Implementing Culture Change within the NHS: Contributions from Occupational Psychology

Introduction

“In the end, culture will trump rules, standards and control strategies every single time, and achieving a vastly safer NHS will depend far more on major cultural change than on a new regulatory regime”, Berwick Review, 2013, (p.11)

Following the landmark publication of the Francis report on 6th February 2013, the result of a Public Inquiry into Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust, the monumental task of implementing its recommended culture change within the NHS has dominated the healthcare policy landscape. Indeed, more recently Francis has launched an independent review into creating an open and honest reporting culture in the NHS. This contribution from the British Psychological Society’s Division of Occupational Psychology presents a series of essays by Occupational Psychologists, each drawing on evidence and expertise from the field to address the question of how this culture change can be implemented within the NHS. Robert Francis QC identified an ‘unhealthy and dangerous culture’ as sitting at the heart of the serious failures uncovered at Mid Staffordshire hospital, and emphasised these as being symptomatic of a wider cultural problem within the health system. In particular, the Francis report highlighted a failure in many cases to put the patient first, and pinpointed several common characteristics of NHS hospital trusts which contributed to this failure, including a lack of candour; low staff morale; disengagement by medical leaders; and cultures of inward-looking secrecy and defensiveness. The report led to the release of several other landmark reports, among them Don Berwick’s influential review into ‘Improving the Safety of Patients in England’. Commissioned by the Government in response to the Francis report, the Berwick review powerfully distilled the lessons learned from the Francis Inquiry and detailed the necessary changes.

Whilst the Francis report makes a total of 290 recommendations, it includes certain core recommendations for NHS culture change that relate closely to some of the key knowledge areas of Occupational Psychology. In particular, a central tenet of these recommendations is a call for a shift towards ‘patient-centred’ care across the NHS, whereby the quality of care in general – and patient safety in particular – is adopted as the top priority. To achieve this, ensuring that staff are engaged and supported to deliver compassionate care, creating stronger healthcare leaders, and developing a climate of transparency, openness and candour, are emphasised as paramount. As has been recognised by a number of NHS institutions, a new organisational culture, one devoted to continual learning, must take root in order for patient experience to be improved.

Overall, these key recommendations of the Francis report and Berwick review carry far-reaching implications for the organisational development of NHS hospital trusts, and have served to push the quality of care in the NHS into the policy and political spotlight, leading to its being ‘scrutinised more in the past year than in any other since 1948’. Indeed, in the year since its publication, the agendas of every key organisation playing a part in healthcare policy and practice - from the royal colleges to
health think tanks, the Health Select Committee and the Department of Health - have been shaped by the need to address the areas detailed.

Our intention in producing this collection of essays is not to rehearse the valuable analyses that have been produced by these organisations, but to shed light on the utility of employing Occupational Psychology evidence and expertise when embarking on the practical implementation of NHS culture change. The need to move the discussion on at this stage from what needs to be done and to ‘how’ to make NHS culture change a reality has been widely recognised, including by The King’s Fund, which has reflected that, “...the real challenge is not in the diagnosis and prescription for the problem, it is ensuring that the remedy is administered effectively.”

Likewise, the Royal College of Nursing remarked in its response to the Francis report that, “Robert Francis has set out a clear direction for the future of the health service; the onus is now on all of us to make sure we follow it.”

This report aims to contribute to these objectives by offering an Occupational Psychology perspective on the practical steps required to deliver organisational culture change within the NHS. The Berwick review highlighted the fact that ‘good people can fail to meet patients’ needs when their working conditions do not provide them with the conditions for success’, and argued that in pursuing a positive NHS culture, a ‘measured and balanced response, anchored in science and evidence, serves the nation well’.

Occupational Psychology as a discipline is concerned with the performance and wellbeing of people at work, and with how individuals, small groups and organisations behave and function. Its aim is to increase the effectiveness of the organisation and improve the job satisfaction of individuals. Therefore, Occupational Psychologists, as scientists of people at work and with practical experience of intervening in a range of organisational contexts, have much to offer here in terms of helping NHS policy makers and hospital trusts to understand how the working conditions for success can be created and sustained.

Running alongside the report’s central theme of how to embed care that is focused on patient safety, many of the following chapters include recommendations that are rooted in the concept of collective and participative leadership, detailing how NHS hospital trusts can develop more collaborative relationships between healthcare leaders and their staff. In particular, there is a concern throughout with ensuring that reforms are implemented via bottom-up processes of co-production.

In recognition of the low morale and lack of candour identified by the Francis report as existing among some NHS hospital staff, and building on the recommendation to embed a culture that ‘fosters wholeheartedly the growth and development of all staff’, the first section of this report is focused on staff selection, wellbeing and empowerment. We open our discussion with a chapter by Professor Fiona Patterson et al., who employ Occupational Psychology evidence on personnel selection to show how Values-Based Recruitment methods can ensure the continual recruitment of compassionate staff into the health service. Subsequent chapters in this section explore how, once compassionate staff have been recruited, NHS hospital employees can be developed on the job. Barbara Wren and Professor Chris Clegg detail the steps required to create working conditions that are conducive to the delivery of compassionate care. In particular, Wren elaborates on the interventions, such as providing reflective space through Schwartz Rounds, that are key to managing
staff experience so as to ensure ‘psychologically safe’ environments, and Professor Chris Clegg et al. look at how to empower and engage staff through effective job and workspace design.

An emphasis on the integral role played by leaders in enabling staff engagement and embedding organisational culture change at a broader level has been a defining feature of current policy discussions on NHS culture change, and forms the basis of our second set of chapters on leadership. Professor Beverly Alimo-Metcalfe and Juliette Alban-Metcalfe examine how leaders can facilitate high-performing teams by creating a developmental culture that is open and responsive, while Professor Rosalind Searle and colleagues explore the necessary composition and behavioural styles of hospital boards. The ‘overarching goal’ specified within the Berwick review, that of ‘continually and forever reducing patient harm by embracing wholeheartedly an ethic of learning’ \(^3\), is addressed by Dr Michal Tombs-Katz’s chapter, which discusses how leaders can foster a continuous learning culture by building work environments based on open communication and bottom-up processes of co-production.

Finally, the concluding section of this report aims to provide a more general review, drawing on lessons from Occupational Psychology, of how organisational culture change can be embedded and sustained throughout all areas of the healthcare system. In particular, Joanna Wilde’s chapter employs a model of psychological imperatives to explore how ‘cultures of transparency and openness’ can be built, and Michael Wellin closes the discussion by giving an overview of how culture change can be managed, detailing key points to bear in mind. Thus, by employing Occupational Psychology evidence and expertise, each of the chapters explore different aspects of organisational culture – from the boards to the wards of hospitals – that must be addressed simultaneously in order to create an NHS that is patient-centred and safety focused.
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Introduction
The Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust Public Inquiry report highlighted the critical role played by the workforce in ensuring the provision of high quality and safe healthcare services and, in particular, the significance of staff values and behaviours on the level of care and patient experience. We emphasise the important role that can be played by a Values-Based Recruitment (VBR) system that prioritises the assessment of an individual’s values when selecting for NHS roles and NHS-funded training courses, as an effective means of achieving an NHS workforce aligned with the values outlined in the NHS Constitution. In particular, recruiting staff on the basis of their values is crucial to achieving the NHS’s constitutional aspiration to ‘put patients at the heart of everything it does.’

The Values-Based Recruitment (VBR) programme currently being taken forward by Health Education England (HEE) aims to deliver a system to recruit staff into the NHS that prioritises high quality care and patient experience, for NHS funded training posts and for all new NHS employees, by March 2015. This programme encompasses three work streams: project 1 – recruiting for values in higher education institutions (HEIs); project 2 – recruiting for values in the NHS, in partnership with NHS Employers; and project 3 – an evaluation of the VBR programme to measure its impact in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and NHS Employment. The author of this chapter (Patterson), alongside other members of the Work Psychology Group, conducted project 3, undertaking a review of the evidence relating to VBR in terms of concepts, methods and effectiveness. A number of key messages have been identified following this review of evidence, which should assist those responsible for recruitment in understanding the issues around VBR in more detail and provide a platform from which effective practice can be agreed. Firstly, it is important to recruit individuals with the right values, whose principle motivation is the delivery of high quality, safe and compassionate care for patients; second, it is also important to understand that VBR should be approached as one part of a multi-faceted approach to embedding appropriate NHS values. The reasons for poor standards of care, are complex, varied and frequently grounded within highly contextual factors, with no single ‘silver bullet’ to fix existing problems where they occur and avoid future ones. Indeed, workload pressures, cultural issues, poor leadership and staff support and development are just a few of the other aspects that require attention in addition to recruitment and selection, and it is these other aspects of organisational culture that are addressed within the following chapters of this report.

Within the context of the NHS, VBR aims to attract and select students, trainees and employees on the basis that their individual values and behaviours align with the values of the NHS Constitution.
This chapter briefly introduces the concept of VBR by first considering how values are defined in the occupational psychology research literature. We then briefly discuss how various selection methods might be useful for VBR, presenting a case study demonstrating how values have been measured using a situational judgement test (SJT), and how these tests might be applied more extensively in the NHS context.

**Values as defined by the Occupational Psychology literature**

Values are a set of *enduring beliefs* that a person holds about what is good or desirable in life\(^5\), thought of as "preferences" or "principles"\(^6\). Values as preferences (also known as work values) are attitudes that indicate the preferences individuals have for various environments\(^6\). Values as principles (or personal values), are guiding principles regarding how individuals feel they ought to behave. Work values predict vocational choice and job satisfaction, whilst personal values are predictive of a broad range of behaviours across various life domains\(^7,8\), and because they relate to how individuals feel they ought to behave, personal values have a motivational impact on behaviour in general\(^7\). In the context of VBR, both work *and* personal values are important to include.

In addition, when considering assessment tools in the context of VBR, it is important to note that personality and values are distinct constructs (see Parks and Guay\(^9\) for a review). In short, personality relates to *enduring dispositions*, whereas values relate to *enduring goals*. Values and personality are both believed to impact behaviour, decision-making, motivation, attitudes, and interpersonal relations\(^9\). Yet, there are also important differences. Values include an evaluative component not found in personality. Values relate to what we believe we ought to do, while personality relates to what we naturally tend to do. Personality traits do not conflict with one another (i.e., one can simultaneously express the personality traits of Extraversion and Conscientiousness), yet values can conflict as some are pursued at the expense of others.

**Organisational theories focusing on values**

A number of theories are discussed in the occupational psychology literature that focus on the context of employee’s values and their impact on the organisation and the workforce. Two such theories are the Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) theory\(^10\), and Socialisation Theories\(^11-13\). The ASA theory is based on the notion that ‘the people make the place’\(^14\), where, over time, the values and personalities of the workforce become increasingly homogeneous as individuals are ‘attracted’ to an organisation based on their values; ‘selected’ due to value congruence; and where value congruence is low, ‘attrition’ will occur. Within the NHS context, individuals with previous knowledge of the organisation (e.g. those with family working in the NHS) may pre-judge its values prior to employment and may be attracted (or not) accordingly.

Socialisation theories have also been linked to the development of values within an organisation following recruitment\(^11-13,15\). Small changes in individual values have been shown following initial employment\(^15-16\), with ‘value internalisation’ being the subtle change in an individual’s values over time\(^15,17-18\) and with both managers and colleagues acting as role models that impact on the values of
In terms of VBR, individuals recruited into the organisation with optimal values for the delivery of high quality, competent and compassionate care may be at risk of a change in their values, either via socialisation or attrition if placed within teams where suboptimal values are evident. Therefore, VBR is only one component of the actions required to embed optimal values in the healthcare context.

The impact of value congruence on outcomes

“Value congruence” represents the extent to which an individual’s values are similar to the organisation in which they work. When using VBR recruitment methods, this construct is used to measure the level of ‘fit’ an individual has with the organisation’s values, with a number of types of ‘fit’ described as: ‘Person-Organisation’ (P-O) fit, ‘Person-Environment’ (P-E) fit, and ‘Person-Culture’ (P-C) fit. Some argue that organisations do not have ‘values’ as such, but rather that organisational values are actually represented (and measured) by the workforce. This is important because the NHS Constitution is frequently used to describe the values of the organisation, and the content of the constitution was developed by healthcare leaders and policymakers. However, the concerns raised following recent inquiries into poor standards of care suggest that variation exists across the NHS with regard to how individuals, teams and institutions operate. The NHS Constitution may accurately represent the values in some NHS areas, but be more aspirational in other areas.

A key objective of the VBR agenda within the NHS is to ensure that recruitment leads to the outcomes identified as crucial by the Francis report and Berwick review; in particular, demonstrating care and compassion towards patients. However, most of the literature describes the impact of value congruence on other outcomes (largely from the employee perspective) such as job satisfaction. Research shows that when an individual’s values closely match those of the organisation they report a significant increase in job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and decrease in intended turnover or attrition.

