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Fear and overprotection in Australian residential aged care facilities: The inadvertent impact of regulation on quality continence care
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Aim: Most residents in residential aged care facilities are incontinent. This study explored how continence care was provided in residential aged care facilities, and describes a subset of data about staffs’ beliefs and experiences of the quality framework and the funding model on residents’ continence care.

Methods: Using grounded theory methodology, 18 residential aged care staff members were interviewed and 88 hours of field observations conducted in two facilities. Data were analysed using a combination of inductive and deductive analytic procedures.

Results: Staffs’ beliefs and experiences about the requirements of the quality framework and the funding model fostered a climate of fear and risk adversity that had multiple unintended effects on residents’ continence care.

Conclusion: There is a need to rethink the quality of continence care and its measurement in Australian residential aged care facilities.
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Introduction
The quality of care provided to individuals living in Australian residential aged care facilities is regulated and enshrined in legislation [1]. The quality framework consists of an Aged Care Complaints Scheme, and an Accreditation Framework. The latter is operationalised through the Australian Aged Care Quality Agency (Quality Agency) and is reinforced by a program of audits and unannounced visits and follow-up action as appropriate. Under the provisions of the Act, facilities that meet a set of Aged Care Accreditation Standards are eligible to be accredited and can subsequently apply for a government subsidy for resident care. The standards address: (i) management systems, staffing and organisational development; (ii) health and personal care; (iii) resident lifestyle; and (iv) the physical environment and safe systems. A number of expected outcomes nest within each standard. The expected outcome of Standard 2.12 (Health and Personal Care) states Care recipients’ continence is managed effectively [2].

The prevalence of incontinence in most residential aged care facilities is high: up to 78% of female residents and 23–72% of male residents are incontinent of urine [3,4] and up to 65% experience faecal incontinence [5–9]. In addition, many residents experience other bladder and bowel symptoms such as constipation, faecal impaction, urinary urgency, urinary frequency, urinary tract infections (UTIs) and nocturia [10]. The majority also have dementia and/or mental illness [11] and need high levels of support to use the toilet or to manage their incontinence. These factors make the management of incontinence and the promotion of continence a challenging task.

Although many people living in residential aged care facilities have chronic incontinence that does not respond to active intervention, others have potentially reversible forms of incontinence. Indeed, many of the risk factors for urinary incontinence in frail older adults are reversible and are not directly related to the genitourinary tract; for example, delirium, UTI and the side effects of medications [12]. A systematic review of seven studies indicated the main risk factors for female incontinence in residential aged care facilities are: physical dependence (e.g. being bedridden or limited to wheelchair locomotion; use of bedrails or chair or trunk restraints), cognitive impairment, prolonged institutionalisation, diabetes and faecal incontinence [3]. Care practices such as the indiscriminate use of laxatives [9] and limited access to toileting assistance [13] also contribute to incontinence in residential aged care settings.

Continence guidelines therefore promote a multidisciplinary case management approach involving active investigation in order to identify and treat reversible causes of incontinence, and to implement treatment options to minimise or cure incontinence [14–18]. The International Consultation on Incontinence recommends people with urinary incontinence be assessed to: diagnose the type, frequency and severity of symptoms; identify contributing factors; and evaluate the social impact of incontinence, its effects on hygiene and quality of life, measures used to contain leakage, and the individual’s preferences for care [18]. In addition, the resi-
dent’s lower urinary tract function should be assessed, as well as their medical status (i.e. to check for diseases of the nervous system and pelvic disorders), as well as medications that could contribute to incontinence [18].

The most common method for managing incontinence in residential aged care facilities is with disposable pads, reusable pads, catheters, condom drainage, bed protection products, urinals, bedpans and commodes. These passive containment approaches contrast with active treatment options such as surgery, medication, bladder training, biofeedback, pelvic floor muscle exercises, electrostimulation and toileting assistance programs. There is very limited research about the effectiveness of most of these active treatment options for people living in residential aged care facilities. However, there is a considerable body of evidence that supports the systematic use of toileting assistance programs. Toileting assistance programs target incontinence that may occur as a consequence of the inability to reach and use the toilet or bathroom because of functional or cognitive impairment. People are verbally prompted or physically assisted at arbitrarily determined fixed voiding intervals or at times based on their usual voiding pattern [19]. Toileting assistance programs are often implemented in conjunction with continence aids, medication, adjustments to fluid intake (including caffeine restriction) and exercise programs to enhance the person’s mobility or toileting skills [19]. A recent systematic review identified 33 interventional studies that examined and compared guidance for the management of incontinence, as well as continence promotion in older care home residents [20]. Of these studies, seven were randomised controlled trials that showed toileting assistance programs were effective in reducing residents’ rates of incontinence, particularly when combined with strength, endurance or mobility training programs [21–28].

