#### IRT Analysis of CAHPS® 2.0 Report Items: Work in Progress

Leo S. Morales, M.D., Ph.D UCLA School of Medicine and RAND Health

Item Response Theory in Health Outcomes and Cancer Care Research October 19, 2001

## **Co-Investigators**

- Kitty S. Chan, Ph.D.
  - RAND Associate Policy Analyst
- Steven P. Reise, Ph.D.
  - UCLA Associate Professor of Psychology
- Robert Weech-Maldonado, Ph.D.
  - Penn State Assistant Professor of Health Policy
- Ron D. Hays, Ph.D.
  - UCLA Professor of Medicine
  - RAND CAHPS® PI

## **Presentation Outline**

- CAHPS® Measures
- NCBD Database
- Dimensionality
- Model Fit
- Item Characteristics

## What is CAHPS®?

- Consumer Assessments of Health Plan Study (CAHPS®) was a study that resulted in a patient survey designed to capture patients' experience with care.
- Purposes of survey include:
  - Performance Measurement and Reporting
  - Quality Improvement

## CAHPS® is Widely Used



- 90 million in 1999:
  - 39 million Medicare
  - 9 million federal employees (OPM)
  - 40 million in Health Plans (NCQA)
  - Other CAHPS® users

## **CAHPS®** Design Principles

- Reliable and valid survey instruments.
- Collect information for which consumers are the best or only source.
- Adult and pediatric (by proxy) populations.
- Applicable in multiple settings: FFS, PPO, Managed Care, Medicaid.
- Flexible design: core and supplemental item sets.

### **Data Source**

- 2000 National CAHPS® Benchmarking Database (NCBD)
- Main Purposes
  - Benchmarking
  - Research
- Contents
  - CAHPS 2.0 Survey Results
  - Adult and Pediatric
  - Commercial and Medicaid

## **Adult Commercial Sample**

- Total Number of Respondents = 135,479
- Number of Health Plans = 282
- Number of Sponsors = 15
- Average Response Rate Among Sponsors = 48% (range 21% to 64%)

## Characteristics of Sample

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTIC	COMPLETES (N=15,807)	INCOMPLETES (N=119,672)	TOTAL (N=135,479)	
Age				
18-34	18	21	20	
35-55	75 73		73	
>55	7	7	7	
Gender				
Male	33	40	39	
Female	67	60	61	
Education				
<hs< td=""><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>6</td></hs<>	4	6	6	
HS	23	28	27	
>HS	72	67	67	
Health Status				
Very Good or Excellent	45	59	57	
Poor, Fair, Good	55	41	43	

## CAHPS® Core Reports and Ratings

- Reports:
  - Access (4 items)\*\*
  - Timeliness (4 items)\*\*
  - Communication (4 items)\*\*
  - Office Staff (2 items)\*\*
  - Health Plan (3 items)

\*\*14 items used in this analysis.

- Ratings:
  - Personal Doctor
  - Specialist
  - Health Care
  - Health Plan

### Medical Care Experience Scale - 1

How much of a problem was it?	
06. To find a personal doctor?	
10. To get a referral to see specialists?	A Big Problem A Small Problem
22. To get needed care?	Not A Problem
23. To get approval from health plan for care?	

### Medical Care Experience Scale - 2

How often?	
15. Did you get an appointment for routine care as soon as you wanted?	
17. Did you get care for an urgent illness or injury as soon as you wanted?	
19. Did you get phone help or advice you needed?	Never
24. Did you wait more than 15 minutes past your appointment time?	Sometimes
27. Did your doctors explain things in a way you could understand?	Usually
28. Did your doctors listen carefully to you?	Always
29. Did your doctors show respect for what you had to say?	
30. Did your doctors spend enough time with you?	
25. Office staff as helpful as you thought they should be?	
26. Office staff courteous and respectful?	

#### Item Descriptive Statistics (n=15,807)

			Distribution of Scores (%)			
ltem	Mean	SD	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4
06	2.48	0.73	14	24	62	
10	2.59	0.69	12	18	71	
22	2.62	0.64	9	20	71	
23	2.61	0.66	10	20	70	
15	3.26	0.82	2	17 33		47
17	3.09	0.89	6	17	38	39
19	3.35	0.86	5	12	12 27	
24	2.57	0.97	19	20	20 45	
27	3.34	0.75	1	13	36	50
28	3.45	0.70	1	9	35	56
29	3.49	0.74	1	11	35	53
30	3.18	0.82	4	15 40		41
25	3.58	0.65	1	7	26	67
26	3.31	0.76	2	13	38	48

