

Title: Factors influencing team behaviors in surgery: A qualitative study to inform teamwork interventions

Short title: Factors influencing surgical teamwork

Authors:

Emma-Louise Aveling, PhD^{1,2}, Juliana Stone, MS², Thoralf Sundt, MD⁴, Cameron Wright, MD⁴,
Francesca Gino, PhD⁵, Sara Singer, PhD^{2,4}

¹*Cambridge Centre for Health Services Research, University of Cambridge, UK*

²*Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA*

⁴*Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA*

⁵*Harvard Business School, Boston, MA*

Corresponding author: Sara Singer, Harvard Chan School, 677 Huntington Ave, Boston MA
02115. ssinger@hsph.harvard.edu, 617-432-7139.

Keywords: teamwork; non-technical skills; context; qualitative

Word count: 4500

Abstract

Background: Surgical excellence demands teamwork. Poor team behaviors negatively affect team performance and are associated with adverse events and worse outcomes. Interventions to improve surgical teamwork focusing on frontline team members' nontechnical skills have proliferated but shown mixed results. Literature on teamwork in organizations suggests that team behaviors are also contingent on psycho-social, cultural and organizational factors. This study examines factors influencing surgical team behaviors in order to inform more contextually sensitive and effective approaches to optimizing surgical teamwork.

Methods: Qualitative study of cardiac surgical teams in a large US teaching hospital included 34 semi-structured interviews. Thematic network analysis was used to examine perceptions of ideal teamwork and factors influencing team behaviors in the OR.

Results: Perceptions of ideal teamwork were largely shared, but team members held discrepant views of which team and leadership behaviors enhanced or undermined teamwork. Other factors impacting team behaviors related to: local organizational culture, including management of staff behavior; variable case demands and team members' technical competence; fitness of organizational structures and processes to support teamwork. These factors affected perceptions of what constituted optimal interpersonal and team behaviors in the OR.

Conclusions: Team behaviors are contextually contingent and organizationally determined, and beliefs about optimal behaviors are not necessarily shared. Interventions to optimize surgical teamwork requires establishing consensus regarding best practice, ability to adapt as circumstances require, and organizational commitment to addressing contextual factors that impact teams.

INTRODUCTION

Promoting effective team behaviors is a principle of safe care. Evidence suggests that preventable errors in surgery today more often relate to nontechnical than to technical failures.[1] Nontechnical skills, “cognitive and social skills, not directly related to surgeons' clinical knowledge, dexterity and use of equipment, which underpin technical performance”, include interpersonal team behaviors like clear and open communication, task management, and information sharing.[2] Poor team behaviors are associated with adverse events (e.g., wrong site procedures) and worse outcomes for patients.[3]

Interventions to improve surgical teamwork, including nontechnical skills/team training, checklists, simulation, and structured communication protocols, have proliferated. Such interventions have shown mixed success, however, suggesting different or complementary approaches are needed.[2,4] Existing surgical teamwork interventions target frontline team members' nontechnical skills directly. Yet literature on teamwork suggests that team behaviors also depend on psycho-social, cultural and organizational factors[5,6] which have received scant attention in designing interventions. Understanding such contextual influences may enhance the impact of training on team performance.[7]

Teamwork is contingent on members sharing common ‘mental models’ of ideal teamwork and the behaviors required to achieve it.[8] Mental models represent an individual's understanding of team objectives, tasks and member roles and relationships, and are shaped by the knowledge, norms and beliefs acquired as individuals train and work in particular professional and institutional contexts. They guide team members' own behaviors and their interpretations of others' behavior. Mismatches in mental models thus risk misunderstandings and coordination breakdown.[9] Yet given the influence of organizational and professional contexts on their development, diverse conceptualizations of appropriate team leadership,[10] teamwork, and teamwork quality are unsurprising.[11]