Although the Australian Government funds and regulates the provision of residential care, and approved providers must comply with responsibilities specified in the Act and the Aged Care Principles, little is known about the impact of the quality framework and the funding model on residents’ continence care from staff’s perspectives.

Using Grounded theory method, the current study sought in-depth information about the management of continence in residential aged care facilities, and about enacting Accreditation Standard 2.12. The overall intention of the study was to develop a grounded theory that described and explained how residents’ continence care needs were determined, delivered and communicated.

Methods
The study was conducted using Grounded theory methods described by Glaser and Strauss [29]. The method included theoretical sampling, constant comparative data analysis, theoretical sensitivity, memo writing, identifying a core category and theoretical saturation. Data were derived from formal semi-structured, open-ended and in-depth interviews with residential aged care staff and from field observations of practice in two facilities. The project was approved by the university’s Human Research and Ethics Committee. Individual consent was obtained for in-depth interviews, and organisational consent was obtained for field observations.

Sample and setting
Eighteen individuals experienced in providing continence care who worked in different residential aged care facilities in Australia participated in formal semi-structured open-ended interviews. Six were Registered Nurses (RNs): four of these worked as Directors of Nursing and two were Clinical Nurse Educators. Five of the six RNs had post-graduate qualifications. Six participants were Enrolled Nurses (ENs), and a further six worked as Personal Care Attendants (PCAs). They volunteered to take part after hearing about the study from their colleagues who had participated, or following dissemination of information about the research at professional network forums and at a tertiary education facility.

Non-participant field observations
In addition to the interviews, 88 hours of non-participant field observations were conducted in two purposively selected facilities in two states: a 75-bed not-for-profit facility in Melbourne, Victoria, and a private 50-bed facility in Adelaide, South Australia. The observational periods encompassed four eight-hour morning shifts (32 hours), four eight-hour afternoon shifts (32 hours) and three eight-hour night duty shifts (24 hours).

Information sessions were convened at each site to ensure open disclosure about the study, and organisational consent was provided for the researchers’ presence. During observation periods, the researcher observed routines of care and interactions between staff and residents from a discrete distance from staff–resident activity and in shared areas of each facility. The researcher wrote occasional field notes about the work staff performed and the way they recognised and responded to residents’ care needs.

Analysis
All data were entered and managed in QSR International NVivo 9 software program [30]. Data were analysed using open coding, theoretical coding and selective coding techniques. Simultaneously, memos were constructed about ideas emerging from coded data. All stages of coding involved comparing code-to-code, incident-to-incident, and category-to-category to establish underlying uniformity and to ensure the data fitted, until higher order and a basic social problem and a basic social process were revealed.

Validity and reliability
Strategies to enhance the credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability of the findings included engaging in reflexivity, searching for disconfirming cases, re-examining the data to look for other ways to organise it to elicit alternate interpretations, sharing data and emergent findings with
colleagues and residential aged care stakeholders, using both field observational and interview data, interviewing participants more than once and maintaining an audit trail [31].

Results
The study resulted in a theory about how overall care, including continence care, was delivered in Australian residential aged care facilities. The theory comprised: (i) a basic social problem termed ‘caring against the odds’, which described the main problem residential aged care staff experienced while performing their work; and (ii) a basic social process termed ‘weathering constraints’, which explained how staff grappled with, or responded to this problem. One key factor that contributed to the basic social problem was the impact of regulation on staff on the overall delivery of day-to-day care. Specifically, staff described being fearful of being found non-compliant with regulation, and this fear caused them to focus on activities to secure funding, meet accreditation standards, adopt overprotective behaviours towards residents and contribute to a charade of regulatory compliance. The following section explicates each of these findings with selective transcripts from interviews and field observations.