Effective selection methods for VBR

Selection practices within many healthcare professions have tended to focus on assessing academic ability alone, and yet research shows that a range of other attributes (such as integrity, empathy and resilience, which relate to the NHS values stipulated as necessary by the Francis report) are important for the implementation of high quality care focused on patient safety. Historically, it has been difficult to measure such attributes on the scale required to assess large numbers of applicants. A key challenge for NHS recruiters lies in how best to assess desired values reliably; as large scale interviewing can be costly and the use of personality measures is problematic since there is limited evidence to support their predictive validity for selection purposes in high stakes settings.

Recruitment processes generally take place in two stages: (1) initial pre-screening and shortlisting of applicants, and (2) final stage selection. This is particularly important where high volumes of applicants apply for a position, as in the case of NHS Trusts.
Pre-screen and shortlisting

The methods often used for this stage of recruitment include personal statements, references, SJTs and personality assessment. There is little evidence to support the validity and reliability of references, and although the candidate acceptability of personal statements is high, this approach is susceptible to coaching. Consequently, these methods are likely to be ineffective for VBR. Although there is evidence for the validity and reliability of personality assessments, they are also susceptible to faking and coaching. Personality assessments may be more useful to drive questions at interview during the final stage of selection. SJTs have improved validity over other selection methods, and can be mapped against the organisational values that must be embedded to ensure positive NHS culture change. Although SJTs can be costly to develop, their scalability is good since they can manage high volumes of applicants (for example, online and/or through automated marking). As such, SJTs are likely to be an effective method for pre-screening applicants in terms of VBR.

Final Stage Selection

Although traditional interviews lack validity and reliability, and are thus ineffective for VBR; structured interviews have better predictive validity and should be considered an effective method for VBR if designed and implemented in a robust manner. Many higher education institutions use group interviews during the selection of students onto health profession degree programmes. Whilst this approach can appear cost effective and feasible in terms of time and workload, evidence for the validity and reliability of group interviews is lacking, and they may represent a ‘false economy’ with good candidates being missed. Thus, group interviews represent an ineffective method for VBR. Assessment centres (also known as selection centres), on the other hand, are able to manage large volumes of candidates, where they are assessed on an individual basis rather than as part of a group. When designed appropriately, using a multi-trait, multi-method approach with worked examples, this method can be a valid predictor of job performance. Although relatively expensive to design, assessment centres are an effective method for VBR during the final stages of selection. Therefore, SJTs offer both a valid and reliable selection method that can be cost effective for VBR in the context of NHS hospitals and ultimately contribute to a positive culture change.

We present a case study below that outlines how SJTs have been used in practice to assess the values of medical school graduates.

Case Study: Developing Situational Judgement Tests to Assess the Values of Medical School Graduates

Context:
Every year, nearly 8,000 final year medical students apply for junior doctor posts in the UK’s Foundation Programme. The two-year programme is a requirement for all medical graduates
wishing to work as doctors in the UK. Competition into the programme is intensifying due to the expansion of UK medical schools and the ever-increasing number of international applications.

The Department of Health recommended that an SJT was implemented to assess professional attributes, judgement and employability for a Foundation Programme post and to replace the open-ended competency based application questions previously used. The SJT presents applicants with scenarios they are likely to encounter as a Foundation Year 1 (F1) doctor and asks how they would react in these situations. Their responses are scored against a pre-determined key defined by subject-matter experts. The SJT ensures candidates selected have the aptitude and values required of a successful doctor.

Key issues and how these were addressed:

In order to understand and define the attributes required to be successful in the role, a job analysis of the F1 doctor role was undertaken. A person specification was developed based on this analysis. Each year, educational supervisors, clinical supervisors and other Foundation Programme experts contribute to the development of new test questions based on the person specification. These questions are further reviewed, including input from Foundation doctors to ensure that the hypothetical situations are realistic and appropriate. From the job analysis, five target domains were identified to be assessed in the SJT and each item is designed to measure one of these. The five target domains are outlined in Table 1 along with examples of the kinds of scenarios which might be included under each.

Table 1: SJT Target Domains and Example SJT Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to Professionalism</th>
<th>E.g. Issues of confidentiality such as hearing a colleague talking about a patient outside of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coping with Pressure</td>
<td>E.g. Dealing with confrontation such as an angry relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>E.g. Gathering information and communicating intentions to other colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Focus</td>
<td>E.g. Taking into account a patient’s views/concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Effectively as Part of a Team</td>
<td>E.g. Recognising and valuing the skills and knowledge of colleagues, when faced with a disagreement about a patient’s care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcomes and Evaluation:

The SJT has been in operational use since 2013, and to date approximately 16,000 medical school graduates have completed the test with results informing their allocation to foundation programme places alongside a measure of educational attainment. Each year the SJT is subject to full psychometric analysis and results consistently show that the SJT is a reliable, valid and appropriate method for foundation selection. Applicant reactions to the test have been positive, with the majority of students indicating that the content of the test seems fair, relevant to the Foundation Programme, and appropriate for their level. Work is currently underway to assess the predictive
validity of the SJT, comparing performance on the test with performance on the foundation programme. This will examine the extent to which the SJT is able to predict a doctor’s attitude and values in the job.

Conclusion

This chapter, on the basis of a large body of occupational psychology research, including an international review of selection practices for the healthcare professions, has suggested that situational judgement tests (SJTs) are a valid and reliable method for assessing a broad range of important non-academic attributes for high volume values-based selection. Since SJTs can be designed in a format that can manage high volumes of applicants (e.g. machine-marked), SJTs are an effective method for pre-screening applicants in terms of VBR in NHS hospitals. The Foundation Programme SJT provides a case study for implementing a robust and consistent approach to assessing aptitude and values for high volumes campaigns. Our evaluation of selection methods indicates that SJTs should be expanded across the NHS to ensure that staff are recruited for values that are conducive to patient-centred care. However, it should be noted that key to the success of the Foundation Year 1 SJT was the initial work to define the job role through thorough job analysis, the involvement of subject matter and key stakeholders throughout the development phases and the ongoing evaluation and analysis. Conducted in a robust way, this could provide the methodology for the design, implementation and long-term evaluation of a values-based SJT applied across the NHS.

References


Managing Staff Experience to Improve Organisational Culture

Barbara Wren

About the author

Barbara Wren is a Consultant Psychologist and Schwartz Round Lead at the Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust, as well as Director of Wren Psychology Associates.

Introduction

Staff experience sits at the heart of organisational culture change in the NHS, and is intimately related to patient experience. The drive to improve organisational culture derives to a significant extent from the concern that patients have suffered needlessly and that their clinical outcomes have been compromised whilst using healthcare services. National data from staff surveys and other sources tell us that staff are suffering too. Psychological theories provide us with sophisticated models to understand the sources of staff suffering, and frameworks from which to derive, develop and evaluate interventions for prevention, treatment and rehabilitation. In this chapter, such work is related to the healthcare context, with an examination of how such approaches rooted in psychological theory can be employed to help staff manage the very predictable risks to which healthcare work exposes them.

The Healthcare Context

The healthcare context is a fast-paced, rapidly changing, hugely demanding and rewarding setting in which to work. Healthcare staff are usually intrinsically motivated to do the work they do and are values-driven in their relationship to work. Yet, work design is also changing in ways that increase the level of demands and reduce the support and control available to staff, an imbalance known to contribute to ill health at work. When combined, these factors pose particular challenges that can lead to increased anxiety in healthcare systems, and it is through helping organisations to understand the impact of this anxiety, and to manage it, that psychologists can make an important contribution to improving staff experience and managing organisational culture.

Anxiety is managed by staff through various means, some more functional than others, that can be broadly categorised in terms of 'creating defences' or 'creating meaning', i.e. by creating a distance between oneself and what is difficult, and by making sense of what is happening. These methods of creating defences or creating meaning occur at both an individual and an organisational level, and psychologists can assist healthcare organisations in understanding the impact of defences on effective and safe organisational functioning, enabling them to more consciously manage these defences and helping managers and their staff to manage meaning. Thus, considering the different aspects of the healthcare context from the perspective of the psychological challenges that it poses to staff opens new possibilities for understanding, and it is this approach to staff management that is outlined below.
Large-scale organisational change and increasing levels of job insecurity

Psychological theories of child development, which inform models of learning and training used in Occupational Psychology interventions\(^8\), describe the necessary conditions for optimal learning and growth as being a sense of safety and containment combined with stimulation and challenge. It is the combination of these elements that is key, with each synergistically interacting with the other to facilitate learning and produce positive behaviour. Currently, the organisational culture in the NHS often produces insecurity and competition without adequate containment, thereby reducing safety, increasing anxiety and fear and disabling learning. In his review into improving patient safety in England, Berwick wrote that “fear is toxic to both safety and improvement”\(^3\). The ‘fear’ Berwick refers to is leading to high levels of anxiety in individuals and systems while limiting access to reality-based ways of managing this anxiety that would involve helping to understand stressors from a ‘whole system’ perspective in order to address them effectively.

One healthy way in which psychology shows us that humans manage their anxiety is through our ‘attachments’\(^9\). That is, we seek out relationships that make us feel confident, competent and reassured and which provide us with opportunities for growth. NHS staff often face a psychological quandary about which attachments will provide safety and help them manage anxiety, and are unsure whether to look to organisational attachments, attachments to their colleagues, attachments to professional groupings or attachments to patients. These decisions can be made especially difficult in an NHS context of insecurity, competition and job cuts. One attachment that has huge potential to mitigate the impact of anxiety is staff relationships with management, with staff who feel well supported by management better able to manage their anxiety and therefore more able to learn and be effective in their role\(^10\). However, NHS managers are one of the most highly stressed occupational groups in the UK\(^11\), and psychology shows that in order to help others feel contained\(^2\) one must be adequately contained oneself; a fact is at the heart of thinking about the relationship between staff and patient experience. There is limited capacity for containing management relationships in the NHS due to some of the issues described here, and due to skill limitations. Many staff consequently alleviate their anxiety through other means, for example through their relationship with patients, returning them to the original values that brought them into healthcare but often increasing the divide between corporate culture and staff experience. Thus, NHS staff can often feel committed to and motivated by their clinical role, and yet psychologically harmed by their organisations. This attachment increases the risk of burnout and ambivalent organisational commitment, which can in turn thwart centrally led culture change initiatives such as that being undertaken in response to the Francis report and Berwick review.

Increasing cost containment pressures

As a result of pressures to contain NHS costs, many staff may have to orient themselves to the provision of “good enough” care. This can lead to anxieties about patient safety and open up the challenge of managing patient relationships in a different way, for example by having to be quicker in consultations, manage expectations downwards and prioritise or ration services. Giving staff space
to reflect on the impact of this experience is vital in order to avoid unhealthy ways of coping with cost containment pressure, as is the need for good translators that are able to conceptualise service priorities at an operational, strategic and clinical level simultaneously. Effective translation should ensure that service priorities are integrated into daily practice and promote meaningful dialogue between different parts of the healthcare system. However, with tired staff and limited containment, these approaches are difficult to undertake and the result is often “splitting”\(^3\), with staff feeling they have bad managers and good doctors, for example, or good and bad nurses, or worthy and unworthy services. Splitting leads to scapegoating and destructive relationships, all too common features of the healthcare culture.

**Increased life expectancy and management of chronic conditions**

Depending on a member of staff’s speciality within the NHS, much healthcare work now involves helping to reorient patients and families to manage chronic conditions, usually in the community rather than in hospital. Rather than providing discrete episodes of care, new skills are required to manage long term relationships whilst helping readjustment to illness. The challenges posed by the need to manage the intimate and dependent relationships at the heart of chronic conditions require support and understanding, and opportunities for staff to renew themselves and process the complex feelings that may be generated by this work.

**The nature of healthcare work**

Healthcare work involves daily exposure to the reality of distress, decay and disfigurement, and to the possibility of death. Menzies Lyth\(^2\), who was a child and adult psychoanalyst and organisational consultant, wrote widely about the process of change in individuals and organisations, and has highlighted the organisational defences that healthcare staff employ in order to protect themselves from this reality. The need for staff to have a sense of detachment carries with it the risk of disengagement from the emotions necessary to cultivate compassionate and safe relationships with patients and colleagues, and this detachment can be seen as lying at the heart of the failings identified in the mid Staffordshire Inquiry\(^3\).

Thus, the various elements of the healthcare context described above pose predictable psychological challenges for NHS staff. These challenges can be anticipated and managed by:

- Providing clear structure and space for reflection, for example by adopting the ‘Schwartz Center Round’ model
- Regularly considering whether work design promotes helpful defences, and supporting and enabling a reality based management function in hospitals
- Consciously paying attention to the content of the work, its emotional impact and the structure and design of jobs, roles and teams.
- Paying attention to the processes supporting the work, including review of work, meetings, supervision, and management of risk.
Ensuring that the skills and resources of management at every level are treated as being of crucial importance.

