BMJ Open Quality Health status of care home residents: practicality and construct validity of data collection by staff at scale

Tim Benson,^{© 1,2} Clive Bowman³

ABSTRACT

To cite: Benson T, Bowman C. Health status of care home residents: practicality and construct validity of data collection by staff at scale. *BMJ Open Quality* 2019;8:e000704. doi:10.1136/ bmjoq-2019-000704

Received 7 April 2019 Revised 13 June 2019 Accepted 25 June 2019 **Background** Medical diagnoses and assessed need for care are the prerequisites for planning and delivery of care to residents of care homes. Assessing the effectiveness of care is difficult. The aim of this study was to test the practicality and construct validity of the *howRu* health status measure using secondary analysis of a large data set.

Method The data came from a Bupa Care Homes Census in 2012, which covered 24 506 residents in 395 homes internationally (UK, Australia and New Zealand). Staff completed optical mark readable forms about each resident using a short generic health status measure, *howRu*. Response rates were used to assess practicality and expected relationships between health status and independent variables were used to assess the construct validity.

Results and discussion 19,438 forms were returned (79.3%) in 360 care homes (91.1%); complete health status data were recorded for 18617 residents (95.8% of those returned). Missing values for any health status items mostly came from a small number of homes. The relationships between *howRu* and independent variables support construct validity. Factor analysis suggests three latent variables (discomfort, distress and disability/ dependence).

Conclusions *HowRu* proved easy to use and practical at scale. The *howRu* health status measure shows good construct validity.

BACKGROUND

The health status of care home residents is a key parameter for all concerned in care homes. A simple way to track health status routinely at both the individual and collectively at care home level is necessary to understand and optimise care and support decision-making.

The Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment remains the key starting point but is not suitable for frequent repeated use.¹ Cognitive impairment, such as dementia, is common in care homes and many residents are not able to rate their own health status. For this reason, proxy ratings by staff are needed.

Between 2003 and 2012, Bupa Care Services undertook a series of censuses of their care home residents.² The June 2012 census provided an opportunity to record resident health status using the short generic staff-reported health status measure, *howRu*.³ While Bupa had undertaken a series of resident surveys serially that had included diagnosis and physical and mental capacity, it had not been able to assess health status. The census covered 24 506 residents in 395 care homes in UK, Australia and New Zealand. The primary purpose of the census was to inform strategic development.

Since 2012, Bupa's Aged Care provision has changed significantly. The number of care homes in the UK has fallen from 303 to 138 and in Australia and New Zealand has increased from 92 to 121. In 2019, Bupa cares for about 17 000 care home residents in these countries.⁴ The data reported here do not represent care homes currently operated by Bupa.

This paper has used secondary analysis to better understand the practicality of the method used to record health status and the construct validity of the measure used, when collected by staff. Other studies have reported the use of staff proxies to record resident health status, 5^{6} but this study is a lot larger.

METHOD

HowRu

The *howRu* measure was chosen to measure health status, because it is short, quick and easy use and had been validated for use by older patients.⁷ It was also being used in other Bupa projects at the time. *HowRu* is a short generic health status measure, which covers how the subject is feeling physically and emotionally, and how much they can do for themselves.

HowRu was developed as a generic patient-reported outcome measure (PROM), suitable for most types of patient irrespective of diagnosis and treatment and across different care settings: secondary, primary, community, social and home care. *HowRu* has been validated for use with patients with

Check for updates

© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2019. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

¹R-Outcomes Ltd, Thatcham, UK ²Institute of Health Informatics, UCL, London, UK ³City University School of Health Sciences, London, UK

Correspondence to

Dr Tim Benson; tim.benson@r-outcomes.com



long-term conditions living in the community against the SF-12 survey tool,⁷ in hospital clinics⁸ and for hip and knee replacement surgery against EQ-5D-3L,⁹ and at the individual patient level.¹⁰ This is the first report of its use in care homes by staff proxies.

HowRu uses the question "How are you today?" referring to the past 24 hours. In this study, the question was adapted to "How is the resident today?".

It has four items:

- Pain or discomfort covers physical symptoms.
- Feel low or worried relates to emotional symptoms.
- Limited in what he/she can do covers disability, activities of daily living and leisure activities.
- Require help from others covers self-care and dependency.

Each option is indicated in the following mutually supporting ways to minimise cognitive effort, for face validity and to reduce training needs:

- Written labels: none, a little, quite a lot and extreme.
- Colour: green, yellow, orange and red.
- Emoji: face pictographs from happy to miserable.
- Position: increasing in severity from left to right.

The combination of four items and four options each creates a 4×4 matrix with 256 (4^4) possible combinations. Each option is allocated a score on a 0 to 3 ordinal scale (extreme=0, quite a lot=1, a little=2 and none=3). The howRu summary score for each subject is calculated by adding the item scores, giving a range from the floor, 0 (4×extreme), to the ceiling, 12 (4×none). A high score is always good, and a low score is bad.

For reporting mean scores for a group of respondents, the average score is converted to a scale with range 0 to 100. A score of zero is obtained when all responses are at the floor (extreme) and 100 when all responses are at the ceiling (none). This scale is familiar to most people, allows comparison of item and summary scores on the same scale, and distinguishes mean scores from individual data collection.

Respondents recorded data on optical mark readable (OMR) forms with sections for staff and residents to complete (this paper only considers staff responses). A bar code identified the care home and region. The staff form (see figure 1) included questions asked in previous censuses, allowing changes in the population over time to be explored.¹¹ In addition, staff rated each resident's health status, using howRu, shown at the bottom of the form. Responses for each region were collated regionally and forwarded to a central scanning bureau for data entry. The data were imported into a database and exported to Excel and the JASP statistical package for analysis.