Working in a climate of fear
Staff in this study described being ‘under scrutiny’, being constantly concerned about ‘getting into trouble’ and being afraid about the potential for complaints or negative regulatory response. For example, they perceived assessors from the Quality Agency could interpret an inconsistency in some documentation as evidence of a facility’s lack of adherence to standards. Similarly, documentation inconsistencies could also place them at risk of having their claim for funding downgraded. Another factor that generated considerable fear among staff was the potential for on-site visits from assessors. The following transcript from a participant who worked as a PCA offers some insight into the impact of an impending visit from an assessor.

For management, they freak out months before because they know it’s [accreditation] coming up. The whole place is in a panic for weeks before when they know they are going to get audited . . . even if it’s a pretty good place. They [the assessors] go through . . . [everything]. You spend so much time going through the notes and the care plans trying to get everything perfect and the auditors will come in and they just pick on one or two and they go through it with a fine tooth comb. We hide, we all just hide. We just toilet people all the time [laughter] (Int-16).

Trying to understand and adhere to non-specific accreditation standards
Staff described being particularly mindful about the need to meet, or at least be seen to meet the Aged Care Accreditation Standards. However, some staff struggled to interpret the standards and described having to figure out for themselves what would constitute adherence. For example, one RN who worked as a manager said:

They [the government] don’t tell you how you have to do it [adhere to the standards], but you have to make sure that their guidelines are followed (Int-15).

Most staff believed they could adhere to Accreditation Standard 2.12 if they could show: (i) they had assessed and reviewed every resident’s continence status; (ii) every resident had an individualised continence care plan; (iii) the facility had a supply of different types of incontinence pads; and (iv) they used appropriate pads. As one RN manager said:

Number one, the charting is in place. That you do have sufficient supplies [of pads]. You are not just running the place on the skeleton supply and that you are using the appropriate aid [pad] . . . they look at all of that . . . that you are using the appropriate aid [pad] (Int-08).

For another RN manager ‘[effective continence care] was when there was an assessment done, there were continence aids [pads] provided and no-one complained’ (Int-07).

Although staff identified the need for residents to be assessed for their incontinence, they consistently equated an individualised continence assessment with a process that was undertaken to apply for funding and to determine the number and types of incontinence pads residents required. Indeed, they used the term ‘individualised continence assessment’ to refer to an assessment to determine residents’ ‘individualised pad needs’. At the same time, staff described policies and practices to ration residents’ incontinence pads, as exemplified by the following comment.

Residents are allocated three [pads]. One for the morning, one for the afternoon and one for the night and they’re different sizes (Int-10).

Staff placed considerable emphasis on developing care plans showing every resident had an individualised toileting program. At the same time, they also indicated they were not well placed to implement these programs. PCAs indicated that while they attempted to provide residents with toileting assistance, it was not always possible or appropriate. By and large, toileting assistance programs were considered to be an aspirational practice. One PCA said:

On paper it [toileting programs] looks fantastic but in theory it [toileting programs] doesn’t really . . . It doesn’t really happen. It . . . it depends on how busy they are – what else is also going on in the shift – sometimes everything is going wrong and you don’t have time to toilet certain people (Int-03).

Therefore, while staff assessed and identified residents’ continence status and need for toileting assistance, the informa-
tion had limited clinical use because staff felt they could not necessarily act on it. They described a number of factors that hindered them, that is being short staffed, residents’ cognitive and functional dependence, residents’ limited responsiveness to toileting, staff availability to use lifting machines to transfer highly dependent residents and other priorities.

Understanding how to operationalise the accreditation standards was also complicated by the fact that, from staff’s perspectives, the factors that constituted adherence could differ from one assessor visit to the next, and different assessors had different expectations. Even the same assessor’s expectations could alter from visit to visit. Data from field observations confirmed staffs’ experience of this variability.

The assessors are on-site. Staff in the dining area are wearing theatre style disposable caps. A PCA is crying. She states ‘last time we got into trouble for not having hats’ (Field notes site 1: PM).

