

Experienced Continuity of Care When Patients See Multiple Clinicians: A Qualitative Metasummary

Jeannie L. Haggerty, PhD¹

Danièle Roberge, PhD²

George K. Freeman, MD³

Christine Beaulieu⁴

¹Department of Family Medicine, McGill University, Canada

²Département de Sciences de la santé communautaire, Université de Sherbrooke, Canada

³Department of Primary Care & Social Medicine, Imperial College London, United Kingdom

⁴St. Mary's Hospital Research Centre, Montreal, Canada

ABSTRACT

PURPOSE Continuity of care among different clinicians refers to consistent and coherent care management and good measures are needed. We conducted a metasummary of qualitative studies of patients' experience with care to identify measurable elements that recur over a variety of contexts and health conditions as the basis for a generic measure of management continuity.

METHODS From an initial list of 514 potential studies (1997-2007), 33 met our criteria of using qualitative methods and exploring patients' experiences of health care from various clinicians over time. They were coded independently. Consensus meetings minimized conceptual overlap between codes.

RESULTS For patients, continuity of care is experienced as security and confidence rather than seamlessness. Coordination and information transfer between professionals are assumed until proven otherwise. Care plans help clinician coordination but are rarely discerned as such by patients. Knowing what to expect and having contingency plans provides security. Information transfer includes information given to the patient, especially to support an active role in giving and receiving information, monitoring, and self-management. Having a single trusted clinician who helps navigate the system and sees the patient as a partner undergirds the experience of continuity between clinicians.

CONCLUSION Some dimensions of continuity, such as coordination and communication among clinicians, are perceived and best assessed indirectly by patients through failures and gaps (discontinuity). Patients experience continuity directly through receiving information, having confidence and security on the care pathway, and having a relationship with a trusted clinician who anchors continuity.

Ann Fam Med 2013;11:262-271. doi:10.1370/afm.1499.

INTRODUCTION

Continuity of care is the extent to which a series of health care services is experienced as connected and coherent and is consistent with a patient's health needs and personal circumstances.¹ As patients increasingly receive care from multiple professionals and organizations, improving continuity of care has become a research priority. Although continuity of care is understood differently across health disciplines, an interdisciplinary review of concepts and measures of continuity of care found all disciplines would recognize 3 types of continuity.^{1,2}

Relational continuity is the therapeutic relationship between a patient and 1 or more clinicians that bridges episodes of care and provides coherence through clinicians' growing comprehensive knowledge of the patient. It is most valued in primary care and family medicine. Informational continuity ensures connectedness and coherence by the uptake of information on past events and is most emphasized in the nursing sciences.³⁻⁶ Management continuity refers to consistent and coherent management by different clinicians

Conflicts of interest: authors report none.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Jeannie Haggerty, PhD
Department of Clinical Epidemiology and
Community Studies
St. Mary's Hospital Center
3830 Lacombe Ave
Montréal, Québec
H3T-1M5 Canada
Jeannie.Haggerty@mcgill.ca

through coordinated and timely delivery of complementary services. It is most emphasized in disease management and is the type most invoked in policy documents.

There is a dearth of generic measures of management continuity, and our initial intent was to develop such a measure from the patient's perspective that can be applied to a variety of conditions and not be confounded by technical quality of care. Existing measures focus on a specific care transition, such as discharge from hospital,^{7,8} or a health condition, such as diabetes,^{9,10} mental illness,¹¹⁻¹⁴ heart disease,^{15,16} or cancer.¹⁷ Some measures include the content of care, confounding technical quality of care with continuity. Some primary care evaluation tools include generic measures of care coordination¹⁸⁻²² but focus only on the primary care clinician rather than on the patient's experience across the system.^{23,24}

Ideally, the design of such an instrument is informed by qualitative inquiry. Freeman and colleagues²⁵ noted that continuity was principally defined by professionals, and they called for qualitative studies to explore what continuity means to patients and how best to measure that experience. Rather than undertaking our own qualitative study, we decided to build on the wealth of information produced after Freeman et al's call for studies. Despite our intention to identify management continuity themes, we also found elements of informational and relational continuity. Consequently, this article presents recurrent continuity-related themes in qualitative studies of patients' experience with care received from various clinicians, in a variety of contexts, and for various conditions, with a view to measure development.

METHODS

We conducted a metasummary of reports of qualitative study to identify continuity-related themes. In a metasummary the unit of analysis is the study report rather than transcripts of interviews from different studies. As outlined by Sandelowski and Barroso,²⁶ it consists of systematic identification of relevant qualitative studies, critical appraisal of the studies' quality, and coding of report extracts to identify emerging themes. The metasummary is an analysis of the data-driven integrated judgments and/or pronouncements made by researchers. We considered this method most suitable for identifying continuity-related issues across a variety of conditions and care settings. The study was approved by the Charles-Lemoyne Hospital ethics review committee.

Systematic Identification of Studies

We identified published qualitative studies from a search of electronic databases (MEDLINE, Embase,

CINAHL, PsycINFO) between 1997 and May 2007, containing the MeSH term "qualitative research" and related text phrases for "assessment of healthcare processes or outcomes" or "continuity of care" or "coordination of care," and consumer/spatient/client perceptions/understanding. We did not limit the search to "continuity of patient care" because we wanted to expand beyond an intended focus on continuity. We reviewed all research reports within the "continuity of care" priority areas funded by the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation and the National Institute for Health Research in England.

The abstracts and/or full text were scanned to ensure studies met all of 4 inclusion criteria: (1) used qualitative methods, (2) examined perception and experience of patients or an informal caregiver (not health professionals), (3) referred to care over time, and (4) referred to care received from more than 1 clinician. We excluded articles specifically focusing on the experience of a disease or treatment rather than on health care received. We wrote to the principal investigators of all eligible studies requesting a more detailed report. The unit of analysis remained the study, not the articles or reports.

