Motivational interviewing-based training enhances clinicians’ skills and knowledge in psoriasis: findings from the Pso Well® study

Journal: British Journal of Dermatology

Manuscript ID BJD-2016-0512.R1

Manuscript Type: Original Article

Date Submitted by the Author: n/a

Complete List of Authors: Chisholm, Anna; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research and Manchester Centre for Health Psychology; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Nelson, Pauline; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Pearce, Christina; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research and Manchester Centre for Health Psychology; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Littlewood, Alison; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Kane, Karen; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Henry, Alasdair; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research and Manchester Centre for Health Psychology; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Thorneloe, Rachael; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research and Manchester Centre for Health Psychology; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Hamilton, Matthew; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Health Economics; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Lavallee, Jacqueline; University of Manchester, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work, and Manchester Centre for Health Psychology; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Lunt, Mark; University of Manchester, Centre for Musculoskeletal Research; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Griffiths, Christopher; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research; Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Cordingley, Lis; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research, and Manchester Centre for Health Psychology; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
Bundy, Christine; University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research and Manchester Centre for Health Psychology; Manchester Academic Health Science Centre

Keywords: Psoriasis, Psychology, Lifestyle, Behaviour change, Training
Motivational interviewing-based training enhances clinicians’ skills and knowledge in psoriasis: findings from the Pso Well® study

Psoriasis and Wellbeing: The Pso Well® clinician training evaluation

Word count (incl. Tables and figures): 3,202

Authors and affiliations: A Chisholm¹,²,³, PA Nelson¹,², CJ Pearce¹,²,³, AJ Littlewood¹,², K Kane¹,², AL Henry¹,²,³, R Thorndloe¹,²,³, MP Hamilton²,⁴, J Lavallee⁵, M Lunt²,⁶, CEM Griffiths¹,²,⁷, L Cordingley¹,²,³ & C Bundy¹,²,³ on behalf of the Identification and Management of Psoriasis-Associated ComorbiditY (IMPACT) Team.

¹ Manchester Centre for Dermatology Research, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
² Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, UK
³ Manchester Centre for Health Psychology, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
⁴ Manchester Centre for Health Economics, Manchester UK
⁵ School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
⁶ Centre for Musculoskeletal Research, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
⁷ Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK

Corresponding author: Dr Anna Chisholm. Address: IMPACT offices, Stopford Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL. Tel: 0161 2750710. Email: anna.chisholm@manchester.ac.uk.

Funding source: This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) under its Programme Grants for Applied Research scheme (RP-PG-0608-10163). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

Conflicts of Interest: None

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Laura Howells for her input to data analysis, the patients actors involved in collection of evaluation data, and all clinicians who took part in this study.

What is already known about this topic?

- Holistic care of people with psoriasis requires knowledge about and management of co-morbidities and associated risk factors.
- Motivational interviewing can support people with long-term conditions to make necessary changes to health-related behaviours.

What does this study add?

- The first evaluation of motivational interviewing skills training for clinicians managing psoriasis patients.
- Psoriasis-tailored motivational interviewing training assists clinicians to manage psoriasis holistically and support behaviour change.
- The Pso Well® training is acceptable to clinicians and feasible to run within UK healthcare settings.
ABSTRACT

Background

Psoriasis is a common long-term, immune-mediated skin condition associated with behavioural factors (e.g. smoking, excess alcohol, obesity) which increase the risk of psoriasis onset, flares, and comorbidities. Motivational interviewing (MI) is an evidence-based approach to health-related behaviour change that has been used successfully with patients with long-term conditions. This study assessed change in clinicians’ MI skills and psoriasis knowledge following Psoriasis and Well-being (Pso Well®) training.

Objectives

1. To investigate whether the Pso Well® training intervention improves clinicians’ MI skills and knowledge about psoriasis-related comorbidities and risk factors.

2. To explore the acceptability and feasibility of the Pso Well® training content, delivery and evaluation.

Methods

Clinicians attended the 1-day training programme focused on MI skills development in the context of psoriasis. MI skills were assessed pre- and post-training using the Behaviour Change Counselling Index. Knowledge about psoriasis-related comorbidity and risk factors was assessed with a novel 22-point measure developed for the study. Interviews with clinicians were analysed qualitatively to identify perceptions about feasibility and acceptability of the training.

Results

Sixty-one clinicians completed the training (35 dermatology nurses; 23 dermatologists; 3 primary care clinicians). Clinicians’ MI skills (p<.001) and knowledge (p< .001) increased significantly post-training. Clinicians found the training valuable and relevant to psoriasis management.

