

Special issue with *Education for Health*

REVIEW ARTICLE

The impact of medical students on rural general practitioner perceptrors

LS Walters¹, PS Worley¹, D Prideaux¹, H Rolfe², C Keaney¹

¹Flinders University, South Australia, Australia.

²Griffith University Gold Coast campus, Centre for Medicine & Oral Health, Southport, Queensland, Australia

Submitted: 18 November 2004; **Resubmitted:** 25 April 2005; **Published:** 11 November 2005

Walters LS, Worley PS, Prideaux D, Rolfe H, Keaney C

The impact of medical students on rural general practitioner perceptrors

Rural and Remote Health 5: 403. (Online), 2005

Available from: <http://rrh.deakin.edu.au>

ABSTRACT

Introduction: As universities rely more heavily on rural GPs to precept medical students, the formation of symbiotic partnerships benefiting students, universities and GPs, becomes imperative. In order to develop and consolidate these partnerships Universities must understand who their rural GP preceptors are and how precepting impacts on them.

Methods: A review of the literature was undertaken to determine the significant themes of student impacts from articles where conclusions were clearly based on empirical findings.

Results: Forty-three articles were included in the final review, but only nine specifically looked at impacts on rural GPs. Impacts were categorised into six domains: personal; time; patient care; professional relationships and professional development; business and infrastructure; and recognition and remuneration.

Conclusions: Literature specifically addressing the impact of precepting on rural GPs is scarce. Further studies are required to evaluate the relationship between the quality of teaching delivered to students, the type and length of student attachments and the likely impacts on rural GPs.

Key words: general practitioner, impact, medical student, precepting, rural, teaching.



Introduction

As universities become more dependent on rural GPs for the delivery of significant amounts of their medical student clinical supervision, they must engage these doctors in mutually rewarding, sustainable partnerships. These partnerships need to be based on an explicit understanding of the rural GPs' motivation for precepting and perceptions of rewards, and the impacts that occur as a result of medical student attachments. In Australia there is increasing involvement of rural GPs in teaching and precepting as a result of the government's targeted programs. It is even more important to engage these practitioners in meaningful partnerships as their involvement has evolved more recently than that of their city-based colleagues. For the purposes of this article, a preceptor is defined as a GP responsible for precepting; that is the instruction, mentorship, supervision and assessment of a medical student's clinical performance within the clinical setting.

This study examines the literature of student impacts on GPs through initially summarizing the effects of student teaching on all GPs then, and more specifically, examining the effects of teaching on rural GPs and their practices.

Methods

The Medline, Ovid and ERIC e-databases were searched for original empirical and descriptive articles. Search terms included:

1. medical student or undergraduate or graduate entry or medical teaching and
2. doctor or practitioner or clinician or physician or preceptor or mentor and
3. general practice or family medicine or primary care or ambulatory setting or community setting.

Because the nature of general practice has changed over time, only articles from 1984 to May 2004 were considered.

Any articles involving the impact of medical students on doctors, which did not involve supervision in a clinical setting, were excluded. Articles voicing individual opinions of impacts on GPs, even if considered 'expert', were excluded. This resulted in the exclusion of program descriptions where authors' references to impacts on GPs were not clearly based on empirical findings using quantitative or qualitative research methods.

The search was further broadened to include all articles fitting the above criteria found either through related articles in PubMed or in the reference list of the remaining articles or in accessible non-MEDLINE listed Australian rural health publications.

Results

In total 43 articles studying preceptors in Australia, UK and USA were included in the final review, nine of which studied solely rural GPs (Appendix I¹⁻⁹), nine studied a mix of both urban and rural preceptors (Appendix II¹⁰⁻¹⁸), and the remaining 25 were solely urban (Appendix III¹⁹⁻⁴³). Of the articles found, four were literature reviews and 39 were original research articles or reports. Fourteen of these articles related to GP preceptors generally and 29 related to preceptors involved in specified types of student attachments or specific medical school programs. Only 16 articles clearly defined the length and nature of student clinical attachments with which GPs were involved.

Six main categories of impacts on the GPs were defined: personal; time; patient care; professional relationships and professional development; practice business and infrastructure; and recognition and remuneration. Each of these is discussed in the following section of this paper.

Personal

The proportion of doctors who reported increased enjoyment when precepting was always high^{6,7,44}. In studies that asked



doctors to think of impacts for themselves there was a reoccurring theme that enjoyment increased while supervising medical students^{1,6}.

Sources of enjoyment were less explicitly defined in the rural literature² compared with urban-based studies (Table 1). However, rural GPs were less likely to think that precepting students increased their overall stress level when compared with their urban colleagues¹⁰ (Table 1). Some components of teaching may mitigate stress³⁶. Active preceptors saw teaching as aiding in their own learning and development and described staying current with medical literature²⁵.

