

PAPER

A descriptive survey of cancer helplines in the United Kingdom: Who they are, the services offered, and the accessibility of those services

Geraldine M. Leydon^{1*} | Beth Stuart^{1*} | Lisa Danquah² | Katie Ekberg³ | Lucy Brindle⁴ | Sue Latter⁴ | Clare Moynihan⁵ | Peter Salmon⁶ | Sonia Howe⁷ | Elizabeth Stokoe⁸ | Paul Little¹

¹Primary Care and Population Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

²London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

³School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

⁴Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

⁵Psychology Research Group, Institute of Cancer Research, Sutton, UK

⁶Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

⁷The Helplines Partnership, Peterborough, UK

⁸Social Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK

Correspondence

Geraldine M. Leydon, Primary Care and Population Sciences, University of Southampton, Aldermoor Close Southampton SO16 5ST, UK.

Email: g.m.leydon@soton.ac.uk

Abstract

Background There are more than 1500 UK health helplines in operation, yet we have scant knowledge about the resources in place to support the seeking and delivering of cancer-related telephone help and support. This research aimed to identify and describe cancer and cancer-related helpline service provision: the number of helplines available, the variety of services provided, and the accessibility of those services.

Method This study used online national questionnaire survey sent to 95 cancer and cancer-related helplines in the United Kingdom.

Results A total of 69 (73%) of 95 surveyed cancer and cancer-related helplines completed the survey. Most helplines/organizations were registered charities, supported by donations; 73.5% of helplines had national coverage. Most helplines served all age-groups, ethnic groups, and men and women. Only 13.4% had a number that was free from landlines and most mobile networks, and 56.6% could only be contacted during working hours. More than 50% of helplines reported no provisions for callers with additional needs, and 55% had no clinical staff available to callers. Ongoing support and training for helpline staff was available but variable.

Conclusion Although cancer helplines in the United Kingdom offer reasonably broad coverage across the country, there are still potential barriers to accessibility. There are also opportunities to optimize the training of staff/volunteers across the sector. There are further prospects for helplines to enhance services and sustain appropriate and realistic quality standards.

KEYWORDS

cancer, cancer information, cancer support, helplines, telemedicine

1 | BACKGROUND

Every year, 250,000 people in England are diagnosed with cancer. An estimated 130,000 will die of the disease, although 1.8 million people are living with or beyond a cancer diagnosis.¹ Helplines are 1 way of

providing patients, and others affected by a cancer diagnosis, with the opportunity to seek information and support outside of the National Health Service and between appointments.² Helplines have become a core feature of the UK health care system, and the importance of them has been acknowledged by the Department of Health as a key way to promote a supported management approach to living with cancer.³

*Joint first authors

In 2009, the Telephone Helplines Association (now Helplines Partnership) estimated there were more than 1500 health-related helplines in operation in the United Kingdom.⁴ Despite the popularity of helpline services in general, and cancer helplines in particular, we currently have little systematic knowledge of the types of cancer helplines in the United Kingdom, their purpose, and the scope of services provided.

This article describes the results from a national survey of UK-based cancer and cancer-related helplines. As services increase in number, it may become difficult for service commissioners, and existing and start-up helpline organizations, to gain a strategic overview of the cancer helpline landscape to identify gaps in service, points of overlap, and possibilities for coordination or integration. This survey aimed to provide useful information in this regard.

This study aimed to identify and describe cancer and cancer-related helpline service provision both in terms of the number of helplines available, the variety of services provided, and the accessibility of those services.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Inclusion criteria

The national survey aimed to identify all helplines operating in the United Kingdom with a cancer-specific or cancer-related remit. A telephone helpline service was defined as an impartial and confidential service that provides information, advice, listening, support, or onward referral through a telephone service (normally offered free of charge).⁵ A mixed approach was used to determine eligibility, involving screening all available websites for relevant information and speaking with a representative at each of the helplines to establish how they provide their service and whether they viewed their service as meeting our eligibility criteria (in a few cases screening for eligibility was performed by e-mail). Organizations were excluded if they provided a support service such as one-to-one telephone buddy schemes or telephone support groups set up to supplement local group support meetings.

