medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Psychological safety, hierarchy, and other issues in operating room debriefing: reflexive thematic analysis of interviews from the frontline

Canice McElroy[1], Emma Skegg[1], Mercedes Mudgway[1], Ngaire Murray[1], Linda Holmes[1], Jennifer Weller[2], James Hamill[1, 3]

Institution

1. Starship Children's Hospital
2. Centre for Medical and Health Sciences Education, The University of Auckland
3. Department of Paediatrics, Child and Youth Health, The University of Auckland

Correspondence

James Hamill, Starship Children's Hospital and The University of Auckland and, Private Bag 92024, Auckland 1042, New Zealand. E: jamesh@adhb.govt.nz

Keywords

Debriefing, Interprofessional Teamwork, Learning, Operating Theatre, Psychological Safety, Thematic Analysis

Declarations

Emma Skegg and Mercedes Mudgway were funded through a Starship Foundation® Grant (SF2142). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background & purpose: Debriefing facilitates team learning but currently is not consistently performed in operating rooms. Barriers exist to consistent, effective operative team debriefing. The purpose of this study was to identify these barriers and their potential solutions as articulated by front-line staff in the operating room.

Methods: We interviewed staff in the operating theatre of a children's hospital and undertook reflexive thematic analysis with a critical realist theoretical framework.

Results: Interviews were analysed from 40 operating room staff: 14 nurses, 7 anaesthetists, 7 anaesthetic technicians, and 12 surgeons; 25 (62%) were female. The key themes were: one of the most valuable things – teamwork and audit; it's a safe space – psychological safety is a pre-requisite of, and is enhanced by, debriefing; natural born leader – constructs around leadership; space-time – finding time to debrief, routinely and after critical events; and doing the basics well – structure without over-complication.

Conclusion: Psychological safety is both a prerequisite for and a product of debriefing. Leadership, if viewed as a collective responsibility, could help break down power structures. Given the results of this study and evidence in the literature, it is likely that routine debriefing, if well done, will improve psychological safety, facilitate team learning, reduce errors, and improve patient safety.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Surgery is a high-risk undertaking in which professionals from a variety of specialties work together on a time-critical operation in which safety is of the utmost importance. Similar to teams in aviation, motor racing and sport, surgical teams can be described as action teams. Where surgical teams differ is the diversity of roles within the group: nurses, anaesthetists, technicians, surgeons, from student level to consultant. To perform effectively, team members must feel safe about sharing observations and opinions with the rest of the team (A. Edmondson, 1999); however, diverse surgical teams are often beset by intergroup rivalries based on profession, gender, and seniority. The resulting power dichotomies inhibit effective teamwork.

One way to counter this problem with surgical teams may be through regular team debriefing. Debriefing is a process that allows individuals to discuss team performance in a constructive, supportive environment (Fanning & Gaba, 2007). Debriefing has been linked to improved performance, teamwork and communication, and can assist with error identification (Zuckerman et al., 2012).

Debriefing is one component of the World Health Organisation Surgical Safety Checklist (SSC). Initially a three-point checklist involving a sign-in, time-out, and sign-out (Haynes et al., 2009), the SSC was expanded to include five steps by adding a briefing discussion at the beginning of the operating list, and a debriefing at the end of the list (Vickers, 2011). The sign-in, time-out, and sign-out are now performed with a high level of compliance in operating rooms throughout the world (Abbott et al., 2018). In our tertiary paediatric hospital, compliance with the SSC is 100% but compliance with debriefing (which is not mandated at the present time) is <10% (personal communication, Starship Children's Hospital Operating Rooms, 2022). Others have found debriefing challenging to implement (Brindle et al., 2018), possibly because it involves a coordinated team discussion rather than a simple checklist, or for reasons related to power dynamics. Debriefing has roots in experiential learning theory (Kolb & Kolb, 2006) and is essential to team learning (A. Edmondson, 1999; Kolbe et al., 2020; Vashdi et al., 2013). Given that debriefing is central to other fields including medical simulation (Fanning & Gaba, 2007; Raemer et al., 2011), the aviation industry (Mavin et al., 2018), the space industry (Landon et al., 2018), and the military (Crane et al., 2006), surgical teams appear to be missing out on its benefits.

