Recruiting Doctors From and for Underserved Groups: Does New Brunswick's Initiative to Recruit Doctors for Its Linguistic Minority Help Rural Communities?

Jacinthe Beauchamp, PhD,¹ Mathieu Bélanger, PhD,¹⁻⁴ Aurel Schofield, MD,¹⁻³ Rachel Bordage, BScN,^{1,2} Denise Donovan, MD,^{1,5} Michel Landry, MD^{2,3}

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: Within health care, there are underserved groups. New Brunswick's French-speaking minority, which also mostly lives in rural communities, is one such group. A physician shortage potentially prevents this population from accessing health promotion and clinical prevention services. This study analyzes whether New Brunswick Francophone doctors with rural backgrounds are more likely than doctors from urban regions to set up practice in rural communities of the province.

METHODS: A questionnaire was sent to 390 New Brunswick Francophone physicians admitted in medicine between 1973 and 2000. It collected information on geographic origin and history of medical practice. Multivariate logistic regressions were used to identify whether a rural background is associated with the likelihood of ever and currently practicing in rural communities. We used the General Practice Rurality Index-simplified to quantify the rurality level of communities.

RESULTS: In total, 264 (67%) physicians participated. A rural background was positively associated with the establishment of a first medical practice in a rural community. This relationship was only significant among family physicians. There was no statistically significant relationship between rurality of community of origin and rurality of current community of practice among either family or specialty physicians.

CONCLUSION: Although Francophone doctors with a rural background were more likely than their urban counterparts to set up their first practice in a rural community, this effect was not sustained. This raises questions as to why they leave rural communities and highlights the importance of measures to retain doctors as a way to promote public health for underserved rural groups.

KEY WORDS: Medically underserved area; minority groups; rural health services; personnel recruitment; professional practice location

La traduction du résumé se trouve à la fin de l'article.

Can J Public Health 2013;104(6)(Suppl. 1):S44-S48.

Access to quality health care may be limited for certain groups. Rural communities¹ and language minorities^{2,3} are two groups likely to be underserved. In New Brunswick, most of the population (roughly 70%) can be considered rural.⁴ New Brunswick's French-speaking minority population has traditionally settled in communities in the predominantly rural northeast and northwest parts of the province. The Francophone minority is generally poorer and older than the province's English majority.⁵ New Brunswick's French minority has thus been identified as an underserved, vulnerable group lacking sufficient access to services in its own language.⁶ In particular, lack of access to physicians could prevent this population from benefiting from optimal community- and individual-level health promotion, prevention, and clinical services.⁷

To redress the imbalance in health care services to its Francophone, mostly rural population, the Government of New Brunswick launched several initiatives over a thirty-year period: securing more reserved seats for its students in three French medical schools in neighbouring Quebec (since 1967), offering a clinical teaching program (since 1981) and a complete 24-month family medicine residency in the province's Francophone communities (since 1999). The goal was to recruit students among an underserved population (French-language minority) and to offer most, and eventually all of their medical training not only in their home province, but in their communities. In 2006, a distributed medical education program, offered in partnership with Université de Sherbrooke, gave

New Brunswick Francophone students the possibility of completing their entire medical training at home. These initiatives are aligned with interventions thought to help better address the medical needs of underserved groups. The existing array of interventions includes selection, education, incentives and support.⁸ Targeting students with a rural background is a World Health Organization recommendation to increase access to health care in rural areas.⁹ It is generally accepted that growing up in a rural community increases the likelihood of choosing to practice medicine in rural areas.^{8,10} Similarly, being a member of an underserved community or group increases the likelihood of setting up practice in an underserved area or for an underserved group.^{11,12}

This article reports on part of the data collected to evaluate New Brunswick's initiatives. Specifically, we investigated whether background (rural, urban) of New Brunswick Francophone doctors was related to the location of their first and current medical practice.

