

Queries for Author



Journal: BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care

Paper: bmjcare-2015-001006

Title: Cancer and the family: assessment, communication and brief interventions—

The proof of your manuscript appears on the following page(s).

It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check against the original manuscript and approve or amend these proofs.

Please read the proofs carefully, checking for accuracy, verifying the reference order and checking figures and tables. When reviewing your page proof please keep in mind that a professional copyeditor edited your manuscript to comply with the style requirements of the journal.

This is not an opportunity to alter, amend or revise your paper; it is intended to be for correction purposes only. The journal reserves the right to charge for excessive author alterations or for changes requested after the proofing stage has concluded.

During the preparation of your manuscript for publication, the questions listed below have arisen (the query number can also be found in the gutter close to the text it refers to). Please attend to these matters and return the answers to these questions when you return your corrections.

Please note, we will not be able to proceed with your article if these queries have not been addressed.

A second proof is not normally provided.

Note Reference	Note
N1	IMPORTANT: Corrections at this stage should be limited to those that are essential. Extensive corrections will delay the time to publication and may also have to be approved by the Editor. Alterations cannot be made after the article has published online.
N2	Author SURNAMES (family names) have been highlighted - please check that these are correct. Please check all names are spelt correctly, and that affiliations and correspondence details are accurate.
N3	Please check funding statement is accurate (and include grant numbers if applicable).
N4	Your article should display in PubMed within 1 week of Online First publication. If you have paid for Open Access, your article will be sent to PubMed Central upon issue publication.

Query Reference	Query
Q1	If your article is linked to a clinical trial please provide the trial registration number and the stage it relates to - Post-results, Pre-results or Results.
Q2	Please check and confirm the changes made in the article title.
Q3	Please provide the page range for reference [39].
Q4	Tables 1 and 2 have been changed to boxes 1 and 2 here and in text citation as they contain only list of questions. Please check and confirm the change.

Author query sheet

If you are happy with the proof as it stands, please email to confirm this. Minor changes that do not require a copy of the proof can be sent by email (please be as specific as possible).

Email: **production.spcare@bmj.com**

If you have any changes that cannot be described easily in an email, please mark them clearly on the proof using the annotation tools and email this by reply to the eProof email.

We will keep a copy of any correspondence from you related to the author proof for six months. After six months, correspondence will be deleted.

Please respond within 48 hours

Cancer and the family: assessment, communication and brief interventions—the development of an educational programme for healthcare professionals when a parent has cancer

Lucy Grant,¹ Amrit Sangha,² Sara Lister,¹ Theresa Wiseman²

ABSTRACT

Objective This study developed and piloted an educational intervention to support healthcare professionals (HCPs) to provide supportive care for families when a parent has cancer.

Methods Programme development followed the Medical Research Council (MRC) framework, beginning with examination of theory and research, and consultation with experts. The programme content incorporated attachment theory, child development and family systems theory. It was piloted thrice with HCPs from a cancer centre. The evaluation involved a questionnaire, comprising open-ended questions, completed before and after the programme. Data from the questionnaire were analysed using framework analysis.

Results 31 HCPs from varying disciplines participated. The programme was evaluated positively by participants. Before the programme, participants had significant concerns about their professional competence, which included: managing their own emotions; a perceived sensitivity around raising child and family matters with patients and a lack of specialist experience, skills and knowledge. After completing the programme, participants reported greater understanding and knowledge, increased confidence to approach patients about family matters, greater skill to initiate conversations and explore family concerns and guiding parent–child communication according to the child’s level of understanding, and an increased engagement and resilience for caring for parents with cancer.

Significance of the results Supporting HCPs to provide family-centred care is likely to reduce psychological difficulties in families where a

parent has cancer. Further work is planned to disseminate the programme, evaluate the transfer of skills into practice, assess how HCPs manage the emotional demands of providing supportive care over time, and consider on-going professional support for HCPs.

