perceive them as more approachable.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The third perceived problem is that undesirable health outcomes are largely the
30 result of the 'poor' health behaviours and choices of individuals. This leads to a theory of
31 change which posits that health trainers can motivate and train individuals to set their
32 own improved behavioural goals, manage their own health behaviours and the events and
33 circumstances in their lives which they would like to change. This approach reflects the
34 'fully engaged scenario' proposed by Wanless (2002, 2004), which portrays citizens as
35 actively involved with the notion of healthy living, and perceives health-related lifestyle
36 advice as part of a 'concerted effort to increase focus on individual responsibility in
37 health management' (Lhussier and Carr 2008, p301). From this perspective, this can be
38 achieved using techniques drawn from behavioural psychology, such as (amongst others)
39 social cognitive theory (Bandura 1989, 1998) and the influential transtheoretical (or
40 stages of change) model (Prochaska and DiClemente 1982). The assumption is that
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 influencing individuals to make ‘better’ health and lifestyle choices will improve both
4
5 individual and overall public health.
6
7
8
9

10 **PUTTING THEORY INTO PRACTICE: THE REALITY**

11
12 Whether the theory underpinning these initiatives is borne out in practice is an
13 important question. To address this question we carried out a scoping review of evidence
14 relevant to the NHS health trainer initiative, using methods adapted from the framework
15 described by Arksey and O’Malley (2005), as part of a wider mapping study of public
16 investment in policies and interventions aimed at addressing the social determinants of
17 health and tackling health inequalities. Two main sources of evidence regarding the NHS
18 health trainer programme were identified: first, from a series of annual audit reports of
19 national data, and reports from the national Health Trainer Data Collection and Reporting
20 System (DCRS). National audits provide information collated annually about health
21 trainer personnel and clients, stage of development of local services, and funding
22 (Wilkinson *et al* 2007, 2008, Smith *et al* 2008, 2010): together with local evaluation data
23 (Wilkinson *et al* 2008). DCRS reports include data on the number of clients using the
24 service, health trainers’ characteristics, and client-centred questions regarding access to
25 the service, behaviours targeted, goal setting and outcomes (Hopkinson and Fidan 2009,
26 Fidan *et al* 2009). Second, a limited number of stand-alone local evaluations of NHS
27 health trainer schemes were identified (See Table 1).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **insert Table 1 about here.**
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Evaluation findings

National reports chart the rapid growth of the NHS health trainer programme: in 2008-2009, 169 health trainer services were in operation across 115 Primary Care Trusts (Smith *et al* 2010). A broad range of disadvantaged communities and groups perceived as vulnerable to the risk of experiencing poor health were targeted by services (Smith *et al* 2010). The most frequent topics on which health trainers were consulted were diet (61%) and physical exercise (27%) (Fidan *et al* 2009). Positive outcomes reported include good uptake of the service, increased access to preventative services for clients, psychological, emotional and social benefits and achievement of behavioural goals (in particular smoking cessation) (Wilkinson *et al* 2008).

Local evaluations of the scheme are also broadly positive in their findings (Visram and Geddes 2007), suggesting that health trainers can provide the type of support necessary to help individuals make desirable lifestyle changes (Ball *et al* 2008, 2009b, Kime *et al* 2008, Meah and Guest 2010). Across a number of initiatives, clients spoke positively about their experiences of the service (Kime *et al* 2008, Ball *et al* 2008, 2009b, Meah and Guest 2010). In one area, health trainers were seen as a way of facilitating communication between community members and the Primary Care Trust, and thus as a means of translating key health messages (Kitchen 2009). Health trainers were also perceived as filling a gap in services in disadvantaged communities (Visram *et al* 2006, Kitchen 2009). From health trainers' perspectives, the role was described as a source of personal fulfilment and career development (South *et al* 2006, 2007, Visram *et al* 2006, Kime *et al* 2008). However, the introduction of the scheme was not without its tensions,