Teamwork is also contingent on how conducive the context is to *enacting* different models of teamwork. In addition to a case's technical demands, local culture may constrain or enable different behaviors. For instance, engrained hierarchical dynamics can stifle non-surgeon team members' ability to speak out and lead.[12] Organizational policies and processes, e.g., handover practices, can also impact staff behaviors and their capacity to provide safe care.[5]

Thus, while team training to improve non-technical skills is valuable, psycho-social, cultural and organizational factors shape mental models of teamwork and influence the opportunities, likelihood and ease with which team members are able to put this training into practice. Better understanding of the factors that promote or undermine developing a shared mental model and that make the context more or less conducive to putting 'ideal' behaviors into practice, may offer complementary targets for intervention.

The aims of this study were to (1) investigate surgical team members' mental models of ideal teamwork and (2) identify contextual factors shaping those mental models and ability to put teamwork ideals into practice. We focused on cardiac surgery, a high risk and high consequence environment where preventable adverse event rates have been estimated to be high[13] and where the technological complexity and degree of technical specialization likely amplifies the importance of nontechnical teamwork behaviors for ensuring optimal coordination and integration. Through in-depth, qualitative study of cardiac surgical teams in a large US teaching hospital, we sought to identify factors underpinning teamwork with the aim of informing the design of more effective, contextually-sensitive interventions to enhance team performance.

METHODS

We conducted semi-structured interviews in a mixed-methods study of leadership and team dynamics in cardiac surgery ORs.[14] The setting was a cardiac surgery division in an Academic Medical Center performing over 1,000 cardiopulmonary bypass cases annually in which mortality and morbidity consistently meet or exceed national benchmarks

(<http://www.sts.org/national-database>) but prior survey data suggested room for improvement in team dynamics, such as psychological safety and burnout.[14]

Through purposive and snowball sampling, we conducted 34 interviews with representatives of all disciplines (surgeons, surgical trainees, scrub, circulating and anesthesia nurses, anesthesiologists, perfusionists and physician assistants) (Table-1). This included all but one attending surgeons, who spanned the full range of academic rank and years of clinical experience. Most had trained in the index institution. Interviews lasting 15- 60 minutes covered views on ideal team dynamics, teamwork experiences and factors that affected team behaviors, and were recorded and transcribed. For the larger study we observed 58 cases; since interviews were conducted by the same researchers (authors 1,2,6), observation data informed probing questions.

Interview data were analyzed using thematic network analysis,[15] supported by Nvivo software. Thematic networks converged around (1) mental models of teamwork; (2) factors influencing team behaviors. For each main theme, we iteratively derived and refined sub-themes and applied this coding framework across transcripts. Theme identification combined deductive and inductive coding, informed by sensitizing concepts[16] derived from existing literature and insights from observations of teamwork in practice.

Supplement-1 provides further methodological details.

RESULTS

1. Mental models of ideal teamwork

Participants held largely shared perceptions of ideal teamwork characterized by flow, competence and appropriate leadership, but views on which interpersonal behaviors best supported these characteristics were conflicting (Supplement-2).

Flow

Across roles, descriptions of ideal teamwork included images such as a “well-oiled machine” and being “on the same page” such that the work “just flows.” Descriptions of bad teamwork emphasized disruption and fracture. Participants expected team members to stay focused and engaged, even when not directly involved in the action. Team members exemplified engagement by anticipating others’ needs, suggesting implicit coordination was particularly valued.

Competence

All roles valued technical and relational competence reliant on both generic skills and local knowledge. Technical competence included: adequate case preparation, i.e., familiarity with technical and clinical details of the procedure and patient; task-related knowledge enabling team members to perform clinical tasks associated with their role; and architectural knowledge about how different team roles and tasks fit together. [6] Such tacit, situated knowledge — central to the implicit coordination of ideal teamwork — required working with particular team members in particular ORs and familiarizing oneself with idiosyncratic jargon, organizational processes and surgeon preferences. Relational competence included interpersonal behaviors such as: sharing appropriate information with the right people, at the right time, audibly and clearly; appropriate communication style and tone; inviting and responding constructively to others’ contributions; and acknowledging mistakes to enable learning.

