UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

Midwives' perspectives of continuity based working in the UK: a cross-sectional survey

Taylor, Rebecca; Cross-Sudworth, Fiona; Goodwin, Laura; Kenyon, Sara; MacArthur, Christine

DOI:
10.1016/j.midw.2019.05.005

License:
Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Taylor, R, Cross-Sudworth, F, Goodwin, L, Kenyon, S & MacArthur, C 2019, 'Midwives' perspectives of continuity based working in the UK: a cross-sectional survey', *Midwifery*, vol. 75, pp. 127-137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2019.05.005

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

Publisher Rights Statement:
Checked for eligibility: 28/05/2019
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2019.05.005

General rights
Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
•Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy
While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 07. May. 2024

Midwives' perspectives of continuity based working in the UK: a cross-sectional survey

Abstract

Objective

UK policy is advocating continuity of midwife throughout the antenatal, intrapartum and postnatal period in order to improve outcomes. We explored the working patterns that midwives are willing and able to adopt, barriers to change, and what would help midwives to work in continuity models of care.

Design

A cross-sectional survey.

Setting

27 English maternity providers in the seven geographically-based 'Early Adopter' sites, which have been chosen to fast-track national policy implementation.

Participants

All midwives working in the 'Early Adopter' sites were eligible to take part.

Method

Anonymous online survey disseminated by local and national leaders, and social media, in October 2017. Descriptive statistics were calculated for quantitative survey responses. Qualitative free text responses were analysed thematically.

Findings

798 midwives participated (estimated response rate 20% calculated using local and national NHS workforce headcount data for participating sites). Being willing or able to work in a continuity model (caseloading and/or team) was lowest where this included intrapartum care in both hospital and home settings (35%, n=279). Willingness to work in a continuity model of care increased as the range of intrapartum care settings covered decreased (home births only 45%, n=359; no intrapartum care at all 54%, n=426). A need to work on the same

day each week was reported by 24% (n=188). 31% (n=246) were currently working 12 hour shifts only, while 37% (n=295) reported being unable to work any on-calls and/or nights.

Qualitative analysis revealed multiple barriers to working in continuity models: the most prominent was caring responsibilities for children and others. Midwives suggested a range of approaches to facilitate working differently including concessions in the way midwife roles are organised, such as greater autonomy and choice in working patterns.

Conclusions

Findings suggest that many midwives are not currently able or willing to work in continuity models, which includes care across antenatal, intrapartum and postnatal periods as recommended by UK policy.

Implications for Practice

A range of approaches to providing continuity models should be explored as the implementation of 'Better Births' takes place across England. This should include studies of the impact of the different models on women, babies and midwives, along with their practical scalability and cost.

INTRODUCTION

Continuity-based models of care are widely recommended in order to improve outcomes and experience for women and babies (Bryant, 2009, National Maternity Review, 2016, World Health Organization, 2016). However, implementing continuity is a challenge for midwives and service planners in many countries with similar maternity systems (Donald et al., 2014, Homer et al., 2017, Dawson et al., 2018a). In order to deliver increased continuity across the antenatal, intrapartum and postnatal periods, it is crucial that midwives are willing and able to adopt as well as sustain new models of care. However, there is inconsistent evidence for the effects of this way of working on midwives. Some studies suggest that working in continuity based models increases midwife wellbeing and satisfaction (Freeman, 2006, Newton et al., 2014, Jepsen et al., 2017, Dixon et al., 2017,

63 Fenwick et al., 2018, Dawson et al., 2018b). Other studies indicate that working patterns
64 and characteristics that may be applied to all midwives, but have been associated with
65 continuity models may increase risk of burnout. Factors which may increase burnout
66 include mixed day and night shifts (Mollart et al., 2013), working in isolation (Young et al,
67 2015), idealism (Lynch, 2002), high workload (Cramer and Hunter, 2018), long hours
68 (Yoshida and Sandall, 2013) and on-call (Fereday and Oster, 2010, Donald et al., 2014, Stoll
69 and Gallagher, 2018).

70

71 The English National Maternity Review, 'Better Births' (National Maternity Review, 2016)
72 set out the vision to improve quality, safety and efficiency of maternity services. The
73 Review states that, "*Every woman should have a midwife, who…can provide continuity*
74 *throughout the pregnancy, birth and postnatally* (National Maternity Review, 2016), p. 9),
75 updated in the recent English NHS Long Term Plan (NHS England, 2019), which states *"By*
76 *March 2021, most women receive continuity of the person caring for them during*
77 *pregnancy, during birth and postnatally"* (page 48). This means that for all women, the
78 majority of their care, including the intrapartum period, should be provided by the same
79 health professional (usually a midwife), regardless of whether care is based in the
80 community or hospital.

81

82 'Team' and 'caseloading' models of care are the primary routes by which NHS England
83 envisage continuity will be delivered. Caseloading is defined as '*whereby each midwife is*
84 *allocated a certain number of women (the caseload) and arranges their working life around*
85 *the needs of the caseload*,' (NHS England, 2017) p.4) and team midwifery is defined as
86 '*whereby each woman has an individual midwife, who is responsible for co-ordinating her*
87 *care, and who works in a team of four to eight…This allows for protected time, during which*
88 *the other members of the team will provide unscheduled care, and the lead midwife will not*
89 *be called upon*' (NHS England, 2017) p.4). While UK policy has defined continuity in terms of
90 relationships (NHS England, 2017), other forms of continuity are also practiced in healthcare
91 including; management continuity (the communication of facts and judgements across
92 team, institutional and professional boundaries), and informational continuity (where
93 information is available in a timely and consistent manner)(Jenkins et al., 2015). Approaches
94 to continuity also differ with regards to periods of care targeted: in some models, continuity

95 applies within or between phases of care (e.g. antenatal and postnatal only), as well as
96 across all phases (from antenatal to intrapartum to postnatal). To explore the feasibility of
97 delivering continuity of care at scale in the UK, we designed a questionnaire study to explore
98 the views of midwives working in England.
99
100 **METHODS**
101 The aim of the study was to examine the working patterns that midwives are willing and
102 able to adopt, and ascertain what barriers exist and what would help midwives to work in
103 continuity models of care.
104
105 **Design**
106 The study was a cross-sectional online survey of all midwives working in seven 'Local
107 Maternity Systems' (defined in 'Setting' below) in England.
108
109 The survey was designed with midwives, and in collaboration with the UK Royal College of
110 Midwives (RCM) and included 49 questions exploring midwife demographics, experience,
111 current working practices and views on different ways of working. There were 33
112 quantitative questions and 16 qualitative questions. The survey was piloted with midwives
113 who work in clinical areas and refined during the design phase. Broad areas surveyed were:
114 age; current working setting and patterns; experience and seniority (staff grade, births
115 attended in past 12 months); carer responsibilities and support; working patterns and
116 settings the participant would be willing or able to undertake in the future. The survey
117 questions are provided as supplementary information.
118
119 **Setting**
120 English maternity services are divided into 44 'Local Maternity Systems', where providers
121 across a geographical locality are grouped together to deliver and improve care. The study
122 was undertaken in the seven 'Early Adopter' sites (see Table 1), Local Maternity Systems
123 chosen to be 'Early Adopters', tasked with implementing some or all of the *Better Births*
124 (National Maternity Review, 2016) recommendations within two years (NHS England, 2016).
125