Conclusions

Attendance at the Pso Well® training resulted in improvements in clinicians’ knowledge and skills to manage psoriasis holistically. Clinicians deemed the training itself and the assessment procedures used both feasible and acceptable. Future research should investigate how this training may influence patient outcomes.
BACKGROUND

Psoriasis is a complex immune-mediated skin condition affecting approximately 2% of the UK population\(^1\). Associations between psoriasis and other physical and psychological comorbidities are well established including cardiovascular disease (CVD), metabolic disease, and diabetes\(^2,3\); psoriatic arthritis (PsA)\(^4\); Crohn’s disease\(^5\); anxiety, depression and suicidality\(^6\). Behavioural factors that increase individuals’ risk of developing or exacerbating psoriasis and its comorbidities include smoking\(^7-9\), obesity\(^8,12\), physical inactivity\(^13,14\), excess alcohol consumption\(^15-18\), and poor medication adherence\(^19-21\). Psychological distress related to living with psoriasis may also limit an individual’s quality of life and capacity for effective self-management\(^17,21-25\).

Holistic psoriasis management therefore requires understanding of the relationships between psoriasis, distress, and behavioural factors\(^26\) as well as the skills to help patients achieve behavioural changes. Behavioural change is notoriously difficult\(^27\) and our earlier studies demonstrated that clinicians working with people with psoriasis miss opportunities to address behaviour change topics within clinical consultations\(^28,29\). Clinicians also report lacking confidence and skills to address lifestyle behaviour change in psoriasis consultations\(^28-30\), and view psoriasis as a simple skin condition rather than a complex long-term condition requiring integrated management of behavioural factors\(^26,30,31\). We therefore developed 1-day training for clinicians to manage psoriasis and support patient behaviour change within standard dermatology consultations.

The UK’s Medical Research Council (MRC) guidelines advocate an iterative approach to the development of complex interventions in which design and evaluation inform one another, moving from exploratory studies to more definitive evaluation phases\(^32\). Resulting interventions are more likely to be effective and implementable within a target care setting due to the process of evidence-based evaluation/revision. Trials of such interventions are also less likely to fail due to problems of acceptability, intervention delivery or insensitivity to local context\(^32\). As an initial step in this process, we assessed whether clinicians acquire new psoriasis management skills following attendance at this training programme.

Motivational Interviewing (MI) is an evidence-based approach that strengthens motivation to change health-behaviours by eliciting people’s beliefs about change, collaboratively developing goals, and increasing confidence to achieve change\(^33,34\). MI techniques typically foster people’s motivations for change by asking them to identify personal reasons, ability, or desires to change; reducing opposition to change by acknowledging barriers and facilitators to making this change; and by reflecting personal strengths and previous examples of engaging in behaviour change. MI has successfully supported individuals to change behaviours across health contexts including in
substance addiction, and long-term conditions (LCTs), including psoriasis. No study has evaluated the effectiveness of MI training tailored to clinicians working with people with psoriasis, or conducted process evaluations to explore factors potentially influencing training efficacy and uptake (e.g. via clinicians’ perspectives on training relevance and utility).

The Psoriasis and Wellbeing (Pso Well®) training programme provided clinicians with skills to support behaviour change with psoriasis patients. It also aimed to increase clinicians’ knowledge about the relationships between psoriasis and risk factors for psoriasis-related comorbidities or worse psoriasis outcomes, given previous research indicating limited knowledge in this area. This exploratory study investigated the following question: Can the Pso Well® training provide clinicians with the skills to address behavioural risk factors in psoriasis, and increase knowledge about the relationships between psoriasis and its comorbidities? We hypothesised that following training clinicians would acquire MI skills to support behaviour change with patients and knowledge about psoriasis-related comorbidities and risk factors.

METHODS
Design
This before and after, exploratory investigation of a 1-day training programme was conducted in small groups of clinicians from a range of practice settings. An embedded qualitative study was used to explore clinicians’ experiences and perceptions of the training. Institutional research ethics approval was obtained (ref: 14223).

Participant recruitment
UK primary and secondary care clinicians involved in psoriasis management were invited to participate in the study via email/letter/phone. Recruitment sources included: British Association of Dermatologists, Scottish and Welsh Dermatological Societies, Primary Care Dermatology Society, local primary care Clinical Commissioning Groups, nurse specialist groups (British Dermatological Nursing Group, National Dermatology Specialist Nurses meeting; established dermatology departments across Wales, England and Scotland), and local research events.

Measures

Clinicians’ motivational interviewing skills
The Behaviour Change Counselling Index (BECCI) is a valid and reliable 11-item skills checklist that assesses core MI competencies\(^{40}\). Clinicians participated in two, 10-minute audio-taped consultations with trained and experienced patient actors, immediately before and immediately after the Pso Well\(^\circ\) training. Four patient actors (2 male; 2 female), were used to standardise the assessment delivery. Scripts provided to patient actors were developed by members of the research team to form anonymous, composite patient cases, with content based on both clinical experience and patient research. Scripts were standardised for length and depth of content, as well as the number and type of cues about behavioural risk factors (e.g. obesity, alcohol, low mood) that patients would provide during assessments.

