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Background

To do the sick no harm; to lessen such suffering in the future from causes that may have been preventable *Nightingale, 1863*

The nation’s health care delivery system has fallen far short in its ability to translate knowledge into practice *IOM, Crossing the Quality Chasm, 2001*

Measuring the incidence rate of accidents . . . has serious drawbacks. Positive measures . . . have been identified as a more effective approach to measuring the degree to which an organization has implemented a safety culture *IOM, Keeping Patients Safe, 2004*

*Our healthcare system tends to be data rich and information poor*
Forces that contribute to the healthcare safety problem in the U.S.

- Complex structure and nature of the healthcare system
- Roles and functions of the regulatory bodies
- Hospital structure; lack of continuity of patient care
- Care provider characteristics, perceptions, and actions
- Patient characteristics, perceptions and actions
- Measurement problems: Errors infrequent, underreported
What is known:

- The hospital unit is “ground zero” for care quality and safety--including errors, failures, and untoward events that harm, or have the potential to harm patients (Tucker & Edmondson, 2003)

- Limited knowledge about the relationships between patients and care providers (Burroughs, et al. 2007)

- Patients, doctors, nurses, will align with their respective groups. Teamwork tends to occur within, but not between, groups (McDonald, Waring, Harrison, Walshe, & Boaden, 2005)

- There are significant mismatches between Patient-RN, RN-MD, or Patient-MD perceptions of care, failures, quality, error reporting, and patient needs (Espin, Levinson, Regehr, Baker, & Lingard, 2006)

- Failures result from mismatch of patient acuity and resources, lack of resources, and caregivers acting in the best interests of their own groups (Young, Minnick, & Marcantonio, 1996)
Significance of the Problem

What is not known:

- No evidence of whether these instruments can tell us anything about the relationships between the unit’s patients and the providers who care for them
- We have very little data on how unit safety culture affects patient outcomes
- Although the tools have similar origins and developers, and pertain to the same unit the data could not be compared
- Little attention has been paid to the relationships between patients and care providers
Questions

• Do patients perceive safety culture on the hospital unit?

• What is the relationship between care providers’ perceptions of safety culture and patients’ perceptions of their experiences of care?

• No standardized tool exists for measuring these two populations as a cohort
  • Cross-sectional, quantitative, correlational design
  • Measured using
    • Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture-SOPS
    • Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (Hospital version)-HCAHPS
Sample

Care Provider Sample-287 SOPS

- All “frontline” care providers
  - Physicians=47
  - Physicians in Training=100
  - Nurses=120
  - Assistive personnel=20

Patient Sample-216 HCAHPS

- Hospital A=84
- Hospital B=44
- Hospital C=88
Measurement of Perceptions

- Underlying assumption is that perceptions influence practice and/or experiences which in turn influence outcomes
- Morbidity and mortality are rare outcomes, other errors are grossly underreported (Vincent, Stanhope, & Crowley-Murphy, 1999)
- We have evidence that patient perceptions are correlated with quality (Weingart et al., 2005)
- The surveys and data used in this study are routinely collected by hospitals
Measurement of Perceptions

- Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture measures care provider perceptions of unit safety
  - Independent (predictor) variables—care providers (42 items, 12 subscales)
  - 5-point Likert scale

- Hospital Consumer Assessment Healthcare Providers and Systems measures patient experiences of care (27 Items, 6 subscales)
  - “Composites” used as Dependent (Outcome) variables—patients
  - 4-point Likert scale
Analysis

- Most difficult do to various data issues
- Needed to find a model that would answer the question using existing data
- Needed to account for patient data’s negative skew
- 72 regression analyses using the Generalized Estimating Equations, Negative Binomial Model
Analysis-Reported Values

- $p$-values

- Incident Rate Ratios (IRR)
  - Used to interpret the coefficients, similar to logistic regression, a relationship between 2 groups
  - Usually used with count data
  - Difficult to interpret by itself, used to calculate effect size

- Effect Sizes
  - Measures the strength of the relationship between 2 variables, in this case the unit safety culture SOPS and patient HCAHPS scores
  - Reports the size of the relationship
  - On the original scale, such as a Likert scale, effect size is useful for determining if a difference is truly significant
Results