126 All midwives across the seven 'Early Adopter' sites were eligible to take part, covering 27
127 hospitals and maternity providers. In the UK National Health Service, maternity is provided
128 in both the community (predominantly by community midwives and maternity support
129 workers) and hospital (by midwives, maternity support workers, and obstetricians). Each
130 individual midwife usually works in *either* hospital or community, though some move
131 between both settings. Obstetricians are based in the hospital. Community midwives
132 provide antenatal and postnatal care in community clinics and women's homes, offering
133 varying levels of continuity. Antenatal care is also provided by obstetricians, midwives and
134 maternity support workers in the hospital, usually for women with increased risk and/or
135 complications. During labour and birth women are always attended by a midwife.
136 Intrapartum care is usually provided in obstetric units, which are obstetric-led, with birthing
137 rooms and operating theatres, however care is provided by midwives unless there are
138 complications. Increasingly, low risk births occur in midwife-led birth centres, which can be
139 'alongside' in/adjacent to the hospital or 'freestanding' in the community. Community
140 midwives usually attend home births, although the home birth rate is low (2.1% in 2017
141 (Office for National Statistics, 2019)).
142
143 **Data collection**
144 Midwives at participating trusts were informed about the online survey by local managers,
145 and participation was voluntary and responses confidential. Electronic data was collected
146 via a secure survey hosting company, Typeform. Information about the project, and a
147 weblink to the survey was sent by email and/or text message to all midwives working at
148 participating organisations by managers. The weblink was also publicised by managers (face
149 to face, by email and/or SMS), communications teams, on posters in staff areas, by RCM
150 representatives and on social media. Midwives could view the weblink at a time, place and
151 on a device of their choosing. The survey was open for a total of four weeks in October
152 2017, and local managers were asked to remind staff about the survey during the data
153 collection period (the researchers did not contact eligible midwives). A prize draw for a £50
154 shopping voucher at each of the seven sites was offered as an incentive for participation.
155 Only midwives working in participating sites were eligible to take part, using a screening
156 question at the start of the survey.
157

158 **Data analysis**

159 For quantitative questions, descriptive statistics (proportions and percentages) were used to
160 summarise the sample. The denominator was derived using locally reported headcounts
161 from participating sites, and 2017 NHS workforce headcount data (NHS Digital, 2017) where
162 local data was not provided by sites, suggesting that there were around 4000 midwives
163 eligible to take part. Qualitative responses were analysed thematically by Authors 1 and 2
164 (Braun and Clarke, 2013). Following familiarisation with the data, inductive open coding
165 was undertaken for different sections of data (referring to settings, organisations and
166 patterns). Codes were reviewed by two members of the team Authors 1 and 2, and
167 subsequently reorganised into- and written up as broad themes.

168

169 **Ethical considerations**

170 Ethical approval was granted by the University of Birmingham ethics committee, ERN_17-
171 0919S. Participants gave consent prior to participation. No survey data were identifiable to
172 the company, the NHS organisations, or the researchers involved in this study (contact
173 details for prize draw were gathered separately).

174

175 **RESULTS**

176 **Sample**

177 There were 798 midwives who participated in the survey from across the different sites (see
178 Table 1), an estimated response rate of 20%.

179

180 Table 1: Early adopter sites

	Number (n=798)	**%**
Cheshire & Merseyside	184	23
Birmingham & Solihull	174	22
North Central London	138	17
Dorset	104	13
Somerset	92	12
Surrey	67	8
North West London	45	6
Total	804*	101

181 * 12 midwives worked in more than one site

182

183 ***Age, experience and personal circumstances:***

184 Participant characteristics are shown in Table 2, with key characteristics summarised below.

185 The most common age was between 50 and 59 years (31%, n=245).

186

187 Table 2: Demographic and work information

	Number of respondents	%
Age (years)	**n=795**	**100%**
20-29	118	15%
30-39	197	25%
40-49	205	26%
50-59	245	31%
60 or over	30	4%
Duration registered as a midwife (years)	**n=794**	**100%**
0-5 years	193	24%
5-10 years	152	19%
>10 years	449	57%
Grade/seniority	**n=790**	**100%**
Band 5 (newly qualified midwife)	25	3%
Band 6 (midwife)	523	66%
Band 7 (sister/team leader/specialist midwife)	201	25%
Band 8/9 (senior midwife/manager)	41	5%
Caring responsibilities*	**n=787**	**100%**
No caring responsibilities	271	34%
Children <18 years old	371	47%
Adult relatives	156	20%
Grandchildren (not primary carer)	69	9%
Other	11	1%
Contracted hours per week	**n=797**	**100%**
Full time (37.5 hours)	415	52%
Part time (less than 37.5 hours)	370	46%
Other	12	2%

188 *Some midwives had more than one caring responsibility

189

190 Over half (57%, n=449) had been qualified for more than 10 years. Two-thirds (66%, n=523)

191 were standard clinical midwives and on a UK pay scale of Band 6 (Band 5 is the midwives

192 entry level pay scale; Band 7 includes midwife specialists and managers)(NHS Health

193 Education England, 2019). Caring responsibilities of some sort were reported by 65%

194 (n=512), with 47% (n=371) reporting primary responsibility for children.

195

196 ***Current continuity-based model working:***

197 A quarter (24%, n=195) of midwives reported that they worked in caseloading and/or team
198 continuity (16%, n=131 in team and 15%, n=119 in caseloading models). The definitions of
199 caseloading and team midwifery were given in the survey but midwives who stated that
200 they worked in one of these models reported practice which did not appear consistent with
201 these. For example, 7% (n=14) had not attended any births, 43% (n=84) had attended up to
202 10 births in the past year; on-call working was only reported by 60% (n=78) of those who
203 said they worked in team midwifery models and 70% (n=83) of the caseloading midwives.

204

205 ***Current place and model of working:***

206 The most frequent places of work were community (36%, n=286), and Obstetric Unit (OU)
207 (34%, n=268) (see Table 3).

208

209 Table 3: Working experience

210

	Number	**%**
Current place of work*	**n=798**	**100**
Community	286	36
Obstetric Unit	268	34
Postnatal ward	133	17
Alongside Midwifery Led Unit	113	14
Antenatal ward	107	13
Specialist	101	13
Rotational/integrated	89	11
Home birth	81	10
Antenatal clinic	73	9
Freestanding Midwifery Led Unit	39	5
Other	38	5
Number of different settings worked in	**n=798**	**100**
1	543	68
2	112	14
3	67	8
4 or more	76	10
Setting(s) most time spent past 5 years*	**n=798**	**100**
Obstetric Unit	321	40
Community	291	36

Postnatal ward	114	14
Antenatal ward	100	13
Rotational/integrated	94	12
Alongside Midwifery Led Unit	88	11
Freestanding Midwifery Led Unit	87	11
Specialist	77	10
Home birth	60	8
Antenatal clinic	50	6
Other	21	2
Pattern of work*	**n=798**	**100**
On a rota (varied shifts)	596	75
Same shifts every week	158	20
Other/Bank shifts	56	7
Number of intrapartum episodes attended past year	**n=793**	**100**
None	89	11
1-10	252	32
11-20	100	13
21-30	52	7
31-40	48	6
41-50	33	4
More than 50	219	27

211 *Some midwives selected more than one answer to this question

212

213 A minority (10%, n=81) currently worked in a home birth setting (not necessarily as part of a
214 specific home birth team), and 30% (n=239) had done so in the past year. Most (88%,
215 n=701) had attended a birth in the past year. Of the midwives working only in the
216 community, 68% (n=124) had attended 1 to 10 births in the last year. A third (32%, n=255)
217 worked in more than one setting. Almost a third (28%, n=81/286) of midwives working in
218 the community were also working in intrapartum care in the hospital setting (i.e. OU,
219 Midwifery Led Units). A fifth (21%, n=292) had never worked in community and a third
220 (34%, n=272) had never worked in a home birth setting.