Completed audio-recordings were reviewed by an independent panel of seven trained BECCI raters from psychology, health economics, health care and health services research. Raters were trained by AC/CB (experienced MI trainers) during three standardisation meetings to calibrate approaches to scoring and then blinded to pre- and post-training audio tapes. The team was assessed for inter-rater reliability by comparing two audio-recordings each against a ‘gold standard’ scorer (MI trainer). Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) indicated ‘almost perfect’ agreement\(^{41}\) on Mean BECCI score (ICC = .93, 95% confidence interval [CI] = .75 -.98, p<.001) and Total BECCI score (ICC = .93, 95% CI = .77-.98, p<.001). The primary outcome was change in clinicians’ BECCI score. A change of 0.8 between the before and after score was considered adequate to measure responsiveness on this measure\(^{40}\), although the study was initially powered to detect a change of 0.4. To have 80% power to detect this change as statistically significant at the 5% level required a minimum sample size of 41 clinicians.

Clinicians working with an MI approach are expected to talk less than patients (i.e. <50% of total consultations time), therefore, BECCI raters also estimated the percentage of time that clinicians talked during consultations compared to patients. Coders’ estimates of ‘talk time’ were compared with objectively calculated ‘talk time’ throughout training to optimise consistency with actual clinician ‘talk time’. This measure is recommended as a supplementary indicator of an MI-consistent consultation approach\(^{40}\).

Patient actors participating in consultations with clinicians provided written feedback on their evaluation of clinicians’ skills pre- and post-training using a five-point Likert scale (with 5 items) plus open text responses which were categorised with content analysis. Likert scale items addressed the degree to which patient actors felt i) listened to in the consultation; ii) the clinician understood how they were feeling; iii) confident to make behavioural changes following the consultation; iv) that the
clinician provided constructive information; and v) they talked more than the clinician about ways to improve their health.

Knowledge of psoriasis-related comorbidities and risk factors

A 22-item survey assessing current knowledge about psoriasis-related comorbidities and risk factors was devised for this study by experts in psoriasis and its comorbidities, and checked for accuracy and ease or difficulty of comprehension with the wider research team. The survey assessed knowledge about (a) psoriasis-related comorbidities; (b) prevalence of behavioural (smoking, alcohol, obesity, physical inactivity) and mood (anxiety, depression, stress) factors in psoriasis; (c) associations between psoriasis and behavioural and mood factors. Maximum scores were 9 points, 19 points and 7 points (respectively); the total maximum score was 35.

To assess the degree to which clinicians applied their knowledge of psoriasis-related risk factors in consultations with patient-actors in a simulated practice setting, the audio-recorded consultations were coded for two additional items. First, researchers scored the clinicians from 0 (not at all) to 4 (a great extent) on the question: Did the clinician make links between psoriasis and behaviour change topics? Second, raters were asked to note the ‘behaviour change topics’ arising during 10-minute consultations to capture the range and type of topics clinicians chose to discuss with patients before and after training.

Analysis

Descriptive analyses were conducted on participant demographics and the frequency and range of topics discussed during audio-recorded consultations. Primary outcome measures (BECCI skills and knowledge survey) were analysed using within group comparisons (paired-samples t-tests and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests) in order to assess change over time. Small amounts of missing data (fewer than three items on any measure) were managed using imputation of the mean value of the other items on that scale or sub-scale. Larger amounts of missing data were managed by adopting a pairwise exclusion approach.

Patient actors’ Likert scale responses were analysed with content analysis\textsuperscript{42} to identify categories in open-ended written responses. These categories were developed inductively from the data (i.e. using emergent rather than pre-determined ideas) and a researcher (LH) not involved in data
collection independently second coded these data. Categories identified by the two coders were subsequently compared and ambiguities resolved via discussion.

**Intervention content and procedure**

The following description of the training intervention is consistent with the ‘Template for Intervention Description and replication (TIDier) guidelines’\(^{43}\). The Pso Well® training programme was designed in line with current recommendations for psoriasis management\(^{43}\) and behaviour change methods\(^{33,45}\). Content was supplemented by additional recommendations from research team members involved in reviewing more up-to-date research evidence on psoriasis\(^{1,3,26,28-31,46,47}\). This 1-day intensive training programme aimed to enable clinicians to adopt a patient-centred consultation approach and applied MI skills. Skills taught to clinicians addressed the core MI *processes* – Engaging, Focusing, Evoking, and Planning. The MI literature provides further detail on these principles\(^{48}\), and its evidence base\(^{33,35-39,49}\).

The 1-day face-to-face training session was delivered in private university/hospital training rooms and delivered by CB and AC for consistency; both are psychologists trained in MI and experienced in delivering MI-based workshops to a range of clinicians. During training, research was presented demonstrating the links between psoriasis and modifiable behavioural factors (i.e. smoking, alcohol, obesity, physical activity, low mood, and medication adherence). MI skill-building activities were presented using a consistent structure, namely: (a) learning about new skills; (b) watching skills demonstration; (c) individual skills practice; and (d) feedback or coaching on skills use. (Video link provides further training details: [http://www.impactpsoriasis.org.uk/practitioners/](http://www.impactpsoriasis.org.uk/practitioners/)).