Psychology services derived from a combination of clinical, occupational and health psychology theoretical frameworks have huge potential to help NHS organisations address these areas, and the case studies below provide some practical examples of effective interventions:

Case Study A: Providing a Systemic Intervention to build Resilience

Background

In 1999, the Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust established an in-house psychology service led by the author. The service provided individual therapy and management and organisational consultancy to all hospital staff and departments. The service worked at the interface between individual and organisational functioning and tackled “downstream problems” by implementing “upstream solutions”. For example, as the overview below shows, an in-house mediation service was established after identifying conflict as the source of a large number of referrals for individual therapy.

Situation

In one particular year, the in-house psychology service received a large number of referrals from the same clinical area, with many junior staff referred for stress management:

- Staff were distressed, tearful and feeling overwhelmed by patient demands. Middle managers were contacting the consultancy service independently of each other, and asking for help with managing “difficult people”.
- Two senior managers contacted the service asking for coaching to provide support as they prepared to compete with external providers for the ongoing provision of this service (they were only partially successful).
- It was hypothesised that there were difficulties in containing pressure and emotion in this service in the context of a fight for survival.

Intervention

An intervention comprised of two ten month learning sets was offered to two groups of middle managers:

- Each set met every six weeks for three and a half hours with no set agenda.
- Staff were encouraged to bring any current concerns and had a fixed amount of time when the group focused exclusively on the issue they had arrived with.

Outcomes

- Over time, the groups had the experience of being heard and helped without needing to act, developed an awareness of typical patterns of responding to problems, and understood the themes linking their varied experiences.
The interventions led to the development of alternative ways of thinking about difficulty. In particular, staff reported higher levels of resilience and satisfaction with work, and a stronger sense of support from colleagues. Thus, using systemic psychological theory to hypothesise about the problem and to develop a solution which strengthened resources enabled the group to move away from a focus on difficult and/or stressed staff and onto shared challenges in the work they were doing as well as a recognition of the range of resources they had available to manage complexity.

See Wren et al\textsuperscript{13} for a further description of this and other similar UK services.

**Case Study B: The Introduction of Schwartz Rounds**

**Background**

In 2009, with the help of the Point of Care Programme at the Kings Fund, the Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust piloted Schwartz Rounds, which provided an opportunity for an organisation-wide reflective space. ‘Schwartz Center Rounds’\textsuperscript{14} originated in the United States and provide a forum for healthcare staff to come together once a month to explore the non-clinical aspects of caring for patients – the psychological, social and emotional challenges. They were piloted in two UK hospitals (the Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust and Cheltenham and Gloucester Foundation NHS Trust), and four years later are still running successfully in both hospitals.

**Format**

- Each Schwartz Round lasts for one hour and includes a presentation of a patient experience by a multi-disciplinary panel who go on to describe the impact that the patient experience has had on them.
- Following the patient experience presentation, there is then time and space for the audience to reflect with the panel on similar experiences of their own.

**Outcomes**

- The rounds are restorative, allowing staff to constructively process difficult work experience and gain reassurance and support.
- Rounds equip staff with new ways of thinking about difficulty, reduce isolation, develop a sense of community, and role model coping with difficult emotions\textsuperscript{15}.
- Staff reported that the presence of the Rounds makes them feel proud to work for their organisation and reconnected to the values that first brought them into healthcare\textsuperscript{16}.
- The implementation of Schwartz Rounds, founded on Psychological approaches, have been recommended in the Department of Health’s response to the Francis Inquiry.
- The Point of Care Foundation\textsuperscript{17} is now rolling out Schwartz Rounds across the UK and provides support, mentoring and training to new organisations starting Schwartz Rounds.

The author works with the Point of Care Foundation using clinical and occupational health psychological theory to develop the training and mentoring that is provided to healthcare organisations to support successful implementation of Schwartz Rounds.
Conclusion

Psychology has much to contribute to the improvement of healthcare culture post-Francis, both in providing evidence based assessments and in conducting well planned interventions. Interventions should be targeted at different levels of the system: individual, role, team and departmental, and must be sophisticated, responsive and systemically derived, even if their focus is on individuals. Interventions rooted in psychology also need to take into account the range of factors impacting on staff experience, the unique demands of different healthcare specialties, the need for renewal among tired staff who are anxious about change, job insecurity and exposed to what are often experienced as limitless demands. The development of psychology based intervention clusters that are regularly reviewed and realigned to emerging staff, patient and organisational will be key to ensuring the successful implementation of NHS culture change recommendations.
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**Introduction**

This chapter argues that work design is a key enabler of the delivery of compassionate care and patient safety in the NHS. By ‘work design’, we mean the organisation of work on hospital wards and the design of physical workspaces. In this view, compassionate care is provided in the daily routines and working practices of those working with patients on wards. In turn, these routines and practices are heavily influenced by how clinicians spend their time; the dominant goals and metrics that are pursued, prioritised and measured; the processes that are followed and enacted; the social interactions enabled by the layouts; the technologies in use; the expectations of managers and others, and the skills and attitudes of the staff.

Using insights from occupational psychology, we argue that work design is fundamental to improving care and to ensuring that what happened at Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust does not happen again. Furthermore, our reading of the various reports and debates surrounding the Francis report is that work organisation as a topic has to date been under-recognised and under-specified (though for brief exceptions, see for example, Francis executive summary 1.202, 2013 and Berwick², section IV, box 3). Our aim is to fill this gap, offering a complementary set of ideas that adds to the analyses offered by Francis and others. In addition, we offer some caveats on the potential confusions and clashes that may result from two emerging rhetorics – one focused on standards, compliance and inspection, vs. the other on staff empowerment and trust.

The objectives of this chapter are to:

- Draw on our experiences as occupational psychologists working in a range of other sectors
- Offer a complementary view to the Francis report and Berwick review, focusing on the role of work design as a core component of the delivery of care on hospital wards
- Make systemic recommendations for the improvement of work design at ward level

**Lessons from other sectors**

Before discussing the topic of work design, we draw on our experiences of working in a range of other sectors. The value of drawing from other sectors of work is illustrated by the experience of Virginia Mason Hospital³ in Seattle, which has succeeded in learning from manufacturing companies (such as Toyota and Boeing) to reduce waste, for example in terms of waiting times and staff movement, and improve patient safety.

**Experiences from major disasters**
An analysis of a wide range of large scale disasters and accidents in safety critical industries reveals some commonality with the failures in patient care and safety that occurred in Mid-Staoffs, from which there are important lessons to learn. For example, analyses of what happened at the Hillsborough Football Stadium Disaster\(^4\)\(^-\)\(^5\), King’s Cross Underground Fire\(^6\), Bradford City Stadium Fire\(^7\), Piper Alpha Oil Terminal Fire\(^8\), and BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Disaster\(^9\) reveal some common systemic failings\(^10\). These common factors include:

- A focus on certain goals to the exclusion of safety (‘managerial headlights’ focused in the wrong place);
- Lack of clarity over responsibility for safety
- Complacency, especially amongst senior managers
- Poor or fragmented leadership
- A separation between the top of the organisation and those on the ground who deliver the services
- A failure to learn lessons from previous failures and external experts
- A lack of empowerment of (and trust in) those on the ground to respond to problems as they occur.

Experiences from the pursuit of quality in manufacturing companies

There has been a long-standing international debate within manufacturing industry on the optimal way of pursuing quality and the respective roles of shop-floor staff and quality inspectors. The lessons from this sector are that:

- Front-line staff must retain primary responsibility for quality, with quality representing an explicit priority in their role even if there may be some investment in a separate quality function (for example, in safety critical industries)\(^11\)\(^-\)\(^12\)
- Front-line staff need to be empowered to act when things go wrong. In Japanese manufacturing systems for example, a problem is never handed on for someone else to solve and if something is not right, they ‘stop and fix it’\(^13\)\(^-\)\(^14\)
- Well-designed systems make problems visible so that they can be understood and rectified\(^15\)
- Quality cannot be ‘inspected’ in after the event, when it is too late, too expensive and counter-productive\(^16\)
- Whilst there are roles for operational and behavioural standards and for the pursuit of compliance, ‘non-compliance’ on the part of staff can often indicate a badly designed system.
- There is a place for inspections and audits, but in large part these are to help the operators deliver the best quality possible, not to take responsibility for it.

The manufacturing sector shows that an over-emphasis on inspections, standards and compliance can create a vicious circle, with inspections becoming adversarial processes in which staff become defensive and tempted to hide problems of poor quality. Such vicious circles can lead to the creation of ever more complicated regimes that soak up and waste scarce resources whilst failing to add value. The overwhelming long term direction of travel in manufacturing has been to move away
from heavy investments in external inspection and improve quality by empowering front-line staff to put things right; a conclusion that is supported by the analyses of major disasters above.

In light of these lessons from other sectors, there are grounds for concern in the call from the Care Quality Commission to “Join Mike’s Inspection Army”\textsuperscript{17}. This is substantiated in the views being expressed regarding the ‘punitive and overbearing’ culture in the NHS\textsuperscript{18}. There remains the potential for a confusing and debilitating cultural clash between the rhetoric of inspection and compliance on the one hand (with its connotations of top-down ‘command and control’, substantiated by the military language), in contrast with the rhetoric of care, listening and empowerment on the other. Indeed Chris Hams\textsuperscript{19} argues the NHS has relied too much on inspection and regulation, advocating a shift towards bottom-up approaches incorporating staff engagement and commitment.

**The role of work design**

There is a longstanding tradition of research into work design by occupational psychologists and others, focused on the daily working practices of who does what, where and when, and on the job designs of key actors working on the wards.

Broadly, the findings in this area are that:

- Empowering people results in higher performance and higher quality\textsuperscript{20}
- Staff usually prefer to be empowered and respond positively to the experience\textsuperscript{21}
- Work design is a core part of a larger organisational system and these systemic elements need to be ‘joined-up’ in their design and operation\textsuperscript{22}

Our view is that compassionate and effective care is undertaken in the hourly and daily praxis of hospital wards and this primarily involves doctors, nurses, healthcare assistants, cleaners, patients and their families, carers and friends. The critical enablers of care lie in the organisation of work for these key actors. In this view, care is provided through a set of patient-centred tasks or activities, which include for example -- feeding and administering drink, drug dispensing, relieving pain, sleeping, toileting, bed-making, cleaning, tidying, communicating about health and care, chatting and conversing, monitoring, responding, reassuring, and providing help (e.g., regarding reading, lighting, noise, shopping, TV and radio, etc.). These are everyday tasks that need to be agreed and prioritised as parts of the roles of the key actors in the NHS.

**Existing research on work design in hospital wards:**

**Healthcare tasks**

- Nurses spend around 17% of their time on non-essential paperwork and clerical tasks\textsuperscript{23}.
- 27% of nurses report they do not have administrative or clerical support\textsuperscript{23}.
- 69% of nurses report that IT systems have increased the time they spend on paperwork and administration\textsuperscript{23}.
- Nurses spend around 15% of their time on bedside care\textsuperscript{24}.
Health care assistants spend around 30% of their time on bedside care\textsuperscript{24}.

A focus on certain metrics (such as infection control) serves to reduce the attention to other aspects of the quality of care and in particular, those which are not measured\textsuperscript{25}.

**Ward layouts**

- The physical design of healthcare facilities has an impact on both staff and patients\textsuperscript{26}.
- Staff involvement in the re-design of their wards has positive effects for both staff and patients.
- Quieter wards are associated with faster patient recovery and the use of fewer analgesic drugs\textsuperscript{27}.
- Patients who have access to external views are reported to recover more quickly than those without\textsuperscript{27}.
- Different ward layouts have an impact on the ability of nurses to observe and monitor their patients. For example, old-fashioned Nightingale wards (large rooms with beds around the sides and with a central nurse station) are associated with the highest level of direct care and with lower workloads, whilst Bay wards (a central nurse station with surrounding bays containing small numbers of beds) generate heavier workloads for staff\textsuperscript{28}.

Our interpretation of the above research is that nurses and other ward staff can often spend too much of their time undertaking routine clerical and computing activities, following the requirements of a managerial and financial set of goals, priorities and metrics and feeding the needs of the bureaucracy. This has distanced them from their patients, both physically and psychologically. In this view work organisation can be seen as part of a complex system that evolved in Mid Staffordshire hospital in a chronically dysfunctional way, with the chronic problems at Mid Staffs appearing similar to the common problems underlying the acute disasters in other sectors described earlier. The solution requires new work designs that trust and empower front-line staff to deliver compassionate care, supported by other systemic changes.

