

**PERCEPTIONS AND OPINIONS OF CRITICAL CARE
NURSES REGARDING FAMILY PRESENCE DURING
RESUSCITATION**

Chanel Le Goff

Research report submitted to the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Nursing.

Johannesburg, 2011

DECLARATION

I, Chanel Le Goff declare that this research report is my own work. It is been submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Science in Nursing at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination at this or any other university.

____ day of _____ 2011

*This research is dedicated to all of the families and the
patients of the ICU*

ABSTRACT

The concept of family witnessed resuscitation in South African critical care areas is one that is rarely practiced. In the majority of cases family members are ushered away from the resuscitation area, and this task is usually one that is performed by the critical care nurse. Consequently, the critical care nurse in the South African public health sector is relatively inexperienced in family witnessed resuscitation. In addition to this, few institutions have written policies with regards to family presence. Hence, the importance of uncovering critical care nurses opinions and perceptions of family presence during resuscitation. Therefore, the aim of this study was to explore and describe a select group of critical care nurses perceptions and opinions regarding family presence during resuscitation.

A qualitative study was undertaken in which one-on-one semi structured interviews were conducted as a means of data collection. The following question was asked of the participants, *‘As a critical care nurse, if your patient was been resuscitated, and the family members requested to be present, how would you feel?’*. In addition to this the following question was asked of the participants with regards to written policy within the institution used in this study, *‘Is there a policy in place in this institution regarding family presence?’*.

A total of 11 interviews were conducted including participants of various cultures and previous experiences of family witnessed resuscitation. The data collection and analysis processes were integrated as each interview was directly transcribed following the interview. The data analysis process was guided by Tesch’s method for qualitative data analysis.

Four nurses interviewed in this study felt that family witnessed resuscitation is unacceptable, and two were unsure. However, these nurses did waver with regards to this. Nine participants expressed reservations regarding family witnessed resuscitation including the potential traumatic effects that it could have on the family. In addition to this, four participants had concerns that family members might interfere with resuscitation efforts came to light. Six participants also feared that their own shortcomings might be exposed to family members should they observe resuscitation attempts. Three nurses in this study believe that family members may misinterpret issues pertaining to resuscitative efforts, and that the physical space at the bedside would be inadequate. Six participants pointed out that it is norm to ask family members to leave the resuscitation area, in part due to habit, and thus could be preventing family members being invited to the bedside. In addition to this, lack of policy guidelines may be acting as a barrier to allowing and facilitating nurses to invite family members to witness resuscitation.

In contrast, five nurses in this study had accepting views on family witnessed resuscitation. This, despite the lack of previous experience these nurses had with regards to family witnessed resuscitation. And as mentioned, nurses did waver with regards to this. Psychological pre-preparation of the family emerged as a concern for three participants. Three of the eleven nurses interviewed would extend an offer to family members to be at the bedside during resuscitation. Four participants felt that a benefit to family witnessed resuscitation is the opportunity it may offer for closure for the family should the resuscitation attempt be unsuccessful.

In concluding, the participants in this study are inexperienced in the field of family witnessed resuscitation, and most participants wavered with regards to their perceptions with regards to family witnessed resuscitation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere ‘thank you’ to all of the critical care nurses who so willingly participated in this study. Your knowledge and vast experience has been invaluable to this study, without you, none of this would have been possible.

To my supervisors, Shelley and Gayle, thank you both for your encouragement and continually challenging me to push myself further. To Professor Bruce, thank you for your support.

To hospital management, unit managers and doctors, thank you for your support and continual assistance.

| TABLE OF CONTENTS | PAGE |
|--|-------------|
| CHAPTER ONE | |
| OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY | |
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY | 1 |
| 1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT | 3 |
| 1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY | 4 |
| 1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS | 4 |
| 1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES | 4 |
| 1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY | 5 |
| 1.7 PARADIGMATIC PERSPECTIVES | 5 |
| 1.7.1 Meta -theoretical Assumptions | 5 |
| 1.7.2 Theoretical Assumptions | 6 |
| 1.7.3 Methodological Assumptions | 8 |
| 1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 9 |
| 1.8.1 Research Design | 9 |
| 1.8.2 Research Method | 10 |
| 1.9 MEASURES TO ENSURE TRUSTWORTHINESS | 11 |
| 1.10 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS | 12 |
| 1.11 PLAN OF THE STUDY | 13 |
| 1.12 CONCLUSION | 13 |