Both rural and urban GPs consistently report time pressure when supervising medical students^{8,38}. Despite exceptionally heavy workloads more than 75% of rural GP preceptors reported spending an average of two additional hours at work on each full day of precepting¹². This is somewhat greater than was found in the studies which were not specifically rural^{15,35}. Several themes related to work time have been described across all studies. These are set out (Fig 1).

Some studies have attempted to measure changes in the length of patient consultations rather than estimations of the length of GPs' days. These studies have shown wide variation in results; with a continuum from time saved to time lost¹⁷. Time and motion studies measuring changes in consulting activities show that overall the frequency ranking of physician activities did not alter with the presence of a student, however doctors spent less time examining patients¹³. Similar findings are described in one Australian rural study⁹.

Patient care

GPs almost universally stated that patient care remained their primary responsibility, and that this was compatible with precepting students⁴⁶. Rural and urban studies concluded that a majority of preceptors feel that precepting improved the quality of their clinical practice³¹. Themes explored in the

non-rural literature are summarised (Fig 2). No rural-specific data were found.

Professional relationships and professional development

Some GPs preceptors have described becoming more aware of the role of others in the practice team²⁷. Key preceptors have described increased interaction with medical schools⁴⁰ and increased identification with peers who also saw themselves as teachers³⁹. This reduced professional isolation of rural practitioners⁶ and resulted in professional pride in relation to their role as a preceptor. Some GPs reported an increase in patients' perceptions of their status²⁵. A small group of GPs described increased recognition in the community as an appropriate reward for teaching students²⁷. Many preceptors described wanting to train the next generation and to be seen by the students as role models. They described a desire to pay back the profession²¹. No data were available regarding rural GPs specifically.

Practice business and infrastructure

Having space to accommodate students was a significant issue for many rural practices⁸ particularly as many practices are already reported to be overcrowded²⁰. In an Australian study 55% of practices had a room available for students to consult on an ongoing basis and 26% on an intermittent basis¹². There was also concern regarding lack of access to study facilities, important reading material, and internet access for student learning³².

Reasons given by rural GPs for teaching included the promotion of rural practice with the aim to recruit future partners to the practice. University involvement in rural practices has improved recruitment outcomes in rural South Australia⁴⁷. Recruitment assistance has been valued highest after direct financial and material supports¹⁴.



Table 1: Evidence regarding sources of enjoyment from precepting

Evidence regarding sources of enjoyment from precepting		
	Rural evidence	General evidence
Personal sources -Increased enjoyment in practice -Sense of increased value in their work	No evidence ²	Refs: 10,11,15,18,21,22,24,25,31,40,41,44,45, Refs: 20, 34
Seeing students positive responses -Motivation and enthusiasm -Skill development		Refs: 27, 30, 41
Evidence regarding undesirable affective impact from precepting		
Work stress	Ref: 10	Ref: 10
Problematic interactions with students -Conflicting cultures -Poor student-preceptor match -Giving student feedback -Managing the occasional problem student		Ref: 10, 27
Problematic interactions with programs -Practical difficulties -Administrative duties		Ref: 27
Problematic interactions with program personnel -Negative feedback		Ref: 27

Work time themes defined in general literature

Conflicting time pressures resulting in changes in learning culture

- a lack of observation of learners,
- an absence of probing of student knowledge and
- a failure of learners to share learning experiences with their peers

Private physicians protect productivity in favour of increased work hours

Solo practitioners more likely to report extra time

GPs have differing adaptive behaviours to time pressures

GPs show poor ability to accurately recollect time taken

Refs: 4,15,16,18,23,28,33,35,37,42,43.

Figure 1: Work time themes defined in general literature.



Patient care themes defined in not specifically rural literature

Common themes regarding students

- did not make patients feel uncomfortable
- did not interfere with the doctor–patient relationship
- preceptors gained new insights into the lives of their patients
- patients gave positive feedback about their interaction with a student.
- patient selection for students based on the anticipated effect on the doctor-patient relationship

Refs: 10,31,37,40,41.

Infrequent themes

- teaching might have an adverse effect on patient care
- students interfere with the doctor–relationship patient
- patients may become overexposed to students
- poor patient satisfaction is a small but significant risk which GP preceptors work to avoid

Refs: 10,20,24,25,31,41.

Figure 2: Patient care themes defined in not specifically rural literature.

Productivity themes defined in general literature

- reduction in number of patients seen is due to students disrupting patient flow
- reduction in patient numbers is highly sensitive to the placement duration
- many GPs still reported they believed they did not have enough time to spend with the student
- private practitioners protect their productivity by increasing their work hours

Refs: 10,12,15,16,19,23,26,29,32,35,41.

Figure 3: Productivity themes defined in general literature.

The GP teachers' contact with keen students increased not only their morale, but also the morale of the whole practice. This may be due to the increase in teamwork, which is beneficial to the practice²⁷. Most rural primary care physicians report that the presence of a medical student did not result in an increase in staff time¹⁶.