221

222 ***Working hours:***

223 Half (52%, n=415) of the midwives stated they worked full-time. The majority (83%, n=659)
224 worked some unsocial hours (outside Monday to Friday office hours) and just over a third
225 (37%, n=295) worked on-calls from home. A third (31%, n=246) only worked 12 hour shifts.
226 Most (75%, n=596) worked a varied set of shifts each week.

227

228 **Midwives' views on different ways of working: Quantitative findings**

229 ***Working in specific models of Care***

230 Midwives were presented with a list of continuity based models involving varying levels of
231 intrapartum care provision (see introduction for definition of caseloading and team models).
232 They were then asked which models would be acceptable to them (see Table 4).

233

234 Table 4: Midwives' willingness to work in specific continuity models of care

235

Midwifery models of care		**Yes**		**Maybe**		**No**		**Total respondents**
		n	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	
Continuity models no intrapartum care (community care only)	Caseloading	380	49%	135	17%	265	34%	780
	Team	370	47%	141	18%	272	35%	783
	Caseloading &/or team	426	54%	188	24%	313	40%	790
Continuity model with home births (community care only)	Caseloading	317	41%	166	21%	299	38%	782
	Team	294	38%	167	21%	321	41%	782
	Caseloading &/or team	359	45%	222	28%	365	46%	790
Continuity model with intrapartum care in all settings	Caseloading	190	24%	168	22%	422	54%	780
	Team	253	32%	190	24%	337	43%	780
	Caseloading &/or team	279	35%	241	31%	440	56%	788

236

237 Willingness to work in continuity-based models increased as the range of intrapartum care
238 settings covered decreased. A third (35%, n=279) of midwives were willing to work in
239 midwifery models that included providing intrapartum care across all settings, which are the
240 models required to fulfil the recommendations of the Better Births policy (24% n=190 as a
241 caseloading model, 32% n=253 in a team model). Almost half (45%, n=359) were willing to
242 work in a continuity based model which included intrapartum care for home births only (not
243 hospital births). Just over half (54% n=426) were willing to work in a continuity model that
244 did not provide any intrapartum care (49%, n=380 caseloading, and 47%, n=370 team).

245

246 We also asked midwives about their willingness to attend home births, and 41% (n=317)
247 were willing to do this as part of a community caseloading model, 38% (n=294) in a
248 community team midwifery model, and 40% as a midwife based in a midwife-led unit
249 (n=318).

250

251 The midwives who were willing to work in a continuity based model of care including
252 intrapartum care across all settings were more likely to be younger (48%, n=57/118 aged 20-
253 29 years old compared to 15%, n=118/798 of all midwives), less experienced (53%,
254 n=102/193 qualified between 0-5 years compared to 24%, n=193/798), Band 5 (64%,
255 n=16/25 compared to 3%, n=25/798) and already work across different settings in rotational
256 posts (51%, n=45/89 compared to 11%, n=89/798).

257

258 ***Working in different organisations and settings***
259 Midwives were asked about their willingness to work across different organisations (i.e.
260 other NHS hospital trusts) and different settings (e.g. obstetric unit or community). Almost
261 half (47%, n= 372) were willing to work across settings, with around half of this group
262 already doing so (26% of whole cohort, n=208). A third (34%, n=269) said that they would
263 not be willing to work across settings. Half (50%, n=396) said that they did not want to work
264 across different organisations. The most popular work settings were: alongside midwifery
265 unit (81%, n=417), and community (72%, n=374) (see Table 5).
266
267 Table 5: Midwives' willingness to work in different settings
268

Settings midwives would work	yes		Maybe		No		Total respondents
	n	%	n	%	No	%	
Alongside Midwifery Led Unit	417	81%	62	12%	37	7%	516
Community	374	72%	92	18%	55	11%	521
Home birth	324	63%	103	20%	89	17%	516
Obstetric Unit	311	60%	81	16%	123	24%	515

Antenatal ward	309	60%	77	15%	129	25%	515
Postnatal ward	296	57%	82	16%	137	27%	515
FMLU	291	57%	80	16%	142	28%	513

269

270 Approximately a third of midwives did not answer the question about specific settings in
271 which they would be willing to work. When asked about working across settings, half (52%,
272 n=417) agreed with the statement "I enjoy working where I am now and do not want to
273 move," and 57% (n=462) agreed with the statement "I have specific knowledge/skills in the
274 area I work and I want to continue focusing on this area." A third 35% (n=277) identified at
275 least one barrier to working in the obstetric unit: 25% (n=201) reported a need to update
276 their skills, and 19% (n=148) of midwives lacked clinical confidence to work there.
277 Shadowing opportunities were the most popular practical way of increasing confidence to
278 work in other settings (52%, n=415).

279

280 When asked about working in a home birth setting (i.e. providing intrapartum care in the
281 home), 63% (n=324) were prepared to do so. We also asked specifically about confidence to
282 attend home births with 13% (n=107) not feeling confident. 50% (n=402) were confident to
283 be first, or first *and* second midwife at a home birth, whilst 24% (n=188) were confident to
284 be second midwife only. 62% (n=491) of midwives thought that there were specific things
285 that would help improve confidence to attend home births with 36% (n=288) identifying
286 shadowing opportunities, and 25% (n=203) suggesting training and update sessions.

287 Feeling confident to run their own community work and clinics was reported by 70%
288 (n=555). Suggested facilitators for this were supernumerary shadowing (16%, n=128) and
289 training/update sessions (8%, n=60).

290

291 ***Different patterns of work***

292 Midwives were asked more general questions about their availability for work days and
293 patterns of work (see Table 6).

294

295 Table 6: Days, times and shift patterns available for work

296

297

Work times and availability		Yes		Maybe in particular circumstances		Possible but don't want to		Not possible		Total respondents
Days and times available	Weekday day time	702	89%	39	5%	23	3%	22	3%	786
	Weekend/ bank holiday day time	562	72%	96	12%	92	12%	29	4%	779
	Weekend/bank holiday days on call from home	347	45%	114	15%	201	26%	113	15%	775
	Weekday nights in hospital	334	43%	65	8%	176	23%	205	26%	780
	Weekend nights in hospital	323	42%	63	8%	208	27%	184	24%	778
	Night time on-call from home	285	36%	104	13%	203	26%	197	25%	789
Ability to work different shift patterns	Set shifts	555	71%	93	12%	88	11%	45	6%	781
	Rota system	548	71%	0	0%	158	21%	64	8%	770
	Annualised hours in caseloading model buddy system	219	28%	112	14%	185	24%	259	33%	775
	Annualised hours as part of a team	271	35%	107	14%	175	23%	221	29%	774