**What this means for Hospital wards: Recommendations**

On the basis of the above analysis, we make a set of inter-related recommendations that are summarised below and in figure 1, using a systems framework\textsuperscript{22}.

**Goals and Metrics**

- On each ward, explicit goals and simple metrics are needed that are focused on daily care activities. The quality of care must be a priority goal. Metrics in support of goals in this area will need careful design to achieve the right balance between empowering staff and external validation.
- Feedback should be provided against these goals and metrics (see below).
- Daily care activities need to be agreed as priorities above all managerial and financial activities, and this will need to be agreed at multiple levels and by all the key stakeholders.

**People**
• Ward staff need to be empowered and trusted to undertake care and safety roles, and to respond to the needs of their patients as they arise.
• Ward staff need to be trained in their care roles and in the cultural norms and expectations regarding the care of patients. Examples of potential training include:
  o Role plays of appropriate behaviours under realistic circumstances on their wards;
  o Discussions on priorities and how to handle conflicting demands;
  o Direct inputs from patients on their experiences of care during their ‘patient journey’ (i.e. walking a mile in their shoes).
  o Imparting lessons and experiences from other relevant sectors (see below).
• Staff need to be reassured that, in the event of lack of time, care activities (alongside clinical and medical work) take priority over managerial and financial tasks. This view and its application will need to be consistent at all levels in the healthcare system (including the statutory framework).

Working practices and processes

• The various roles (for all people working on the ward) need to include specific care activities and have Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) attached to these, based on the metrics above.
• Agreement, clarity and transparency are required about the care roles on each ward.
• There need to be quick and direct feedback loops from patients (and their families, friends and carers) regarding their care. There is opportunity for experimentation to develop cost-effective feedback systems. Examples of such feedback systems could include:
  o Direct feedback from patients and their visitors using simple electronic (push-button) technologies;
  o The use of charts above hospital beds;
  o Displays of aggregated feedback on each ward using colour-coding systems;
  o Regular patient surveys;
  o The collection and collation of data by volunteer visitors, and
  o The regular posting of such results on ward patient information boards (comment – this last point does not solely apply to data from volunteers and cannot just be included in the previous bullet)
• Feedback systems need to operate openly, in as near real time as possible, and in the right language for both patients and staff.
• New processes to support empowered staff should include, for example, systems for ‘Stop and Fix It’* (when any member of staff can stop the ongoing work in the event of poor safety or care, acknowledging the need to prioritise clinical emergencies) and ‘Continuous Improvement’* (which involves team-based discussions for improving local work, often held on a daily basis.
• Existing activities and processes may need to be simplified, dropped or re-allocated. Techniques to do this include Process Re-engineering* (streamlining processes and cutting out waste) and Value Stream Mapping* (understanding and improving workflows in complex systems). Such techniques* and their underlying philosophies again help demonstrate that there are substantial lessons to learn from ‘good practice’ in other sectors. We note for
example that value stream mapping is already a part of the existing NHS Productive Ward Programme.

**Infrastructure**

- Ward layouts, wherever possible, need to support daily care roles and make the provision of safe care ‘easy’. For example, the layouts should allow ‘line of sight’ to all patients to enable easy monitoring and response, and should promote effective working by reducing wasteful trips for equipment, materials and information.
- Ward layouts should help make ‘problems visible’ (as opposed to hidden out of sight).

**Technology and tools**

- There need to be tools to support the above, for example, to enable quick and easy feedback from patients on the metrics for quality of care and safety (see above).

**Culture**

- Norms and expectations need to be established and reinforced regarding the centrality of patient care and the need for transparency.
- These are complex systems and their design needs to be ‘joined up’ to deliver effective services.
- The direct involvement of ward staff in the design of their work needs to be part of this new culture (see below).
- NHS staff need to be open to learning about ‘good practice’ from other safety critical sectors. Learning lessons from elsewhere should be a cultural norm. Moreover, such external lessons should be part of training inputs within the NHS.

**Process of change**

- There is a need for an agreed national framework on these issues, in particular with regard to goals and metrics, the priority given to care activities and the need for well-designed work organisations.
- There needs to be a local agreement on the above on each and every ward.
- Staff need to be actively engaged in the discussion of all the issues above. Each local ward will need to involve all the relevant staff in local discussions and agreements on the provision of care under all the headings above. Such ‘user-centred’ design is practised in other sectors.
- The inspection process needs to be designed to ensure it is aligned with the rest of the care system and to ensure it is not wasteful and counterproductive.
Concluding remarks

Since publication of the Francis report there has been a great deal of discussion on how to improve the quality of care in hospitals. We believe there are six key points which emerge from our review and perspective, which complement other work. These are --

- There are powerful lessons to learn from elsewhere, in particular from the causes of major disasters and from the pursuit of quality in manufacturing industry.
- No amount of inspection or exhortation for change will deliver the cultural changes required, unless attention is paid to work design. Work design is an essential and core enabler of the new culture. The whole system needs to be ‘joined up’ to deliver high quality and safe care.
- Compassionate care can only be delivered by staff on the ground in the daily practice of their work on the wards. Thus far, the importance of work design has been relatively under-recognised and under-developed in the ongoing debates.
- The process of work design is a bottom-up ward-based approach to improvement, aligned with a top-down pursuit of change. Front-line staff will need to be directly involved in the design of their work to deliver compassionate care.
- An emphasis on care may mean that some non value-adding activities have to go – hospitals need to review the processes and activities that are soaking up staff time and drop them, make them more streamlined, or get someone else to do them.
• Great care needs to be taken over the design of the emerging inspection regime to ensure it is not wasteful or counter-productive.
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Introduction
In addition to recruiting effectively, enhancing staff wellbeing and ensuring good work design, an understanding of what affects the social and psychological environment at team level will be critical in order for the NHS to successfully implement the Francis report’s recommendations for fundamental culture change. In this context, “teams” should be thought of as distinct units of professionals who work together with a specific remit, rather than team working that occurs between units of professionals in a joined-up manner.

The role of Psychology in strengthening leadership and team working
Occupational psychology can play a critical role in providing evidence of the ways in which NHS leaders can create teams that are high performing, and the developmental steps they need to take to achieve this. Wider knowledge in the field, and recent research undertaken in the NHS relating to high-performing teams, has identified the critical importance of a range of team characteristics. Team characteristics are important not only in creating a culture of engagement and wellbeing - which are essential for sustaining high levels of performance - but also in strengthening a culture of innovation and a focus on quality and constant improvement, all of which are central to the Francis report and Berwick review recommendations. Broadly, occupational psychology research shows us that the key characteristics required of high performing teams are:

- The team lead provides a clear sense of direction (e.g. Hackman, 2002; Schaubroeck, Lam & Cha, 2007)
- The team lead involves all key stakeholders (team members, patients, partners, colleagues) in developing the team’s vision (Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2007, 2008).
- All members of the team contribute to determining how to achieve the vision (Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2007, 2008)
- Team members all have clear goals, roles, and a shared understanding of responsibilities (e.g. Hackman, 2002; West & Markievicz, 2004)
- The team has clearly-defined processes and procedures (Hackman, 2002; West & Markievicz, 2004)
- Team members have a high degree of autonomy and confidence in their ability to succeed, and are trusted to take decisions independently (e.g. Hyatt & Ruddy, 1997; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999)
A shared belief of ‘team potency’ exists, i.e. a sense of confidence in the team’s ability, to deal with all challenges (e.g. Gully et al, 2002; Van der Vegt & Bunderson, 2005; Schaubroeck, Lam & Cha, 2007; Tesluk & Mathieu, 1999).

Teams operate within a ‘psychologically safe’ environment enabling them to challenge, admit mistakes, and seek help without fear of ridicule (e.g. Edmondson 1996; Edmondson, Bohmer and Pisano, 2001; Nemhard & Edmondson, 2006; Wageman, 1995).

Team members receive high levels of social support, including coaching (e.g. Yukl, 1989; Burke et al., 2006).

Team leads make the time to discuss problems and issues, despite having a busy schedule, and they celebrate individual and team achievements (Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2007, 2008, 2013).

Team leads facilitate regular face-to-face communication within the team and regularly review progress on projects/goals (e.g. Bantel & Jackson, 1989; Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002).

Team leads regularly update the team and keep them informed of the wider context (for example, progress with change initiatives, decisions to be taken, etc.) (e.g. Amabile & Kramer, 2011; Alimo-Metcalfe, et al., 2007; West & Markievicz, 2004).

Teams value different perspectives and minority views, rather than only ‘established’ perspectives (e.g. Gillson & Shalley, 2004; Van der Vegt & Bunderson, 2005).

Team culture encourages sharing of specialist knowledge, and how to apply it (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002; Srivastava, Bartol & Locke, 2006; Tsui, Egan, & Xin, 1995).

Team culture is open to change, enabling adaptation to external demands and cementing resilience to change-related pressures (e.g. Cunningham et al., 2002; Jones, Jammieson & Griffiths, 2005).

Team culture actively encourages learning and promotes a ‘no-blame’ culture (e.g. Edmondson, 1196; Edmondson, Bohmer & Pisano, 2001; Perry-Smith & Shalley, 2003).

Team culture encourages questioning of traditional ways of delivering services, generation of new ideas and approaches, and constructive debate.

Teams regularly seek feedback from patients and carers about how best to meet their needs and continually improve the quality of care (Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2007, 2008, 2013; West et al., 2012; West & Markievicz, 2004).

There are strong inter-team and inter-agency relationships, based on mutual respect, the sharing of information, and understanding of each other’s roles (e.g. Serva et al., 2005).

Team leads promote strong inter-team and inter-agency collaboration and undertake joint strategic planning to improve the quality of services (Alimo-Metcalfe et al., 2013; Hartley & Allison, 2000)

“Team working” vs. genuine team working

The evidence for the need to focus on effective teams at a ‘unit’ level comes in part from a large study by the Healthcare Commission in 2006, which found that whilst 92% of NHS staff surveyed (based on all categories of NHS staff) said they work in teams, only 42% reported working in well-structured (‘genuine’) teams; that is, those where team members report that they have:

- Clear team objectives;
• Interdependent working;
• Regular meetings to discuss effectiveness\(^3\)\(^4\).

It follows, therefore, that many staff work in ‘pseudo’ teams, defined as poorly structured, and whose members report high levels of errors, accidents and poor staff wellbeing\(^3\). If the NHS is to improve the quality of care it provides, the existence of ‘pseudo’ teams represents a significant challenge given that evidence shows a clearly positive relationship between team working and organisational performance in a range of healthcare and non-healthcare settings\(^5\).

**Team members’ wellbeing and provision of high quality care**

A number of key studies show that team leadership which increases team members’ engagement and wellbeing is crucial for understanding the factors that will create cultures of high quality, compassionate care. As well as the Boorman Review\(^6\), which recognised that “staff ill-health is...a serious barrier to the provision of consistently high quality patient care”, a study by West and Dawson\(^7\), has highlighted that levels of staff engagement in the NHS are significantly associated with not only patient satisfaction but also mortality rates. Numerous studies have shown that the role of the team leader or line manager is vital to employee health, wellbeing and engagement (see Donaldson-Feilder, Munir and Lewis for a review) and Occupational Psychologists have created frameworks that help managers understand what they need to prevent and reduce stress in their team and enhance and sustain employee engagement. Alimo-Metcalfe et al.\(^8\)\(^9\) have also found that those aspects of leadership culture which significantly predict levels of team engagement and wellbeing are also those that have been identified through longitudinal research as having a direct, causal influence on productivity.

**Contemporary understandings of effective leadership**

To further understand the context of these major studies highlighting the importance of team engagement, it must be noted that ideas of effective ‘leadership’ have changed in recent years. In particular, psychologists working in the academic field of leadership studies now look on notions of good ‘leadership’ as having shifted from a focus on the characteristics of ‘leaders’, to approaching leadership as a collective or shared activity, irrespective of one’s role; a social process which emerges through collaborative relationships\(^10\)-\(^12\). This new concept of ‘collective leadership’ presents challenges to an organisation such as the NHS, in which there exists a strong tradition of hierarchy, particularly within the clinical professions. Nonetheless, organisations such as the British Medical Association\(^13\) have endorsed the recommendations for culture change detailed in the Francis report and have signalled a shift in attitudes towards how the leadership role of doctors should be enacted; advocating a culture of empowerment and support rather than of blame, and is seeking ideas and experiences from its members in how to enable an open and honest culture.

Similarly, psychological notions of effective leadership in relation to teams have changed in recent years. Whereas traditionally team leadership has been seen as something a leader inputs to their team, the contemporary understanding is that leadership should be regarded as an outcome of team members working together collaboratively. Gary Yukl, a well-known US academic, encapsulates collective leadership as:
“a shared process of enhancing the collective and individual capacity of people to accomplish their work roles effectively ... the leadership actions of any individual leader are much less important than the collective leadership provided by members of the organisation” (p.293).