Our surgical unit consists of seven operating rooms within a tertiary referral paediatric hospital providing cardiac, ear nose and throat (ENT), orthopaedic, thoracic, urology, and general paediatric surgical services. We introduced debriefing into our operating theatres in 2017. Despite the positive feedback, debriefing did not become routine practice throughout our operating rooms, being performed in only a minority of operating lists. Given the potential value of debriefing for surgical teams but the challenges of putting it into practice, we were interested in the views of our theatre staff on the how, why, when and where to debrief.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The purpose of this study was to gain insights from frontline workers on how to set up an effective debriefing policy for our operating theatre suite, to explore theatre workers' experiences with debriefing, and to critically reflect on the meaning of debriefing to psychological safety, hierarchy, and teamwork.

Methodology

Ethics and trial registration

This study was registered with the institutional research office and received ethical approval from the Auckland Health Research Ethics Committee (#3228).

Context

The setting was the operating theatre of a children's hospital. Theatre workers had some experience with debriefing since it was informally introduced in 2017. A simple debriefing structure was developed which consisted of three phases: 1) introductions and ground rules (confidentiality, respect, share the air-time); 2) discussion (what went well, what could have gone better); and 3) take home actions. This structure was used mostly in paediatric surgery and ENT theatre lists. Paediatric cardiac surgery regularly debriefed all operations using an extended checklist structure. Elsewhere, debriefings were inconsistently performed and not part of theatre culture at the time of the study.

Researcher characteristics and reflexivity

Researchers brought together a mix of experience and fresh eyes on the subject. Two researchers were senior nurses who had been instrumental in introducing debriefing in 2017. At the time of the study, one was a senior theatre nurse (LH) and the other was the nurse manager of perioperative services at Starship Children's Hospital (NM). One researcher was a psychology masters graduate with background in neuroscience (MM). Two researchers were medical students (CM and ES). Two researchers were doctors: JW is an anaesthetist with extensive experience in simulation training, debriefing and multidisciplinary teamwork; and JH is a paediatric surgeon with experience in debriefing in simulation training and in operating theatre. CM and ES performed all interviews; as students, they came from a more independent stance than some of the other researchers who were co-workers and colleagues of the participants. Theme development and critical interpretation was performed by a student (CM), psychologist (MM), and theatre worker (JH), bringing a variety of perspectives on the topics.

Qualitative approach and research paradigm

The qualitative methodology used for this research was reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2022). The theoretical framework was one of critical realism (Yucel, 2018) which allows ontology and causation to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

be emphasised (Pilgrim, 2014). Operating theatre personnel work in a technological environment. We wanted to "give voice" to what people told us in the interviews while recognising that how we understand these "truths" is focused through the psycho-social lens of the interviewers and the interviewees. As operating teams, we deal in reality – "life and limb" – so reality matters; however, we recognise that social constructs determine how team members relate to each other, hence the reason for choosing a critical realism paradigm. Our purpose was to shed light on the barriers to debriefing and to identify factors that might facilitate routine debriefing. Critical realism and reflexive thematic analysis also allowed us to recognise the transitive nature of the research where the researchers are part of the study.

Sampling strategy

The inclusion criteria were people who worked in the operating theatres including administrators, anaesthetists, anaesthetic technicians, nurses, and surgeons. Students and other temporary visitors to the operating theatres were excluded. The sampling strategy was to invite as many participants as practicable within the constraints of the study period while obtaining a good mix of different specialty groups in the theatre environment, resulting in a targeted convenience sample. Sample size was determined reflexively as recommended by Braun and Clarke (Braun & Clarke, 2021a, 2022), and Malterud's "information power" concept helped guide the decision as to when to stop recruiting (Malterud et al., 2016).

Data collection

Theatre staff were made aware of the project through presentations at theatre meetings. Two researchers (CM and ES) invited participants to take part in an interview. Participants gave written informed consent. Interviews were conducted between December 2021 and February 2022. All interviews took place in person in a private space using a semi-structured interview guide (available in Appendix 1 in supplementary material). The interview guide was developed by the researchers to cover the items of interest based on our experience with surgical debriefing (e.g. issues of timing and structure). Limited testing of the interview guide was undertaken by mock interviews between three researchers. Interviews began with making personal connections and explaining the study, then proceeded with open-ended questions with an emphasis on letting the interviewee tell their story and do most of the talking. Interviews were audio recorded using a mobile device and transcribed verbatim. Participants received a copy of their transcript for editing and approval.