Study: Alligators Dangerous No Matter How Drunk You Are

Alligators exhibit the potential to inflict serious harm, regardless of the blood-alcohol levels of their victims.
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# Results of 72 Regression Analyses, p < .001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Predictor</th>
<th>Patient Outcome</th>
<th>SOPS</th>
<th>HCAHPS</th>
<th>Nurse communication</th>
<th>MD communication</th>
<th>Responsiveness</th>
<th>Physical environment</th>
<th>Pain control</th>
<th>Communication about meds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Errors Reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning- QI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork Within Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Feedback &amp; Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpunitive Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork Across Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Handoffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Predictor</th>
<th>Patient Outcome</th>
<th>Nurse Communication</th>
<th>MD Communication</th>
<th>Staff Responsiveness</th>
<th>Physical Environment</th>
<th>Pain Control</th>
<th>Communication about meds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Errors Reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Learning- QI</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork Within Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Openness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Feedback &amp; Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpunitive Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork Across Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Handoffs</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation Examples

Organizational learning (SOPS) + Nurse communication (HCAHPS)

- for every 1 point increase in the SOPS subscale organizational learning/QI there is a predicted 1.08 point, or 97% increase in the HCAHPS subscale nurse communication

Staffing (SOPS) + Communication about medications (HCAHPS)

- for every 1 point increase in the SOPS subscale staffing, there is a predicted .79 point, or 61% increase in the HCAHPS outcome communication about medications
Results

Looking for a pattern of results for significant relationships between SOPS and HCAHPS p<.001

- Organizational learning 6/6
- Overall perceptions of safety 6/6
- Teamwork within the unit 6/6
- Teamwork across units 5/6
- Staffing 5/6
- Supervisor and management support for safety 5/6
Results

Looking at effect sizes of 0.5 pts or >

- Organizational learning/QI 6/6
- Teamwork within units 4/6
- Staffing 3/6
- Teamwork across units 3/6
- Non-punitive response to error 3/6
Discussion

Found relationships consistent with the literature that support positive patient safety activities on the unit

- Provides validation for management and organizational commitment to safety and quality outcomes (Khatri, Baveja, Boren, Mammo, 2006)

- Supports the learning organization. Although a good deal has been written on reliability theory in hospitals, very little empirical data exists that supports HRT principals (Tamuz & Harrison, 2006)

- There was no relationship between error reporting (SOPS) and ANY of the HCAHPS composites—consistent with recent OIG report on adverse events

- Informs the current health profession education reform movement: that teaching the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that promote patient safety in the health professions’ curricula is appreciated by the patient.

- Care that is truly patient-centered results in the best outcomes for the organization
What is Organizational Learning?

- From high reliability theory
  - Focus is on monitoring inputs, maintaining alertness
  - No strict boundaries on where learning comes from
    - Weick and Sutcliffe, 2001

- Active improvements that promote patient safety

- Active review of errors on the unit that lead to positive changes

- Reviewing changes to evaluate effectiveness

Patient room information board with posted patient daily goal
Meaning of the Findings

So What? Implications for policy

- Literature is full of unproven ways to improve safety culture, patient safety, patient experiences
- Often derived from other industries

- Although interactions occur at the unit level, results provide support for specific conditions that make up a safety milieu that supports positive patient outcomes
- Identifies areas to be targeted for change
Meaning of the Findings

- Uses existing hospital data
  - HCAHPS part of CMS Conditions of Participation
  - HCOPSC in wide use nationwide, over 400 hospitals benchmark externally with AHRQ

- Hospitals can leverage the most out of their data
  - Provides useful patient data independent of infrequent error and failure rates
  - Can tell your staff how they are doing

- Hospitals can use evidence to invest scarce resources in care provider programs **known to impact** patient outcomes
  - Such as programs and other structures that support positive patient outcomes
Limitations of the Study

- Unlinked observations within the units
- Social desirability bias
- Ongoing interventions during the data collection periods
Questions for Future Research

- Could a simpler design be developed to compare these two instruments?
- Would these findings replicate in other settings and hospitals?
- What are some of the best practices in place in hospitals that promote “Organizational Learning”?
- How might these findings differ with different groups?