Recent research by the co-author of this chapter, Alimo-Metcalfe et. al., which consisted of a three-year investigation into effective team working across the NHS in Yorkshire and the Humber, uncovered similar findings on the components of effective team leadership, leading to a number of essential, practical implications for leadership and team development in the NHS. In particular, we found that exemplary team leadership operates through influencing the activity of teams so as to ensure three positive outcomes that can be regarded as critical foundations for high quality performance – innovation, focus on quality, and continuous improvement. The following case studies, based on this three year research investigation, provide examples of how teams and team leaders can be effectively developed:

Case Study A: Leading to Quality – South West Yorkshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust

Background

South West Yorkshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SWYPFT) led on a regionally funded project commissioned by Yorkshire and the Humber Strategic Health Authority, which ran from 2010 to 2013. The project, entitled Leading to Quality, was directed by Professor Beverly Alimo-Metcalfe on behalf of the University of Bradford and undertaken by researchers from Real World Group and SWYPFT. This initial phase has now been extended by the Trust to conduct action research applying the findings to 10 Mental Health Teams (MHTs) of different types (both community and inpatient). The Leading Quality project at SWYPFT provides an example of the development of new, more effective ways of team working in Mental Health Teams (MHTs), as well as providing insight into the research informing the project.

Intervention

Rather than adopting assumed measures of quality, safety and effective care, the research began by exploring what service users and their carers believed to be the most important aspects of these crucial outcomes. The project aimed to create developmental workbooks for self-directed learning, providing background information and practical exercises for the team leaders and the teams themselves:

‘Train-the-trainer’ workshops

- Run over three non-consecutive days and facilitated by occupational psychologists
- Train the trainer workshops sought to explain the research behind the proposed model of team working and leadership; describing the benefits of and appropriate application of 360-degree feedback; and discussing and agreeing on the best way of conducting the action research (based on the specific context and appropriate selection criteria of pilot teams).
- The final day of the workshop provided an opportunity for the Coaches to understand and practice providing 360-degree feedback, at team and individual level and in an ethical way with maximum benefit for all participants.

Team 360-degree feedback sessions
Teams themselves selected their reviewers, who provide them with quantitative and qualitative feedback on the proven dimensions of team leadership and team working. The feedback assesses team members’ levels of wellbeing and positive attitudes to work, as well as the process outcomes of innovation, focus on quality, improvement and performance. Real World Group’s 360-degree feedback tool was applied, based on the validated dimensions of team leadership (five dimensions) and team working (nine dimensions). A total of five reviewer categories were provided for the team to populate with individuals of their choice (as well as a “self” category, where each team member can provide their own review). The reviewer categories are Service Manager or equivalent (the person to whom the Team Leader reports), Internal Clinical Teams, Internal Others and External Groups.

Facilitated feedback and action planning for each of the team leaders and teams, based on the 360-degree findings

Feedback on the findings was provided by coaches, first to the team leader and then to the team members themselves. Team leaders viewed feedback on their own leadership, as well as the feedback provided to the team members. They were encouraged to share a summary (if not all) of their own feedback report with the team and explore this feedback. Team leaders then selected appropriate workbooks to utilise for ongoing development activities addressing key development needs at the team level.

Comment from SWYPFT:

‘The Trust hosted the original LTQ research, which was sponsored by the Chief Executives of the 6 Mental Health/Community Trusts within the Yorkshire and the Humber region, to gain a greater understanding of the nature of the leadership challenge as part of the transformation agenda facing the NHS. The research examined both team leadership and team-working and provided a new evidence model of the relationship between these and team outcomes. The follow-on project provides a valuable opportunity for the Trust to enhance the quality of service provision and support employee well-being and engagement.’

- Alan Davis, Director of Human Resources and Workforce Development

Case Study B: Fit for the Future – Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust

Background

Rotherham Doncaster and South Humber NHS Foundation Trust (RDaSH) embarked upon a major development and culture enhancement programme in order to ensure that their leaders are fit for the future, and wanted to use the findings from The Leading to Quality research undertaken in South West Yorkshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust as the basis of its design.

The ‘Fit for the Future’ project was launched in September 2013 and was formally concluded in terms of external support in July 2014. The programme was commissioned to provide space for leaders to reflect upon their leadership skills and behaviours, and the extent to which they are appropriate and effective in the new context of the NHS. The Trust sought to enhance key aspects of
the leadership culture within its organisation, including the ability to achieve more with fewer resources, accommodate to shifting population demands, increase its partnership working and inter-agency connectedness and enhance continual learning, innovate and improve, and a keener sense of commercial awareness.

**Intervention**

Participants on the programme were all leaders with line management responsibility from Agenda for Change Band 7 and above, up to and including Board level.

- The RDaSH Chief Executive, Chris Bain, and her Board participated in a development workshop to explore the leadership needs of the Trust going forward, and their role in creating the right culture.
- The Board workshop and the rest of the programme were designed to provide research evidence and practical business case reasons for adapting leadership styles from what might have been previously useful; guidance on how leadership needs to be in future; and reflective exercises and discussion. Participants were also provided with practical exercises, tools and techniques that can be used with their own teams after the workshops.
- Participants undertook a series of one and two-day models, on subjects including ‘Building a Shared Vision of Quality Services’, ‘Engaging Your Team in Change’ and ‘Inspiring Your Team and Promoting Your Service’.

**Outcomes**

Indications from the annual NHS Staff Survey already show that the organisation has significantly improved its ratings on a wide variety of measures. In addition, many participants have commented that they have applied and have noticed changes in leadership style, as well as witnessing its impact among colleagues.

Comment from RDaSH:

“...We found the programme stimulating, empowering and often very challenging and I am grateful to all colleagues who have engaged with me on this journey – the benefits from the experience will hopefully enhance the offer we make to our service users and their families, and enable us to improve further the experience of our workforce.”

- Christine Bain, Chief Executive
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Fostering a Continuous Learning Culture in the NHS: The Role of Leadership
Michal Tombs-Katz

Introduction
The Berwick review\(^1\) highlights that *The most important single change in the NHS would be for it to become, more than ever before, a system devoted to continual learning and improvement of patient care, top to bottom and end to end* (p.5). The key theme that emerges from the recommendations made in Berwick’s report is that leaders in the NHS are responsible for embracing and implementing a culture of continuous learning, at scale. This, it claims, will be a vehicle for continuous improvement in quality and safety. This chapter looks at the challenges the NHS is facing in terms of continuous learning, and offers some solutions from the field of Occupational Psychology for the NHS to use in the improvement of its current practices. The chapter is organised into three themes. These themes include thinking about continuous learning and the challenges facing the NHS, considering the impact of leadership and the organisational context on continuous learning, and facilitating a culture of continuous learning in the NHS to improve quality and patient safety.

Thinking about continuous learning and the challenges facing the NHS
The NHS in England has long recognised the importance of becoming a learning organisation\(^2\). Indeed, the work of Health Education England reflects well written strategic policies of continuous learning and improvement for the benefits of patient care. In 1998, the government’s quality strategy presented a blueprint for a new NHS, the aim of which was “to create a culture in the NHS which celebrates and encourages success and innovation . . . a culture which recognises . . . scope for acknowledging and learning from past mistakes”\(^3\). In response to this document, Davies and Nutley\(^2\) wrote a paper highlighting that building a learning organisation requires attention to some key cultural values including celebration of success, absence of complacency, tolerance of mistakes, belief in human potential, recognition of tacit knowledge, openness, trust, and being outward looking. However, the Francis\(^4\) and Berwick\(^1\) reports bring to light some major gaps in the implementation of these recommendations. A culture where ‘bad news become unwelcome and over time, silenced’, where ‘loud and urgent signals of poor quality and deterioration of care are muffled and explained away’ (p.8), is a culture that fails to embrace its strategy for continuous learning. A continuous learning culture is one where employees change their behaviour upon deepening and broadening of their skills, knowledge, and worldviews\(^5\). For this to occur the main challenge for leadership in the NHS is to address the barriers that inhibit motivation and volition and prevent workers from fully engaging in the learning process, particularly informal learning.
Considering the impact of leadership and the organisational context on continuous learning

The following three case studies, taken from different sectors of work, illustrate how the successful implementation of a learning culture extends beyond policies and strategies and rests on leadership, resources, and relationships that support the informal learning process. Each case study provides an explanation of the context, and concludes with some key practical implications for the NHS.

Case study A: Organisational factors that impact the informal learning process

It is often claimed that informal learning is more important than formal learning and that it comprises the majority of learning that occurs in the workplace. In contrast to formal learning, informal learning may be intentional or incidental, it is not highly structured, and is a volitional behaviour. Because of this, informal learning is complex and this case study illustrates factors associated with leadership and the work environment that act as barriers or enablers of learning:

- The philosophy of this organisation, a large manufacturing company in the US, encompasses a strong commitment to employee development. As with other companies experiencing the turbulence of the global marketplace, at the time of data collection the organisation was in the midst of implementing several changes.
- Ellinger was interested in finding out examples of ‘critical incidents’ that relate to positive and negative contextual factors for informal learning in this manufacturing company. She conducted in-depth interviews with employees and asked questions such as “What makes this an optimal environment for your informal learning?” and “what prevents this from being an optimal environment for your informal learning”?

Positive critical incidents

- The positive critical incidents provided by employees indicated that informal learning is more likely to occur in the presence of learning-committed leadership and management (i.e., when managers act as coaches or mentors and provide space for learning), when the internal culture is committed to learning (i.e., being seen to invest in good quality training and encouraging sharing of knowledge), when work tools and resources are available to support learning and development, and when people are encouraged and supported in the formation of webs of relationships for learning.

Negative critical incidents

- Not surprisingly, the negative critical incidents reported by employees typically referred to examples where the opposite was the case, that is, when leadership and management are unsupportive and disrespectful and do not value learning, and where they tend to micromanage and tell staff what to do. Negative accounts also highlighted an internal culture of entitlement, where the work tools and resources do not support learning and development (e.g., budget constraints), and where people disrupt webs of relationships for learning.
• In addition to these, negative critical incidents also included examples where the workplace design inhibits learning (i.e., working in silos), where there is lack of time because of job pressures and responsibilities, when there is too much change too fast, with no learning from other people’s learning.

Key implications for practice:

• The findings from this study emphasise the importance of learning-committed leadership and management in the process of informal learning and toward building a learning culture.
• The NHS can educate leaders about the conditions that trigger informal learning as well as the process of informal learning.
• Managers and leaders should be assisted with developing coaching and mentoring skills that may enable them play a more pivotal role in the process of informal learning. In particular, leaders must be equipped with the skills to become adept at providing feedback and helping employees assess, evaluate, and reflect on the outcomes of their informal learning activities are critical competencies.
• Developmental attention should be given to employees who may need to further build teaming and collaborative skills, so that collective learning can be shared in organisations.
• Providing a physical infrastructure and resources that stimulate informal learning are also important considerations. For example, creating workplace designs and open spaces and facilitating opportunities for employees to meet, work, and socialize is fundamental to building networks and communities of practice that foster conditions for informal learning.

Case Study B: The role of group and organizational perspectives for continuous learning (Mulholland et al., 2005)

Learning and the re-construction of ideas occur through observation, imitation, sharing, and reinforcement (i.e., Social Learning Theory, Bandura, 1962). This is key to the informal learning process, as it recognizes learning as being located within social relationships, such as networks or communities of practice. For organisations to learn and develop, they require the knowledge creation that occurs at a local level to travel beyond the boundaries of teams and communities. However, the extent to which this happens hinges on empowerment and effective communication. Teams and communities also need appropriate tools that they can use to communicate and share knowledge within and between teams and communities.

With the advancement of technology, more and more organisations are turning to electronic-based methods to support learning and development within teams. However, the effectiveness of such electronic methods hinges on certain conditions being recognised and met, including motivation and the availability of sufficient support and guidance. This case study illustrates how motivation and the usability of an electronic workbook can be leveraged through careful design and consultation with those who ultimately are expected to use it:

Situation
The organisation in Mulholland et al.’s study, a large engineering company in the UK, was using a paper-based workbook, the aim of which was to support reflection on work practices in order to foster team development.

The workbook was based on five company values and included a number of tools, activities, and metrics to guide the team planning process. The organisation believed that the workbook was in wide use and went on to develop and implement an electronic version.

Mulholland et al. found that although the strategic development and dissemination of the tool had succeeded in increasing awareness of the initiative, it was not incorporated into everyday practice. This led to a series of interviews with twelve teams in the organisation that resulted in the development of a scaled-down version of the e-workbook, incorporating only the aspects that were in widespread use and removing unwanted parts.

