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Aim

- To measure the effect of a hospital lecture series given by GPs, with the topics related to General Practice, on resident medical officers’ opinions on General Practice as a career
Methods

- **The Intervention**
  - 12 lectures given by 4 different GPs at 9 Queensland hospitals to attending resident medical officers (Feb-Aug 2010)

- **Lecture titles**
  - The Evolving Relationship between General Practice and the Hospitals (4)
  - Sexually Transmitted Infections (1)
  - Dementia (3)
  - Fits Faints and Funny Turns (1)
  - Removing the White Coat from Treating Hypertension in General Practice (1)
  - Men’s Health (1)
  - Chronic Kidney Disease (1)
Methods

- Phase 1
  - After the lecture the resident medical officers were asked to complete a 1 page questionnaire
- Phase 1 questionnaire background information:
  - AMG/IMG
  - Gender
  - Year of graduation
  - Intended career path
Methods

- Intended career path
  - Started specialty training
  - Started GP training
  - Applied for specialty training
  - Applied for GP training
  - Considering one specialty
  - Considering multiple specialties
  - Considering GP
  - Considering GP and specialties
  - Not considering GP or specialty
Methods

- Phase 1 Questionnaire Outcomes
  1) Are GP lectures relevant to their training needs?
  2) Are more GP presentations wanted?
  3) Has their opinion about General Practice changed?
  4) Has their interest in PGPPP increased?
  5) Has their interest in GP as a career increased?
  6) Has their confidence in pursuing GP as a career increased?
Methods

- Phase 2 Questionnaires were given to CSQTC GP training candidates immediately after their interviews August-September 2010
- Phase 2 Questionnaire background information:
  - Year of graduation
  - AMG/IMG
  - Gender
  - Hospitals where worked in last 2 years
  - Attendance at GP lecture series
Methods

Phase 2 questionnaire outcomes

- Should GPs give clinical presentations on topics related to General Practice?
- Did lecture attendance motivate/make no difference/act as disincentive to GP training application?
- Did lecture attendance motivate/make no difference to enquiry about or doing a PGPPP term?
Methods

- Statistical analysis
  - Fisher’s exact test was calculated for phase 1 outcome data
Results Phase 1

- 195 questionnaires completed
- Response rate = 66%
- 15 exclusions
  - 13 medical students
  - 2 allied health professionals
Are GP presentations relevant to your training needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which specialty being considered</th>
<th>GP education not relevant to training</th>
<th>GP education relevant to training</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP alone</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>21 (95%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + other</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>17 (94%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other alone</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
<td>51 (85%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination other</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>27 (90%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GP or specialty</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>33 (94%)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16 (9%)</td>
<td>158 (91%)</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.75 (Fisher’s exact)
Are GP presentations relevant to your training needs?

- Yes
- No

Category: GP alone, GP + other, Other alone, Combination other, No GP or specialty, DNA

Graph showing the distribution of responses.
Would you like more presentations relating to General Practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which specialty being considered</th>
<th>No more GP education desired</th>
<th>More GP education desired</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP alone</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>20 (91%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + other</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
<td>15 (83%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other alone</td>
<td>21 (36%)</td>
<td>38 (64%)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination other</td>
<td>7 (24%)</td>
<td>22 (76%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GP or specialty</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>28 (82%)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41 (24%)</td>
<td>130 (76%)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p = 0.15$ (Fisher’s exact)
Would you like more presentations relating to General Practice?
Has the presentation changed your opinion of General Practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which specialty being considered</th>
<th>Opinion of general practice not changed</th>
<th>Opinion of general practice changed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP alone</td>
<td>15 (71%)</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + other</td>
<td>12 (71%)</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other alone</td>
<td>40 (68%)</td>
<td>19 (32%)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination other</td>
<td>21 (72%)</td>
<td>8 (28%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GP or specialty</td>
<td>18 (51%)</td>
<td>17 (49%)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>109 (64%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>61 (36%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.166 (Fisher’s exact)
Has the presentation changed your opinion of General Practice?