Accommodating time needed to teach diminished the number of patients seen per clinic session¹⁹. Most rural and urban GPs described a reduction of 6-10 patients per day or

1-2 patients per hour¹². Further exploration of productivity is found in mainly urban-based studies (Fig 3).

There was a small but significant group of rural preceptors who described no reduction⁴ or an increased productivity when supervising medical students¹⁷.

Recognition and remuneration

Approximately half rural preceptors believed student attachments had a negative effect on their income³, and 40%



agreed that precepting students increased practice costs. Physicians in rural private practice found this cost prohibitive and were significantly less likely to agree to precepting a student¹⁰. This was more likely where practices were responsible for student accommodation and learning resource costs.

In an Australian study, the majority of rural GP preceptors agreed that there should be financial remuneration for precepting medical students in their private practices¹². Significant numbers of GPs who have been paid have argued that they received inadequate remuneration^{5,24}. In the past, preceptors have stated that lack of funds would not change their commitment to teaching³². However, more recently increasing pressures from clinical responsibilities have begun to change this³⁹. Other authors have found that 'dollars alone were not helpful'¹⁴ and recognition by the University of the work that rural GPs were doing under difficult circumstances was just as important¹.

Discussion

Where rural and urban studies focused on impacts affecting GP preceptors generally, few articles clearly defined the length and nature of student clinical attachments. In articles defining impacts to preceptors involved in specified types of student attachment or specific medical school programs there was limited discussion regarding whether findings were generalizable. Many studies have argued that the positive impacts of precepting far outweigh the negative impacts, however the risk of under-reporting of negative impacts has been described previously²⁷.

Only nine empirical studies addressed the impact of medical students on rural GPs specifically. All but one of these studies were Australian, where the majority of studies from the total group of studies were from USA. Personal factors, including satisfaction in teaching, and increased interest in clinical medicine, are the main drivers for the majority of rural preceptors. There is some evidence that enjoyment can be secured with positive feedback from students and

increased confidence in teaching and student assessment. Threats to this enjoyment jeopardise retention of rural GP preceptors and considerable program support is needed where negative experiences occur.

Rural GPs consistently report the single most significant pressure when supervising medical students is time management. It is likely that time impacts will differ, depending on how actively the learner participates in patient care, how the appointment system is adapted to manage the presence of students, whether the rotation is block or longitudinal, the point in the student attachment and how time impacts are measured. More research is needed to unravel these variables. Many authors have failed to make explicit the actual involvement of the preceptor in the medical student program, making comparisons among studies difficult.

The length of longitudinal attachment may affect the impacts on rural GPs. This confounding factor has not been evaluated in assessing differences between rural and urban contexts. One hypothetical model suggests that students became less of a time burden to their supervising doctors in prolonged attachments⁹: however, this model was extrapolated from two data sets only. Further studies of the effect of prolonged student attachments are required.

In considering professional impacts, further research is needed to define the characteristics of the small group of preceptors who express concerns that teaching might have an adverse effect on their patient care, and validate or challenge their concerns. Most supervisory relationships have a defacto power relationship between the supervisor and the trainee. Individual social position, particularly race, gender, social class and sexuality, also confer relative power. The possibility that demographic relationships between rural GPs and students could change the teaching context, and thereby alter the impacts on the supervisor, has not been evaluated.

If universities are expected to compensate for business impacts, including infrastructure requirements and reported decreased productivity through direct financial payments,



current and future teaching may prove to be unsustainable. There are a group of rural practices where these business challenges have reportedly been overcome through adopting various consulting and teaching blends; however, it is not known if this has been at the expense of student learning. Further studies are required into different curricular structures which may minimize negative impacts and measure these against student feedback and performance. Recruitment through mentoring, although reported as an important motivator, is a primary motivator for only a minority of GPs, usually practice principals, who perhaps see student supervision from a more strategic perspective.

Conclusions

There is a paucity of literature specific to rural GPs in this field. However, from the wider literature, we have categorized the impact of precepting students into personal, professional, and business domains. Personal factors, including satisfaction in teaching, and increased interest in clinical medicine, are the main drivers for the majority of rural preceptors. Both rural and urban GPs consistently report the single most significant pressure when supervising medical students is time management. There seem to be some differences in time impacts between rural and urban studies, but country of origin of the studies and length of attachment are obvious confounding factors. Most rural GPs feel precepting does not negatively impact on professional factors, including patient care. Further studies need to evaluate the differences between these GPs and the small percentage of GPs who have concerns regarding quality of patient care. Business factors including decrease productivity; and clinic space pressures significantly impact on the capacity of some rural practices to precept students.

