Working with families: analysis of a dataset about family-centred care across six countries
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“a way of caring for children and their families within health services which ensures that care is planned around the whole family, not just the individual child/person, and in which all the family members are recognised as care recipients” (Shields et al. 2006, p. 1318).
Cochrane review 2007, update 2012: Family-centred care of hospitalized children 0-12 years (Shields, Zhou, Taylor, Pratt, Pascoe, Hunter)

RCTs
• All children <13 (excluding premature neonates)
• Models + single interventions
• “family-centredness” score >50%

JBI review of quasi-experimental studies 2012 (Shields, Zhou, Munns, Taylor, Watts)
➢ Only 1 study could be included
➢ No evidence family-centred care works or is effective

JBI review of qualitative research 2014 (Watts, Zhou, Shields, Taylor, Munns, Ngune)
➢ 14 studies – difficulties with implementation of FCC
➢ Darbyshire, 1994 – wonderful ideal, almost impossible to implement effectively
How should we understand family-centred care?
Uniacke, Kayali-Browne & Shields, 2018

“To recognize and embrace the whole family when planning the child’s care is different from recognizing and embracing the whole family as a care recipient.”

“The crucial difference is between, on the one hand, placing a child’s family at the centre of that child’s care, and on the other hand, regarding the child and his or her family as care recipients.”, p6).

“... the family unit interpretation ... a child’s illness can and often does negatively affect the interests of other family members or the whole family” (p7)

Once care of the whole family becomes the goal of FCC, then FCC can persist in cases in which [it] ... does not best promote the hospitalized child’s welfare (p8)

2 problems:
1. what is good for the family may not be good for the child, (and vice versa),
2. the child’s voice is not necessarily considered.
All countries/cultures?

“Working with families” study

• staff: nurses, doctors, AHS, ancillary

• tertiary paediatric hospitals, secondary hospitals, rural, ED, community child health

• Australia, UK, USA, Indonesia, Thailand, Turkey
• semantic differentials – mean score
  ➢“I find working with children ...”
  ➢“I find working with parents of children ...”

• Demographic characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year published</th>
<th>Work with children (mean)</th>
<th>Work with parents (mean)</th>
<th>Difference (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Nth Qld</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.29 (CI 4.06, 4.51)</td>
<td>3.9 (CI 3.68, 4.12)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ED Nth Qld</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.81 (CI 3.7, 3.93)</td>
<td>3.29 (CI 3.18, 3.4)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural hospitals Nth Qld</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.35 (CI 3.22, 3.47)</td>
<td>3.79 (CI 3.66, 3.92)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary hospital WA</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.3 (SD=0.57)</td>
<td>3.8 (SD=0.66)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-level hospitals WA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.26 (SD=0.62)</td>
<td>3.7 (SD=0.66)</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary hospital Turkey</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.224 (SD=0.53)</td>
<td>2.26 (SD=0.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary hospital USA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.57 (SD=0.46)</td>
<td>3.82 (SD=0.718)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary &amp; 2nd-level hospitals UK</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary &amp; 2nd-level hospitals Indonesia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary &amp; 2nd-level hospitals Thailand</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary &amp; 2nd-level hospitals Australia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall

significant difference ($p<0.005 = <0.0001$) between scores – more positive scores for working with children than parents
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