Primary Care Physicians’ Perspectives of Facilitating Older Patients’ Access to Community Support Services: A Qualitative Case Study
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Abstract

Objective: To understand how family physicians facilitate older patients' access to community support services and to identify similarities and differences across primary healthcare (PHC) models.

Design: Qualitative multiple case study using semi-structured interviews.

Setting: Four models of PHC, specifically two family health teams (FHT), four non-family health team family health organizations (FHOs), four fee-for-service practices and two community health centres (CHC) in urban Ontario.

Participants: Purposeful sampling of 23 family physicians in solo, small and large group practices within four models of PHC.

Methods: A multiple case study approach was used. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and data were analyzed using within and cross case analysis. Case study tactics to ensure study rigor included memos and an audit trail, investigator triangulation and the use of multiple rather than single case studies.

Main Findings: Three main themes are reported: (a) consulting and communicating with the healthcare team to create linkages, (b) linking patients and families to CSSs, and (c) relying on out-of-date resources and ineffective search strategies for information on CSSs. All participants worked with their team members; however, those in FHTs and CHCs generally had a broader range of healthcare providers available to assist them. Physicians relied on home care case managers to help make linkages to CSSs. Physicians recommended the development of an easily searchable, online database containing available CSSs.

Conclusion: This study shows the importance of interprofessional teamwork in primary care settings to facilitate linkages of older patients to CSSs. The study also provides insight into the strategies physicians use to link older persons to CSSs and their recommendations for change.
This understanding can be used to develop resources and approaches to better support physicians in making appropriate linkages to CSSs.
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Introduction

Many communities have an array of community-based health and support services to assist older adults and their caregivers. Community support services (CSSs) are delivered in the home or community to assist people with health or social limitations to maintain the highest possible level of physical and social functioning as well as quality of life. Examples of CSSs include meal services, transportation services, day programs, volunteer visiting, and caregiver support services. Use of such services results in positive impacts for older adults and their caregivers (Winslow, 2003; Zarit, Gaugler & Jarrott, 1999). However, older adults and family caregivers have very low utilization rates (Strain & Blandford, 2002) and limited awareness of CSSs. Lack of awareness of available services leads to failure to recognize service needs, an inability to access appropriate services, and is a strong predictor of unmet needs for services (Calsyn, Roades, & Klinkenberg, 1998; Kushman & Freeman, 1986; Strain & Blandford; Wister, 1992).

Older adults obtain information about CSSs from a variety of sources such as service providers, informal sources such as family members, and media sources such as television (Ehrlich, Carlson, & Bailey, 2003; Goodman, 1992; Wicks, 2004). Family physicians and physicians’ office staff have been identified as the most preferred and important sources of information on CSSs (Denton et al., 2008; Ehrlich et al.; Feldman, Oberlink, Simantov & Gursen, 2004; Ploeg et al., 2009). A recent study used a series of 12 vignettes to describe common situations faced by older adults for which CSSs might be appropriate (Denton et al., 2008; Ploeg et al., 2009). In telephone interviews with 1,152 older persons aged 50 years and over, an average of 26% of respondents (and as high as 71%) indicated that they would turn to their family physician for help in the described situations. Thus, it is critical that physicians are
aware of and able to link older adults to CSSs. Physicians have been identified as "mediators", "boundary spanning agents" and "gate-keepers" in this area (Henninger, Henninger, Morse & Zweigenhaft, 1987).

However, there is limited research on physicians’ awareness and use of CSSs for older patients. Some studies have found that physicians have greater knowledge of health-related services such as home health agencies and skilled nursing facilities compared to social or CSSs such as adult day care, housing, and congregate meals (Damron-Rodriguez et al., 1998; Henninger et al., 1987; Yeo & McGann, 1986). A number of studies focused on physician awareness and use of services specifically for patients with dementia and their caregivers (Brown et al., 1998; Fortinsky, Leighton & Wasson, 1995; Fortinsky, 1998; Yaffe, Orzech & Barylak, 2008). Physicians were much more likely to refer patients with dementia to home health agencies (83%) and nursing homes (82%) than to community support services such as respite or adult day care (57%) or the Alzheimer’s Association (31%) (Fortinsky, 1998). Many physicians noted that they lacked knowledge or confidence in community resources for their patients, and rarely referred patients or families to Alzheimer societies (Yaffe et al.).

