



asim | Swiss Academy of Insurance Medicine

„Perceived fairness and satisfaction with the process“
Development of a questionnaire for claimants
undergoing a disability assessment

Monica Bachmann, Regina Kunz

Background

Anecdotal evidence in Switzerland suggests that claimants do not always feel fairly treated in their assessment for disability benefits.

It is unclear if the media reflects a minority of dissatisfied and expressive claimants or whether claimants experience considerable dissatisfaction with the assessment process.

Fairness towards the claimant is not systematically monitored, nor reported about in the scientific literature.

Study aim

To develop a questionnaire

to assess the claimants' perception of fairness with the disability assessment process

→ How reliable and valid is the questionnaire we develop?

Method I

1. Literature search

Several instrument measure patient satisfaction in medical settings

→ Questionnaire developed in the Dutch disability insurance (29 items)

2. Item generation: Identification of relevant items

Back-translation process: Dutch to German to Dutch (33 items)

3. Piloting: first impression, acceptance, comprehensibility

First testing with 10 claimants from asim → simplify the items

Method II

4. Completeness of the construct:

Expert consensus: shortening of questionnaire, simplification of items (29 Items)

5. Retrospective considerations:

33 claimants from asim 1) filled in the questionnaire, 2) were interviewed about difficulties on language level and importance of questions.

Questions of **particular importance** :

- The assessor treated me respectfully.
- The assessor listened to me.
- The assessor had sufficient time for me.
- I felt that the assessor took me seriously.

Item examples:

Please indicate to what extent the following statements apply to your assessment.

- The assessor treated me respectfully.
- The assessor listened to me.
- The assessor was well prepared.
- The assessor was in a hurry.
- The assessor explained his actions.
- The assessor inquired carefully about my ailments.

Response options: Not at all (1) to absolutely (5)

6. Reliability and validity

To develop a reliable and valid questionnaire.

a. Item analysis, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis

→ Decision on number of items

b. Correlations

→ Relationship of fairness construct with validation questions

Definition of reliability and validity



Unreliable & Invalid



Unreliable, But Valid



Reliable, Not Valid



Both Reliable & Valid

Measures for reliability and validity

Reliability: Cronbach Alpha

Validity: Item examples

- The assessor treated me unfairly.
- The assessor did not pay attention to me.
- The assessor treated me in an impersonal fashion.

- In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
- The conditions of my life are excellent.

(from: *Satisfaction With Life Scale*

)

Methodological challenges

- Short and comprehensible questionnaire for native and not native German speaking claimants
- Extension to retest-reliability (= two measurement points)

Challenges to implement the questionnaire

- Research in the disability evaluation process
- Acceptance of the questionnaire in the community
(medical experts, assessments centers)

Feedback from claimants

- Claimants feel taken seriously
- Claimants appreciated being given a voice in the process
- The vast majority of the claimants find the questionnaire important
- Claimants did not request additional topics

Future

- Reliable and valid questionnaire in German, French, English and other common languages in claimants
- Assessment of retest-Reliability
- International usage of the questionnaire

Thank you

- the claimants who gave feedback
- Disability insurance Netherlands
- Wout de Boer, Bärbel Brigger, Sarah Kedzia, asim
- Irena Pjanic, Dept. Clin Psychol. and Psychotherapy, University Bern
- Katrin Fischer, University of Applied Sciences, Olten
- Gordon Guyatt, McMaster University