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Abstract

Objective—To document the nature of audit activity at the primary-secondary care interface; to explore participants’ experiences of undertaking such interface audit; to identify factors associated with these experiences; and to gather views on future interface audit activities.

Design—A three phase national survey by postal questionnaire with a cascade sampling approach.

Setting—England and Wales.

Results—Response rates were: 65% to the first questionnaire; 34% to the second questionnaire; and 45% to the third questionnaire. 56% of the audits covered some element of management of patients or disease; only 33% of the audits were within a single topic area. Most audits had more than one trigger: for 61% the trigger was a perceived problem; for 58% it was of mutual interest. Only 18% of audits were initiated collaboratively; doctors were the most frequent initiators (72%), and most audits (63%) involved collaborative groups convened specifically for the audit. 58% of groups had between three and eight members, 23% had 12 or more. Doctors were the most frequent group members. There was differential involvement of group members in various group tasks; the setting of guidelines was highly dominated by doctors. Of reportedly complete audits, only two fifths had implemented change and only a quarter had evaluated this change. There was widespread feeling of successful group work, with evidence of benefit in terms of the two sectors of care being able to consider issues of mutual concern. Levels of understanding of the group task and of participation were positively related to the duration of meetings. Joint initiation of audits facilitated greater understanding of the group task. Larger group sizes allowed primary and secondary carers to discuss issues of common concern; however, larger groups were more likely to experience disagreements. Having previously worked with group members increased trust and good working relations. The main lessons learnt from the experience included the importance of setting clear objectives and good communications between primary and secondary carers. Factors identified as important for future audit activity at the primary-secondary care interface included commitment, enthusiasm, time, and money.

Conclusions—Audit at the primary-secondary care interface is taking place on a wide scale and has been an enjoyable experience for most of the respondents in this study.

Implications—Despite being a positive experience most audits stopped short of implementing change. Care must be taken to complete the audit cycle if audit at the primary-secondary care interface is to move beyond the roles of education and professional development and to fulfil its potential in improving the quality of care.

(Quality in Health Care 1996;5:193–200)
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Introduction

Health care in the United Kingdom National Health Service (NHS) is clearly divided into primary and secondary care and there is only a limited amount of face to face contact between healthcare professionals from the two sectors. In contrast, patients often cross backwards and forwards across the interface between the two sectors. Certain elements of the structure, process, and outcome of care that patients receive become more prominent as patients move backwards and forwards. At its best, movement between the sectors will be totally seamless with the care of a patient totally coordinated as they move from their own home, through primary care services into secondary care and back again. At its worst, care at the interface may suffer from problems such as inadequate sharing of relevant information about patients, and unplanned discharge from or readmission to secondary care. The process of care for clinical conditions for which patients require referral, the referral process itself, and communication across the primary-secondary care interface will all have the potential to affect the quality of the care that patients receive. For that reason they form legitimate topics for audit. Box 1 summarises the components of primary and secondary care and of the interface between the two sectors.

Although there is no clear consensus, there are three important facets to the definition of interface audit as given in box 1. Firstly, in common with other types of audit, it is deemed to have successfully occurred only if all stages within the audit cycle, including change and re-evaluation, have been completed. Secondly, there must be active involvement of both sides of the primary-secondary interface. One way audits of activity across the interface are specifically excluded; these can be more
Primary care is the health service sector providing most of the medical services at the first point of contact for the population; comprised of general practice and community services.
Secondary care is the health service sector based in hospitals; patients do not have direct access to secondary care; most patients are referred to secondary care by general practitioners.

The primary-secondary care interface is a concept rather than a physical structure; it is composed of the multiple potential points of contact between the two sectors (there is only a limited amount of face to face contact between healthcare professionals from the two sectors; by contrast, patients often cross backwards and forwards across the interface between the two sectors as a result of referral to, and discharge from, secondary care.

Audit of the primary-secondary care interface has been defined as "complete audit cycles conducted by professionals from both primary and secondary care working together as a team to improve quality."3

Judgmental than useful2 and are limited in their effectiveness as changes identified by one side for the other are unlikely to be implemented.

Finally, audit should seek to improve quality of care rather than being primarily an educational experience.

There are several potential benefits of successful audit activities across the primary-secondary care interface. Although the main aim is an improvement in the quality of patient care there may be additional benefits. Collaborating in an audit will bring together groups of healthcare professionals who might not otherwise meet, thus providing the potential for interchange on a broader range of topics and for improved communication and understanding between the two sectors of the health service. However, Baker,1 in his analysis of interface audit, is not optimistic about current practice and suggests that, although one way audit and quality assessment projects are commonplace, bonafide interface audits are rare. Case reports of interface audit suggest that they encounter difficulties with issues such as defining common aims, multidisciplinary membership, controlling group size, and meeting deadlines.7 However, there seems to be little systematically gathered data on audit activity across the primary-secondary care interface.

Our study therefore aimed to explore audit activity across the interface between primary and secondary care in England and Wales. The objectives were (within a survey by a national postal questionnaire that used both closed and open questions): to document the focus of current audit activity across the primary-secondary care interface; to explore participants' experiences of undertaking such audit; to identify factors associated with these experiences; and to gather views on possible future audit activities and the means by which such audits could be fostered.

Methods

A three phase national postal questionnaire survey was initiated in mid-1993 with a cascade sampling approach, in which respondents to each round of the survey generated the sampling frame for the subsequent round. In each phase a single reminder (including a duplicate questionnaire) was sent to non-responders after three weeks. Box 2 shows the phases of the survey.