There are a number of limitations to the existing literature. Most studies included not only primary care physicians, but also some combination of other health professional such as internists, neurologists, doctors of osteopathy, and general surgeons (Brown, Mutran, Sloane & Long, 1998; Damron-Rodriguez et al., 1998; Fortinsky, 1998; Fortinsky et al., 1995; Henninger et al., 1987). This limits the ability to generalize results specifically to primary care physicians, who are a main and regular point of contact for most older adults. Only three studies provided any information related to the types of practice(s) represented, with fee-for-service and solo practices being the most common (Damron-Rodriguez et al., 1998; Fortinsky, 1998; Fortinsky et
al., 1995). This is particularly important given the increasing trend towards interprofessional team models of primary health care (PHC) in countries such as Canada (Hutchison, Levesque, Strumpf & Coyle, 2011). We did not find any studies examining how primary care physicians facilitate linkages of older persons to CSSs or differences across models of PHC. In three studies, a list of community health and support services was provided to physicians to check off or rate their awareness (Damron-Rodriguez et al., 1998; Fortinsky, 1998; Fortinsky et al., 1995; Yeo & McGann, 1986), leading to over-claiming or acquiescence bias (Calsyn & Winter, 1999). Finally, much of the published literature is out-of-date, having been published in the 1980s and 1990s.

In summary, there are important gaps in our understanding of how primary care physicians respond when older persons need CSSs and we do not know if similarities and differences exist across PHC models. This understanding is critical in developing approaches to improve physicians' ability to facilitate effective linkage of older adults to CSSs with the potential of improving quality of life, sustaining independence in the community, reducing visits to the emergency room, reducing hospitalization and decreasing or delaying institutionalization. The purpose of this study was to understand how family physicians facilitate older patients' access to CSSs and to identify variations in the approach to making linkages across different PHC models.

Method

Design and Settings

A qualitative, multiple-case study design was used (Yin, 2014). Case studies are most appropriate to answer ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions regarding a contemporary phenomenon about which there is little research (Yin). An exploratory case study approach was used to discover what primary care physicians (hereafter referred to as physicians) do when interacting with older
patients who need CSSs. We made reasoned assumptions that physicians' responses to older patients needing CSSs might vary depending on the type of PHC model they work in, given the differences in interprofessional teams available in such models. Thus, we included four cases in this study, each representing a type of PHC model common in Ontario, Canada (see Table 1 for detailed descriptions of each model): (a) Family Health Teams (FHTs), (b) non-FHT Family Health Organizations (FHOs), (c) fee-for-service practices (FFS), and (d) Community Health Centres (CHCs) (Hutchison et al., 2011). FHTs are most likely to have the broadest range of interprofessional healthcare providers as team members while FFS models are least likely to do so. FHTs are also most likely to have an assigned home care case manager who regularly attends team meetings and facilitates connections with CSSs. The presence of these interprofessional teams facilitates interprofessional collaboration, defined as occurring when "learners/practitioners, patients/clients/families and communities develop and maintain interprofessional working relationships that enable optimal health outcomes" (Canadian Interprofessional Health Collaborative, 2010, p. 6). The study was conducted in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

[insert Table 1]

**Participants**

Physicians (n=23) were purposively sampled from sampling frames of the family practices within each of the four PHC models (Patton, 2002). Where possible, maximum variation sampling was used to include solo, small and large group practices (See Table 2). A variety of recruitment strategies were used such as meeting with executive directors of the teams or practices, attending practice team meetings, and meeting personally with physicians to discuss the study. Participant demographics are presented in Table 3.
Data Collection

Face-to-face, in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with physicians by a trained Research Coordinator. An interview guide (available on request) was developed based on a review of the literature and the team's previous experience and research in the area of CSSs. Participants were asked to: (a) describe what they do when an older patient needs CSSs, (b) describe the resources and healthcare professionals they turn to for help in linking older patients with CSSs, (c) respond to two vignettes (Table 4) related to older adults requiring CSSs and (d) make recommendations to improve their ability to link older patients to CSSs. Vignettes were used to address acquiescence bias and constitute a well established research approach (Hughes & Huby, 2002; Spalding & Phillips, 2007). The interviews, approximately 30 minutes in length, were conducted between October 2009 and January 2011. Interviews were conducted in a quiet room at the workplace of participants, and were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim.

Analysis

Transcriptions were entered into NVivo8 software to help with data management. Data analytic strategies were used based on the work of Yin (2014) and Miles and Huberman (1994). The Principal Investigators (JP and MD) and Research Coordinator jointly conducted the data analysis, and preliminary findings were discussed with the other investigators as the analytic process continued. Transcriptions were read and re-read. Line-by-line coding of the data was conducted, using both in-vivo codes (arising from the data themselves) and the research and interview questions. A coding list was developed, applied by two team members on the first four transcripts, revised and applied to the remaining transcripts. The processes used by physicians to
link older adults with CSSs were contrasted and compared within models of PHC, and then across models (cross-case synthesis). We developed word tables (Miles & Huberman; Yin) that displayed the processes used to link older adults to CSSs in each case and analyzed these tables for similarities and differences.