Data processing & analysis

The online version of Taguette (Rampin & Rampin, 2021) was used as an aid to coding. We drew mind maps to help visualise the diversity and connectedness of themes as they developed. Two researchers coded the data separately and met regularly to discuss and mould themes. We used the process of reflexive thematic analysis described by Braun and Clarke (Braun & Clarke, 2006). We familiarised ourselves with the dataset

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

by transcribing (performed by ES and CM) and reading interview transcripts. Using a mostly inductive approach, two researchers (CM and JH) coded the transcripts creating numerous codes. Through a process of team discussion and reflection, we refined codes into initial themes. Mapping themes graphically helped demonstrate connections and interactions between initial themes. Through a process of reflection, discussion, re-reading transcripts, and reflecting on codes, we refined and renamed themes. Coding and theme development was a recursive process involving immersion in data and reflection.

Techniques to enhance trustworthiness

To enhance trustworthiness of this report, we took a lead from Braun and Clarke's guidance on quality and reporting (Braun & Clarke, 2021b) and from the guidelines for publication of qualitative research by Elliot et al. (Elliott et al., 1999). First, we applied Braun and Clarke's 15-point checklist of criteria for good thematic analysis to our study (Braun & Clarke, 2006) as shown in Appendix 2 in supplementary material. Next, we used Nelson's conceptual depth scale to self-evaluate robustness of our conceptual categories (Nelson, 2017) as shown in Appendix 3 in supplementary material. We used Braun and Clarke's 20 questions for evaluating thematic analysis manuscripts for publication (Braun & Clarke, 2021b) as shown in Appendix 4 in supplementary material. The present report follows the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (O'Brien et al., 2014) as shown in Appendix 5 in supplementary material.

Results

Of 41 interviews conducted, one recording failed leaving 40 interviews to be transcribed and analysed. Interviewees were predominantly female (n = 26, 65%). Interviewee characteristics are shown in Table 1. Interview transcripts amounted to 84748 words, an average of over 2,100 words per transcript.

A map of initial themes is presented in Fig. S1 in supplementary material. Through a process of reflection, discussion, and re-reading transcripts, we refined the initial themes to five final themes. The development of these themes is shown in Fig. 1. A final table of themes is presented in Table 2. In the following paragraphs, we illustrate each theme with selected quotations from the interviews.

Theme 1. One of the most valuable things

There was a clear theme from the interviewees that debriefing can be of immense value as expressed by one interviewee:

> "I've found it absolutely one of the most valuable things that we've had instituted here."

1.1. We can work better together – team learning

Interviewees saw value in bringing the team together in a forum for learning:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

> "It's just a way to kind of come together with the team at the end of the day and talk about any issues and try and think of possible solutions, so that when we do this, when we do the list again, we can work better and not have those issues."

> "Sometimes there's quite good key learning points and from theatre, well if every theatre did a decent debrief at the end of the day, I think that there might be things that might come up consistently, repeatedly, that actually we can learn from – learning debriefs…"

> "Is there anything that we can learn from this, you know that's almost the most important thing in modern medicine and healthcare, isn't it? You know it's, 'what can we do better next time so that we can avoid this situation?'"

1.2. Can you close that? – the audit cycle

Debriefing was seen as an instrument to bring about organisational change. Interviewees wanted issues to be addressed by the organisation and for debriefs to be incorporated into an audit cycle – identify the issue, implement change, and re-audit. Interviewees felt that it was important to document issues that needed to be followed up; however, documentation of all topics discussed in a debrief was neither necessary nor desirable. If debriefs did not lead to quality improvement, then they were seen as a waste of time.

> "Can you close that? Can you come back to us in two weeks to know how you progress?"

> "Although if there is any big issue, I think if there's anything that needs improving, it could be good to record… otherwise it won't get fixed."

> "It's kind of like you just get stuck in Groundhog [Day] with the same – you're not coming to a conclusion or fixing the problem; it's just you're continuously talking about it."

Theme 2. It's a safe space

The importance of being psychologically safe in the team was a strong theme throughout the interviews. Psychological safety was promoted *by* debriefing, but also a pre-requisite *for* effective debriefing.

> "And then also just making sure that if someone does say something they're not going to be shot down or they're not going to be – yeah, just making sure it's a safe space to do so."