The first questionnaire was posted in June 1993. It asked for brief details of complete or ongoing interface audits and the names and addresses of appropriate contacts. It was sent to groups and individual people identified through previous networking, as well as the chairpeople of Medical Audit Advisory Groups and Medical Audit Committees, medical audit facilitators, directors of public health, academic departments of general practice, regional advisers in general practice, faculty secretaries of the Royal College of General Practitioners, and general managers of Family Health Services Authorities. The responses were used to generate the list of recipients for second phase questionnaires.

The second questionnaire was sent out in October 1993. It gathered details about the audit topic and the structure and organisation of the audit group (box 3). Respondents were asked to supply the names and addresses of all their interface audit group members. All those thus identified were sent the third questionnaire in January 1994. This gathered information about individual group members, their opinions of participating in an interface audit and their views on subsequent interface audit activity (box 4). In two questions (4,5) respondents were asked to answer on a five point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). Six open ended questions (8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14) examined: the lessons learnt from participating in an interface audit; the impact of working with people known previously; suggested topics for future audits; and the factors which would facilitate and encourage interface audits.

Box 1 Information about the primary-secondary care interface.

Box 2 Summary of the survey by postal questionnaire.
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Audit in the future. These responses were read, common themes were identified, and codes were developed and applied.

To examine whether subjective experiences of interface audit were related to characteristics of the audit itself and of the group, factual data from the second questionnaire and information on experiences from the third questionnaire were combined. We considered three specific areas:

- Who initiated the audit: this was examined as we anticipated that collaboratively initiated audits, with input from both primary and secondary care, would be more successful.1,2

- Duration of meetings: lack of time for audit is often offered as a reason for not participating in audit activity,17 so we tested whether duration of meetings was associated with views of success.

- Group size and composition: this has often been seen as crucial to the way in which an audit group operates and has been a reason for highlighting the importance of having a skilled small group leader.3 Scott and Marinker4 see groups that are too small as limiting creativity and allowing strong personalities to dominate whereas too large a group leads to erosion of cohesion. They suggest that eight is the optimum number. Larger groups may not operate as well as smaller groups.5 Large groups may also lead to practical difficulties — for example, in arranging meetings. Although it will be possible to conduct interface audits within a small group, interface groups are more likely than non-interface groups to be large and we wanted to explore the consequences both of this and the effect of previously knowing other group members.

The data were analysed with the statistical package for social sciences.18 The χ² test was used to test the significance of associations. When a linear trend in percentage agreement was expected — for example, for group size and duration of meeting — the Mantel-Haenszel χ² was used.19

Results

RESPONSE RATES AND RESPONDENTS

Box 2 shows that the first questionnaire was sent to 715 contacts and generated 466 replies (response rate 65%). These produced 848 contacts for the second questionnaire from whom 401 questionnaires were returned (response rate 47%). However, 17 were unusable and a further 99 did not fit our definition of interface audit, leaving a usable sample size of 285. One hundred and seventy five of the 285 valid responses to the second questionnaire provided contact details for their group members; this gave 556 names for the third questionnaire. From these we obtained 251 replies (response rate 45%) reporting on 125 audits. The median response rate per reported audit was 47% (the number of respondents ranged from zero to five). In both the second and third questionnaires non-response rates varied from question to question. Therefore, when the number of respondents to a given question was less than that for the corresponding questionnaire as a whole, the appropriate denominator is given in the text and tables.

Of the respondents to the third questionnaire 119 (47%) were based in primary care, 116 (46%) were from secondary care, 10 (4%) were from public health, and six (2%) came from other sectors or were in posts spanning sectors. Most respondents were doctors (139 of 251 (55%)); 78 (31%) responses came from principal general practitioners and 61 (24%) from hospital doctors, with the Medical Audit Committee and staff of the Medical Audit Advisory Group each making up about 9%. There were very few hospital nurses or midwives (4 (1.6%), or practice or community nursing staff (10 (4.0%)); only one reply was received from a practice manager (0.4%).

AREAS COVERED BY THE AUDIT (QUESTIONNAIRE QUESTION 2)

Table 1 shows the areas covered by the audits. When allowance was made for audits covering more than one area, 155/276 (56%) contained some element of management of patients or disease. Ninety two (33%) of the audits were within a single area; 74 (27%) within two; 53 (19%) within three; and 57 (21%) covered four or more topic areas.

---
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The data were analysed with the statistical package for social sciences.18 The χ² test was used to test the significance of associations. When a linear trend in percentage agreement was expected — for example, for group size and duration of meeting — the Mantel-Haenszel χ² was used.19

### Results

**Response Rates and Respondents**

Box 2 shows that the first questionnaire was sent to 715 contacts and generated 466 replies (response rate 65%). These produced 848 contacts for the second questionnaire from whom 401 questionnaires were returned (response rate 47%). However, 17 were unusable and a further 99 did not fit our definition of interface audit, leaving a usable sample size of 285. One hundred and seventy five of the 285 valid responses to the second questionnaire provided contact details for their group members; this gave 556 names for the third questionnaire. From these we obtained 251 replies (response rate 45%) reporting on 125 audits. The median response rate per reported audit was 47% (the number of respondents ranged from zero to five). In both the second and third questionnaires non-response rates varied from question to question. Therefore, when the number of respondents to a given question was less than that for the corresponding questionnaire as a whole, the appropriate denominator is given in the text and tables.