Surgeon-directed leadership

Although participants argued that all team members should be valued, many pointed to the need for a ‘director’ to ‘take charge’ when needed to coordinate group activity. Participants felt surgeons should usually serve this role, although others (e.g., anesthesiologists) may also do so.

Conflicting views of appropriate behaviors

While participants broadly agreed on how ideal teamwork looked and felt, views differed regarding which interpersonal behaviors supported flow, relational competence and appropriate surgeon-directed leadership.

Surgeons and non-surgeons disagreed whether needing a 'director' meant the surgeon should *always* have more decision-making authority than others. This disagreement reflected perceived differences in responsibility felt for the patient's life. Some surgeons felt they carried greater responsibility than other team members and that this was not sufficiently recognized by other disciplines. Our data indicate, by contrast, that non-surgeons *did* recognize the "heavy load" (13, nurse) surgeons carried, and that this did not diminish non-surgeons' own sense of responsibility.

Perspectives differed regarding the extent to which this 'heavy load' afforded surgeons license to adopt an authoritarian leadership style. While some surgeons argued it did (and espoused a more hierarchical view of team relationships), non-surgeons favored more distributed leadership, emphasizing *shared* responsibility and support for voicing concerns and opinions. Moreover, many non-surgeons argued that authoritarian leadership could be interpreted as negative or aggressive, induce fear and anxiety, shift attention from 'doing the best for the patient' to avoiding negative interactions, or threaten patient safety by making team members unwilling to raise concerns.

Particularly for surgeons there appeared to be a tension between creating a safe environment for speaking up and learning from mistakes, and ensuring everyone could perform under pressure. Some argued that anxiety inhibited speaking up and curtailed learning, others that stress was necessary for learning to perform under pressure: "being tough" on someone could be "doing them a service" (5, surgeon).

Surgeons also differed in their attitudes toward information sharing. One surgeon suggested that some saw sharing information as giving up their "mystique". These surgeons

often shared case details on a need-to-know basis. Others viewed information sharing as a way to enhance overall team performance by drawing out others' contributions and shared information more freely. In addition to getting team members 'on the same page', non-surgeons suggested that information-sharing fostered inclusion, engagement and open communication, while withholding information promoted division, exclusion, or unhelpful hierarchy. Thus, even when the desired goal (ideal teamwork) was shared, discrepant views of optimal interpersonal and leadership behaviors could generate frustration and misunderstanding, undermining teamwork.

2. Factors influencing aspirations for and experiences of teamwork

We identified three sets of factors influencing mental models of teamwork and the potential to practice ideal teamwork (Supplement-3).

Local organizational culture

Participants felt a local history of hierarchy among disciplines had bred an antagonistic culture and negative reputation. While many felt these inter-professional dynamics were changing and that teamwork was often extremely good, others felt that authority gradients still dominated, affecting the way team members engaged, e.g., making them afraid to speak up or raise concerns. Although participants' teamwork ideals contrasted with such a culture, there was evidence that "bad physician behavior" (89, nurse) had become normalized.[17] Shouting and bullying were often seen less as deviant behaviors warranting censure than as a 'normal' part of the stressful business of cardiac surgery.

In addition to local history, surgeons suggested that surgical training did not focus sufficiently on developing relational competence, but rather promoted competition and autonomy. Once a physician, autonomous practice and production pressure left little opportunity for surgeons to observe and learn from peers.

Formal mechanisms for addressing disrespectful behaviors also seemed limited. Our data suggest such behaviors often went undisciplined and persisted over time. Participants' frustration lay not only with the impact of not holding individuals accountable, but also with what this indicated about how little the organization valued relational competence. Conversely, some felt the division's recent introduction of initiatives aimed at improving teamwork had a positive effect, signalling that relational competence and its improvement mattered.