2.1. Debriefing promotes psychological safety

Interviewees felt that consistent debriefing would facilitate better communication, help flatten the hierarchy, and create a more inclusive work environment. Many participants recognised the importance of acknowledging positives during debriefs. Positive feedback is an effective way to encourage speaking up. Developing a structure that makes space for positives ("what went well") was helpful. Several respondents

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

commented that debriefing is a good way to unpack what had happened during the day, unwind a bit, and to go home leaving work at work, which would clearly carry co-benefits for mental health and resilience. Debriefing critical events was also seen as essential for people's mental health.

> "By doing briefing and debriefing it actually helps to break down barriers between different subgroups."

> "So sometime, often when the list is run really well, I think it's really important to acknowledge that too, everybody to kind of be grateful to each other."

> "I think the debriefing actually finishes off the day and creates a good work environment and lets people kind of put work aside."

> "Everybody responds very differently to trauma and to, you know, critical incidents, and sometimes people just need that little bit of help and support to sort of express how they feel. Because otherwise you may end up losing these people because they just don't want to do this job anymore."

2.2. Psychological safety facilitates debriefing

Theatre staff needed to feel they were in a safe place to debrief effectively. Safety took various forms: assurance of confidentiality, a non-judgmental and respectful environment, and a flat hierarchy. People need to feel safe from being judged. Debriefs need to be conducted in a climate of respect. Creating an environment in which everyone, including inexperienced staff and students, can feel free to speak up is a challenge when there is an obvious hierarchy arrangement. There was an interplay between the tone set in the pre-operative briefing and that of the post-operative debriefing, and an interplay with the general culture of the operating room environment. Responses suggest that the attitude and approach to preoperative briefings impacts on the postoperative debriefings. Most interviewees felt that psychological safety is largely determined by broader operating room culture and attitudes in the workplace.

> "I think that starts from before the brief. So, I think having everyone there from the beginning, having an expectation that there's a flattened hierarchy, we would welcome people speaking up, and that we use individual names, we introduce each other at the brief, we highlight how important each team member is."

> "In terms of like if people want to – anyone can say something, like it's not a judgmental environment."

> "I think also that needs to be emphasised that it's confidential."

> "I guess sometimes that's where there might be issues with people not wanting to speak up if they feel that there's a hierarchy."

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

> "It's a longer-term thing… I think there's an old-school way of practicing that you might not have even experienced that I experienced as a junior doctor – it's fading out where there's quite a lot of barriers to communication with senior people. And I think that's improving, definitely, but I think it's something that we generate every day through our interactions with other staff members. So I think it's on the ward, it's in pre-op, it's in the clinic, it's in the operating theatre, you just want to have an open, positive environment for discussion."

Theme 3. Natural born leader

The theme of leadership considers interviewee perspectives on nominating a leader of the debrief session. Responses indicate that leadership is necessary to facilitate an efficient and effective debrief. In the following extract, an interviewee discussed options for leadership.

> "I think that's a difficult one, actually. Because it could be different people on different days… it shouldn't really be a set person every time. Because sometimes the surgeons change, sometimes the nurse in charge will pop out and then come back at the end. So really, there should be a natural leader that emerges, and sort of leads the debrief. But probably the person that needs to instigate it should be the nurse in charge, because otherwise surgeons might just forget to do it. So, it should be instigated by the nurse in charge, but then the natural leader should just do the chatting…"

3.1. Surgical leadership in surgery

Many interviewees viewed senior doctors, the surgeon or the anaesthetist, as the main leaders in the OR.

> "In my experience, I think it's best to have a surgeon or anaesthetist be onboard and leading it. I feel like they're more of like a leader in the room and… in my experience people appear a lot more engaged when it's an anaesthetist or a surgeon or someone quite senior in the room to be leading it."

3.2. Nursing leadership is structured and comprehensive

Other interviewees felt that nurses were best suited to provide a comprehensive overview of theatre events and tended to follow a more structured and systematic approach.

> "The experience that generally I have is that the nurse that's coordinating the list for the day runs it, and I think that allows for a lot more of an inclusive approach."

3.3. It's about skills

Many interviewees felt that anyone within the multidisciplinary operative team should be able to lead an operative team debrief. Responses suggest that an individual's experience and communication skills may be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

more relevant to a leadership position than their title or specialty. Therefore, the leadership role can be flexible and negotiated.