**Embedded qualitative study**

A purposive sample of trainees, with a broad range of characteristics (e.g. profession, sex, training session attended) were invited to complete a semi-structured interview to explore their experiences and perceptions of the Pso Well® training. Invitations to interview were made face-to-face immediately following training and researchers (AC/CP) followed up to arrange interviews with those expressing interest. Interview topics focused on clinicians’ experiences and views of the training content, delivery, and assessment methods. Interviews were digitally audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analysed using an inductive thematic analysis\(^{50}\). Supplementary File 1 provides further detail on the methodological approach undertaken.
RESULTS

Recruitment

Sixty-one clinicians attended training; it was not possible to identify exact numbers of clinicians invited to participate in the study due to third parties forwarding on invitations to whole organisation/membership lists. Of the 61 participants, six did not complete pre- and/or post-training audio-taped consultations. Three clinicians were unwilling to complete patient actor consultations due to low confidence in their anticipated performance, one clinician was absent post-training and two technical faults occurred. This resulted in five audio recordings being omitted from the analysis; these were instead used for training of the BECCI rater team. In total 110 audio-recordings were included in the BECCI analysis. Training courses ran across the UK with between five and 15 clinicians; of the 61 attendees, 53 were female (86.9%). Purposive sampling based on a range of characteristics (Table 1) resulted in 18 clinicians completing a post-training qualitative interview (17 by telephone; one face-to-face).

Claire's motivational interviewing skills

A paired-samples t-test was conducted on the BECCI data to evaluate the impact of the Pso Well® training on clinicians’ (n=55) motivational interviewing skills. There was a statistically significant increase in BECCI scores from pre-training (M = .50, SD = .47) to post-training (M = 1.26, SD = .71), t(54) = 8.37, p < .001 (two-tailed). The mean increase in BECCI scores was .76 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from .57 to .94. The eta squared statistic of .56 indicated a large effect size regarding observed improvement in MI skills.

Figure 1 illustrates the mean BECCI scores before and after training. Figure 2 shows BECCI scores broken down by domain pre- and post-training. Percentages are calculated here because potential maximum total scores on each domain varied between 4 and 20 points.

Table 2 displays descriptive data illustrating pre- and post-training BECCI scores organised by clinician group.
Table 2

Figure 3 illustrates mean clinician ‘talk time’ estimated by raters before and after attending the training. A paired-samples t-test was used to compare the proportion of the consultation time in which the clinicians spoke during patient-actor consultations before and after the Pso Well® training (n=55). There was a statistically significant decrease in talk time from pre-training ($M = 58.36\%, SD = 15.93$) to post-training ($M = 47.18\%, SD = 11.46$), $t(54) = 6.22, p < .001$. The mean decrease in clinician talk time was 11.18% with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 7.58 to 14.79. The eta squared statistic (.42) indicated a large effect size.

Figure 3 here

Scores from the scale completed by patient actors indicated greater improvement in clinicians’ consultation approaches post training (Figure 4). The content analysis of actors’ open text responses identified differences in consultation approach before and after training. These differences are outlined in Table 3.

Figure 4 & Table 3

Clinicians’ knowledge of psoriasis-related comorbidities and risk factors

A paired-samples t-test was conducted on the survey data to assess the change in levels of clinicians’ knowledge following the Pso Well® training. Statistically significant increases were found for participants’ knowledge of risk factor prevalence ($t(60) = 4.30, p < .001$; pre-training $M = 5.82$, $SD=1.21$, post-training $M = 6.47$, $SD=.93$), as well as the mechanisms linking psoriasis and risk factors ($t(60) = 7.12, p < .001$; pre-training $M = 11.52$, $SD=3.70$, post-training $M = 14.21$, $SD=3.66$) but not regarding knowledge of psoriasis-related comorbidities ($p = .096$) (Figure 5).

Figure 5
Table 4 displays descriptive data illustrating pre- and post-training knowledge scores categorised by clinician group (primary care clinician/dermatologist/specialist nurse).

[Table 4]

Figures 6 and 7 show the number and type of change topics discussed during audio-taped consultations, before and after training. A Wilcoxon signed-ranks test showed no significant difference (z = 1.32, p = .19) in the extent to which clinicians linked psoriasis and these change topics during consultations, pre and post training. This was measured using a single-item – ‘Did the clinician make links between psoriasis and behaviour change topics?’