Variable technical case demands and technical competence

Case-related factors, such as complexity, patient acuity, cognitive demand and degree of urgency, could raise or lower intensity, tension and stress team members endured. One common effect of case-related stress was to decrease timely information sharing, which could undermine team coordination and 'flow'. Surgeons' ability to remain calm under stress and maintain constructive communication was particularly influential. Technical demands also varied *within* cases, with different phases being more or less demanding for different professionals at different times.[18] Failure to understand this could disrupt teamwork, e.g., when team members lacked the architectural knowledge to adapt their own behavior to others' needs.

As situational leadership theory would predict, [19] technical demands of the case also affected which interpersonal behaviors were most appropriate. For example, during complex cases or when unanticipated complications arose, more authoritative direction by the surgeon was considered appropriate. The technical competence of team members – which varied by case and training – also affected which behaviors were most appropriate, e.g., whether or not using local jargon was problematic, how much direction and information-sharing was appropriate. Demonstrating relational competence thus meant *adapting* interpersonal behaviors to suit the technical competence of teammates and technical demands of the case and phase.

As observed generally,[20] trust in team members' technical competence played a central role in determining appropriate interpersonal behaviors. Confidence in others' technical

competence appeared fundamental to respectful, constructive ways of interrelating and establishing a psychologically safe environment. Lack of confidence in non-surgeons' technical competence appeared associated with a tendency of some surgeons to adopt more authoritarian interpersonal behaviors. The inevitable subjectivity of judgements about colleagues' technical competence introduced potential for mismatched perceptions of appropriate interpersonal behaviors. Such mismatches could have negative effects on team dynamics, e.g., when well-intentioned direction by one team member was perceived as condescending and "micro-managing" by another.

Organizational fitness

Organizational structures and processes influenced team behaviors directly and indirectly, in transient and enduring ways.

Team Stability. The extent to which the same individuals consistently worked together was limited by trainee turnover, call schedules and considerations of efficiency, equity and training needs. Instability was exacerbated by non-specialty-specific nightshift nurses who were less familiar with rooms and teams. Some staff felt this instability undermined teamwork by reducing team members' opportunities to develop situated architectural and relational competence, e.g., knowledge of particular surgeon's preferences. It also limited opportunities to leverage positive interpersonal relationships that can develop within stable groups.

Operational failures. Delays or problems with equipment could generate tension, frustration or interpersonal conflict. Nurses often felt unfairly blamed by surgeons, since problems were caused by systems defects beyond their control. Systems-issues repeatedly reported yet unresolved exacerbated strain on relationships.

Formal information-sharing structures and processes. Case preparation was an important element of ideal teamwork but was impacted by individuals' ability to access information.

Scheduling practices resulted in some staff receiving little notice about case assignments, limiting opportunity to review case-related information.

By contrast, almost all staff viewed the introduction of pre-case briefings as beneficial in that they provided structured time to share information and facilitate preparations. Directly, this enhanced shared understanding and coordination of activities. Indirectly, staff perceived formalized briefings as providing a space that legitimized asking questions and voicing concerns. Other aspects of organizational fitness could undermine benefits of briefings, e.g., if surgeons' other duties prevented them from being physically present. Their value also depended on constructive participation; disrespectful or dismissive responses to 'speaking up' undermined the value of the briefing.

Another supportive structure was overhead cameras worn by surgeons, which helped everyone be 'on the same page' even when not directly involved in the action.