Construct validation

Construct validation explores how a measure relates to existing theories. It provides information about how scores can be interpreted and used. Construct validation involves setting out theoretical concepts, how they relate to each other and the dimensions of the measure, and then testing the relationships between these constructs and the results obtained.¹²

Resident name/room Reasons for admission Instruction (mark one or more) Clearly mark with a horizontal dash e.g. (mark one or more) Stroke Dementia Parkisson's Mater or term in each group (except Reasons for admission) Other shar name and noom above, do not write anywhere else Multiple Sciencesis On the sheet. Do not fold the form Female So 54 Nature of admission 60-64 Long term care 65-69 Nature of admission 50-54 Nature of admission 50-54 Nature of admission 50-54 Convelsecant or rehabilitation 75-79 Convelsecant or rehabilitation Convelsecant or rehabilitation Cancer 75-79 Convelsecant or rehabilitation 90-54 Convelsecant 90-54 Convelsecant 7270 Convelsecant 7271 Convelsecant 7272 Convelsecant 7273 Convelsecant 7274 Intermediate or subazute care 7379 Convelsecant 7474 Intermediate or subazute care <th>Staff</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>-</th> <th>I</th>	Staff					-	I
Instructions (mark with a horizontal dash e.g	Bupa	Resident	name/room			Peacone for admission	-
Instructions (mark with a horizontal dash e.g. (mark one or more) Clearly mark with a horizontal dash e.g. (mark one or more) Instructions Stroke Otesty mark with a horizontal dash e.g. (mark one or more) (please don't use a fibre-tip, get or roller-ball pen) (mark one term in each group (except Reasons for admission) Other than name and room above, do not write anywhere else (mark with a horizontal dash e.g. on the sheet. Do not fold the form (mark with a horizontal dash e.g. Asc now Gender >05.54 Nature of admission Social Male Female Depression BipData disorder BipData disorder Social Long term care 65.69 Nature of admission 72.74 Intermediate or subacute care 73.79 Convalescent or rehabilitation 90.54 Detection of Resident 95.59 Dementia care Frail Elderly Moth Young physically disabled Continent 2002 Feb Totally dependent 70.71 Jul Moderate Yes 2003						Reasons for aumission	
Instructions Dementia Clearly mark with a horizontal dash e.g. Dementia (no tick, crosses or cicles, please) Dementia (please don't use a fibre-tib, gel or roller-ball pen) Motor Neurone Mark one item in each group (except Ressons for admission) Dementia Other than name and room above, do not write anywhere else Schizophrenia So 54 Male Female So 54 Nature of admission Schizophrenia So 54 Long term care Bipolar disorder So 54 Long term care Bipolar disorder So 54 Long term care Cancer So 54 Respite/holiday relief admission Sight Marka distorder stabalitation Convalescent or rehabilitation Cancer So 54 Long term care Cancer Bobard distorder Family/social Unknown Joo+ Frait Elderly Unknown Mental illness (other than Dementia) Unknown Other 2002 Jan Fully mobile Continence 2003 Mar Tutally dependent Paecal incontinence 2004 Apr					_	(mark one or more) Stroke	
Use and mark with a notronal dath e.g. Parkinson's Use blue or black ball-point pen or HB pencil (please don't use a fore-to, gel or roller-ball pen) Parkinson's Mark one item in each group (except Ressons for admission) Other than anne and room above, do not write anywhere else Other than anne and room above, do not write anywhere else Parkinson's Are now Sender <5054	Instruction	1 <u>5</u>	- de contrat de altre en la l	-		Dementia	
Use blue or black ball-point per of HB pendl (please don't use a fibre-top, get or rolle-ball pen) Mark one item in each group (except Reasons for admission) Other than name and noom above, do not write anywhere else on the sheet. Do not fold the form So 54 So 54 Nature of admission 60-64 Long term care 65-69 Resplite/holdsy relief admission 75-79 Category of Resident 90-94 Do+ FrailtPlanet 100+ FrailtPlanet Year admitted Motor that sitten in more indicate or subacute care 75-79 Dementia care 85-89 Category of Resident Year admitted Motor iter Year admitted Motor iter 2002 Feb War Vear admitted Moderate 2003 Mar 2004 Apr Yusua Impairment 2005 Jun None Severe 2001 Oct None Aug Severe 2001 Jun None Severe None None Severe None Severe None Severe None Severe None <td>(no ticks ci</td> <td>rk with a hi rosses or ci</td> <td>ircles_please)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Parkinson's</td> <td></td>	(no ticks ci	rk with a hi rosses or ci	ircles_please)			Parkinson's	
lplease don't use a fibir-tub, gel or roller-ball pen) Multiple Sclerosis Cerebral Palsy Fibilepsy Head Aspinal injury Schizophrenia So-S4 Male Female So-S4 Male Female So-S5 Male Female So-S5 Male Female So-S5 Male Female So-S5 Male Female So-S5 Male Category Male Female So-S5 So-S4 Long term care Long term care Long term care So-S4 Convalescent or rehabilitation So-S4 So-S4 Convalescent or rehabilitation So-S4 So-S4 Category of Resident Hearing So-S4 Category of Resident So-S4 So-S4 Category of Resident So-S4 S	Use blue or	r black ball	-point pen or HB pencil			Motor Neurone	
Mark one item in each group (except Reasons for admission) Checkpit Read Spit Spit Spit Spit Spit Spit Spit Spit	(please dor	n't use a fik	pre-tip, gel or roller-ball	pen)		Huntingdon's Multiple Sclerosis	
Other than name and noom above, do not write anywhere eise Epilepsy a Kee now Gender c=50 Male Female 50-54 Nature of admission Bipolar disorder 55-59 Convelocational provided admission Bipolar disorder 60-64 Long term care Bipolar disorder 60-64 Long term care Bipolar disorder 60-64 Cong term care Bipolar disorder 60-64 Long term care Bipolar disorder 80-84 End of life care Frailty (lunspecified) 77-79 Convalescent or rehabilitation Diabetes 80-84 End of life care Frailty (lunspecified) 95-99 Dementia care Frailty (lunspecified) 100+ Frailt Elderly Unknown Vaug physically disable Continent Urinary incontinence 2002 Jan Fully mobile Urinary incontinence 2003 Mar Totally dependent Dual incontinence 2004 Apr Visual ingairment Continent 2005 May Severe No Dual incontinence	Mark one i	tem in eac	h group (except Reasons	for admission)		Cerebral Palsy	
Alex now Gender Ase now Gender So-Sa Male Female So-Sa Male So-Sa So-Sa Male So-Sa Male Female Diabeta So-Sa Respite/holiday relief admission Sight Heard discase Convalescent or rehabilitation Cancer So-Sa Category of Resident Housing So-Sa Female diefly Unknown Mental illness (other than Dementia) Other Other 2002 Jan Fully mobile Continence 2003 Mar Totally dependent Paecal incontinence 2004 Apr Visual impairment Continence 2005 Jun None Male Severe	Other than	name and	fold the form	ite anywnere eise		Epilepsy	
Are now Gender Schlicphrenia -50 Male Female 0554 Nature of admission 5559 Long term care 6569 Respite/holiday relief admission 7579 Convalescent or rehabilitation 80-84 End of life care 85-89 Category of Resident 90-94 Dementia care 95-99 Dementia care 7577 Category of Resident 90-94 Dementia care 95-99 Dementia care Frail Ederly Unknown Woung physically disabled Continence 2002 Feb 2003 Mar 2004 Apr 2005 May 2006 Jun None Yes 2008 Aug 2009 Sep 2004 Apr 2005 May 2006 Jun None Yes None Yes 2004 Apr 2005 Sep Hearing difficultis Feb 2001 Oct May 2002 Feb 2003 Mar 2004 Apr	on the shee	et. Do not				Head/spinal injury	