The study focused on helplines that had a cancer-specific remit—either covering specific types of cancer (eg, breast cancer, colon cancer) or providing more generalized support to those affected by any type of cancer (eg, Macmillan Cancer Support). Some helplines were not cancer-focused but often took calls from individuals affected by cancer, for example, Cruse Bereavement Helpline and Pain Concern. This article will refer to these as cancer-related helplines.

2.2 | Identification of participants

To identify eligible helplines, an online search was undertaken to identify organizations that might provide cancer-specific or cancer-related helpline services.^{6–16} This included generalized searches on publicly available search engines, including “google,” “yahoo,” “bing,” “Ask,” and using terms such as “cancer helpline services” or “cancer helpline,” as well as specific searches related to the twenty most common cancer types in the United Kingdom.¹⁷ Established directories such as were also consulted.^{4,18,19}

In total, 152 organizations were identified and assessed according to the eligibility criteria. Fifty-one were excluded because when

contacted it was established that they did not provide a helpline service. Six helplines had closed—the researcher attempted to contact them but the telephone number was no longer in service and no alternatives could be found. This provided 95 cancer or cancer-related helplines eligible for participation. A database was compiled of the organizations identified as eligible to receive the questionnaire survey.

Each helpline was contacted, the research was explained, and a lead individual responsible for managing and overseeing the helpline was identified at all eligible organizations. This person was contacted by the researcher to confirm that they were interested in participating and that they were the most appropriate individual to complete the survey. The survey was designed to be completed by a single individual, but they were encouraged to consult colleagues or documents if they were unsure of any answers.

Ethics approval was obtained from the University of Southampton (reference no. SOMSEC060.10).

2.3 | Questionnaire development

The questionnaire items were developed by the research team in consultation with the steering group, 2 Telephone Helpline Association (THA, now Helplines Partnership) staff and the relevant literature.^{20–29} The survey was administered online to identified participants using SurveyMonkey.³⁰ Paper-based copies and telephone support from the research team were available on request.

The survey was sent to the 95 participants in May 2011, and they were asked to complete it within 2 weeks. A total of 2 reminder e-mails (in weeks 3 and 4) were sent and the completion period of the survey was extended for 3 weeks to increase the participation rate. Any remaining nonresponders were telephoned from week 5 to ascertain whether they required assistance completing the survey.

2.4 | Data analysis

All surveys were completed online, and data were extracted from the SurveyMonkey website into Excel. No paper versions were requested. Data were analyzed descriptively using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 21.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Helpline characteristics

Of the 95 eligible helplines, 69 (73%) completed the questionnaire. Not all questions were mandatory so not all participants completed all questions. The main characteristics of participating helplines are summarized in Table 1. The majority of respondents stated that provision of the helpline was one of their organization's primary functions (65%).

Most of the responding helplines (59.7%) reported providing support for specific cancers, with only a third providing general support for all cancer types. A total of 73.5% ($n = 50$) provided national coverage, and almost all helplines stated that they aimed to serve all age-groups, ethnic groups, and men and women.


TABLE 1 Characteristics of participating helplines

Helpline is one of the primary functions of organization?	44/68 (64.7%)
Main source of income for helpline ^a	
• Central government	2/69 (2.9%)
• Local authority	5/69 (7.2%)
• NHS organizations	8/69 (11.6%)
• Private sector	9/69 (13.0%)
• Donations	56/69 (81.2%)
• Other	22/69 (31.9%)
Date established	
• Pre-1990	16/68 (23.5%)
• 1991–1995	7/68 (10.3%)
• 1996–2000	15/68 (22.1%)
• 2001–2005	15/68 (22.1%)
• 2006–2011	15/68 (22.1%)
Type of support offered	
• Site-specific cancer (eg, breast, lung, bowel, etc)	40/67 (59.7%)
• All cancer types	21/67 (31.3%)
Provide national coverage	50/68 (73.5%)
Support all age-groups	49/68 (72.1%)
Support all ethnic groups	65/68 (95.6%)
Support both genders	65/69 (97.0%)

^aMultiple response item.