Author Affiliations

1. Centre de formation médicale du Nouveau-Brunswick, Moncton, NB
2. Dieppe Family Medicine Unit, Vitalité Health Network, Moncton, NB
3. Department of Family Medicine, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC
4. Research Centre, Vitalité Health Network, Moncton, NB
5. Department of Community Health, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC

Correspondence: Jacinthe Beauchamp, Centre de formation médicale du Nouveau-Brunswick, Pavillon J.-R.-Frenette, Université de Moncton, Moncton, NB E1A 3E9, Tel: 506-863-2258, Fax: 506-863-2284, E-mail: Jacinthe.beauchamp@umoncton.ca

Acknowledgements: The authors thank the many participants, the evaluation committee and reviewers for editorial comments and suggestions, Rachelle Kerry and Rita Landry for their work during data collection, as well as Consortium national de formation en santé for partly funding this project.

Conflict of Interest: None to declare.

Table 1. Characteristics of Study Participants

	All Participants (n=151*) Mean (SD) or N [%]	Family Physicians (n=109) Mean (SD) or N [%]	Specialty Physicians (n=45) Mean (SD) or N [%]
Community of origin, GPRI	38.7 (13.7)	39.0 (13.7)	36.6 (13.7)
First community of practice, GPRI	29.3 (16.7)	32.1 (16.2)	22.0 (16.0)
Current community of practice, GPRI	28.0 (16.4)	30.6 (16.1)	21.0 (15.5)
Time in practice, years	9.4 (6.8)	9.9 (7.2)	8.4 (6.4)
Sex, female	88 [58%]	70 [64%]	20 [44%]
University attended			
Université de Sherbrooke	59 [39%]	45 [41%]	14 [31%]
Université Laval	59 [39%]	40 [37%]	21 [47%]
Université de Montréal	33 [22%]	24 [22%]	10 [31%]

SD, standard deviation; N, number; GPRI, General Practice Rural Index simplified score.

* Three participants reported having conducted postdoctoral training in family medicine and in specialty medicine.

METHODS

Study population

This study targeted all 410 students who had been trained under the Quebec-New Brunswick agreement for training of French language minority physicians between 1973 and 2000. Graduates of the program were contacted between October 2007 and July 2008. Initial contact was made by letter to explain the study. This was followed by phone calls to offer participants the option of answering survey questions by phone or in writing (either by returning the questionnaire in a pre-addressed and pre-stamped envelope or by faxing it). Second and third phone calls were made when necessary. A paper questionnaire was sent to those who had not responded after phone calls. Two study nurses were trained for standardized administration of the questionnaire. Ethical approval was granted by the regional health authority's Research Ethics Board.

Instrument

The questionnaire was partly based on two surveys: the 2004 Canadian National Physicians Survey and the 2004 Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty of Medicine survey of past graduates.^{13,14} The questionnaire was reviewed by a statistician and methodologist for content and face validity. It was also pilot tested by four local practicing physicians to ensure clarity. The questionnaire included a question on geographic origin ("Where were you living upon high school completion?"). Locations of first and current medical practices were measured with the items "Where did you first practice after residency?" and "Where do you currently practice?"

Variables

The General Practice Rural Index-simplified (GPRI-S), which takes into account realities of medical practices and population,^{15,16} was used to define rurality in relation to the region of origin of physicians and their first and current practice settings. The GPRI-S includes three weighted variables: remoteness from a basic referral centre, remoteness from an advanced referral centre, and population size. Communities get a score from 0 to 100, with higher scores representing more rural communities. Demographic variables, including sex, number of years of medical practice, and university attended were also measured.

Data analyses

Univariate and multivariate linear regression models were developed to test the hypothesis that a geographic origin that is more rural is associated with more rural locations of first and current medical practice among Francophone physicians from

New Brunswick. All analyses were conducted using SAS statistical package version 9.1 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC).