c=50 Male Female Department 50-54 Nature of admission Bipolar disorder Learning difficulties 60-64 Long term care Bipolar disorder Learning difficulties 60-64 Long term care Bipolar disorder Learning difficulties 70-74 Intermediate or subacute care Diabetes Bipolar disorder 80-84 End of life care Frailty (lunspecified) Hearing 80-84 End of life care Frailty (lunspecified) Housing 95-99 Dementia care Frailty (lunspecified) Housing 95-99 Dementia care Frailty (lunspecified) Housing 95-99 Dementia care Frailty (lunspecified) Housing 100+ Frailt Elderly Unknown Unknown 7002 Fab With assistance Urinary incontinence Face 2002 Fab With assistance Urinary incontinence Face 2003 May None Continent Urinary incontinence Face 2004 Apr Ysual ingairment Continent Urinary incontinence	Age now		Gender			Schizophrenia	
50-54 Nature of admission Learning difficulties 55-59 Long term care Hearning difficulties 65-69 Respite/holiday relief admission Sight 70-74 Intermediate or subacute care Barling 75-79 Convalescent or rehabilitation Diabetes 80-84 End of life care Cancer 95-99 Dementia care Faillelerly 90-94 Frail Elderly Unknown Young physically disabled Continence 2002 Jan Fully mobile 2002 Feb With assistance 2003 Mar Totally dependent 2004 Apr Visual impairment 2005 Jun None Continence 2006 Jun None Continence 2006 Jun None Continence 2006 Jun None Continence 2004 Apr Visual impairment Continence 2005 Jun None Continence 2006 Jun None Continence 200	<=50	-	Male Fer	nale		Bipolar disorder	
55-59 Hear at disease Ingtermediate or subscript Hear tigease Ingtermediate or subscript 65-64 Respite/holiday relief admission Ingtermediate or subscript Sight Indig disease Ingtermediate 75-74 Intermediate or subscript Indig disease Sight Indig disease Ingtermediate Sight Indig disease Ingtermediate Ingtermedi	50-54		Nature of admirster			Learning difficulties	
60-64 tong term care	55-59		Nature of aumission			Heart disease	
0-9-9 Intermediator subactice care Signt 75-74 Convalescent or rehabilitation Diabetes 80-84 End of life care Cancer 85-89 Category of Resident Diabetes 96-99 Dementia care Fail Elderly 9100+ Frail Elderly Unknown Mental illness (other than Dementia) Other 2002 Jan Fully mobile 2003 Mar Totally dependent 2004 Apr Visual impairment 2005 May Visual impairment 2006 Jun None Confused 2006 Jun None Confused 2007 Jul Moderate Yes 2008 Aug Severe No 2011 Nov None Catine for No 2011 Nov None Mar Catine for No 2011 Nov None Confused Yes 2012 Dec Moderate No Severe 2011 Nov None Aitttle Quite	60-64	\vdash	Long term care	- designing	_	Lung/chest illness	
2007 Forming Diabetes 2004 Convision or rehabilitation Diabetes 90-94 Category of Resident Frailty (unspecified) 90-94 Dementia care Frailty (unspecified) 90-94 Dementia care Frailty (unspecified) 90-94 Dementia care Frailty (unspecified) 90-94 Mental lines (other than Dementia) Other 2002 Feb Feb Continence 2003 Mar Totally dependent Diabetes 2005 May Visual Impairment Continence 2006 Jun None Pase 2007 Jul Moderate Yes 2008 Aug Severe No 2009 Sep Heating impairment Challenging behaviour 2010 Oct None Pes 2011 Nov None Pailer 2012 Dec Moderate Yes 2014 Nore Pailer Quite a lot Extreme 2012 Dec Moderate Pes Pos	65-69 70-74	H	htermediate or subac	ute care		Signt Hearing	
80-84 End of life care Cancer Frail Eldery 90-94 Dementia care Frail Eldery Frail Eldery 100+ Frail Eldery Unknown Other 2002 Fab With assistance Urinary incontinence 2003 Mar Totally dependent Frail Eldery 2004 Apr Visual impairment Continent 2005 Jun None Continence 2006 Jun None Continent 2006 Jun None Continent 2006 Jun None Continence 2007 Jul Moderate No 2008 Aug Severe No 2010 Oct Mar None Continent 2007 Jul Moderate No Severe 2011 Oct None Extreme No 2012 Dec Moderate No Severe 2011 None A little Quite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Severe Sever	75-79		Convalescent or rehab	ilitation -	-	Diabetes	
85-59 90-94 95-99 100+ Category of Resident Dementia care Frail Elderly Mental illness (other than Dementia) Young physically disabled Frail Fullows 100+ Frail Elderly Mental illness (other than Dementia) Young physically disabled Continence Continence 2002 Jan Fully mobile Continence 2003 Mar Totally dependent Continence 2004 Apr Visual impairment Continence 2005 May Visual impairment Continence 2006 Jun None Continence 2006 Jun None Continence 2006 Jun None Continence 2007 Jul Moderate Yes 2008 Aug Severe No 2010 Oct Haarinsimment Challenging behaviour 2011 Nov None Yes 2012 Dec Moderate Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe 2011 Nov None A little Quite a lot Extreme Severe Severe Severe <td< td=""><td>80-84</td><td></td><td>End of life care</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>Cancer</td><td></td></td<>	80-84		End of life care	-	-	Cancer	
90-94 definition of the settoms in the settom of the sett	85-89		Category of Resident			Frailty (unspecified)	
95-99 Dementia care Frail Elderly Young physically disable 2002 Feb 2002 Feb 2002 Feb 2003 Mar 2004 Apr 2004 Apr 2005 May 2006 Jun 2006 Jun 2007 Jul 2007 Jul 2007 Jul 2007 Jul 2008 Aug 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Mar 2004 Mar 2007 Jul 2007 May 2007 Jul 2007 May 2008 Aug 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2009 Sep 2010 Oct 2001 Moderate 2002 None 2012 Dec 2012 None 2012 None 2012 Severe 2014 Canture 2015 Severe 2016 Canture 2017 Severe 2018 Severe 2019 Sep 2010 Oct 2010 Oct 2010 Oct 2011 Nov 2012 None 2012 Severe 2014 Canture 2015 Severe 2016 Severe 2017 Severe 2018 Severe 2019 Sep 2010 Oct 2010 Oct 2010 Oct 2011 Nov 2012 Severe 2011 Nov 2012 Severe 2014 Severe 2015 Severe 2016 Severe 2017 Severe 2018 Severe 2019 Sep 2010 Severe 2010 Severe 2010 Severe 2010 Severe 2010 Severe 2011 Severe 2012 Severe 2013 Severe 2014 Severe 2015 Severe 2016 Severe 2017 Severe 2018 Severe 2019 Severe 2010 Severe 2	90-94	· · ·	category of Resident	-		Housing	· ·
John Mental illes (other than Dementia) Young physically disabled Other Other 2002 Jan Feb Totally dependent Continence 2003 Jan Fully mobile Continence Incention incece 2004 Apr Visual inpairment Continence Incention incece 2005 May Visual inpairment Continence Incention incece 2006 Jun None Yes Dal incontinence 2008 Aug Severe No Incention incece 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2010 Oct Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2011 Nov None Yes No 2011 Nov None Yes No 2012 Dec Moderate Severe Severe No 2011 Nov None A little Quite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Severe Sever Sever Sever Sever Sever Pain or discomfort Sever Se	95-99 100+	H	Dementia care	-		Family/social	