INTRODUCTION

Families when a parent has cancer

In the UK, 10% of all new cancer cases occur in adults aged between 25 and 49 years.¹ Trends towards people having children later in life, combined with recent advancements in diagnostic and screening tools means the incidence of cancer in parents with young children will increase. Data on patients with dependent children do not exist in the UK, but ~4% of all children in Norway, aged 0–25 years, have or have had a parent diagnosed with cancer.² While in the USA, 18.3% of recently diagnosed cancer survivors and 14% of all survivors live with a minor child.³ A Finnish cohort study followed up all children born in 1987; 3909 (6.6%) of the children had a parent with cancer.⁴

Families face many challenges associated with the nature of the illness and treatment.⁵ Children contend with the disruption of family roles and routines, the temporary loss of the parent due to symptoms and treatment side effects and the threat of parental loss.⁶ Family members are susceptible to distress and can experience clinical levels of stress, anxiety and depression,^{7 8} which can lead

¹Department of Pastoral and Psychological Care, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

²Health Service Research, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

Correspondence to

Dr Lucy Grant, Pastoral and Psychological Care, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, Fulham Road, London SW3 6JJ, UK; lucy.grant@rmh.nhs.uk

Received 8 September 2015

Revised 13 June 2016

Accepted 25 July 2016



CrossMark

To cite: Grant L, Sangha A, Lister S, et al. *BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care* Published Online First: [please include Day Month Year]
doi:10.1136/bmjspcare-2015-001006

to long-standing issues.⁹ Poor family functioning and restricted communication are strongly associated with higher levels of psychological morbidity in families,¹⁰ independent from disease characteristics.¹¹ Families that communicate illness-related information openly, express feelings directly and solve problems together show lower levels of depression and anxiety.⁸

Communication when a parent has cancer

Parents feel unsure about how to talk to children about cancer in a way the child will understand and identify a need for support in discussing these issues.^{12 13} Children's understanding of illness follows developmental stages in line with the child's age, independent of other factors.^{14 15} Communication around parental illness is commonly restrictive, parents believe children are too young to understand or focus on technical details;^{13 16} however, it is possible if it is tailored to the child's level of understanding.^{13 15 16}

Without guidance, parents may attempt to protect children by avoiding illness-related discussion or limit discussion to information giving rather than exploring the child's emotions about the parent's illness.¹³ This is complicated by the way parents perceive the child's capacity to cope and the distress of disclosure on their children and on the patient themselves.¹⁷ Studies show that parents misunderstand their child's reactions, are poor at recognising distress and underestimate the emotional difficulties experienced by their children,^{18 16} highlighting a need for professional support.

The role of healthcare professionals

Patients report that healthcare professionals (HCPs) do not enquire about their children, and as a result, patients do not feel that they can raise the topic,^{12 19} which leaves them feeling isolated with family-related challenges.^{13 20}

Supporting patients' psychological needs can be a challenge for HCPs and, over time, some HCPs will experience emotional strain.²¹ This is amplified when patients are younger and when there are more complex psychological and social concerns.²² A way of coping with emotional strain is for HCPs to reduce investments by emotionally distancing themselves.²³

An Australian study explored nurses' perceptions of the support given to patients with advanced cancer who had young children.²⁴ Providing support was viewed as important and central to their role, but the nurses had significant difficulties managing the emotional aspects. Caring for patients with young families brought up personal experiences of loss. Nurses also described a lack of education or psychological training, poor support and limited supervision, which compounded their feelings of uncertainty and distress.

Turner *et al*^{25 26} developed and evaluated an educational programme for nurses working with parents with advanced cancer. The training was self-directed

by participants using a distance learning manual but also included a 1-day communication skills training workshop. Nurses were highly accepting of the educational intervention and reported increased confidence in their ability to initiate discussion, provide support and information for patients.

Rationale for current study

In a recent cancer survivorship survey (UK Department of Health),²⁷ parents reported no practical or emotional support being offered by healthcare services in relation to the family and children. This lack of provision has previously been recognised in national cancer guidelines²⁸ and reviews^{7 8 29} and provided the impetus to develop an education intervention to address this gap in services. It was hoped that by focusing on improving the quality of supportive care provided by HCPs, they can positively influence patient and family experience and potentially reduce psychological difficulties in children and families where a parent has cancer.