RESULTS

Of the 410 potential participants identified, 20 were not eligible because they started medical training before 1973 or after 2000. Contact information could not be found for 57 participants, no contact could be made with 54 other physicians and 15 refused to participate. Of the 264 who completed questionnaires, 59 did not provide information for all three community-level variables and 54 practiced medicine outside of New Brunswick, for a final sample of 151 participants. Non-responders were similar to responders in terms of sex (53% women) and median year of admission (1991 and 1990, respectively). About half of the non-responders for whom we had contact information had an address in New Brunswick (49%). More responders than non-responders trained in family medicine (56% and 41%, respectively).

The mean GPRI-S scores for community of origin (range: 5 to 57) were similar for family and specialty physicians. On average, the first and current community of medical practice were situated in more rural areas for family physicians compared to specialty physicians (Table 1).

Results indicate that originating from a more rural community is associated with establishing a first medical practice in a community that is more rural (Table 2). This association remained significant following adjustments for number of years in practice, sex, and university attended. However, the positive relationship between rurality of community of origin and rurality of first community of practice was only significant among family physicians. Although the relationship between rurality of community of origin and rurality of current community of practice was also positive, it did not reach statistical significance among family or specialty physicians (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Results from this study suggest that Francophone doctors with a rural background, specifically family physicians, are more likely than their urban counterparts to establish a first practice in a rural community. These results remained significant following adjustments for known determinants of recruitment, including number of years in practice and sex. In terms of recruitment, our findings are consistent with results from other studies that considered the effect of background on choice of practice location.^{11,17-19} Training students from an underserved group, in this case language minority students with a rural background, facilitates their recruitment to provide care for this group.

Table 2. Beta Coefficients* and 95% Confidence Intervals Estimated in Linear Regressions for Difference in GPRI for the Community of First Practice per Unit Difference in the GPRI of the Community of Origin

	All Participants		Family Physicians		Specialty Physicians	
	First Community of Practice (GPRI)	First Community of Practice (GPRI)	First Community of Practice (GPRI)	First Community of Practice (GPRI)	First Community of Practice (GPRI)	First Community of Practice (GPRI)
	Crude β (95% CI)	Adjusted β (95% CI)	Crude β (95% CI)	Adjusted β (95% CI)	Crude β (95% CI)	Adjusted β (95% CI)
Community of origin, GPRI	0.28 (0.09, 0.47)	0.31 (0.11, 0.50)	0.34 (0.11, 0.55)	0.38 (0.16, 0.60)	0.08(-0.28, 0.44)	0.13 (-0.28, 0.55)
Time in practice, years	0.06 (-0.34, 0.46)	0.07 (-0.40, 0.50)	-0.04 (-0.48, 0.39)	-0.21 (-0.68, 0.26)	-0.14 (-0.90, 0.62)	-0.04 (-1.0, 0.90)
Sex, female vs. male	-2.2 (-7.7, 3.2)	-3.1 (-8.8, 2.5)	-4.9 (-11.3, 1.5)	-7.5 (-14.1, -0.83)	-1.0 (-10.8, 8.7)	-2.3 (-13.0, 8.4)
University attended						
Université de Sherbrooke	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Université Laval	1.7 (-4.4, 7.8)	0.36 (-6.2, 6.9)	2.7 (-4.3, 9.7)	3.2(-4.1, 10.6)	1.0 (-10.1, 12.2)	0.52 (-12.9, 14.0)
Université de Montréal	3.2 (-4.0, 10.4)	2.0 (-5.2, 9.2)	2.5 (-5.7, 10.7)	0.46(-7.6, 8.6)	8.6 (-4.8, 21.9)	9.0 (-4.8, 22.9)

GPRI, General Practice Rurality Index simplified score; β, regression coefficient; CI, confidence interval.

* The regression coefficient represents the estimated difference in GPRI for the community of first practice that is associated with one additional unit of the GPRI for the community of origin.

Table 3. Beta Coefficients* and 95% Confidence Intervals Estimated in Linear Regressions for Difference in GPRI for the Current Community of Practice per Unit Difference in the GPRI of the Community of Origin

	All Participants		Family Physicians		Specialty Physicians	
	Current Community of Practice (GPRI)	Current Community of Practice (GPRI)	Current Community of Practice (GPRI)	Current Community of Practice (GPRI)	Current Community of Practice (GPRI)	Current Community of Practice (GPRI)
	Crude β (95% CI)	Adjusted β (95% CI)	Crude β (95% CI)	Adjusted β (95% CI)	Crude β (95% CI)	Adjusted β (95% CI)
Community of origin, GPRI	0.12 (-0.07, 0.31)	0.15 (-0.05, 0.35)	0.10 (-0.12, 0.33)	0.15 (-0.08, 0.38)	0.10 (-0.24, 0.45)	0.16 (-0.24, 0.57)
Time in practice, years	0.07 (-0.32, 0.47)	0.08 (-0.36, 0.53)	-0.05 (-0.48, 0.38)	-0.15 (-0.63, 0.34)	-0.03 (-0.77, 0.71)	0.04 (-0.92, 1.0)
Sex, female vs. male	-2.0 (-7.4, 3.3)	-2.6 (-8.3, 3.1)	-3.9 (-10.2, 2.4)	-5.8 (-12.7, 1.1)	-2.7 (-12.1, 6.7)	-3.6 (-14.0, 6.9)
University attended						
Université de Sherbrooke	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Université Laval	0.2 (-5.8, 6.2)	-0.8 (-7.4, 5.8)	0.85(-6.1, 7.8)	1.28 (-6.3, 8.9)	0.64 (-10.3, 11.6)	-0.54 (-13.7, 12.6)
Université de Montréal	-2.1 (-9.2, 5.0)	-3.1(-10.4, 4.2)	-3.5 (-11.6, 4.6)	-4.7(-13.1, 3.7)	4.6 (-8.5, 17.8)	5.2 (-8.4, 18.7)

GPRI, General Practice Rurality Index simplified score; β, regression coefficient; CI, confidence interval.

* The regression coefficient represents the estimated difference in GPRI for the community of first practice that is associated with one additional unit of the GPRI for the community of origin.

However, results also reveal this effect was not sustained. Of physicians who initially set up practice in a rural area, those from an urban background were as likely as those from a rural background to remain in practice in a rural community. Other studies have noted a tendency for physicians to move from rural to urban practice.^{20,21} Poor retention of doctors, particularly family physicians, jeopardizes access and continuity of care, and consequently health promotion and disease prevention.

This raises questions as to why rural-born practitioners leave rural communities. The decision to practice in rural locations is a complex phenomenon shaped as much by nature (rural background) as by nurture (programs that encourage and maintain rural affinity).^{22,23} To that point, analysis of another set of our survey data revealed that exposing medical students to practice in New Brunswick during their medical training considerably increased the odds that they will set up practice and later remain in that province.²⁴ Our results suggest admission criteria for medical programs need not include information on geographical background of candidates. To promote recruitment to rural areas, it may be more important to select for factors associated with an interest in rural medicine, such as desire for close relationships with patients and staff and for variety, autonomy and opportunity in practice.^{25,26}

Studies examining the issue of retention have found the decision to stay or leave a rural practice is a delicate balance often tipped by an acute factor. Personal,^{23,27} professional^{23,27,28} and community^{28,29} factors play important roles. An Australian study³⁰ suggests that in most, if not all cases, professional satisfaction was the main influence in physicians' decision to stay or leave, while other studies^{31,32} found professional satisfaction is not strongly related to professionals' decision. Those who had worked through professional dif-

ficulties and felt they were making a contribution stayed whereas those who were unable to overcome problems became dispirited and left. Efforts should focus on emphasizing attractive features of the practice and community while minimizing sources of stress: workload, isolation, lack of relief or support and no professional/personal boundaries.^{28,29,32} A developmental model of rural physician recruitment and retention proposed by Hancock et al.²⁶ includes self-actualization as a key pathway to successful and fulfilling rural practice. As defined by Maslow, it refers to the full use and exploitation of talents, capabilities, potentialities. Therefore, efforts could also be directed towards the professional development and contribution of rural physicians.