Critical Appraisal of the Studies

All studies were appraised critically using the Walter et al (2004)²⁷ scoring grid for qualitative articles. We found that the scoring grid scored the quality of reporting rather than the methods, however, so we did not formally integrate the quality score into our analysis; instead, we prioritized findings that were well supported by citations and where we judged saturation was achieved.

Coding

Three of the authors (J.L.H., G.K.F., D.R.) independently coded the extracts to identify themes. Codes were defined clearly to ensure consistency between analysts and studies, then were collapsed or split and redefined through consensus meetings until there was minimal conceptual overlap. Codes were entered in NVivo (QSR International)²⁸ and grouped by continuity of care dimension. Only codes seen in more than 1 care context or condition were identified as generic.

RESULTS

We identified 514 potentially eligible studies; 34 met our inclusion criteria. We obtained additional reports for 8 studies. As shown in Table 1, studies addressed a wide variety of health conditions and care contexts. Below we describe the findings from this metasummary and show how the importance of connectedness

Table 1. Studies Included in the Metasummary, in Chronological Order, Showing Author, Year, Country, Qualitative Design, and Patient Population

Author Year, Country	Qualitative Design	Patient Population and Setting
American Hospital Association and The Picker Institute ²⁹ 1997, USA	Focus groups (n = 31) and Picker Institute patient surveys	Adult patients (public perceptions of health care and hospitals in 12 different states in the United States)
Burkey et al ³⁰ 1997, UK	In-depth semistructured interviews (n = 43); follow-up with 37 at 6 months	Patients followed at 5 general medical outpatient clinics (3 or more attendances) and discharged in April-May 1995
Adeyemi-Dalton et al ³¹ 1998, UK	Semistructured interviews about routine hospital follow-up (n = 113)	Women with breast cancer in remission discharged to usual care
Armitage et al ³² 1998, Australia	Telephone semistructured interviews (n = 29) at home (5 to 36 days after discharge) about discharge planning	Patients (inpatient >2 days) discharged from 3 medical wards of a large tertiary referral teaching hospital
Gallagher et al ³³ 1999, Canada	10 Individual semistructured interviews	Seniors from across Canada who use 2 or more health services, recruited in their community by Advisory Council members, themselves seniors
Wallace et al ³⁴ 1999, UK	Focus groups (n = 3)	Women with epilepsy recruited from tertiary hospital's Epilepsy Clinic and through the epilepsy support group
Wallace et al ³⁵ 1999, Canada	Focus groups (n = 9) with patients and family members separately (n = 41)	Psychiatry patients discharged from inpatient unit and still being treated in the outpatient department, and family members
McCourt et al ³⁶ 2000, UK	Semistructured narrative individual interviews (n = 20)	Visible minority women, one-half receiving caseload midwifery care and one-half conventional maternity care (ethnic categories: black Caribbean and African, South and East Asian, and Mediterranean or Middle Eastern)
Radwin et al ³⁷ 2000, USA	Interviews about quality nursing care with a semistructured schedule (n = 22)	Oncology patients in outpatient treatment at an urban medical center (19 hospitalized for cancer treatment at least once)
Bakker et al ³⁸ 2001, Canada	Interviews relatively unstructured in patient's home (n = 28)	Patients receiving chemotherapy at 1 of the 13 community chemotherapy clinics after medical oncology consultation at regional cancer center
Kai et al ⁵ 2001, UK	Individual in-depth interviews (n = 34)	Patients with enduring mental ill health registered with 4 general practices referred to 2 consultant psychiatrist-led community mental health teams at a local hospital inpatient unit
Bain et al ³⁹ 2002, Scotland	Focus groups (n = 4), 22 patients with colorectal cancer (and 10 of their relatives) and in-depth interviews conducted in the participants homes (n = 39 patients and 24 relatives)	Oncology and surgical outpatient clinics for colorectal cancer and from chemotherapy outpatients and in-patients. North and Northeast of Scotland
Harrison et al ⁴⁰ 2002, Canada	In-depth personal interviews and short telephone interviews to understand coordination of care	Patients (n = 26) discharged from an acute care hospital into the community with home care support, (n = 5 urban and 1 rural)
McKinney et al ⁴¹ 2002, UK	Phenomenological approach (interpretative Heideggerian approach, n = 6)	Patients (n = 6) who have been transferred from intensive care to general ward; before and after transfer from intensive care unit
Murray et al ⁴² 2002, UK	In-depth interviews every 3 months for 1 year with patients and their main caregiver plus professional identified as key by patients. Two multidisciplinary focus groups. Postbereavement interviews with caregivers and key professionals	Patients with inoperable lung cancer (n = 20) and patients with advanced cardiac failure (n = 20) receiving community terminal care, with caregivers and key professional carers
Osse et al ⁴³ 2002, The Netherlands	In-depth interviews with patients (n = 9) and relatives (n = 7) followed by interviews using a checklist (n = 31 and 15)	Adults cancer patients with metastatic disease in a palliative phase of cancer. Patients were selected through randomly chosen general practitioners and through patient organizations
Kroll et al ⁴⁴ 2003, USA	Semistructured telephone interviews (n = 30)	People with cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, or spinal cord injury, with reported problems of health insurance coverage and accessibility; across all services
O'Connell et al ⁴⁵ 2003, Australia	Focus groups (n = 12), mixed groups about transition from pediatric to adult care	Young adults (aged 16-25 years) with a disability, their caregivers, and health care service clinicians
Tarrant et al ⁴⁶ 2003, UK	Narrative-based individual interviews, "framework" approach. Followed by focus groups with patients (n = 4) and with health professionals (n = 4)	Adult patients (n = 40), practitioners (n = 13), practice and community nurses (n = 10), and practice administrative staff (n = 6) in 6 general practices in Leicestershire
Ware et al ¹⁴ 2003, USA	Ethnographic study using data collected through observation and open-ended interviewing	Severely mentally ill persons (n = 9) and their health professional, in public mental health services, Boston, Massachusetts
Arthur et al ⁴⁷ 2004, UK	Semistructured interviews (n = 10)	Rheumatology outpatients using antirheumatic drugs