COMMENT

The results of this study indicate that perceptions of ideal team behaviors depend on the specifics of a given situation and team members' (sometimes conflicting) mental models of teamwork. Mental models of teamwork characterized by effortless 'flow', technically competent team members, and appropriate interpersonal and leadership behaviors align with surgical safety and teamwork literature emphasizing implicit coordination, technical competence, nontechnical skills and effective leadership. [2,10-12] However, discrepancies regarding authoritarian behavior by surgeons-as-leaders, which behaviors kept people focused and performing under pressure but not too afraid to speak up, and how much and when to share information, could engender misunderstandings, frustration and breakdowns in flow and coordination. Accordingly, improving teamwork requires explicit attention to achieving consensus around ideal teamwork and the specific interpersonal and leadership behaviors

needed to support that model. Our results suggest that these behaviors include in-person preoperative briefing and active sharing of information during the case. Institutional mechanisms sensitive to local history and culture should be established to adapt leadership behaviors to specific team composition, technical demands and phases of a case. When misperceptions or misunderstandings arise out of inconsistent mental models, opportunities to debrief and clarify both intent and impact of behaviors should be created.

Our findings also highlight the role of organizational practices, policies and systems in shaping team behaviors and the opportunities to put teamwork skills into practice. Hence interventions that solely target development of frontline team members' nontechnical skills, though necessary, may not be sufficient for high functioning teams. Optimizing teamwork interventions for surgical safety requires organizational commitment to addressing contextual factors that can undermine OR team behaviors in practice. These include minimizing operational failures, and institutional appreciation for the importance of specialty specific familiarity and information, and accordingly efforts to establish specialty specific teams. In addition, efforts should be made to share case assignments to OR staff in sufficient time for them to prepare themselves as team members. In turn, when organizational constraints make these interventions impractical, all team members must recognize that accommodation must be made for the loss of implicit knowledge with greater degrees of explicit information sharing.

Recommendations. Interventions to improve teamwork should build and reinforce consensus on optimal interpersonal and leadership behaviors. Beyond developing skills and knowledge, this means addressing adaptive (socio-cultural, psychological and political) challenges to mobilize a 'collective local faith' in the efficacy of specific behaviors.[21] Disagreements between surgeons and non-surgeons over authoritarian versus distributed models of leadership[10] no doubt reflect the practical challenge of ascertaining when to assume control and when to 'trust others to do their job'. However, they may also reflect well-described tensions that arise when

professionals feel their authority and autonomy threatened.[22] Therefore optimizing teamwork requires use of coercive 'hard edges' as well as 'soft' tactics (e.g., persuasion and discussion), both of which rely on supportive organizational policies and practices.[23]

Hard tactics include instituting formal mechanisms for holding individuals accountable for technical and nontechnical performance (e.g., through performance appraisals, mechanisms for collecting and acting on team member feedback, teamwork and culture assessments) and rewarding greater relational competence. As this study showed, through such management practices, leaders shape local culture and expectations of 'normal', acceptable or valued team behaviors.[24]

Soft tactics include training and ongoing professional development opportunities which create forums for explicitly articulating assumptions about ideal teamwork in order to reach consensus about appropriate behaviors.[25] Well-intentioned interpersonal behaviors may have unintended consequences because team members hold different views regarding the meaning of those behaviors. Thus, well facilitated multidisciplinary forums, which enable non-surgeon team members to share their interpretation of team leader behaviors and their consequences, are needed to enable unit-wide consensus building. Post-case debriefings could also incorporate more emphasis on nontechnical failures.

Our findings also suggest the need for consensus-building and horizontal norming amongst attending surgeons, e.g., through peer-to-peer observation, or use of leadership behavior profiling tools,[14] to raise awareness of differences in leadership behaviors among attendings. Further research to better establish associations between interpersonal team and leadership behaviors and objective outcomes would also inform and motivate interventions.