298

299 Being able to work at weekends/bank holidays was reported by 72%, (n=562), but fewer
300 midwives were available to work on-calls at night (36%, n=285) than night shifts during
301 weekdays (43%, n=334) or at weekends (42%, n=323). More midwives were able to work set
302 shifts (71%, n=555) and rotas (71%, n=548) than annualised hours (caseloading 28%, n=219;
303 team 35%, n=271). A quarter (24%, n=188) needed to work on specific days of the week.
304 When asked how many night time on-calls were acceptable, the most frequent response
305 was 'none' (31%, n=245), and the median was 2 nights (26%, n=207). Measures commonly
306 selected by midwives to facilitate working more nights, weekends and bank holidays
307 included knowing the rota well in advance (56%, n=444), being able to swap shifts (51%,
308 n=406), have flexible working (44%, n=354) and accommodate annual leave (43%, n=344).
309 Few midwives selected measures to facilitate working different days of the week, with no
310 more than 4% of midwives selecting any of the suggested measures.
311

312 **Qualitative findings: midwives' views on different ways of working**

313 ***Barriers to changing the way midwives work: qualitative findings***

314 Midwives described a range of challenges to working across organisations, settings, and in
315 different patterns. The barriers to changing the way midwives work fell into four cross-
316 cutting themes: practical barriers; wellbeing and work-life balance; personal preference;
317 quality and safety concerns.
318

319 *Practical barriers to working differently*

320 Practical barriers constituted relatively fixed circumstances in midwives' lives which made
321 working differently challenging, and included the sub-themes of caring responsibilities;
322 transport issues; responsibilities elsewhere; health conditions. Concerns primarily related
323 to working flexible and unpredictable hours that are required in most continuity based
324 models.
325

326 Caring responsibilities were frequently reported, mainly for children but also adults. The
327 need for predictability to accommodate carer responsibilities, and the inflexibility and cost
328 of childcare were reported by a large number of midwives. A lack of family support,
329 partners who were shift workers, and being a single parent were exacerbating factors.
330

331 *If my children are expecting me to pick them up from school and I don't because I'm*
332 *called to a labouring woman, that would put them under stress. My husband works*
333 *shifts also and we do not have a lot of family support. ID 65d 40-49yrs old from*
334 *Cheshire & Merseyside*
335

336 In describing caring responsibilities, some described concerns about being expected or
337 'pressured' into working in ways that did not enable them to meet their family's needs, and
338 a sense that their needs were not valued as highly as those of the women they care for.
339

340 *As a single parent the face that I may be forced to work across settings that don't*
341 *allow me to adequately care for my children makes me extremely uneasy. The fact*
342 *that my working life is expected to be my top priority and my children come second*

343 *does not make me feel valued or appreciated. ID 682c 20-29 yrs old from Cheshire &*
344 *Merseyside*
345
346 However, it was also suggested that flexible working patterns associated with continuity
347 may align better with caring responsibilities, except for intrapartum care which was by its
348 nature unpredictable.
349
350 *Flexible working can also benefit the midwife in terms of childcare. I organise my*
351 *visits around school plays, parents' evenings, activities, husband work and childcare.*
352 *It is only the birth element which is unpredictable. I see more of my children working*
353 *flexible hours than in scheduled hours. ID 99d 50-59 yrs old from Dorset*
354
355 Some midwives also reported difficulties in travel, including living far away, travelling at
356 peak times, proximity to children, not being able to drive, and concerns about driving when
357 fatigued. Many reported responsibilities elsewhere which limited their availability, such as
358 management or specialist clinical duties, volunteering, study, and bank midwifery shifts. A
359 smaller number of midwives described medical conditions, e.g. diabetes. There was also a
360 sense that willingness and ability to work in continuity models was not fixed, and could
361 change over the course of midwives' careers.
362
363 *Would LOVE!! To work this way [continuity models] in the future as is the ideal way I*
364 *would like to practice and the care I want to be able to provide, however just not*
365 *possible at present.* ID *577d 50-59 yrs old from North Central London*

366 *Wellbeing and work-life balance concerns*
367 Many midwives expressed concerns about wellbeing, stress, and work-life balance, with a
368 small number stating that they would leave midwifery if asked to adopt particular ways of
369 working.
370
371 *I do not want to be doing any more on calls than 2 per month as this does not suit*
372 *family life balance. If the model of working like 1-2-1 [an independent midwifery*
373 *provider] was introduced then I would definitely resign from midwifery and I know a*

374 *lot of my colleagues would too. It is not sustainable way of working in the long run,*
375 *as midwives get burned out very quickly. ID 61f 50-59 yrs old from North Central*
376 *London*
377
378 Some described negative impacts on their own or colleagues' wellbeing while working in
379 continuity based models in the past.
380
381 *Previously worked in caseloading model for homebirth quickly became burned out.*
382 *Team had high levels of sickness/stress related conditions. Very poor work/life*
383 *balance. ID 50d 30-39 yrs old from Cheshire & Merseyside*
384
385 It was suggested that current plans to scale up continuity may not be sustainable, due to the
386 possible impact on work life balance of the workforce, and staff retention.
387
388 *Caseloading is only suitable for a small group of women. We cannot expect a*
389 *workforce of hundreds of midwives to have no work/life balance. Small teams of 4-6*
390 *midwives is not continuity. Expecting all midwives to care for their caseload in all*
391 *locations/situations will dilute the care that women receive. The caseloading model is*
392 *only suitable for women not midwives. Consider the staff retention at organisations*
393 *who currently practice a caseloading model. Unsustainable. ID 50d 30-39 yrs old from*
394 *Cheshire & Merseyside*
395
396 A minority described positive personal experience of continuity based models.
397
398 *As a community midwife, over 10 years ago, I worked in a team of 6 (all Band 7)*
399 *midwives … We provided 24 hour care to our women…It was an excellent service,*
400 *enjoyed by our clients and their families and by us, the midwives. I found it a very*
401 *satisfying period in my career. ID 713c 50-59 yrs old from North West London*
402
403 Some participants suggested that increasing age meant they were becoming less suited to
404 working across settings, organisations, or unsocial/flexible hours. Some midwives
405 described current concerns regarding work-life balance alongside fears about the impact of

406 continuity, and how they already perceived that their needs were not adequately
407 considered, or feel valued.
408
409 *Unfortunately many staff are now unwell as a result of poor health that is or was*
410 *contributed to by working conditions and hours. We have no protection on hours*
411 *worked as a profession and it's ridiculous watching others health failing due to*
412 *demands. ID 68a 40-49 yrs old from North Central London*
413
414 *I would leave the profession. It's bad enough now but this would be totally*
415 *unreasonable. Can't think of anyone who would find this acceptable. ID 676e 40-49*
416 *yrs old from Surrey Heartlands*
417
418 For some midwives, there was a desire to separate private life and work, to be 'on' or 'off'
419 duty.
420
421 *Do not want to be available to women at all times, need time when I can be off and*
422 *have a glass of wine etc. without worrying that I am going to be called. ID 55d 50-59*
423 *yrs old from Somerset*

424 *Personal preference for particular ways of working*
425 Midwives reported how they liked where they currently worked and how they did not think
426 they would enjoy working in other settings. Personal preference was expressed for
427 particular settings, organisations and shift patterns. Many simply expressed that they simply
428 did not wish to work differently without providing a reason.
429
430 *It sounds awful to say this but I actually do not want to work anywhere other than a*
431 *Labour Ward/ Birth centre environment. I have found my "place" in midwifery. I have,*
432 *over the years, experienced and worked in all areas but enjoy working in this*
433 *environment the most. ID 713c 50-59 yrs old from North West London*