Continued

Table 1. Studies Included in the Metasummary, in Chronological Order, Showing Author, Year, Country, Qualitative Design, and Patient Population (continued)

Author Year, Country	Qualitative Design	Patient Population and Setting
Dolovich et al ⁹ 2004, Canada	Focus groups with patients (n = 7) and health care clinicians (n = 2), approximately one-half being physicians	Patients with a diabetes diagnosis registered in a multidisciplinary health service organization in Ontario
Infante et al ⁴ 2004, Australia	Focus groups (n = 12)	Health consumers with chronic illnesses, followed in general practice
Miles et al ⁴⁸ 2004, UK	Single semistructured interviews (n = 7) about transition	Adolescent patients human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection transferred from hospital pediatric unit to the adult HIV outpatient center
Williams et al ⁴⁹ 2004, Australia	Colaizzi's phenomenological method using single semistructured interviews (n = 12)	Patients with multiple chronic illnesses for approximately 5 years, admitted to acute care hospital from home, during hospital care of at least 4 days' duration
Woodward et al ⁵⁰ 2004, Canada	Interviews home care case managers (n = 13), home service clinicians (n = 19), clients (n = 25), and their caregivers (n = 5) and 3 physicians	Home care cases with different entry mechanisms to home care (from hospital or from the community) and different availability of family caregivers
Pâquet et al ⁵¹ 2005, Canada	Focus groups (n = 3) from rural, semirural and urban milieu, about cardiac rehabilitation programs	Adults hospitalized for a cardiovascular event: myocardial infarction, angina, or percutaneous angioplasty
Alazri et al ⁶ 2006, UK	Focus groups (n = 12) about primary diabetes care	Patients with type 2 diabetes from 2 rural and 5 urban practices in Leeds of different sizes
Fraenkel et al ⁵² 2006, UK and USA	Focus groups (n = 8, 4 per setting)	Patients with hepatitis C attending the outpatient liver clinics in 2 different settings
McCurdy et al ⁵³ 2006, Canada	Qualitative case study approach, 4 focus groups with young adults about pediatric to adult care transition	Patients aged 19-24 years, after transfer at 18 years from pediatric to adult center after kidney, liver, or heart transplant
Naithani et al ⁵⁴ 2006, UK	In-depth semistructured interviews in patient's home	Type 2 diabetic patients from general practices in 2 inner London boroughs with young, mobile, and ethnically diverse populations and high level of deprivation
Hildingsson et al ³ 2007, Sweden	Written response to 1 open-ended question about maternity services	Women seen in a Swedish prenatal clinic
Lester et al ⁵⁵ 2007, UK	Focus groups (n = 18) (separate with patients, physicians, practice nurses)	Patients with broadly defined serious mental illness in 6 primary care trusts, West Midlands
Burns et al ¹³ 2007, UK	In-depth interviews with 20 psychotic patients and 11 nonpsychotic patients	Patients with mental illness (and their caregivers) in 2 London mental health National Health Service accessing a variety of health and social services

and patients as active participants were important to patients' perception of continuity. A summary of the identified themes are displayed in Table 2.

Connectedness as Security and Confidence, Not Seamlessness

Terms such as "seamlessness," "smoothness," and "uninterrupted care" were used by researchers to describe the degree of connectedness between health care encounters,^{14,57-60} but patients seem to experience continuity as feelings, either positively as security,^{3,31,37,38,61} confidence,^{33,36,38,40,46,54} safety,^{61,62} or support⁴⁰; or they experience them negatively as uncertainty,^{32,41} insecurity,^{33,34} lostness,^{52,55} vulnerability,^{37,56} or mistrust.^{34,49} They may respond by seeking alternate care (including self-care), mistrusting their clinician, becoming noncompliant, or withdrawing from the formal care system.⁵⁴

...trust was linked to care coordination. In particular, patients felt more confident that mistakes were less likely to happen and that clinicians would be "on top of things" because they were connected to a "responsible party."³⁷

Connectedness Beyond Health Care Encounters

Perhaps not surprisingly, patients' experience of continuity transcends health care encounters to include connectedness between their personal lives and the health system.

They regarded visits to their doctor as part of their lives, in which their diseases were integrated. The patients felt it was important for their health care that the doctor be informed of their life situation, to create a sense of coherence.⁶⁰

Predictability and stability are hallmarks of well-organized health care and successful transitions, providing a sense of security, coping, and confidence about future care.^{14,29,40,42} Even so, predictability needs to be balanced with flexibility and adaptation to changing needs, knowing that appointments can be more frequent or that a contingency plan is in place if the patient needs it.^{14,29,54}

Patients as Active Agents

The patient's role emerged in management, informational, and relational continuity. Many patients want

and expect to be involved in their care, specifically in communicating, monitoring, and self-management.^{3,40} They want their role and ideas to be acknowledged, however, especially from their most trusted clinician.