An RN manager suggested that the issues assessors appraised were person-dependent and that in some cases it was a positive experience for staff and in others it was negative. Because assessors’ expectations could vary, staff felt they could not rely on the knowledge they gained from prior assessor visits. Some staff blamed assessors’ different expectations for the difficulty they experienced adhering to the accreditation standards.

Working to a funding model that incentivises higher levels of incontinence

Although there is no regulation requiring service providers to apply for funding, the availability of government subsidies and funding formulas had a considerable impact on care priorities. Staff described a range of practices that seemed to be designed to maximise government funding. For example, with respect to funding for residents’ continence, staff felt compelled to monitor residents as closely as possible over a number of days and nights to identify when they voided, and whether they were incontinent or not. Higher rates of incontinence optimised the chances that managers could claim the highest level of funding. Staff described policies requiring them to conduct hourly continence checks, even at night and in some cases, even when residents reacted negatively to being woken. As one staff member said:

*The new resident is sleeping and we will avoid waking her. She will be on an ACFI soon and then we will have to check her every hour. Some of them [residents] don’t like it [being woken to have their continence status checked] and some get aggressive* (Field notes site 2: Night shift).

However, other staff objected to conducting continence checks at night, claiming that residents had a right to privacy and sleep. A PCA said:

*It’s an hourly chart . . . and it’s pretty degrading to go to someone and say ‘I have to check’. So that [frequent continence checks] goes out the window really* (Int-16).

Another inadvertent consequence of the funding model was the pressure staff felt to passively manage residents’ continence care needs during the assessment phase, thus making it easier for staff to identify residents’ maximum levels of dependence and incontinence and for managers to claim a higher level of funding. An RN manager said:

*I would hope that ethically our people wouldn’t do it [make residents’ continence appear worse that it is] but there is a tendency for the . . . how can I say this nicely . . . probably a tendency for people to not manage the continence properly* (Int-07).

Indeed, some staff indicated they felt bound by organisational rules to withhold giving residents’ pads during the assessment phase, or to limit residents to small size pads so that residents’ incontinence would be more evident. Other staff, particularly those working in direct care roles, were uncomfortable about these practices, and indicated they did not always comply with them. A PCA said:

*They [residents] are not supposed to have any pads [when staff undertake the ACFI assessment]. They are supposed to be left on a draw sheet [linen material]. Now that’s a bit hard. You can’t really do that!* (Int-03).

Staff indicated they spent considerable time collecting information in order to complete forms for funding purposes; however they were also sceptical about the quality of the information, particularly when it related to residents who were cognitively impaired. They felt the information was not necessarily representative of residents’ actual continence status. One staff member described the charting procedures as a ‘bit of a joke’. She said:

*It’s [bowel charting] a bit of a joke really because let’s face it . . . it [bowel charting] is mostly done for the funding. Because you can go round and ask the residents and most of them can’t remember if they’ve been that morning or not. You go in and ask them and they say ‘oh yes’* (Int-16).

As staff explained, it was not always feasible to complete forms accurately because it was not always possible or appropriate to conduct regular continence checks. Staff indicated they attempted to accommodate the situation by completing forms retrospectively, or based on a best guess. An RN described the difficulty of obtaining accurate information as follows.

*They [staff] have to do it [fill in the continence form indicating they have checked the resident’s continence status]. They have to fill in the form to account for every hour but they don’t really do this. What they do is they fill it in for the preceding hours when they check the residents’ pads so if the pad is wet when they check it, they fill in the form to indicate that the resident was dry between the last pad check and that pad check. But of course, the resident might have been wet for hours* (Int-17).
Therefore, as far as staff were concerned, documentation did not necessarily reflect residents’ actual status or the care provided, and had a limited clinical usefulness. While staff were cognisant of their complicity in creating a documentation smokescreen, and concealing the gap between documented care and actual care, they also described being powerless to alter the situation, because they were compelled by regulation.

**Accommodating regulation**

Interview and field observation data suggested staff attempted to accommodate the difficulties they experienced in two main ways. One such method was characterised by highly protective behaviours towards residents. Staffs’ concerns about residents’ need for protection caused them to place considerable value on using incontinence pads to contain residents’ incontinence and to keep residents visibly clean. Staff equated the practice of using pads to manage incontinence with protecting residents from the indignity of incontinence, from the risk of pressure injuries and from falls. Such was staffs’ concerns about residents’ safety, that some staff indicated it was safer for residents to use pads at night than attempt to use the toilet.

Protection concerns also caused staff to adopt a range of measures designed to minimise residents’ risks of falling, such as repeatedly reminding them of their risk of falling, discouraging them from walking unaided, placing their beds in low positions to reduce the impact of a fall, placing mattresses on the floor beside beds to reduce the impact of a resident fall, and using hip protectors. By reducing residents’ independence to walk to and use the toilet, these measures inadvertently contributed to residents’ incontinence.

The second main response involved attending to cosmetic issues and developing a paper trail of evidence to document regulatory compliance. As one participant said: ‘you’ve got to have evidence for everything . . . absolute evidence for everything. They [the assessors] go through progress notes . . . even with things like behaviour . . . and you have to document everything’ (Int-15). Staff indicated that they spent excessive amounts of time developing a paper trail of documentation they thought would meet regulatory requirements. However, having developed such documentation, they also had to ensure it remained current. The following data from field observations demonstrate the burden created by the belief that inconsistent documentation could leave a facility open to being negatively appraised during an audit.

**Jane is responsible for selecting and allocating residents’ incontinence pads. Night staff give out the pads using a list with information on the number and type of pad each resident receives. This information is also on a card on the inside of residents’ wardrobe doors, and it is documented in residents’ medical files. Jane says that the information on all three sources needs to match because it may be audited and any discrepancy can ‘let them down’. Jane will request a shift where she can focus solely on the task of ensuring paperwork is accurate (Field notes site 2: PM shift).**

Moreover, some staff, particularly PCAs, were somewhat cynical about the accreditation process, which they perceived was farcical. A PCA who had worked in three different facilities described service providers’ attempts to improve the cosmetic appearance of the facility in preparation for an on-site visit from the Quality Agency. She said:

*I think it’s [the accreditation process] all rubbish! I’ve had a few different experiences in three different places. The first place they [the service providers] rented all this nice décor stuff and they had like a water feature and drinking fountains and a statue in the garden. And after, it all just went. I’ve had other ones where staff come in like an hour and a half earlier on the day, just to have everything all nice, showers all organised and breakfast right on time. I think its bullshit! I hate it! (Int-16).*

**Discussion**

Consistent with findings from research conducted in other countries [32–34], residential aged care staff in this study were particularly mindful about the need to secure funding for resident care, get their facility over the line in terms of complying with regulation, and avoid complaints and adverse event that could result in sanctions and a corresponding loss of funding. While this paper is not the first to describe the unintended impacts of the quality framework and the funding model in the residential aged care sector [35], it is the first to identify, describe and explain these anomalies on residents’ continence care.

One of the more concerning findings was that staffs’ interpretations about the requirements of the funding model caused them to engage in a set of practices that were difficult and onerous, and which were likely to interrupt the quality and duration of residents’ sleep at night. Moreover, given it was not feasible for staff to consistently perform these procedures, the information was of dubious quality. The researchers suggest there is a need to reconsider the value of information about the frequency of residents’ incontinence for funding purposes.

The findings also suggest the funding model has the potential to obfuscate the purpose and quality of a continence assessment. In practice, continence assessments appear to be a function of contested values about the need for funding, regulatory compliance and clinical care. Specifically, as higher rates of incontinence attract a higher subsidy, the funding model provides a high incentive for staff to identify residents with severe incontinence, but little incentive to actively prevent or treat it. It would seem that this funding incentive could hinder residents from accessing a comprehensive continence assessment to actively prevent and manage their incontinence.
It is also possible that the generalised nature of Accreditation Standard 2.12 leaves open the possibility that assessors could be evaluating systems and processes that inadvertently endorse, promote and reinforce passive continence care, and facilities could pass on the basis they have documented processes or systems in place, regardless of the quality of those processes or systems [36]. Indeed, a number of submissions to the recent national inquiry into the care of older people in Australia highlighted possible distortions in care arising from the gaps in the accreditation framework [35]. At worst, a lack of understanding about what constitutes ‘effective continence care’ could leave facilities open to subversion by an industry that has a financial interest in promoting effective incontinence containment rather than continence promotion.