[Figures 6&7]

**Thematic analysis of qualitative interviews**

Five overarching themes accounted for clinicians’ experiences and views of the Pso Well® training: ‘Delivery of the training’; ‘Utility of the training content’; ‘Skills acquisition and scope for implementation’; ‘Interest in and ability to attend’; and ‘Trade-offs when undergoing assessment’. Overall clinicians reported that the training enabled acquisition of novel consultation skills that were relevant and useful in the management of psoriasis. They highlighted the contrast between standard care and the more patient-centred/holistic approach used within the training. Clinicians also noted that for this approach to be fully embedded within their practice, they would require further coaching/feedback on their use of MI skills in practice. The full thematic structure alongside anonymised illustrative quotes from clinicians is illustrated in Supplementary File 2.

**DISCUSSION**

As understanding increases about how behavioural/psychological factors relate to psoriasis, so do calls for effective interventions targeting these factors. The current findings show that the 1-day Pso Well® training programme enhanced clinicians’ ability to use MI skills to address behaviour change in the context of managing psoriasis. The degree of change in MI skills found in this study is equivalent to that demonstrated by other MI training. Our previous work has shown that clinicians’ understanding about the relationships between psoriasis and related behavioural/psychological factors is limited and even when clinicians recognise psoriasis as a complex condition, this understanding may not translate into clinical management approaches.
The Pso Well® training therefore aimed to integrate clinicians’ understanding and clinical management approach by providing them with evidence-based behaviour change strategies to use during standard psoriasis consultations. As well as demonstrating increased understanding of the links between psoriasis and lifestyle and mood factors, findings also showed that following training, clinicians discussed a broader range of these topics within consultations and focused conversations less on medications management alone. Patient actor feedback also illustrates (from a ‘proxy’ patient perspective) high levels of overall satisfaction with the consultation style used by clinicians following training that is consistent with core components of MI\textsuperscript{48}: partnership (e.g. collaborative care); compassion (e.g. empathy, acknowledgement of people’s thoughts/feelings); and evocation (e.g. eliciting patient-led solutions and management plans).

It was notable that following training clinicians’ knowledge of psoriasis-related comorbidities did not increase, nor were they more likely to explain to patients how psoriasis and behavioural factors are associated. This may have been because the training focused less on the relationships between psoriasis-associated conditions and behaviours per se, and more on how to address behaviour change with patients. Addressing behavioural factors as part of psoriasis management is important because modification of lifestyle factors, medication adherence and low mood can improve psoriasis outcomes and reduce the likelihood of developing or exacerbating psoriasis-related comorbidities\textsuperscript{55}.

Given that clinicians often don’t opportunistically or systematically discuss these issues with patients\textsuperscript{26,28,30-31}, training such as Pso Well® is needed to support clinicians with this task. Despite not indicating an increase clinicians’ knowledge about psoriasis comorbidities, the Pso Well® training can change clinicians' approaches to psoriasis management discussions in line with current recommendations\textsuperscript{44}. Moreover, this shift in approach can be carried out within the context of a 10-minute consultation about psoriasis. Measuring the effects of this training intervention on patient outcomes within a controlled trial is now warranted.

Consistent with the MRC guidance for complex intervention design\textsuperscript{32} this study also allowed us to explore the extent to which clinicians endorsed the training as relevant, useful, and usable within clinical practice. Qualitative findings indicate that the Pso Well® training is both feasible to conduct and evaluate within existing health care settings, and that clinicians are satisfied with the training content, delivery, and assessment methods chosen.

Although the clinicians within this study were self-selected and thus potentially more skilled or predisposed to this approach\textsuperscript{56}, baseline scores indicated little or no experience of using MI skills. This suggests that even those who were enthusiastic about or familiar with MI techniques, benefitted from training. As the sample included mostly secondary care clinicians, the results cannot
be generalised to the management of psoriasis by primary care professionals. Further work is
necessary to explore the impact of this training on clinical management approaches to psoriasis
conducted within general practice settings. Finally, recruitment to the training highlighted that
secondary care clinicians are more likely to attend than GPs (with or without a special interest in
dermatology). Barriers to engaging with, or attending this training should therefore be explored with
this professional group.