A very dramatic finding...was the importance of consumers in coordinating their own care.... This...involvement may include a variety of actions that have been classified as consumer roles: communicate, monitor, prepare, and manage.⁴⁰

Additionally, patients emphasized how patient self-care and self-responsibility are integral parts of continuity of care... given that patients with a chronic condition make many healthcare decisions external to the healthcare system, and are required to continually and consistently adhere to their decisions to maintain their health....⁹

But not all patients are willing or able to take such a role,⁴ notably those who are not familiar with the health system, have low health literacy, or are simply not able to advocate for themselves.⁴⁶ This group can include otherwise-proactive patients whose illnesses worsen. These patients' sense of security and connectedness depends on coordinating actions taken on their behalf.

Patients talk about how assertive they must be to get answers, and the frustrations of trying to coordinate care among many different specialists. Many of these patients worry about what will happen if and when they are too sick to manage such things on their own behalf.³⁹

Management Continuity or Experienced Coordination

Coordination Assumed, Not Observed

Studies consistently specified that coordination is fundamental to care being connected and coherent, but coordination, by definition, refers to collabora-

tive actions among clinicians, and little evidence was provided in the studies about patient awareness of such actions.⁵⁴ An ethnographic study of continuity of care for patients with severe mental health problems observed a variety of coordination mechanisms to create connectedness and smoothness,¹⁴ but it was clinicians who were conscious of these behaviors, not patients. Patients presume communication between clinicians, consistent retrieval of available information, and the existence of an agreed-upon care pathway. Coordination is inferred when no problems have occurred:

When care was coordinated, patients felt that clinicians had communicated with one another.³⁷

Clients are least likely to talk about care management as important to continuity; only clients who had experienced care management problems that resulted in discontinuities commented on it.²⁹

Likewise, patients seldom observe the negotiation of roles and complementary actions among different professionals, although role clarity emerged as a recurrent finding. Again, role clarity is assumed until proven otherwise and enters patients' awareness as discontinuity when different clinicians work at cross-purposes or when care is compromised because of lack of coordination or communication.^{49,51,52}

Physicians' confusion regarding perceived roles and responsibilities for the care of patients with HCV [hepatitis C virus] resulted in frustration on the part of patients and physicians, and poor treatment of patients' symptoms.⁵²

An indicator of confused or unclear roles is when patients receive conflicting advice or information.^{50,51,54} Inconsistent messages or lack of role clarity shakes patients' faith in their clinicians' overall competence and expertise.^{5,51}

Patients considered that consulting more than 1 doctor could disorganize the treatment plan initiated by their named GP [general practitioner], as they might receive different opinions from the various doctors, confusing them about whose advice to follow.⁶

Clinicians' Care Plans Are Not Patients' Care Plans

The care plan used by clinicians outlines the content and timing of services on the clinical pathway, and study reports consistently emphasize its importance. Again, patients presume their different clinicians share such a plan.^{6,14,54} Simply receiving written information about treatment does not constitute a functional care plan

Table 2. Summary of Identified Themes Related to Experienced Continuity of Care When Seeing Multiple Clinicians

Dimension	Emerging Finding
Overarching themes	Connectedness experienced as security and confidence, not seamlessness Connectedness beyond health care encounters: between personal lives and health care Patients as active agents: for most but not all patients
Management continuity or experienced coordination	Coordination assumed, not observed Clinician care plans are not patient care plans; patients want to know what to expect, what to do Every transition benefits from discharge planning
Informational continuity	Information among clinicians experienced through gaps Information from clinicians enables patient agency and empowerment
Relational continuity	One, most trusted clinician among many Beyond empathy to partnership
Care coordinator	An identified and proactive connector and advocate who knows the patient

for patients, especially when the treatment plan fails to account for comorbidities⁴⁹ or presupposes resources or capacity that is unrealistic for the patient.^{33,50-52} For patients, a functional care plan provides a sense of their future care or health trajectory and can be integrated into their lives. Patients want to know how their health condition will likely change over time and what they can do, and they want to have predictable scheduling and content of care, a specific plan for when things go wrong, and confidence their care will change in a timely way when and if their health condition changes.^{6,39,46,50,54}

Every Transition Benefits From Discharge Planning

The literature consistently indicated the transition across organizational boundaries as the breaking point for continuity of care, and our analysis underlines this problem. Most of the focus is on discharge from a hospital, but whenever a patient crosses an organizational boundary, care is vulnerable to discontinuity.

Patients often experience a discontinuity of care as they move back and forth between inpatient, outpatient, and home care settings. They do not understand the institutional and functional boundaries and find it difficult to negotiate the system actively.³⁹

Professionals often forget that every transition is a new experience for patients, who need transition support. Learning from hospital discharge planning, transition care provides information to help patients anticipate and understand the new environment and know where to get help, and it outlines a contingency plan for returning to a safe care environment in the case of unmanageable distress.^{35,40,41,43,51}

Informational Continuity

Information Among Clinicians Experienced Through Gaps

Patients assume clinicians are communicating until proven otherwise. Communication failures defined patients' experience of discontinuity in almost two-thirds of the studies. Evidence of failure to transfer or use appropriate information occurs when important patient comorbidities or life circumstances are ignored,^{29,49} when clinicians are unaware of other professionals' treatment decisions,⁶ and when patients get conflicting messages.^{5,50} Patients find repeating information for every clinician particularly disturbing and burdensome,^{37,51,60} especially when it is sensitive or embarrassing and is probably in the medical record.^{5,14}

Information From Clinicians Enables Patient Agency

Information transfer between patients and clinicians was included by one author as part of management continuity⁵⁴ and by another as an element of relational

continuity and self-management.⁹ We include it as a dimension of informational continuity given how often it was raised in this context. This dimension overlaps and interacts with the functional care plan, above.