> "I don't think it should be any particular person, I don't think. But I think the person needs to be able to lead it, so they need a sense of confidence, and they need to be able to understand when the most appropriate time is for debriefing… So, you have to be experienced enough to know – pick up on those sorts of things, but also subtle clues as well that maybe something is going on, it's not quite the right time. So, you need a bit of experience I think to lead the debrief, and very much so, confidence. So, you need to be a little bit more experienced, but I don't think necessarily it should be one person's role."

Theme 4. Space-time

There was little debate about the right place to debrief – consistently people found the practical place to be in the same operating room where the case(s) had been performed. Finding "space" in the sense of time in the day, however, was a challenge.

4.1. One foot out the door – routine debriefing

Some participants suggested that debriefing should occur whilst closing the skin of the final case. Interviewees felt that this approach would be the most achievable way to ensure that all team members are still present and engaged. At this point, the most challenging parts of the operative procedure have been completed, and the anaesthetic team is yet to begin waking up the patient. Responses suggest that during this time window, team members are still focused on the current theatre session, which may be optimal for recalling learning points from the preceding list. Additionally, this time avoids the challenge of trying to bring team members back, which is practically challenging after the list is finished.

> "Because pretty much as soon as we start closing people start wandering off, and the surgeon has already got one foot out the door by the time the registrar or the fellow gets on to closing the skin layer. So I would have thought towards the end of the last operation would be the best time to catch everyone who was in that session without delaying people who want to get away at the end of the day."

Other participants felt that the ideal time to debrief is at the end of the theatre session, after the patient has been taken to recovery. Responses suggest that this approach is likely to be associated with fewer distractions and result in greater focus on the debrief itself. Interviewees also felt that because the whole list is finished, the debrief would be able to cover all aspects of the day, including the closing of the final case. Responses revealed the main drawback to this approach is the challenge to get all team members back to the operating room for a debrief.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

> "I really think it should be done at the very end, when the patient has left the room. Because, and everyone should be, you should sort of say at the end of the case. 'we're going to do a debrief, so can we all meet back here in ten minutes'. And then it just means that everyone's mind is on that rather than on the patient. And it also makes it a bit more, sort of, real, if everyone's just focusing on that rather than focusing on other things."

4.2 Time to debrief after a critical event

Debriefing critical events was seen as valuable but, again, there was a timing debate. Some believed that critical event debriefs were best performed straight after the event ("hot"); others felt that critical event debriefs should wait until things settle down ("cold").

> "If there's something happened, if there's something wrong, like baby died on the table or something happened like an emergency or crisis that happens on the table, it should be right after. Not tomorrow, not the next day. Yeah, like on the day when everyone's still around and you don't have to look for them."

> "It should probably be dealt with a little bit later in a setting where everybody feels safe. And preferably the timing, depending on the personalities and how well you know the people, to be able to give a bit of time for people to be able to process it after a case, personally."

4.3. All the time

One facet of the collective effort theme is that debriefing should be done consistently across all teams. This creates a universal standard of practice. Interviewees felt that collective support would be necessary to facilitate this cultural change.

> "The more they see people doing it... the more they feel that they can contribute. Because they've seen it before, it becomes more familiar, more routine, and they realise that there's no negative repercussions for it."

> "It actually breaks down those barriers, and people feel that they can ask those questions... by doing them consistently is actually how we break down the barriers as well."

Theme 5. Doing the basics well

Interviewees felt that debriefing techniques should be kept simple but implemented in an effective and efficient manner. There was clearly a need for some framework in which to construct a purposeful conversation. One aspect of structure was the "reactions" or feelings phase which commonly occurs near the start of simulation debriefs.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

> "Try to keep doing the basics well. We're not overcomplicating too much stuff; I think that would be the way to go."

> "I think it needs to be structured because otherwise it descends into waffle and stories and anecdotes and opinions rather than actually exchanging information that is relevant to how the day went and to use our time efficiently and particularly at the end of the day… I do think that it's better having some structure, and it being led by someone with a particular interest in getting some useful information."

> "It also gives people an opportunity to tell how they're feeling although often people won't necessarily say how they're feeling, but I think that's the thing of a good debrief is to make people feel comfortable to do that and I think it's good to do it even when everything went smoothly and everything went fine."