Of the respondents to the third questionnaire 119 (47%) were based in primary care, 116 (46%) were from secondary care, 10 (4%) were from public health, and six (2%) came from other sectors or were in posts spanning sectors. Most respondents were doctors (139 of 251 (55%)); 78 (31%) responses came from principal general practitioners and 61 (24%) from hospital doctors, with the Medical Audit Committee and staff of the Medical Audit Advisory Group each making up about 9%. There were very few hospital nurses or midwives (4 (1.6%), or practice or community nursing staff (10 (4.0%)); only one reply was received from a practice manager (0.4%).

### Areas Covered by the Audit (Questionnaire Question 2)

Table 1 shows the areas covered by the audits. When allowance was made for audits covering more than one area, 155/276 (56%) contained some element of management of patients or disease. Ninety two (33%) of the audits were within a single area; 74 (27%) within two; 53 (19%) within three; and 57 (21%) covered four or more topic areas.
INITIATION OF THE AUDIT (QUESTIONNAIRE 2; QUESTIONS 3, 9, 10)
In the question asking about the trigger for initiating the audit, it was possible to endorse more than one response, therefore the percentages total more than 100%. Most audits had more than one trigger. For 170/277 (61%) respondents a “perceived problem” was at least part of the reason for undertaking audit; for 160 (58%) the topic was of “mutual interest” but only 26 (9%) respondents endorsed economic reasons as a trigger. Only 51/281 (18%) audits were initiated collaboratively, with primary care initiating 111 (40%) and secondary care initiating 92 (33%). Management or other groups were responsible for initiation in 27 (10%) cases. Most initiators of audits were doctors (178/247 (72%)); the only other sizeable category of staff initiating audits was audit support personnel (41 (17%).

COMPOSITION OF AUDIT GROUPS (QUESTIONNAIRE 2; QUESTIONS 5, 6, 8)
Most audits (178/283 (63%)) involved collaborative groups set up specifically to conduct the audit with Medical Audit Advisory Groups involved in 148 (52%) audits and Medical Audit Committees involved in 92 (33%). Most groups (160/274 (58%)) had between three and eight members. Although groups of two were rare (14 (5%)), groups of nine to 11 (37 (14%)) and 12 or more (63 (23%) were not uncommon. Table 2 shows the representation of healthcare professions within interface audit groups. As with initiation, doctors dominated. The next largest groups were primary and secondary audit support staff. The total number of disciplines per audit ranged from two to 19. Eighty five (30%) audits had an equal number of primary and secondary specialties.

INVolVEMENT IN TASKS WITHIN THE AUDIT (QUESTIONNAIRE 2; QUESTIONS 6, 7, 13, 15, 17)
We asked about task allocation: who was involved in setting guidelines (table 2), data

Table 1. Areas covered by interface audits (n=276) (questionnaire 2; question 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Audits n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of patient or disease only</td>
<td>40 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral only</td>
<td>10 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge only</td>
<td>11 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications only</td>
<td>14 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of secondary resources only</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One other only</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of patient or disease + any one of the other categories</td>
<td>115 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations of two or more categories</td>
<td>69 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Representation of healthcare professions within interface audit groups: overall, in setting guidelines, and in data collection (questionnaire 2; questions 6, 13, and 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthcare profession</th>
<th>Overall representation (n=285)</th>
<th>Setting guidelines (n=158)</th>
<th>Data collection (n=252)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary care:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital doctor</td>
<td>257(90)</td>
<td>131(83)</td>
<td>61(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital nurse or midwife</td>
<td>79(28)</td>
<td>33(21)</td>
<td>24(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital manager</td>
<td>43(15)</td>
<td>14(9)</td>
<td>6(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allied to medicine</td>
<td>77(27)</td>
<td>47(30)</td>
<td>17(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit support staff</td>
<td>167(59)</td>
<td>35(22)</td>
<td>105(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>63(22)</td>
<td>30(19)</td>
<td>42(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary care:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal general practitioner</td>
<td>262(92)</td>
<td>129(82)</td>
<td>96(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice nurse</td>
<td>52(18)</td>
<td>21(13)</td>
<td>27(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community nurse or midwife</td>
<td>58(20)</td>
<td>15(10)</td>
<td>16(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice manager or receptionist</td>
<td>48(17)</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
<td>58(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community professions allied to medicine</td>
<td>40(14)</td>
<td>25(16)</td>
<td>7(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit support staff</td>
<td>116(41)</td>
<td>29(18)</td>
<td>69(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>72(25)</td>
<td>26(17)</td>
<td>31(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages do not add up to 100 because of representation of multiple professions in groups and activities.

collection (table 2), and data analysis. We also asked who had input into the audit without being a group member. Although the setting of guidelines was dominated by doctors, the largest share of data collection (by percentage of audits) was undertaken by audit support staff in secondary care (105/252 (42%) audits). In 20/38 (53%) audits involving primary care receptionists, they took part in data collection only and were not reported to be members of the audit group; the corresponding figure for practice managers was 17/47 (36%). Data analysis was dominated by secondary (92/207 (44%)) and primary (64/207 (31%)) care audit support staff.

DURATION OF MEETINGS (QUESTIONNAIRE 2; QUESTION 22)
For 125/260 (48%) groups the average duration of meetings was less than one hour; for 74 (29%) meetings generally lasted 60 to 90 minutes, and for the remaining 61 (24%) the average meeting took over 90 minutes.

