PRACTICE OBSERVED

Practice Research

Does the underprivileged area index work?

RALPH LEAVEY, JO WOOD

Abstract

The underprivileged area index was developed by Jarman to identify areas with the greatest need for general practitioner services and where general practitioners were under the greatest pressure. We found that in wards that scored the worst on the underprivileged area index the doctor:patient ratios were the highest. We suggest that the index needs to be used with other indicators to identify variations in need in small areas.

Introduction

Doctors, nurses, and social workers know all too well that working in socially deprived areas is a lot tougher than working elsewhere. Despite this, proposals for positive discrimination in primary health care have met with little success in the past. One of the difficulties with such proposals has been how to identify deprived areas. To help district health authorities and family practitioner committees to do so, Professor Jarman, a member of the Acheson committee, developed the underprivileged area index. The background to the index, some preliminary results, and a study showing that the "worst" wards identified by the index agreed with five local medical committees' perceptions of such areas were published in this journal in 1983 and 1984.¹ More information about the index appeared in an article in the *Health and Social Services Journal* in January 1985.² Before using the index one question that district health authorities and family practitioner committees need to ask is: Does it work?

Primary Care Research Unit, Department of General Practice, University of Manchester.
RALPH LEAVEY, MA, MRCP, research fellow
JO WOOD, BA, MRCP, research fellow
Correspondence to Jo Wood, Rudstone Health Centre, Manchester M14 5NP.

AIMS OF THE INDEX

It is necessary to begin by asking what the index is intended to identify. What exactly is meant by an underprivileged area? In his first paper Jarman explained that the index was a response to the need recognised in the Acheson report³ to identify urban areas "where the difficulties are greatest... with a view to improving services".

The key characteristics of areas of "greatest difficulty" implicit in this paper are: areas with the greatest need for general practitioner services, areas where general practitioners are under the greatest pressure, and areas where hospital and community health services are "deficient". In Jarman's second paper the most important characteristic of an underprivileged area emerged as being one where general practitioners or their representatives—members of local medical committees—believe that "the population is such that it causes the greatest workload or pressure on the services of general practitioners".

Though it is possible to make an analytical distinction among areas of the greatest need, the greatest pressure on the services, the most deficient hospital and community services, and the "worst" areas in the opinion of general practitioners, these areas may or may not overlap in practice. It is, therefore, important to look at the empirical evidence and to assess the value of the underprivileged area index in the light of the available data.

Potential workload

There is no simple way of measuring the relative need for general practitioner services or even for primary health care services—that is, general practitioner services together with the community health services provided by health authorities. Any approach inevitably runs into problems of values and objectives.

To practice the need for general practitioners is determined by a central body, the Medical Practices Committee, in relation to doctor:patient ratios. Does the underprivileged area index then identify wards with the lowest doctor:patient ratios? Data on doctor:patient ratios are not routinely available by ward at national level. But in three selected family practitioner committee areas, Manchester, Salford, and Trafford, doctors in the "worst"

not great, and leaving aside the question whether high or low rates are desirable, the pattern is at least consistent.
The analysis presented in table II differs, however, from depending completely on the law of averages. Though averages can tell you something about the volume of patient contact in an area, they tell you nothing about the amount of patient contact individual general practitioners have. As table I shows, variations in the amount of patient contact by individual general practitioners within wards with similar underprivileged area scores were greater than the differences between the averages for wards with different scores.

TABLE III—Variations in individual general practitioners' workload by underprivileged area ward scores

	Worst	Below 0	Best
Ward scores	10-29	0-9	Below 0
General practitioners	10	10	10
Consultations per patient per year	5.11	5.36	4.5
General practitioner with highest workload	11.2	10.2	10.2
General practitioner with lowest workload	2.7	4.5	3.1
Ratio of highest to lowest workload	4.1	2.3	3.3
General practitioner with highest workload	232	245	209
General practitioner with lowest workload	26	34	42
Ratio of highest to lowest workload	8.9	7.2	5.0
General practitioner with highest workload	36	39	42
General practitioner with lowest workload	3	3	4
Ratio of highest to lowest workload	12	13	10

TABLE IV—General practitioners' perception of workload by underprivileged area ward scores

	Worst	Below 0	Best
Ward scores	10-29	0-9	Below 0
General practitioners	10	10	10
Very busy	5	11	14
Modestly busy	15	40	12
Not particularly busy	10	48	29
Not at all busy	6	1	6

Two lessons emerge from this. Firstly, if the aim is to identify general practitioners with above average workloads—judged by the amount of face to face contact with patients—then relying on the index will allow many general practitioners with heavy workloads to escape notice while pinpointing some general practitioners who do not have above average workloads. Secondly, it seems that the type of area in which a general practitioner works is a less important influence on the volume of patient contact than has previously been supposed.

