LAW AND ETHICS

Program code: BP032

Title: Bachelor of Nursing

Course code & title:: Law and Ethics

Title of Assignment - Case Study A: Mrs. Y.

Course Coordinator:

Word Limit - 1500

My word count - 1550

Case Study A: Mrs Y.

Introduction

This is a case of requests for non-disclosure, which might be a significant distress for clinicians. A huge literature explains the opinion in support of and against disclosure in this case. In this piece, we would in brief review the literature on nondisclosure and offer few ideas for managing requests related to the one posed in the case.

The Code of Ethics for Nurses in Australia and its purpose – *(waubrafoundation.org.au, 2015)*

Nurses value quality nursing care for everyone, respect and kindheartedness for self and others, the diversity of populace, access to quality treatment and health care for everyone, informed choice making, a culture of security in nursing and health care, ethical administration of information's, a socially, cost-effectively and ecologically sustainable surroundings promoting health and well-being.

The purpose is to recognize the basic ethical standards and principles towards which the nursing occupation is dedicated, and that are integrated in other authorized professional nursing guiding principle and standards of conduct, to offer nurses with a reference point from which to reflect on the conduct of themselves and others, to guide ethical choice making and carrying out, and to point out to the community the human rights standards and ethical values it can expect nurses to maintain.

The laws persist; with a small amount of exceptions that those are able of consenting to cure get the proper information revealed to them. Such a potential exception to revelation is the therapeutic privilege. *(Cote A., 2000)*

Therapeutic privilege denotes the preservation of information's by the physician during the approval procedure in the trust that revelation of this information will cause damage or distress to the patient." (*Etchells E, Sharpe G, Burgess MM, Singer PA., 1996) Though it is considered that the failure to inform the reality in the perspective of the physician-patient*

relation is a vital element of therapy, it is uncertain whether physician is capable or right in making an importance decision regarding what is good for a capable patient. (Johnston C, Holt G., 2006)

The Argument:

In support of telling the fact

Moral opinions in support of fact telling could be acceptable on the base of autonomy, obligation of fidelity and the requirement for trust in the physician and patient relation as said by Beauchamp and Childress. *(Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. 2001)*

Autonomy

The moral standard of autonomy that guards patient self-willpower goes together by reality telling. Misleading and lying to patients violate the individual's autonomy; also interfere with the principle of informed approval. Though doctors generally argued that the majority of patients do not desire to listen to the reality, indeed, there is a very slight proof in favor of this. Withholding information's from patients' damage their choice making capability. Moreover, when healing choices are restricted, and prediction is serious, knowing what to anticipate permits patients to get ready for what awaits rather than being overtaken by actions. *(Sullivan RJ, Menapace LW, White RM, 2001)*

Responsibility of loyalty and keeping of promise

Though physician's duty of loyalty and assurance keeping means that they must be honest to their patients concerning their situations, at times, the want to guard patients from damage made clinicians less honest with the sick person. The clinician-patient relation, at its spirit, depends on truthful communiqué. Misleading the patients or lying weakens the authenticity of the respective physician as well as casts severe uncertainty on the reliability of the health profession all together. *(Capozzi JD & Rhodes R., 2004)*

Requirement for belief in physician-patient relation

Faith considered debatably the primary good value at the spirit of being an excellent physician. Consequently, patients' belief physicians to offer them with info are on which they could base a choice regarding in order to carry on with a process or cure. Since faith could not be built up on dishonesty, it is vital that clinicians honestly reveal info's to the patients. This would promote and sustain faith in the physician and patient relation; and also it would assist patients towards understanding and dealing with the hard conditions they might be going through thus helping them and keeping the moral values of beneficence. *(Stirrat GM & Gill R., 2005)*

In support of not disclosing the entire fact

According to Beauchamp and Childress there are few ethical arguments for restricted disclosure.