PROGRESS ROUND THE AUDIT CYCLE
(QUESTIONNAIRE 2; QUESTIONS 4, 18)
Table 3 shows that the questionnaire set out nine steps of the audit cycle and how many of these steps were completed by audits that were reportedly complete, in progress, or incomplete. Of completed audits, almost all had collected and analysed data relating to practice after standards had been set or agreed. Three quarters had suggested changes, but only two fifths had implemented change and only a quarter had evaluated change.

EXPERIENCES OF INTERFACE AUDIT
(QUESTIONNAIRE 3; QUESTIONS 4, 5.)
Table 4 shows that there were widespread feelings of successful group working. Table 5 shows the experiences of interface audit, and although none of the statements show unanimity, most reflect a positive view (for those statements phrased negatively low percentage responses indicate positive views). Only one quarter to one third of respondents did not agree with the three statements: “meetings provided clinicians from both primary and secondary care with the opportunity to discuss areas of common concern”; “group members enjoyed meeting colleagues, especially those from another discipline”; and “meetings stimulated learning”. However, 94/248 (38%) did not agree with the statement “meetings led to closer working relations between primary and secondary care”. Infrastructure barriers were also identified — in particular, problems with incompatible computer systems.

FACTORS INFLUENCING VIEWS OF INTERFACE AUDIT

Duration of meetings (questionnaire 2; question 2, questionnaire 3; questions 4, 5)
Overall 90% of respondents thought that the “task of the group was well understood”. The longer the meeting, the greater the agreement with this statement: 65/68 (96%) in groups whose meetings lasted over 90 minutes; 86/93 (93%) in groups with meetings of 60 to 90 minutes’ duration; and 73/87 (84%) in groups whose meetings lasted less than 60 minutes (χ² for trend 6.23, P = 0.01). Duration of the meetings was also significantly associated with positive responses about high levels of participation; 57/67 (85%) respondents from groups with the longest meetings agreed, compared with 71/93 (76%) from groups with medium duration meetings, and 61/87 (70%) of those whose meetings lasted less than one hour (χ² for trend 4.65, P = 0.03). Similarly, the longer the meeting the greater the opportunity for discussion of topics of common concern. Of respondents from groups whose meetings lasted more than 90 minutes 60/69 (87%) were in agreement with the statement “meetings provided clinicians from both primary and secondary care with the opportunity to discuss areas of common concern”, compared with 74/90 (82%) from groups whose meetings lasted 60 to 90 minutes and 58/84 (69%) from groups with meetings of less than one hour’s duration (χ² for trend 7.58, P = 0.006). However, it seems possible that some groups’ meetings may have been protracted by discussion of issues about confidentiality of data. Only 6/83 (7%) respondents from groups with short meetings agreed that “confidentiality of...
Table 4 Respondents positively endorsing statements about experience of interface audit
group work (questionnaire 3; question 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree and strongly agree (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The task of the group was well understood</td>
<td>225/250 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The task of the group was accepted by its members</td>
<td>225/250 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions reflected a consensus of group opinion</td>
<td>208/247 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every idea was given a hearing</td>
<td>201/248 (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group enjoyed the experience of working together</td>
<td>199/248 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any disagreements were effectively resolved</td>
<td>184/237 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a high level of participation</td>
<td>190/249 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were few disagreements in the group</td>
<td>177/248 (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group took no longer than necessary to complete its tasks</td>
<td>154/246 (63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Respondents positively endorsing statements about experiences of working across the interface (questionnaire 3; question 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Agree and strongly agree (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings provided clinicians from both primary and secondary care with the opportunity to discuss areas of common concern</td>
<td>193/245 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group members enjoyed meeting colleagues, especially those from another discipline</td>
<td>184/238 (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings stimulated learning</td>
<td>173/250 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group provided a forum for discussion relating to aspects of care other than the audit topic</td>
<td>162/244 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The computer systems between primary and secondary care were not compatible</td>
<td>79/127 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings led to closer working relations between primary and secondary care</td>
<td>154/248 (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of possible topics for another interface audit were discussed</td>
<td>132/231 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical distance between group members created problems</td>
<td>56/240 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was difficult to establish common goals between the different parties to the audit</td>
<td>46/247 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality of data between primary and secondary care was an issue</td>
<td>32/239 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was disagreement over who should be responsible for funding the audit</td>
<td>23/201 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding somewhere neutral for the meeting was a problem</td>
<td>23/231 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding who should be responsible for data collection was a problem</td>
<td>21/242 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was disagreement about the ownership of the data</td>
<td>20/244 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying which party should be responsible for the analysis was a problem</td>
<td>20/238 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

data between primary and secondary care was an issue”, compared with 13/87 (15%) from medium length meetings, and 13/67 (19%) from the longest meetings ($\chi^2$ for trend 4.80, $P = 0.03$).

Initiation of audits (questionnaire 2, question 9, questionnaire 3, questions 4, 5)
Joint initiation of an audit seemed to facilitate greater understanding of the group task; 48/49 (98%) respondents from audits initiated collaboratively were in agreement with the statement “the task of the group was well understood”. The corresponding figures for audits initiated by secondary and primary carers were 66/72 (92%) and 98/111 (88%), respectively, whereas only 11/16 (69%) in other solely initiated audits agreed ($\chi^2$ 11.97, $P = 0.007$). Audits initiated solely by someone outside the primary or secondary care sectors were more likely to experience problems with confidentiality of data (6/16 (38%)); the corresponding figures for audits initiated by primary carers, secondary carers, and collaboratively were 12/108 (11%), 8/68 (12%), and 6/45 (13%), respectively ($\chi^2$ 8.60, $P = 0.04$).