1
2
3 especially where there was a perceived overlap between the roles of health trainers and
4
5 existing workers (South *et al* 2006, 2007, Visram and Geddes 2007, Ball *et al* 2008,
6
7 2009b).
8
9

10 11 12 **Limitations of the evaluation evidence**

13
14
15 Taken overall, the evidence base concerning the health trainer initiative has
16
17 important limitations. There is a notable lack of research evaluating the impact of the
18
19 NHS health trainer role, the extent to which the initiative leads to health improvements
20
21 for clients, and whether it is cost effective, although it is acknowledged that it is
22
23 relatively early in the life of the scheme for robust outcome evidence to be available (a
24
25 number of studies, including a national evaluation, are ongoing) (Ball *et al* 2009b).
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Although national reports contain a good deal of descriptive data concerning the
33
34 NHS health trainer scheme, there is a paucity of data in the public domain about its
35
36 effectiveness in bringing about health improvement or reducing health inequalities in
37
38 disadvantaged communities. There are a number of problems inherent in the evidence
39
40 base. Firstly, the national data set is incomplete. In 2008 to 2009, 62% of NHS health
41
42 trainer services were included in the DCRS (a further 30% were planning to use the
43
44 system), while information concerning completion of Personal Health Plans (a health
45
46 ‘stock-take’ which records clients’ goals and achievements) was limited (Smith *et al*
47
48 2010). Secondly, the focus of national reports is primarily on *outputs* (e.g. the number of
49
50 clients reached by services) rather than *outcomes* in terms of delivering behaviour change
51
52 (Smith *et al* 2008). Thirdly, whether health trainers are successfully tackling inequalities
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the areas they serve is inferred by the approach and reach of initiatives, rather than
4
5 substantive outcomes (Wilkinson *et al* 2008). Finally, there are limitations in the national
6
7 evidence base regarding data quality. For example, local evaluations synthesised in
8
9 national reports were typically non-experimental, observational studies of the processes
10
11 and/or outcomes of health trainer services, usually collected at a single time point (i.e.
12
13 cross-sectionally) (Wilkinson *et al* 2008). Behaviour or health outcome measures were
14
15 not stated clearly in the majority of evaluations and few studies employed comparison or
16
17 control groups or localities.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Local evaluations of the NHS health trainer scheme also have notable
26
27 weaknesses. Firstly, there are problems with the generalisability of findings, as service
28
29 models vary both between and within sites (because of differing local priorities) (South *et*
30
31 *al* 2006, Visram *et al* 2006, Kitchen 2009). Secondly, no local evaluations included in
32
33 this paper employed comparison areas or groups; the majority involved relatively small
34
35 samples of stakeholders, often self selected, whose views may not be representative of
36
37 wider constituencies (Visram *et al* 2006, Visram and Geddes 2007, Ball *et al* 2008,
38
39 2009a, Meah and Guest 2010). Typically, only clients who agreed to be followed up were
40
41 asked for their views of the health trainer service (South *et al* 2006, 2007, Kime *et al*
42
43 2008), and it is possible that such samples were biased towards those with more positive
44
45 experiences. Thirdly, the collection of service performance data is inconsistent, meaning
46
47 that assessing client outcomes over time is difficult (Ball *et al* 2008, 2009a, 2009b, Kime
48
49 *et al* 2008); importantly, therefore, we learn little about the *sustainability* of behaviour
50
51 change.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Although this type of approach to evaluation provides a great deal of valuable
7
8 contextual detail regarding the *process* of implementing health trainer services, it is less
9
10 useful in assessing the *outcomes* in terms of lifestyle change and health improvement.
11
12