Therapeutic privileges – It let doctors to modify or withhold info's when its revelation will disturb a patient that they cannot not sensibly engaged in a discussion regarding healing choice and outcomes. If revelation of certain info's is considered damaging to patients, the physician might be defensible in withholding that information's. *(Meisel A. &Kuczewski M., 1996)*

This argument is, though, not adequate. There is proof to hold the idea that telling patients honestly regarding serious illnesses does not cause a bigger occurrence of nervousness, misery, sorrow, depression, sleeplessness or panic. In contrast, knowledgeable patients had improved communiqué with family and personnel and better faith in the treatment given. Thus withholding info's from patients destroys faith and cut off patients. *(Gold M., 2004)*

Health care experts cannot recognize the entire fact

This dispute is derived from the actuality that physicians cannot recognize the full truth. Although they can make out the full truth, several patients will be incapable of understanding the info's specified. Several doctors return to non-disclosure in the view of doubt regarding patients' diagnosis and the supreme path of healing, thus closing off chances for collective choice making. Effectual revelation would guard patient belief in the long-run and assist patients handle info regarding indecision. *(Begley A. & Blackwood B., 2000), (Parascandola M, Hawkins J, & Danis M., 2002)*

Many patients does not desire to know the reality about their situation

This dispute is based on the hypothesis that few patients does not desire to be informed the reality regarding their situations. Basically, the sick person waives their right towards information. It is crucial to differentiate the healing privileges from sick person waiver. In case of waiver the sick person decides that they will be hurt by revelation. Therefore waiver could be analyzed as patient's therapeutic freedom in not to know. *(Johnston C. & Holt G., 2006)* Though a lot of patients might like to recognize the fact, the civil rights of them who does not wants to know must also be valued. *(Marzanski M., 2006)*

Suggestion

According the law, the lawful opinion in support of fact telling could function as guidance towards legislation stating necessitates for physicians to abstain from usage of the healing privileges. The exclusive exemption to fact informing is the notable case of patients' waiver. Revealing critical information's is by no means a pleasing job for physicians, but it's a necessary element of the clinician-patient relations. Baile et al. described a simple and sensible procedure that meet up the necessities on giving horrific information's to patients in a simple and empathetic way. This procedure is recognized as "SPIKES protocol", which contains 6 steps. *(Baile WF, Buckman R, Lenzi R, Glober G, Beale EA, & Kudelka AP., 2006)*

6 Steps of SPIKES protocol are- *(SPIKES protocol, 2015)*

S – Setting; P - Perception of situation or seriousness; I - Invitation from the patient to offer info; K - – Knowledge: providing therapeutic details; E - Explore sentiments and empathize; S - Strategy and synopsis.

So in order to handle Mrs. Y, I have adopted the SPIKES protocol, and a good approach for handing a request by the daughters for non-disclosure of the illness to her.

The approaches are-

Not to over react

Doctor might over react for many reasons. In over reacting, the doctor's loses the chance to find out why the relatives are asking that their dear ones not be informed about the illness and diagnosis. *(Quill TE, & Brody H, 1996)*

Efforts to recognize the relative's perspective

The doctors are encouraged towards stepping back and an attempt to know the request made by the family. Prior to sharing doctor's concerns, one must understand for what the relatives or children's of Mrs. are making such requests. *(Kleinman A, 1978)*

Reacting empathically and flexibly towards the family's suffering

The relative's grounds for non-disclosure might cause the doctors to reconsider their position. Attending empathically towards the emotions of family members is significant. Setting up an empathic association by the requesting individual would encourage optimistic relations, building up a base for succeeding cooperation and discussion. Talking to the family regarding what the patient wants is also an important approach. The difficulty with non-disclosure is that it discourages sharing of discrepancies of view. Clearly understanding the family's outlook and responding empathically towards their suffering is vital. *(Orona C, Koenig B. & Davis A, 1994), (William A. Wood, Mary S. McCabe & Richard M. Goldberg, 2009)*

Proposing a discussing approach

For those patient with choice making capability, the claim is to understand what the patient wishes by not giving disclosure in that procedure. The doctor might recommend talking with the patient concerning her wishes. By talking with the Patient about her wishes for information regarding her health condition and also inquiring for the sick person's view and desires is a significant task to do. *(William A. Wood, Mary S. McCabe & Richard M. Goldberg, 2009)*

Conclusion

In viewing all the point, we can now recommend an apt reaction that can be taken by me to discuss with Mrs. Ys daughters to provide disclosure to Mrs. Y in a sympathetic and ethnically capable way. Being a doctor I guarantee Mrs. Y's daughters that their perspective is valued. With the guarantee that an evaluation of approach towards disclosure shall be taken, and Mrs. Y's daughters can be invited to a conversation between the me and Mrs. Y. Mrs. Y's daughter's unwillingness to the disclosure might stem from their own anxiety or nervousness regarding dealing with their mother's apparent suffering, so there I can assist in addressing this by presenting help for any emotional difficulty. Dealt properly, such a discussion may lead towards therapeutic relation amongst the doctor, patient, and family which will help Mrs. Y's upcoming care. *(William A. Wood, Mary S. McCabe & Richard M. Goldberg, 2009)*