Many participants described the importance of communication links. These links referred to communication between the patients and their specific health care clinicians as well as to the communication between health care professionals.³⁸

Patients, especially those who see themselves as agents of their own care, want to be part of the information loop around their care, both giving and receiving information.⁴⁸ Information needs most commonly identified were about the health condition and effects of treatment,^{30,31,42,52,62} prognosis,^{32,47} what to expect in a new environment or on discharge,^{41,49,53} self-management and treatment,⁴⁰ and contingency plans for complications or unexpected events.⁵³ Information empowers patients, giving them a sense of partnership and control,^{3,37,43} particularly for informal caregivers.^{44,60} Just as most information transfer between clinicians depends upon documentation, written information for patients is important for achieving continuity and a sense of security. Several studies suggest that enabling patients with information is more problematic in primary than in secondary care.^{44,53,57}

Relational Continuity

One Most Trusted Clinician Among Many

Two-thirds of the studies referred to the importance of a therapeutic relationship, especially with an individual clinician who has developed a comprehensive knowledge of the patient as a whole person and uses that in managing a health condition.^{4,46,60} This relationship was characterized by "trust" in 16 studies. When patients see various clinicians, having a single trusted clinician is particularly important for sensitive or embarrassing aspects of care and for managing comorbidity.^{5,6,49}

Responders consistently highlighted the importance of building a continuing relationship with one individual over time. This allowed responders to feel that the professional had developed an understanding of their problems and of possible solutions achievable within the particular context of their own social and medical histories.⁵

The relationship is so important that some patients trade off the clinical expertise of specialists for the security of being looked after by a known and trusted family physician.^{38,45,55,60} Patients are often proactive in maintaining a continuing relationship, typically by making appointments when not necessarily ill. This activity is legitimized through wellness care in general practice,^{4,46,60} but it also occurs in such other contexts as mental health.⁵

Beyond Empathy to Partnership

Partnership seems especially important for patients seeing multiple clinicians, especially if they assume an active role in care. Partnership involves sharing power in the therapeutic relationship.^{4,9,51,60} Patients want to be taken seriously, be empowered to share in decision making, and have their contribution to care enabled and recognized.^{5,37,51,54,60}

Health professionals were often key people with whom responders could discuss their problems and mental distress, given these contexts. Some felt that this had formed one important source of support over time, which had helped them overcome barriers. They felt more empowered to identify solutions and establish control over their lives and illness experience.⁵

Care Coordinator

Typically, the clinician with comprehensive knowledge is also the care coordinator, reinforcing ongoing trust and relationship,* but this relationship can change when care is intensified in a specific context, such as in a hospital, with home care, or with active cancer treatment.^{31,36,37} Likewise, some patients trade off comprehensive knowledge for care coordination by a specialist who can assure the highest quality of care.^{44,47,52}

The notion of care coordinator was expressed succinctly as "the one in charge of your health care in the system."⁶ Although not always aware of specific actions, patients know the care coordinator organizes the care journey, is their advocate, and generally is "on top of things" for them.^{29,37}

They felt their clinician should not only be knowledgeable about their health care needs, but also provide assistance with navigating the complexity of...care delivery systems.⁴⁴

Patients emphasize that security comes from knowing that a personal GP assumes responsibility, keeps care coordinated, and refers to other professionals when needed.⁶⁰

The studies provide evidence of patients knowing when comprehensive knowledge about them is brought to bear on the care plan,^{5,38,46} when transfers are arranged,^{53,62} when information or the care plan is passed on to other clinicians,^{29,37} when monitoring and follow-up is proactive,^{40,55} and when the coordinator has good working relationships with other clinicians involved in their care.^{29,52}

DISCUSSION

This review of qualitative studies of the patient experience of seeking care from multiple clinicians was undertaken to gain insights initially as a basis for a

generic measure of management continuity from the patient perspective. Perhaps the most striking insight is that the desire for connectedness extends beyond health care encounters to include connectedness between health care and the rest of the patient's life, which translates to a sense of security and confidence more than of seamlessness. We could not extricate relational or informational continuity from management continuity, but new nuances emerge in the context of multiple clinicians. Patients often want to play an active role in connecting their health care, especially in ambulatory care for chronic conditions, which adds a partnership dimension to relational continuity with the most trusted clinician. Provision of information to patients enables and empowers them in their own care and emerges as a dimension of informational continuity and partnership. Care plans not only help different clinicians coordinate their complementary services but also outline an expected trajectory for patients, providing a sense of security and a basis for shared decision making. Not all patients are able to assume an active role, however, making the accumulated knowledge from relational continuity critical to adapting care.

Our investigation has strengths and limitations. The metasummary includes various study designs and addresses a broad range of contexts from different disciplinary perspectives. This approach is a strength for developing a generic measure based on recurring themes recurring across studies. The metasummary, however, limits us to findings considered important or significant by the researcher and may miss those considered minor in the original study that would have emerged as important across several studies. Another limitation is that the patient's voice is captured only in the citations in the report; limited exposure to the patient's voice poses a challenge for finding appropriate language for a patient questionnaire. There were additional issues or emphases pertinent to specific types of care or patient groups, and we purposely selected those generic for ambulatory care. Despite these limitations, we believe the metasummary provided information that was vastly richer than would have been obtained from doing another single qualitative study.

A final limitation is that our review ended with studies published in mid-2007, and several more recent studies would meet eligibility for inclusion. Although not submitted to the same level of analysis, the recent studies did not contradict or substantially change our conclusions.^{17,63-70} Our findings are highly coherent with a recent metasynthesis of 25 qualitative studies of patients' perceptions of continuity of care by Waibel and colleagues.⁷¹ Their synthesis aimed to contribute new knowledge to the conceptualization of continuity of care, whereas we were looking for measurable dimen-

* References: 4-6, 33, 44, 46, 50, 53, 55, 60.

sions in the multiple clinician context. We both identify patient involvement in care as a key element; Waibel et al classify patient involvement as a facilitator of continuity; however, and we believe that informing and educating patients are integral to informational continuity, and that supporting and recognizing the patient's role in care are dimensions of relational continuity that are particularly important when a patient's care spans multiple clinicians. We emphasize that confidence—a state of trust, reliance, and a feeling of hope—applies not only to relational continuity but is how patients experience management continuity as a proxy for seamlessness.