3.2 | Services offered

The helplines offered a wide range of services as set out in Figure 1. Almost all helplines, 63 (91.3%) of 69, stated that they provide emotional support to callers and signposted to other external services, most commonly Macmillan Cancer Support, Breast Cancer Care, Cancer Research UK, and the Lymphoma Association. Other services offered included the provision of information and practical support, referral to other services, and referral to specialist cancer nurses who provide information on the signs/symptoms of cancer, cancer prevention, treatments, and prognosis.

**FIGURE 1** Services provided by participating helplines

3.3 | Accessibility

3.3.1 | Hours of operation and out-of-hours service provision

Approximately half (56.5%, $n = 35$) of the helplines operated between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM or 6:00 PM, Monday to Friday. Some (14.5%, $n = 9$) helplines were able to offer longer hours, closing between 8:00 PM and 11:00 PM but fewer than 10 helplines opened on a Saturday and those that did tended to operate a reduced service, typically closing around 2:00 PM. Although 8 helplines stated that they were open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, some of these only provided an answerphone service.

3.3.2 | Helpline access numbers

Relatively few helplines could be contacted free of charge. Only 13.4% provided a 0808 80 number that could be contacted free from both landlines and (most) mobile networks. Another key feature of this number range is that the calls do not appear on bills, offering greater confidentiality to callers living in shared households. A further 16.4% reported providing numbers that could be called free from most landlines only. Most commonly (44.8%), helplines could be contacted on standard geographic numbers beginning with 01 and 02.

3.3.3 | Provisions for non-English speakers

Two thirds ($n = 47$) of helplines had no provision in place for callers who prefer to speak a language other than English. The remaining third were able to make arrangements, which could include the use of a generic 3-way interpreting service ($n = 10$), referral to helplines with an interpreting service ($n = 3$), assistance from staff and volunteers who speak other languages ($n = 6$), provision of translation services if advance notice is given ($n = 6$), and provision of materials printed in other languages ($n = 1$).

3.3.4 | Specialist provisions

Similarly, more than 50% of helplines reported that they had no provisions in place for callers with hearing impairments, speech impairments, communication difficulties, visual or other physical

impairment, or learning difficulties. Fourteen (21.2%) helplines had provisions in place for callers with physical impairments, 12 helplines (18.2%) for callers with learning disabilities, and 11 for callers with visual impairment. Only 4 had provisions for those with hearing impairments, and only 3 had provisions for those with speech impairments. However, 14 helplines (21.2%) were able to provide services on request and/or make use of other channels such as e-mail or instant messaging. Many helplines noted that they tried to be as accommodating as possible and would work with individuals to ensure their needs were met.

3.3.5 | Use of social media

Helplines were also asked about the use of media other than the telephone, including e-mail, SMS, and social networking sites. Nearly all (94.1%) used e-mail as a communication channel to support their helpline service; 79% sent letters to enquirers, and 45.6% used web forums. Although many helplines (43.9%) did not use social networking sites, 34 respondents stated that they had a proactive presence on Facebook and 21 had a presence on Twitter. Others stated that although they currently did not use these sites, they were working towards doing so in the future.

3.4 | Staffing and training/support

3.4.1 | Staff

As shown in Table 2, at the time of the survey, most helpline staff were full-time employees or volunteers at the organization. Very few helplines provided welfare, benefits, or legal specialists (21.6%). Of the responding helplines, 55% (28/51) did not have doctors or nurses on their staff. This may indicate a need for cancer helplines to have greater awareness of other services that offer specialist health care professional provision to refer a caller appropriately.