This scaled-down version was trialled, and despite the changes and improvements, the planning tool was not sustained by the teams. The main problem identified was that the scaled-down version failed to provide content that was specific to some teams.

**Intervention**

- Following the failure of the scaled-down workbook, a bottom-up approach was adopted that addressed the teams’ needs instead of trying to provide a management-led solution:
  - A customized planning tool was developed for each team, with the close co-operation of one individual from each team who was interested in the project.
  - Suggestions made by the teams were taken on board, as a result of which the tool ended up looking very different from the generic look and feel of the earlier workbook.
  - The new, customised planning tool was keenly utilised, and yet interestingly the plans constructed by the teams were remarkably similar. Thus, the modifications did not produce different content but were necessary for the motivation and acceptance required to facilitate continual learning.

**Key implications for practice:**

- High level strategies for continual learning initiatives and the use of learning tools such as e-workbooks can serve to set the wheels for learning in motion, but do not guarantee acceptance or constructive use.
- Local autonomy and customization at team or community of practice level are crucial to facilitate effective and continual learning. The team or community should be empowered to express its own way of doing things and to influence practice in the design of learning workbooks.
- Strategic initiatives need to be interfaced with local autonomy in order to sustain low- and high-level support. The strategic initiative has to be connected with work practices on the ground. Thus, when senior hospital management are developing a new learning initiative, they should develop the overall methodology, concepts and terminology but should provide support for teams and communities to interpret and customize these, so as to ensure they are accurately aligned with the practicalities of individual jobs.
Case Study C: How leaders stimulate employee learning

Understanding the leadership behaviours and mechanisms that are conducive to creating the right conditions for learning to occur is key to the question of ‘how to’ stimulate a continuous learning culture. Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX) is widely used by Occupational Psychologists, as it provides a description of the psychological processes that leaders can utilise to encourage and motivate employees’ engagement in learning activities, both formal and informal:

Based on social exchange and reciprocity principles, LMX theory explores how leaders and managers develop relationships with team members and explains how those relationships can either contribute to growth or hold people back. A high quality relationship is characterized by the member having high levels of responsibility, decision influence, and access to resources. In contrast, low quality LMX relationships are characterized by leaders that offer low levels of support to the member, with members having low levels of responsibility and decision influence. According to this theory, the quality of the leader-member exchange relationship is theorised to be related to work and attitudinal outcomes, including engagement in learning. On the basis of this theory, Bezuijen et al. proposed that high quality relationships create a feeling of obligation in members to reciprocate and employees in the High quality relationship group are likely to be more motivated to learn (i.e., set themselves learning goals) and engage more frequently in learning activities (formal and informal).

- Case study C is based on Bezuijen et al.’s study of seven organisations in the Netherlands, including health care, the police and social services.
- Bezuijen’s questionnaire findings provide evidence that leaders tend to set more difficult and more specific learning goals for high-LMX members than they do for low-LMX members. By setting such goals and providing more feedback to high-LMX members, leaders encourage high LMX employees to develop themselves and live up to their leader’s expectations.
- Bezuijen et al. found that High-LMX employees engaged in learning activities more frequently to show their loyalty and earn their leader’s trust.
- Compared to employees in low-LMX relationships, employees in high-LMX relationships appeared more eager to succeed with difficult learning goals by engaging in learning activities.

Key implications for practice

- This study reveals that leaders are inclined to treat employees differently, and that they are more active and more effective in motivating and encouraging participation in learning when they have trusting, respectful, and reciprocal exchange relationships with their members. All members of staff with line management responsibilities in the NHS should be made aware of this tendency, and try to stimulate all employees equally to engage in learning, regardless of the exchange relationship.
- Bezuijen et al. recommend that leaders should try to develop social bonds with more employees and learn about the development needs and expectations of low-LMX employees as well. Simply putting more effort into the relationship by having regular contact with
employees and showing an interest has also been shown to be effective for improving the quality of LMX relationships.

**Conclusion: Facilitating a culture of continuous learning in the NHS**

A continuous learning culture requires the establishment of important sets of behaviours and processes by leadership and management. What do leaders do when something fails, for example? How do they treat the people who deliver bad news? How well are decisions delegated to owners of the problem? These are critical questions which deal with a learning culture\(^{11}\). For a continuous learning culture to be developed, **leaders at all levels within the NHS** (clinical and non-clinical) need to take accountability of the issue at hand and accept that a continuous learning culture is not only a function of a top-down strategy and formal training. The NHS should focus on changing the work environment to one that that is based on fairness, empowerment and open communication, all of which are the bed rocks for a culture that motivates continuous learning.

Leaders and managers should be aware of and learn how to change their behaviour in order to influence the psychological processes that drive motivation and inspire employees to fully engage with the informal learning process. They should ask themselves:

- Are we able to demonstrate learning values to the people we manage?
- Do we provide feedback and help our workforce to assess, evaluate, and reflect on the outcomes of their informal learning activities?
- What do we do to build trust amongst the teams we manage / lead? Do we, and if so how, empower the people we manage and listen to them? Do we let them know that they were listened to?
- Do we treat the people we manage equally and fairly? Do we provide all team members with opportunities to learn? Do we show all members of our team that we are interested in their development?
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Introduction
In the wake of a series of hospital scandals, issues of governance and the capability and actions (or failure to act) of those in the NHS executive have been highlighted. As stressed in both the Berwick review and Francis report, the quality of leadership and governance at the top of NHS trusts has been shown to be essential to patient safety and performance, as well as to the conduct of these organisations and their staff. The topic of governance commands prominence and policy importance as a result of the high levels of change underway within the health sector, including the devolution of decision-making and the inclusion of new health care providers and commissioners. Boards are faced with the challenge of balancing the demands of multiple internal and external stakeholders. Improving governance and accountability are critical matters that those at the top have to address, whilst at the same time developing a coherent strategy and ensuring high trust performance. In this chapter, the governance and the executive within the NHS is considered in relation to psychological theory and research concerning corporate governance and boards. Key recommendations are made in three areas which are crucial to enhancing the effectiveness of NHS Trust boards. These include: effectively balancing compliance and performance functions; board composition and underrepresentation; and achieving transformation via changes in behavioural styles.

Improving Board Effectiveness: The Role of Occupational Psychology
Currently, psychology has no direct impact on developments and practices within corporate governance, which are instead primarily influenced by disciplines including accountancy, law, economics and management. Nevertheless, a content analysis of the UK Corporate Governance Code (Code) and Guidance on Board Effectiveness (Guidance) highlights many instances where psychological concepts and constructs have been incorporated. In the following discussion, we seek to show how Occupational Psychology underpins and offers key insights into improving board effectiveness, which have so far not been sufficiently heard or acknowledged.

The Role of Boards: Balancing compliance and performance
All management boards, particularly those in the healthcare sector, have two important roles to fulfill: conformance and performance. Each of these roles can be further divided into internal and external focuses (See Table 1). Conformance emphasises the achievement of short-term goals, externally through compliance with regulations and stakeholders (‘accountability), and internally
through the oversight and monitoring of standards (‘supervision’). The Department of Health requires boards to ensure the achievement of excellent standards of care quality and patient experience. The second focus on performance, involves a longer term perspective identifying and delivering the goals of the organisation. Externally, this involves the development of core values and long term plans (‘policy formulation’); and internally it involves the implementation and review of these plans (‘strategic thinking’).

Table 1: Board functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>Performance/ Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointing, overseeing and rewarding senior management</td>
<td>Agreeing strategic direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring finances and key performance indicators</td>
<td>Reviewing and deciding long-term plans, including resource allocation and investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring external accountabilities to regulators and stakeholders are met</td>
<td>Determining the organisation’s mission and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring compliance responsibilities (e.g. audits, inspections and reporting)</td>
<td>Deciding long-term goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing appropriate policies and systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During periods of ambiguity and change, however, clarity, guidance and support from the top is vital to keep staff engaged in patient-centred care, in order to avoid governance issues being reduced to mere box ticking. Similarly, myopic attention on performance can come at the expense of clinical care, quality and compliance, with this lack of oversight evident in the high profile examples highlighted in the Keogh Review. Despite the need for balance, a survey of 15 primary care boards in England and Wales showed a tendency towards focusing on financial and administrative related issues. This is not surprising given that Monitor recently reported that 26% of NHS Trusts were predicted to be in financial deficit for 2013-14. The challenge for boards is in striking an appropriate balance between conformance and performance, particularly as evidence demonstrates that boards attentive to both strategy and governance are more effective. Possible steps that can be taken to ensure this include:

- Ensuring that all board members undergo a selection, induction, training and development, and annual appraisal to understand their role and allow for further professional development;
• Boards should identify the impact of how they work on their degree of engagement, morale and wellbeing. This can be done via anonymous 360 ratings (e.g. B360™) or self-assessed evaluations (e.g. Board Self-Assessment Questionnaire);
• Ensure the board is aware of key compliance issues, including responsibilities, deadlines, and stakeholders involved;
• Devolve aspects of conformance functions to lower levels of management to allow for a greater focus on performance functions;
• When decision making and responsibility is delegated to lower levels of the organisation, ensure that the board retains adequate oversight to detect and attend to problems;
• Recognise the different forms of data and processes within healthcare, including their limitations and subsequent implications (e.g. mortality rates, self-assessed board evaluations)
• Assess yearly the purpose, values, vision and corporate culture and how it relates to the changing environment in the coming year;
• Encourage intelligent nativity, where members who lack understanding of a discussion topic are encouraged to query and clarify, which helps framing issues differently;
• Develop board diversity to encourage different thinking styles, backgrounds and experience;
• Evaluate the types of information presented to the board in terms of its relevance and quantity in order to prevent information overload.

**Board composition and diversity**

There has been growing research examining the impact of board composition and diversity on organisational performance\(^\text{15-16}\), including on boards within the healthcare setting\(^3\). For example, in one review of 19 English NHS Trusts’ board information, agendas, and minutes, Chambers\(^\text{17}\) et al. identified a number of key features present within ‘high performing trusts’. Specifically, board features including more female board members and more active non-executive directors were associated with better staff and patient experience, and higher financial and clinical performance. The lack of diversity within hospital boards, and the tendency for boards to appoint board members of similar background to themselves, are therefore issues which need to be addressed in order to implement NHS culture change.

The rationale behind diversifying boards lies with overcoming ‘groupthink’, a social psychology phenomenon characterised by a mode of thinking in cohesive groups, where the desire to reach unanimous agreement overrides the motivation to adopt proper rational decision-making procedures\(^\text{18-19}\). In addition, board diversity allows the boards to better understand their stakeholders and draw upon a wider talent pool\(^\text{20}\). It is worth noting that while the underlying logic for diversifying boards is applicable to all under-represented groups\(^5\), the majority of our understanding in this area is constrained to the underrepresentation of clinicians and women at board level, as well as the engagement of non-executive directors.

**Clinician representation**
Clinicians are still underrepresented on UK health boards\textsuperscript{21}. They bring medical expertise and credibility into the boardroom, help direct resources and foster communication between management and medical staff\textsuperscript{22-23}. It is therefore not surprising that participation by clinicians at board level has been linked with improved financial performance\textsuperscript{24-25}, clinical performance\textsuperscript{26-27} and patient satisfaction\textsuperscript{21}, as well as reduced morbidity\textsuperscript{21,27}. The Francis Report\textsuperscript{1} stressed the fact that there is a detrimental impact when this profession has neither a voice at the board level nor are they able to make their concerns heard by the leadership. Significantly, for clinicians this can precipitate a more general disengagement by junior medics, with concerns even involving standards of patient care left unpursued. Interestingly, the same benefits were not found for directors from other clinical domains, including nurses or other allied health professions\textsuperscript{21}.

Female representation

In contrast to clinicians, the underrepresentation of women at boards is not unique to the healthcare sector, and remains an issue in both the public and private sectors. Both the glass ceiling\textsuperscript{1} and the glass cliff\textsuperscript{ii} are concepts within the psychological literature that explain the lack of women in senior leadership positions\textsuperscript{28}. Within the health context, female directors have been found to enhance hospital clinical and financial performance\textsuperscript{2,29}. In other sectors, women executives are typically more conscientious in their preparations, more devoted to issues of monitoring and governance, more benevolent than their male counterparts, and ask more challenging questions\textsuperscript{30-31} 32. The attraction of women candidates to board roles, however, can be problematic as their life and career trajectories differ such that neither potential candidates nor headhunters may recognise the transferability and value of their skills\textsuperscript{33}.