Perceived workload

Though it is difficult to show conclusively that the index does or does not identify small areas where the population has above average need for general practitioner care, the results of a survey conducted in this unit among above average workloads, it is less difficult to test whether the index identifies areas where general practitioners believe their workloads are high. Indeed, Jarman chose to use the index to identify areas where the results of a study conducted among members of five local medical committees he concluded that "it may identify underprivileged areas which have been shown to fit well with the opinions of general practitioners in the areas concerned".

It was not clear from this study, however, whether the opinions of members of local medical committees agreed or disagreed with those of other general practitioners. The results of a survey conducted in this unit among all general practitioners in Manchester, Salford, and Trafford family practitioner committee areas in 1981 suggest that general practitioners in the worst wards, on the basis of their scores on the index, may disagree with local medical committee members. As table IV shows, fewer general practitioners in the worst wards than in the best wards, in this survey, claimed that they felt very or moderately overworked.

Deficient services

Finally, does the index identify areas where hospital and community health services are "deficient"? It is not possible, of course, to answer this

question in the absence of any agreement about the specific dimensions on which hospital and community health services are to be judged adequate or inadequate.

Interestingly, in response to a question about which aspects of their work they found frustrating, colourful general practitioners in the worst wards were more likely to mention the hospital and community health services as a cause of frustration than their colleagues elsewhere. To this extent, there is slight support for the belief that the index may help to identify areas where general practitioners judge the hospital and community health services to be deficient.

Conclusion

High ward scores on the underprivileged area index in general appear to be associated with greater needs for health care, as judged by mortality, low birth weight, and prevalence of disability. To this extent, our findings are consistent with Charlton and Lakshani's,⁴ which showed a relation between high index scores and other measures of need.⁵ But, as a means of pinpointing and selecting needy small areas for special attention the index has its limitations.

Essays on Practice

Essays of up to 1000 words on any aspect of practice are welcome for consideration.

GP obstetrics: safe but endangered

DAVID JEWELL

General practitioners who are concerned with delivering babies have for some years resembled a primitive tribe. Depleted in numbers, threatened repeatedly with extinction, and continuing to practice their quaint, colourful skills according to age-old precepts, they have been overtaken by the march of civilisation. Successive government reports,¹⁻³ the drop in family size, and decisions made by general practitioners themselves⁴ have all contributed to the increasing proportion of deliveries done in consultant units. Despite such pressures there are some areas where general practitioner obstetrics has flourished, thanks to local enthusiasm and the support of women who are sceptical about the benefits of high technology medical care.

How can such an apparently anachronistic, low technology service be defended when the potential cost of failure is so high? Women with first hand experience give positive accounts of the personal service they get from their own doctor and midwife, but such soft anecdotal evidence carries little weight. The results of studies that compared general practitioner and consultant care in the John Radcliffe Hospital in Oxford have confirmed the safety of the general practitioner unit by retrospective survey of case notes.⁵

More recently a prospective study was done in the John Radcliffe to compare women's reactions to consultant and general practitioner care.

Addenbrooke Health Centre, Southampton SO1 6ST
DAVID JEWELL, MA, MRCP, lecturer in primary medical care

Furthermore, general practitioners who practise in needy small areas, contrary to popular belief, tend to have smaller lists, see fewer patients, spend less time in patient contact, and are less likely to say that they feel overworked than their colleagues in other areas. This suggests that before using the underprivileged area index district health authorities and family practitioner committees need to consider carefully what they wish to identify and exactly what they wish to achieve.

References

- 1 Jarman B. Identification of underprivileged areas. *Br Med J* 1983;286:1705-9.
- 2 Jarman B. Underprivileged areas: validation and distribution of scores. *Br Med J* 1984;289:1517-9.
- 3 Irving D. How to identify the needy. *Health and Social Services Journal* 1983;1:118-9.
- 4 London Health Planning Committee. Primary Health Care Study Group. Primary health care in inner London. London: LHPCC, 1981. (Acheson report.)
- 5 Charlton RW, Lakshani A. Last night and present day in general medical practice. *Br Med J* 1984;289:1501-5.
- 6 Charlton RW, Lakshani A. Is the Jarman underprivileged area score valid? *Br Med J* 1985;290:1714-6.