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 2.0 | INTRODUCTION | 15 |
| 2.1 | THE STAGE FOR FAMILY WITNESSED RESUSCITATION: CRITICAL CARE IN SOUTH AFRICA | 15 |
| 2.2 | THE HEALTH CARE TEAMS PERSPECTIVES ON FAMILY WITNESSED RESUSCITATION | 17 |
| 2.3 | FAMILY MEMBERS PERSPECTIVES ON FAMILY WITNESSED RESUSCITATION | 20 |
| 2.4 | PATIENTS PERSPECTIVES ON FAMILY WITNESSED RESUSCITATION | 21 |
| 2.5 | FAMILY WITNESSED RESUSCITATION AND SOUTH AFRICA | 22 |
| 2.6 | CONCLUSION | 23 |

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND RESEARCH METHOD

| | | |
|-------|-----------------------|----|
| 3.0 | INTRODUCTION | 24 |
| 3.1 | RESEARCH DESIGN | 24 |
| 3.2 | RESEARCH METHODS | 26 |
| 3.2.1 | Entrance to the field | 26 |
| 3.2.2 | Population and Sample | 27 |
| 3.2.3 | Data Collection | 28 |
| 3.2.4 | Data Analysis | 30 |

| | | |
|-------|------------------------------------|----|
| 3.3 | MEASURES TO ENSURE TRUSTWORTHINESS | 31 |
| 3.4 | ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS | 35 |
| 3.4.1 | Permission | 35 |
| 3.4.2 | Informed Consent | 36 |
| 3.4.3 | Anonymity | 36 |
| 3.5 | CONCLUSION | 36 |

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

| | | |
|---------|---|----|
| 4.0 | INTRODUCTION | 37 |
| 4.1 | RESEARCH QUESTIONS | 37 |
| 4.2 | PARTICIPANTS | 37 |
| 4.3 | DATA ANALYSIS | 39 |
| 4.4 | THEMES AND SUB-THEMES EXTRAPOLATED FROM THE INTERVIEWS | 42 |
| 4.4.1 | ‘Wavering’ | 42 |
| 4.4.2 | Exclusion of the family from viewing resuscitation efforts | 42 |
| 4.4.3 | Attitudes surrounding the exclusion of family members from the resuscitation process | 43 |
| 4.4.3.1 | It’s a traumatic experience | 44 |
| 4.4.3.2 | Family members may misinterpret issues | 45 |
| 4.4.3.3 | Family may interfere | 47 |
| 4.4.3.4 | Physical space constraints | 48 |
| 4.4.3.5 | Nurses’ fear of exposing their own inadequacies | 49 |
| 4.4.3.6 | It’s the norm to ask the family members to leave | 50 |

| | | |
|---------|---|----|
| 4.4.3.7 | Uncertainty regarding policy guidelines | 51 |
| 4.4.4 | Inclusion of the family in viewing resuscitation efforts | 52 |
| 4.4.5 | Attitudes surrounding the inclusion of family members in the resuscitation process | 53 |
| 4.4.5.1 | The importance of preparing the family | 54 |
| 4.4.5.2 | Opportunity to offer the family closure | 55 |
| 4.4.5.3 | Offering the family the choice | 56 |
| 4.5 | SUMMARY OF FINDINGS | 57 |
| 4.6 | CONCLUSION | 60 |

CHAPTER FIVE

RECOMMENDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

| | | |
|-------|--------------------------------|----|
| 5.0 | INTRODUCTION | 61 |
| 5.1 | SUMMARY OF THE STUDY | 61 |
| 5.1.1 | Research questions | 61 |
| 5.1.2 | Research design | 62 |
| 5.1.3 | Research method | 63 |
| 5.2 | MAIN FINDINGS | 63 |
| 5.3 | LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY | 65 |
| 5.3.1 | Small sample/study | 65 |
| 5.3.2 | Demographics of the Sample | 65 |
| 5.4 | RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE | 65 |
| 5.5 | CONCLUSION | 67 |

APPENDICES

1. Appendix 1: Copies of permission granting letters 68
2. Appendix 2: Transcribed interview 76
3. Appendix 3: Copy of consent form 80

REFERENCES 82