Another factor that warrants further attention was staffs’ experiences of variability in assessors’ expectations, which caused them to mistrust the accreditation process and feel uncertain or confused about what they had to do to meet the standards. Arguably, staff and service providers should not be left in a situation of having to second-guess accreditation goal posts and deal with standards that are vague and open to misinterpretation.

Staff described highly protective, and arguably, risk-adverse approaches to resident care, which they attributed to the pressures they were under to avoid regulatory scrutiny. However, this risk-adverse approach to care could also adversely affect residents’ autonomy and increase their risk of incontinence. The Australian Productivity Commission [35] has also expressed concern that the Australian government has adopted what it calls ‘a zero tolerance approach to risk’ in the residential aged care sector, and stated the approach could have the inadvertent effect of undermining or adversely affecting residents’ care.

There are multiple ways to interpret the findings of this study. For example, one explanation is that they point to a lack of appropriate expertise and leadership skill at a managerial level. As this study did not focus on leadership, this issue warrants further research. Currently, the Government’s approach to quality and regulation in the residential aged care sector is based on service providers having responsibility for providing, maintaining and improving services and encouraging or requiring compliance when needed [1]. Whether the residential aged care sector requires more, less or different regulation is a moot point. In its deliberations about the best ways to strengthen the overall quality framework for Australia’s residential aged care sector, policy-makers and aged care leaders should test the impact of regulation at the point of care.

Consistent with findings from the current Grounded theory study, research conducted in other countries also raises concern that staffs’ abilities to address residents’ social and emotional needs can be inversely affected when staff perceives regulation as a barrier to care [32–34]. Using a critical ethnographic approach to examine the effect of introducing new legislation and a standardised resident assessment instrument into Canadian nursing homes, DeForge et al. [34] found policy-driven structural mechanisms yielded unintended consequences that can have a major impact on frontline workers’ abilities to deliver care. The researchers stated ‘government initiatives designed to ensure accountability and transparent quality of care in nursing homes can, in fact, (re)produce conditions that result in staff being afraid and to feel as if they are unable to care, and thereby adopt a risk adverse approach to care’ (p. 145). Similarly, Colón-Emeric et al. [32] examined the influence of regulation on the mindfulness of staff behaviour in eight nursing homes in the US, and found ‘facilities’ strong fear of citations [sanctions] could paradoxically reduce care quality’ (p. 1292).

Current explanations for the lack of an active approach to continence management in residential aged care facilities tend to attribute blame to staff, citing gaps in their knowledge about incontinence and its management [37–45]. However, the current study indicates the problem is multifactorial. Education alone is unlikely to lead to sustainable changes in practice. In the first instance, Australian aged care policy-makers should consider disentangling assessment processes for funding purposes and assessment processes for clinical care. They should also incentivise the quality framework in ways that promote strategies to prevent, comprehensively assess and actively manage incontinence.

Conclusion
The emergent findings offered rich insights into a small sample of residential aged care staffs’ beliefs and experiences of the quality framework and the funding model, and the impact of these beliefs on residents’ continence care. Regulation that staff find punitive causes staff to shift focus from residents’ physical health and psychosocial well-being to practices that centre on securing funding and avoiding sanctions. It is possible the very policies and processes that are designed to improve the quality of resident care have the potential to undermine and distort it, and drive the difficulties associated with complying underground. As part of the Australian government’s agenda to ensure the sustainability of the residential aged care system and the quality of residents’ care, there is need to charter new territory to strike the right balance between over- and under-regulation.
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Key Points

- Continence assessments in Australian residential aged care facilities are a function of contested values about the need for funding, regulatory compliance and clinical care.

- As current processes to determine the level of funding required to care for residents with incontinence are difficult, onerous and potentially intrusive, consideration should be given to the value of this information for funding purposes, or the development of methods to obtain the information in a less onerous or intrusive manner.

- Regulation that generates a climate of fear and uncertainty among staff and creates incentives for facilities to care for residents with higher levels of incontinence has the potential to hinder residents from accessing a comprehensive continence assessment to actively prevent and manage their incontinence.

- Current discussions about poor quality continence care in residential aged care facilities should extend beyond the debate about staffs’ limited knowledge and skill.
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