Group size and composition (questionnaire 2; question 8, questionnaire 3; questions 4, 5, 10, 11)
Not surprisingly, the larger the group the greater the opportunity for primary and secondary care specialists to discuss matters of common concern. Of the people from groups of nine or more 68/101 (87%) responded positively to the statement “meetings provided clinicians from both primary and secondary care with the opportunity to discuss areas of common concern”, as opposed to 61/77 (79%) from groups of six to eight, and 44/67 (66%) from groups of two to five ($\chi^2$ for trend 10.81, $P=0.001$). Group size also influenced the likelihood of disagreement within the group although there was no significant linear trend. Of people in groups of two to five 57/69 (83%) thought that there had been few disagreements versus 51/78 (65%) in groups of six to eight, and 69/101 (68%) in groups of nine or more ($\chi^2$ 6.09, $P = 0.05$).

In the third questionnaire respondents were also asked to indicate whether they had known other members of the group before the audit. Of the respondents 226/250 (90%) had previous knowledge of at least one other group member. Of these, 214/226 (95%) thought that this was helpful to the way the group worked. One hundred and ninety seven respondents gave reasons for their answers, with some mentioning more than one reason. Previous knowledge of other group members was said to lead to good working relations (57 (29%)), efficiency (50 (25%)), shared understanding (49 (25%)), and trust (47 (24%)).

LESSONS LEARNT FOR THE FUTURE OF INTERFACE AUDIT (QUESTIONNAIRE 3; QUESTIONS 6; 7, 8, 9)
In an open ended question respondents were asked to state the main lessons learnt from their experience; 203 (81%) questionnaires contained responses to this question. The issues identified were the importance of setting clear objectives (54 (27%)); the importance of primary-secondary communication (40 (20%)); the importance of primary-secondary understanding (32 (16%)); the need for adequate resources (26 (13%)); and the importance of multidisciplinary working (24 (12%)). When asked, in a further open ended question, what they would do differently in a future interface audit, 54/159 (34%) said they would not do anything differently. However, 50 (48%) of the 105 who would make some changes said that they would ensure that objectives were more clearly specified, 25 (24%) would make organisational changes, and 24 (23%) would aim to improve communications. In response to the question “If you had known what the experience of interface audit would be like before this audit would you still have participated?” 235/251 (94%) said that they would. Of all respondents 242/251 (96%) stated that they would participate in another interface audit in the future.

FUTURE INTERFACE AUDIT ACTIVITIES (QUESTIONNAIRE 3; QUESTIONS 13, 14, 15)
Five topics dominated as favourites for future interface audit: referrals and admissions (45/179 (25%)); management of chronic diseases (44 (25%)); discharge procedures (30 (17%)); communications (20 (11%)); and the management of various specific conditions (20...
(11%). These represent the areas in which primary and secondary care are most likely to meet, and reflect current interface audit activities (table 1). In answer to open ended questions about factors which would facilitate future interface activity and factors which would encourage interface audit activity to take place in the future, the most common responses were commitment, money, time, and improved communication (table 6).

**Discussion**

We have produced a detailed picture of aspects of the structure and process of a sample of audit activity across the primary-secondary care interface in England and Wales. Because it involves bringing together people who might not usually meet and who come from different sectors of the health service, interface audit could potentially have problems with either the structure or process of the audits. However, for the respondents in this study this did not seem to be the case. In general, respondents were positive about their experiences of interface audit, would still have participated even with the benefit of hindsight, and would take part in another interface audit. This suggests that any difficulties encountered do not deter participants unduly. Another marker of success is the extent of improved collaboration between primary and secondary care. Although some did not think that interface audit led to closer working relations between primary and secondary care, fewer reported problems such as data confidentiality or difficulty establishing common goals. This suggests that those cultural differences that produce barriers between primary and secondary care can be successfully overcome within the process of interface audit.

Although it is possible to draw out several messages for those undertaking or considering interface audit, it is necessary to be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of this study in two particular areas: the sampling approach and the representativeness of respondents. The main strength of the cascade sampling approach that we used is in providing an appropriate sampling frame when no other explicit list of appropriate people exists. We did not have, and still do not know of, any comprehensive register of interface audits that we could have used; this made the cascade approach the only choice. However, with this technique it is difficult accurately to target questionnaires and therefore usable response rates are lower than in an orthodox postal questionnaire survey. The problem of targeting is shown by the fact that of the audit groups identified by respondents to the first questionnaire and subsequently surveyed in round two, a quarter were not interface audits according to our definition and others were only at a planning stage and could not therefore be expected to provide us with any information on group structure and process. Also, we cannot know what proportion of all interface audits our 285 responses to round two represent. Moreover, responses to each phase of the survey may not be representative of all interface audits. It is possible that those audits that regarded themselves as successful were more likely to respond (although non-response bias may occur no matter what sampling strategy is adopted); it is therefore possible that our findings may represent an optimistic view of interface audit. Indeed, the generally positive views elicited by this survey contrast with the more negative experiences reported elsewhere. However, the respondents were not unanimous in their endorsement of interface audit. In particular their experiences were significantly associated, as anticipated, with aspects of the group structure and process. By their nature interface audit groups tend to be larger than small group theory suggests is optimal but among the respondents to this survey this did not seem to cause problems. Increasing group size was positively associated with discussion of matters of common concern although it was also associated with more disagreement. Although we did not enquire about group leadership, these results would support the importance of skilled small group leadership in such groups.