A number of case study tactics were used to ensure the quality of this study, consistent with Yin's (2014) approach. Memos were written and an audit trail was maintained that outlined decisions during data collection and analysis. Investigator triangulation, involving the use of several different investigators in the analysis process, facilitated a deeper understanding of data from multiple perspectives. The use of multiple, rather than single, case studies contributed to external validity given the inclusion of multiple PHC models and practices of different size.

**Ethics**

Ethics approval was granted by the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (#09-267). The Research Coordinator ensured informed consent, collection of signed consent forms and protection of participant confidentiality.

**Findings**

Almost all physicians (91%) identified the Alzheimer's Society while few (17%) identified adult day programs as possible CSSs in response to the first vignette (caregiver of patient with Alzheimer's Disease). For the second vignette (patient unable to do home and yard work), only 35% of physicians identified a CSS related to house and yard work, and 44% identified Meals on Wheels as possible CSSs. In both scenarios, many physicians said they would consult with the home care agency as a way to address needs for CSSs.

The following themes were identified from physicians' responses to both the general and vignette-specific questions: (a) consulting and communicating with the healthcare team to create
linkages, (b) linking patients and families to CSSs, and (c) relying on out-of-date resources and ineffective search strategies for information on CSSs. Themes are described below and illustrative quotations are identified by participant number and model of PHC. The similarities and differences in linking with CSSs across models of PHC are then described, followed by physicians’ recommendations to improve linkage to CSSs.

Consulting and Communicating with the Healthcare Team to Create Linkages

Physicians explained that they consulted and communicated with healthcare team members to facilitate linkages to CSSs for older patients. This included both: (a) consulting with team members to obtain information about available CSSs so they [physicians] could initiate connections themselves, as well as (b) delegating to team members the responsibility for making the linkages. Physicians stated that they most frequently consulted with nurses (registered nurses, registered practical nurses, clinical nurse specialists, and nurse practitioners) who they believed had extensive knowledge of CSSs (See Table 5). For example, one physician stated that:

[RPNs and NPs] provide a lot of help: [they are the] number one tool for assisting me...The nurse practitioner I work with...certainly knows our community well and so she knows what's out there, and sometimes if I'm not sure if there's something I'll ask her. (006 FHT)

Physicians also consulted other available team members, such as social workers, mental health workers, dietitians, pharmacists, and clerical staff to learn about CSSs. Some healthcare professionals provided useful information about resources for certain conditions: “our mental health counselor...[is] somebody that I’ll ask sometimes...particularly if there are mental health issues" (009 FHT). Overall, physicians used the knowledge and experiences of all team members to seek out “what else is sort of new out there [and to]...sort of pick their brains with things” (016 FFS).
Some physicians expressed a lack of experience or a gap in their knowledge and skills to connect older adults with CSSs: "Family doctors have some knowledge but it's an incomplete amount of knowledge. It's just that there's a lot of stuff to know and a lot of services and it's hard to keep up" (002 FHT); “I don’t think I’m very good at it...in terms of linking them up with a particular agency” (013 FHO). Physicians also acknowledged their time and resource constraints in making these linkages themselves:

*My financial resources are limited... I've got to deal with all these issues within the ten minute[patient visit] period. It’s time consuming. Time is dollars. And there’s no extra funds allotted to the family doctors to sit down and talk about all these things. It’s nice to have other people out there* (013 FHO).

As a result, many physicians stated that they do not initiate the call themselves, but instead delegate and designate team members to facilitate linkages, make phone calls, and follow-up the linkage with CSSs:

*For getting patients linked to services I would always have my nurse get involved. I would either bring her in at that point or I would send her a to-do in the EMR [electronic medical record] and say 'could you please look into this or set this up for this patient.' And I rely completely on my nurse...My own skill level and knowledge is probably not as good as it should be...She’s the sort of system advocate.* (004 FHT)

Where physicians did not have large teams, they would ask clerical staff to "contact, whether it be by phone or fax or whatever the appropriate method, the community resource, initiate the referral process"(019 FFS). Some physicians who had social workers on their teams spoke of the value of their role in assessing patients in their homes for needed CSSs. One physician stated that:

*[The social worker] would go into their home...she reports back to me [and] writes a note on every visit which I’d read....She would arrange to meet the patient again or she often will contact whatever services might be required and try and arrange things for [the patient].* (010 FHO)

Some physicians felt that making these linkages was not only beyond their expertise but outside of their role:
I’m now becoming a coordinator of social services, which is going outside of my own personal realm of expertise... And that’s where I start questioning what is my role as a trained physician, trained in medicine. Am I really the most effective person? (012 FHT)

In response to the vignettes, physicians most commonly identified home care case managers as resources to help link older adults to CSSs. Physicians relied on case managers to provide advice and take the lead on connecting older adults to the most appropriate CSSs:

*If the client comes in or the family comes in and says “We’re not getting what we hoped. We need more help.” Then I usually just call the case manager. Speak to them myself... I rely fairly heavily on [them] to be up-to-date on what they can and can’t do and what’s out there.* (009 FHT)

Physicians would often have the case managers “do an assessment of home safety and personal care issues” (004 FHT) which helped to determine care needs and the appropriate resources to fill the gaps. In some practices, case managers were part of the team, which facilitated monthly patient conferences:

*I have found it very helpful...[when case manager] comes in once a month with her list of people that are on home care...and we will discuss the patients....She’s gone in and assessed them in the home. A lot of it’s around placement issues or what we can do to support them being in the home and so I find that absolutely invaluable.* (008 FHT)

In practices where other healthcare providers were available and accessible, physicians engaged in verbal, face-to-face communication with team members: “we case conference together once a week...if there’s a...complex patient with high risk who we’re worried about...[the team] will come together and somebody will case manage that” (015 CHC). When certain healthcare professionals were not available and additional expertise was required, physicians contacted them by phone: “if I don’t have any experience or no idea, I would probably call one of the geriatricians that I use regularly and just see what they can provide or what their advice is” (023 FFS). Physicians in the FHT model used email or the electronic medical record (EMR) to communicate with the team.

**Linking Patients and Families to CSSs**
Physicians often described how they developed strategies for linking patients and families to CSSs. Strategies included: (a) giving information about CSSs to patients and families, (b) encouraging families to access the CSSs on behalf of patients, and (c) initiating linkages for patients and families who required assistance. One physician explained the importance of CSSs to support patients and families:

*We recognize that linking to the community support services is really key along with patient engagement and empowerment in their care. We recognize that we can't do it all alone...It's about the patient and their family...and community agencies are a really important part of the network of care and support.* (004 FHT)

Some physicians stated that they would provide the name and contact information of the CSS to the patient and their family often in the form of pamphlets or brochures: “it might be me giving the name to the patient or the care giver to contact...Occasionally if we have brochures around then we’ll give the brochures out” (002 FHT). Other physicians provided information if they were familiar with certain services suitable to the patient. As one physician states, “if I happen to know of something, I will tell them about it” (004 FHT).

Interestingly, some physicians described reaching out to the patient's family and friends to assist with care prior to reaching out to available CSSs. One physician described a process of identifying patient needs, assessing receptivity to services, exploring alternatives to CSSs, determining if family could address the needs, and then discussing possible CSSs:

*My first step would be to label the need, address whether they [patients and family] agree that this was a need, whether they were receptive to the provision of service, whether there were alternatives to reaching out to a community resource, meaning where there are family members that might be able or would want to fill this void. And then if the need was still present then discuss the resources that I was aware of.* (019 FFS)

Physicians indicated that they would “involve [the patient’s] family in decisions about what sort of help they needed and how much the family could provide” (010 FHO).
Most physicians explained that they would provide family members with information regarding a service and expect the family to advocate for their relative by connecting with the necessary CSSs:

*Often times I will provide the information but charge the family member with the connection piece....I find that usually the patient and the family member are much better at actually distilling down. I mean a patient doesn’t often do it if you leave it with them. But if there is a family member that you connect with and who's acting as an advocate, then they're usually quite keen to access the services that would be helpful to their parent or to their spouse.* (006 FHT)

Physicians explained that many CSSs are obtained through self-referral and that they rely on family members to make this type of connection:

*And if it’s one [a referral] that the family needs to arrange themselves, they’ll leave the office with contact information. And we’ll ask them if it’s a self-referral, to follow through with us by phone to let us know that they’ve initiated that process. And if we have a family member present, we will usually give the information with the patient’s permission to the family member.* (019 FFS)

If the patient or family was unable to make the phone call themselves, then physicians would take it upon themselves to make the linkage: “[I would give them] a piece of paper assuming that there’s somebody advocating for them or they can do it themselves....If they couldn’t do it I don’t mind making a phone call at all and getting a start for them” (022 FHO).

Another physician described making the initial contact just to ensure the correct referral path: “we would contact whoever it is we’re trying to do and make sure that we have the right referral path – phone numbers, addresses, contact people – [either] we do it and inform the patient or give that information to the patient or the family and get it going from there” (020 FHO).

Follow-up of linkage with CSSs was only mentioned by a few participants. Physicians would “want to follow-up with [the patient and their family] and see if what we put in place had any effect” (014 FHT). One physician talked about following up with the patient in subsequent visits about how things were going since the linkage to the CSSs: “I’ll say [during the next visit]
how are things going with your mother? Did you get the help you were looking for? How are you doing mentally, emotionally? Following up with [them]” (009 FHT). Another physician stated that he and his team would not follow-up, saying “it would be up to the patient and their family to follow through” (011 FHO).