Young physically disable Continence 2002 Jan Fully mobile Continent 2003 Mar Totally dependent Dual incontinence 2003 Mar Totally dependent Dual incontinence 2004 Apr Visual ingaiment Continent 2005 May None Continence 2006 Jun None Continence 2007 Jul Moderate Yes Dual incontinence 2008 Aug Severe No Contused 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour Contused 2010 Oct None Yes No Contused 2012 Dec Moderate No No Contused 2012 Dec Moderate No Contused Contused Pain or discomfort None Alittle Quite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Contused Contused Contused Contused Feel low or worried Contused Contused Contused Contused	100+	1	Mental illness (other t	han Dementia		Other	
Year admitted Month Mobility Continence 2002 Jan Fully mobile Continent Urinary incontinence 2003 Mar Totally dependent Pacal incontinence Pacal incontinence 2004 Apr Visual impairment Dual incontinence Dual incontinence 2005 Jun None Continent Urinary incontinence 2006 Jun None Continent Dual incontinence 2007 Jul Moderate Yes No 2008 Aug Severe No Continent 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2010 Oct None None No 2011 Nov None No Severe 2012 Dec None A little Cuite a lot Extreme 2012 Dec None A little Cuite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Image: Construct on the set			Young physically disab	led		outer	
2002 Jan Fully mobile Continent Urinary incontinence 2003 Mar Totally dependent Urinary incontinence Dual incontinence 2004 Apr Visual impairment Confused Dual incontinence 2006 Jun None Confused Confused 2007 Jul Moderate No Confused 2008 Aug Severe No Confused 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour Confused 2001 Oct None Yes No Confused 2011 Oct None No Severe No Confused 2012 Dec Moderate No No Confused Confused 2012 Dec None A little Quite a lot Extreme Confused Pain or discomfort Confused Confused Confused Confused Confused Confused Confused Feel low or worried Confused Confused Confused Confused Confused Confused	Year adm	nitted	Month	Mobility		Continence	
2002 Feb With assistance Urinary incontinence 2003 Mar Ysual inpairment Facal incontinence 2006 Jun None Yes 2006 Jun Moderate Yes 2007 Jul Severe No 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2010 Oct None Yes 2011 Nov None Yes 2012 Dec Moderate Yes 2011 Nov None Yes Work is resident today? (pair a lot screenee) Extreme Yes None A little Quifte a lot screenee Pain or discomfort Severe Severe Severe Pain or discomfort Severe Severe Severe Limited in what he/she can do Severe Severe Severe Requires help from others Severe Severe Severe Severe	<2002	· · ·	Jan · ·	Fully mobile		Continent	
2003 Mar Totally dependent Faceal incontinence Incontinence 2004 Apr Visual impairment Dual incontinence Incontinence 2005 May None Confused 2006 Jun None Confused 2007 Jul None Confused 2008 Aug Severe No 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2010 Oct None Yes 2011 Nov None Yes 2012 Dec Moderate No 2012 Dec Moderate No 2012 Dec Moderate No Pain or discomfort Ouite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Image Image Image Feel low or worried Image Image Image Image Limited in what he/she can do Image Image Image Image Imited in what he/she can do Image Image Image Image Image Imite he/	2002	<u> </u>	Feb -	With assistance		Urinary incontinence	
2004 Apr Visual impairment Dual incontinence 2005 May None Confused 2006 Jun None Confused 2007 Jul Moderate Yes 2008 Aug Severe No 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2010 Oct None Yes 2011 Nov None Yes 2012 Dec Moderate Yes 2012 Dec Moderate No Severe None A little Quite a lot Extreme Severe Severe Severe How is resident today? (pait 24 hours) None A little Pain or discomfort Severe Severe Severe Severe Feel low or worried Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe Limited in what he/she can do Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe Requires help from others Severe Severe Severe Seve	2003		Mar · ·	Totally depende	ent -	Faecal incontinence	
2006 Jun None Confused 2007 Jul Moderate Yes 2008 Aug Severe No 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2010 Oct None Yes 2011 Nov None Yes 2012 Dec Moderate Yes Severe None Yes How is resident today? None A little (past 24 hours) None A little Pain or discomfort Image: Severe Image: Severe Feel low or worried Image: Severe Image: Severe Limited in what he/she can do Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Limited in what he/she can do Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Pain or discomfort Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Limited in what he/she can do Image:	2004	H-1	Apr	Visual impairm	ent	Dual incontinence	
2007 Jul Moderate Yes 2008 Aug Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2010 Oct None Yes 2011 Nov Moderate No 2012 Dec Moderate No How is resident today? None A little Ouite a lot Pain or discomfort Extreme Extreme Extreme Feel low or worried Image: Comparison of the second of the se	2005		Jun	None	F - 1	<u>Confused</u>	
2008 Aug Severe No Image: Character and the severe 2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2011 Nov None Yes 2012 Dec None Yes How is resident today? None A little Quite a lot Fall Severe Severe Severe How is resident today? None A little Quite a lot Fall or discomfort Severe Severe Severe Feel low or worried Severe Severe Severe Limited in what he/she can do Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe Severe	2007		Jul	Moderate		Yes	
2009 Sep Hearing impairment Challenging behaviour 2011 Oct None Yes 2012 Dec None A little Yes No Image: Severe No How is resident today? None A little Quite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Image: Severe Feel low or worried Image: Severe Image: Seve	2008		Aug	Severe		No	
2011 Nov None Yes 2012 Dec None Moderate No How is resident today? (past 24 hours) None A little Quite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Image: Comparison of the second of the sec	2009	<u> </u>	Sep -	Hearing impair	ment	Challenging behaviour	
Z012 Dec None Tes No How is resident today? (past 24 hours) None A little Quite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Image: Comparison of the second o	2010	\square	Uct · ·	Nono		Var	
How is resident today? (past 24 hours) None A little Quite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Image: Comparison of the state of the	2011	\square	Dec	Moderate		No	
None A little Quite a lot Extreme Pain or discomfort Image: Comparison of the state of t	_012			Severe			
Image: pair or disconfort None A little Quite a lot Extreme Pain or disconfort Image: pair of disconfort Image: pair of disconfort Image: pair of disconfort Image: pair of disconfort Feel low or worried Image: pair of disconfort Image: pai	How is re	sident tod	lay?				
Pain or discomfort Content Content Content Feel low or worried Image: Content Image: Content Image: Content Limited in what he/she can do Image: Content Image: Content Image: Content Requires help from others Image: Content Image: Content Image: Content Image: Content	(past 24 h	nours)		None	Alittle	Ouite a lot Extreme	
Feel low or worried Image: Constraint of the constrain	Pain or d	iscomfort					3
Limited in what he/she can do	Feel low	or worried	I				э
Requires help from others	Limited in	n what ha	(she can do				_
Requires help from others	Limited i	n what nej	rsne can do	••••	•••		
	Requires	help from	others	•	••••		3