Lack of time is often given as a reason for not being involved in audit and doctors view audit as time consuming. Our findings suggest that longer meetings are beneficial in fostering good understanding and allowing for interchange of ideas; this suggests that protected time for audit meetings may be necessary if audit of this kind is to achieve its full potential. Sufficient time was one of the factors identified by respondents as likely to facilitate further interface audits.

With the initiation of the audits coming equally from primary and secondary care, collaboration between the sectors seems to be taking place. The same is not necessarily true at an interdisciplinary level; the audits that we identified were numerically dominated by doctors. Without a more detailed knowledge of each audit it is difficult to set this in perspective but it does suggest the scope for greater involvement of other healthcare professionals. This could be seen as a general message and not specific to interface audit; none the less is more likely to be an issue at the primary-secondary care interface as there are more disciplines that are potential stakeholders and that could therefore have a legitimate input into the audit process.

---

**Table 6: Main factors facilitating future interface audit and encouraging more interface audit (questionnaire 3; questions 14 and 15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Respondents n/total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating future interface audit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment and enthusiasm</td>
<td>52/208 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>50/208 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>44/208 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear purpose</td>
<td>43/208 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower</td>
<td>36/208 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved communications</td>
<td>31/208 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common objectives</td>
<td>26/208 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging more interface audit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>57/210 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved communications</td>
<td>44/210 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of benefit</td>
<td>43/210 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>41/210 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower</td>
<td>20/210 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents could endorse more than one factor; therefore the total is greater than 100%.
Those who provide an input to the audit process but are not full members of the group are likely to be disenfranchised. This lack of involvement is a potential barrier to implementing any changes suggested and thus to improving the quality of care, the ultimate aim of any audit activity. The importance of multidisciplinary involvement in interface audits is also acknowledged by the report of the United Kingdom Regional Clinical Audit Coordinators. (Audit at the interface. Internal working party report to the regional audit coordinators, 1995.)

The findings on progress around the audit cycle are complex to interpret. The 22% of completed audits that had gone through all the steps of the audit cycle, including reauditing, clearly had the potential to use audit to improve quality of care. Similarly, just over a quarter of incomplete audits had got as far as implementing change. However, almost two thirds of audit groups that reported their work as complete had stopped short of implementing change. It has been suggested that failure to "close the audit loop" means that audit is rendered nearly useless and a waste of time and money. Authors have decried the failure of audit to get as far as the remedial action of suggesting and implementing change.11,14 Our findings measure, and endorse, for interface audit what Baker1 and others have said about this failure. The amount of money already spent on audit has been questioned on the grounds of lack of evidence of effectiveness.15

The ultimate criteria of success of audit has to be improved quality of care. Although our findings show it to be an enjoyable educational exercise with the potential to improve communication and professional development, to move interface audit beyond this future initiatives must emphasise the importance of completing the audit cycle.

None the less, we conclude that interface audit is occurring, is enjoyable, and has the scope to improve the quality of care. But with most audits stopping short of implementing change, the activity seems currently to be limited in its achievement of this goal. If interface audit is to be effective in improving the quality of care, barriers to implementing and evaluating change must be identified, and strategies developed to overcome these barriers.

We are grateful to Allen Hutchinson for the initiation of the interface audit project and to the Northern Regional Health Authority for funding it. We thank the project steering group of Mr R Attard, Dr G Bradshaw, Dr C Davidson, Dr W Ennis, Dr A Hendricks, and Dr J Woodhouse. We also thank Sylvia Hudson for secretarial support in conducting the survey and Zoe Clapp for her input into the second phase of the survey.

Culture of safety

Congratulations to Singer et al for the comprehensive survey of safety culture performed in 15 hospitals. The overall response rate of only 47.4% was largely due to the poor response by physicians (13%). Efforts need to be undertaken to raise the response rate to achieve a more reliable result. Most of the participants in the survey responded in ways which indicated a culture of safety. However, it would be interesting to determine the safety culture in hospitals which do not belong to the “hospitals participating in the California Patient Safety Consortium” group. It is noted that higher responses are attributable to shorter survey questions. People are generally not interested if they have to go through a large format. Clinicians, as expected, were more critical about the patient care safety and thus scored more “problematic responses”. The survey sample noted that a total of 6312 eligible individuals participated. That figure is actually 6332 individuals (initial mailing list of 6909 names minus 347 duplicates minus 227 undeliverable = 6332). The high percentage of non-respondents (an overall figure of 53%) may possibly still lead to non-response bias. A survey of the non-responders would be interesting.

Senior managers gave fewer problematic responses than frontline workers. Generally speaking, all senior managers will want to give a high opinion of their own organization/institution. In addition, they may not have been briefed about the patient care problems.

Using the High Reliability Organization (HRO) standard cut off point of 10% problematic attitudes, the results of an overall problematic response of 13% is worrying. Generally it can be assumed that we still need to improve and to internalize the culture of safety in healthcare settings among all levels of healthcare workers. A culture of safety should be instilled into all healthcare workers from their undergraduate student days if it is to be internalized within ourselves. Stevens emphasizes that “improving health and health care begins with the focus on improving medical education”.