Relying on Out-of-Date Resources and Ineffective Search Strategies for Information on CSSs

Many physicians referred to the use of out-of-date resources and ineffective search strategies when determining the appropriate CSSs for older adults. They commonly described using 'The Red Book' which was developed by a local community information service and last updated in 2007. The hard copy binder included a listing of community health and support agencies, the services provided by that agency and contact information. The book lacked an easy search mechanism and was not updated regularly:

At one point in time we had this binder of all the community resources. What I found is that it tends to be a little bit out of date. And it wasn’t updated frequently so you’d find a resource and they’re no longer around... there was too much almost. (002 FHT)

Physicians also described using a handbook called 'Family Physicians Guide to Community Resources.' Like the Red Book, this provided a listing of community health and social services, but was not updated regularly:

The other thing we have, and I'm not sure mine's up-to-date, is this community resources book. Family Physicians Guide to Community Resources. And this, I must say I don't use a lot...I'm just looking here and I see services for older adults in here. (008 FHT)

A few physicians referred to using free flyers, pamphlets and loose leaf booklets for information about CSSs:

Well, sometimes they have pamphlets that come through. They're very beneficial...And I tend to have those shoved on the desk or somewhere like that...Sometimes I'll see one that I find beneficial and I’ll ask for more to be sent to us. Rarely will I do it if it costs us anything. (021 FHO)
Physicians described using a variety of internet websites and online searches to find information on CSSs. Some mentioned looking on the local city website and the related public health resources; “[I] use [city website], particularly the public health portion [as] they do have a comprehensive resource listing” (019 FFS). Some physicians described performing a Google search, often with few valuable results, to find information about CSSs. Physicians working in a FHT described using their own website which provides a list of local CSSs:

[The Family Health Team] have a list on [their website] of what sort of groups there might be, like caregiver burnout groups... They’re always offering different things. So, I might look on there, see if there’s anything that looks appropriate. (003 FHT)

Physicians described their lack of awareness of a central site on the internet to find appropriate CSSs which resulted in ineffective and inefficient search strategies.

**Comparison Across Primary Healthcare Models**

There were similarities and differences in the ways physicians made linkages with CSSs both within and across PHC models. At the level of the individual physician, self-reported knowledge, experience and use of CSSs varied from those who felt very comfortable and confident in making linkages to CSSs (13%), fairly or reasonably comfortable (57%), to very uncomfortable and lacking in confidence (30%).

All participants consulted and communicated with their team members however, those in FHTs and CHCs usually had a broader range of healthcare providers available to assist them. Because FHT and CHC models generally consist of interprofessional teams, physicians worked alongside other health professionals in the same clinical area, which facilitated ease in communication: “it’s nice to have people on-site because they all work with me here at the office, it’s nice to just literally go down the hall, knock on the door and ask a question” (007 FHT). On the other hand, physicians working in a FFS model do not readily have access to the
same variety of professionals, as most of these practices only consist of the physician and a nurse or clerical staff. Physicians stated that because “there’s only me and my secretary...I do rely quite a bit on the front desk” (018 FFS). These physicians (and those from other models) expressed the need for more accessible and available social workers to be part of the team to help facilitate counseling and coordination of services for their clients: “it’s absolutely horrible. We need more availability of the social worker...Getting people assessed by social workers and counseling and that kind of thing” (013 FHO). In the FHO model, there is additional funding which enables the hiring of healthcare professionals with specific skills, such as mental health counselors. Physicians without these supports described the challenges they faced in making linkages with CSSs:

A common problem [is that] I’m the doctor looking after medical health. This is a woman who needs help in the house with her facilities. If it’s not based on illness, somebody else has got to come in. That sounds terrible as I say that, but that’s not my role as a family doctor...Everything dumps down back on the family doctors. Family doctors should be doing all these things. And in the real world, yes if we had staff to do that kind of thing, marvelous, but I don’t have the staff, the resources to do it.... My job is health issues. How are they functioning? They can’t cut their grass. You know what? I’m sorry, but it’s not my job. Should it be? Maybe in a perfect world, yeah. (013 FHO)

Physicians relied on different resources for CSSs depending on the PHC model in which they practiced. Although physicians in the FHT used the Red Book and other written materials from time to time, they also had high confidence in their own team members and therefore used these professionals as their primary source for available CSSs. On the contrary, physicians working in a FFS had few staff and often relied heavily on the Red Book and any pamphlets and handouts mailed to them by community agencies and organizations. Almost all physicians from all PHC models mentioned using the internet as one of the sources, although not all physicians specified which websites they visited. Physicians identified a lack of a central point of access with an up-to-date listing of available CSSs. However, these comments reflected a lack of
awareness of two existing data bases of CSSs, one focused specifically on older adults developed by a Regional Geriatric Program and one focused on a broad range of services developed by a Community Information Service.