This study shows that the Pso Well® training programme can enhance standard clinical management
of psoriasis to include an MI-consistent approach to addressing a range of psoriasis-related
behavioural risk factors. Furthermore, it is likely that clinicians will engage with this training and find
it useful for practice. The findings warrant further investigation of how this holistic approach to care
could affect psoriasis outcomes within current clinical settings.
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Table 1. Recruitment to the Pso Well® training programme and data collected from clinicians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical specialism</th>
<th>Attended Pso Well® training programme</th>
<th>Completed skills measure</th>
<th>Completed knowledge measure</th>
<th>Completed qualitative interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dermatologist</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology specialist nurse</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Practitioner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of the 23 dermatologists who attended the training, nine were dermatology specialist registrars
Table 2. Mean BECCI scores grouped by participants’ health care discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinician group</th>
<th>Mean BECCI score Pre (SD)</th>
<th>Mean BECCI score post (SD)</th>
<th>Mean change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dermatologist (consultant/registrar) N = 22</td>
<td>.37 (.20)</td>
<td>1.35 (.76)</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary care clinician (GP, Health care assistant, primary care nurse) N = 6</td>
<td>.51 (.39)</td>
<td>1.35 (.66)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse specialist (secondary care) N = 27</td>
<td>.60 (.61)</td>
<td>1.16 (.69)</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3. Content analysis of patient actor feedback (n=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code label</th>
<th>Illustrative quote(s) [clinician ID number]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation approach</td>
<td>Good rapport with patients: Good, open, friendly, empathetic. (ID18) Very kind and gentle consultation. (ID29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judgemental approach</td>
<td>She did not criticise my ‘heaviness’ which I thought made it easy to open up. (ID2) Lovely approach, non-judgemental. (ID37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic messages</td>
<td>The nurse practitioner was very positive and offered me lots of hope to control the psoriasis. (ID2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused upon clinicians’ agenda</td>
<td>Did not really ask about psycho-social situation until she picked up on cue at end. More the clinician’s agenda. (ID19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient agenda/concerns unaddressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow focus on disease/treatment</td>
<td>Clinician’s agenda was primarily to treat psoriasis condition. (ID14) Concentrated on treatments available rather than lifestyle change. Cues about weight not picked up. (ID31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable discussing lifestyle factors</td>
<td>Only comfortable discussing all treatment options rather than addressing cues about lifestyle. (ID39) Listened to a few accounts of lifestyle then back to comfort zone of describing treatments. (ID37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to management planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management planning</td>
<td>Seemed unsure whether to commit to a course of action and if so which action it should be. (ID51) Did not offer particular help. Commented only on my drinking habits. Time limitation prevented any constructive discussion. (ID21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive suggestion/ advice giving rather than patient-led</td>
<td>Used phrases like &quot;you need to do this&quot;; &quot;you must...&quot; TOLD Sylvia to stop drinking. (ID24) I felt this clinician had a set view to tell me what could be offered and the risks which were off-putting...information giving only. (ID52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice giving rather than patient-focused</td>
<td>I felt the doctor gave me lots of advice and stories of other people in my situation but I would have liked to talk a more about my problems and find more ways of dealing with it. (ID33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code label</td>
<td>Illustrative quote(s) [clinician ID number]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation approach</td>
<td>Noticeable improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive affect/satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation focus</td>
<td>Patients’ agenda and concerns elicited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledged patients’ thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More focus on behaviour change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked psoriasis and lifestyle factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to management planning</td>
<td>More focused on developing a plan from the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management discussion not always led to change plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patient-led solution finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Mean knowledge measure scores grouped by participants’ health care discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinician group</th>
<th>Mean Knowledge score Pre (SD)</th>
<th>Mean Knowledge score post (SD)</th>
<th>Mean change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurse specialist (secondary care) N = 31</td>
<td>20.51 (4.26)</td>
<td>24.00 (4.48)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatologist (consultant/registrar) N = 23</td>
<td>21.76 (5.25)</td>
<td>24.67 (4.77)</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary care clinician (GP, Health care assistant, primary care nurse) N = 7</td>
<td>22.71 (2.67)</td>
<td>25.29 (4.23)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GP = general Practitioner
Notes. Four BECCI domains include: 1. Agenda setting and permission seeking, 2. The why and how of behaviour change, 3. The whole consultation, 4. Talk about targets. Maximum score for each domain = 100%.

**Figure 1.** Mean BECCI score before and after attending Pso Well training (n=55)

**Figure 2.** Mean BECCI domain scores before and after attending Pso Well training (n=55)
Figure 3. Mean estimated clinician talk time (% of total consultation) before and after attending Pso Well training (n=55)
Key: Patient Actor Feedback Items (Questions 1 – 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: As the patient I felt listened to</th>
<th>Q2: As the patient I felt the clinician understood how I was feeling</th>
<th>Q3: As the patient I felt the clinician helped me to feel confident I could change my lifestyle</th>
<th>Q4: As the patient I felt that the clinician used information I was providing to have a constructive discussion about changing a behaviour or managing my health</th>
<th>Q5: As the patient I felt I was talking more than the clinician about what I could do to better manage my health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All items answered on a 5-point Likert scale. (1=not at all; 5=to a great extent)

Figure 4. Patient actor assessment of clinicians' consultation approach pre- and post-training (n=46)
Figure 5. Mean clinician knowledge scores before and after attending Pso Well training (n=60)
Figure 6. Number of topics discussed during clinician-patient actor consultations before and after attending training (n=55)

Figure 7. Type of topics discussed during clinician-patient actor consultations before and after attending training (n=55)
Supplementary File 1. Embedded qualitative study methods

Design

This qualitative evaluation was embedded within a pre-and-post study investigating change in clinicians’ skills and knowledge following attendance at the Pso Well® training programme. Interviews with clinicians were used to elicit perceptions of the training and of the training assessments (including the questionnaire of clinicians’ knowledge about psoriasis-related comorbidities and associated risk factors, and the 10-minute audio-recorded consultation with a patient actor). This inductive approach allowed for unanticipated issues influencing the potential feasibility and acceptability of the Pso Well® training to be identified.