Figure 1 Staff data collection form (A4).

We tested the following hypotheses:

- 1. Health status, age and sex. We did not expect any difference between sexes but expected that older people would have lower health status in terms of disability and dependence.
- 2. Health status and length of stay in the care home. We expected that health status would generally diminish with length of stay, as people got older and frailer.
- 3. Health status, admission type, resident category, number of reasons for admission and case mix. We expected to find differences in health status between different categories of resident.
- 4. Health status, mobility, visual and hearing impairment, continence, confusion and challenging behaviour. We expected health status to be negatively associated with impairment.
- 5. Health status and whether residents could complete the survey themselves. We expected a strong positive association.

Psychometric analysis

The inter-relatedness of the *howRu* items was assessed by examining correlations, Cronbach's α and exploratory factor analysis, orthogonal rotation (varimax).^{12 13}

Table 1 Number of care homes, occ	ble 1 Number of care homes, occupancy and completed forms by country							
Region	Care homes	Homes with >3% returned	Home response (%)	Number of occupants	Number of completed returns	Individual response rate (%)		
UK	303	273	90%	17913	13152	73%		
Australia	48	44	92%	3666	3462	94%		
New Zealand	44	43	98%	2927	2824	95%		
Total	395	360	91%	24506	19438	79%		

Ethics statement

We carried out secondary analysis of data collected as part of a routine census of care home residents. The data were anonymous and undertaken to evaluate the current services without randomisation, so ethics approval was not required. No data were collected about identifiable residents, and there was no risk to individual residents.¹⁴

Patient and public involvement

There was no direct involvement of patients or the public. All data were anonymous.

RESULTS

Response rates

In June 2012, centrally collected management statistics showed that the 395 care homes had 24506 residents. Thirty-five care homes did not return any completed forms or only returned forms for less than 3% of its residents, giving a home response rate of 91.1% (360/395).

Staff completed and returned 19438 responses, an overall completion rate of 79.3% (table 1). Any form that was returned but did not, at a minimum, contain resident gender was not treated as completed.

The number of responses and missing values for each *howRu* item are shown below (table 2). Missing values for one or more *howRu* items were found in 821 resident forms (4.2%). A very small number of respondents (less than 0.3%) made two responses for items that required only one response. Such entries were treated as null.

More than a third (34%) of all missing values were from just 13 care homes (3.5%). This suggests that two different types of error are taking place. For a few residents (probably no more than 1%), staff found it hard to

 Table 2
 Responses and missing values completing staff

 howRu form
 Provide the staff

Item	Responses	Missing values	%
Pain or discomfort	18931	507	2.6
Feeling low or worried	18838	600	3.1
Limited in what he/she can do	18864	574	3.0
Require help from others	18915	523	2.7
All howRu items	18617	821	4.2

make the right choice, but in a few care homes, missing values are due to local circumstances or processes, such as staff training, management or simple human error. For example, one member of staff might complete basic data for all residents in a home, but expect someone else, who knew individual residents better, to complete the remainder of the form, which was not done.

Overall distribution

The overall frequency distribution of individual *howRu* items rated by staff on residents is shown in table 3.

This distribution differs substantially with that of people with long-term conditions, who are living in their own homes,⁷ although that study was based on reporting by patients themselves, not staff as proxies.

The *howRu* score is an aggregate of the four items, with a range from 0 to 12. The mean staff-rated *howRu* score for care home residents is 7.14 (SD 2.31). Figure 2(figure 2) shows the broad distribution of scores, showing a broadly normal distribution. The number of residents rated at the ceiling state ($4 \times none$) is 666 (3.6%); the number at the floor state ($4 \times extreme$) is 46 (0.2%).