Across the four PHC models, all physicians relied on home care case managers for their knowledge related to CSSs and their roles in conducting home and safety assessments and connecting patients and their families with appropriate CSSs. However, the FHT practices in this study had specific case managers assigned to their teams which facilitated ongoing communication and regular face-to-face meetings to discuss patient needs. Other PHC models were more likely to have different case managers working with them and to communicate via telephone or email only.

**Recommendations to Improve Linkages with CSSs**

Physicians made a number of recommendations to improve their ability to link older adults to CSSs. The two main recommendations, consistent across models of PHC, were related to the need for an easily searchable “one-stop shop” online database with all available community services, and the need for a one-stop referral agency (See Table 6).

[insert Table 6]

**Discussion**

The study findings shed new light on how primary care physicians facilitate linkages to CSSs for older adults and the similarities and differences in approach across different models of PHC. The key findings are: (a) physicians consult and communicate with healthcare team members to facilitate linkages; (b) physicians develop strategies for linking patients and families to CSSs; and (c) physicians often use out of date materials and ineffective search strategies to
find information on available CSSs. Each key finding is explored within the context of previous literature.

First, physicians relied on the expertise of team members and often delegated to these individuals the responsibility for linking patients with CSSs. The multiplicity and complexity of older adults' care and social needs requires a variety of health care professionals with diverse types of expertise to work together to address unmet needs and facilitate optimal care. Physicians reported frequently consulting with nurses, social workers, and home care case managers for help. There is significant value in linking with professionals within and across teams in primary care. In particular, home care case managers play an integral role in identifying older adults' needs for CSSs and linking them appropriately. According to the Canadian Home Care Association (CHCA) (2006), it is crucial for home care case managers to align and collaborate with family physicians through formalized and structured partnerships to create health teams that are equipped to provide optimal patient care. These partnerships can result in better understanding of available community resources, more timely introduction of resources, and more time for physicians to focus on complex clinical client issues (CHCA, 2006).

Physicians who worked in interprofessional team models of PHC reported that they consulted extensively with other healthcare team members in making linkages to CSSs while physicians in other models of PHC counted on their office support staff for this assistance. In this study, physicians who worked in FHT models benefited from having an interprofessional team, which offers a larger pool of knowledge and established relationships with CSSs than are available in conventional FFS practices. This interprofessional team provides opportunities to work collaboratively to identify the most appropriate services for a given patient and their caregivers. As in other studies, physicians readily identified their own lack of knowledge about
CSSs as well as the barriers of lack of time during office visits and tensions related to their roles in making these connections (Brown et al., 1998; Damron-Rodriguez et al., 1998; Fortinsky, 1998; Henninger et al., 1987; Yaffe et al., 2008).

Second, this study described how physicians develop strategies to link patients and families to CSSs. Physicians appear to consider options for linkage, often starting with simply giving the patient or family information on the service and expecting them to make the linkage, moving to "charging" the family member with making the linkage for the patient, and then making the linkage on behalf of those patients or families who required assistance. Involving older adults and their families as key decision makers in care is crucial to effective practice and has been shown to be cost-effective while enhancing the quality of community care (Boynton, Shute, Rawlin, Smith & Willett, 2013).

Finally, physicians in this study often relied on out of date materials and ineffective search strategies to find information on available CSSs. Yaffe and colleagues (2008) found that only 17% of family physicians maintained office reference lists of community services. Some physicians in team practices had lists of services available on EMRs, but many others did not. Physicians in all models of primary care recommended central listings of available CSSs that could be easily searchable as well as a central access point for CSSs.

There are a number of implications for practice and policy based on this research. Primary care physicians are key agents in identifying and responding to the needs of older adults and families related to CSSs. They are indeed "boundary spanners" and together with their interprofessional team members, play critical roles in facilitating these linkages. Within Canada, there have been numerous primary care reform initiatives implemented, with the majority of provinces and territories incorporating interprofessional team-based care (Aggarwal &
Hutchison, 2012). This type of care provides a broad range of resources for family physicians to rely on in facilitating linkages to CSSs, as evidenced by accounts of FHT physicians in this study. Team-based models of healthcare have been shown to lead to better health outcomes for clients with chronic diseases, increased access to healthcare and improved patient experience (Health Innovation Working Group, 2012).

