

Assessing measurement tools of health and wellbeing for evaluating a community intervention

Mithilesh Dronavalli, Sandra Thompson

Western Australian Centre for Rural Health, The University of Western Australia, WA

Background: Often in public and rural health, interventions are proposed or implemented with a community or a group of individuals to improve their health and wellbeing. Those with an interest in evaluation often want information about what tools that are available and those that are best suited to measure improvements that could be attributed to their intervention. There are obvious benefits from using efficient and standardised tools of measurement and for which population norms are available.

This study evaluated tools that measure community health and wellbeing, which could potentially be used before and after an intervention.

Methods: A literature was undertaken on the following health and sociological databases—Medline/PubMed; ERIC; JSTOR; Proquest etc. Articles that mentioned community, overall health, wellbeing or quality of life and included widely used named measurement tools were extracted. These tools were evaluated by a further search of the literature of their psychometric properties. Each tool was scored (good=1; mediocre=0.5, poor=-1 or missing =0) for a number of fields including: internal consistency; length, use in cross-cultural setting, global health and wellbeing assessment, use of subjective measures; clarity; measure of health; measure of wellbeing; responsiveness; validity; and test-retest reliability. A composite score was made from the sum of field ratings divided by number of fields available for a tool.

Result: Of 958 articles that were screened, 152 articles were extracted for review. From those articles 27 measurement tools were identified and assessed.

The composite scores for tools ranged from 0–1. Six tools had a rating of excellent.

Conclusion: Use of any of the 6 tools rated as excellent is recommended for before and after an intervention based on the criteria in this article. Cost is another issue, which also may be important for implementation. The recommended tools will be discussed at the conference.

Composite score	No. of tools	Rating
1–0.9	6	Excellent
0.89–0.7	6	Good
0.69–0.5	10	Mediocre
<0.5	5	Poor