3.4.2 | Training

Almost two thirds of helplines (64.6%) reported that staff received helpline-specific induction training for their role. Eleven helplines responded that they provided a general induction course or that they organized external training, such as the courses provided by Macmillan Cancer Support.

Induction training most commonly consisted of a 3- to 4-week induction period whereby staff working on the helpline received an introduction to the organization, specific training in call handling and management, introduction, and training on cancer and in some cases, more specific training on specific cancers. Further aspects of induction training included communication and listening skills training,

assessment of calls, and call shadowing. Many organizations stated that training was an ongoing process but did not provide further details.

3.4.3 | Support and supervision

Forty helplines (59.7%) reported that supervision and support were available to staff. Most commonly, this was in the form of debrief or offloading sessions at the end of a call with another member of staff or a supervisor. The other common formal method of support was allowing staff to take a break from answering calls as needed. However, a total of 22 helplines (32.8%) reported that they had no formal systems in place.

3.5 | Helpline monitoring and assessment

There are several forms of accreditation available to helplines. However, 36 of 64 helplines (56.3%) stated that they had no accreditation. Of those helplines that did have some form of accreditation, this tended to be the THA quality standard (n = 9), the Information Standard (n = 8), Investors in People (n = 5), and PQASSO (n = 3).

Most helplines were neither members of the THA nor holders of the THA Quality Standard. Most (61.9%, n = 37/59) were aware of the THA and the Quality Standard (52.5%, n = 31/59), and 22 (37.3%) reported that they were members of the THA; 25.9% reported that they were working towards the Quality Standard or reaccreditation.

3.6 | Challenges identified

Respondents were asked to provide details of any challenges facing their service. This was an open-ended question and 25 helplines responded. Four individuals (16%) mentioned the challenges posed by advances in technology enabling callers to seek information via the Internet before calling the helpline. Some callers were worried by information from online sources, which were inaccurate or provided poor quality information. It was suggested by 1 respondent that the Internet contributed to reduced call volume, as people seek information and support online instead of using a telephone service, although 3/25 (12%) helplines indicated that they were experiencing increasing call volumes, which they were finding challenging.

Ensuring adequate funds to keep the service going was a key challenge for 7/25 (28%) of respondents. This is particularly difficult as there are several helplines offering similar services. Although not strictly in competition with one another, there is an overlap of some services, which means that some providers may not need to or be able to grow/sustain the helpline service.

TABLE 2 Numbers of staff employed directly by the helpline

	None	1–5	6 or more
Nurses	29 /51 (59.6%)	16/51 (31.4%)	6/51 (5.9%)
Doctors	34/40 (85.0%)	4/40 (10.0%)	2/40 (5.0%)
Other full-time staff and volunteers	3/54 (5.6%)	31/54 (57.4%)	20/54 (14.8%)
Allied health professionals	31/36 (86.1%)	5/36 (13.9%)	–
Welfare and benefits professionals	29/37 (78.4%)	7/37 (18.9%)	1/37 (2.7%)
Legal professionals	28/31 (90.3%)	3/31 (9.7%)	–

4 | CONCLUSIONS

4.1 | Study limitations

The study team identified 95 helplines operating in the United Kingdom. Although every effort was made to contact all cancer and cancer-related helplines, it is possible that some smaller, specialist services may have been missed. The survey response rate (73%) was high given the completion time of 30 to 40 minutes. Every effort was made to follow up nonresponders, but it is possible that those who chose not to take part offer different services and face different challenges to those outlined.

The questionnaire was designed for this specific study and as such could not make use of validated questions from previous surveys. The questionnaire was designed to be answered by 1 key person within each helpline organization. Therefore, the information provided may not have been representative of all aspects of service provision; respondents were encouraged to consult with colleagues or records, it is possible that some respondents did not. Additional efforts were made to facilitate ease of completion for respondents such as being able to save and return to the questionnaire later and to receive the questionnaire in paper form. The deadline for the online survey was also extended to enable participants who needed extra time to complete the survey.

