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

Background information: 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 continue to fear peer retaliation and nothing will be done by leadership. 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. Therefore we developed our own intervention focusing on a non-punitive approach, which was directed at the behavior and not the person.

The following were developed:

A. Sacred word; which is 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 the mediator; chosen by the parties involved. The outcomes were kept between the people that were involved.

Process of Implementation: A case study focused on OR Holding staff, with the support of the staff and management. Survey was done by staff pre and post on disruptive and assertive behavior. The Sacred word, person and mediation protocol trial for 6 months using this interventions. This was done with a formal collection of data, and results given to the staff.

Statement of Successful Practice: This project now spans three years. The first year the staff was surveyed and educated on disruptive behavior and its prevalence on the unit. The results were disruptive behavior existed and the staff wanted a solution to the problem. The staff did a formal survey on assertive behavior and they all agreed that they had an assertive personality but the problem continued. The staff was educated at the start of May 2017 and started using the collected data through October 2017. An informal survey was done with the staff and the results showed an earnest adaption of the intervention. The use of the sacred word and person declined during the six month. The perception of the unit staff was that the disruptive behavior decreased. The use of the sacred word decreased over a six month period to less than 1 per day, sacred person also decreased to less than 1 per day, and only 3 mediations during this time. These methods yield no disciplinary actions by leadership.

Discussions: The staff in OR Holding upon being educated on disruptive and assertive behaviors decided that the education was needed. As a unit, through informal discussions, became more
cohesive and a better place to work. The unit feels free to talk about and confront this behavior. We as a unit felt that based on the evidence the interventions have effectively decreased the disruptive behavior on the unit.

**Implications for Advancing the Practice of Perianesthesia Nursing:** To make this a sustainable policy or guideline needs to be established. This policy/guideline has to be adapted by the unit as part of the orientation policy. A formal survey must be done to test the validity of the decrease of disruptive behavior on the unit. To test the soundness of this change in behavior it would need to be test on other units and assess for the same results. The poster and podium presentations should also be continued. Publication would also help with having this be sustainable.