As universities become more dependent on GPs to deliver significant amounts of medical student clinical supervision, they must develop an explicit understanding of the impacts on rural GPs. Given the emerging acknowledgement of the differences between rural and urban practice, rural-specific studies are required. Furthermore, these studies should

evaluate the relationship between the quality of teaching delivered, with the type and length of student attachments, and the likely impacts on rural GPs. As the trend towards longitudinal attachments continues, the impact of these specifically needs investigation.

References

1. Ampt A, Bloomfield L, Sutherland D. *Medical School Rural Education an evaluation and development project. Project of National Significance - Commonwealth Rural Undergraduate Support and Coordination (RUSC) Program*. Townsville: James Cook University, 2004.
2. Baker P, Dalton L, Walker J. Rural General Practitioner Preceptors - How can Effective Undergraduate Teaching be Supported or Improved?. *Rural and Remote Health* 3: 107. (Online) 2003. Available: <http://rrh.deakin.edu.au> (Accessed 9 August 2005).
3. Barritt A, Silagy C, Worley P, Watts R, Marley J, Gill D. Attitudes of rural general practitioners towards undergraduate medical student attachments. *Australian Family Physician* 1997; **26**: S87-S90.
4. Fields SA, Toffler WI, Bledsoe NM. Impact of the presence of a third-year medical student on gross charges and patient volumes in 22 rural community practices. *Academic Medicine* 1994; **69**: S87-89.
5. Mahnken J. *Clinical Placements in Victoria: Issues affecting co-ordination in nursing and medical education*. Rowville, Victoria: Victorian Universities Rural Health Consortium, 2002.
6. Oswald N. *Parallel Rural Community Curriculum (PRCC) Final Evaluation report*. Flinders University of South Australia. School of Medicine, South Australia, 2002.
7. Walker-Jeffreys M. *Rural Week Preceptor Feedback Report*. Whyalla Norrie, SA: Spencer Gulf Rural Health School, 2003.



8. Walters L, Worley P, Mugford B. The parallel rural community curriculum: is it a transferable model? *Rural and Remote Health* 3: 236. (Online) 2003. Available: <http://rrh.deakin.edu.au> (Accessed 9 August 2005).
9. Worley P, Kitto PA. Hypothetical Model of the Financial Impact of Student Attachment on Rural General Practice. *Rural and Remote Health* 1: 83. (Online) 2001. Available: <http://rrh.deakin.edu.au> (Accessed 9 August 2005).
10. Baldor R, Brooks W, Warfield M, O'Shea K. A survey of primary care physicians' perception and needs regarding the precepting of medical students in their offices. *Medical Education* 2001; **35**: 714-715.
11. Chambers R, Campbell I. Anxiety and depression in general practitioners: associations with type of practice, fundholding, gender and other personal characteristics. *Family Practice* 1996; **13**: 170-173.
12. Department Of Health and Aged Care. *Establishment of a profile of undergraduate medical student placements and teaching practices*. Final Report. Melbourne, VIC: Monash University, KPMG, Flinders University, 1999.
13. Frank S, Stange K, Langa D, Workings M. Direct observation of community-based ambulatory encounters involving medical students. *JAMA* 1997; **278**: 712-721.
14. Langlois J. Support of Community Preceptors: What do they need? *Education Research and Methods* 1995; **27**: 641-645.
15. Levy B, Gjerde C, Albrecht L. The effects of precepting on and the support desired by community-based preceptors in Iowa. *Academic Medicine* 1997; **75**: 382-384.
16. Vinson D, Paden C. The effect of teaching medical students on private practitioners' workloads. *Academic Medicine* 1994; **69**: 237-238.
17. Vinson D, Paden C, Devera-Sales A. Impact of medical student teaching on family physicians' use of time. *Journal of Family Practice* 1996; **42**: 243-249.
18. Vinson D, Paden C, Devera-Sales A, Marshall B, Waters E. Teaching medical students in community-based practices: a national survey of generalist physicians. *Journal Family Practice* 1997; **45**: 482-484.
19. Ferenchick GS, Chamberlain J, Alguire P. Community-based teaching: defining the added value for students and preceptors. *The American Journal of Medicine* 2002; **112**: 512-517.
20. Fine B, Seabrook M. GPs attitudes towards increased medical education in the community. *Education for General Practice* 1996; **7**: 42-47.
21. Foley R, Yonke A, Smith J, Roe B, Vance J. Recruiting and retaining volunteer community preceptors. *Academic Medicine* 1996; **71**: 460-463.
22. Fulkerson P, Wang-Cheng R. Community-based faculty: motivation and rewards. *Educational Research and Methods* 1997; **29**: 105-107.
23. Garg M, Boero J, Christiansen R, Booher C. Primary care teaching physicians' losses of productivity and revenue at three ambulatory-care centres. *Academic Medicine* 1991; **66**: 348-353.
24. Gray J, Fine B. General Practitioner teaching in the community: a study of their teaching experience and interest in undergraduate teaching in the future. *British Journal of General Practice* 1997; **47**: 623-626.
25. Grayson Ms, Klein M, Lugo J, Visintainer P. Benefits and costs to community-based physicians teaching primary care to medical students. *Journal of Internal Medicine* 1998; **13**: 485-488.
26. Heath J, Beatty P. Does teaching medical students in the office affect the way physicians complete patient-encounter forms? *Academic Medicine* 1998; **73**: 439-441.