The ability to adapt team behaviors to situational demands of the case and team also influenced teamwork. Video-recordings of cases offer a powerful tool for ensuring situational

contingencies are accounted for both in building consensus on ideal behaviors and providing lessons on adaptability of style and approach. By preserving situational specifics, video excerpts provide fertile prompts for discussion about beliefs and assumptions, and examples of best practice that are more persuasive than generic prescriptions. Organizational fitness[26] must also be optimized to enable team members to enact ideal behaviors adaptively. For example, while the ability to prepare, maintain coordination, and stay engaged and in sync may appear to reflect individual competence, we observed that enacting such team behaviors was organizationally determined. Scheduling practices and formal information-sharing structures (pre-case briefings, use of overhead cameras) must work well to ensure individuals' capacity to adequately access information, prepare for a case and be attentive and coordinated during surgery. Similarly, the functioning of organizational processes, including those seemingly unrelated to teamwork, e.g., systems underlying equipment failures, is also important to address. Ways in which policies driven by other imperatives (e.g., efficiency concerns) may undermine those intended to promote quality, safety and effective teamwork require careful consideration.[6]

Finally, interdependence of factors suggests interventions focused on any one aspect are likely to bring limited gains. For example, the value of structured communication protocols,[27] (e.g., checklists or briefings), depends on other (more or less supportive) contextual factors, such as a culture that promotes constructive engagement, organizational processes that enable surgeons to participate (not be diverted to other duties), and organizational will and mechanisms to ensure 'active resisters' are held accountable.[28] Multifaceted interventions that recognize the bi-directional interaction of interpersonal behaviors and technical performance, and the need to address both technical barriers and adaptive, context-dependent challenges[5,21] have the greatest chance of success.

Limitations

Our study is a single-site, in-depth case study and inclusion of more sites may have identified further factors influencing team behaviors. Dynamics and processes identified may manifest in particular ways in this institution (e.g., specific structures that facilitate or impede information sharing). However, the factors theorized to affect team behaviors (e.g., local organizational culture or organizational fitness) are likely to apply elsewhere. Literature suggests that challenges such as an unsupportive organizational culture, inadequate organizational fitness, disruptive team instability or within-team discrepancies in mental models of teamwork are present in other settings. [5,6,11,26]

This study makes clear the central role of organizations in cultivating and reinforcing consensus on ideal team behaviors and the nontechnical (as well as technical) abilities of surgical team members. Optimizing teamwork to reduce nontechnical errors is not simply a matter of one-off training for frontline staff, but rather requires multifaceted interventions that promote team consensus and target the organizational determinants of team behaviors including organizational culture, institutional prioritization given to team behaviors, and the fitness of the organizational processes that support the work of surgical teams.

Table-1: Interviews by role

Role	Number
Surgeons	11
Anesthesiologists	3
Nurses	7
Perfusionists	4
Surgical trainees	4
Anesthesia nurses	1
Physician assistants	4
Total	34

Acknowledgements/disclosures

Thanks to hospital staff for participating, Josephine Fisher for data collection, and Molly Freaun for manuscript preparation. We acknowledge grants from MGH Division of Cardiac Surgery and CRICO (225243). ELA's contribution was supported by funding from a Wellcome Trust Senior Investigator award [WT097899M].

References

- [1] Catchpole KR, Giddings AE, Wilkinson M, Dale T, de Leval MR. Improving patient safety by identifying latent failures in successful operations. *Surgeon* 2007;142:102–10.
- [2] Weaver SJ, Rosen MA, DiazGranados D, Lazzara EH, Lyons R, Salas E, et al. Does Teamwork Improve Performance in the Operating Room? A Multilevel Evaluation. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 2010;36:133–42.
- [3] Mazzocco K, Petitti DB, Fong KT, Bonacum D, Brookey J, Graham S, et al. Surgical team behaviors and patient outcomes. *The American Journal of Surgery* 2009;197:678–85.
- [4] McCulloch P, Rathbone J, Catchpole K. Interventions to improve teamwork and communications among healthcare staff. *Br J Surg* 2011;98:469–79. doi:10.1002/bjs.7434.
- [5] Aveling EL, McCulloch P, Dixon-Woods M. A qualitative study comparing experiences of the surgical safety checklist in hospitals in high-income and low-income countries. *BMJ Open* 2013;3.
- [6] Finn R, Waring J. Organizational Barriers to Architectural Knowledge and Teamwork in Operating Theatres. *Public Money and Management* 2006.
- [7] Marshall M, de Silva D, Cruickshank L, Shand J, Wei L, Anderson J. What we know about designing an effective improvement intervention (but too often fail to put into practice). *BMJ Quality & Safety* 2016.
- [8] Weick KE, Sutcliffe KM, Obstfeld D. Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Organization Science* 2005;16:409–21.
- [9] Engeström Y. Expansive Learning at Work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work* 2001.
- [10] Künzle B, Kolbe M, Grote G. Ensuring patient safety through effective leadership behavior: A literature review. *Safety Science* 2010;48:1–17.

