

dependence, a fear of negative judgment by the clinician, and a perception that the patient will no longer be welcome at treatment facilities if his or her drug use is known.

A further difficulty with the Carey report is that 82 percent of the patients who volunteered to participate were rated as not using drugs at all, and an additional 9 percent were rated as being mild drug users. Similarly, alcohol use was rated as none to mild for 90 percent of the patients. Yet it has been estimated that up to half of the patients admitted to mental health treatment settings are substance abusers (5).

Carey and associates acknowledge that the patient group they describe is not representative of the general population of psychiatric patients and is skewed away from those in whom detection of substance abuse is most important, that is, those whose drug or alcohol use would be described as moderate or severe.

The detection of comorbid substance abuse in patients with psychiatric illness is important in both diagnosis and management. However, future studies in this area require the use of objective measures of substance use before any meaningful conclusions can be drawn about the validity of the rating scales under evaluation.

Cherrie Galletly, F.R.A.N.Z.C.P.

Dr. Galletly is a visiting psychiatrist with the Western Regional Mental Health Service in Adelaide, Australia, and a clinical lecturer at the University of Adelaide.

References

1. Carey KB, Cocco KM, Simons JS: Concurrent validity of clinicians' ratings of substance abuse among psychiatric outpatients. *Psychiatric Services* 47:842-847, 1996
2. Appleby L, Dyson V, Altman E, et al: Utility of the Chemical Use, Abuse, and Dependence Scale in screening patients with severe mental illness. *Psychiatric Services* 47:647-649, 1996
3. Crowley TJ, Chesluk D, Dilts S, et al: Drug and alcohol abuse among psychiatric admissions. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 30:13-20, 1974
4. Galletly CA, Field CD, Prior M: Urine drug screening of patients admitted to a state psychiatric hospital. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry* 44:587-589, 1993

5. Caton CLM, Gralnick A, Bender S, et al: Young chronic patients and substance abuse. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry* 40:1037-1040, 1989

In Reply: Dr. Galletly's objections to our study appear to be based on two assumptions: that the clinician ratings relied entirely on self-reports, and that because patient self-reports are sometimes inaccurate, they are always suspect.

First, the strength of the clinician rating scales combines their longitudinal perspective with explicit instructions to use all information available. Although self-reports represented a proportion of the input available to the primary therapists in our study, other available sources of data included the therapists' own observations of the patients and other behavioral data such as patterns of attendance or treatment response. In addition, therapists had input from medication nursing, treating psychiatrists, payees, group home supervisors, and family members, most of whom had clear incentives for keeping the primary therapist informed of suspected or confirmed substance abuse.

Second, unlike the assessments in the studies cited by Galletly, the assessment in our study did not take place on inpatient admission, when acute symptoms are likely to interfere with accurate self-reports. Objective measures such as urine screens are essential in such contexts. In our outpatient sample, urinalysis tests more often underdetected than overdetected patients who were using drugs or alcohol. This problem is probably a result of the narrow window of detection for most drugs and the relative psychiatric stability of our sample.

Finally, one could argue that clinicians could more easily identify the more severe and dysfunctional substance abusers who did not enter our study had they known the patients for a comparable period of time. Our participants controlled their substance use enough to maintain regular clinic visits, enhancing the risk of nondetection. The utility of the clinician rating scales would be limited in acute care

settings and with individuals who have strong incentives to misrepresent their substance use. However, all available evidence supports their reliability and validity for the majority of psychiatric outpatients.

Kate Carey, Ph.D.

Why Elderly Veterans Choose VA Services

To the Editor: A popular perception of the Veterans Affairs health care system is that veterans who use it do so because they cannot afford care elsewhere. Indeed, the 1978 National Survey of Veterans found that the most important factor affecting veterans' choice of VA hospitalization was the availability of health insurance; veterans without health insurance were nearly five times more likely to choose VA hospitals than those with health insurance, regardless of age, income, or service-connected disabilities (1).

A more recent study in 1993 determined that veterans most likely to use the VA health care system were age 65 or older, were unemployed, lived alone, and had low income and limited or no insurance (2). They were more likely to have a service-connected psychiatric disorder, to reside near a VA facility, and to have previously used VA benefits or VA health care services.

These studies suggest that limited access to other health care delivery systems is a major factor behind the demand for VA care (3). Studies of factors influencing the use of VA mental health services are particularly sparse, even though such services constitute a major portion of VA health care delivery.

To better understand elderly psychiatric patients' reasons for choosing VA mental health services and their satisfaction with VA care, in September 1995 we mailed a confidential survey to 240 veterans age 65 or older (114 inpatients and 126 outpatients) who were treated in the geriatric psychiatry program at the Houston VA Medical Center between August 1, 1994, and July 31, 1995. A to-

tal of 91 responses were received, a response rate of 38 percent.