27. Howe A. Teaching in practice: a qualitative factor analysis of community-based learning. *Medical Education* 2000; **34**: 762-768.
28. Irby DM. Teaching and learning in ambulatory care settings: A thematic review of the literature. *Academic Medicine* 1995; **70**: 898-931.
29. Kearl G, Mainous A. Physicians' productivity and teaching responsibilities. *Academic Medicine* 1993; **68**: 166-167.
30. Kilminster SM, Jolly BC. Effective supervision in clinical practice settings: a literature review. *Medical Education* 2000; **34**: 827-840.
31. Kirz H, Larsen C. Costs and benefits of medical student training to a health maintenance organization. *JAMA* 1986; **256**: 734-739.
32. Kollisch DO, Frasier PY, Slatt L, Storaasli M. Community preceptors' views of a required third-year family medicine clerkship. *Archives of Family Medicine* 1997; **6**: 25-28.
33. McKee MD, Steiner-Grossman P, Burton W, Mulvihill M. Quality of student learning and preceptor productivity in urban community health centres. *Family Medicine* 1998; **30**: 108-112.
34. Murray E, Jolly B, Modell M. Can students learn clinical method in general practice? A randomised crossover trial based on objective structured clinical examinations. *BMJ* 1997; **315**: 920-923.
35. Ricer R, Van Horne A, Filak A. Costs of preceptors' time spent teaching during a third-year family medicine outpatient rotation. *Academic Medicine* 1997; **72**: 547-551.
36. Rutter H, Herzberg J, Paice E. Stress in doctors and dentists who teach. *Medical Education* 2002; **36**: 543-549.
37. Simon SR, Davis D, Peters A, Skeff K, Fletcher R. How do precepting physicians select patients for teaching medical students in the ambulatory care setting? *Journal of Internal Medicine* 2003; **18**: 730-735.
38. Slatt L, Egelhoff C, Sloane P. Why do preceptors teach? *Family Medicine* 1984; **16**: 189-190.
39. Starr S, Ferguson W, Haley H, Quirk M. Community preceptors' views of their identities as teachers. *Academic Medicine* 2003; **78**: 820-825.
40. Ullian J, Shore W, First L. What did we learn about the impact on community-based faculty? Recommendations for recruitment, retention and rewards. *Academic Medicine* 2001; **76**: 78-85.
41. Usatine R, Hodgson C, Marshall E, Whitman D, Slavin S, Wilkes M. Reactions of family medicine community preceptors to teaching medical students. *Family Medicine* 1995; **27**: 566-570.
42. Usatine R, Nguyen K, Randall J, Irby DM. Four exemplary preceptors' strategies for efficient teaching in managed care settings. *Academic Medicine* 1997; **72**: 766-769.
43. Walter L, Zweig S, Hosokawa M. A process evaluation of a required primary care clerkship. *Family Medicine* 1991; **23**: 547-548.
44. Shorey J, Epstein A, Moore G. The clinical-teacher in managed care settings. *Managed Care* 1997; **12**: S98-S103.
45. Wang-Cheng R, Fulkerson P, Barnas G, Lawrence S. Effect of student and preceptor gender on clinical grades in an ambulatory care clerkship. *Academic Medicine* 1995; **70**: 324-326.
46. Mann K, Holmes D, Hayes V, Burge F, Viscount P. Community family medicine teachers' perceptions of their teaching role. *Medical Education* 2001; **35**: 278-285.
47. Wilkinson D, Laven G, Pratt N, Beilby J. Impact of undergraduate and postgraduate rural training, and medical school entry criteria on rural practice among Australian general practitioners: national study of 2414 doctors. *Medical Education* 2003; **37**: 809-814.