13
14
15 It is also clear that evaluations have not addressed the logic models underpinning
16
17 the health trainer initiative in any depth. Apart from some limited discussion about the
18
19 desirability of employing a local person with community knowledge in the health trainer
20
21 role (cf. South *et al* 2006, Visram and Geddes 2007, Ball *et al* 2008, Kime *et al* 2008,
22
23 Kitchen 2009), the assumptions on which the scheme is based remain unexamined. In
24
25 contrast, the adoption of a theory-based or realist approach to evaluation would place the
26
27 emphasis on identifying the underlying programme logic – articulating in advance *how*
28
29 intervention activities would be expected to lead to outcomes for recipients, and crucially,
30
31 in what contexts (Judge and Bauld 2001, Parry and Judge 2005).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **WIDER CRITIQUES OF THE LOGIC MODELS**

40
41 One of the assumptions underpinning the NHS health trainer initiative is that a
42
43 knowledgeable local person, who understands the experiences and concerns of clients, is
44
45 likely to prove a more effective agent of change than a health professional, who may be
46
47 perceived as remote by the community they serve. However, findings from studies of the
48
49 effectiveness of engaging lay peers in health promotion activities, in comparison to health
50
51 professionals, are inconsistent, and vary for different groups of people, by age, gender,
52
53 ethnicity and risk-group membership (Durantini *et al* 2006). There is a need, therefore,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for further research comparing the relative effectiveness of lay people and professional
4 health care providers in bringing about health improvement (Lewin *et al* 2005), and to
5 identify populations in which lay helper models work most successfully, in order to tailor
6 interventions to individuals and groups from diverse cultures and backgrounds (Durantini
7 *et al* 2006, Norris *et al* 2006, Brownstein *et al* 2007).

14
15
16
17 NHS health trainers' practice draws heavily on techniques from behavioural
18 psychology to deliver sustained health improvement through individual behaviour
19 change (Department of Health, 2008a). However, the research literature evaluating
20 the relevance and use of individual behaviour change models is inconsistent and
21 does not support any particular approach or strategy (NICE 2007). To take one
22 example, the 'stages of change' theoretical model (Prochaska and DiClemente
23 1982) has been found to lack evidence of effectiveness (West 2005), particularly in
24 relation to bringing about *lasting* behavioural change (Moore and Charvat 2007). A
25 systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions based on a stages-of-change
26 approach found that there was little evidence to suggest that stage-based behaviour
27 change interventions are more effective than non-stage-based interventions
28 (Riemsma *et al* 2002, 2003). A number of randomised trials of individual-level
29 interventions to increase physical activity have also failed to demonstrate their
30 long-term effectiveness (Harland *et al* 1999, Foster *et al* 2005, NICE 2006,
31 Kinmonth *et al* 2008).

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 The NHS health trainer initiative is informed by an individual-responsibility model
56 of health inequalities, which broadly sees undesirable adult health behaviours, such
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as smoking, as primarily the result of poor personal choices (McGinnis and Foege
4
5 1993, Patterson *et al* 1994, Wayland 2002, Morgan and Ziglio 2007). Public health
6
7 initiatives influenced by this philosophy seek to address lifestyle management
8
9 issues mainly through health education (Lynch *et al* 1997). An alternative model
10
11 for addressing health inequalities emphasises the effects of socio-economic status,
12
13 social conditions and social relations on health (Dahlgren and Whitehead 2007,
14
15 Trayers and Lawlor 2007), arguing that policies which focus on individual health
16
17 education alone and fail to engage with the material conditions in which people live
18
19 are unlikely to improve the health of disadvantaged populations (Butterfoss *et al*
20
21 1993, Lynch *et al* 1997). Rather, policies which aim for a modest redistribution of
22
23 wealth are seen as more likely to have an impact on health inequalities (Mitchell *et*
24
25 *al* 2000). According to this model, the primary role of social policy should be to
26
27 shape an environment, for example through methods such as increasing
28
29 employment opportunities or the accessibility of healthy foods, which *enables*
30
31 individuals to make healthier choices (Exworthy *et al* 2003). There is scant
32
33 evidence, however, to suggest that NHS health trainers are working with
34
35 communities to address the social determinants of health.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Conclusions**

