

The background of the cover is a photograph of ancient Greek temple columns, likely from the Temple of Apollo at Delphi. The columns are made of light-colored stone and show signs of weathering and repair. They are set against a clear, deep blue sky. The perspective is from a low angle, looking up at the columns, which creates a sense of height and grandeur.

The Delphi Technique in Nursing and Health Research

INEAD KEENEY | FELICITY HASSON | HUGH McKENNA

The logo for Wiley-Blackwell, featuring a stylized 'W' and 'B' inside a red-bordered square.

WILEY-BLACKWELL

The Delphi Technique in Nursing and Health Research

Sinead Keeney

*Senior Lecturer, Institute of Nursing Research,
School of Nursing, University of Ulster, UK*

Felicity Hasson

*Senior Lecturer, Institute of Nursing Research,
School of Nursing, University of Ulster, UK*

Hugh McKenna

*Dean of Faculty of Life and Health Sciences,
University of Ulster, UK*



 **WILEY-BLACKWELL**

A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication

This edition first published 2011
© 2011 Sinead Keeney, Felicity Hasson and Hugh McKenna

Blackwell Publishing was acquired by John Wiley & Sons in February 2007.
Blackwell's publishing programme has been merged with Wiley's global Scientific,
Technical, and Medical business to form Wiley-Blackwell.

Registered office

John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19
8SQ, United Kingdom

Editorial offices

9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, United Kingdom
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK
2121 State Avenue, Ames, Iowa 50014-8300, USA

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services and for information
about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please
see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

The right of the author to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in
accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval
system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical,
photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that
appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as
trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names,
service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The
publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book. This
publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to
the subject matter covered. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not
engaged in rendering professional services. If professional advice or other expert
assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Keeney, Sinead.

The Delphi technique in nursing and health research/Sinead Keeney, Felicity
Hasson, Hugh McKenna.

p. ; cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4051-8754-1 (pbk. : alk. paper) 1. Nursing--Research--Methodology.

2. Health--Research--Methodology. 3. Delphi method. I. Hasson, Felicity.

II. McKenna, Hugh P., 1954- III. Title.

[DNLM: 1. Nursing Research--methods. 2. Delphi Technique. 3. Health Services
Research--methods. 4. Research Design. WY 20.5]

RT81.5.K47 2011

610.73072--dc22

2010040520

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Set in 9.5/12.5pt Palatino by Aptara® Inc., New Delhi, India
Printed and bound in Malaysia by Vivar Printing Sdn Bhd

Preface

The Delphi Technique in Nursing and Health Research is written as a guide for any students and/or researchers who wish to use this methodological approach. The aim of the book is to introduce the researcher to the 'Delphi', outline its historical development and serve as a manual to facilitate the use of the technique. Issues that a Delphi researcher must consider will be presented in a straightforward fashion by discussing in detail applications to research. The reader is taken on a step-by-step journey from the research question to choosing a sample through conducting and analysing data. For example, methodology and issues related to design typologies, sampling, instrumentation, methodological rigour and methods of data analysis are discussed. Parameters for the successful application of the Delphi and its variety of uses are analysed, using examples of real empirical investigations.

The technique's key characteristics, anonymity, use of experts and controlled feedback are examined. Furthermore, the specific role of the Delphi researcher will be explored in depth. The book provides the reader with the necessary information to participate in and conduct studies using the Delphi methodology. Brief case scenarios are presented for readers' consideration. In addition, key learning points are detailed at the end of each chapter along with an extensive and current annotated bibliography.

Acknowledgements

This book is a collective creation and, as authors, we recognise the benefit from the support and labour of others.

Hugh acknowledges his wife, Tricia, his son, Gowain, and his daughter, Saoirse, whose patience and support know no bounds.

Felicity thanks her family for the support and encouragement they provided in the writing and production of this text.

Sinead thanks her husband, Declan, and her children, Niamh and Niall, for their unwavering support, belief and encouragement.

