

Critique of a journal article:

Smith, S.J., Parveen, S., Sass, C. et al. *An audit of dementia education and training in UK health and social care: a comparison with national benchmark standards*. BMC Health Serv Res 19, 711 (2019).

BY ADELA BACHLEDA (1909934)

BMHP4013

Link to video:

<https://youtu.be/-3YC1s2o-KM>

Agenda

- ▶ Method of evaluation of the journal article
- ▶ Information about the journal and journal article and its authors
- ▶ Overview of the topic
- ▶ Sections of the article
- ▶ Review of the research problem, method and evaluation of accuracy
- ▶ Overview and a discussion of the research method
- ▶ Summary of the findings and discussion of issues
- ▶ Ethics overview
- ▶ References overview
- ▶ Recommendations for improvement
- ▶ Conclusion

Method of evaluation of the journal article

The CRAAP method is an evaluation method for sources and stands for Currency, Relevance, Authority, Accuracy, Purpose and can be used to evaluate the journal article (Kurpiel, 2018).

Information about the journal, journal article and its availability

Journal article:

Smith, S.J., Parveen, S., Sass, C. et al. An audit of dementia education and training in UK health and social care: a comparison with national benchmark standards. BMC Health Serv Res 19, 711 (2019).

- ▶ The article was last accessed on 10.08.2022.
- ▶ Publication date: 21 October 2019
- ▶ DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4510-6>
- ▶ Publication: BMC Health Services Research, Volume 19, Article number 711
- ▶ The publication is recent and information is current, freely available to view and download.

Popularity (on 10.08.2022):

- ▶ 8 citations
- ▶ 6265 accesses

Published online by BMC Health Services Research (BioMed Central, n.d.), available at online at: <https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-019-4510-6>

- ▶ BMC Health Services Research is a journal that is open access, peer-reviewed
- ▶ Established in 2001
- ▶ Focuses on health services

Information about authors

- ▶ The authors are academics working at British universities - Leeds Beckett University and University of Bradford.
- ▶ Authors:
 - ▶ S. J. Smith (Leeds Beckett University)
 - ▶ S. Parveen (University of Bradford)
 - ▶ C. Sass (Leeds Beckett University)
 - ▶ M. Drury (University of Bradford)
 - ▶ J. R. Oyebode (University of Bradford)
 - ▶ C. A. Surr (Leeds Beckett University)

Authors are credible as they work in university departments dedicated to research about dementia.

Main objectives of the journal article

- ▶ An insight into levels of education, knowledge and training of social care and healthcare staff in the UK about caring for people with dementia
- ▶ Gathering quantitative data by surveying health and care workers, as well as university staff working in a relevant field asking them about level of training they have received regarding treating people suffering from dementia
- ▶ Reviewing frequency, type of trainings that were provided for health and care professionals.

Justification for the research

The journal article (Smith et al., 2019) emphasises an importance of a training for care and health professionals to help dementia patients

- ▶ People suffering from dementia represent up to 40% of people in hospitals (Alzheimer's Society, 2009), going up to 80% of people in residential care (Prince, 2014).
- ▶ There is no mandatory training required for care workers to support people with dementia.

Alzheimer's Society. Counting the cost. Caring for people with dementia on hospital wards. London: Alzheimer's Society; 2009. https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/sites/default/files/2018-05/Counting_the_cost_report.pdf. [Accessed 10.08.2022]

Prince M, Knapp M, Guerchet M, McCrone P, Prina M, Comas-Herrera A, et al. Dementia UK: report to the Alzheimer's society. London: Alzheimer's Society; 2014. https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/sites/default/files/migrate/downloads/dementia_uk_update.pdf. [Accessed 10.08.2022]

Sections of the journal article

Sections:

- ▶ Abstract
- ▶ Introduction
- ▶ Methods
- ▶ Results
- ▶ Discussion
- ▶ Conclusion

Criticism

- ▶ The structure, sections and their naming follows a valid standard for a scientific publication (Rakotsoane, 2019).
- ▶ The flow of the article is logical and well-structured.

Rakotsoane, Francis. (2019). Structure and Parts of an Article.

Main method of a research – an audit

- ▶ The authors of a journal article decided to perform an audit of the level of training and awareness amongst care and medical staff in the UK regarding providing support for people suffering from dementia .
- ▶ Conducted through an online survey tool.

Selection of the recipients of the survey - discussion

- ▶ The sample size is important, as it reduces a margin of error (Bullen, 2013).
- ▶ A sample of 436 survey responses can be considered as satisfactory and above recommendation.
- ▶ The authors ensured to cover main places of care, such as hospitals, residential care, medical centres, which allowed them to compare the results based on a workplace.
- ▶ Some places of work were underrepresented, such as there were only 5 domiciliary care workers that responded to the survey, compared to 44 hospital workers.

Bullen, P.B. (2013). How to choose a sample size (for the statistically challenged). [online] tools4dev. Available at:
<https://tools4dev.org/resources/how-to-choose-a-sample-size/>.

Types of questions in an audit

There were several types of questions that recipients were asked:

- ▶ Number of dementia-related training received
- ▶ Type of delivery of a training
- ▶ Category and a type of a training about dementia such as awareness, identification, assessment.

Audit response rate

Survey response rates

- ▶ Responses from 436 surveys were used for evaluation, making up around 27% of all surveys sent out (1621).