Independent variables

This section examines the relationship between *howRu* data and independent variables including resident gender, age, length of stay (year of admission), admission type, resident category, number of reasons for admission, mobility, visual impairment, hearing impairment, continence, confusion and challenging behaviour, and the ability of residents to complete the *howRu* questionnaire. The distribution of responses and mean scores for each *howRu* item and summary score are shown in table 4. This shows results where all *howRu* items were completed. Where numbers do not add to the overall total, this indicates missing values.

All responses

Overall, 18617 responses with complete *howRu* data were analysed. The mean scores (on 0–100 scales), SD, SEM and skewness for each item were Discomfort, 82.30 (SD 22.68, SEM 0.17, skewness –1.08); Distress, 78.63 (SD 24.97, SEM 0.18, skewness –0.96); Disability, 41.70 (SD 31.60, SEM 0.23, skewness 0.22); Dependence, 35.33 (SD 29.97, SEM 0.22, skewness 0.37); and summary *howRu* score, 59.49 (SD 19.28, SEM 0.14, skewness –0.03). Note

Table 3 Overall distribution of staff rate	able 3 Overall distribution of staff ratings of resident health status						
	None	A little	Quite a lot	Extreme	Total		
Pain or discomfort	10741 (57%)	6507 (34%)	1508 (8%)	175 (1%)	18931		
Feeling low or worried	9523 (51%)	6880 (37%)	2086 (11%)	349 (2%)	18838		
Limited in what he/she can do	1989 (11%)	5462 (29%)	6676 (35%)	4737 (25%)	18864		
Requires help from others	1111 (6%)	4880 (26%)	6877 (36%)	6047 (32%)	18915		

the large SD, showing the heterogeneity of care home residents.

Gender

Responses were received on 12380 women (67%) and 6033 men (33%). The ratio of women to men is approximately 2:1. The scores on all dimensions are a little higher (better) for men than for women (howRu score 58.9 vs 60.6), but the differences are small. Given the large sample sizes used, these differences are statistically significant but are not important.

Age

The average age of residents was 83 (men 80.0, women 84.6). The mean health status of care home residents has little relationship to the age of resident for all of the *howRu* dimensions. In general, care home residents have poor Disability and Dependence scores, and much better scores for Discomfort and Distress. In this respect, care home resident population differs from people living in their own home, where health status tends to deteriorate with older age.⁷

At the age extremes, residents aged under 50 (mainly young physically disabled) had the lowest (worst) scores for Disability and Dependence, while those over 100 years old had the highest (best) Distress score.

Year of admission

Year of admission is a measure of length of stay (data were collected in June 2012). The average level of Distress and Discomfort (to a slightly lesser extent) improved gradually as length of stay increases, while Disability and Dependence became worse.



Figure 2 Distribution of staff-reported *howRu* summar scores for care home residents (n=18617).

Admission type

Most residents (95%) were admitted to care home for long-term care. The remainder comprise respite/holiday care (2.2%), end-of-life care (1.5%), convalescent care (0.5%), and intermediate or subacute care (0.4%). Although these percentages are low, the large size of the study allowed us to look at differences in their health status. Those admitted for intermediate (subacute) care had a better health status on all dimensions than any other category.

Convalescent (rehabilitation) residents had poorer Discomfort than any other group apart from end-of-life care. Those admitted for end-of-life care had lower health status scores on all dimensions than any other group.

Resident category

Dementia care residents had better scores for Discomfort but have worst Dependence (lowest scores). Residents with mental illness other than dementia had worse Distress than any other category, but better scores for Discomfort, Disability and Dependence. Young physically disabled residents had the best scores for Distress, but worst for Disability.

Number of reasons for admission

Health status is strongly related to what is the matter with the resident.¹⁵ Most residents were recorded as having two or more health-related reasons for admission. In this study, the association was much less than for people living in their own homes,⁷ although all dimensions were associated with the number of reasons recorded. The smaller effect may be because most care home residents are already dependent. The largest impact was in terms of Distress (feeling low or worried) and Discomfort (pain and discomfort).

Mobility

Mobility was strongly associated with Disability and Dependence, modestly with Discomfort, but not with Distress.

Visual and hearing impairment

Both visual and hearing impairment were moderately associated with all four dimensions of *howRu*.

Continence

Continence was strongly associated with Disability and Dependence, but not with either Discomfort or Distress.

Table 4 Mean scores for each scores	each item and summary	score on 0-100	scale by indep	pendent variab	le	
Independent variable	N (%)	Mean Discomfort Score	Mean Distress Score	Mean Disability Score	Mean Dependence Score	Mean <i>howRu</i> Score
With complete <i>bow</i> Ru data	18617	82.3	78.6	<i>A</i> 1 7	35.3	59.5
Gender	10017	02.0	70.0	71.7	00.0	00.0
Female	12380 (67%)	81.7	77.7	41.3	35.0	58.9
Male	6033 (33%)	83.6	80.4	42.5	36.0	60.6
Age				.2.0		
<50	196 (1%)	81.6	79.8	33.7	27.4	55.6
50-54	152 (1%)	83.3	81.4	39.0	34.4	59.5
55-59	302 (2%)	85.4	81.1	42.2	37.3	61.5
60–64	436 (2%)	85.9	80.3	44.3	36.8	61.8
65–69	745 (4%)	83.0	79.9	40.6	35.2	59.7
70–74	1222 (7%)	82.6	78.4	40.1	34.2	58.8
75–79	2124 (12%)	81.8	78.3	39.9	33.4	58.4
80–84	3474 (19%)	82.9	78.7	42.5	35.7	59.9
85-89	4408 (24%)	82.3	78.0	42.9	36.2	59.8
90–94	3421 (19%)	81.2	78.5	42.2	36.3	59.6
95–99	1406 (8%)	81.3	78.5	39.8	33.2	58.2
100+	237 (1%)	81.3	81.7	38.8	32.8	58.6
Year of admission						
2012 (<6 months)	3754 (21%)	80.5	76.9	47.2	40.8	61.4
2011	4535 (25%)	82.0	77.0	44.8	38.3	60.5
2010	3007 (17%)	82.2	77.9	42.1	35.9	59.6
2007-2009	4613 (25%)	82.7	79.7	37.6	31.4	57.9
2004-2006	1467 (8%)	84.4	82.5	33.9	26.6	56.8
Before 2004	792 (4%)	84.7	83.8	34.0	27.4	57.4
Admission type		0		0.10		
Intermediate	80 (<1%)	82.9	83.6	55.9	55.4	69.5
Respite	417 (2%)	82.9	78.0	53.6	49.2	65.9
Convalescent	91 (<1%)	72.0	77.8	49.4	45.2	61.1
Long-term care	17649 (95%)	82.5	78.7	41.4	34.8	59.4
End-of-life care	283 (2%)	70.2	73.0	29.6	26.5	58.4
Resident category						
Mental illness (excluding dementia)	592 (3%)	83.0	75.7	50.1	43.6	63.1
Frail elderly	9059 (52%)	80.5	79.1	42.8	37.0	59.9
Dementia care	6896 (40%)	84.6	78.0	39.9	32.4	58.7
Young physical disabled	723 (4%)	82.1	81.1	37.6	32.7	58.4
No of reasons for admission						
1	8322 (45%)	83.7	80.5	43.2	37.0	61.2
2	5694 (31%)	82.7	78.4	40.8	33.9	59.0
3	2776 (15%)	81.0	76.4	39.6	32.9	57.5
4	1076 (6%)	77.3	73.5	36.7	31.2	54.7
5 or more	533 (3%)	74.2	70.7	38.5	32.2	54.0
Mobility						
Fully mobile	4771 (26%)	87.6	79.9	64.1	57.6	72.4
With assistance	5876 (32%)	80.7	77.3	48.9	42.7	62.4
Totally dependent	7628 (42%)	80.1	78.8	21.9	15.3	49.0