434

435 It was also suggested that midwives' preferences would impact on the ability to scale up
436 continuity models.

437

438 *We are using a huge amount of resources to explore a model that is not transferable*
439 *on a larger scale. In the vast majority midwives do not want to work to the true*
440 *caseloading model. Midwives will leave the profession at a time when we are*
441 *reduced in numbers due to an aging workforce. ID 73d 30-39 yrs old from Cheshire &*
442 *Merseyside*

443

444 *Quality and safety concerns*
445 Some midwives reported concerns about the quality and safety of care that may result from
446 changing the way they work. The most commonly reported concern was a need to have
447 setting-specific expertise, and not be a 'Jack of all trades'. Some of the midwives had
448 specific concerns about the quality and/or safety of cross-organisational working, moving
449 between different NHS Trusts. Fatigue and safe working were concerns with respect to
450 different shift patterns and unsocial hours with reasons including: age; working the day after
451 night duty; working a mixture of days and nights in quick succession; long hours; having
452 insufficient work-life balance to feel rested.
453

454 *I feel we should have midwives with more clinical specialities and passions. We do*
455 *not want a Jack of all trades workforce who do not have the specialist knowledge to*
456 *provide safe care to women at the different stages of their care. This sort of flexibility*
457 *will increase risk to women as the role will become too broad. Many midwives will*
458 *leave the profession if they are asked to spread their expertise too thinly and will not*
459 *risk being left vulnerable. ID 73d 30-39 yrs old from Cheshire & Merseyside*

460

461 Some related how they perceived current models of maternity care as working well, and
462 that proposed models would not achieve the anticipated improvements in care quality for
463 women.

464

465 *We are constantly being told that our current model of care is not working. My*
466 *patients currently receive continuity of carer in the antenatal and postnatal setting of*
467 *over 90-95%. I do not see how by employing small teams that this continuity can be*
468 *improved upon and feel devastated that this wonderful service we have strived so*
469 *hard to achieve will be replaced by a second hand model of care, which was*
470 *disbanded 9 years ago in our unit as it did not work and midwives were burned out.*
471 *ID 65d 40-49 yrs old from Cheshire & Merseyside*

472

473 ***What would help midwives to work differently: qualitative findings***
474 Midwives provided a range of suggestions for what would help them to work differently.
475 The main themes are presented in order of prominence.
476

477 *Concession in how midwife roles are organised*
478 Midwives suggested that predictability, and/or concessions in their working patterns would
479 encourage them to work differently, with a wide range of suggestions including: increased
480 flexibility in hours; autonomy and choice about working patterns; limiting number of on-call
481 shifts; part time working; choice over annual leave; shorter shifts; fixed shifts; ability to
482 caseload own women; and having a buddy to work with. Predictability was mentioned most
483 frequently. A small number of midwives suggested measures that would encourage them to
484 consider caseloading midwifery specifically: annualised hours, provision of a buddy and
485 manageable-sized caseload.
486

487 *Self rostering, more flexibility to change shifts and annual leave …more individual*
488 *options to work for staff with children or other carers requirements, trial of working 8*

489 *hour shift patterns (6-14, 14-22, 22-6) being less exhausted from night shifts, able to*
490 *do school runs, more productive. ID 7d 50-59 yrs old from North Central London*

491

492 *Adequate staffing*

493 Midwives described how sufficient staffing for models of care would encourage them to
494 consider change, and some contrasted this with current gaps in NHS midwifery staffing.
495 There were also concerns raised about being used to cover areas that were short staffed.

496

497 *Have already worked a team case load model. There was not enough staff to cover*
498 *all requirements in the end only labour care received full attention the rest suffered.*
499 *The staff involved were so overworked they actually reached burn out and sickness*
500 *levels were really high. Before any team care could be considered again the staffing*
501 *level would need to be generous not adequate. ID 62a 60 plus yr old from Dorset*

502

503 *Financial incentives: enhanced pay and assistance with travel*

504 Many midwives stated that additional pay would encourage them to work differently.
505 Proposed support for travel included covering costs, reliable parking provision, pool car,
506 courtesy bus/taxi, travel time included in paid hours.

507 *Free parking, accessible guaranteed parking space, payment for fuel and other*
508 *expenses [would help me to work in this way]. ID 10b 30-39 yrs old from Birmingham*
509 *& Solihull*

510

511 *Induction, support, training and development opportunities*

512 Midwives reported how they would require support to work across organisations and
513 settings. Some midwives stated that the opportunity to develop in a new role or
514 organisation would help them to consider working differently.

515

516 *Am happy to work in any setting but need the time and space to be allowed to come*
517 *back up to speed with all the changes etc. and not just pulled in and made to take*
518 *over in short staffing situations where the senior back up is non-existent. ID 658e 30-*
519 *39 yrs old from North Central London*

520 *Good orientation [would help me work across settings]… [if the settings I was asked*
521 *to work in] had some specialist services or areas that were well developed that were*
522 *different to where I work currently so that could learn new lessons. ID 152e 40-49 yrs*
523 *old from Surrey Heartlands*

524

525 *Leadership, management and organisation*

526 Leadership, management and organisation of maternity services were reported to be a
527 facilitator for working across organisations and settings, and some midwives related how
528 they had seen this working well elsewhere. Many midwives focused on a specific aspect of
529 cross-organisational working: significant variation in policies and practice therefore it was
530 implicit that this variation would need to be addressed, though only a few explicitly
531 recommended standardising across the system.
532

533 *There are huge cross-agency issues, all the 4 NHS trusts nearby do things differently,*
534 *expect different things and make our lives to caseload women difficult and at times*
535 *unsafe. I therefore am reluctant to wish to work across the settings until there is a*
536 *better culture of supportive care for women's choices. ID 88f 40-49 yrs old from*
537 *Surrey Heartlands*

Continuity and quality as an incentive

Some midwives strongly supported continuity-based models of care, and reported that they would be happy to, or are already working in them, and that they found the way of working, and the continuity they could offer, attractive, suggesting that this would incentivise them to change the way they work.

> *I will work across any site as long as it includes community (including homebirth) and birth centre, fundamentally with as much continuity as possible. ID 813e 40-49 yrs old from North Central London*

However, there were midwives who strongly supported continuity yet still stated that they would not be able to work in this model themselves.

A change in midwifery culture

Some midwives suggested that a significant change was required in the midwifery culture as a whole, and the NHS systems and structures that support it, in order to change the way midwives work.

> *There needs to be a wholesale shift in the culture of the midwifery management to allow midwives the autonomy to work in a caseloading model rather than the current micromanagement. There also needs to be a radical rethink of the skills midwives need to work in this way the current NHS structure has eroded skills like clinical reasoning and decision making midwives have a pass the buck attitude to decision making. To be truly autonomous in practice within midwifery Clinical skills such as advanced history taking and physical assessment need to be incorporated into post registration education as midwives move towards non-medical prescribing. ID 56d Prefers not to say age from Dorset*

DISCUSSION

This study is the first to the authors' knowledge that has assessed the proportion of the midwifery workforce willing to work in a continuity model of care. Dawson et al explored the willingness of Australian student midwives exposed to caseloading in training to work in this way when qualified, with 67% saying that they would want to (Dawson et al, 2015). The results of this study suggest that implementing midwife-led, continuity based care which includes the intrapartum period for every woman giving birth in the UK is unlikely to be feasible at the current time, however just over a third of midwives were willing and able to work in this way. Midwives, who were not, described a range of barriers including: practical barriers, in particular childcare; wellbeing and work-life balance; personal preference to work in particular ways/places; confidence and concern about quality and safety of certain ways of working.