The aim of the pilot was twofold; first, to develop an educational programme suitable for a wide range of HCPs working across the illness trajectory to enhance the supportive care of patients and families when a parent has cancer; and second, to evaluate the implementation of the programme and begin to establish its efficacy.

METHODS

Development of the educational programme

Programme development followed the Medical Research Council framework³⁰ titled 'Cancer and the Family: Assessment, Communication and Brief Interventions'. Development of the 3-day educational programme involved examination of the theoretical and research evidence and consultation with experts in family therapy, child psychology and education.

The programme built on Turner's work²⁴⁻²⁶ and drew on a range of seminal child development theories, including attachment theory,³¹ Piaget's model of cognitive development³² and developmental literature on children's conceptions of health, illness and bodily functions.^{14 15} Theoretical concepts from family systems theory were included, with consideration given to how illness can disrupt the family life cycle and delay important individual and family developmental stages;^{5 33} the influence of intergenerational patterns and behaviours on family functioning and relationships^{34 35} and the strengths and qualities associated with resilient families.^{36 37}

Learning methods

The delivery of the programme incorporated effective HCP communication skills training and learning methods.³⁸ Cognitive and experiential learning was promoted through case discussion, problem-solving exercises, role play based on clinical examples, and

233 the use of digital versatile discs (DVDs) of real parents
 234 and children describing their experience of parental
 235 cancer.³⁹ To deepen learning, participants were
 236 encouraged to explore personal and professional
 237 experiences, their attitudes and beliefs about commu-
 238 nication and providing supportive care to families.⁴⁰
 239 Reflective practice was encouraged and modelled by
 240 facilitators to enhance participant's self-awareness and
 241 strategies for self-care.⁴¹

242 Pilot implementation

243 A total of three programmes were run with 31 partici-
 244 pants. The range of senior HCPs included medics,
 245 clinical nurse specialists from various tumour groups,
 246 occupational therapists, ward-based nurses including
 247 sisters/senior staff nurses, radiographers, and clinical
 248 and health psychologists. The majority of participants
 249 were from a nursing background.

250 In total, 30 out of 31 participants were from a ter-
 251 tiary specialist cancer treatment centre with 1 external
 252 candidate.

253 The programmes took place away from the work-
 254 place to enhance participant engagement. Participant
 255 numbers were kept low with a maximum of 10 per
 256 group to ensure participants had sufficient opportuni-
 257 ty to practice skills and to encourage experiential
 258 learning and group cohesion. Respondents had to
 259 have an active role in dealing with patients with
 260 dependent children to take part in the course.

261 The 3 programme days spanned 3 weeks to give par-
 262 ticipants time to read, reflect on the course material
 263 and practice clinical skills and bring back issues for
 264 discussion. The programmes were facilitated by a
 265 senior clinical psychologist with significant experience
 266 of working therapeutically with children and families
 267 and teaching professionals and a senior nurse
 268 educator.

269 Evaluation

270 The pilot was evaluated using semistructured ques-
 271 tionnaires, consisting of open-ended questions, com-
 272 pleted immediately before and after the programme.
 273 Free-text data were analysed using framework ana-
 274 lysis.⁴² Prior to the programme, the focus was on
 275 ascertaining participant's views and concerns about
 276 providing support to patients with young families
 277 (box 1). Following completion of the programme, the
 278 focus was on the participant's experience of the pro-
 279 gramme and their perceived impact of the course on
 280 their ability to provide supportive care when a parent
 281 has cancer (box 2).

282 Two researchers (LG and TW) independently con-
 283 ducted preliminary analysis on the data from the first
 284 pilot programme, to develop the framework.
 285 Following identification of potential themes, the
 286 researchers discussed and compared the themes and
 287 LG revised the framework. Emerging themes were
 288 used to form the following two axes of the

291 Box 1 Precourse open questions

- 292 Q4
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
1. Why would you like to attend the course and what do you hope to gain?
 2. Do you have any concerns or anxieties about working with patients with dependent children on the topic of family support?
 3. In brief, can you describe the work you currently do with patients and their families?