Appendix I

Author	Location	Preceptor demographics	Student year level	Length of attachment	Teaching involvement	Methods	Results
Ampt ¹	Australia	rural GPs	all levels	variable, defined < 6 weeks	key preceptors	Questionnaire and SSI	Themes included: willingness, enjoyment, time pressure, recognition, communication, payment, community services involvement.
Baker ²	Tasmania, Australia	rural GPs	Year 6 of 6	3 weeks	all in single program	Questionnaire - 5 point Likert scale and open questions	Preceptors felt their teaching role had not been well defined, and did not know how their teaching fitted into the curriculum; however, they believed they understood what students needed to learn. Student feedback showed rural preceptors performed well overall but considerable range of scores.
Barritt et al. ³	South Australia	rural GPs	all levels	variable, defined < 6 weeks	precepted in 1996	3 point Likert scale	Relative perceived effect on GP family and social life, CME, PD, and level of enjoyment.
Fields et al. ⁴	Oregon USA	22 rural practices	Year 3 of 4	≥15 days over 6 weeks	key preceptors, single program	Billing and patient numbers	No sig. difference in billing or patients seen with or without student. Some physicians reported extending their days in order to interact with students.
Mahnken ⁵	Victoria, Australia	rural nursing and medical student supervisors	not specified	unspecified	unspecified	SSI	PIP not enough to be an incentive to teach
Oswald ⁶	South Australia, Australia	4 GP preceptors	Year 3 of 4	40 week 2 students per practice	2 clinical sessions per week, plus full-time supervision.	unstructured interviews	Confidence generated among rural preceptors improves their morale, in turn increasing the support for rural programs.
Walker-Jeffreys ⁷	Australia	rural GPs	Year 1 & 2 of 4	1 week	undefined	Likert scale	Most highly ranked statement related to enjoyment of precepting role.
Walters et al. ⁸	Australia	rural GPs	Year 3 of 4	40 weeks	2 clinical sessions per week, plus full-time supervision.	reflective diary	GP preceptor concerns, initial student results. Described initial GP anxiety and early adopters' satisfaction following success.
Worley & Kitto ⁹	Australia	rural GPs	Year 3 of 4	40 weeks	2 clinical sessions per week, plus full-time supervision	Time-and-motion observations plus log books	Student and practitioner logbooks showed mean length of consultation by a GP was 14.4 min without a student and 9.5 min with a student. Reduced proportion of time spent taking a history, discussion with patient or family, reviewing patient records and doing patient specific paper work.



Appendix II

Author	Country	Preceptor demographics	Student year level	Length of attachment	Teaching involvement	Methods	Results
Baldor et al. ¹⁰	New England, USA	community based physicians; 21% rural	all levels	unspecified median = 2 months/yr	50% any and 50% none	5 point Likert scale, 12 statements Ranked order	Comparison of responses between some demographic groups.
Chambers & Campbell ¹¹	UK	620 GP principals in Staffordshire; % rural not specified	all levels	unspecified	any or none	Anxiety and Depression Scale	There was a significant association between high depression scores and working in a non-training practice.
Dept of Health and Aged Care Report ¹²	Australia	580 practices urban and rural	all levels	defined number of days/ year precepting	primary supervisor in clinic	GP Questionnaire	Practice profile 30% had 4-6 GPs; only 16% >7GPs. Half of all practices only placed 1 or 2 students. Consistently positive attitude to reimbursement, regardless of cost reported. Support was very strong when practice management costs are incurred.
Frank et al. ¹³	Ohio, USA	16 Physicians in community-based primary care with 50 km radius of Cleveland	unspecified	unspecified	volunteer motivated preceptors of single program	Clinical Time Use, measured directly by the Davis Observational Code.	When a student was present there was no time difference but the content of the consultation changed: > time discussing visit expectations and other family member's problem; < time history taking, providing assessment and answering questions No less time spent examining the patient
Langlois ¹⁴	USA	147 community preceptors - rural and urban	Year 3 of 4	unspecified	single program: unspecified	questionnaire - 5 point Lickert scale	CME credit for teaching was the most valued. Other areas of financial and material support were also the most valued. Rural preceptors demonstrated significant differences in need ($p < .05$) for 13 types of support, and in all cases they indicated a higher value than their counterparts in suburban or urban locations.
Levy et al. ¹⁵	USA	139 community family physician preceptors	Year 3 of 4	3 weeks with plan to increase to 6 weeks 1:1 with preceptor	single program: unspecified, assumed fulltime	questionnaire	Neither the reported decrease in number of patients seen nor the reported reduction in practice income was associated with variations in preceptor demographics.
Vinson & Paden ¹⁶	USA	56 primary care physicians	Year 3 & 4 students	4 weeks	single program: unspecified, assumed fulltime	Questionnaires to physicians	Mean increased in time spent at work 46 minutes (SD 32.1) but 5 noted no change and 1 noted a decrease. No sig. relationship between the student's feedback and the physician's perception of amount of extra time spent
Vinson et al. ¹⁷	USA	22 non- and 12 academic family physicians 86% rural	Year 4 of 4	4 weeks plus 4 weeks	single program: unspecified, assumed fulltime	Time-and-motion observations	Private vs academic physicians worked 52 mins vs 0 mins longer with a student present for the day. Substantial shift for patient-centred to student-centred work.



Appendix II contd.