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
1 The Delphi Technique	1
Introduction	1
History of the technique	2
What is the Delphi technique?	3
Defining the Delphi technique	3
The Delphi process	4
Original Delphi	4
Idea generation	5
Priority setting versus consensus	5
Non-consensus Delphi	5
Types of Delphi	6
How has the Delphi evolved?	6
Sampling and the use of experts	7
Defining 'expert'	7
Employing an expert panel	8
Size of the expert panel	8
Valid opinion	9
Anonymity	9
Quasi-anonymity	9
Group dynamics	10
Delphi rounds	10
Round 1	11
Subsequent rounds	11
Response rates	12
Enhancing response rate	12
Consensus	13
Does consensus exist in expert panels?	14
Concept of consensus	14
Increasing popularity in nursing and health research	14
Comparison of the Delphi with other consensus methods	15
Nominal group technique	15
Consensus conference	16
Key learning points	16
Recommended further reading	17

2 Debates, Criticisms and Limitations of the Delphi	18
Introduction	18
The qualitative-quantitative debate – which paradigm does the Delphi belong to?	18
Criticisms of the Delphi technique	20
Lack of universal guidelines	20
Size of expert panel	21
Implications of lack of anonymity	22
Expert ‘opinion’	23
Level of consensus	27
Limitations of the Delphi	28
Pressures of conformity	28
Demanding nature of the technique	29
Key learning points	30
Recommended further reading	31
3 Applications of the Delphi in Nursing and Health Research	32
Introduction	32
Historical application of the Delphi technique in nursing	32
Identification of clinical nursing research priorities	36
Trends of the Delphi in nursing	40
Key learning points	41
Recommended further reading	42
4 How to Get Started with the Delphi Technique	43
Introduction	43
Preparation and practicalities	43
Suitability of the Delphi	43
Availability of resources	44
Level of consensus	45
Identifying target sample – panel of experts	46
Who is the target population?	46
How do you select your experts?	47
Sampling criteria	47
What size does the sample have to be?	48
Response rate and attrition	53
Deciding on nature and delivery of the first round	55
Gaining names and addresses	56
Deciding on a ‘return by’ date	56
Administration	57
Invitation to participate	57
Explicit cover letter outlining the working of the Delphi	59
Design of questionnaire	59

Administration systems	63
Mailing	64
Maximising response rate	64
Content analysis	65
Process	66
Key learning points	67
Recommended further reading	67
5 Conducting the Research Using the Delphi Technique	69
Introduction	69
First round	69
Classical Delphi	69
Modified Delphi	70
Return of first round	71
Consideration of sample size and number of items generated	71
Bootstrapping	72
Content analysis	72
Subsequent rounds	73
Round 2	74
Cover letter explaining Round 2	74
Instructions for Round 2	75
Designing Round 2 questionnaires	76
Likert scales	77
Round 2 analysis	77
Sample motivation	78
Follow-ups/reminders	78
Round 3	78
Individual and group feedback	78
Round 3 analysis	81
Number of rounds	81
When to stop	82
When not to stop	82
Reaching consensus	82
Key learning points	83
Recommended further reading	83
6 Analysing Data from a Delphi and Reporting Results	84
Introduction	84
Analysis of Round 1	85
Content analysis – the practical aspects	85
Demographics for sample profiling	86
Analysis of middle rounds (Round 2)	86
Consensus level	86
Statistical analysis	86

Statistical feedback to panel	87
Exclusion of items with consensus	88
Analysis of end round (Round 3)	89
Determining the end of the process	89
Statistical analysis	89
Items that have gained consensus	90
Items that have not gained consensus	90
Stability of responses	91
Examples of statistical analysis used in recent Delphi studies	92
Reporting of results from a Delphi study	92
Key learning points	95
Recommended further reading	95
7 Reliability and Validity	96
Introduction	96
Reliability	96
Criteria to assess rigour	99
Response rates as a measure of rigour	99
Is the definitive answer reached?	99
Validity	100
Content validity	100
Criterion-related validity	100
Threats to validity	101
Key learning points	104
Recommended further reading	104
8 Ethical Considerations	105
Introduction	105
Ethical principles	105
Respect for human dignity	106
Justice	106
Principle of beneficence	108
Principle of non-maleficence	108
The role of the researcher	108
Ethics documentation	109
Key learning points	113
Recommended further reading	113
9 A Classical Delphi Design Case Study	114
Introduction	114
Background	114
Methods	115
Initial considerations	116
Enhancing response rates	117