The questionnaire did not ask helplines whether they screen callers for distress (eg, using a validated distress thermometer). This would have been useful to know given that there is some evidence to suggest that screening can improve communication between patients and clinicians and may enhance onward referrals.^{31,32}

The time elapsed between data collection and the reporting of findings may mean that the data gathered is not up to date. However, there remains a dearth of information on the available cancer and cancer-related helpline services in the United Kingdom, and this study provides important comprehensive information on what services exist, what they do, and the challenges they are likely to face going forward.

4.2 | Discussion

The majority of participating organizations offered national coverage, served all ethnic groups, and were not gender specific. However, there were several potential barriers to access. First, services tended to be available on weekdays and during the typical "in hours" working day. Some helplines addressed this by having a standard voicemail system, providing a callback facility to out-of-hours callers. However, individuals are likely to want to talk about cancer-related issues outside of working hours at times that are amenable to them. An interview study with callers to cancer helplines indicated that the most commonly suggested improvement was longer opening hours, particularly in the evening to allow individuals to call when they had time and when they felt most at risk of emotional distress.³³ However, funding pressures can have a significant effect on provision, and this was identified as a key operational challenge for helplines in this study. There is evidence that between 2009 and 2011 helplines experienced a 4% reduction in national government funding and a 6.6% reduction in local government funding.³⁴ A 2014 survey of helplines by the Helplines Partnership

(the national membership body for helplines in the United Kingdom) identified that helplines of all sizes face problems with call volume and answering calls.³⁵ Limited resources may mean that helplines answer as many calls as they can within their financial and staffing constraints rather than meeting the overall level of demand.

Approximately 30% of helplines had a number that was free to call from most landlines and/or mobiles. Extending the use of free or reduced-cost telephone numbers could help to improve accessibility. However, some research suggests that cost is a barrier for helplines seeking to move to free-to-caller number ranges.³⁵ The situation became more complex in July 2015 as a result of telecoms industry and regulatory changes, which meant that all UK calls via a mobile to a 0800 number will be free of charge, but it is likely that helplines using 0800 ranges will see an increase in costs. This may lead to helplines migrating to number ranges where the caller pays for the call which could in prove a barrier for some people.

Many helplines were unable to assist people who require specialist provisions but were keen to adapt services to meet individual needs. However, it must be remembered that many helplines grow organically from demand in a community and are provided by nonprofit and voluntary sector organizations.³⁶ Community language and accessible service provision can also support callers to access a confidential service independently from family, friends, or carers.

Many helplines provided e-mail communication and some were expanding into social networking media. The increased presence of helplines on social networking sites may help to reach a broader demographic, eg, "hard to reach"/"hidden groups"/and those of younger ages. There is some evidence of growth in the number of helplines offering multichannel communications using newer forms of technology such as Skype, social media, e-mail, text, and instant messaging.³⁵ The move toward e-mail support has been a particularly strong trend, which can be seen across the helpline sector in general supporting a wide demographic of users (personal correspondence Helplines Partnership). To some extent, the Internet/social media and other "new" technologies may help to overcome obstacles in communication.

Just over half of the helplines were staffed by people without a clinical background and so it might be they cannot answer callers' medically related questions. Most helplines did not offer legal, welfare, or benefits advice. Induction training tended to be short and variable, with some reporting limited or no training on providing the type of emotional support that callers may require. Interviews with helpline callers suggests that the call handler's knowledge and ability to display empathy are key factors in terms of whether their encounter with a helpline was viewed as successful.³³ It is vital that the training for helpline staff, whether they are paid staff or volunteers, equips them with the confidence and skills necessary to deal with caller's sometimes complex, sensitive, and emotional needs. Although a minority of helplines did offer ongoing training and indicated that they were constantly evolving the training available, most did not. It may be as demand increases and the significance of the helpline sector grows that external validation of an organization's internal training provision through a robust quality standard will be needed to limit variation and optimize the experience for callers and call handlers.