Recruitment

Clinicians who completed the Pso Well® training (n=61) were subsequently invited to take part in an in-depth interview about their experiences and perceptions of its delivery, content and evaluation. In order to obtain a variety of potential views and experiences, the sampling strategy focused upon maximising variation across clinicians in terms of specific features: clinicians’ work location; clinician discipline; training session attended; and time between attending training and completing the interview. In line with established qualitative principles, recruitment / data collection were carried out simultaneously until data saturation was achieved (i.e., when new concepts were no longer apparent in the data), at which point recruitment was brought to a close.

Procedure

Ethical approval for this study was obtained by the University of Manchester Research Ethics Committee (ref: 14223).

Clinician interviews

Clinicians were invited to take part in a one-to-one interview either by telephone or face-to-face with a member of the research team (AC/CP) to discuss their experiences and views of the Pso Well® training programme. Written consent was obtained prior to the interview. Interviews were based on a topic guide structured around the research objectives related to key implementation issues; the guide was semi-structured comprising open ended questions and more focused probing/prompting questions to elicit clinicians’ perceptions about training content, delivery and evaluation (see below).
Clinician interview topic guide.

1. Views and experiences of training

- Please tell me in your own words how you found attending the 1-day training session?
- What were your overall impressions?
- What was most memorable about the day?
- What key messages did you take away?
- What new skills did you learn, if any?
- How did this session compare to previous training you have attended?
- What could have been done better?
- What would you have liked more/less of?
- Can you give one or two words or phrases to describe the training leaders?

2. Views and experiences of outcome measures

Knowledge and beliefs measure:
- What are your overall impressions of this questionnaire?
- How did you find the wording of questions?
- How easy/difficult was it to complete? (Why?)
- How did you feel about the time taken to complete the measure?
- Did you think the time taken was acceptable?
- How do you think the measure could be improved? (content, questions wording, duration, other)
- What other thoughts do you have about this outcome measure?

Skills measure:
- What are your overall impressions of completing the consultation skills measure?
- What worked best about it?
- What didn’t work / what did you find difficult about it?
- How accurate/realistic did you find the patient scenarios given?
- How did you find it working with patient actors?
- What was it like to have your consultations audio-recorded?
- How well do you think this worked overall in achieving its aim of measuring communication skills taught during training?
- Any other thoughts about this measure?

3. Feasibility and acceptability of the study design

- To what extent did participating in this research study impinge upon or fit into your existing workload?
- How feasible do you think your colleagues would find it to participate in this study? (the training itself, and completing the outcomes measures?)
- How useful / interesting do you think your colleagues would find participating in this study? (the training itself, and completing the outcomes measures?)
- How relevant did you find the study in relation to the work you do with people with psoriasis?
- How useful did you find it to take part in this study?
- Did any other issues for you arise whilst being part of this study? (time commitments, queries/ambiguities, other similar/conflicting training).

Any other thoughts about your experiences or views of being involved in this study?
Analysis

Interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, anonymised (i.e. all identifying information such as names and locations were removed from the transcripts), and imported into NVivo 10 (QSR International, Doncaster, Australia). Thematic analysis involved one researcher (AC) becoming immersed in the data, annotating transcripts to identify initial patterns which were subsequently organised into broader categories of data and themes. To check coding reliability another researcher (PAN) with expertise in qualitative methods independently analysed three interview transcripts. The two researchers compared analyses for consistency and resolved any disagreements via discussion with each other and with the wider research team. Themes were revised iteratively by the researchers alongside data collection until data saturation was achieved and final definitions/labels were allocated.
Supplementary File 2. Themes, subthemes and data extracts illustrating clinicians’ views of the acceptability and feasibility of the Pso Well® training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme title</th>
<th>Sub-theme title</th>
<th>Data extracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Delivery of the training</td>
<td>1.1 Benefits of shared learning</td>
<td>I really like the mixture, because I think GPs have had consultation and training, so it was quite nice to have GPs that had a point of view... actually having people from different specialties and different backgrounds. (ID16) Other participants, I found that really interesting. There was one participant in my group, at my table, who had such a different approach to anything I'd really seen. (ID23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Skills practice and coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>To actually do it, and I think that's the only time that you really learn. (ID19) I quite liked the way that there was intermittent supervision, so people were walking round and jumped in if they saw what was happening, or could suggest things if we were getting stuck, that was quite useful, rather than just labouring the point and then feeding back to the group, it was quite useful to get those kind of experiences as you went along as well as well. (ID23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Training support materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>You've given me a whole lot of back up stuff that I haven't had to refer back to yet... if I was wondering what to do next I'd go and look back at my tool kit. (ID6) That was really handy because that's things that you can go back to yourself and the little cards that we got... that sort of jog your memory. (ID63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Engaging delivery style</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think it was a very relaxed course, I think you felt quite happy if you had any questions to ask or anything I think you felt you could contribute and ask questions. (ID2) Approachable, supportive, and enthusiastic [trainers]. (ID5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Utility of training content</td>
<td>2.1 Knowledge transfer</td>
<td>It was for dermatology, which is where I work, you could see how many different, obviously this is focusing on psoriasis, and using psoriasis, and using psoriasis as well, but how many transferable things there were. That the whole way through I was thinking of different patients and different situations I could use these in. I was thinking about the psoriasis patients too, but also other ones. (ID23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Contextualising the patient-focused approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think the overall course made you look more at the patient really because I think that was a valuable aspect, you look more at the patient and their point of view of the psoriasis rather than just how we would look at it as just trying to get the psoriasis under control. (ID2) I almost had to try and bite my tongue while I was trying to do it, because you just want to tell them what you want them to do. And that's quite unusual. People come to a specialist for an opinion, so you're quite used to just telling them what you want, and trying to do it the other way around, is quite new for me. (ID23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Interactive and reflective</td>
<td></td>
<td>More interactive and involved more self-reflection. The other training that I've been on has been very much didactic learning with lectures, whereas this was far more interactive, and maybe fewer hard facts to take away with you, but equipping you with a different set of skills at the end of the day. This was a different way of learning. I enjoyed it very much. (ID5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme title</td>
<td>Sub-theme title</td>
<td>Data extracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Skills acquisition and scope for implementation</strong></td>
<td>3.1 Understanding ineffective behaviour change strategies</td>
<td>The patient should be doing more talking than the clinician, that it doesn’t work just telling people things. (ID16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Adopting novel behaviour change skills</td>
<td>I summarised my understanding of their situation and asked them to sort of reflect on how they might go forward… I think it’s a very useful technique, it sort of gets the patient bought into the way going forward. (ID6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Implications for practice: application of new skills</td>
<td>It’s probably made me more confident in addressing behaviour change. (ID3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Skills refresher</td>
<td>Perhaps my approach to patients has evolved over many years and is perhaps slightly stuck in its way. (ID6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Interest in and ability to attend</strong></td>
<td>4.1 Flexibility to facilitate attendance</td>
<td>It’s okay because you’ve obviously been able to be flexible with us, if you’d have said I can only come at five o’clock on a Friday then it would have been a bit more difficult. (ID3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Intensity of training</td>
<td>It was all relevant, I just feel it was just all too squished into the day. (ID7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Prior expectations of the training</td>
<td>I thought it was maybe going to slightly more be how to tick all the boxes in ten minutes…whereas I was pleasantly surprised, it’s more about finding out where they’re at, and trying to focus on the things that they might be wanting to do. (ID23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Theme title** | **Sub-theme title** | **Data extracts**
---|---|---
4.4 Existing interest in the area | | I know my patients are very resistant to it, because they don’t want to change their lifestyle. And losing weight is the hardest thing in the world for everybody. So I’m aware of that already. (ID11)
| | I would definitely make the effort to come, but this is my kind of thing, like I really think the consultation is important and I’m constantly trying to modify my skills. (ID16)
4.5 Endorsement of learning | | I think they’d all find it interesting and relevant for their practice...all enjoy it and they’d find it worthwhile and would impact upon their daily practice. (ID5)
| | I would really highly recommend the registrars and like consultant colleagues to come...I don’t know whether everybody realises the importance of it actually and I certainly think for the registrars it should be part of what they do with their training. (ID16)

5. Trade-offs when undergoing assessment | 5.1 Realism of patient actors | Certainly the actor I had he was quite typical of a slightly difficult patient. He didn’t want to engage, didn’t want to look at you, no eye contact – so you had to do quite a bit of engaging at the beginning. No. I think they are very realistic. (ID16)
| | It was done very well and I do think yes, I do think, that could very easily have been a real patient. (ID35)
| 5.2 Challenge of skills assessment | One of the girls came out and she was really stressed and she sat like next to me and her eyes were all red and her face was all red and she felt like she had made a real muck of it. (ID48)
| | Well I was quite anxious going into it because like I said role play isn’t something that I particularly like doing. But once I was in there I found it fine actually, I was quite amazed how quick it passed the ten minutes. (ID2)
| 5.3 Thought-provoking Knowledge questionnaire | It was certainly thought provoking...it was fairly easy to fill it out to start with, but then when you start to think about it a bit more, it was more challenging and that’s probably where I got more worth when I had to stop and think a bit more deeply. (ID26)
| 5.4 Burden of knowledge assessment | I think I just felt it was a little bit too long winded and it was a touch repetitive. (ID2)
| | There seemed to be a lot of repetitive questions where my answer was very similar from one question to the next. I’m not sure that was intended or to see what we’d write, but that was something that I certainly felt from it, and I think the others on my course felt that as well. (ID5)