Recommendation (Fincham, 2008).

- ▶ Using an e-mail survey yields lower results, compared to in-person or phone surveys, and averages between 25% to 30%.
- ▶ Response rates approximately 60% should be an aim for researchers .

Fincham, J.E. (2008). Response rates and responsiveness for surveys, standards, and the Journal. American journal of pharmaceutical education, [online] 72(2), p.43. doi:10.5688/aj720243.

Findings about method of delivery and recipients

- ▶ Most common type of a training delivery was face-to-face in groups (73%)
- ▶ E-learning was represented by only 13%.
- ▶ There was a discrepancy between whom the training packages addressed – 49% were for all medical staff, 30% for only unqualified clinical staff and 26% for only qualified staff.

Criticism of quantitative results

- ▶ The authors have audited the training packages provided to professionals.
- ▶ It is unclear how many questions respondents were asked.
- ▶ The evaluation criteria by authors (Learning Outcomes by The Framework) are not fully explained.

Ethics



The authors have included information about ethics of the research.

- ▶ They have received an ethical approval from Leeds Beckett University Research Ethics Committee
- ▶ The participation in the survey required a written consent
- ▶ They included data protection information and right to withdrawal

Also, the authors claim that the datasets are available to view upon a reasonable request.

An overview of the discussion and conclusion section and criticism

Overview:

- ▶ The authors criticised that for only 35% of the learning packages about dementia there was an assessment that followed.
- ▶ They criticised that there was a significantly lower level of training that for Tiers 2 and 3 of The Framework (between 30 and 40%), compared to Tier 1 (above 70%).
- ▶ They emphasised that more training and education is required to improve quality of support for people suffering from dementia.

Criticism:

- ▶ At the time of publishing the article, The Framework (Dementia Training Standards Framework, 2018) was released recently – 2018 -, therefore there is potentially an need to perform another audit once the framework is fully put in practice.

Dementia Training Standards Framework (2018). Dementia Training Standards Framework. [online] Health Education England. Available at: <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/dementia-awareness/core-skills>.

Overview of the references

References:

- ▶ There are 29 of the references used in the article
- ▶ The authors reference various reports that were published by official organizations, such as WHO, NHS and government reports.
- ▶ Several official reports about dementia are referenced.

Summary

- ▶ They make use of scientific books and literature, using credible sources.
- ▶ There are no apparent sources which validity can be questioned.

Recommendations for improvement

- ▶ Using a more effective way for conveying a survey, as the e-mail surveys bear low response rates.
- ▶ Focusing on more specific groups, such as residential home carers, where awareness of dementia is the most important, instead of trying to audit various groups in healthcare. There may be no requirements to have an equal level of knowledge about dementia in children care, compared to the elderly care, and thus, those cases should be treated differently.
- ▶ Using a newly introduced framework as a benchmark may not be fully accurate.

Conclusion

Overall, the journal article is written by credible dementia-researchers. It is well-structured, with a good explanation of the method, clear results and conclusion. The claims made by authors are backed-up by credible sources. There was no issue with any ethical consideration. However, the research may have been more accurate if focused on a specific group, and had more explanation about criteria of Dementia Training Standards Framework (Dementia Training Standards Framework, 2018).

References

- ▶ Smith, S.J., Parveen, S., Sass, C., Drury, M., Oyeboade, J.R. and Surr, C.A. (2019). An audit of dementia education and training in UK health and social care: a comparison with national benchmark standards. BMC Health Services Research, [online] 19(1). doi:10.1186/s12913-019-4510-6.
- ▶ Alzheimer's Society. Counting the cost. Caring for people with dementia on hospital wards. London: Alzheimer's Society; 2009. https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/sites/default/files/2018-05/Counting_the_cost_report.pdf. [Accessed 10.08.2022]
- ▶ Prince M, Knapp M, Guerchet M, McCrone P, Prina M, Comas-Herrera A, et al. Dementia UK: report to the Alzheimer's society. London: Alzheimer's Society; 2014. https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/sites/default/files/migrate/downloads/dementia_uk_update.pdf. [Accessed 10.08.2022]
- ▶ Kurpiel, S. (2018). Research Guides: Evaluating Sources: The CRAAP Test. [online] Benedictine University. Available at: <https://researchguides.ben.edu/source-evaluation>. [Accessed 10.08.2022]
- ▶ BioMed Central. (n.d.). BMC Health Services Research. [online] Available at: <https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/> [Accessed 10.08.2022]
- ▶ Rakotsoane, Francis. (2019). Structure and Parts of an Article.
- ▶ Bullen, P.B. (2013). How to choose a sample size (for the statistically challenged). [online] tools4dev. Available at: <https://tools4dev.org/resources/how-to-choose-a-sample-size/>. [Accessed 10.08.2022]
- ▶ Fincham, J.E. (2008). Response rates and responsiveness for surveys, standards, and the Journal. American journal of pharmaceutical education, [online] 72(2), p.43. doi:10.5688/aj720243.
- ▶ Dementia Training Standards Framework (2018). Dementia Training Standards Framework. [online] Health Education England. Available at: <https://www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/dementia-awareness/core-skills>. [Accessed 10.08.2022]

Video

Link to video: <https://youtu.be/-3YC1s2o-KM>