- [11] Makary MA, Sexton JB, Freischlag JA, Holzmueller CG, Millman EA, Rowen L, et al. Operating room teamwork among physicians and nurses: teamwork in the eye of the beholder. *J Am Coll Surg* 2006;202:746–52.
- [12] Edmondson AC. Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1999;44:350–83.
- [13] Guru V, Tu JV, Etchells E, Anderson GM, Naylor CD, Novick RJ, et al. Relationship between preventability of death after coronary artery bypass graft surgery and all-cause risk-adjusted mortality rates. *Circulation* 2008;117:2969–76.
- [14] Stone JL, Aveling EL, Freaun M, Shields MC, Wright C, Gino F, et al. Effective Leadership of Surgical Teams: A Mixed Methods Study of Surgeon Behaviors and Functions. *The Annals of Thoracic Surgery* 2017;104:530–7.
- [15] Attride-Stirling J. Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research* 2001;1:385–405.
- [16] Charmaz K. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd; 2006.
- [17] Vaughan D. *The Challenger Launch Decision: Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at NASA*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press; 1996.
- [18] Wadhwa RK, Parker SH, Burkhart HM, Greason KL, Neal JR, Levenick KM, et al. Is the “sterile cockpit” concept applicable to cardiovascular surgery critical intervals or critical events? The impact of protocol-driven communication during cardiopulmonary bypass. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2010;139:312–9.
- [19] Hersey P, Blanchard KH. *Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1969.
- [20] McAllister DJ. Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* 1995;38:24–59.

- [21] Bosk CL, Dixon-Woods M, Goeschel CA, Pronovost PJ. Reality check for checklists. *Lancet* 2009;374:444–5.
- [22] Scott RW, Backman EV. Institutional Theory and the Medical Care Sector. In: Mick SS, editor. *Innovations in health care delivery: insights for organization theory*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers; 1990.
- [23] Aveling EL, Martin G, Armstrong N, Banerjee J, Dixon-Woods M. Quality improvement through clinical communities: eight lessons for practice. *J Health Organ Manag* 2012;26:158–74.
- [24] Aveling EL, Parker M, Dixon-Woods M. What is the role of individual accountability in patient safety? A multi-site ethnographic study. *Sociol Health Illn* 2016;38:216–32.
- [25] Brewster L, Aveling EL, Martin G, Tarrant C, Dixon-Woods M, Safer Clinical Systems Phase 2 Core Group Collaboration & Writing Committee. What to expect when you're evaluating healthcare improvement: a concordat approach to managing collaboration and uncomfortable realities. *BMJ Quality & Safety* 2015;24:318–24.
- [26] Dixon-Woods M. Why is patient safety so hard? A selective review of ethnographic studies. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2010;15 Suppl 1:11–6.
- [27] Henrickson SE, Wadhera RK, ElBardissi AW, Wiegmann DA, Sundt TM. Development and Pilot Evaluation of a Preoperative Briefing Protocol for Cardiovascular Surgery. *J Am Coll Surg* 2009;208:1115–23.
- [28] Saint S, Kowalski CP, Banaszak-Holl J, Forman J, Damschroder L, Krein SL. How Active Resisters and Organizational Constipators Affect Health Care-Acquired Infection Prevention Efforts. *The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 2009;35:239–46.