(Accepted 19 July 1985)

toner care and the results published by the Royal College of General Practitioners. *Booking for Maternity Care. A Comparison of Two Systems.* Women who were booked for delivery in the consultant and general practitioner units were interviewed at 36 weeks' gestation and twice after delivery, at about 10-14 days and three to four months postpartum, and their reactions to antenatal care and to events during and immediately after delivery were compared. An encouraging picture emerges of both systems, with generally positive feelings expressed towards all aspects of care. The accounts of the two groups are broadly similar, but a few differences were found, all in favour of the general practitioner unit. Women who booked for the general practitioner unit tended to come into hospital in more advanced labour, probably because a midwife was more likely to have seen the woman at home in early labour, and there was a shorter average time from admission to delivery. They were seen by fewer medical staff during labour and were more likely to recognise those whom they did see. They also found antenatal visits more helpful and enjoyable, but there was no difference between the two groups in their experience during labour.

Safety?

We now know enough about general practitioner obstetrics to answer the question stated above. It has been consistently demonstrated to be as safe as consultant care for women of low obstetric risk.¹ Indeed, the findings of one study that compared data from different areas suggest that it might be safer, and before that argument is dismissed out of hand consider whether being booked after in labour by staff whom women know and trust might have a

measurable effect on outcome. It has also been shown to provide a more acceptable system of antenatal care,² and now a more personal, equally acceptable system of intrapartum care.³ Answering the immediate question, however, raises broader issues that have considerable relevance to general practice beyond that of obstetric care.

There is the ethical dimension of patient autonomy. One of the most satisfying aspects of using a general practitioner unit is being able to offer patients a real choice. If, however, we give patient autonomy a high priority that may mean respecting their choice of a more acceptable service with, perhaps, a small increase in risk to their unborn child. It is important to acknowledge that a patient might legitimately choose to take a small risk whereas someone who is allowed to act for them might choose the option of least risk regardless of other considerations. Unfortunately, Klein and his colleagues did not examine how years, in the opinion both of physician and other system of obstetric care. They ignored possible selection bias introduced by patients' choice, and the issue is addressed only in terms of women choosing their doctor, not the system of care, with the implication that the choice system was made randomly. They did establish that none of the women had chosen their general practitioner on the grounds of the doctor's obstetric practice. This is a credible reminder of our patients' unwillingness to exercise their right to change doctor, and by implication also a reminder that the same right does not exist with choice of midwife, which may have more relevance to pregnant women.

References

- 1 Ministry of Health. *Report of the maternity services committee*. London: HMSO, 1984. (Cranbrook report.)
- 2 Ministry of Health and Social Security. *Domestic midwives and maternity beds in London*. HMSO, 1979. (Parker.)
- 3 Obstetric Risk. *Br Med J* 1985;290:1139-42.
- 4 Marks GN, Gannon HA, Russell IT. General practitioner obstetrics in the Northern Region in 1981. *Br Med J* 1982;284:960-3.
- 5 Klein M, David L, Redman C, Bull B, Turnbull A. A comparison of low risk pregnant women booked for delivery in two systems of care: shared care (consultant and designated general practice) vs. obstetric practice. *Br Med J* 1985;290:1139-42.
- 6 Klein M, David L, Redman C, Bull B, Turnbull A. A comparison of low risk pregnant women booked for delivery in two systems of care: shared care (consultant and designated general practice) vs. obstetric practice. *Br Med J* 1985;290:1139-42.
- 7 Klein M, Redman C, David L. *Booking for maternity care: A comparison of two systems*. (Occasional paper 11.) Essex: Royal College of General Practitioners, 1982.
- 8 Marks GN. Obstetric risk in general practice. *Br Med J* 1977;1:1084-6.
- 9 Taylor GW, Slogar W, Taylor BS, Neil LG. How safe is general practitioner obstetrics? *Lancet* 1980;1:787-9.
- 10 Marks GN. General practitioner obstetrics: a personal medical history. *Br Med J* 1982;284:960-3.
- 11 Marks GN, Bull M. General practitioner obstetrics: two series. *Br Med J* 1982;284:960-3.
- 12 Frew R, Ashford JR. Trends in personal and neonatal mortality in England and Wales 1973-1980. *Br Med J* 1982;284:960-3.
- 13 O'Brien M, Smith C. Women's views and experiences of antenatal care. *Practitioner* 1982;225:133-5.
- 14 Garcia J. *Women's views of antenatal care*. In: Eskin M, Chalmers I, eds. *Effectiveness and evaluation in obstetrics*. London: Heinemann Medical, 1982.
- 15 Office of Population Censuses and Surveys. *Birth statistics: Report of the Registrar General on births and deaths in family households in England and Wales, 1982*. London: HMSO, 1984.
- 16 Houghton P. Reconstruction of general practice: failure of reform. *Br Med J* 1982;284:921-6.
- 17 Morris H, et al. The Liverpool Health Service. Liverpool: Liverpool Health and Health Department, 1982. (Scottish Health Service Studies No 41.)

