UNIT Method of Changing Behavioral Culture

Deborah L. Threats MDIV, BSN, RN, CAPA, CPAN
Anne M. Burke BS, BSN, RN, CAPA

MedStar Georgetown University Hospital

MAGNET RECOGNIZED

PICOT

"In OR Holding, how does staff usage of a sacred word, sacred person and mediation compared to ad hoc use of tradition/policy of MGUH, affect disruptive behavior among peers."

Introduction/Background

Disruptive behavior is defined as "any inappropriate behavior, confrontation, or conflict ranging from verbal abuse, physical or sexual harassment" (Rosenstien 2006). The staff in OR Holding feared peer retaliation if they confronted peers about disruptive behavior and fear that nothing would be done. Therefore, alternative methods were designed to fulfill the needs of the staff to minimize disruptive behavior. After a review of the literature we found a dearth of evidence on intervention of disruptive behavior. As a result, we developed our own intervention focusing on a non punitive approach, directed at the behavior and not the person.
The following were developed:
a. Sacred word; a word spoken when a staff member demonstrated disruptive behavior. This word was chosen by staff via voting (we choose marshmallow).
 b. Sacred person; a person trusted and chosen by staff members to express their opinion without fear of reprisal.
 c. Mediation; a face to face meeting with both parties and a mediator who was chosen by the parties involved. The outcomes to the mediation were not disclosed to non-involved individuals.

Methods

Staff were provided education on disruptive and assertive behavior and were surveyed before and after the education. A mediation protocol trial lasted 6 months using specific interventions with a formal collection of occurrences.

Results

This project now spans three years. During the first year, staff was surveyed and educated on disruptive behavior and its prevalence on the unit. The results were that disruptive behavior existed, and the staff wanted the behavior to stop. Staff participated in a formal survey on assertive behavior. Analysis revealed that many staff had an assertive personality and disruptive behavior continued. Education and data collection occurred from May 2017 through October 2017. Next, staff participated in an informal survey and the results showed an earnest adaption of the intervention. Over time, the need to use a sacred word or a sacred person declined. The use of the sacred word decreased over a six month period to less than 1 per day, use of sacred person also decreased to less than 1 per day and only 3 mediations occurred during this time. Additionally, there was no need for disciplinary actions by leadership. The perception of the unit staff was that the disruptive behavior decreased.

Discussion

After being educated on disruptive and assertive behaviors, the staff in OR Holding decided that education was needed. Staff members feel that informal discussions with each other helped them became more cohesive and made the unit a better place to work. The staff feels free to talk about and confront this behavior. These interventions have effectively decreased the disruptive behavior on the unit.

	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct
Used sacred word	35	46	14	18	12	18
Sacred person verified	18	29	9	27	31	23
Mediation	2	1	0	0	0	0

Implementation/Next Steps

To make this effort sustainable, a policy or guidelines need to be established. Once written, the policy/guideline can become a part of the unit orientation.
Additionally, a repeat survey can be done to test the validity of the decrease of disruptive behavior on the unit.
Providing information and testing on other units and evaluating for similar results can further demonstrate effectiveness.

References

Babalola, Olubukola., Grant-kel, Jane., Parish, Lawrence Charles. (2012). *Ethical dilemmas in journal publications.* Clinics in Dermatology, 30, 231-236
Bank, Lindsay, Jippes., Marielle, Leppink., Jimmie, Scherpbier., Albert, JJA., Rooyen, Corry den., Van Luijk Shceitus., & Scheele, Fedde. (2017) *Are they ready? Organizational readiness for change among clinical teaching teams.* Advances in Medical Education and Practice. 8: 807-815
Cullen, Laura & Adams, Susan L., (2012). *Planning for Implementation of Evidence-Base Practice.* The Journal of Nursing Administration. 42 (4): 222-230
Medstar Georgetown University Hospital. (2017). Procedure for Policy Approval (1) http://starport.medstar.net/mguh/policies_procedures/Pages/policies.aspx#Inplview Hashda884b13-d5b3-4bd6-99af-35835825ef37=WebPartID%3D%7BDA884B13-- D5B3--4BD6--99AF--35835825EF37%7D
Kemper, Roger D,.(May 2010) *Ethical issues in biomedical publications.* American Society for Reproductive Medicine. 77 (5): 883-888
Milner, Kerry A,. (2014). *10 STEPS From EBP project to publication.* Nursing 2014 53-56
Overholt-Fineout, Ellen., Gallagher-Ford, Lynn., Melnyk, Bernadette Mazurek, & Stillwell, Susan B. (July 2011).*Evaluating and Disseminating the Impact of an Evidence-Based Intervention: Show and Tell.* American Journal of Nursing, 111 (7)
Street, Jackie M, Rogers, Wendy A, Israel, Mark, & Braunack-Mayer, (2010) *Credit where credit is due? Regulation, research integrity and the attribution in the health sciences. Social Sciences & Medicine,* 70 1458-1465
Tancred, Tara, Mandu, Rogers, Hanson, Claudia, Okuga, Monica, Manzi, Fatuma, Peterson, Stefan, Schellenberg, Joanna, Waiswa, Peter, Marchant, Tanya. (September 2014). *How people-centred health*