Continued

Table 4 Continued						
Independent veriable	N (94)	Mean Discomfort Secro	Mean Distress	Mean Disability	Mean Dependence Secre	Mean howRu
	N (70)	30016	30016	30016	30016	30016
Visual impairment						
None	5524 (30%)	84.7	80.9	46.1	39.3	62.8
Moderate	11 465 (62%)	81.4	78.0	40.6	34.2	58.6
Severe	1609 (9%)	79.3	75.3	33.4	27.8	54.1
Hearing impairment						
None	11269 (62%)	84.0	79.8	44.0	37.3	61.3
Moderate	5471 (30%)	79.4	76.6	37.7	31.7	56.3
Severe	1360 (8%)	78.6	76.3	36.3	30.6	55.5
Continence						
Continent	5460 (30%)	83.2	79.1	62.7	57.9	70.7
Urinary incontinence	3048 (17%)	80.7	76.0	47.0	40.7	61.1
Faecal incontinence	297 (2%)	80.4	78.9	40.3	32.6	58.2
Dual incontinence	9413 (52%)	82.3	79.2	27.7	20.4	52.4
Confused						
No	6487 (35%)	81.3	81.5	49.6	44.1	64.2
Yes	12172 (65%)	82.7	76.9	37.3	30.4	56.9
Challenging behaviour						
No	12800 (69%)	83.1	81.7	43.5	37.3	61.5
Yes	5843 (31%)	80.2	71.9	37.3	30.3	54.9
Resident completion						
Unaided	1043 (5%)	80.9	82.5	61.6	57.7	70.8
With help	8052 (42%)	81.1	78.1	48.5	42.3	62.5
Not answered	3872 (20%)	83.7	79.3	40.6	33.4	59.2
Unable to complete	6061 (32%)	83.2	78.2	29.6	22.7	53.5

Confusion and challenging behaviour

Confusion and challenging behaviour were both moderately associated with Disability and Dependence. There is no association with Discomfort, but behaviour that is challenging is strongly associated with Distress.

Resident completion

The survey included a question about whether each resident was able to complete a patient-recorded questionnaire unaided, with assistance or was unable to complete it at all. This question was not answered for 20% of residents. Residents' ability to complete the forms was strongly associated with their Disability and Dependence scores, but not with Discomfort or Distress.

Psychometric analysis

Table 5 shows the Spearman correlations between items and the aggregate *howRu* score. All correlations are highly significant (p<0.001). Cronbach's α is 0.65, which suggests that in care homes health status represents more than one concept.¹²

Factor loadings are shown in table 6 showing two latent variables, with Disability (limited in what he/she can do) and Dependence (require help from others) being closely related (factor 1). The other two latent variables are Feeling low or worried (and Pain and discomfort (factor 2).

Table 5 Spearman correlations between items and the aggregate howRu score							
Item	Distress	Disability	Dependence	HowRu Score			
Pain or discomfort (Discomfort)	0.43	0.15	0.13	0.53			
Feeling low or worried (Distress)		0.13	0.11	0.53			
Limited in what he/she can do (Disability)			0.84	0.83			
Require help from others (Dependence)				0.81			

Table 6 Rotated factor loadings			
Component Loadings			
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Uniqueness
Pain or discomfort		0.612	0.607
Feeling low or worried		0.689	0.510
Limited in what he/she can do	0.888		0.186
Requires help from others	0.893		0.191

DISCUSSION Practicality

This paper reports results from one of the largest studies of care home residents' health status, as rated by staff. The good response rates indicate the practicality of the method used.

The study makes clear that health status is distinct from both diagnosis and physical and mental capability. Arguably, care for residents should be commissioned to meet assessed medical and disability needs but, in the absence of a clear end point, the use of an easily repeated PROM such as *howRu* can inform on the success of care individually and collectively.

The method used proved efficient when used at scale internationally and across continents. The bar-coded OMR forms were easy to complete and the scanning process was efficient and largely automated. The number of missing data and errors (such as marking two boxes when only one is allowed) were low. As digital transformation of care homes progresses, this health status measure could be incorporated into weekly routines providing a set of vital signs on health status.

Differences in national and regional response rates may be explained by the enthusiasm and engagement of local managers. New Zealand and Australia had the highest response rates (95% and 94%, respectively). New Zealand was the first to return all their forms. The manager responsible also asked several questions to clarify how to complete and return the forms. Unfortunately, we were not able to circulate the questions and answers given to all other homes. In future surveys, we recommended that a single person be appointed to coordinate all queries, circulate frequently asked questions and chase late responders.