Most midwives who took part in the survey were used to working flexible and unsocial hours. Many however, had personal circumstances or responsibilities outside of work which made them unable to work in ways consistent with a full continuity of care model, and a third were working permanent 12 hour shifts, an approach which enables staff to condense a working week into a shorter timeframe. Caring responsibilities were a prominent practical concern, and over half had dependent children. However, there was also an account in the data of how the flexible working associated with continuity models can suit family life for some midwives.

Half of the midwives reported being unwilling to work in particular places of work or working environments. However, a quarter already worked across settings, and half of those willing to work in continuity based models were working across settings, e.g. in rotational posts. Increasing general exposure to cross-setting working may address skills gaps, and increase midwives' confidence to adopt continuity models.

595 While continuity models were predominantly described as having a negative impact by
596 midwives in our study, some recent research suggests that they can be associated with
597 increased midwife wellbeing and satisfaction (Collins et al., 2010, Yoshida and Sandall, 2013,
598 Newton et al., 2016, Jepsen et al., 2017, Fenwick et al., 2017, Fenwick et al., 2018, Dawson
599 et al., 2018b). However, it has been argued that midwives choosing to work in these models
600 are a self-selecting group, unrepresentative of the wider workforce, who prefer and thrive in
601 this environment (Turnbull et al., 1995, Newton et al., 2014, Dawson et al., 2018b), chiming
602 with others' studies looking at preferences for different ways of working (Bogaerts et al.,
603 2018). Some of our survey participants described past negative experiences of continuity
604 based models, consistent with others' study findings regarding midwife burnout (Sandall,
605 1997, Stevens and McCourt, 2002b, Young et al., 2015). Many perceived these models as
606 impacting negatively, with additional concerns about midwives leaving if compelled to
607 adopt them. It is likely that the flexibility required to work in these roles may be a better
608 'fit' for some midwives than others. For many UK midwives, who have chosen to spend
609 their careers working in shift patterns where one is either 'on' or 'off duty', models where
610 boundaries are more blurred this may not fit their inherent preferences, and result in
611 significant stress (Bogaerts et al., 2018).

612

613 At a time when there is an international shortage of midwives (Nuffield Trust, 2017), it is
614 vital that the workforce is supported and retained. In our survey, there were many reports
615 of midwives feeling stressed, under pressure, and undervalued, which aligns with other
616 recent work exploring midwife wellbeing (Royal College of Midwives, 2016a), and is likely to
617 be a key factor in midwives' receptivity to change. Evidence suggests that some midwives
618 can adapt to flexible continuity-based working patterns (Edmondson and Walker, 2014,
619 Newton et al., 2016, Jepsen et al., 2016). Our findings indicate that full-scale continuity-
620 based working may suit some midwives at particular times in their lives and careers.

621

622 Implementing continuity represents a shift in expectations of the midwifery profession in
623 health systems where these models are not embedded in practice. They often reduce
624 separation of life and work, and making working life more reactive and less predictable.

625 Midwives willing to adopt continuity models in our study tended to be younger, and may be
626 more amenable to change, perhaps because they were not working during the last national
627 implementation of continuity, and possibly exposed to fewer negative accounts/experiences
628 of that time. It has been suggested that increasing students' and other midwives' exposure
629 to continuity models may increase awareness, interest, and with it future sustainability
630 (Carter et al., 2015, Dawson et al., 2018a). However, recent work has highlighted the
631 importance of work-life balance, particularly to younger midwives (Jones et al., 2015), so
632 continuity models will need to take account of this.

633

634 Our findings suggest that in order to implement continuity, health service leaders need to
635 ensure that staffing is adequate to meet the requirements of new care models, provide
636 clinical and change management support for staff, address practical barriers and align with
637 midwife preferences where possible, engage midwives in planning and consider making
638 concessions in midwives' pay and conditions of work. In our study, important quantitative
639 observations were the increasing willingness to work in continuity-based models as
640 intrapartum care decreased, and a preference for team midwifery models over caseloading.
641 This may be related to the need/desire for predictability expressed by many (as births are
642 unpredictable), and this could be addressed more easily by implementing team models of
643 midwifery, where duties are shared with a wider group with less on-call. Willingness to
644 undertake intrapartum care may also relate to lack of confidence and a perceived need to
645 update skills, which could be addressed by including shadowing and training opportunities
646 as part of implementation. The evidence highlights the importance of addressing
647 operational and staff wellbeing issues, and indicates that midwives need occupational
648 autonomy and social support (Sandall, 1997), time to adapt to a different way of working
649 and appropriate training (Stevens and McCourt, 2002a), family friendly working
650 environments (Fenwick et al., 2017), managerial support (Yoshida and Sandall, 2013,
651 Newton et al., 2014, Dixon et al., 2017), funding/adequate resources and support for new
652 models (Dawson et al., 2016, Dixon et al., 2017), flexibility (Fereday and Oster, 2010) as well
653 as adequate leave (Dawson et al., 2018a). To support implementation in the NHS, the RCM
654 has produced detailed guidance that managers can use to explore these issues with
655 midwives at a local level (Royal College of Midwives, 2017).

656 While in the UK the Royal College of Midwives supports the NHS plans for the continuity
657 model outlined in *Better Births* (Sandall, 2017), and continuity is advocated in other health
658 systems around the world, current and future midwives will need to agree and accept the
659 role of a midwife, and what continuity in midwifery looks like in the twenty first century.
660 Midwives in our survey were concerned about safety of working across different settings as
661 a 'jack of all trades', which would be required to offer continuity across the continuum in all
662 maternity settings. The quality and safety of care will be an important consideration if more
663 midwives are required to work flexibly across settings and times, and this must be
664 monitored and evaluated. It is likely that there will always be a need for midwives with
665 setting-specific expertise.

666

667 Some midwives in our survey suggested that current approaches to delivering care were
668 working well, with good ante- and postnatal continuity, and questioned the need for
669 change. In order to implement change in healthcare it is important that those involved
670 agree the 'problem', support the proposed solution, and feel that it is achievable and
671 sustainable (Dixon-Woods et al., 2012). It appears that some UK midwives need to be
672 convinced that continuity is worthwhile and possible, and to understand how current plans
673 are different to previous failed attempts to scale it up nationally (particularly from *Changing*
674 *Childbirth (*(Department of Health, 1993). The UK policy change is underpinned by the
675 Cochrane review of 'Midwife-led continuity models versus other models of care for
676 childbearing women', which showed that midwife-led continuity models resulted in
677 substantial benefits (such as 24% reduction in preterm birth and 16% reduction in fetal loss
678 and neonatal death). However, the comparator maternity care models (i.e. controls) in the
679 trials included in the review were heterogeneous, and often included hospital-based and
680 obstetric-led services as controls, which is very different to UK current practice. As such, the
681 review findings should be interpreted with caution in specific health service contexts. It is
682 unlikely that the introduction of continuity of midwife-led care across the whole UK
683 maternity pathway, where much care is already provided by midwives, will provide similar
684 benefits to those seen in the Cochrane review meta-analyses. This would also apply to
685 other international settings with standard care that is similar to that in the UK. Work to
686 implement continuity should include gathering and disseminating evidence to show

687 midwives the benefits of continuity, and what plans would mean for them, and the women
688 they care for, in a way that is acceptable to them.

689

690 It may not be possible to provide continuity based models at scale for most women if the
691 pool of willing and able midwives is too small, and our findings suggest that this is currently
692 the case in the UK. In addition, the benefits and risks of implementing these models across
693 an entire country's health system are not known. However, continuity based models could
694 be implemented incrementally, targeting populations with greatest likelihood of benefit,
695 and working with midwives who are willing to work in this way (Allen et al., 2016, Homer et
696 al., 2017, Reid et al., 2018). Recently updated UK policy acknowledges ability to benefit, and
697 now states that while 'most' women should receive continuity by 2021, "*75% of women*
698 *from BAME [black and minority ethnic] communities and a similar percentage of women*
699 *from the most deprived groups will receive continuity of care*" (NHS England, 2019) (page
700 41). At the same time, continuity may be optimised for women cared for in other models,
701 and its impact evaluated. For example, where continuity of midwife across the entire
702 continuum (including intrapartum care) is not possible, services might maximise continuity
703 across the antenatal and postnatal periods, and provide opportunities for women to meet
704 the team of midwives who will attend their birth.

705

706 Where health systems are implementing these models, they should be rigorously evaluated,
707 to identify what is safe, effective, affordable and feasible, with scale up and spread as
708 appropriate (Sandall, 2018, Royal College of Midwives, 2017). Future work should consider:
709 the characteristics of midwives suited to continuity based working; characteristics of models
710 that are acceptable and beneficial to both midwives and women; effective approaches to
711 recruitment, support and training of students and midwives to work successfully and
712 sustainably in continuity models; the impact of implementing large-scale continuity models
713 on midwives, and midwife attrition.

714

715 ***Strengths and limitations***

716 This was a pragmatic study which aimed to respond to an important policy and practice
717 question in a timely way, and was therefore carried out over a short timeframe. Given a
718 longer duration it may have been possible to achieve a higher response rate, although
719 participants had broadly similar characteristics to recent national workforce data and survey
720 reports (Royal College of Midwives, 2016a, Royal College of Midwives, 2016b). The survey
721 focused on 'Early Adopter' sites only, and there may be differences in the views and
722 experiences of midwives in other services. We also identified some potential confusion in
723 the survey around continuity based models (caseloading and team) with only 60% (n=78) of
724 team midwives, and 70% (n=83) of the caseloading midwives reporting working any on-calls,
725 when on-calls for intrapartum care are normally part of working in continuity models. While
726 definitions of the models were provided in the survey, there may have been some
727 misinterpretation.

728

729 The survey was developed collaboratively with midwives and the RCM, included both
730 qualitative and quantitative questions, was piloted, and the questions have been made
731 available for other sites to adapt and use to support their own continuity work. The
732 questions were comprehensive, though this resulted in a relatively lengthy survey which
733 may have impacted on the response rate. Comparison with data on the wider midwife
734 workforce characteristics in England suggests that midwives in our survey appear be
735 representative (Royal College of Midwives, 2016b). A wide range of LMSs, geographical
736 areas, and providers were included in the survey.

737

738

739 **CONCLUSION**

740 This study is the first to assess the proportion of the midwifery workforce willing to work in
741 a continuity model of care. The findings have shown that many UK midwives are not
742 currently able or willing to change the way they work to implement continuity for every
743 woman as recommended by national policy, suggesting that rapid scale-up of continuity
744 models will be challenging. Moreover, the evidence underpinning the policy is drawn from a
745 wide range of complex service contexts which differ from the UK, meaning that anticipated
746 outcomes may not be realised. However, increasing continuity is welcome, and range of
747 approaches to providing continuity in different service contexts are currently being explored

748 as a result of 'Better Births' policy in England, providing further opportunities to build the
749 international evidence base in this important area of practice. This study has identified
750 what may help or hinder implementation of continuity. Further rollout and scale up of
751 continuity models should include studies of the impact of different continuity models on
752 women, babies and midwives, along with their practical scalability and cost.
753
754

755 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

756 Alongside Midwifery Led Unit (AMLU)
757 Freestanding Midwifery Led Unit (FMLU)
758 Local Maternity System (LMS)
759 Midwife Led Unit (MLU)
760 National Health Service (NHS)
761 Obstetric Unit (OU)
762 Royal College of Midwives (RCM)
763

764 **REFERENCES**

765

766 ALLEN, J., KILDEA, S. & STAPLETON, H. 2016. How optimal caseload midwifery can modify predictors
767 for preterm birth in young women: Integrated findings from a mixed methods study.
768 *Midwifery,* 41**,** 30-38.
769 BOGAERTS, Y., DE COOMAN, R. & DE GIETER, S. 2018. Getting the Work-Nonwork Interface You Are
770 Looking for: The Relevance of Work-Nonwork Boundary Management Fit. *Frontiers in*
771 *psychology,* 9**,** 1158-1158.
772 BRAUN, V. & CLARKE, V. 2013. *Successful Qualitative Research,* London, Sage Publications Ltd
773 BRYANT, R. 2009. Improving Maternity Services in Australia. The report of the Maternity Services
774 Review
775 CARTER, A. G., WILKES, E., GAMBLE, J., SIDEBOTHAM, M. & CREEDY, D. K. 2015. Midwifery students'
776 experiences of an innovative clinical placement model embedded within midwifery
777 continuity of care in Australia. *Midwifery,* 31**,** 765-771.
778 COLLINS, C. T., FEREDAY, J., PINCOMBE, J., OSTER, C. & TURNBULL, D. 2010. An evaluation of the
779 satisfaction of midwives' working in midwifery group practice. *Midwifery,* 26**,** 435-441.
780 DAWSON, K., FORSTER, D. A., MCLACHLAN, H. L. & NEWTON, M. S. 2018a. Operationalising caseload
781 midwifery in the Australian public maternity system: Findings from a national cross-sectional
782 survey of maternity managers. *Women and Birth,* 31**,** 194-201.
783 DAWSON, K., MCLACHLAN, H., NEWTON, M. & FORSTER, D. 2016. Implementing caseload midwifery:
784 Exploring the views of maternity managers in Australia - A national cross-sectional survey.
785 *Women and Birth,* 29**,** 214-222.