A challenging aspect when studying issues related to rurality is to appropriately define rural. Studies often use definitions centred on population numbers, but these can be problematic. For example, one of Statistics Canada's most commonly used definitions of rurality, the Metropolitan Area and Census Agglomeration Influenced Zones (MIZ), categorizes New Brunswick towns perceived by most as "more rural than urban" (e.g., Miramichi, Campbellton) as metropolitan areas to the same degree as large metropolitan areas of Canada such as Toronto and Montreal. Such definitions do not account for the practice environment of doctors which has been shown to be a factor in recruitment and retention.^{23,26} It has been proposed that rurality is essentially a social representation.³³ In other words, people's perception of rurality will influence their expectations and their demands. Besides the GPRI-S, which fits with the notion of social representations of rurality, we conducted sensitivity analyses using the MIZ definition of rurality. These analyses lead to the same results as those presented herein. New Brunswick may be a particular case. Depending on definitions,

most, or a large portion of it is rural. Yet, it is a small province with well-developed roadways, which facilitates movement within it. This could explain why physicians, whether with an urban or a rural background, were equally likely to currently practice in a rural setting. Differences between milieus might not be important enough to matter.

One limitation of this analysis is the cross-sectional design of the study, which limits the assessment of causality. In addition, problems of recall might be responsible for a reduction of estimated effects. The relatively small sample size also reduced our chances of finding statistically significant results. With regards to generalizability of results, the sample obtained for this study likely is representative of the population of interest. Half of potential participants did not participate because we could not find contact information for them; of these 13% potential participants, many might not have completed their medical education given that estimates for medical school drop-out rates typically range from 7 to 15%.^{34,35}

In conclusion, results from this study indicate that Francophone doctors with a rural background, particularly family physicians, are more likely than their urban counterparts to establish a first practice in a rural community. They are not, however, more or less likely to continue practicing in these areas. It raises questions about access to health promotion and clinical prevention services. Family physicians in first-line practice are most important in these areas. It also suggests that accounting for rural background of candidates during the medical program admission process is unlikely to secure access to health services, including health promotion and clinical prevention services, in underserved rural areas. Rather, efforts should focus on measures to retain doctors in rural areas.

REFERENCES

1. Canadian Institute for Health Information. How healthy are rural Canadians? An assessment of their health status and health determinants. Ottawa, ON: CIHI, 2006. Available at: http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/rural06/pdf/rural_canadians_2006_report_e.pdf (Accessed October 22, 2008).
2. Schofield A, Grand'Maison P, François J, Roy J. Des médecins et des soins de qualité pour les communautés francophones minoritaires du Canada. Ottawa: Association des Facultés de Médecine du Canada, 2006.
3. Fédération Canadienne des Communautés Francophones et Acadiennes du Canada. Pour un meilleur accès à des services de santé en français. Ottawa: Fédération des communautés, francophones et acadiennes du Canada, 2001.
4. New Brunswick Health Council. New Brunswickers' Experiences with Primary Health Care. 2011 Survey Results. Available at: <http://www.csnb.ca/docs/acute/NBHC%20Primary%20Health%20Care%202011%20Survey%20Results.pdf> (Accessed December 11, 2011).
5. Bélanger M, Bouchard L, Gaboury I, Sonier B, Gagnon-Arpin I, Schofield A, Bourque P-E. Perceived health status of Francophones and Anglophones in an officially bilingual Canadian province. *Can J Public Health* 2011;102(2):122-26.
6. Bowen S. Barrières linguistiques dans l'accès aux soins de santé. Ottawa: Santé Canada, 2001.
7. Art B, Deroo L, De Maeseneer J. Towards unity for health utilizing community-oriented primary care in education and practice. *Ed for Health* 2007;20(2):1-10.
8. Wilson NW, Couper ID, De Vries E, Reid S, Fish T, Marais BJ. A critical review of interventions to redress the inequitable distribution of healthcare professionals to rural and remote areas. *Rural Remote Health* 2009;9:1060.
9. World Health Organization. Increasing Access to Health Workers in Remote and Rural Areas Through Improved Retention. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 2010. Available at: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241564014_eng.pdf (Accessed July 7, 2011).
10. Laven G, Wilkinson D. Rural doctors and rural backgrounds: How strong is the evidence? A systematic review. *Aust J Rural Health* 2003;11:277-84.
11. Wayne SJ, Kalishman S, Jerabek RN, Timm C, Cosgrove E. Early predictors of physicians' practice in medically underserved communities: A 12-year follow-up study on University of New Mexico School of Medicine graduates. *Acad Med* 2010;85(10):S13-S16.
12. Vanasse A, Orzanco MG, Courteau J, Asghari S, Scott S. Link between students' personal characteristics, background and medical training and their