Identifying and accessing the sample	117
Round 1	118
Round 2	119
Discussion	122
Lessons learned	123
Conclusion	123
Acknowledgements	123
Further information	124
Publications	124
10 A Modified Delphi Case Study	125
Introduction	125
Aims of the study	126
Methodology	126
Expert panel	126
Round 1 – focus groups	127
Delphi Round 2 – postal round	127
Round 3 – postal round	128
Consensus conference	129
Results	129
Commissioning of health and social care	129
Leadership	131
Generic and specialist roles	131
Clinical governance	132
Teamwork	133
Public involvement	133
Education	134
Practical training versus academia	135
Attitudes to nurse training and education	135
Multidisciplinary education in nurse training	135
Communication	135
Conclusion	136
Recommendations	137
Commissioning of health and social care	137
Leadership	137
Generic and specialist roles	138
Clinical governance	138
Teamwork	139
Public involvement	139
Education	140
Communication	140
Reflections on the modified Delphi	140
Acknowledgements	141
Further information	141
Publications	141

11 e-Delphi Case Study	142
Introduction	142
Sample	142
Setting a consensus level	143
Theoretical framework	143
Data collection and analysis	144
Design of instrument	144
Pilot study	144
Round 1	144
Round 2	145
Round 3	145
Ethical considerations	145
Results	146
Round 1	146
Round 2	146
Round 3	147
Discussion	147
Conclusion	148
Reflections on the e-Delphi	149
Acknowledgements	150
Further information	150
Publications	150
<i>Annotated Bibliography</i>	151
<i>References</i>	164
<i>Index</i>	193

1

The Delphi Technique

Introduction

Most research studies are driven by research questions that need answering. To do so, the researcher must employ a research design. While there is little agreement among researchers as to the proper classification, Parahoo (2006) suggested that there are three types of research designs: experimental, case study and survey designs.

Experimental designs tend to be future oriented and the researcher often has to set up the conditions under which the investigation will take place. The most 'scientific' version of the experiment involving human subjects is the double-blind randomised clinical trial. It is employed widely in medicine in the testing of new drugs and is often referred to as the gold standard of research designs.

Case studies are in-depth investigations of phenomena. This type of design helps researchers gain an intimate knowledge of a person's or a group's condition, thoughts, feelings, actions both past and present, intentions and environment (Creswell, 2003).

Survey designs are by far the most common type used in health care research. This may be classified as descriptive, exploratory or comparative. The aim of a survey is to gather data from specific individuals, groups or populations for the purpose of addressing a particular issue. A more detailed overview of survey designs can be found in McKenna et al. (2006).

One type of survey that is gaining in recognition and popularity is the Delphi Technique and that is the focus of this book. This chapter will define and describe the technique, provide background as to its origins and outline the different types of Delphi surveys available to researchers. The characteristics of the Delphi will be outlined and there will be discussions on who can be categorised as experts, what constitutes a round, how feedback is handled and what is meant by anonymity and consensus. Finally, the Delphi will be compared with other consensus reaching methodologies including the nominal group technique and the consensus conference.

History of the technique

The desire for humankind to predict their future is an ongoing quest. Dating back thousands of years, oracles had a firm place in the life of Greeks and Romans. One of the most important oracles in the classical Greek world was at 'Delphi'. The Greek word *Delphois* refers to the womb indicating the Grandmother earth (Fontenrose, 1978). The name 'Delphi' is derived from the Oracle of Delphi. Delphi is an archaeological site in Greece on the south-western face of Mount Parnassus. In Greek mythology, Delphi was the location of the most important oracle in the classical Greek world, and a major site for the worship of the god Apollo. The god Apollo made himself master of Delphi, after slaying the dragon Pathos who protected the site, was also famous for his ability to foresee the future (Linstone, 1978). Legend has it that Apollo prophesies were transmitted through female intermediaries, known as *Pythia*, a name derived from the python, a source of wisdom in ancient Greece (von der Gracht, 2008). She had to be an older woman of blameless life chosen from among the peasants of the area.

In a state of trance, induced by vapours rising from a chasm in the rock, the Pythia (or priestess) would sit on a tripod over an opening in the earth and would communicate Apollo's answers to priests who would translate these back to the petitioners. People from far and wide consulted the Delphic oracle on a range of topics including important matters of public policy, to personal affairs, to the outcome of wars and the founding of colonies. Therefore, the term 'Delphi' has become synonymous with receiving good judgement on an issue.

The Delphi technique itself was developed at the beginning of the cold war to forecast the impact of technology on warfare (Custer *et al.*, 1999). In 1944, General Henry Arnold commissioned a report for the US Air Force on the future technological capabilities that might be used by the military.

Two years later, the Douglas Aircraft Company started Project RAND to study inter-continental warfare. Different approaches were tried, but the shortcomings of traditional forecasting methods, such as theoretical approaches, quantitative models or trend extrapolation, in areas where precise scientific laws have not been established yet, quickly became apparent. Similarly, exploring the use of focus groups to forecast events indicated three main problems including the influence of dominant personalities, noise and group pressure (Dalkey, 1969a).