5.1. No-one is born knowing how to do this

Some participants expressed the need for teaching and modelling of debriefing skills. Critical event debriefing would be easier if there was a culture of routine debriefs and if staff had training in how to facilitate a debrief. Other interviewees expressed that ongoing training and education would be useful for debrief leaders.

> "No one is born knowing how to do this, you actually do need to have some training."

> "I think that hot debriefs are very difficult, and you need to be very very careful that they're done safely. I wonder if we could… have a format and have a culture of how those should be carried out and maybe some specific people that might champion doing the hot debriefs that I think everyone should probably have some training on doing it safely."

> "I think some form of support for the people that lead the debrief would be useful, as well as teaching of certain skills saying that you know like, when we do this, these are the aims, and let's try to keep things running that way."

Discussion

By giving voice to frontline workers, we have attempted to understand what is important when working within an operating room environment. The themes reflected a rich sense of the value of debriefing for learning, culture, and togetherness as a team. Debriefing's influence on a culture of gratitude and psychological safety came through strongly, as did the contribution debriefing could make to team performance. Our research has established a foundation for various factors that relate to psychological safety including power hierarchies and perceptions of leadership.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Psychological safety holds that an individual will not be punished or humiliated for speaking up about ideas, questions, concerns, or mistakes (A. Edmondson, 2008). Our research found that psychological safety and the ability to be open and confident in group situations is determined by a broader operating room culture and attitudes in the workplace. Research shows that teams who welcome feedback have the healthiest work environment by supporting staff that report problems without fear of retribution and accountability (A. C. Edmondson, 2003). This creates an environment focused on proactively identifying and addressing actual and potential safety concerns, building a safer health system for patients, and increasing psychological safety for staff (Leonard et al., 2004).

To create trust, some institutions incorporate programmes that acknowledge or give positive recognition for reporting (Trossman, 2019). Positive recognition can be implemented by thanking individuals for speaking up and acknowledging why reporting is necessary, reinforcing trust between groups (Trossman, 2019). Eliminating the fear of consequence is crucial to building trust and establishing that reporting will not negatively affect the staff member voicing their concerns or the member of staff involved in a report (Dekker, 2016). During our research, we found that people felt comfortable to speak up in a debrief about anything that had gone wrong during surgery. It was a process of team reflecting, rather than an outlet of blame on an individual, which coincided with an elimination of fear of consequence. This elimination of fear of consequence further builds on staff trust, ensures a positive feedback loop, and provides a learning opportunity from the event that has been reported (Dekker, 2016; Waring, 2005). Further, our research recognised the importance of acknowledging positives during debriefs. Positive feedback was seen as an effective way to encourage individuals to speak up and developed a structure that makes space for positives.

While psychological safety and just culture are paramount in a health care setting, there are various reasons why they may not be implemented into the everyday workplace culture. One reason can be social power and perceived hierarchies in the workplace. Many disciplines have generalised what “power” in the workplace is. These understandings have often grown from various locations and can implicitly grow in unpredictable ways (Vanstone & Grierson, 2022). In an interdisciplinary field like medicine, ideas of power are understood as hierarchies that can present themselves in many areas (Vanstone & Grierson, 2022). Hierarchy in medical teams comprises a set of integrated levels within which members are ranked by their disciplines and levels of authority, giving individuals with a perceived higher rank a sense of power over those with a lower perceived level of hierarchy (Hughes & Salas, 2013). Medical power hierarchies can start implicitly from the day students start professional training and often reflect biases held from a young age (Gopal et al., 2021). These ideas of power hierarchies can diminish the effectiveness of critical work teams and team performance (Hughes & Salas, 2013).

One of the ways power operates in a workplace is under the establishment and by maintaining hierarchies (Vanstone & Grierson, 2022). Hierarchies can be defined as a rank order of individuals or groups concerning a valued social dimension, such as control of resources or ability to influence, as determined by power

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(Vanstone & Grierson, 2022). Hierarchies are a well-recognised feature of the clinical environment, with research indicating that hierarchies can be harmful (Vanstone & Grierson, 2022). Research shows evidence that clinical hierarchies can impede patient safety by contributing to a reluctance to speak up if the superior makes an error (Brennan & Davidson, 2019; Vanstone & Grierson, 2022). Further, hierarchies can obstruct interprofessional teamwork and collaboration and create a hostile work environment, ultimately impacting individual and team psychological safety (A. Edmondson, 2008; McClintock & Fainstad, 2022). On the contrary, hierarchies can provide a template for expectations of interaction that generate and sustain the structure and stability necessary to enable the formation and efficiency of the team (Knight & Mehta, 2017; O'Shea et al., 2019; Vanstone & Grierson, 2022).