46
47
48 In this paper we have outlined a number of gaps between the theory and rhetoric
49
50 underpinning the NHS health trainer scheme, and the reality in practice. Deficiencies in
51
52 the evidence base have been discussed, and it is suggested that further research is needed
53
54 to test the assumption that lay people are more effective than health professionals in
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 promoting health improvement for ‘at risk’ populations. Questions have been raised
4
5 about the strength of the evidence supporting individual behaviour change strategies, and
6
7 the limitations of introducing individually-based interventions into disadvantaged
8
9 communities while neglecting the social determinants of health. Evidence that health
10
11 inequalities can be decreased by initiatives that target disadvantaged groups or areas is
12
13 lacking (Lynch *et al* 1997), primarily because of a failure to take the effect of social
14
15 circumstances into account (Lee *et al* 2008).
16
17
18
19

20
21
22
23 A lack of evidence has not precluded the national roll out of the NHS health
24
25 trainer scheme, however. Critics suggest that there is a tendency for health policy to
26
27 advance in *parallel* with the development of the evidence, introducing interventions
28
29 based on *assumptions* of effectiveness, in place of evaluation data from pilot initiatives
30
31 (Bonner 2003, Sowden and Raine 2008). Policymakers argue, however, that action often
32
33 needs to be taken whether or not ‘strong’ evidence is available, and that pragmatic
34
35 considerations, such as cost, may prevail over the perceived weight the UK government
36
37 places on evidence-based practice (Petticrew *et al* 2004).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Although the health trainer scheme has adopted a number of different service
46
47 models (Visram and Drinkwater 2005, Visram *et al* 2006), over time there has been a
48
49 notable shift towards focusing on individual behavioural change (Smith *et al* 2008),
50
51 reflecting the thrust of public health policy in general (Graham 2009). Doubts have been
52
53 expressed about the effectiveness of interventions which concentrate on changing
54
55 individual behaviour, while ignoring or sidelining the social determinants of health
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Macintyre 2007). A major stumbling block to the introduction of initiatives which target
4
5 health inequalities more broadly, however, particularly in times of economic cutbacks, is
6
7 that while schemes that utilise lay people in advisory roles are relatively easy and
8
9 inexpensive to implement – hence their popularity with governments - tackling the social
10
11 determinants of health is comparatively costly and time consuming (Wayland 2002).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Arksey, H. and O'Malley, L., 2005. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8 (1), 19-32.
- Ball, L. *et al.*, 2008. *Evaluation of the North East Lincolnshire health trainer programme: final report*. Sheffield Hallam University, Centre for Health and Social Care Research.
- Ball, L. O'Kasheh, R. and Qutishat, D., 2009a. *Evaluation of health trainers working in primary care*. Sheffield Hallam University, Centre for Health and Social Care Research.
- Ball, L. O'Kasheh, R. and Whitfield, M., 2009b. *Summary evaluation of the North East Lincolnshire health trainer services*. Sheffield Hallam University, Centre for Health and Social Care Research.
- Bandura, A., 1989. Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44, 1175-1184.
- Bandura, A., 1998. Health promotion from the perspective of Social Cognition Theory, *Psychology and Health*, 13, 623-649.
- Bonner, L., 2003. Using theory-based evaluation to build evidence-based health and social care policy and practice. *Critical Public Health*, 13(1), 77-92.
- Brownstein, J.N. *et al.*, 2007. Effectiveness of community health workers in the care of people with hypertension. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 32(5), 435-447.

1
2
3 Butterfoss, F.D. Goodman, R.M. and Wandersman A., 1993. Community coalitions for
4 prevention and health promotion. *Health Education Research: Theory & Practice*,
5
6 8(3), 315-330.
7
8

9
10 Dahlgren, G. and Whitehead, M., 2007. *European strategies for tackling social inequities*
11
12 *in health: Levelling up Part 2*. Denmark: World Health Organization, Regional
13
14 Office for Europe.
15

16
17 Department of Health, 2004. *Choosing health: making healthy choices easier*. London:
18
19 The Stationery Office.
20

21
22 Department of Health, 2008a. *Improving health: changing behaviour: NHS health trainer*
23
24 *handbook*. London: DH Publications.
25

26
27 Department of Health, 2008b. *Health trainer strategic aim and objectives 2009-11*.