From a measurement perspective, this analysis shows that many aspects contributing to care continuity are assumed by patients. Eliciting their evaluations of communication between clinicians or of care planning will reflect their assumptions rather than their lived experience; however, they can accurately report on failures and gaps. Consequently, when we developed the measure of continuity of care,^{7,23} for some dimensions of management and information continuity, we elicited experience of discontinuity, such as observed lack of coordination and information gaps. Because patients can accurately evaluate whether they have received information giving them a care plan, whether their clinicians use comprehensive knowledge about them in care coordination, and whether they have a sense of partnership, we measured these attributes as positive expressions of continuity. Finally, we elicited experiences of abandonment or lostness, suffering, and recourse to nonplanned care as lack of seamlessness or fragmented care.

From the health service delivery perspective, clinicians need to recognize the stress for patients of crossing any care boundary. There is an implicit pledge that clinicians will communicate and coordinate across boundaries, and experienced failures shake patients' confidence and trust, often with negative health or health care consequences. Most patients are willing and able to assume some agency in management, however, and clinicians need to build this capacity through information sharing and partnership. Though most continuity-related reforms emphasize information and service integration, the patient's perspective underlines the need to support and protect relational continuity with trusted and trustworthy clinicians.

To read or post commentaries in response to this article, see it online at <http://www.annfammed.org/content/11/3/262>.

Key words: continuity of patient care; primary health care; patient-centered care; quality of health care; patient satisfaction; process assessment (health care); qualitative research

Submitted April 10, 2012; submitted, revised, August 23, 2012; accepted September 4, 2012.

Funding support This study was supported by a research grant from the Funds for Health Research of Quebec. During the conduct of this study Dr Haggerty held a salary award as a Canada Research Chair funded at the Université de Sherbrooke funded by the Canadian Institute for Health Research.

Prior presentations: Some of the material in this article was presented at the following peer-reviewed scientific conferences:

Haggerty J, Beaulieu C, Bouharaoui F, Fournier M, Freeman G, Roberge D. "When patients see many clinicians: development and validation of a generic measure of management or cross-boundary continuity of care." North American Primary Care Research Group (NAPCRG), Seattle, Washington, November 13-17, 2010.

Haggerty J, Freeman G, Roberge D, Fournier M, Beaulieu C, Mvumbi Mambu L, "A meta-summary of qualitative studies of patient experience of care from different clinicians: common themes leading to a generic measure of management continuity." Society for Academic Primary Care, United Kingdom, July 2009.

References

- Haggerty JL, Reid RJ, Freeman GK, Starfield BH, Adair CE, McKendry R. Continuity of care: a multidisciplinary review. *BMJ*. 2003; 327(7425):1219-1221.
- Reid R, Haggerty J, McKendry R. *Defusing the Confusion: Concepts and Measures of Continuity of Care*. Ottawa: Fondation canadienne de la recherche sur les services de santé; 2002 mars.
- Hildingsson I, Thomas JE. Women's perspectives on maternity services in Sweden: processes, problems, and solutions. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2007;52(2):126-133.
- Infante FA, Proudfoot JG, Powell Davies G, et al. How people with chronic illnesses view their care in general practice: a qualitative study. *Med J Aust*. 2004;181(2):70-73.
- Kai J, Crosland A. Perspectives of people with enduring mental ill health from a community-based qualitative study. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2001;51(470):730-736.
- Alazri MH, Neal RD, Heywood P, Leese B. Patients' experiences of continuity in the care of type 2 diabetes: a focus group study in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2006;56(528):488-495.
- Coleman EA, Feuer EJ; NCI Breast Cancer Screening Consortium. Breast cancer screening among women from 65 to 74 years of age in 1987-88 and 1991. *Ann Intern Med*. 1992;117(11):961-966.
- Hadjistavropoulos H, Biem H, Sharpe D, Bourgault-Fagnou M, Janzen J. Patient perceptions of hospital discharge: reliability and validity of a patient continuity of care questionnaire. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2008;20(5):314-323.
- Dolovich LR, Nair KM, Ciliska DK, et al. The Diabetes Continuity of Care Scale: the development and initial evaluation of a questionnaire that measures continuity of care from the patient perspective. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2004;12(6):475-487.
- Gulliford MC, Naithani S, Morgan M. Measuring continuity of care in diabetes mellitus: an experience-based measure. *Ann Fam Med*. 2006;4(6):548-555.
- Adair CE, McDougall GM, Mitton CR, et al. Continuity of care and health outcomes among persons with severe mental illness. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2005;56(9):1061-1069.
- Cockerill R, Jaglal S, Lemieux Charles L, Chambers L, Brazil K, Cohen C. Components of coordinated care: a new instrument of assess caregivers' and care recipients' experiences with networks of dementia care. *Dementia*. 2006;5(1):51-66.
- Burns T, Catty J, Clement S, et al. *Experiences of Continuity of Care and Health and Social Outcomes: The ECHO Study*. London: NCCSDO; 2007.