Given the complexity of the community health and social service systems, new primary care roles such as patient navigator, psychologist and physician assistant may be valuable to help link older adults to CSSs. Patient navigators may be healthcare professionals or lay persons who assist particularly vulnerable individuals to obtain needed supports and transition between care sectors (Freeman & Rodriguez, 2011). They have also been referred to as care managers, care coordinators, or patient coaches and take on a central role in primary care to deliver and coordinate services for patients, including coordinating care across clinicians, settings, and conditions/diseases (Taylor, Machta, Meyers, Genevro & Peikes, 2013). Most of the research on navigators has been conducted in the area of cancer (Dohan & Schrag, 2005; Natale-Pereira, Enard, Nevarez & Jones, 2011; Wells et al., 2008), and more recently stroke care (Egan, Anderson & McTaggart, 2010). The Guided Care intervention was designed to enhance the quality of healthcare of older adults with multimorbidity within a primary care setting (Boyd et al., 2010). This multi-component intervention included supports to access community resources and was found to improve ratings of chronic care by patients. Primary care physicians in the Guided Care intervention groups were more likely to report improvements in communication with patients and caregivers, improvements in self-management, knowledge of patient medications and community referrals to CSSs (Boult et al., 2008). Further research is needed on the impact of system navigators for older adults in primary care.
Physicians described using technology to facilitate linkages to CSSs, particularly in facilitating communication between healthcare professionals and identifying relevant services for older adults. Information technology to support clinical practice is essential to the provision of high quality, efficient primary care (Aggarwal & Hutchison, 2012). Physicians commonly lamented the lack of a central access point (on the internet and an agency contact) for information and referral to CSSs, even though there were two internet-based information services available for the community. One option is that such a service become part of the EMR.

There are some recent innovations that hold promise for increasing awareness of CSSs among patients and providers. In Canada, for example, some communities have introduced 211 as a telephone/internet information service about a variety of community and other support services (http://211.ca/). In Ontario, Community Care Access Centres have created a website that lists information about health and social services (http://www.thehealthline.ca/). In the UK, AgeUK offers an advice line about services for older adults (http://www.ageuk.org.uk/). Similarly, in Australia, My Aged Care is a telephone service where staff provide information about aged care services and develop a personalized client record that holds information about individual clients and the services they receive (http://www.myagedcare.gov.au/). In the European Union, EUGENIE (European Generating Engagement in Networks Involvement, 2014) is an innovative intervention involving the development of maps of personal and community support networks for people with chronic conditions. The intervention provides lists of resources tailored to individual needs and interests using an online navigation tool. Research is needed to evaluate the impact of these innovations.

Overall, study findings provide an enhanced understanding of how primary care physicians facilitate linkages to CSSs by working with the interprofessional team members,
planning with patients and family members, and using both written and electronic sources of information. This understanding is valuable in guiding future strategies to improve these linkages and ultimately improve the quality of life of older adults.

**Study Strengths and Limitations and Future Research**

A study strength is the use of a case study approach that examines similarities and differences in physicians' linkage of older patients to CSSs across four PHC models. Further, the use of vignettes provides a hypothetical context that closely approximates real-life decision-making situations. Study limitations include the use of only one city within one province and the fact that the diversity in PHC models in this city is not reflective of all models of PHC.

Future research is needed to understand how the healthcare team members who physicians work with facilitate linkages to CSSs for older adults. There is also a need to develop and evaluate strategies to help physicians and other healthcare providers to improve linkages to CSSs, including the use of technology. Further, there is a need to understand how primary care practitioners facilitate linkages to CSSs for older adults from multi-cultural and multi-ethnic backgrounds. Lastly, there is a need for the development of educational initiatives to increase awareness and use of available CSSs among older persons, their family caregivers, physicians and other health care providers.
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Table 1. Description of Models of Primary Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHC Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Health Teams</td>
<td>FHTs consist of interprofessional teams of health professionals (e.g., family physicians, nurse practitioners, nurses, counselors, dietitians, pharmacists) who provide comprehensive care to patients with a focus on chronic disease management and disease prevention. Most FHTs are physician-governed. FHT physicians are paid using a blended capitation model that includes a variety of incentive payments. Some FHTs are academic FHTs and also committed to training health professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Health Organizations</td>
<td>FHOs also provide comprehensive care to their patients. Some FHOs have access to additional funds which enable them to hire other health professionals to provide special programs such as mental health, nutrition and foot care. FHO physicians are paid using a blended capitation model that includes a variety of incentive payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee-for-service Practices</td>
<td>Fee-for-service physicians are paid for services rendered and rarely employ health professionals other than nurses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Centres</td>
<td>Like FHTs, CHCs provide comprehensive care through interprofessional teams. CHCs differ from FHTs in their emphasis on community development and the social determinants of health. CHCs have community governing boards. Physicians in CHCs are paid a salary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Participating Family Practices and Family Physicians by Model of Primary Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Models of Primary Care and Primary Health Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model of Primary Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Health Teams (FHTs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Family Health Team Family Health Organizations (non-FHT FHOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee-for-Service Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Health Centres (CHCs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers of Practices and Physicians Participating in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 FHTs: 2 Solo practices: 2 physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Small Group Practice: 1 physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Large Group Practices: 4 physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Academic Practice: 3 physicians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
<th>Case D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Solo Practice: 3 physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Small Group Practices: 2 physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Large Group Practice: 1 physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Solo Practices: 2 physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Group Practices: 2 physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CHCs 2 physicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Participants (n=23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7 (30.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16 (69.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Practice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>4 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>9 (39.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>10 (43.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of Older Adults (65+) in Practice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25.0%</td>
<td>12 (52.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1-50.0%</td>
<td>10 (43.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.1-75.0%</td>
<td>1 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.1% +</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model of Primary Care¹:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Health Team</td>
<td>11 (47.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Health Team</td>
<td>6 (26.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Health Organization</td>
<td>4 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Centre</td>
<td>2 (8.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹: *The proportion of physicians recruited in each model of care is broadly representative of the number of practices in the community at the time*
Table 4: Vignettes and Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette 1: Mrs. Brown</th>
<th>Vignette 2: Mrs. Jones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your patient, Mrs. Brown is the main caregiver for her parent who has Alzheimer’s disease. She has discovered that her mother has been taking more pills than she should. What would you do if Mrs. Brown came to you with that situation?</td>
<td>Your patient Mrs. Jones comes to you and says that due to her poor health she is no longer able to do her shopping, house work or yard work. Her family members are busy and she doesn’t want to bother them. What would you do if Mrs. Jones came to you with that situation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Questions Related to the Vignettes**