Non-executive director representation

A final important group for effective boards are non-executive directors, who should make up half of NHS Boards and be drawn from the public, private and third sector\textsuperscript{2,34}. Evidence highlights the value that diversity in experience, expertise and background non-executives bring\textsuperscript{2,35}. Specifically, non-executives are pivotal in raising the attention and knowledge about governance; they can refocus CEOs attention onto compliance, and boards with a governance focus are shown to perform better\textsuperscript{3}. However, the challenge can lie in non-executive directors engaging and understanding hospital operations, particularly as many typically have commitments elsewhere\textsuperscript{36}. The Francis Report\textsuperscript{1} singled out the detrimental impact to Mid-Staffordshire NHS Trust of non-executives who remained aloof from operational concerns, even where they constituted a potential risk to patient safety. Thus, all of this further underlines the importance this group has in developing more effective healthcare boards.

Interventions to encourage board diversity

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1}The glass ceiling refers to women's lack of advancement into leadership positions despite no visible barrier \textsuperscript{ii}The glass cliff explains that woman are typically appointed to precarious senior leadership positions where failure is often inevitable}
There is a growing emphasis on the importance of ensuring these key groups are represented and engaged at board level, bringing both the appropriate skills and a demonstrable commitment to NHS values. Measures that can be taken to do so include:

- Developing a target and strategy for improving the diversity of the Trust Board, and make this information public;
- Utilising an open and transparent selection process where equality and diversity are important themes throughout the recruitment process, and not restricted to one or two interview questions;
- Periodically advertising non-executive board positions to reduce the reliance on recruitment through personal contacts and friendships;
- Emphasising competencies and skills of candidates instead of previous experience;
- Establishing a standard requirement for board composition which includes clinical representation on each board;
- Effectively managing the time commitments and responsibilities of non-executive directors, and providing additional time and support for newly appointed non-executive directors to learn about the organisation, its people and its context;
- Conducting, and making public, regular skill audits of board members to ensure an effective balance of knowledge, skills, expertise, and backgrounds.

**Achieving transformation through changes in behavioural style**

Boards have it within their power to transform organisations simply by the way they behave with each other and with other stakeholders. Psychology theories, such as Upper Echelons Theory, explain that those at the top of any organisation have a critical role to play in developing and maintaining a positive culture. Senior executives set the tone for the behaviour within the organisation, and are a key referent for enforcing policies. For example, bullying or overassertive behaviour by board members undermines board effectiveness and staff conduct policies, creating an environment for other staff to follow suit. Boards should therefore be made aware of the influential role they play in terms of behaviour modelling and the salience of their actions for observers further down the hierarchy.

Within the healthcare sector, research has found that cultures which emphasise openness, trust and patient care are linked with improved staff wellbeing and satisfaction, being more responsive to error detection, the breaking down of professional distinctions, and better hospital performance. Such cultures emphasise the sharing of knowledge, information and innovation, which are also important in helping reduce costs and achieving savings, lower waiting times, and produce greater throughput of day cases. Encouraging and dispersing decision-making throughout the organisation enhances discretion and autonomy through more participative decision making, and has been shown to facilitate trust. Similarly, trust and openness can be improved by engaging and acting with staff feedback and concerns. Indeed, studies have found an open climate for communication to be a key predictor of trust in senior management and subsequent positive attitudes towards the organisation, such as affective commitment.
By creating cultures of safety and ensuring realistic expectations, individuals whether patients or staff, will feel safe but also correct to raise legitimate concerns. This approach, coupled with demonstrations of their ethical behaviour, attracts followers’ attention and awareness, enhancing adherence towards ethical standards. The development of safety culture is essential in ensuring that compliance functions, described earlier in the chapter, are not restricted to checklists and paperwork. The board plays a pivotal role in sending out a message of how important patient care and clinical issues are to the organisation. The involvement of the board with clinical issues, especially the setting up of a board quality committee, has been associated with lower mortality and better quality of care. Despite this, a review of the board agenda items of 60 trusts revealed that only 14% of agenda items related to clinical issue and patient care. Furthermore, how and when clinical items are presented in agendas matter. When items are presented as information, rather than for discussion, or when clinical items are scheduled for the end of board meetings, discussions tend to be shorter and lacking in depth.

The board’s role in developing a healthy organisational culture should be part of a wider organisational intervention (See Chapter X on organisational culture). However, there are a number of actions boards should take as part of this process, including:

- Being aware of appropriate leadership behaviours and modelling these in their interactions with each other, hospital staff, patients and their families, and other stakeholders;
- Treating all board members respectfully, with zero tolerance of bullying or ‘over-assertive’ behaviour;
- Recognising the importance of staff and patient surveys as a mechanism for gathering insight on these stakeholder groups’ concerns;
- Holding open board meetings and publicising board level discussions and decisions;
- Ethical conduct can be increased by training. However, simple behaviours, including talking openly about dilemmas, and acting in an ethical fashion, can influence the performance of others, potentially raising the quality of the care and service patients receive;
- These actions taken are mere gestures unless they are also accompanied by leaders that are genuinely available and willing to listen, and to address concerns. Part of this communication includes transparency and the re-calibrating of expectations where certain services or quality of service cannot be offered to service users;
- Committing to clinical care by setting aside a fixed proportion of time, early on in board meetings to discuss clinical issues;
- Speaking to patients, their families, and staff, who have been involved in a serious harm incident;
- Developing a framework for the information required to assess clinical quality and maintain patient safety.

**Conclusion**

One caveat to consider is that while suggestions are made to help enhance board effectiveness, there are no golden rules or ‘right’ structure. Instead, the suitability and effectiveness of these suggestions need to be evaluated in relation to the context in which the board and Trust is set. In
addition, effective board governance is a complex and dynamic procedure, and it is beyond the scope of this chapter to consider all aspects of it. However, in summary, through the more effective directing of recruitment and selection, and attention towards how those at the top behave, the transformation required among NHS hospital cultures can be greatly enhanced so as to ensure they achieve more inclusive, safe and high quality patient care.
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Introduction

“For a common culture to be shared throughout the system, these ... characteristics are required: Openness: enabling concerns to be raised and disclosed freely without fear, and for questions to be answered; Transparency: allowing true information about performance and outcomes to be shared with staff, patients and the public.... This requires all organisations and those working in them to be honest, open and truthful in all their dealings with patients and the public.”

Building cultures of transparency and openness (CTO) has now been widely recognised as essential in order to increase the level of patient safety in the NHS. It requires us as a society to stop blaming those that are working diligently within the health system and start making NHS workplaces more effective and more compassionate towards their staff. Creating these essential conditions is a complex requirement in the NHS context, due to both the psychological factors that inhibit CTO and the range and type of NHS organisations included within the system. Each of these organisations have generated their own distinct cultural habits, developed in response to the policy context within which the NHS operates.

The following chapter explores the psychological factors which need to be managed effectively across the health system to enable transparency and openness. Effective intervention needs to be grounded in the specific context of the NHS, requiring the resources for support rather than being designed and imposed from a distance.

What do the terms Transparency and Openness mean?

As an organisational psychologist supporting culture change with senior leaders in large complex organisations, the author’s starting point when intervening is to generate clarity to enable shared understanding, clear dialogue and the identification of the practices that are most relevant to

---

iii In the NHS (2013 figures) there were 211 commissioning groups, 160 acute trusts, 56 mental health trusts, 10 ambulance trusts, 34 community providers, 2,300 hospitals and 7,960 GP practices
support the change in habit required\textsuperscript{4,5}. In this context the ‘client input’ from the Francis report\textsuperscript{1} and NHS staff survey\textsuperscript{6} have been used to generate the following potential definitions:

1. **Openness** is a characteristic of working relationships within an organisation that enables people to notice and act on errors to enable improvement and learning from experience. This is dependent upon the extent to which the psychological environment is safe\textsuperscript{7}.

2. **Transparency** requires visibility of information and ‘inferability’ – the ability to draw accurate inferences from that information\textsuperscript{8} which is manifested through the delivery of processed outputs (reports) at the organization level. It is dependent on a system that has the characteristic of openness in working relationships defined above\textsuperscript{10}.

**How can openness be achieved?**

Broadly, the psychological literature indicates that openness will be enabled through:

- The compassionate moderation\textsuperscript{11} of counter-productive group processes that cause bias, silo thinking, groupthink, compliance, hostility, discrimination, apathy, learned helplessness and fear in the workplace\textsuperscript{10,12}.
- The design of grounded interventions that are highly supportive, low in hassle and have meaning for those impacted\textsuperscript{9}.
- The presence of active and accessible role models, ideally from those with authority in the system\textsuperscript{13-15}.
- The deployment of double loop responses to staff feedback, whereby feedback is used productively, its impact is shared and then evaluated so that the work of improvement becomes habitual; known as organisational learning\textsuperscript{16}.

**How can transparency be achieved?**

Transparency is based on the practices outlined above, and requires:

- Intelligent and open signal detection; the ‘passive’ awareness of what is going on\textsuperscript{17}.
- Evidence based practice; the ‘active’ collection of information held throughout the organization\textsuperscript{18}.
- Diagnostic approaches to evidence that infer system patterns rather than deploying simple measures that lead to unintended consequences\textsuperscript{2,9,19}.
- Behavioural strategies within governance practices, ensuring report integrity by managing bias and groupthink\textsuperscript{20}.
The challenge in the NHS

As has been noted, the extent to which a CTO can be built and sustained is directly linked to the degree of psychological safety in any system\(^7\)\(^,\)\(^10\). Predictors of low psychological safety are deficiencies in work design, role ambiguity, high demands, deficiencies in leadership behaviour and evidence of tolerance for bullying\(^21\)\(^-\)\(^22\). In addition, a history of ‘organisational trauma’ described as survivor syndrome is predictive of low safety\(^23\). Re-structuring and redundancy provide significant examples of factors that can create survivor syndrome, and the NHS was impacted by both of these in 2013\(^8\).

The above experiences generate perceptions that the organisation is dangerous, unfair and set in its ways. In such working contexts, people will ‘keep their heads down’, ‘keep their mouths shut’ and ‘turn a blind eye’.

At the current time, there appears to be a belief that openness and transparency will be supported by the encouragement of whistleblowing in healthcare. However, public whistleblowing can carry serious negative concerns for individuals and organisations that suggest this is not necessarily the most helpful approach to invest in. From other sectors of work, the evidence of physical retaliation, dismissal and bullying against whistleblowers makes for very troubling reading. For example, 22% of whistleblowers report physical and violent retaliation, 75% have a move to dismiss made against them and nearly all report bullying after raising a concern\(^45\)\(^-\)\(^47\). More significantly however, is the substantial research evidence showing that, over the long term, such disclosures also have a serious detrimental impact on overall organisational effectiveness\(^24\)\(^-\)\(^25\).

To build a CTO in the NHS and repair healthcare cultures that are currently ‘silent’\(^26\), we must build psychologically safe work environments for the 1.03 million staff in the NHS\(^27\). This includes all staff; those providing direct day-to-day care for patients, their managers and senior managers, and the clinical leaders and commissioners of services. Such comments are in reality ‘easy to say, hard to do’ especially given two starkly contrasting features of the NHS context:

1. The psychological environment that we expect our NHS staff to work within is not safe. Over a quarter of NHS staff report physical and psychological violence from patients and the same levels of psychological violence from other NHS staff members. The figures equate to 300,000 of NHS staff being bullied or hurt by patients or managers every year. A further 72% do not believe that anything would be done if they spoke up about their concerns. Of these, 14% believe they would be punished for speaking.\(^6\)

2. This complex NHS system works 24/7 and delivers exceptional levels of service to our society. 1 million people are seen every 36 hours with as astounding 81% of patients giving a very positive (always) response to the question “are you treated with dignity and respect?” \(^8\)

These headline figures indicate a substantial ‘compassion gap’, whereby greater compassion is often shown to patients than is shown to NHS staff. To disengage and withdraw commitment and compassion in unsafe environments is a deeply rational response. It is self-protective of individual psychological wellbeing. It is now substantially evidenced that work environments characterised by low levels of fairness, and psychological safety is a serious risk factor for depression\(^29\). The current estimate is that mental ill health costs the UK economy £105 billion per annum and that
dysfunctional workplaces, such as that indicated by the NHS staff survey results, are a growing cause of this social problem.

**Diagnosing and intervening to improve psychological safety**

Based on the author’s own professional practice, the following model outlines those diagnostic clusters that can help frame insight into the causes of poor practice and ensure interventions are designed so as to improve psychological safety:

![Model Diagram](image)


In summary, these dimensions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description and Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning making</strong></td>
<td>refers to our need to make meaning out of the experiences in our lives. We read meaning into what is done, and specifically into the gap between espoused and actual behaviour. Studies of political skill point to this capacity to work with meaning making in organisations as a distinct and teachable capability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belonging</strong></td>
<td>refers to the experience of being social animals that depend deeply on others for the lives we lead. A sense of shared group identity is essential for commitment to work projects. The work of constantly reinforcing such social identity is a critical requirement from leaders, explicitly ensuring their decisions affirm distinct social identities shared by employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution</strong></td>
<td>is also a significant human drive and central to any consideration of the workplace. It is focused on the critical relationship human beings have with the work that they do. This is described as intrinsic motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is not possible to offer a full account of this model in this short summary, but this diagnostic approach has been applied to the issues raised in the Francis report to generate options for intervention in the NHS.