302 Box 2 Postcourse open questions

- 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
1. The things I have learnt from this course are;
 2. This learning will influence my practice in the following ways;
 3. I am feeling;
 4. My concerns are;
 5. The course could have been improved if: (was anything missing?);
 6. I would recommend this course to the following colleagues.

315 framework: (1) professionals' concerns about provid-
 316 ing supportive care when a parent has cancer (2) par-
 317 ticipants' experience and perceived impact of the
 318 programme on their practice. The framework was
 319 piloted for suitability and the final framework was
 320 used to analyse all data.

321 Ethics

322 From 1 September 2011, changes to the Governance
 323 Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees
 324 (GAFREC) in the UK mean that it is no longer necessary
 325 to submit to the National Research Ethics Service for
 326 review of studies where the requirement is based solely
 327 on the use of National Health Services (NHS) staff as
 328 participants or the use of NHS premises. Consent was
 329 implied by returning completed questionnaires.

330 RESULTS

331 Professionals' concerns about providing supportive care 332 when a parent has cancer

333 Data referring to participants' concerns were inserted
 334 into 'professional concerns about providing supportive
 335 care when a parent has cancer' framework. The over-
 336 arching concern reported was professional compe-
 337 tence to provide support. Three subthemes emerged:
 338 managing difficult emotions; challenges associated
 339 with raising child and family matters; and a lack of
 340 experience, skill and knowledge to competently
 341 support parents with cancer.

342 Managing difficult emotions

343 Participants described concerns about their emotional
 344 capacity to deal with patients with young families and
 345
 346
 347
 348

349	whether they could remain professional due to the	family-centred care, (4) experience of the programme	407
350	emotional nature of the issues and identified a need	and (5) challenges transferring skills into practice.	408
351	for support in dealing with this.		409
352		Greater understanding and knowledge	410
353	I worry about feeling out of my depth.	Participants gained a more comprehensive and theoret-	411
354		ical understanding of how parental illness impacts	412
355	I am worried about being able to stay professional	on children and families. They reported being more	413
356	because it is a very emotional area.	knowledgeable about how children process informa-	414
357		tion, cope and emotionally respond to a parent with	415
358	I feel there is a potential to over empathise with this	cancer according to the child's age and developmental	416
359	patient group.	stage. They were more aware of how open communi-	417
360		cation is beneficial within families and how restricted	418
361	I find this issue generally challenging and benefit from	communication exacerbates distress experienced by	419
362	support from my MDT colleagues.	family members and limits family coping.	420
363	Raising child and family matters		421
364	Participants worried about how to intervene on	Understanding about how children of different ages	422
365	matters relating to family relationships, how to raise	and stages cope with a parent's illness.	423
366	the topic of patients' children and family communica-		424
367	tion. They described a heightened sensitivity and were	Picking up failed communication or where families	425
368	concerned not to upset or offend patients. They were	lack communication and understanding how this can	426
369	aware that their care needed to be specialised and	lead to further distress and compound issues and	427
370	based on being able to competently form relationships	affect effective coping.	428
371	with patients that would allow them to raise these		429
372	issues.	A deeper understanding of the complex factors	430
373		involved in working with parents and families.	431
374	It's a sensitive issue to discuss with parents.		432
375		Increased confidence and skill	433
376	I am aware that this is a difficult situation for families	Participants described more confidence to approach	434
377	and for those involved and so I worry about saying	patients about family matters, they felt more skilful in	435
378	the wrong thing.	their ability to initiate conversations and explore	436
379		patients' family-related concerns.	437
380	I am concerned about broaching the subject with a	Participants reported developing their ability to	438
381	family who do not communicate openly.	assess how families and children were coping and to	439
382		identify signs when a child or family may be strugg-	440
383	How can I develop a rapport with families so that	ling. They felt they had greater confidence to guide	441
384	matters of support can be discussed?	parent-child communication about parental illness	442
385		and treatment, tailored to the specific age of children	443
386	Experience, skill and knowledge	and needs of the family. They also felt they could rec-	444
387	Participants described concerns about whether they	ommend resources, and know how and when to refer	445
388	had the personal and professional experience, as well	families for further support.	446
389	as skills and knowledge to offer supportive care to		447
390	younger patients and their children.	Working with families in recognising their own indi-	448
391		vidual needs and what they want in greater depth.	449
392	Dealing with new patient cohorts who are generally		450
393	younger and thereby have young families is quite chal-	More knowledgeable about how to assess and commu-	451
394	lenging, as the psychosocial needs are very different to	nicate with families.	452
395	older population groups.		453
396		To listen carefully, advise less but facilitate discussion,	454
397	I wonder whether or not having children of my own	explore emotions and feelings.	455
398	influence patients' view on my ability to help.		456
399		I know how to communicate and tailor conversations	457
400	I am uncertain about the level (amount) of informa-	to children's age and understanding of illness.	458
401	tion to give to children.		459
402		How to support patient to break news to their chil-	460
403	Participants' experience and perceived impact of the	dren in a protected safe way.	461
404	programme on their practice		462
405	Data referring to the evaluation of the programme	More confident giving advice, suggesting resources or	463
406	were inserted into the framework; ' <i>participants' experience and perceived impact of the programme on their practice</i> '. The five main themes were as follows:	services and in general talking to patients.	464
		Increased engagement and emotional resilience	461
		Participants described an enthusiasm to provide	462
		family-centred care when a parent has cancer. Some	463
		described becoming advocates for family-centred care	464