- plans to serve an underserved community: Insight from the 2007 Canadian National Physician Survey. North American Primary Care Research Group (NAPCRG) Annual Meeting, Montréal, November 14-19, 2009.
13. College of Family Physicians of Canada, Canadian Medical Association, Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada. National Physician Survey. 2007. Available at: <http://www.nationalphysiciansurvey.ca/nps/> (Accessed August 26, 2010).
14. Mathews M, Rourke J, Park A. National and provincial retention of medical graduates of Memorial University of Newfoundland. *CMAJ* 2006;175(4):357-60.
15. Olatunde S, Leduc ER, Berkowitz J. Different practice patterns of rural and urban general practitioners are predicted by the General Practice Rurality Index. *Can J Rural Med* 2007;12(2):73-80.
16. Leduc E, Creston BC. Defining rurality: A general practice rurality index for Canada. *Can J Rural Med* 1997;2(2):125.
17. McGrail MR, Humphreys JS, Joyce CM. Nature of association between rural background and practice location: A comparison of general practitioners and specialists. *BMC Health Services Research* 2011;11:63-70.
18. Pretorius RW, Lichter MI, Okazaki G, Sellick JA. Where do they come from and where do they go: Implications of geographic origins of medical students. *Acad Med* 2010;85(10):S17-S20.
19. Rourke J, Incitti F, Rourke L, Kennard M. Relationship between practice location of Ontario family physicians and their rural background or amount of rural medical education experience. *CMAJ* 2005;10(4):231-40.
20. Inoue K, Matsumoto M, Toyokawa S, Kobayashi Y. Transition of physician distribution (1980-2002) in Japan and factors predicting future rural practice. *Rural Remote Health* 2009;9:1070.
21. Frisch L, Kellerman R, Ast T. A cohort study of family practice residency graduates in a predominantly rural state: Initial practice site selection and trajectories of practice movement. *J Rural Health* 2003;19(1):47-54.
22. Ballance D, Kornegay D, Evans P. Factors that influence physicians to practice in rural locations: A review and commentary. *J Rural Health* 2009;25(3):276-81.
23. Orzanco MG, Lovato C, Bates J, Slade S, Grand'Maison P, Vanasse A. Nature and nurture in the family physician's choice of practice location. *Rural Remote Health* 2011;11:1849.
24. Landry ML, Schofield A, Bordage R, Bélanger M. Improving the recruitment and retention of doctors by training medical students locally. *Med Ed* 2011;45(11):1121-29.
25. Kapadia RK, MacGrath BM. Medical school strategies to increase recruitment of rural-oriented physicians: The Canadian experience. *Can J Rural Med* 2011;16(1):13-19.
26. Hancock C, Steinbach A, Nesbitt TS, Adler SR, Auerswald CL. Why doctors choose small towns: A developmental model of rural physician recruitment and retention. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;69:1368-76.
27. Laurence CO, Williamson V, Sumner KE, Fleming J. "Latte rural": The tangible and intangible factors important in the choice of a rural practice by recent GP graduates. *Rural Remote Health* 2010;10:1316.
28. Miedema B, Hamilton R, Fortin P, Easley J, Tatemichi S. The challenges and rewards of rural family practice in New Brunswick, Canada: Lessons for retention. *Rural Remote Health* 2009;9:1141.
29. Cameron PJ, Este DC, Worthington CA. Physician retention in rural Alberta: Key community factors. *Can J Public Health* 2010;10(1):79-82.
30. Kamien M. Staying in or leaving rural practice: 1996 outcomes of rural doctors' 1986 intentions. *Med J Aust* 1998;169:318-21.
31. Betkus MH, MacLeod MLP. Retaining public health nurses in rural British Columbia. *Can J Public Health* 2006;95(1):54-58.
32. MacIsaac P, Snowdon T, Thompson R, Crossland L. General practitioners leaving rural practice in Western Victoria. *Rural Remote Health* 2000;8:68-72.
33. Shucksmith M. Conceptualisation de la ruralité post-industrielle. Dans: Bryden JM (Éd.), *Vers des communautés rurales durables. Towards sustainable rural communities. The Guelph Seminar Series*. Guelph, ON: Guelph University, 1994.
34. Arulampalam W, Naylor RA, Smith JP, Hazard A. Model of the probability of medical school dropout in the UK. *J R Statist Soc A* 2004;167(1):157-78.
35. Ward AM, Kamien M, Lopez DG. Medical career choice and practice location: Early factors predicting course completion, career choice and practice location. *Med Educ* 2004;38(3):239-48.