## Analysis Plan

#### Assess Dimensionality

- Factor Analysis Using Polychoric Correlations
- Microfact 2.0
- Assess Model Fit
  - Graded Response Model (GRM)
  - General Partial Credit Model (GPCM)
  - Parscale 3.5
- Review Results
  - Item and Test Characteristics

## **Dimensionality - 1**

- Cronbach's Alpha =0.90
- Results of 1-Factor Solution Using Polychoric Correlations
  - Ratio of first (7.6) to second (1.6) eigenvalues=4.8
  - Mean residual=0.04
  - SD of residuals=0.10

- GFI=0.98

## Dimensionality - 2

ITEM	FACTOR LOADINGS
06	0.65
10	0.66
22	0.76
23	0.58
15	0.79
17	0.69
19	0.75
24	0.53
27	0.85
28	0.77
29	0.84
30	0.80
25	0.77
26	0.82

## Model Fit

- Model Chi-Square:

  GRM= 4,235.15 (285 d.f., p<0.001)</li>
  GPCM= 5,421.29 (272 d.f., p<0.001)</li>

  -2 Log Likelihood:

  GRM = 362,945.2
  - GPCM = 364,835.7

#### Model Fit Root Mean Square Residual

	Graded Response Model	General Partial Credit Model			
<u>Overall</u>	0.576	0.631			
Item-Specific					
06	0.629	1.046			
10	0.605	0.632			
22	0.509	0.529			
23	0.596	0.623			
15	0.594	0.605			
17	0.713	0.729			
19	0.676	0.698			
24	0.864	0.875			
27	0.388	0.403			
28	0.445	0.459			
29	0.384	0.399			
30	0.482	0.495			
25	0.472	0.484			
26	0.495	0.502			

#### Observed Versus Expected Scores GRM (n=15,807)



#### Observed Versus Expected Score GPCM (n=15,807)



#### Expected Scores GRM and GPCM



## **Slope Parameters**

Item	Graded Response Model	General Partial Credit Model
06	0.69	0.52
10	0.69	0.51
22	1.00	0.82
23	0.60	0.46
15	1.10	0.88
17	0.83	0.59
19	0.94	0.67
24	0.53	0.33
27	2.07	1.93
28	1.50	1.35
29	2.06	1.93
30	1.61	1.40
25	1.24	1.09
26	1.41	1.24

#### Location and Intersection Parameters

		Graded Response Model				General Partial Credit Model			
ltem	Loc	B1	B2	B3	Loc	B1	B2	<b>B</b> 3	
06	-1.22	-1.91	-0.53		-1.16	-1.23	-1.09		
10	-1.54	-2.12	-0.95		-1.43	-1.16	-1.69		
22	-1.38	-1.96	-0.79		-1.29	-1.53	-1.05		
23	-1.79	-2.56	-1.02		-1.64	-1.56	-1.72		
15	-1.31	-2.82	-1.19	0.08	-1.26	-2.53	-1.06	-0.09	
17	-1.06	-2.49	-1.14	0.45	-0.98	-2.22	-1.17	0.23	
19	-1.40	-2.55	-1.42	-0.23	-1.30	-1.41	-1.30	-0.59	
24	-0.08	-1.87	-0.56	2.19	0.10	-2.91	-1.47	2.33	
27	-1.24	-2.54	-1.19	0.00	-1.20	-2.34	-1.15	-0.05	
28	-1.56	-2.94	-1.56	-0.17	-1.47	-2.44	-1.51	-0.24	
29	-1.30	-2.53	-1.29	-0.08	-1.25	-2.24	-1.25	-0.13	
30	-0.97	-2.16	-1.04	0.28	-0.93	-2.19	-1.04	0.22	
25	-1.90	-3.27	-1.88	-0.55	-1.75	-2.20	-1.73	-0.66	
26	-1.30	-2.64	-1.32	0.06	-1.22	-2.38	-1.28	0.00	

# Item 06: Finding a Personal Doctor



# Item 10: Getting Referrals to Specialists



# Item 15: Getting Phone Advice



# Item 24: 15 Minutes Past Appointment Time



# Item 27: Listen Carefully



# Item 25: Courtesy and Respect



#### Distribution of Respondents versus Items Locations



## **Test Information**



## Summary of Findings

- Model Choice
- Items
- Future Directions:
  - IRT Models with Covariates
  - Testlets
  - DIF

For More Information:

Leo Morales, MD, PhD 310.794.2296 morales@rand.org



## **Root Mean Square Residual**

$$RMSR = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} (x_{ij} - p_{ij} | \hat{\theta}_i)^2}{I \times J}}$$

Where, Items = 1,2,3, ... I Persons = 1,2,3, ... J