Davidoff raises another important point when he states that “Bringing issues of quality and safety out of the shadows can remove some of the sting associated with improvement”. Who can doubt that the real agenda in the controversy currently raging over mandatory mortality reporting errors is the fear of being ashamed? The results of this study also support this—problematic responses were higher for questions that were phrased as hypothetical or impersonal and lower for questions that were personal or time delimited. It would be interesting to adapt and conduct a similar survey on the culture of safety in our own healthcare institutions and to compare the findings using the results obtained by Singer et al as a baseline measure.

N K S Vengadasalam
Medical Hospital Sg, Malaysia;
Dr_neel@hotmail.com
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We welcome Singer and colleague’s contribution to developing the concept of a safety culture. Policy makers, managers, and clinicians are slowly realising that patient safety will not be improved solely by counting adverse events or by introducing technical innovations. Singer et al. highlight that when these initiatives are evaluated, the results will probably show a marginal impact on patient safety and one that is likely to be poorly sustained. In order to maximise their impact we need to understand the shared attitudes, beliefs, values, and assumptions that underlie how people perceive and act upon safety issues within their organisations. This is what is commonly called the “safety culture” of an organisation.

The problem with the approach adopted in this paper is that it fails to get to the heart of the hospital’s culture. What they have done is to use a blunt survey instrument to assess the opinions of individual members of staff to a series of statements about safety. The responses represent the most superficial evaluation of the “climate” of the organisations in which they work. These opinions are likely to be influenced by a wide range of factors that have little to do with the organisation’s culture. Furthermore, the relationship between these opinions and the shared values that underlie them is largely unknown.

If we really want to understand the safety culture of an organisation, we need to use more sophisticated approaches. These should draw on a wide range of methods—participant observation, in-depth and semi-structured interviews and focus groups, together with attitudinal surveys and the use of new and established culture measurement tools. Developmental or action research approaches might provide additional insights into the complexity of the organisations. The aim should be not only to understand and assess the concept of safety culture, but also to examine ways of improving it and integrating it with the broader field of organisational culture. This presents a significant challenge to health service researchers. Singer and colleagues have made a start, but there is a long way to go before we know how—or, indeed, whether—it is possible to change the safety culture of our hospitals and primary care centres.

M Marshall, D Parker, A Esmail, S Kirk, T Claridge
Institute for Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester M3 9PL, UK; martin.marshall@man.ac.uk
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Quantifying Quality in Primary Care


It is always helpful to have a checklist for any task, whether it is for simply preparing to go on an overseas trip or something as complex as ensuring a high quality service for patients in primary care. It is even better if someone as experienced as Peter Graves has compiled one for you, which can be the basis of your own tailor-made solution.

Clinical governance lies at the heart of this book, but many sources are used to inform its content such as NHS (GMS) regulations, Health and Safety at Work laws, and the GMC’s views on Good Medical Practice. The main areas that are addressed are “The Patient’s Experience”, “Patient Management and Treatment”, and “Practice Management”, and if all three are right then the aim of good patient care and outcomes will be achieved. The charts and scoring system are consistent and very sensible. The layout is clear and the questions are realistic, with a range of scores possible that will help practices understand their current position and enable them to plan for improvement.

Few will take the whole content on board but, as a basis for assessing even just a few areas where weakness is perceived, the order and common sense brought to the process will be rewarding.

D Empey
Rapid Response Unit, National Clinical Governance Support Team, NHS Modernisation Agency; duncan.empey@barstabitshelthondon.nhs.uk

Getting Health Economics into Practice


It was with a somewhat heavy heart that I accepted the challenge to write a review of an economics book. Although I knew the editor wrote well, a book on economics was not at the top of my reading list. It would do me some good, I thought. In the end it wasn’t a challenge—I read the book in two weeks, enjoying the punchy, well written text, and—yes—it did me good. But unlike many self-betterment schemes, it was painless.

What stood out were the clear aims at the start of the book and the introductions to each section and to most chapters. Sometimes this
can be laboured (tell them what you’re going to say, say it, and then tell them what you said). On this occasion it felt as if it was worked in a coherent manner, and aided me to understand better the text and where the following chapter fitted in with the big scheme of economic things.

For much of the book I was introduced to new ideas that helped me think about how health care could work. Sometimes, though, the book gave words to issues that are often discussed in the “hurly burly” of health care (the “swamp lands”, as David Kernick puts it). For instance, the concepts of moral hazard (where someone doesn’t have to pay for a service) and principal agent (where someone carries out a task on behalf of others) were particularly helpful. Chapters on well worn issues like the transfer of activity to primary care and skill mix also breathed new life into an old chestnut by stopping properly thinking about.

Criticism? Very few. The book is too focused on primary care. Although it is relevant to the whole of health care, the examples belie the editor’s roots which might wrongly limit its appeal to other readers. Astonishingly, I found some of the chapters too brief. I cannot decide whether this was a fault of the book or whether it has whetted my appetite to look further. Although the book was laid out, sometimes the connections between the chapters were not clear and they were lumpy together in a section that might more appropriately be considered miscellaneous. But this is nit picking. Inevitably in a multi-authored book there was repetition, but even this was generally helpful to an ignorant reader like myself, especially because—where it occurred—it was thankless.