Vinson et al. ¹⁸	USA	Randomly selected AMA listed physicians. Response of office based teachers.	not specified	10 days	median of three medical students per year	postcard questionnaire, then with a 4 page questionnaire	30% respondents had taught clinical students. Teacher demograhpy-younger, male, in group practice. 60% perceived a lengthening of their work day by a median of 30 mins; 30% perceived a decrease in productivity.
-----------------------------	-----	---	---------------	---------	---	--	--

Appendix III

Author	Country	Preceptor demographics	Student year level	Length of attachment	Teaching involvement	Methods	Results
Ferenchick et al. ¹⁹	USA	Community-based teachers	unspecified	unspecified	any or none	Literature review to determine the impact of teaching on community-based teachers	<i>Affective Benefits:</i> satisfaction and pride in teaching. <i>Cognitive Benefits:</i> learning from teaching is an important reward and motivator. <i>Tangible Effects:</i> increase by average of 30 min per half day. Recruitment of partners among their learners.
Fine & Seabrook ²⁰	UK	17 inner city GPs. Spectrum of backgrounds.	all levels	unspecified	variable teaching experience	qualitative study based on in depth interviews	Themes: <i>Motivation for teaching:</i> enjoy working out how to impart knowledge, gave value to their work, enjoy the one-to-one relationship. <i>Concerns:</i> included lack of time and adverse effect on patient care. Desire for educational, organisational and emotional support.
Foley et al. ²¹	USA	103 community preceptors - metro Chicago	Year 1, 2 & 3	3 years	Yr 1, 1 session per month; Yr 2, 2/mth; Yr 3, 4/mth	Likert scores for 12 statements	ranked 12 statements relating to motivation to precept. Most agreement for statements relating to contribute to the development of young professionals and give others some of what they had received from medicine.
Fulkerson and Wang-Cheng ²²	USA	74 current community physicians, urban	Year 3 of 4	1 month	7 half days a week	13-item Likert scale questionnaire	84% found the personal satisfaction of working with students was a motivating factor. The most common response to how their efforts could be best recognised was: clinical appointment. No preceptor directly suggested monetary compensation.
Garg et al. ²³	USA	urban community health centre faculty	Sophomores, juniors and seniors	30 months	2 half days per week	appointment logs.	no. patients seen compared with national average states from Am. MA data suggests productivity reduced by 30%–40% when teaching.



Appendix III contd

Gray & Fine ²⁴	UK	303 GP principals in Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham (London)	all levels	unspecified	any or none	Questionnaire	<i>Rewards:</i> mainly learning from their own teaching. Others: belonging to tutors' group; enhancing the doctor-patient relationship; gains in self-esteem and financial reward. <i>Problems:</i> lack of time; lack of space; lack of confidence; worried of adverse effect on patient care. Undergraduate GP teachers more in tune with intrinsic rewards.
Grayson et al. ²⁵	USA	185 urban community-based primary care physicians	Year 1 & 2 of 4	16 weeks	1 session per week	Questionnaire	82% > enjoyment of practicing medicine 6% > time reviewing clinical medicine basics 62% decrease no. of patients seen. 49% > desire to keep up to date with recent developments in medicine 44% increased patient perception of their status.
Heath & Beatty ²⁶	New York, USA	4 preceptors- unspecified	Year 3 of 4	unspecified	single program: unspecified	Examined patient encounter forms	no sig. difference between 5 most common billing codes or 5 most common diagnostic studies ordered.
Howe ²⁷	UK	15 urban general practitioners. New program.	Year 4	8 weeks	1-2 students 3 days a week	SSI	Impacts relate to preceptor, practice and student factors. Key facilitating and hindering factors grouped in relation to individual tutor, their practice, the students, and the input of the academic unit. <i>Positive Impacts to GPs:</i> feeling they help students develop; the practice teamwork increases <i>Negative Impacts to GPs:</i> increased time pressure.
Irby ²⁸	any	doctors in ambulatory care	not specified	unspecified	unspecified	Literature review: effective supervision	Keys to effective teaching included: 1) involving students in the learning process, 2) communicating expectations of student performance, 3) positive modelling of clinical skills
Kearl & Mainous ²⁹	USA	family practice faculty and 3rd year resident physicians - unspecified	Year 3 of 4	unspecified	single program: unspecified	Number of patients seen and average charges billed	No significant differences. Only 1.6 patients seen per hour.