465	within their teams. They reported feeling less anxious,	valued the opportunity to reflect and anticipated chal-	523
466	experiencing fewer concerns and greater pragmatism	lenges incorporating reflective practice into their role.	524
467	around finding solutions and facing challenges.		525
468	They reported being more accepting and better able	Using knowledge appropriately into practice	526
469	to manage their emotions when they were faced with	That I will lose momentum and not use what I've	527
470	parents and families who declined support or made	learnt.	528
471	decisions about communication that were different to	I would have liked that we had more time to learn	529
472	their personal value systems. They were much more	from group members.	530
473	aware of the significance between their capacity to	I may not have enough time to have as many reflective	531
474	care and their emotional well-being and the need for	moments as I might need.	532
475	their own self-care.		533
476			534
477	Very privileged to work in this area and to support		535
478	families who are going through one of the most sig-	DISCUSSION	536
479	nificant life events they will find themselves having.	Evaluation of this pilot supports previous research ^{21 23}	537
480	I feel more knowledgeable and empowered to help	and confirms that HCPs experience significant con-	538
481	others.	cerns over providing supportive care when a parent	539
482	I can teach others what I have learnt.	has cancer. They worry about providing competent	540
483		specialised care and describe a significant level of	541
484	I will feel more able to deal with emotional and chal-	anxiety professionally and personally. Participants	542
485	lenging conversations.	described a lack of previous education, skill, knowl-	543
486	An acceptance and greater appreciation that not all	edge and experience. This all highlights the need for	544
487	families want support even when you feel they need it.	tailored professional training and support, as HCPs	545
488		may cope by disengaging from this aspect of patient's	546
489	How to look after myself better in order to effectively	care and compound the lack of support experienced	547
490	help patients	by patients. ^{11 12 19 26}	548
491		Following the programme, participants' reported an	549
492	Experience of the programme	increased engagement to support families where a	550
493	Participants valued the opportunity to reflect and	parent has cancer. They were more confident in their	551
494	share experiences in a multiprofessional group; the	ability to initiate conversations, assess coping, judge	552
495	support system that was created within the group	how far to explore issues and intervene appropriately,	553
496	helped participants to normalise the challenges and	especially in terms of facilitating parent-child commu-	554
497	difficult emotions associated with this area of care.	nication. These outcomes may help to address the	555
498	Participants valued the varied learning methods	reported gap that HCPs were not initiating conversa-	556
499	used, in particular DVDs of patients, children talking	tions about patient's children. ^{11 18} Participants par-	557
500	about their experiences of parents with cancer and	ticularly valued having a better understanding of how	558
501	role plays.	children tend to cope in response to parental illness	559
502		according to developmental stage. This is important	560
503	Sharing experiences was extremely beneficial and	as parents struggle to explore children's emotional	561
504	allowed me to get most out of course.	concerns and communicate in a way that is age appro-	562
505	Simply fantastic! Enjoyed the course, even the role	prate. ¹²⁻¹⁵	563
506	plays and group participation.	Participants described a deeper level of understand-	564
507	Understanding in more detail the impact of illness on	ing and awareness of the individual needs of families	565
508	the family through the use of video, role play, discus-	when a parent has cancer and the protective role of	566
509	sion has helped to make it more meaningful.	communication within families. ^{7 9} They gained a	567
510		more complex psychological understanding of patient	568
511	Great the course was multi-professional.	and family members' experiences, behaviours, beliefs	569
512		and emotional responses through the consideration of	570
513	Challenges transferring skills into practice	past events, contextual factors and systemic principles	571
514	While participants felt confident to engage in conver-	around family functioning and roles. It is hoped that	572
515	sations with patients regarding their children, they	this outcome may help HCPs to sustain and rationalise	573
516	described concerns about transferring their new	the need for family-centred care when a parent has	574
517	knowledge and skills into practice and identified a	cancer and maintain engagement, which may improve	575
518	need for support beyond the 3-day programme. They	the quality of care and potentially reduce psycholo-	576
519	described concerns about forgetting skills and not	gical difficulties in patients and children.	577
520	implementing the new skills correctly.	Experiential learning was identified as helpful, in	578
521	Participants had concerns about losing the forum of	particular participation within a multidisciplinary	579
522	the group and wanted more time for discussion. They	group, which gave an opportunity to share experi-	580
		ences and provide mutual support and encouraged	

reflective practice. Participants reported that this increased awareness of their own emotional needs and the relationship this has to their capacity to care for others. This insight may help HCPs to manage the emotional aspects of providing supportive care to parents with cancer, encouraging them to be more proactive in addressing their need for support.^{21–23}

Although the findings of this pilot study are based on a self-selected sample, the content of the programme and the learning methods employed appears to have achieved positive learning outcomes and support Turner's research on addressing the training needs of HCPs, when supporting parents with cancer.^{23 25}

Participants identified a need for support beyond the programme and described concerns about losing the reflective forum of the group and forgetting new skills and knowledge.

Further work is being carried out to disseminate the programme to other sites, evaluate the transfer of knowledge and skills into practice and assess how professionals continue to manage the emotional demands of providing family-centred support with the addition of supervision.

The programme is applicable to other areas of care where a family-centred approach is needed; for example, families caring for teenagers and young adults with cancer or other life-limiting illnesses such as HIV, multiple sclerosis (MS) and cystic fibrosis and may be adaptable pending further evaluation to other professional contexts, for instance, general practitioners and community HCPs.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the programme was to address the gap in education and support for HCPs. It is hoped that by focusing on improving the quality of supportive care that HCPs provide, they can positively influence patient and family experience. Providing support to families that encourages open communication, assesses family coping and considers children's needs may potentially reduce psychological difficulties in children and families where a parent has cancer. Findings from the pilot support previous research that an educational approach is acceptable and enhances HCPs' perception and confidence to provide supportive care.

Twitter Follow Theresa Wiseman at @gtwiseman

Acknowledgements The authors wish to thank the experts who were consulted on the development of the programme and the members of staff who participated. Research infrastructure was supported by the NIHR RM/ICR Biomedical Research Centre.

Contributors LG led the project, developed and delivered the programme, conducted analysis, devised the framework with TW, wrote the report and took overall responsibility for the manuscript. AS assisted with the report and drafting of the manuscript. SL supported the delivery of the programme and reviewed the manuscript. TW supervised the project and analysis, devised the framework and contributed to the analysis and drafting of the manuscript.

Funding Research was supported by The Royal Marsden Cancer Charity who were not involved in any part of the work.

Competing interests None declared.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

REFERENCES

- 1 Cancer Research UK. Cancer incidence by Age. 2014. <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/incidence/age/#heading-Five> (accessed Jun 2015).
- 2 Syse A, Aas GB, Loge JH. Children and young adults with parents with cancer: a population-based study. *Clin Epidemiol* 2012;1:41–52.
- 3 Weaver KE, Rowland JH, Alfano CM, *et al.* Parental cancer and the family: a population-based estimate of the number of US cancer survivors residing with their minor children. *Cancer* 2010;18:4395–401.
- 4 Niemela M, Paananen R, Hakko H, *et al.* The prevalence of children affected by parental cancer and their use of specialized psychiatric services: the 1987 Finnish Birth Cohort study. *Int J Cancer* 2012;9:2117–25.
- 5 Rolland J. *Families, illness, and disability. An integrative treatment model.* New York: Basic Books, 1994.
- 6 Welch AS, Wadsworth ME, Compas BE. Adjustment of children and adolescents to parental cancer. Parents' and children's perspectives. *Cancer* 1996;7:1409–18.
- 7 Osborn T. The psychosocial impact of parental cancer on children and adolescents: a systematic review. *Psychooncology* 2007;2:101–26.
- 8 Edwards B, Clarke V. The psychological impact of a cancer diagnosis on families: the influence of family functioning and patients' illness characteristics on depression and anxiety. *Psychooncology* 2004;13:562–76.
- 9 Wong M, Cavanaugh C, MacLeamy J, *et al.* Post traumatic growth and adverse long-term effects of parental cancer in children. *Fam Syst Health* 2009;1:2821–35.
- 10 Thastum M, Watson M, Kienbacher C, *et al.* Prevalence and predictors of emotional and behavioural functioning of children where a parent has cancer: a multi-national study. *Cancer* 2009;17:4030–9.
- 11 Kuhne F, Krattenmacher T, Bergelt C, *et al.* Parental palliative care: psychosocial adjustment and health related quality of life in adolescents participating in a German family counselling service. *BMC Palliative Care* 2012;11:21. doi:10.1186/1472-684X-11-21 [published Online First: 30 Oct 2012].
- 12 Barnes J, Kroll L, Burke O, *et al.* Qualitative interview study of communication between parents and children about maternal breast cancer. *BMJ* 2000;321:479–82.
- 13 Turner J, McGrath P. Children of mothers with advanced breast cancer: a review of needs and services. *Cancer Forum* 2004;3:191–5.
- 14 Koopman HM, Baars RM, Chaplin J, *et al.* Illness through the eyes of the child: the development of children understands of the causes of illness. *Patient Educ Couns* 2004;3:363–70.
- 15 Eiser C. Changes in understanding of illness as the child grows. *Arch Dis Child* 1985;5:489–92.
- 16 Forrest G, Plumb C, Ziebland S, *et al.* Breast cancer in the family—children's perceptions of their mother's cancer and its initial treatment: qualitative study. *BMJ* 2006;332:998–1003.
- 17 Semple CJ, McCance T. Parents' experience of cancer who have young children: a literature review. *Cancer Nurs* 2010;2:110–18.