RÉSUMÉ

OBJECTIFS : Dans le domaine des soins de santé, il y a des groupes mal desservis. La minorité francophone au Nouveau-Brunswick, qui réside principalement dans des collectivités rurales, en est un exemple. Une pénurie de médecins pourrait empêcher cette population d'accéder à des services cliniques de prévention et de promotion de la santé. Dans cette étude, nous étudions s'il est plus probable que les médecins francophones néo-brunswickois d'origine rurale établissent leur pratique dans les régions rurales de la province que leurs homologues d'origine urbaine.

RECRUITING DOCTORS FROM AND FOR UNDERSERVED GROUPS

MÉTHODOLOGIE : Nous avons envoyé un questionnaire à 390 médecins francophones néo-brunswickois admis en médecine entre 1973 et 2000. Ce sondage a rassemblé des renseignements sur l'origine géographique et sur l'historique de la pratique médicale des participants. Nous avons effectué des analyses de régression logistique multivariée pour découvrir si l'origine rurale est liée à la probabilité qu'un médecin établisse sa pratique ou poursuive sa pratique dans une collectivité rurale. Pour quantifier le niveau de ruralité des collectivités, nous avons employé l'indice de ruralité en pratique générale (IRPG) (cote simplifiée).

RÉSULTATS : Au total, 264 (67 %) médecins ont participé à l'étude. Nous avons trouvé une corrélation positive entre l'origine rurale et l'établissement d'une première pratique médicale dans une collectivité rurale. Par contre, cette corrélation est seulement statistiquement significative chez les médecins de famille. Nous n'avons pu établir aucune corrélation significative entre la ruralité de la collectivité d'origine et la ruralité du lieu de pratique actuel pour les deux groupes de médecins.

CONCLUSION : Bien que les médecins francophones d'origine rurale soient plus susceptibles que leurs homologues urbains à s'établir dans une collectivité rurale comme premier lieu de pratique, cet effet n'a pas été soutenu. Cette étude suscite des questions relatives aux raisons qui poussent ces médecins à quitter les collectivités rurales et souligne l'importance de prendre des mesures visant à retenir les médecins afin de promouvoir la santé publique pour les groupes mal desservis.

MOTS CLÉS : groupes mal desservis en matière de soins de santé; minorité; recrutement du personnel; lieu de pratique professionnelle; services de santé rurale