To combat these shortcomings, the Delphi method was developed, essentially founded on the premise that individual statistical predictions were stronger than unstructured, face to face group predictions (Kaplan *et al.*, 1949). Entitled Project RAND during the 1950–1960s (1959) by Olaf Helmer, Norman Dalkey and Nicholas Rescher (Rescher, 1998) the Delphi

method started to develop. Initial application of the method required experts to provide their opinion on the probability, frequency and intensity of possible enemy attacks and the number of atomic bombs needed to destroy a particular target. This process was repeated several times until a consensus emerged.

Whilst Helmer and Dalkey developed the method, Abraham Kaplan, a qualified philosopher employed by the RAND Corporation, coined the name 'Delphi'. The founders of the method, however, were critical of the name 'Delphi'. As Dalkey (1969a, p. 8) explained:

In some ways it is unfortunate – it connotes someone oracular, something smacking a little of the occult – whereas as a matter of fact, precisely the opposite is involved; it primarily is concerned with making the best you can of a less than perfect fund of information.

Nevertheless, since the Delphi's development, there has been a broadening of the technique and it is now commonly used across a wide range of disciplines including health, nursing and medical research. The use of the Delphi technique to identify research priorities and gain consensus in many areas of health research is clearly apparent (Edwards, 2002; Sowell, 2000; Palmer & Batchelor, 2006; Byrne *et al.*, 2008).

What is the Delphi technique?

The main premise of the Delphi method is based on the assumption that group opinion is more valid than individual opinion. A novel and contemporary way of illustrating this is through the use of 'ask the audience' in the popular game show, *Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?*, where the audience effectively act as the 'expert panel', experts in general knowledge, and the contestant asks the audience for their opinion on a certain question. The audience is asked to vote on the answer using a keypad and the results displayed in a bar chart form showing where the consensus lies. Obviously, the use of the word 'expert' is used loosely here but this demonstrates the main premise of the Delphi Technique that group opinion is considered more 'valid' and 'reliable' than individual opinion.

Defining the Delphi technique

The Delphi technique has been defined as a multi-staged survey which attempts ultimately to achieve consensus on an important issue (McKenna,

1994a). Prior to this, Dalkey and Helmer (1963) asserted that the Delphi was a method used to obtain the most reliable consensus of opinion of a group of experts by a series of intensive questionnaires interspersed with controlled feedback. In essence, all definitions agree that the purpose of the technique is to achieve agreement among a group of experts on a certain issue where none previously existed.

The original advocates of the Delphi Technique, Dalkey and Helmer (1963), defined the Delphi technique as 'a method used to obtain the most reliable consensus of opinion of a group of experts by a series of intensive questionnaires interspersed with controlled feedback' (p. 458). With increasing usage, broader definitions have been put forward. For instance, Reid (1998) believed that Delphi is a method for the systematic collection and aggregation of informed judgement from a group of experts on specific questions and issues.

Lynn *et al.* (1998) defined the Delphi technique as an iterative process designed to combine expert opinion into group consensus. Most definitions attempt to encompass or highlight the ever-adapting Delphi process in one sentence, which has resulted in broad and varying interpretations of the technique. Regardless of definition, as alluded to above the purpose of the technique is to achieve consensus among a group of experts on a certain issue where no agreement previously existed.

There are many differing forms of Delphi now in existence, such as the 'modified Delphi' (Rauch, 1979; McKenna, 1994a), the 'policy Delphi' (Crisp *et al.*, 1997), and the 'real-time Delphi' (Beretta, 1996). Few researchers now use a uniform method of the Delphi technique, and this has been heavily criticised since the emergence of modifications of the technique poses a threat to the credibility of the Delphi technique and the validity and reliability of the research findings (Sackman, 1975).

The Delphi process

Original Delphi

In its original form, the Delphi process consists of two or more rounds of questionnaires administered by post to an expert panel. The first questionnaire asks the expert panel for their opinions on a certain issue or topic in an open-ended manner. These responses are then analysed by the researchers and sent back to the expert panel in the form of statements or questions. The expert panel rate or rank the statements or questions within the second questionnaire according to their expert opinion on the subject. Rounds continue until a consensus is reached on some or all of the items as required. Today, this is known as the Classical Delphi.