28
29 [online] Available from:

30
31 http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/documents/digitalasset/dh_100880.pdf [Accessed 17 February 2010]
32
33

34
35
36 Durantini, M.R. *et al.*, 2006. Conceptualizing the influence of social agents of behaviour
37
38 change: a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of HIV prevention interventionists
39
40 for different groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(2), 212-248.
41
42

43
44 Exworthy, M. Bland, D. and Marmot, M., 2003. Tackling health inequalities in the
45
46 United Kingdom: the progress and pitfalls of policy. *Health Services Research*,
47
48 38(6), 1905-1922.
49

50
51 Fidan, E. Hopkinson D. and N'Kongolo, R.K., 2009. *National health trainer data*
52
53 *collection and reporting system: system update & initial responses to national*
54
55

- 1
2
3 reporting framework 'key questions'. Birmingham Primary Care Shared Services
4
5 Agency.
6
7
- 8 Foster, C. Hillsdon, M. and Thorogood, M., 2005. Interventions for promoting physical
9
10 activity. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 1, Article No.
11
12 CD003180.
13
- 14
15 Gould, M., 2009. Can health trainers reduce poor health? *Health Service Journal*.
16
17 [online] 24 April 2009. Available from:
18
19 [http://www.hsj.co.uk/resource-centre/can-health-trainers-reduce-poor-
21 health/2007724.article](http://www.hsj.co.uk/resource-centre/can-health-trainers-reduce-poor-
20 health/2007724.article) [Accessed 17 February 2010]
22
23
- 24 Graham, H., 2009. Health inequalities, social determinants and public health policy.
25
26 *Policy & Politics*, 37(4), 463-479.
27
28
- 29 Harland, J. *et al.*, 1999. The Newcastle exercise project: a randomized controlled trial of
30
31 methods to promote physical activity in primary care. *British Medical Journal*,
32
33 319, 828-32.
34
35
- 36 Hopkinson, D. and Fidan, E. 2009. *National health trainer data collection and reporting*
37
38 *system: updated national report – February 2009*. Birmingham Primary Care
39
40 Shared Services Agency.
41
42
- 43 Hunter, D., 2005. Choosing or losing health? *Journal of Epidemiology and Community*
44
45 *Health*, 59 (12), 1010-1013.
46
47
- 48 Hunter, D.J. *et al.*, 2010. Getting to grips with health inequalities at last? *British Medical*
49
50 *Journal*, 340, 323-324.
51
52
- 53 Judge, K. and Bauld, L., 2001. Strong theory, flexible methods: evaluating complex
54
55 community-based initiatives. *Critical Public Health*, 11(1), 19-38.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kime, N. South, J. and Lowcock, D., 2008. *An evaluation of the Bradford District health*
4
5 *trainers programme – Phase 2*. Leeds Metropolitan University, Centre for Health
6
7 Promotion Research.
8
9
10 Kinmonth, A. *et al.*, 2008. Efficacy of a theory-based intervention to increase physical
11
12 activity in an at-risk group in primary care (ProActive UK): a randomised trial.
13
14 *The Lancet*, 371:41-48.
15
16
17 Kitchen, G., 2009. *Health trainers in Cheshire and Merseyside*. Liverpool: HM
18
19 Partnership.
20
21
22 Lee, J.E.C. *et al.*, 2008. Health risk perceptions as mediators of socioeconomic
23
24 differentials in health behaviour. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 13, 1082-1091.
25
26
27 Lewin, S *et al.*, 2005. Lay health workers in primary and community health care.
28
29 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2005, Issue 1, Article. No.
30
31 CD004015.
32
33
34 Lhussier, M. and Carr, S.M., 2008. Health-related lifestyle advice: critical insights.
35
36 *Critical Public Health*, 18(3), 299-309.
37
38
39 Lynch, J.W. Kaplan, G.A. and Salonen, J.T., 1997. Why do poor people behave poorly?
40
41 Variation in adult health behaviours and psychosocial characteristics by stages of
42
43 the socioeconomic lifecourse. *Social Science and Medicine*, 44(6), 809-819.
44
45
46 Macintyre, S., 2007. *Inequalities in health in Scotland: what are they and what can we do*
47
48 *about them?* Occasional paper No 17. Glasgow: MRC Social and Public Health
49
50 Sciences Unit.
51
52
53 McGinnis, J.M. and Foege, W.H., 1993. Actual causes of death in the United States.
54
55 *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 18, 2207-2212.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Meah, S. and Guest, S., 2010. *An evaluation of the health trainer service across Greater*
4
5 *Manchester*. University of Salford, Greater Manchester Public Health Practice
6
7
8 Unit.