Appendix III contd

Kilminster & Jolly ³⁰	any	doctors in clinical setting	not specified	unspecified	unspecified	Literature review: effective supervision	Quality of relationship between supervisor and trainee is probably the single most important factor for effective supervision. No adequate theoretical accounts of supervision in medicine. Behavioural changes can occur quickly, changes in attitude take longer. More effective when the student is less experienced. Has a positive effect on patient outcome.
Kirz & Larsen ³¹	USA	salaried, primary care and hospital doctors in a health cooperative - urban	not specified	unspecified	unspecified	estimate time used solely for teaching and patients seen per half day	Mean response for time used solely for teaching with no patient present was 46.8 min. Nurses estimated the time to be significantly more than the physicians. Objective measurements found a decrease in 1.1 patients per half day.
Kollisch et al. ³²	USA	33 private practice physicians: unspecified	Year 3 of 4	4 week rotation	4 days a week	questionnaire	<i>Positive outcomes:</i> a positive teaching experience; intellectual stimulation; patients pride; collegial relationships <i>Negative outcomes:</i> increased time management pressures; slowed down the practice; longer hours; <i>Concerns:</i> poor student-preceptor match; evaluating students; problem students; lack of resources for teaching; loss of revenue.
McKee et al. ³³	USA	21 ambulatory care clinical preceptors	not specified	6 weeks	single program: unspecified, assumed fulltime	Surveys completed by students and preceptors re teaching time and quality	Patients seen per hour did not differ when a student was present. min or less per teaching time. General conclusions: minimal time spent observing history and examination skills.
Murray et al. ³⁴	UK	20 practice-based urban GP tutors. 12 male, 8 female	Year 4 of 6	20 weeks per year	2 days a week; but only 1 consulting session	SSI in tutor's practice	Tutors identified the personal benefits of teaching as development of their own clinical skills and the stimulation of teaching.
Ricer et al. ³⁵	USA	26 different preceptor-student pairs- unspecified	Year 3 of 4	4 weeks	17 full day equivalents	preceptor and student actions timed and categorised	Teaching time categorised into 4 options: 1) seeing pts with student, 2) reviewing student findings, 3) teaching, 4) waiting. Average total amounts of time the preceptor spent with the student were 3.28 hours per day.



Appendix III contd

Rutter et al. ³⁶	any	doctors and dentists generally	not specified	undefined	undefined	Literature Review: relationships between a teaching role and stress	4 stressors most predictive of job dissatisfaction and stress were patient's expectations; interference with family life; constant interruptions and practice administration some evidence that teaching might mitigate stress.
Simon et al. ³⁷	USA	14 generalists and 5 paediatricians - urban	Year 3 & 4 students	21 months	1 afternoon per week	SSI	Competing needs of patient (dr-pt relationship), student (educational value) and practice (time and efficiency) the most important factors in selecting patients for teaching.
Slatt et al. ³⁸	USA	17 actively precepting physicians - unspecified	Year 3 or Year 4	4 weeks	single program: unspecified, assumed fulltime	SSI	<i>Advantages:</i> interaction with students, CME, make medical practice more enjoyable. <i>Disadvantages:</i> considerable extra time isolation from the department, loss of a stipend not viewed as a major problem.
Starr et al. ³⁹	USA	35 experienced preceptors - unspecified	any	undefined	undefined	focus groups systematic content analysis for evidence of themes	Factors contributing to a strong sense of teacher identity: 4 themes suggested in the social sciences literature for teacher identity where confirmed: 1) intrinsic satisfaction; 2) knowledge and skill; 3) external rewards; and 4) social supports. Three others were identified: (a) the integrated role of being a physician and teacher; (b) feeling a sense of responsibility to teach medicine; and (c) being a representative of their own discipline of primary care.
Ullian et al. ⁴⁰	USA	urban generalist preceptors, 48% family physicians	Years 1 and 2	over 2 years	at least 75 hours	surveys, discussions and AGMs & formal reports	<i>Desirable impacts:</i> 1) affective, eg. enjoying teaching; 2) cognitive, eg. own learning; 3) tangible eg. discount on CME. <i>Undesirable impacts:</i> 1) resource problems; 2) problematic interactions; 3) burdensome/ unnecessary administrative tasks. Length of day varied with student from no extra time to 30-45 min per half day of precepting. Conclusions discuss recommendations for program management.



Appendix III contd

Usatine et al. ⁴¹	USA	Urban: 25% female 49% in private practice 21% solo practice	1-2 first year medical students	4 visits over 4 months	visiting once a month	attitudinal survey consisting of 53 items. Then SSI	Enjoyed being a preceptor and interacting with student. Patients reported new, mainly useful information to students. Positive feedback from patients. 2/89 believed patient would not return to the clinic as the result of a student. In the telephone interview, 17/19 preceptors said the worst aspect of precepting was the time management.
Usatine et al. ⁴²	USA	4 exemplary preceptors who claimed to practice more efficiently with student present - unspecified	family medicine clerks in managed care clinics	undefined	undefined	time-and-motion observations	1.1 min more spent on patient encounter when student present. Not statistically significant. This time difference did not include preparing for teaching (done before the student saw the teacher), teaching, giving feedback, orientations or clinical conferences at the beginning or end of the clinic. It also did not include the time savings associated with students helping with charting, which all the preceptors identified as being a major time saver.
Walter et al. ⁴³	USA	urban primary care preceptors	not specified	1 month	6 half-day clinics each week	time and motion study	16% of time students were based in clinic during 4 hour session the students were interacting with their preceptor.