14. Ware NC, Dickey B, Tugenberg T, McHorney CA. CONNECT: a measure of continuity of care in mental health services. *Ment Health Serv Res.* 2003;5(4):209-221.
15. Kowalyk KM, Hadjistavropoulos HD, Biem HJ. Measuring continuity of care for cardiac patients: development of a patient self-report questionnaire. *Can J Cardiol.* 2004;20(2):205-212.
16. Hadjistavropoulos HD, Biem HJ, Kowalyk KM. Measurement of continuity of care in cardiac patients: reliability and validity of an in-person questionnaire. *Can J Cardiol.* 2004;20(9):883-891.
17. King M, Jones L, Richardson A, et al. The relationship between patients' experiences of continuity of cancer care and health outcomes: a mixed methods study. *Br J Cancer.* 2008;98(3):529-536.
18. Safran DG, Kosinski M, Tarlov AR, et al. The Primary Care Assessment Survey: tests of data quality and measurement performance. *Med Care.* 1998;36(5):728-739.
19. Flocke SA. Measuring attributes of primary care: development of a new instrument. *J Fam Pract.* 1997;45(1):64-74.
20. Cassady CE, Starfield B, Hurtado MP, Berk RA, Nanda JP, Friedenberg LA. Measuring consumer experiences with primary care. *Pediatrics.* 2000;105(4 Pt 2):998-1003.
21. Shi L, Starfield B, Xu J. Validating the Adult Primary Care Assessment Tool. *J Fam Pract.* 2001;50(2):161-171.
22. Flocke SA, Miller WL, Crabtree BF. Relationships between physician practice style, patient satisfaction, and attributes of primary care. [see comment]. *J Fam Pract.* 2002;51(10):835-840.
23. Haggerty J, Beaulieu C, Lawson B, Santor D, Fournier M, Burge F. What patients tell us about primary healthcare evaluation instruments: response formats, bad questions and missing pieces. *Healthc Policy.* 2011;7(Spec Issue):66-78.
24. Haggerty J, Burge F, Pineault R, et al. Management continuity from the patient perspective: comparison of primary healthcare evaluation instruments. *Healthc Policy.* 2011;7(Spec Issue)139-153.
25. Freeman G, Shepperd S, Robinson I, Ehrich K, Richard S. *Continuity of Care: Report of a Scoping Exercise for the National Co-ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisation R & D.* London: NCCSDO; 2001.
26. Sandelowski M, Barroso J. Creating metasummaries of qualitative findings. *Nurs Res.* 2003;52(4):226-233.
27. Walter FM, Emery J, Braithwaite D, Marteau TM. Lay understanding of familial risk of common chronic diseases: a systematic review and synthesis of qualitative research. *Ann Fam Med.* 2004;2(6):583-594.
28. Guizzo BS, Krzimirski CdeO, de Oliveira DL. [The software QSR Nvivo 2.0 in qualitative data analysis: a tool for health and human sciences researches]. *Rev Gaucha Enferm.* 2003;24(1):53-60.
29. Woodward CA, Abelson J, Tedford S, Hutchison B. What is important to continuity in home care? Perspectives of key stakeholders. *Soc Sci Med.* 2004;58(1):177-192.
30. Arthur V, Clifford C. Rheumatology: the expectations and preferences of patients for their follow-up monitoring care: a qualitative study to determine the dimensions of patient satisfaction. *J Clin Nurs.* 2004;13(2):234-242.
31. Adewuyi-Dalton R, Ziebland S, Grunfeld E, Hall A. Patients' views of routine hospital follow-up: a qualitative study of women with breast cancer in remission. *Psychooncology.* 1998;7(5):436-439.
32. Armitage SK, Kavanagh KM. Consumer-orientated outcomes in discharge planning: a pilot study. *J Clin Nurs.* 1998;7(1):67-74.
33. Gallagher EM, Hodge G. The forgotten stakeholders: seniors' values concerning their health care. *Int J Health Care Qual Assur Inc Leadersh Health Serv.* 1999;12(2-3):79-86.
34. Wallace HK, Solomon JK. Quality of epilepsy treatment and services: the views of women with epilepsy. *Seizure.* 1999;8(2):81-87.
35. Miles K, Edwards S, Clapson M. Transition from paediatric to adult services: experiences of HIV-positive adolescents. *AIDS Care.* 2004;16(3):305-314.
36. McCourt C, Pearce A. Does continuity of carer matter to women from minority ethnic groups? *Midwifery.* 2000;16(2):145-154.
37. Radwin L. Oncology patients' perceptions of quality nursing care. *Res Nurs Health.* 2000;23(3):179-190.
38. Bakker DA, DesRochers C, McChesney C, Fitch M, Bennett J. Community cancer clinics: patients' perspectives. *Support Care Cancer.* 2001;9(4):234-240.
39. American Hospital Association and the Picker Institute. Eye on patients: excerpts from a report on patients' concerns and experiences about the health care system. *J Health Care Finance.* 1997;23(4):2-11.
40. Harrison A, Verhoef M. Understanding coordination of care from the consumer's perspective in a regional health system. *Health Serv Res.* 2002;37(4):1031-1054.
41. McKinney AA, Deeny P. Leaving the intensive care unit: a phenomenological study of the patients' experience. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs.* 2002;18(6):320-331.
42. Pâquet M, Bolduc N, Xhignesse M, Vanasse A. Re-engineering cardiac rehabilitation programmes: considering the patient's point of view. *J Adv Nurs.* 2005;51(6):567-576.
43. Burkey Y, Black M, Reeve H. Patients' views on their discharge from follow up in outpatient clinics: qualitative study. *BMJ.* 1997;315(7116):1138-1141.
44. Kroll T, Neri MT. Experiences with care co-ordination among people with cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, or spinal cord injury. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2003;25(19):1106-1114.
45. Bain NS, Campbell NC, Ritchie LD, Cassidy J. Striking the right balance in colorectal cancer care—a qualitative study of rural and urban patients. *Fam Pract.* 2002;19(4):369-374.
46. Tarrant C, Windridge K, Boulton M, Baker R, Freeman G. How important is personal care in general practice? *BMJ.* 2003;326(7402):1310.
47. Murray SA, Boyd K, Kendall M, Worth A, Benton TF, Clausen H. Dying of lung cancer or cardiac failure: prospective qualitative interview study of patients and their carers in the community. *BMJ.* 2002;325(7370):929.
48. Salmoni A, Pong R. *Continuity of Care for Community-dwelling Seniors.* Ottawa: Canadian Health Services Research Foundation and Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-term Care. 2003.
49. Williams A. Patients with comorbidities: perceptions of acute care services. *J Adv Nurs.* 2004;46(1):13-22.
50. Osse BH, Vernooij-Dassen MJ, Schadé E, de Vree B, van den Muijsenbergh ME, Grol RP. Problems to discuss with cancer patients in palliative care: a comprehensive approach. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2002;47(3):195-204.
51. Wallace T, Robertson E, Millar C, Frisch SR. Perceptions of care and services by the clients and families: a personal experience. *J Adv Nurs.* 1999;29(5):1144-1153.
52. Fraenkel L, McGraw S, Wongcharatrawee S, Garcia-Tsao G. Patients' experiences related to anti-viral treatment for hepatitis C. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2006;62(1):148-155.
53. O'Connell B, Bailey S, Pearce J. Straddling the pathway from paediatrician to mainstream health care: transition issues experienced in disability care. *Aust J Rural Health.* 2003;11(2):57-63.
54. Naithani S, Gulliford M, Morgan M. Patients' perceptions and experiences of 'continuity of care' in diabetes. *Health Expect.* 2006;9(2):118-129.
55. Lester H, Tritter JQ, Sorohan H. Patients' and health professionals' views on primary care for people with serious mental illness: focus group study. *BMJ.* 2005;330(7500):1122.
56. Bass RD, Windle C. Continuity of care: an approach to measurement. *Am J Psychiatry.* 1972;129(2):196-201.