At any time, about 95% of care home residents are admitted for long-term care, with the remaining 5% having shorter stays. The number of short-stay admissions is much greater than is indicated by the number of residents on a particular day and varies substantially between regions and homes.

This study is based on staff ratings of resident health status. Comparing staff reports and resident reports presents problems.⁵ Most care home residents suffer from cognitive impairment and are not able to complete surveys reliably. They adapt to the secure environment of a care home and may consider themselves to be less disabled and dependent than staff think they are. On the other hand, staff may also consider residents to have less

discomfort and distress than residents report. Staff do not see residents 24 hours a day and may think that medication is more effective than it is.

Construct validity

Recording multiple variables allowed assessment of the construct validity of the measure used. Taken together, these results provide strong evidence of the construct validity of the *howRu* items and *howRu* summary score used in care homes, as well as insights into what is happening.

For example, we found little difference in health status between different age groups. This care home population differs considerably from that of people with long-term conditions, who live in their own homes, where health status is strongly associated with age. In the care home population, the correlation between Discomfort and Disability was low (r=0.14), but for people living in their own homes it was much higher (r=0.58).⁷ People become care home residents because they need physical care.

People with a longer length of stay had higher wellbeing (better Distress scores). This may be explained in part by adaptation to living in a residential care home. However, they were also more Dependent.

Different categories of admission type, resident category and number of reasons have distinct profiles of Discomfort, Distress, Disability and Dependence, which are as expected. Mobility, visual and hearing impairment, continence, confusion and challenging behaviour were strongly associated with Disability and Dependence, but less with Discomfort or Distress. We also found a strong association between Disability and Dependence scores and residents' capability to complete parts of the survey unaided. The distribution of scores for each item was quite broad, showing that care home residents are far from being homogeneous. However, due to the large sample size, the confidence limits for the mean scores are small.

The evidence presented here only considers mean scores within this population. However, *howRu* has been validated at the individual patient level, which is essential if it is to be used to guide clinical decisions.¹⁰ This suggests that these ratings could have clinical uses.

Limitations

This study has limitations, some of which stem from the way that it was commissioned. This study was conceived as an aid to managers at international, country, region and care home level, not as academic research. Care home managers were responsible for collecting the data, which may have created some biases, although no evidence of bias has been detected.

One limitation of this study was that health status was recorded at a single point on time. This means that it was not possible to see how individual residents progressed over time. This study was quantitative only. Practicality and ease of use were assessed using response rates and completeness of data, not on qualitative study of the acceptability to staff or usefulness of the information. Such work needs to be done.

Following company reorganisation, this study did not lead to further work with Bupa. The study did not collect any qualitative data about the acceptability of the method to staff, residents, care homes or the organisation.

More recently, we have examined staff perceptions of the quality of service they provide to care home residents, their well-being at work and their confidence in doing their job.¹⁶

CONCLUSIONS

The method used to survey care homes proved very practical when used at scale. The *howRu* health status measure shows good construct validity.

Acknowledgements We are grateful for the support of Bupa Care Services, which funded the study, and to the care home staff and managers who took part.

Contributors TB designed the surveys with CB and wrote the first draft of the paper. TB performed the analyses. CB and TB managed the data collection. All authors contributed to the final text, read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests TB is a director and shareholder of R-Outcomes Ltd, which provides quality improvement and evaluation services in the health and social care sectors using *howRu*. CB was previously medical director of Bupa Care Services and is a non-executive director of AKARI Care Homes, FINCCH and Invatech Health, all of which have interests in care homes and social care. Please contact R-Outcomes Ltd if you wish to use *howRu*.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement Data are available on reasonable request.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which

permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

REFERENCES

- Clegg A, Young J, Iliffe S, et al. Frailty in elderly people. Lancet 2013;381:752–62.
- 2. Bowman C, Whistler J, Ellerby M. A national census of care home residents. *Age Ageing* 2004;33:561–6.
- 3. Lievesley N, Crosby G, Bowman C. *The changing role of care homes*. Centre for Policy on Ageing, 2011.
- Report BA, 2018. Available: https://www.bupa.com/~/media/files/ site-specific-files/our%20performance/pdfs/financial-results-2018/ annual-report-and-accounts-2018.pdf
- Gordon AL, Franklin M, Bradshaw L, et al. Health status of UK care home residents: a cohort study. Age Ageing 2014;43:97–103.
- Usman A, Lewis S, Hinsliff-Smith K, et al. Measuring health-related quality of life of care home residents: comparison of self-report with staff proxy responses. Age Ageing 2019;48:407–13.
- Benson T, Sizmur S, Whatling J, et al. Evaluation of a new short generic measure of health status: howRu. Inform Prim Care 2010;18:89–101.
- Benson T, Potts HWW, Whatling JM, et al. Comparison of howRU and EQ-5D measures of health-related quality of life in an outpatient clinic. *Inform Prim Care* 2013;21:12–17.
- Benson T, Williams DH, Potts HWW. Performance of EQ-5D, howRu and Oxford hip & knee scores in assessing the outcome of hip and knee replacements. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16
- Hendriks SH, Rutgers J, van Dijk PR, et al. Validation of the howRu and howRwe questionnaires at the individual patient level. BMC Health Serv Res 2015;15:447.
- Centre for Policy on Ageing. A profile of residents in BUPA care homes: results from the 2012 BUPA census, 2012. Available: http:// www.cpa.org.uk/information/reviews/Bupa-Census-2012.pdf [Accessed 2 Apr 2019].
- Streiner DL, Norman GR, Cairney J. Health measurement scales: a practical guide to their development and use. 5th edn. Oxford University Press, 2015.
- JASP Team. JASP (Version 0.10.0) [Computer software], 2018. Available: https://jasp-stats.org/https://jasp-stats.org/
- 14. NHS Health Research Authority. *Defining research: research ethics service guidance to help you decide if your project requires review by a research ethics committee.* UK Health Departments' Research Ethics Service, 2016.
- Mujica-Mota RE, Roberts M, Abel G, *et al.* Common patterns of morbidity and multi-morbidity and their impact on health-related quality of life: evidence from a national survey. *Qual Life Res* 2015;24:909–18.
- Benson T, Sladen J, Done J, et al. Monitoring work well-being, job confidence and care provided by care home staff using a self-report survey. BMJ Open Qual 2019;8:e000621.