References

1. Baile WF., Buckman R, Lenzi R, Glober G, Beale EA, & Kudelka AP. (2006) - SPIKES—A Six-Step Protocol for Delivering Bad News: Application to the Patient with Cancer. *A Journal on Oncologist*. Vol. 5, pp. 300–311

2. Begley A. & Blackwood B. (2000) – Truth-telling versus hope: a dilemma in practice. *A Journal for Talking With Your Doctor - MedlinePlus Health Information*, 6(1), pp. 25–31

3. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. (2001) - Principles of Biomedical Ethics , A Journal for Biomedical Ethics , Edition.5, Oxford University Press, pp. 280–293

4. Capozzi JD & Rhodes R., (2004) – Lying for the Patient's Good. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2004 Jan;(86-A(1)), pp.185–190

5. Cote A. (2000) – Telling the truth? Disclosure, therapeutic privilege and intersexuality in children. *A Journal for Health Law*. Vol.2(8), pp. 199–217

6. Etchells E, Sharpe G, Burgess MM, Singer PA. (1996) – Bioethics for clinicians: Disclosure. *A Journal for Bioethics for clinicians*, (155), pp.385–391

7. Gold M. (2004) – Is honesty always the best policy? Ethical aspects of truth telling. *A Journal for International Med*.(34), pp.575–581

8. Johnston C., & Holt G. (2006) – The legal and ethical implications of therapeutic privilege - is it ever justified to withhold treatment information from a competent patient?. *A Journal for Clinical Ethics*, Vol. 1, pp. 145–151

9. Kleinman A. (1978) – Culture, illness and cure: Clinical lessons from anthropologic and cross-cultural research. *A Journal on Intern Medical*.Vol.2(5), pp. 250 -260

10. Marzanski M. (2006) – Would you like to know what is wrong with you? On telling the truth to patients with dementia. *A Journal for Medical Ethics*. Vol.2(26), pp. 108–114

11. Meisel A. &Kuczewski M. (1996) – Legal and Ethical Myths about Informed Consent.*A Journal for Medical Ethics – Medline Plus Health Information*.(156), pp. 2520–2525

12. Orona C, Koenig B. & Davis A (1994) - Cultural aspects of nondisclosure. *A Journal for Health Ethics*, Vol.1 (140), pp. 335 -346.

13. Parascandola M, Hawkins J, & Danis M. (2002) – Patient autonomy and the challenge of clinical uncertainty. *A Journal for Ethics*,12(3), pp. 245–265

14. Quill TE, & Brody H (1996) – Physician recommendations and patient autonomy: Finding a balance between physician power and patient choice. *A Journal for Intern Medical*. pp 762 -770

15. Sullivan RJ, Menapace LW, White RM (2001) – Truth-telling and patient diagnoses. *A Journal for Medical Ethics*.125(9), pp. 190–197

16. SPIKES protocol (2015) – Strategy for breaking bad news. *A Journal for Strategy for breaking bad news*, Retrieved on 30th August 2015 from http://hiv.ubccpd.ca/files/2012/09/Summary-on-Breaking-Bad-News.pdf

17. Stirrat GM. & Gill R. (2005) - "Autonomy in medical ethics", A Journal for Medical Ethics,(31), pp. 122–130

18. William A., Wood, Mary S., McCabe, & Goldberg RM. (2009) – "*Commentary: Disclosure in Oncology—To Whom Does the Truth Belong?"*, The Official Journal For The Society Of Translational Oncology, published online in THE ONCOLOGIST Express on January 15, 2009, Retrieved on 31st August 2015 from http://theoncologist.alphamedpress.org/content/14/1/77.full

19. waubrafoundation.org.au (2015) – *"Code of Ethics for Nurses in Australia",* A Journal of Australian Nursing and Midwifery Council, Australian College of Nursing, Australian Nursing Federation, Retrieved on 31st August 2015 from http://waubrafoundation.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/New-Code-of-Ethics-for-Nurses-August-2008.pdf