While hierarchy can hinder processes, it can also be necessary for achieving a team goal. Those deemed as holding higher hierarchical positions in a surgical environment can not only set the mood for the day but can create a positive team environment and initiate or delegate team debriefing. Numerous studies (Berenholtz et al., 2009; Paull DE et al., 2010; Robinson et al., 2010) have found that debriefing has a positive impact on teamwork and communication, and can help break down the barriers of hierarchy. Additionally, hierarchy can be understood in terms of leadership. Interestingly, our research indicates whom individuals ascertain as a "natural leader"; consequently, these ideas exacerbate hierarchical constructs. Although there is limited research on what constitutes a leader in medical debriefing, our research indicates that the idea of leadership is subjective. Ideas of a "natural leader" can exacerbate the constructs of hierarchy, which encourage those more dominant to take over (Adams & Anantatmula, 2010; Gamble & Christensen, 2022).

Dominance can be a problem if an individual perceives themselves as someone who is not a natural leader and, therefore, does not want to speak up about an adverse event or discuss something they were not satisfied with (Adams & Anantatmula, 2010). Some interviewees viewed senior doctors, the surgeon, or the anaesthetist as the prominent leaders in the operating room and, therefore, the individuals who are "natural leaders" based on hierarchical bias (Vanstone & Grierson, 2022). Moreover, many interviewees felt that anyone within the multidisciplinary operative team should be able to lead an operative team to debrief. Responses suggest that an individual's experience and communication skills may be more relevant to a leadership position than their title or speciality. Therefore, the leadership role can be flexible and negotiated. Ideas that those who take the debrief "should" have leadership skills, however, is not necessarily true. Research suggests that those who are perceived to be leaders due to their hierarchical standing may not necessarily be capable of leading teams due to insufficient training and are therefore no more capable than anyone else at taking a debriefing (Greer et al., 2017).

Understanding leadership leads to different ideas of what leadership should be in a medical context. Although there are different understandings of who should be in charge, considerable research indicates that leadership is entirely necessary when used correctly (Berenholtz et al., 2009; Brennan & Davidson,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2019; Sammer et al., 2010). The understanding of leadership is to achieve a collective purpose (A. Edmondson, 2008; Vanstone & Grierson, 2022). Research indicates that leadership can lead to achieving safety in various industries (Berenholtz et al., 2009; Brennan & Davidson, 2019; A. C. Edmondson, 2018) and can be critical for cultural change (McClintock & Fainstad, 2022). When we look at leadership and the breakdown of barriers, we can focus on the ideas of transformational leadership, collectivistic leadership, and flat hierarchies. Transformational leadership occurs when leaders engage with individuals to complete common goals (Matheson et al., 2020; Smith, 2015). The purpose of transformational leadership is to elevate, inspire, and ensure individuals become more active in themselves (Matheson et al., 2020; Smith, 2015). Transformational leadership is an empirically supported approach understood as a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that raises the level of aspirations of both the leader and those led, thereby transforming both (Matheson et al., 2020; Smith, 2015). Research indicates that transformational leadership in healthcare settings has favourable outcomes with individuals realising their capabilities to reach higher levels of performance and personal meaning (Matheson et al., 2020; Smith, 2015).

Another aspect of leadership is a collective approach, where the leadership roles and responsibilities are shared, distributed, or rotated amongst team members (Lv & Zhang, 2017; West et al., 2014). By distributing leadership across teams, formal and informal leaders work together to generate actions. This highly beneficial distribution of power ensures individuals feel involved in decision-making and considered within a group (Lv & Zhang, 2017; West et al., 2014). Lastly, while hierarchical leadership is an antiquated practice seen commonly in health care, unintended consequences can cause a pressurised environment. In contrast, flat hierarchies are gaining popularity, as they afford the flexibility and equality vital in a caring environment, where no one should be afraid to raise concerns and voice their opinion (Green et al., 2017) Flat hierarchies mean that employees have more responsibility for each staff member, as there are more people for support and guidance (Green et al., 2017). