Professionalism in Healthcare: Critical Analysis of Journal Article, Report and Blog

The purpose of this assignment is to critically appraise three different types of literature – Journal article, Report and Blog on the topic of professionalism in healthcare. Each resource approached the topic from different angle. Research has consistently highlighted the need to improve medical professionalism. Professionalism has been defined as the social contract between Health professionals and society which is patient centred and based on trust. (Brennan and Monson, 2014). The Royal college of Physicians (rcp) defined it as “a set of values, behaviours and relationships that underpin the trust the public has in doctors” (Tweedie, Hordem and Dacre 2018). The health and Care Professional Council (hcpc) report considered professionalism “as a meta-skill of circumstantial awareness and judgement in choosing the appropriate skills for a given situation” (hcpc. 2014).

The beneficiaries of Healthcare professionalism are the patients, practitioners, communities, and healthcare organizations (Tweedie.J, Borden.J, and Dacre.J 2018; Brennan and Monson, 2014).

In this assignment, I will be reviewing the three resources using the currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, and purpose (CRAAP) tool. The methodology used in the three resources would also be appraised. I would search and access the resources via – Google Scholar, General Google, and PubMed search. I would read and analyse each resource and critically explore their strengths and weaknesses, in my 1000-word essay. I would then present my conclusion with the summary of my key findings.

Journal article

- Brennan, M.D. and Monson, V. (2014). Professionalism: Good for Patients and Health Care Organizations. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, [online] 89(5), pp.644–652. Available at: https://www.mayoclinicproceedings.org/article/s0025-6196(14)00064-0/ [Accessed 29 October. 2020]

In-Text citation: (Brennan and Monson, 2014)

Summary:

The paper is a narrative review of literature from several domains of knowledge on professionalism in Healthcare in USA. The findings show that investing in organizational professionalism led to positive health outcomes (Brennan, and Monson, 2014). This finding was collaborated by Tweedie et al 2018 and hcpc report 2014.

On appraisal I noted that the article is persuasive with clear germane purpose. The points made are factual, verifiable, and supported by other publications such as hcpc report 2014. Furthermore, the article was published in 2014, and accessible with functional weblink. Study design is narrative literature review of scholarly literature and published by a reputable Journal

adding to its strength (Aveyard, 2010) The publication is relevant as it addressed a topical issue of public interest relevant to my assignment.

Nonetheless, it exhibited some weakness such as lack of a clear research question and limitations inherent in narrative literature reviews - undefined methods of searching, appraising, and synthesising of literature. Other limitation of the paper includes total absence of information on methodology - number of papers reviewed, inclusion and exclusion criteria; all of which are essential elements of the quality, validity, and reliability of any review (Aveyard, H. 2010). A systematic review is suggested.to improve on the reliability.

Considering its strengths and limitations I find the paper a reasonable source of information and would use it for research.

Report

- hcpc (2014). Professionalism in healthcare professionals. [online] Available at: https://www.hcpc-uk.org/globalassets/resources/reports/professionalism-in-healthcare-professionals.pdf.[Accessed 29 October 2010]

In-text citation: (hcpc, 2014).

Summary:

The report explored professionalism in healthcare professions focusing on the practitioners' understanding of professionalism, the scope, and the association of professionalism with short-term career consequences.

The report is the outcome of a well planned and executed qualitative study. Ethical approval was sort and obtained from relevant ethics committee. The design and methodology were clear and robust. The sample size was defined. Representative sampling method was used. Interviews and focus group discussions were adopted for data collection. Data analysis was systematic and detailed using appropriate analytical software (NVivo). Inclusion and exclusion criteria was well defined and the findings consistent as findings by Brennam and Monson 2014.(???). All these contributed to the strength of the report and the reliability of the findings

The report exhibited further strengths - reasonably current and accessible. The weblink is functional. It has good justification of purpose and relevant. The report is credible as it was published by recognised UK Government regulatory body. In addition,

Being a qualitative study, it is subject to limitations inherent in qualitative research, viz: unreliability - uncontrolled factors, labour intensiveness, subjectivity, and limited generalization. Using the focus group method for data collection is flawed by the limitation that it cannot completely collect all the viewpoints even with a good number of participants. Bearing the strength and weakness identified, I would be positively disposed to cite and use the report for a research paper.

Blog

- Dacre, J. and Tweedie, J. (2018). Preserving professionalism in the current healthcare environment - The BMJ. [online] The BMJ. Available at: https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2018/12/06/preserving-professionalism-in-the-current-healthcare-environment/[Acccessed 30 October 2020]

In -text citation: (Dacre and Tweedie, 2018)

Summary:

The focus is on promoting Professionalism to save our 70 years NHS in this challenging time of austerity which led to the first doctors strike in decades. It suggested the revisiting of Medical Professionalism to address real problems facing NHS. The article called for a better perception and understanding of medical professionalism. The Royal college of Physicians defined medical professionalism in their report as “a set of values, behaviours and relationships that underpin the trust the public has in doctors.” The hcpc however considered Professionalism as a meta -skill comprising situational awareness and contextual judgement (hcpc 2014).

The article is current, accessible and the link to the blog is functional. It is relevant as it focused on topical issue of public interest related to my assignment. It canvased generally held views of the medical community. The purpose of the article was to inform and persuade the medical community for action to stem the collapse of the NHS. The blog is the opinion of the authors. It is not peered reviewed but professionally edited for BMJ (Dobson and Abbasi, 2017) and are subjective.

The authors are reputable with good credentials and experience to write on such a topic. The information given are factual, verifiable, and supported by evidence. The information is factual and collaborated by rcp report.

Though I agree with the points raised, based on its technical weakness I would be unwilling to cite and use this article for a research.

Conclusion

There is mounting evidence in the literature of the need to improve medical professionalism because it benefits it benefits the patients, practitioners, communities, and healthcare organizations (Tweedie.J, Borden.J, and Dacre.J 2018; Brennan and Monson, 2014).

My choice of literature represented a range of literature with varied research design, methodology and purpose. Their credibility, relevance, authority, and accuracy were identified.

While the purpose of the resources was good – to inform and promote action, the Journal article and the report were considerably current both published in 2014. However, the blog was published in 2018. All the three resources were relevant as they addressed a topical issue of public interest and relevant to my assignment. The authors of the three resources were experts and eminently qualified to write on the topic conferring authority to the resources. The Journal article and the report were peer reviewed. The blog is not peered reviewed but professionally edited (Dobson and Abbasi, 2017) The journal article is a narrative literature review of scholarly literature and published by reputable Journal. The report is the findings of a qualitative research

published by a UK Government regulatory agency adding to its strength -accuracy -reliability. Although the blog is published on BMJ platform the reliability is suspect. I would be unwilling to cite and use in research.

Based on their various strengths and limitations shown above I would confidently use the Journal article and the report in my research and tread cautiously with the use of the blog.