- 697 18 Watson M, St James-Roberts I, Ashley S, *et al.* Factors associated with
698 emotional and behavioural problems among school age
699 children of breast cancer patients. *Br J Cancer* 2006;1:43–50. 755
- 700 19 Turner J, Clavarino A, Yates P, *et al.* Development of a resource
701 for parents with advanced cancer: what do parents want?
702 *Palliat Support Care* 2007;2:135–45. 756
- 703 20 Schmitt F, Manninen H, Santalahti P, *et al.* Children of parents
704 with cancer: a collaborative project between a child psychiatry
705 clinic and an adult oncology clinic. *Clin Child Psychol
Psychiatry* 2007;3:421–36. 757
- 706 21 Leiter M, Maslach C. The impact of interpersonal environment
707 on burnout and organizational commitment. *J Organ Behav*
708 1988;4:297–308. 758
- 709 22 Ramirez A, Addington-Hall J, Richards M. ABC of palliative
710 care: the carers. *BMJ* 1998;316:208–77. 759
- 711 23 Maslach C, Jackson SE, Leiter MP, *et al.* *Maslach burnout
712 inventory manual*. 3rd edn. Palo Alto, California: CPB, 1996. 760
- 713 24 Turner J, Clavarino A, Yates P, *et al.* Oncology nurses,
714 perceptions of their supportive care for patients with advanced
715 breast cancer: challenges and needs. *Psychooncology*
716 2007;2:149–57. 761
- 717 25 Turner J, Clavarino A, Yates P, *et al.* Enhancing the supportive
718 care of parents with advanced cancer: development of a
719 self-directed educational manual. *Eur J Cancer*
720 2008;12:1625–31. 762
- 721 26 Turner J, Clavarino A, Butow P, *et al.* Enhancing the capacity
722 of oncology nurses to provide supportive care for parents with
723 advanced cancer: evaluation of an educational intervention.
724 *Eur J Cancer* 2009;10:1798–806. 763
- 725 27 Corner J, Wagland R. Quality of Life of Cancer Survivors in
726 England: Analysis of Patients' Free Text Comments: Final
727 Report. A National Cancer Survivorship PROMs Survey.
728 University of Southampton and Department of Health, 2012.
729 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/
730 attachment_data/file/213317/NCSS_PROMs_text_analysis_
731 report_Final_Report_040213.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213317/NCSS_PROMs_text_analysis_report_Final_Report_040213.pdf) (accessed Jun 2015). 764
- 732 28 National Institute for Clinical Excellence. Improving
733 Supportive and Palliative Care for Adults with Cancer, 2004. 765
- 734 29 Niemelä M, Hakko H, Räsänen S. A systematic narrative review of
735 the studies on structured child-centred interventions for families
736 with a parent with cancer. *Psychooncology* 2010;5:451–61. 766
- 737 30 Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, *et al.* Developing and
738 evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research
739 Council guidance. *BMJ* 2008;337:a1655. 767
- 740 31 Bowlby J. Attachment. *Attachment and Loss*. Vol. 1. Loss.
741 New York: Basic Books, 1969. 768
- 742 32 Piaget J. *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic Books,
743 1972. 769
- 744 33 Carter B, McGoldrick M. *The expanded family lifecycle.
745 Individual family and social perspectives*. 3rd edn. Pearson, 1998. 770
- 746 34 Goldenberg H, Goldenberg I. *Family therapy: an overview*. 8th
747 edn. CENGAGE Learning Custom Publishing, 2012. 771
- 748 35 Byng-Hall J. *Rewriting family scripts: improvisation and
749 systems change*. New York: Guilford Press, 1995. 772
- 750 36 Allison S, Stacey K, Dadds V, *et al.* What the family brings:
751 gathering evidence for strengths based work. *J Family Therapy*
752 2003;3:263–84. 773
- 753 37 Patterson JM. Understanding family resilience. *J Clin Psychol*
754 2002;3:233–46. 774
- 755 38 Wilkinson S, Perry R, Blanchard K, *et al.* Effectiveness of
756 a three-day communication skills course in changing nurses'
757 communication skills with cancer/palliative care patients: a
758 randomised controlled trial. *Palliat Med* 2008;4:365–75. 777
- 759 39 Chowns G. 'No—You Don't know how we feel!' (DVD)
760 Collaborative Inquiry using video with children facing the
761 life-threatening illness of a parent. In: *Handbook of action
762 research*. Reason P, Bradbury H, eds. London: Sage, 2008. 782
- 763 40 Argyris C, Schön D. *Organization learning: a theory of Action
764 Perspective*. Addison Wesley Longman Publishing Co, 1978. 783
- 765 41 Schön DA. *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think
766 in action*. 1 edn. Basic Books, 1984. 784
- 767 42 Ritchie J, Lewis J, eds. *Qualitative research practice: a guide for
768 social science students and researchers*. London: Sage
769 Publications, 2003. 785
- 770 790
771 791
772 792
773 793
774 794
775 795
776 796
777 797
778 798
779 799
780 800
781 801
782 802
783 803
784 804
785 805
786 806
787 807
788 808
789 809
790 810
791 811
792 812