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Support for Children as next of kin

• Municipalities, county/regional bodies, non-profit organizations and churches
• Support groups
• Knowledge of support groups’ methods and results is limited
• Are the efforts of any help for the children?
• National Board of Health and Welfare
Systematic follow up

Continuously document individual children's problems, needs, support and results

• See if the individual child receives satisfactory support, needs extended support, is there any need for other support and that the support does not harm?

• Results from their support activities at group level - continuous organization development
Part of a project

• The National Board of Health and Welfare claims that the support activities are monitored through systematic follow-up
• Challenge to implement new methods
• With the support of Participatory Action Research (PAR)
Research questions

• How do PAR work in order to implement systematic follow-up?
• How can the process be when researchers and staff collaborate in order to implement systematic follow-up?
Process

• A single case study
• Group leaders collaborate with the researchers, in order to implement systematic follow up
• Data were collected from the group leaders through seven meetings, documents and notes
• Hermeneutic approach – How can we understand what happen in the process
The support group

• Children aged 6-12 years whose parents or siblings had a serious medical condition or disability
• Group meetings - six times/semester for one year
• Eight children for each group
• Various themes every session
• Parents - separate group, three times per semester.
Results
PAR: the process

The process can be described in four phases:

• enthusiasm,
• confusion,
• fumbling
• decision
The results show three aspects about the process

• Time: a common dance at different pace
• “Land of uncertainty”
• Pleasure and creativity
Time: a common dance at different pace

- The researchers wanted more time for reflection,
- while group leaders were pressured to develop interventions that could be used at work
Land of uncertainty

• Group leaders, wanted the researchers to answer questions

• Researchers, the role of "expert"

• Different perspective and knowledge were met which led to uncertainty, which in turn was a potential for creative development.
Pleasure and creativity

• The dialogue was characterized by reflection and hermeneutical approach
• The group leader stated that the researchers were like "their blueberry soup at "the Vasa Race"
Conclusion

• PAR is a creative research design with synergic effect to support the implementation process, while common understanding developed
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