cost, may be made out of soups, fish, milk-puddings, the great variety of cheap available vegetables, and some of the higher qualities of imported tinned meats. It does not need the genius of a Francis and Taylor to do this, or the taste of a Brill Savarin to appreciate it. A Restaurant Duvall forms a part of the Exhibition of Inventions that year, a faint shadow of the reality, no doubt, but novel in some ways to England, and offering those at what is possible with little trouble or expense. And the reason why it is worth while, and, indeed, in the long run economical, to take some trouble with the nurses' food is that a hospital-life so often leads to uncertain appetite and a refusal of monotonous and uninteresting dishes, and this again to excessive tea-drinking, or even worse, with many discomforts of malnutrition, and all tend ultimately to what is the main point for the hospital to consider, namely, bad nursing, by women of poor health, and often on the sick-bed. It would be quite unfair to attach such blame to all managers of hospital-kitchens; but that there has been, and is, some want of attention to the matter is a fact of which there is much evidence.

(British Medical Journal 188:1:1166.)

TABLE I—Average rate (per 1000) by underprivileged area ward scores

	Worst	Below 0	Best
Ward scores	10-29	0-9	Below 0
General practitioners	10	10	10
Average rate (per 1000)	2.6	2.7	2.4
No. of general practitioners	22	41	16

*Rate per 1000 is based on general practitioners' response of practice list size. For general practitioners in partnership, individual list sizes were calculated by dividing the total number of patients by the number of practitioners.

wards that were identified by the index—that is, those with the highest scores—on average had the highest doctor:patient ratios.
Many people, however, have been dissatisfied for a long time with this crude approach to identifying the population's health care needs since it assumes that all patients, all areas, and all general practitioners are equal. In practice analyses of census data for small areas show that there is more ill health, using certain indicators, in some areas than in others. Does the index then pick out the areas where the challenges to health are greatest?
Using standardized mortality ratios and using the proportion of babies who were born weighing less than 2500 g and the proportion of the population who reported being permanently sick or disabled at the time of the 1981 census as indicators of ill health there was a fairly high correlation between ward scores on the index and each of these indicators (0.68, 0.85, and 0.66 respectively) in the three selected family practitioner committee areas. There were anomalies, however, in the way that individual wards were ranked on the index compared with these health indicators. For example, in Manchester the worst 18 wards scored on the index excluded six of the 18 wards with the worst standardized mortality ratios, five of the 18 wards with the highest proportion of low birthweight babies, and six of the 18 wards with the highest proportion of people who were permanently sick or disabled. Also, the ward with the highest overall standardized mortality ratio (172) ranked twentieth in terms of its underprivileged area score, whereas another ward which ranked sixteenth on a combined ranking of these health indicators ranked thirty seventh in terms of its underprivileged area score.

These findings suggest that the index may be a useful first pointer towards where social conditions and the population's health are poor but it needs to be used carefully if wards where certain health problems are so bad in the worst wards are not to be excluded. So, if the concern is to identify such areas, then the index needs to be used in conjunction with other available information about variations in health in small areas. On the other hand, if the sole aim is to identify wards with poor health but not just use health indicators at ward level as they stand?

Actual workload

Just as there is no simple way of identifying areas with an above average need for primary care, so there is no simple way to identify areas where general practitioners have high or above average workloads—indeed, this is part of the rationale given for designing the index. Clearly, it is not easy to define what constitutes a general practitioner's workload. None the less, one important and generally accepted dimension of general practitioners' workload is the amount of time they spend face to face with their patients.
Some evidence about this is available from a study conducted by the primary care research unit at Manchester University in 1982.¹ Comparing the patient contact indicators for general practitioners who participated in this study and who worked in the "worst" and "best" wards according to their scores on the index there was no evidence that general practitioners in the worst wards were under greater pressure on average than their colleagues in the best wards. On the contrary, as each of the patient contact indicators in table II shows, general practitioners with surgeries in the worst wards were spending less time on average with their patients than general practitioners with surgeries in the best wards. Although the differences are

TABLE II—Patient contact indicators by underprivileged area ward scores

	Worst	Below 0	Best
Ward scores	10-29	0-9	Below 0
General practitioners	10	10	10
Consultations rate over 10 weeks	2.80	1.47	2.94
Some time spent in surgery per week	11.0	1.29	12.0
Time spent in surgery per week (h)	14.1	1.46	15.0
Time spent in surgery per week (min)	14.1	1.46	15.0
Time spent in surgery per week (min)	17.2	1.94	19.1
Time spent in surgery per week (min)	17.2	1.94	19.1
No. of general practitioners	22	41	16