Helpline staff may need to "offload" or debrief following calls and many helplines provided this opportunity, but at several helplines,

there was no formal supervision or support available.³⁷ In addition to presenting a risk to helpline staff, this can also effect on the quality of service offered. Helplines are not formally regulated and although there are several forms of voluntary accreditation in place, more than half had no accreditation. Just as the information that individuals access on the Internet varies, so too the information and support obtained on contacting a helpline may be of variable quality. In the absence of regulation, there is great opportunity for helplines to share knowledge to optimize services, and agree and sustain appropriate and realistic quality standards. There is a particular opportunity to share learning around the areas that offer most challenges, such as providing services to groups who are at risk of not being supported. Helplines are a core part of the support and information available for people affected by cancer, and this is a sector that is likely to continue to grow and continue to be a vital service in the landscape of supportive care in cancer. This article offers insight into the varied and important work they do and some of the key challenges they face while doing so.

4.3 | Future research

Further research in partnership with helplines is required on how best to train and support staff. This is central to the provision of safe and effective services. Although larger helplines may be well placed to access externally accredited training provision, smaller organizations are likely to have to evolve their own training systems and more work exploring the actual processes of helpline delivery is required, along with the actual benefits of cancer helplines through systematic measurement of caller outcomes and through intervention-focused studies.³⁸