1. Is there a community support service that you can think of that could provide help to the Mrs. Brown/Jones in that situation?
2. Is there anyone in your practice that you would turn to for help to link Mrs. Brown/Jones to community support service?
3. Are there any resources or services that you would turn to for helping to decide where to refer Mrs. Brown/Jones for help?
4. How comfortable are you with your ability to link older persons in the situation like Mrs. Brown/Jones to community support services?
5. What kind of resources, services or supports do you feel you need to help you link older persons such as Mrs. Brown/Jones to appropriate community support services?
Table 5. Health Care Professionals that Physicians Worked with to Facilitate Linkages to CSSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Care Professional</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurse(s)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care Case Managers</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Worker</td>
<td>17 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietitian</td>
<td>17 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>12 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Practitioner(s)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Practical Nurse(s)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Summary of Recommendations Made by Physicians to Improve Linkages to CSSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Sample Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Availability of a “one-stop shop” online database</strong></td>
<td>I would like a really useful, easy to read, accessible, up-to-date database that’s searchable and quick and readily available. I think that would expand the access to that information to other people as well. So it wouldn’t just be a repository in one person who when she retires or goes on vacation we’re screwed. I would like it on-line. And searchable. Ideally right inside my EMR or on my server so I don’t have to waste time going to somebody else’s website that I’m uncomfortable with. Ideally a kind of searchable database that’s locally available and updated. I think if my nurse has the same thing it would be very helpful. And there are other members of the team that would also take more advantage of it. For example, if the pharmacist or the dietician are seeing someone who is senior and needs some help in nutrition, if they also had ready access to a database that’s searchable, I think that would be very helpful. So, that others on the team develop that expertise, instead of everyone sort of going to the nurse. (004 FHT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physicians want a searchable, easy-to-read, regularly updated database that is accessible to both health care providers and clients/families in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The database or directory should have the contact information, the cost, and availability of the different services in the community in addition to a brief description of each service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The database or system rates the various community supports and services in terms of usefulness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Need for one-stop referral agency</strong></td>
<td>&quot;I think if there was a system in place to come up with different services and contacts, I would hope that that system would kind of rate them at the same time and say: these are the ones we found that are the top two or top three, if you were going to look at them [or that] I wouldn’t recommend these because we didn’t find them useful, or are actually detrimental in some cases” (023 FFS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physicians describe the need for a central agency that assesses and refers patients and their families to appropriate CSSs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The referral agency would also provide suggestions of relevant CSSs for the physician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there’s an agency like the [home care agency name] who is a one contact service that would look at the problems of the elderly and sort out the dilemma of where people should go [for CSS’s], I would think that would be excellent. We have in the adolescent group and children CONTACT. CONTACT is the group you send them. And they sort out what your problems are and where they can be directed. We need a “CONTACT” for [older] adults, if that’s available” (013 FHO).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess it would be nice and maybe this exists so there you go...to have like a central registry where you could just call or you could send in a quick fax and just outline a very basic [need] and just have them at least even just spit out back or contact you again with suggestions or contact the family with suggestions or however you wanted it to be set-up. (006 FHT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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