9
10 Mitchell, R. Shaw, M. and Dorling, D., 2000. *Inequalities in life and death: what if*
11
12 *Britain were more equal?* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

13
14
15 Morgan, A. and Ziglio E., 2007. Revitalising the evidence base for public health: an
16
17 assets model. *Promotion and Education*, 14, 17-22.

18
19
20 NICE (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence), 2006. *A rapid review of the*
21
22 *effectiveness of exercise referral schemes to promote physical activity in adults*.
23
24 London: NICE.

25
26
27 NICE (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence), 2007. *Behaviour change at*
28
29 *population, community and individual levels*. NICE public health guidance 6.
30
31 London: NICE.

32
33
34 Norris, S.L. *et al.*, 2006. Effectiveness of community health workers in the care of
35
36 persons with diabetes. *Diabetic Medicine*, 23, 544-556.

37
38
39 Oxford Policy Management, 2002. *Lady health worker programme: summary of final*
40
41 *report*. Oxford: Oxford Policy Management.

42
43
44 Parry, J. and Judge, K., 2005. Tackling the wider determinants of health disparities in
45
46 England: a model for evaluating the New Deal for Communities regeneration
47
48 initiative. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95(4), 626-628.

49
50
51 Patterson, R.E. Haines, P.S. and Popkin, D.M., 1994. Health life-style patterns of United-
52
53 States adults. *Preventive Medicine*, 23(4), 453-460.

