areas for change. This is the assumption behind the Prescription Pricing Authority statistics which are provided to each general practitioner.

The same system could be applied to the referral habits, the care of chronic diseases and the preventive care of general practitioners. However, little evidence is available to demonstrate an alteration in clinical behaviour from general feedback of this kind. This lack of evidence may further increase the trend towards using information as a means of regulating the profession. We are all aware of the variation in the standards of care which patients encounter but the profession has been unable to identify unacceptable practice because the data has not been available. Information gathering in general practice will increasingly highlight practitioners whose performance fails to match objective criteria and the profession will be faced with a challenge: respond to this information with education and professional regulation or have external controls imposed.

Here lies the nub of the issue. Bearing in mind the reluctance to date to define and enforce minimum standards of care, will the profession become prepared to do so in the future on the basis of information supplied by external sources? If we appear reluctant to impose and police minimum standards because we doubt the validity of the information, it is possible that pressure from government and from patients for externally imposed standards will become intense.

Furthermore, the DHSS will no doubt wish to use the information to establish guidelines for identifying general practitioners who refer patients frequently to hospital, have high prescribing costs and achieve low rates of immunization. It is their clear intention to use such information to implement a performance related contract. Both minimum standards and a performance related contract might therefore be imposed using information derived from data of unknown quality and analyses of unknown integrity.

General practitioners will be vulnerable unless we can check the quality of the original data and monitor its conversion into information. The imposition of inappropriate performance criteria will distort our professional work in a way which will not necessarily be in the interests of patients. In the long term, external controls will weaken the concept of self-regulation, which has been the hallmark of professions in the past.

There are only two realistic alternatives. General practitioners, through their representative bodies, must either purchase the raw data and be in a position to monitor its validity, or set up an independent data gathering system. Either of these two courses would be expensive both in money and in time, but the risks of passivity are quite profound. The message in Bacon's aphorism appears as clear today as it was in 1619.

M I K E  P R I N G L E
Senior Lecturer in General Practice, University of Nottingham
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Rediscovering the role of the pharmacist

S E L D O M is the pharmacist considered part of the primary care team, yet both the Nuffield report and the government's green and white papers on primary care have recommended an increase in the role of the community pharmacist, especially in the now eroded activity of advice giving. Certainly the functions of general practitioners and pharmacists overlap, but the pharmacist should not be portrayed as providing a complementary service rather than a competitive service to the general public. There is a sufficient need for accessible, professional health care at all levels in the community for the pharmacist to perform an important and valuable role. General practitioners should welcome the pharmacist's contribution, and the burden it may lift from their own workloads. As Taylor pointed out previously in this Journ-

It is now well known that general practitioners only see the tip of the iceberg, and that many people react to symptoms without consulting their doctor. Traditionally people have resorted to home remedies of various types, and in pre-NHS days many will have used the local pharmacist for both advice and treatment. While the advent of free health care for all led to a change in the main function of pharmacists, their role in the community still retains some of its traditional basis — this has tended to remain unacknowledged, ill researched and poorly remunerated. Today lay responses to illness often involve the purchase and use of over-the-counter remedies: for example, research into the lay management of children's illnesses has shown that these form a large part of treatment for minor symptoms. Indeed these replace traditional home remedies as the common response to minor illness. Although not everyone uses proprietary medicines, for many people they nevertheless play an important role, both before and instead of going to see a general practitioner. They may also, of course, be recommended by the general practitioner.

A community pharmacist can be used for advice on 'differential diagnosis', as an alternative to the doctor and as a stepping stone to the doctor. In addition to this there are potentially numerous fleeting contacts when a person purchases the over-the-counter medicine that they have already decided upon. It would seem that although pharmacists today have lost some of their traditional functions they have retained others: they are seldom required now to compound their own medicines, yet their role as the givers of advice and treatment for minor ailments remains significant.

There are many positive aspects to this situation from the patient's point of view. The pharmacist enables people to cope with their own and others' minor symptoms, without necessarily seeking the attention of a doctor. Pharmacists provide an external source of advice, and may help people to come to appropriate decisions about care for themselves. A considerable strength of the community pharmacists' role is that they form a convenient part of existing lay health resources. For many they are accessible, informal, helpful and responsive. They are in a unique position...
A challenging and informative new book for all in the primary health care team...

MEDICAL PRACTICE IN A MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY

J H S Fuller and P D Toon
Lecturers

Joint Department of General Practice and Primary Care, The London and St Bartholomew's Hospitals, and General Practitioners, Hackney, London.

This book is for all in the primary health care team, dealing in a practical way with the cultural and racial characteristics of their patients which have a bearing on health and illness.

- Presents detailed information on the social, family and cultural patterns of different groups.
- Offers guidance on how to work constructively towards better health care in multicultural communities.
- Suggests ways to improve communication between doctors and patients, with specific advice on the use of interpreters and examination of patients in different cultural groups.
- Details the psychiatric and organic disorders characteristic of different races and cultures.
- Features key points that will benefit practitioner and patient alike.
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