Idea generation

This original approach sets the foundation for an idea-generation strategy to uncover the issues pertaining to the topic under study. To do this, the respondents, referred to as panellists or experts, are asked to put forward as many relevant issues as possible in Round 1. Once analysed, these responses act as a springboard for the rest of the Delphi process. Feedback from Round 1 is provided in the form of a second questionnaire and opinion is asked on the issues raised. Normally, in subsequent rounds each panel member is provided with their own responses as well as those of the other panellists or experts and he or she is asked to reconsider and (if they wish) change it in the light of other panellists' responses. This continues for subsequent rounds until consensus is obtained. This process is best described as multi-stage where each stage builds on the results of the previous one (Sumsion, 1998).

Priority setting versus consensus

The Delphi technique is used for two main purposes within nursing and health research. Firstly, it is commonly used to set priorities, for example the identification of nursing research priorities. Nurses, academics and researchers could form an expert panel to identify research priorities for the nursing profession at present. There are a large number of studies that have been undertaken in this area across the world (e.g. French *et al.*, 2002; Griffen-Sobel & Suozzo, 2002; McIlfatrick & Keeney, 2003; Cohen *et al.*, 2004; Annells *et al.*, 2005; Back-Pettersson *et al.*, 2008; Grundy & Ghazi, 2009). This type of priority setting exercise can be useful for the profession or experts involved or for funders to prioritise what areas of research should be funded in the short, medium and long term.

The second main use of the Delphi technique is to gain consensus. This can be on any set of issues or ideas. The expert panel are asked to rank or rate items either generated by themselves within Round 1 of the Delphi, as in the Classical Delphi, or in a modified Delphi through the literature or the use of focus groups or interviews. A consensus level is set (e.g. 70%) and once the pre-determined percentage of the expert panel has come to agreement on the importance or position of the statement, it is said to have reached consensus. Consensus studies have been widely utilised in nursing and health research to date (e.g. Butterworth & Bishop, 1995; Beech, 1997; Graham *et al.*, 2003; Beattie *et al.*, 2004; Cornick, 2006; Ferguson *et al.*, 2008; Jorm *et al.*, 2008).

Non-consensus Delphi

While it may not appear immediately relevant to nursing or health research, it is important to point out that not all Delphi's aim to reach

consensus. Traditionally, the method has aimed at gaining consensus but other Delphi's, such as the Policy Delphi, aim to support decisions by structuring and discussing the diverse views of the 'preferred future' (Turoff, 2006). The Argument Delphi, a derivative of the Policy Delphi (Kuusi, 1999), focuses on ongoing discussion and seeking relevant arguments rather than focusing on the output. The 'Disaggregative Policy Delphi' (Tapio, 2002) uses cluster analysis as a systematic tool to construct various scenarios of the future in the latest Delphi round.

Types of Delphi

How has the Delphi evolved?

Since its inception the Delphi technique has evolved into a number of modifications (see Table 1.1). There are hundreds and possibly thousands of studies in the literature reporting on studies using these different manifestations, and this is tribute to the flexibility of the method.

The reason for these adaptations is based on the fact that there are no formal, universally agreed guidelines on the use of the Delphi. Its original form, known as the *classical Delphi*, involves the presentation of a questionnaire to a panel of 'informed individuals' in a specific field of application, in order to seek their opinion or judgement on a particular issue. After they respond, the data are summarised and a new questionnaire is designed based solely on the results obtained from the first round. This second instrument is returned to each subject and they are asked (in the light of the first round's results), to reconsider their initial opinion and to once again return their responses to the researcher. Repeat rounds of this process may be carried out until consensus of opinion, or a point of diminishing returns, has been reached. This illustrates the Delphi technique is a multi-stage approach with each stage building on the results of the previous one. Hitch and Murgatroyd (1983) saw it resembling a highly controlled meeting of experts, facilitated by a chairperson who is adept at summing up the feelings of the meeting by reflecting the participants' own views back to them in such a way that they can proceed further – the only difference is that the individual responses of the members are unknown to one another. A *classical Delphi* format was employed by McIlpatrick and Keeney (2003) with 112 nurses attending a cancer nursing research conference in Northern Ireland. The aim of this survey was for those attending to identify priorities for cancer research.

Nevertheless, it is widely used in a great variety of forms (Mead, 1991; Butterworth & Bishop, 1995; Green *et al.*, 1999) without adequate consideration of the consequences. For further reading of the numerous variations of formats of the Delphi, see Chien *et al.* (1984).