57. Saarento O, Oiesvold T, Sytema S, et al. The Nordic Comparative Study on Sectorized Psychiatry: continuity of care related to characteristics of the psychiatric services and the patients. *Soc Psychiatr Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 1998;33(11):521-527.
58. Shortell SM. Continuity of medical care: conceptualization and measurement. *Med Care*. 1976;14(5):377-391.
59. Donaldson MS. Continuity of care: a reconceptualization. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2001;58(3):255-290.
60. von Bültzingslöwen I, Eliasson G, Sarvimäki A, Mattsson B, Hjortdahl P. Patients' views on interpersonal continuity in primary care: a sense of security based on four core foundations. *Fam Pract*. 2006;23(2):210-219.
61. Arnaud JP, Gramfort JL, Weill-Bousson M, Dahly R, Adloff M. [Contribution to the study of cholecystoses. Clinical, radiological and pathological analysis (author's transl)]. *Sem Hop*. 1981;57(3-4):189-195.
62. McCurdy C, DiCenso A, Boblin S, Ludwin D, Bryant-Lukosius D, Bosompra K. There to here: young adult patients' perceptions of the process of transition from pediatric to adult transplant care. *Prog Transplant*. 2006;16(4):309-316.
63. Shaw KL, Southwood TR, McDonagh JE; British Paediatric Rheumatology Group. User perspectives of transitional care for adolescents with juvenile idiopathic arthritis. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*. 2004;43(6):770-778.
64. Cowie L, Morgan M, White P, Gulliford M. Experience of continuity of care of patients with multiple long-term conditions in England. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2009;14(2):82-87.
65. McCormack B, Mitchell EA, Cook G, Reed JAN, Childs S. Older persons' experiences of whole systems: the impact of health and social care organizational structures. *J Nurs Manag*. 2008;16(2):105-114.
66. Medina-Mirapeix F, Oliveira-Sousa S, Sobral-Ferreira M, et al. Continuity of rehabilitation services in post-acute care from the ambulatory outpatients' perspective: a qualitative study. *J Rehabil Med*. 2011;43(1):58-64.
67. Miller AR, Condin CJ, McKellin WH, Shaw N, Klassen AF, Sheps S. Continuity of care for children with complex chronic health conditions: parents' perspectives. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2009;9:242.
68. Jones IR, Ahmed N, Catty J, et al; Echo group. Illness careers and continuity of care in mental health services: a qualitative study of service users and carers. *Soc Sci Med*. 2009;69(4):632-639.
69. Berendsen AJ, de Jong GM, Meyboom-de Jong B, Dekker JH, Schulding J. Transition of care: experiences and preferences of patients across the primary/secondary interface—a qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2009;9:62.
70. Preston C, Cheater F, Baker R, Hearnshaw H. Left in limbo: patients' views on care across the primary/secondary interface. *Qual Health Care*. 1999;8(1):16-21.
71. Waibel S, Henao D, Aller M-B, Vargas I, Vázquez M-L. What do we know about patients' perceptions of continuity of care? A meta-synthesis of qualitative studies. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2012;24(1):39-48.
72. Haggerty JL, Roberge D, Freeman GK, Beaulieu C, Bréton M. When patients encounter several clinicians: Validation of a generic measure of continuity of care. *Ann Fam Med*. submitted.

family medicine RESIDENCY CURRICULUM resource

The Family Medicine Residency Curriculum Resource was developed to house peer-reviewed, competency-based curriculum content organized by post-graduate year. When complete, the resource will comprise case-base presentations, quizzes, and facilitators' guides for the core content of family medicine education.

Log on now for PGY1 topics and recommended readings and to submit an application for curriculum development.

www.fammedrcr.org

Smarter together — building a standardized, peer reviewed residency curriculum resource with interactive learning covering all core topics of family medicine