REFERENCES

1. Department of Health. *Improving Outcomes: A Strategy for Cancer*. London: Department of Health; 2011.
2. CancerBACUP. *The Cancer Information Maze: Report Investigating Information Access for People with Cancer*. London: CancerBACUP; 2005.
3. Department of Health. National Cancer Survivorship Initiative: Vision; 2010.
4. *The Helplines Association Telephone Helplines Directory 2008–2009*. London: The Helplines Association; 2009.
5. The Helplines Association. What Is a Helpline; 2011a <http://www.helplines.org.uk/content/whathelpline>. Accessed February 15, 2011.
6. BBC. Cancer Useful Contacts; 2011. http://www.bbc.co.uk/health/support/cancer_usefulcontacts_index.shtm. Accessed February 16, 2011.
7. Beating Bowel Cancer. Talk to Our Nurses; 2011. <http://www.beatingbowelcancer.org/talk-our-nurses>. Accessed February 16, 2011.
8. Bowel Cancer UK. Information and Support Service; 2011. <http://www.bowelcanceruk.org.uk/livingwith-and-beyond/information-support-service/>. Accessed February 16, 2011.
9. Breast Cancer Care. Services–Helpline; 2010. http://www.breastcancercare.org.uk/breast-cancerservices/ask-us-yourquestions/helpline?utm_source=Footer&%3Butm_medium=menu&%3Butm_campaign=helpline. Accessed October 1, 2010.
10. Cancer Research UK. General Cancer Organisations; 2010a. <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancerhelp/coping-with-cancer/general-books-and-links/general-cancerorganisations>. Accessed October 1, 2010.
11. Cancer Research UK. Cancer Help; 2010b. <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancerhelp/utilities/contact-us/send-a-question/?secure=true>. October 1, 2010.
12. Lymphoma Association. Information and Support; 2011. <http://www.lymphomas.org.uk/information-and-support/freephone-0808-808-5555>. Accessed February 16, 2011.
13. The Helplines Association. Find a Helpline–Cancer; 2011b.
14. Patient.co.uk Support Groups. Support Groups by Letter: C; 2011. <http://www.patient.co.uk/selfhelp/c.htm>. Accessed February 15, 2011.
15. Macmillan Cancer Support. Support Line; 2010. <http://www.macmillan.org.uk/Donate/MacmillanProjects/MacmillanSupportLineProject/MacmillanSupportLineProject.aspx>. Accessed October 1, 2010.
16. Prostate Cancer UK. Contact Our Specialist Nurses; 2010. <http://prostatecanceruk.org/we-can-help/ourspecialist-Nurses>. Accessed October 1, 2010.
17. Cancer Research UK. Cancer Mortality for Common Cancers; 2012. <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancerinfo/cancerstats/mortality/cancerdeath/>. Accessed November 12, 2012.
18. Allan C. Cancer Care 2010/11: The National Cancer Directory—A comprehensive review of UK Cancer Services; 2011.
19. Yell. Cancer and Helplines in the UK; 2011. <http://www.yell.com/ucs/UcsSearchAction.do?keywords=Cancer+and+helplines&location=United+Kingdom&scrambleSeed=29249248&searchType=&M=&bandedclarifyResults=&ssm=1>.
20. BMRB. Developing Information for Cancer Patients. Report for Macmillan Cancer Relief. London: BMRB; 1999.
21. Boudioni M, McPherson K, Mossman J, et al. An analysis of first-time enquirers to the CancerBACUP information service: variations with cancer site, demographic status and geographical location. *Br J Cancer*. 1999;79:138–145.
22. Breast Cancer Care. Helpline Evaluation 2011; 2011. http://www.breastcancercare.org.uk/sites/default/files/files/pdf/helpline_evaluation_2011_summary.pdf.
23. Byers R, Vézina A, Campbell H. Measuring the performance of telephone information services: a literature review. Canadian Cancer Society (on behalf of Centre for Behavioural Research and Program Evaluation, National Cancer Institute of Canada); 2002.
24. Dean A, Scanlon K. Telephone helpline to support people with breast cancer. *Nurs Times*. 2007;103:30–33.
25. Hardyman R, Hardy P, Brodie J, Stephens R. It's good to talk: comparison of a telephone helpline and website for cancer information. (0738-3991 (Print)).
26. Jefford M, Black C, Grogan S, Yeoman G, White V, Akkerman D. Information and support needs of callers to the Cancer Helpline, the Cancer Council Victoria. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl)*. 2005;14:113–123.
27. Lechner L, De Vries H. The Dutch cancer information helpline: experience and impact. *Patient Educ Couns*. 1996;28(2):149–157.
28. Reubsaet A, Lechner L, De Vries H. The Dutch cancer information helpline: more critical patients after 10 years. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2006;63(1-2):215–222
29. Ross T. Prostate cancer telephone helpline: nursing from a different perspective. (0966-0461).
30. Surkey Monkey. Survey Monkey User Manual; 2011.
31. Carlson LE, Waller A, Mitchell AJ. Screening for distress and unmet needs in patients with cancer: review and recommendations. (1527-7755 (Electronic)).
32. Hutchison SD, Steginga SK, Dunn J. The tiered model of psychosocial intervention in cancer: a community based approach. *Psychooncology*. 2006;15(6):541–546.
33. Ekberg K, McDermott J, Moynihan C, Brindle L, Little P, Leydon GM. The role of helplines in cancer care: intertwining emotional support with information or advice-seeking needs. *J Psychosoc Oncol*. 2014;32(3):359–381.
34. The Helplines Association. State of the Sector 2011. London: The Helplines Association; 2011c.
35. The Helplines Partnership. Helplines Survey 2014; 2014.

36. The Helplines Partnership and Race Equality Foundation. *Shaping Our Lives: Helplines at the Frontline of Health and Social Care*; 2014.
37. The Helplines Association. *Who Helps Helpline Workers?* London: The Helplines Association; 2015.
38. Clinton-McHarg T, Paul C, Boyes A, Rose S, Vallentine P, O'Brien L. Do cancer helplines deliver benefits to people affected by cancer? A systematic review. *Patient Educ Couns*. 97(3):302–309.

How to cite this article: Leydon GM, Stuart B, Danquah L, et al. A descriptive survey of cancer helplines in the United Kingdom: Who they are, the services offered, and the accessibility of those services. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2017;26:1140–1146. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.4293>