In their instructions QSHC asks book reviewers not to end with the well worn phrase “this should be on the shelves of every departmental library”. I agree. For many this book will be of little interest and, for accountants, there should be a health warning because of the unflattering comparison made with economists on page 7 (a cause of much celebration with economically minded colleagues for whom Dr Kernick is a new celebration with economically minded. But this is nit picking. Inevitably in a multi-authored book there was repetition, but even this was generally helpful to an ignorant reader like myself, especially because—where it occurred—it was thankless.

In their instructions QSHC asks book reviewers not to end with the well worn phrase “this should be on the shelves of every departmental library”. I agree. For many this book will be of little interest and, for accountants, there should be a health warning because of the unflattering comparison made with economists on page 7 (a cause of much celebration with economically minded colleagues for whom Dr Kernick is a new hero). But I finish with an alternative cliche—“this should be required reading for everybody” making healthcare resource decisions at (primary and acute) trust, health authority and department levels.

T Wilson
Strategy Unit, Department of Health. London, UK; tim.wilson@dh.gov.uk

An A-Z of Management for Healthcare Professionals

There is a view that good management boils down to good common sense and that management books and courses just make the obvious explicit. It has also been noted that the trouble with common sense is that it is not all that common. Perhaps if it was we would not need management books and courses. At one end of the spectrum management books, particularly the more theoretical, can provide a turgid read or, like this one at the other, are full of practical tips. This book is entertaining and well written in plain English with a light hearted style. It is interactive with quotes and exercises. It is intuitive rather than systematic, well sprinkled with witty insights, and it is certainly not academic, comprehensive, or even evidence based.

Roy Lilley has done many things in his working life and, of these, his spell as Chairman of an NHS trust was the one he found most difficult to get to grips with. He well understands that healthcare management are not the only box on the shelves of every manager. For example, A is for Assertive, I is for Leadership, and S is for So outside the box. The alphabet format does make the text a bit stilted. For some letters there is a lot of text while, for others, the author seems to have run out of things to say. Between each letter there is a page with a single quote, most of which are about leadership such as “there are no office hours for leaders”—attributed to Cardinal Gibbons. The approach taken is very general, in some places to the point of vagueness and blandness. Curiously, there is virtually nothing very specific about healthcare itself, despite the title; the NHS is mentioned once or twice only, and it would have been helpful to have had more on healthcare management as there is a lot of specific material that is unique to the dilemmas involved in managing a healthcare system. Some topics are dealt with in a superficial way. For example, I for Judgement has only one page and basically just says that judgement is the opposite of prejudice, so “don’t be prejudiced” seems to be the message. The section on L for Leadership is good, probably the best bit of the book, and the section on Difficult People and How to Deal with Them is useful and insightful.

This is an enjoyable and entertaining read, with some important messages and absolutely no jargon or “management speak”. There is also plenty of empty space in the book, maybe to scribble your own notes. I recommend it.

D Mitchell
Chest and Allergy Clinic, St Mary’s Hospital, London W2 1NY, UK; david.mitchell@stmarys.nhs.uk

Using the Internet in Healthcare. 2nd Edition

The internet is an integral part of our health care system. This book will not replace the IT support staff or the hands-on computing course, but it will inform clinicians and administrators who want to gain confidence about using internet technologies in daily practice.

Stuart Tyrrell seeks to educate us about the internet. He provides overviews about what the internet is and how internet technologies such as intranets, e-mail, and the world wide web work using clear language and explanation. He demystifies web page design and addresses current issues such as the security and quality of online health information. Mike Ingham also authors a chapter outlining the role of the intranet as an organisational communications medium using an NHS case study.

The chapter entitled “Searching and Sifting” provides an excellent introduction for beginners searching the world wide web for health and non-health related information. Like most of this book, it is easy to read and will allay the fears of the most ardent technophobes. However, it lacks a discussion of health portals and will not meet the needs of clinicians or students wishing to undertake systematic literature reviews.

Although this is a useful addition to the Harnessing Health Information Series, it is limited by its technological viewpoint. There is sparse discussion of the applications of internet technologies to improve healthcare delivery and services. For example, the concepts of e-commerce and SMS messaging in healthcare are introduced without reference to some pharmacies or the use of text messaging to improve medication compliance. There is little mention of telemedicine, online support groups, e-books, e-health promotion, e-prescribing or online clinical trials and research. Thus, it may fail to inspire those clinicians and administrators seeking ways to improve access or efficiency of healthcare delivery in their own practices.

Stuart Tyrrell provides a short but limited discussion about the future implications of e-health technologies for the NHS, consumers, and healthcare providers. He mentions the potential e-health issues such as the globalisation of health care but does not elaborate on the potential effects on policies, costs, and outcomes. There is also no mention of guidelines for the exchange of clinical information between clinicians and consumers, or the opportunity for shared clinical decision making and outcome monitoring.

In summary, if this book was a red wine I would describe it as “medium colour; well balanced with integrated fruit and oak; good weight and structure; overall soft and approachable; drink now”. However, those readers seeking a more complex vintage will have to wait for the 3rd edition.

T L Bessell
Monash Institute of Health Services Research, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3168, Australia; tracey.bessell@imined.monash.edu.au

CORRECTION

In the paper entitled “A national survey of audit activity across the primary-secondary care interface” by M Eccles, M Deverill, E McColl, and P Richardson which was published in Quality in Health Care in 1996, the number of audits in column 1 of table 3 headed “Audit complete” should be 117, not 177.