786 DAWSON, K., NEWTON, M., FORSTER, D. & MCLACHLAN, H. 2018b. Comparing caseload and non-
787 caseload midwives' burnout levels and professional attitudes: A national, cross-sectional
788 survey of Australian midwives working in the public maternity system. *Midwifery,* 63**,** 60-67.
789 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH 1993. Changing Childbirth: Report of the Export Maternity Group. London:
790 HMSO.
791 DIXON-WOODS, M., MCNICOL, S. & MARTIN, G. 2012. Ten challenges in improving quality in
792 healthcare: lessons from the Health Foundation's programme evaluations and relevant
793 literature. *BMJ Qual Saf,* 21.
794 DIXON, L., GUILILAND, K., PALLANT, P., SIDEBOTHAM, M., FENWICK, J., MCARA-COUPER, J. &
795 GILKISON, A. 2017. The emotional wellbeing of New Zealand midwives: comparing responses
796 for midwives in caseloading and shift work settings. *New Zealand College of Midwives*
797 *Journal,* 53**,** 5-14.
798 DONALD, H., SMYTHE, L. & MCARA-COOPER, J. 2014. Creating a better work-life balance. *New*
799 *Zealand College of Midwives Journal,* 49**,** 5-10.
800 EDMONDSON, M. C. & WALKER, S. B. 2014. Working in caseload midwifery care: The experience of
801 midwives working in a birth centre in North Queensland. *Women and Birth,* 27**,** 31-36.
802 FENWICK, J., LUBOMSKI, A., CREEDY, D. K. & SIDEBOTHAM, M. 2017. Personal, professional and
803 workplace factors that contribute to burnout in Australian midwives. *Journal of Advanced*
804 *Nursing,* 74**,** 852-863.
805 FENWICK, J., SIDEBOTHAM, M., GAMBLE, J. & CREEDY, D. K. 2018. The emotional and professional
806 wellbeing of Australian midwives: A comparison between those providing continuity of
807 midwifery care and those not providing continuity. *Women and Birth,* 31**,** 38-43.
808 FEREDAY, J. & OSTER, C. 2010. Managing a work–life balance: the experiences of midwives working
809 in a group practice setting. *Midwifery,* 26**,** 311-318.
810 FREEMAN, L. M. 2006. Continuity of carer and partnership. A review of the literature. *Women and*
811 *Birth,* 19**,** 39-44.
812 HOMER, C. S. E., LEAP, N., EDWARDS, N. & SANDALL, J. 2017. Midwifery continuity of carer in an area
813 of high socio-economic disadvantage in London: A retrospective analysis of Albany
814 Midwifery Practice outcomes using routine data (1997-2009). *Midwifery,* 48**,** 1-10.
815 JENKINS, M. G., FORD, J. B., TODD, A. L., FORSYTH, R., MORRIS, J. M. & ROBERTS, C. L. 2015.
816 Women's views about maternity care: How do women conceptualise the process of
817 continuity? *Midwifery,* 31**,** 25-30.
818 JEPSEN, I., JUUL, S., FOUREUR, M., SØRENSEN, E. E. & NØHR, E. A. 2017. Is caseload midwifery a
819 healthy work-form? – A survey of burnout among midwives in Denmark. *Sexual &*
820 *Reproductive Healthcare,* 11**,** 102-106.
821 JEPSEN, I., MARK, E., NØHR, E. A., FOUREUR, M. & SØRENSEN, E. E. 2016. A qualitative study of how
822 caseload midwifery is constituted and experienced by Danish midwives. *Midwifery,* 36**,** 61-
823 69.
824 JONES, K., WARRENT, A. & DAVIES, A. 2015. Mind the gap: exploring the needs of early career nurses
825 and midwives in the workplace. London: Health Education England.
826 LYNCH, B. 2002. Care for the caregiver. *Midwifery,* 18**,** 178-187.
827 MOLLART, L., SKINNER, V. M., NEWING, C. & FOUREUR, M. 2013. Factors that may influence
828 midwives work-related stress and burnout. *Women and Birth,* 26**,** 26-32.
829 NATIONAL MATERNITY REVIEW 2016. Better Births. Improving outcomes of maternity services in
830 England. A Five Year Forward View for maternity care. London.
831 NEWTON, M. S., MCLACHLAN, H. L., FORSTER, D. A. & WILLIS, K. F. 2016. Understanding the 'work' of
832 caseload midwives: A mixed-methods exploration of two caseload midwifery models in
833 Victoria, Australia. *Women and Birth,* 29**,** 223-233.
834 NEWTON, M. S., MCLACHLAN, H. L., WILLIS, K. F. & FORSTER, D. A. 2014. Comparing satisfaction and
835 burnout between caseload and standard care midwives: findings from two cross-sectional
836 surveys conducted in Victoria, Australia. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth,* 14**,** 426.

837 NHS DIGITAL. 2017. *NHS Workforce Statistics, December 2017* [Online]. Available:
838 https://files.digital.nhs.uk/publication/q/o/nhs_workforce_statistics__september_2017_org
839 anisation_tables.xlsx [Accessed 29.04.19].
840 NHS ENGLAND. 2016. *Maternity Transformation Programme Early Adopters* [Online]. London: NHS
841 England. Available: https://www.england.nhs.uk/mat-transformation/early-adopters/
842 [Accessed 24.01.18].
843 NHS ENGLAND 2017. Implementing Better Births: Continuity of Carer. London: NHS England.
844 NHS ENGLAND. 2019. *The NHS Long Term Plan* [Online]. Available:
845 https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/nhs-long-term-plan.pdf
846 [Accessed 29.04.19].
847 NHS HEALTH EDUCATION ENGLAND. 2019. *Agenda for change - pay rates* [Online]. Available:
848 https://www.rcm.org.uk/news-views-and-analysis/analysis/agenda-for-change-
849 %E2%80%93-what-it-means-for-midwives [Accessed 29.04.19].
850 NUFFIELD TRUST 2017. The NHS workforce in numbers - facts on staffing and staff shortages in
851 England. London: The Nuffield Trust.
852 OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS 2019. Birth characteristics in England and Wales: 2017. Available:
853 https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/livebir
854 ths/bulletins/birthcharacteristicsinenglandandwales/2017. Accessed 11.04.19.
855 REID, N., GAMBLE, J., CREEDY, D. K. & FINLAY-JONES, A. 2018. *Benefits of caseload midwifery to*
856 *prevent fetal alcohol spectrum disorder: A discussion paper* [Online]. Available:
857 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1871519217305541 [Accessed 29.04.19].
858 ROYAL COLLEGE OF MIDWIVES 2016a. Caring for You Campaign: Survey Results. London: Royal
859 College of Midwives.
860 ROYAL COLLEGE OF MIDWIVES 2016b. State of Maternity Services Report 2016. London: Royal
861 College of Midwives.
862 ROYAL COLLEGE OF MIDWIVES 2017. Can continuity work for us? A resource for midwives. London.
863 SANDALL, J. 1997. Midwives' burnout and continuity of care. *British Journal of Midwifery,* 5**,** 106-111.
864 SANDALL, J. 2017. The contribution of continuity of midwifery care to high quality maternity care.
865 London: Royal College of Midwives.
866 SANDALL, J. 2018. Measuring continuity of care. London: Royal College of Midwives.
867 STEVENS, T. & MCCOURT, C. 2002a. One-to-one midwifery practice part 2: the transition period.
868 *British Journal of Midwifery,* 10**,** 45-50.
869 STEVENS, T. & MCCOURT, C. 2002b. One-to-one midwifery practice part 4: sustaining the model.
870 *British Journal of Midwifery,* 10**,** 174-179.
871 STOLL, K. & GALLAGHER, J. 2018. A survey of burnout and intentions to leave the profession among
872 Western Canadian midwives. *Women and Birth*.
873 TURNBULL, D., REID, M., MCGINLEY, M. C. & SHIELDS, N. R. 1995. Changes in midwives' attitudes to
874 their professional role following the implementation of the midwifery development unit.
875 *Midwifery,* 11**,** 110-119.
876 WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION. 2016. *WHO recommendation on midwife-led continuity of care*
877 *during pregnancy* [Online]. Available: https://extranet.who.int/rhl/topics/improving-health-
878 system-performance/implementation-strategies/who-recommendation-midwife-led-
879 continuity-care-during-pregnancy [Accessed 29.04.19].
880 YOSHIDA, Y. & SANDALL, J. 2013. Occupational burnout and work factors in community and hospital
881 midwives: A survey analysis. *Midwifery,* 29**,** 921-26.
882 YOUNG, C. M., SMYTHE, L. & COUPER, J. M. 2015. Burnout: Lessons From the Lived Experience of
883 Case Loading Midwives. *International Journal of Childbirth,* 5**,** 154-165.

884