Ways to think about intervening

- **Role model the behaviour required at regulatory level**: Develop ‘intelligent customer’ approaches from commissioners and regulators, using the growing knowledge about organisational capabilities and routines that increase resilience in a system. Regulatory bodies can then work as effective stewards of NHS culture change rather than as scrutineers. Such stewardship requires inquiry skills, cross-cultural capability, political skill, requisite variety in team structures, and diagnostic approaches to evidence. Once social norms have become established, as they have been across the NHS, only intelligent, long-term and subtle intervention will generate change to this very stable perceptual framework.

- The consistency, frequency and visibility of contradictory data needs to be high, constantly reinforced and sustained over an extended period in order to overcome the impact of ‘confirmatory bias’ whereby people only see evidence that confirms what they already believe.

- Positive managerial behaviour must be exercised as a critical requirement of transparent and open cultures; with managers being clear with staff about what is realistic, the constraints in the system and being actively interested in the wellbeing of staff. As emphasised by other chapters within this report, managers must role-model compassion so that employees more easily supported to act compassionately and report concerns.

- Staff engagement processes should be developed that explicitly listen. For listening to be ‘evidenced’ to staff two steps are required that loop together. Firstly, listening should be actively expressed through such means as surveys, organisational development sessions or via ‘yammer’ type social media. Secondly, staff should be able to see the consequence in action, such as through action planning sessions, choice of what to track, and regular feedback from what they have shared and has been played back to them. Most such attempts are currently only partial and, hence dysfunctional. Full double loop approaches are essential for organisational learning and to prevent pluralistic ignorance.

- Ensuring there is time to talk: Making space for talking enables peer-to-peer compassion and support, and heightens staff ability to reflect upon and improve their work approaches and learn from errors, thereby increasing organisational resilience. In contrast, the current level of staff overload in the NHS often means that only the immediate work priority gets attention.

- It should be made safe to speak within the system about areas of concern through a confidential disclosure mechanism, and which gives confidence that action will be taken. This needs to be linked with the design of approaches for intervening with compassion in situations where individual or group behaviour is inconsistent with transparency and openness, ensuring appropriate sanction for the behaviour and dignity for the perpetrator hence removing the need to rely on external approaches to whistleblowing.
• Deployment of ‘free radicals’ or brokers across the organisation to model listening to all groups: These brokers should be focused on interpreting and translating meaning across all levels and disciplines within the NHS, a role that has been conceptualised as equivalent to that of the court jester, who served an integral role in keeping the ‘king safe’ through giving the truth a safe place. Such a role could take the form of mentor sessions between CEOs and service users in the NHS, an internal organisational development consultant working across professional groups, or an external provider of group facilitation services.

• Build NHS-relevant behavioural strategies for managing groupthink at leadership group level: As explored by Searle et al.’s chapter in this report, the introduction of diversity in decision-making groups can disrupt the tendency to groupthink. Since groups do not usually voluntarily invite this disruption, organisations need to have routines that make this the social norm.

• The development of inquiry skills has been identified as a core organisational capability to prevent the confirmatory bias that leads to ‘system blindness’. The introduction of cross-discipline peer review sessions in the NHS is an example of an approach that can increase open inquiry skills, as different ways of seeing are brought to bear on a situation. The literature on network structures, in this case the effectiveness of ‘brokering’ role in the functioning of multi-disciplinary teams in the health care context also points to the positive impact of enabling loose boundaries around groups for overall system effectiveness.

• Put in place deliberate peer review processes or episodic team working. There are several approaches, these can be within discipline but across organisational groups or cross discipline, designed to deliberate inviting cross group boundary review – implemented with capability development in coaching and reflection skills.
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Introduction

This chapter addresses high level practical issues involved in changing NHS culture to align better with the requirements of the Berwick and Francis reports. It is written from an occupational psychology perspective – a profession which can provide insights about organisation culture, and practical ideas and actions for shaping and changing organisation culture.

Changing culture is the organisational equivalent of a heart transplant for an individual. As with a heart transplant, there are no processes that guarantee successful culture change. Occupational psychology, however, provides powerful ideas, principles and practices for changing culture.

The sections that follow explore (1) What we mean by organisational culture, (2) The culture change recommendations proposed by the Berwick and Francis reports. (3) Outlines of some relevant culture change case studies, and (4) Critical issues that need to be taken into account when leading culture change.

What we mean by organisation culture

Organisation culture is frequently described as “the way we do things round here”. A more robust academic definition from a leading guru on culture, Edgar Schein, is that “Culture is the learned, shared and tacit assumptions on which people base their daily behaviour”. This definition implies that people may or may not be aware of the organisation culture they work in, but whether or not they do, culture is about employee beliefs that drive actions and behaviour in the workplace.

An effective way of illustrating culture is to reflect on our reactions and feelings when we come into contact with different organisations that provide the same service, for example, different coffee shops or different train companies. One of the main reasons why going on a Virgin Train is different from going on a First Great Western train is because the two companies have different cultures. Exactly the same applies to patients’ experiences of different hospitals.

The culture of an organisation is manifested in many different ways: the physical environment (EasyJet: Orange), the values the organization claims it upholds (Tesco: ‘every little bit helps’) or the founders’ beliefs (Steve Jobs’ obsession with usability and detail at Apple). Organisation culture is also to be found in the stories people tell, the symbols they use, the rituals and routines people follow, and in the way power is exercised.

Culture is important because it is one of the main drivers of actions and behaviour at work, including behaviour with service users. In hospitals, as has been recognised within the Francis report and Berwick review, culture is one of the key drivers of patient care and safety.
Culture change recommendations made by the Francis report and Berwick review

Key recommendations for changes in NHS culture have been put forth by the Francis report and Berwick review, some of which are summarised below, and which are explored in greater depth within the subsequent chapters of this report:

1. **Openness, Transparency and Candour**

Perhaps the most important culture change requirement is for greater openness, transparency and candour, so that individual employees and patients can freely raise concerns without fear in the knowledge that these will be discussed and addressed. It also means that data about patient care quality and safety will be shared openly with all relevant parties, including when a patient may have been harmed.

2. **Leaders should focus to a greater extent on patient care quality**

An overall shift is recommended in leader behaviours which gives more priority to patient care and safety. Leaders need to focus more of their energies on supporting their teams’ patient care efforts, inquiring about and reporting on these, and investing in and improving patient care. Patient Care lies at the heart of NHS values and culture, and it should be a core part of every leader’s role to actively advocate these.

3. **Encourage personal responsibility rather than blame**

Errors occur in all human activity, and despite these it is important to appreciate the good intentions of staff, and their desire to provide high levels of patient care. Individuals should be encouraged and recognised for taking responsibility for their work, rather than blamed whenever they make a mistake. Errors should not be automatically punished and treated as misconduct, but as opportunities for learning and improvement.

4. **Create a learning organisation culture**

One way of improving patient care is through embracing an ethic of curiosity and learning. This will involve a culture which facilitates individuals to learn about new methods which improve patient care and safety, as well as learning from individuals’ own and their colleagues’ practical experience in caring for patients.

5. **Facilitate Process Improvement**

This concerns the creation of an ethos to improve both the design and implementation of organisation processes. This includes complaints procedures, and a single regulatory system which clarifies expectations and detects failure. A need has also been identified regarding the way quantitative targets should be used as a means towards the end of improved patient care, rather than becoming an end in themselves.

The extent to which any healthcare organisation may need to change to implement each of the above recommendations will vary. Some units may already achieve an excellent standard against all five culture areas, many may have strengths in some and have gaps in one or two.

A critical challenge when implementing these recommendations is to adopt a systematic method of evaluating how well an individual patient service organisation currently performs against these five
culture recommendations, and use this to prioritise where change is most needed. Adopting a blanket approach to culture change by insisting all patient service organisations take action against all five culture recommendations would be a recipe for failure.

**Some key culture change case studies:**

This section provides three case studies that provide lessons on how the NHS, in a broad sense, might begin to implement the key recommendations for culture change as suggested by the Francis report and Berwick review. These case studies are not presented as the best or the most relevant, but simply as good examples from which the NHS can take inspiration when implementing culture change.

**Case Study A: Kingston General Hospital, Ontario – Patient Focus Changes**

Underperformance across a number of areas, including high infection rates and poor financial performance, prompted leaders of the hospital to ask “What would be different if our patients ran our hospital?” A number of actions were taken with the aim of answering this question, including:

- The creation of a ‘Patient Advisory Council’ made up of patients who had had difficult experiences. Following this, some 50 patient advisors were set up, whose role was to work with staff representatives to co-design the health service experience.
- Outcomes: A number of changes were made to the hospital’s working practices, and four years after the intervention, infection rates had reduced and the hospital was in a position to balance its books for the first time in 16 years.

**Case Study B: Arup – Developing a More Client Focused Engineering Service**

Following a major client’s concerns, the author was invited to lead a team delivering a series of interventions to one engineering team of 400+, which over five years contributed in part to the largest UK infrastructure project being delivered on time and budget in 2012:

- The core of the project involved annual in depth client surveys, which identified client satisfaction levels and more importantly their priorities for an engineering consultancy, with detailed information about where Arup’s service levels achieved and fell short of these priorities.
- A series of interventions were undertaken to raise performance to fully achieve client requirements, including defining the behaviours required from employees, leadership development, individual coaching and use of the psychological contract and client service workshops.

**Case Study C: Patient Centred Care Project – Guys & St Thomas Hospital**

The goal of this project, which was independently evaluated by the King’s Fund, was to improve the experience and quality of patient care for treatment of breast and lung cancer:
Following the collection of patient and staff views about the service, Staff Patient Co-Design Groups were formed to jointly address the problems identified.

Solutions implemented included redesign of the day surgery unit to become more patient focused, and more open team working and communications across departments and clinicians at different grades.

Feedback from patients indicates that the project has brought about important and noticeable improvements in the quality of patient care.

Critical issues to take into account when leading culture change

This section presents some important issues, based on experience and applied occupational psychology theory, that need to be taken into account when planning and implementing an organisation culture change programme.

- **Create Evidence Based Goals for Culture Change.** Starting culture change is like any other organisation change, such as investing in new technology or creating new buildings; goals and targets need to be created at the outset. In the case of culture, this should entail the collection of robust data about the present culture and its strengths and weaknesses, using this to prioritise change. The evidence can be obtained from patient and employee feedback, as well as from hard performance indicators, for example readmission rates, infections, legal cases for negligence, etc.

- **Gain Top Management Commitment to Culture Change.** Whilst culture change can be implemented at the top or bottom of the organisation it is essential to gain top management commitment to whatever approach is adopted. Culture change will require scarce resources – which people at the top control. Successful culture change interventions are almost always aligned to other organisational priorities, i.e. the strategic goals of the organisation, which are decided at the top. The third reason for top management commitment is that they act as role models to others in the organization. If they do not demonstrate that commitment others cannot be expected to do so.

- **Make a Robust Business Case for Culture Change.** At different implementation stages, people will question the need for culture change, and whether it is justified and / or cost effective. It is essential to have a clear rationale for culture change that has been fully documented and cost-justified. In the same way that investment in new operating theatres or a new building will need to be justified, so also there needs to be a full justification and business case for culture change. The business must include a financial case for culture change, including the anticipated costs and expected financial benefits.

- **It must be Remembered that Most People Tend to Resist Change:** However enthusiastic the initial proponents of culture change may be, one of the facts of organisational life is that most people, initially at least, resist change. It is therefore essential that culture change interventions not only repeatedly communicate the reasons for the organization culture change, but also answer the all-important unspoken employee question “What’s in it for me?”

- **Culture Change is a Journey best led by a Small Team of Employee Representatives:** Culture change never occurs through a single transaction or intervention. Whichever methods are adopted, culture change needs to be seen as a journey lasting at least two
This journey, however carefully planned, may encounter unexpected obstacles and roadblocks – from groups of staff who offer unexpected resistance through to unexpected crises which distract attention from the culture change effort. To sustain the journey, culture change needs to be led by a small team of up to 12 which includes representatives from across the organization, perhaps with patients as well as culture change experts.

- **Culture Change, like any innovation, will face the unexpected**: Innovation in any area of life involves experimentation, trial and error, and overcoming unexpected barriers. The culture change team need to be prepared for this, and if they feel challenged need to admit they face barriers and should be prepared to ask for help from others in the organisation. This is not an admission of failure – but an admission that no one has all the answers. There is a possibility that the culture change may fail, and if it does the organisation needs to learn from this, and either adopt different approaches or give up.

Steps to take to assess this -
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