- GP alone:
  - No: 70%
  - Yes: 30%

- GP + other:
  - No: 70%
  - Yes: 30%

- Other alone:
  - No: 60%
  - Yes: 40%

- Combination other:
  - No: 80%
  - Yes: 20%

- No GP or specialty:
  - No: 50%
  - Yes: 50%

- DNA:
  - No: 40%
  - Yes: 60%
Has the presentation increased your interest in PGPPP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which specialty being considered</th>
<th>No increased interest in PGPPP</th>
<th>Increased interest in PGPPP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP alone</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>15 (68%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + other</td>
<td>7 (39%)</td>
<td>11 (61%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other alone</td>
<td>43 (70%)</td>
<td>18 (30%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination other</td>
<td>16 (53%)</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GP or specialty</td>
<td>18 (51%)</td>
<td>17 (49%)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95 (54%)</td>
<td>80 (46%)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.02 (Fisher’s exact)
Has the presentation increased your interest in PGPPP?
Has the presentation increased your interest in General Practice as a career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which specialty being considered</th>
<th>No increased interest in General practice</th>
<th>Increased interest in General practice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP alone</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>16 (73%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + other</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>13 (76%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other alone</td>
<td>44 (72%)</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination other</td>
<td>23 (77%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GP or specialty</td>
<td>20 (54%)</td>
<td>17 (46%)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101 (58%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>74 (42%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.001 (Fisher’s exact)
Has the presentation increased your interest in General Practice as a career?

- GP alone
- GP + other
- Other alone
- Combination other
- No GP or specialty
- DNA

Yes
No
Has the presentation increased your confidence in pursuing General Practice as a career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which specialty being considered</th>
<th>No increased confidence in General practice career</th>
<th>Increased confidence in General practice career</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP alone</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>18 (82%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP + other</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>14 (78%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other alone</td>
<td>45 (74%)</td>
<td>16 (26%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination other</td>
<td>21 (75%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GP or specialty</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95 (56%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>76 (44%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.001 Fisher’s exact
Has the presentation increased your confidence in pursuing general practice as a career?

Yes

No
Has today’s presentation reduced your interest in GP as a career?

- 4 (2.2%) Yes
  - All talks given by me
  - 3/4 attended “The evolving relationship between GP and the hospitals”
    - 2/3 RBWH
    - 1/3 Redland
  - 1/4 attended “Sexually Transmitted Infections“
    - Mater Hospital
  - Comment - already attended too many lectures on STIs!
Phase 2 results

- Response rate 97%
- No exclusions
- 31 (28%) of 112 attended at least 1 lecture
- 12 of 31 attended multiple lectures
Should GPs present at RMO meetings?

- Yes: 107
- No: 2
- DNA: 3

N = 112
Influence of lectures on decision to choose GP as a career

Motivated
No difference
Disincentive

N=31

Questions

Number

Yes
No
DNA

Motivated
No difference
Disincentive

4
8
2

1
1
2

26
22
27

2
2
2

N=31
Influence of lectures on doing or enquiring about PGPPP

![Bar chart showing the influence of lectures on PGPPP.

- **Motivated**: 18 responses
- **No difference**: 17 responses

Total responses: 35

N=18

Questions

- Yes
- No
Conclusions

- Phase 1 results demonstrate RMOs:
  - Believe GPs presentations are relevant to their learning needs (91%)
  - Would like more GP clinical presentations (76%)
Conclusions

- Phase 1 results demonstrate presentations to RMOs *considering GP* (alone or in combination with specialties):
  - Increased their interest in PGPPP in 60-70%
  - Increased their interest in GP as a career in 70-80%
  - Increased their confidence in pursuing GP as a career in 80%
Conclusions

- Phase 1 results demonstrate presentations to RMOs who had *not chosen a particular career path*:
  - Increased their interest in PGPPP in 49%
  - Increased their interest in GP as a career in 46%
  - Increased their confidence in pursuing GP as a career in 50%
Conclusions

- Phase 1 results demonstrate presentations to RMOs who were considering specialties (single or multiple):
  - Increased their interest in PGPPP in 30-50%
  - Increased their interest in GP as a career in 20-30%
  - Increased their confidence in pursuing GP as a career in 25%
Conclusions

- Phase 2 results demonstrate that 96% of GP training candidates believed that GPs should present at RMO meetings.
- Phase 2 results demonstrate that the presentations to GP training candidates (CSQTC)
  - Motivated them to apply for GP training in 84%
  - Motivated them to do or enquire about PG PPP in 100%
Conclusions

- GP clinical lectures are an effective means of marketing GP career to RMOs
- Acceptability to RMOs