- 1
2
3 Petticrew, M. *et al.*, 2004. Evidence for public health policy on inequalities: 1: The
4 reality according to policymakers. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community*
5 *Health*, 58, 811-816.
6
7
8
9
10 Prochaska, J.O. and DiClemente, C.C., 1982. Trans-theoretical therapy – toward a more
11 integrative model of change. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*,
12 19(3), 276-288.
13
14
15
16
17 Riemsma, R.P. *et al.*, 2002. A systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions
18 based on a stages-of-change approach to promote individual behaviour change.
19 *Health Technology Assessment*, 6(24).
20
21
22
23
24 Riemsma, R.P. *et al.*, 2003. Systematic review of the effectiveness of stage based
25 interventions to prevent smoking cessation. *British Medical Journal*, 326, 1175-
26 1177.
27
28
29
30
31
32 Smith, D. Gardner, B. and Michie, S., 2008. *National health trainer end of year report*
33 *07/08*. London: Centre for Outcomes Research and Effectiveness, University
34 College London.
35
36
37
38
39 Smith, D. Gardner, B. and Michie, S., 2010. *Health trainers national end of year report:*
40 *2008-09*. London: Centre for Outcomes Research and Effectiveness, University
41 College London.
42
43
44
45
46 South, J. *et al.*, 2006. *An evaluation of the Bradford district health trainers programme:*
47 *an early adopter site*. Leeds Metropolitan University: Centre for Health
48 Promotion Research.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 South, J. Woodward, J. and Lowcock, D., 2007. New beginnings: stakeholder
4 perspectives on the role of health trainers. *The Journal for the Royal Society for*
5
6 *the Promotion of Health*, 127, 224-230.
7
8
9
- 10 Sowden, S.L. and Raine, R., 2008. Running along parallel lines: how political reality
11 impedes the evaluation of public health interventions. A case study of exercise
12 referral schemes in England. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 62,
13
14 835-841.
15
16
17
18
19
- 20 Trayers, T. and Lawlor, D.A., 2007. Bridging the gap in health inequalities with the help
21 of health trainers: a realistic task in hostile environments? A short report for
22 debate. *Journal of Public Health*, 29(3), 218-221.
23
24
25
26
- 27 Visram, S. and Drinkwater, C., 2005. *Health trainers: a review of the evidence*.
28 Northumbria University.
29
30
- 31 Visram, S. et al., 2006. *An evaluation of the early adopter phase of the health trainers*
32 *project in the North East: final report*. Northumbria University.
33
34
35
- 36 Visram, S. and Geddes, L., 2007. *What does it mean to be a NHS health trainer? Further*
37 *evaluation of the health trainers initiative in County Durham and Tees Valley:*
38 *final report*. Northumbria University.
39
40
41
42
- 43 Wanless, D., 2002. *Securing our future health: taking a long-term view – final report*.
44 London: HM Treasury.
45
46
47
- 48 Wanless, D., 2004. *Securing good health for the whole population – final report*. London:
49 HM Treasury.
50
51
52
- 53 Wayland, C., 2002. Acceptable and appropriate: programme priorities vs. felt needs in a
54 CHW programme. *Critical Public Health*, 12(4), 335-350.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 West, R., 2005. Time for a change: putting the Transtheoretical (Stages of Change)
4
5 model to rest. *Addiction*, 100, 1036-1039.
6
7

8 Whitehead, M., 2007. A typology of actions to tackle social inequalities in health.
9
10 *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 61, 473-478.
11

12 Wilkinson, D. *et al.*, 2007. *National health trainer activity report (Based on end year*
13 *reports 06/07)*. London: Centre for Outcomes Research and Effectiveness,
14
15 University College London.
16
17
18

19 Wilkinson, D. *et al.*, 2008. *National health trainer outcome and evaluation synopsis*.
20
21 London: Centre for Outcomes Research and Effectiveness, University College
22
23 London.
24
25
26

27 Zhang, D. and Unschuld, P. U., 2008. China's barefoot doctor: past, present, and future.
28
29 *The Lancet*, 372 (9653), 1865-1867.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 1: Evaluation studies

Author(s) and date	Focus of study	Study methods	Sample	Limitations of study
Ball <i>et al</i> 2008	Evaluation of the North East Lincolnshire health trainer service.	Secondary analysis: client data set 2007-2008; post-engagement client satisfaction survey (at 3 and 6 months). Qualitative methods: interviews (face to face and telephone), and focus groups.	Interviews with 8 key stakeholders and 4 clients. Focus groups with 10 health trainers. Client satisfaction survey - 59 respondents (46% response rate).	Consistency of data collection e.g. follow-up data at 3 and 9 months difficult to capture; sample may be biased in favour of service. Service performance comparison data pre- and post-intervention (2007-2008) included a high proportion of missing cases, making statistical comparisons difficult.
Ball <i>et al</i> 2009a	Evaluation of health trainers working in primary care in North East Lincolnshire.	Qualitative methods: interviews.	Convenience sample of 8 health care staff and 2 health trainers across 3 primary care practices.	Service performance data lacking; no client data included; no comparison areas/groups used.
Ball <i>et al</i> 2009b	Evaluation of the North East Lincolnshire health trainer service.	Secondary analysis: synthesis of published data on the effectiveness of the health trainer scheme and lay health promotion workers; service performance data 2008-2009 (reporting on work by 15 health trainers); published data, guidance and pilot schemes relating to the NHS Cardio-vascular Health Check	As above.	Paucity of published impact evidence. Comparison of performance data for 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 affected by limitations outlined above for Ball <i>et al</i> 2008.