Contrary to stereotypes about VA patients, the study showed that quality of care was the most important reason for seeking mental health services at the center. Fifty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they were very satisfied or extremely satisfied with VA care, and only 4 percent were not satisfied. Even more interesting was the finding that although 71 percent of the respondents had physician and medical coverage under Medicare Part B and 26 percent had some other type of insurance, the great majority (78 percent) would still choose VA mental health services even if cost was not a factor.

This study has several important limitations. We surveyed only veterans who had previously used VA mental health services. The low response rate may have introduced a significant response bias if dissatisfied patients were less likely to respond. Furthermore, 59 percent of the respondents were patients' surrogates, who may not have accurately described patients' satisfaction with care (4).

Why do our findings differ from previous studies suggesting that cost and limited alternatives are the major determinants of veterans' choosing VA care? A possible explanation is that the availability of both inpatient and outpatient care at the Houston VA Medical Center, along with the continuity of staff across such care, may have increased patient satisfaction by fostering an "institutional transference" to the VA system as well as a more enduring personal relationship with the health care team members. These are potentially important lessons for VA facilities as they begin to compete for elderly veteran patients in the rapidly changing health care market.

Hernando Ponce, M.D.
Mark E. Kunik, M.D.
Victor Molinari, Ph.D.
Joseph D. Hamilton, M.D.

Dr. Ponce is a fourth-year resident in psychiatry at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, where Dr. Kunik is an assistant professor and Dr. Molinari and Dr. Hamilton are associate professors. Dr. Kunik is

director of the geropsychiatry program. Dr. Molinari is director of geropsychology, and Dr. Hamilton is chief of the psychiatry service at the Houston Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

References

1. Page WF: Why veterans choose Veterans Administration hospitalization: a multivariate model. *Medical Care* 20:308-320, 1982
2. Cowper DC, Manheim LM, Weaver FM, et al: Mix and match: VA and non-VA care for elderly veterans. *VA Practitioner*, Aug 1993, pp 41-44
3. Wolinsky FD, Coe RM, Moselly RR, et al: Veterans' and nonveterans' use of health services. *Medical Care* 23:1358-1371, 1985
4. Lavizzo-Mourey RJ, Zinn J, Taylor L: Ability of surrogates to represent satisfaction of nursing home residents with quality of care. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 40:39-47, 1992

Quality Improvement in Japanese Hospitals

To the Editor: On August 28, 1996, a Japanese psychiatric hospital underwent an official third-party evaluation for the first time. The hospital's voluntary step forward into openness was a memorable day in Japanese psychiatric history.

Because Japanese psychiatric hospitals differ considerably from other Japanese hospitals, the whole system of psychiatric hospitals has not been well understood. Sometimes the hospitals have been a target of criticism, especially in relation to the long length of stay (more than 400 days on average) and the presumably lower quality of care, including the failure to obtain proper informed consent to treatment.

Japanese quality improvement activity, called *kaizen* in industry, has been the key concept behind Japan's high-quality products (1). *Kaizen* has had a great impact on improving health care in the United States (2,3). In contrast, Japan has been far behind in applying *kaizen* in health care.

Japanese general hospitals began modest efforts to improve the quality of care in the mid-1980s, but most psychiatric hospitals did not participate in those efforts. Only the government is able to influence health care

services, but gradually hospitals have been exposed to evaluation by third parties. The Japan Council for Quality Health Care was established in 1995 under the guidance of the government and major Japanese health care organizations, including the Japan Medical Association, the Japan Hospital Association, and the Japanese Association of Psychiatric Hospitals. The council's aim is to improve the quality of care by conducting national surveys.

Japan has 1,672 psychiatric hospitals (with 362,962 beds), including some facilities that would be classified as nursing homes by American standards. A new generation of the Japanese Association of Psychiatric Hospitals, which includes 70 percent of Japanese psychiatric hospitals, faces the reality that the hospitals may lose their identity as hospitals if they ignore the movement toward quality improvement. Loss of their hospital identity is a serious concern and also the main driving force toward quality improvement.

Awakening to the need for quality improvement will be a long and stormy passage for some hospitals. The first evaluation in one hospital was only the beginning of a wave, but it has significant meaning for the future of Japanese psychiatric hospitals.

Hiroto Ito, Ph.D.
Sakai Iwasaki, M.D.
Kazushige Komine, M.D.

Dr. Ito and Dr. Iwasaki are affiliated with the department of health services administration at the Nippon Medical School in Tokyo. Dr. Komine is with Nishigahara Hospital in Tokyo.

References

1. Imai K: *Kaizen*. New York, Random House, 1986
2. Berwick DM: Continuous improvement as an ideal in health care. *New England Journal of Medicine* 320:53-56, 1989
3. *Agenda for Change*. Chicago, Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, 1987