1				
2				
3				
4				
5			Programme; synthesis of	
6			qualitative data from 2 previous	
7			evaluations (Ball <i>et al</i> 2008,	
8			2009a).	
9				
10	Kime <i>et al</i>	Evaluation of the	Secondary analysis of monitoring	Interviews with 20
11	2008	Bradford district	data concerning client	health trainer clients, 9
12		health trainers	characteristics, health issues and	health trainers, 11 key
13		programme phase	outcomes Jan 2006-Oct 2007.	informants, 3 senior
14		2.		health trainers and 4
15			Qualitative methods: in depth case	project leads. Focus
16			studies of 3 localities using	group with senior
17			interviews and a focus group.	health trainers ($n=3$),
18				project leads ($n=4$).
19				
20	Kitchen	Evaluation of	Secondary analysis of regional hub	18 interviews with
21	2009	health trainer	activity report 2008-2009.	provider agencies,
22		schemes in		service commissioners
23		Cheshire and	Qualitative methods: semi-	and directors of public
24		Merseyside.	structured interviews with key	health. Supplementary
25			personnel in 8 Primary Care Trust	interviews with health
26			areas (4 of which were currently	trainers (number not
27			operating a health trainer service);	specified) and
28			supplementary interviews with	fieldwork visits.
29			health trainers in 3 Primary Care	
30			Trusts.	
31				
32				
33	Meah and	Evaluation of a	Analysis of secondary sources:	Questionnaires
34	Guest	health trainers	national policy documents, Greater	completed by 99 health
35	2010	scheme in 10	Manchester strategy and service	trainers (82% response
36		Primary Care	documents (reported activity),	rate), 10 financial leads
37		Trusts across	literature search and review.	and 39 service users
38		Greater		(9% response rate).
39		Manchester.	Quantitative methods: survey of	
40				Response rate to the health
41				trainer survey inconsistent
42				between Trusts. Response rate for
43				service users low (9%). Possible
44				sample bias towards those with
45				more positive experiences.
46				
47				
48				
49				

1				
2				
3				
4				
5		health trainers, financial leads and	Telephone interviews	
6		service users.	with 10 service	
7			commissioners (one in	
8			each PCT).	
9		Qualitative methods: non-		
10		participant observation of health		
11		trainers; semi-structured telephone		
12		interviews with service		
13		commissioners.		
14	South <i>et al</i>	Analysis of secondary sources -	2 focus groups	Transferability of findings:
15	2006, 2007	client monitoring data; health	involving 15 health	intended to provide formative
16		trainer feedback forms.	trainers; telephone	feedback to service; limited in-
17			interviews with 16 key	depth exploration of issues;
18			informants from	potential bias in client sample –
19		Qualitative methods: semi-	placement	only those who attended follow-
20		structured telephone interviews,	organisations	up and agreed to be interviewed
21		focus groups, group interview and	(purposive sample);	(a minority of those eligible);
22		learning event.	group interview with	sustainability of client behaviour
23			project leads; learning	change not evaluated.
24			event with key	
25			stakeholders; 22 clients	
26			followed up by	
27			telephone interview.	
28				
29				
30				
31	Visram	Analysis of secondary sources –	Purposive sample of 8	Relatively small sample from one
32	and	literature review of use of lay	health trainers across 3	strategic health authority;
33	Geddes	workers in health promotion	different models of	volunteers not recruited for the
34	2007	activities.	service provision. The	study; descriptive nature of
35			intention was to recruit	reflective diaries.
36			members of the original	
37		Qualitative methods - unstructured	cohort from early	
38		interviews, field notes, health	implementer sites but	
39		trainers' reflective diaries.	recruitment problems	
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				

			meant that later cohorts were included.	
7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31
32	33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40	41
42	43	44	45	46
47	48	49		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

For Peer Review Only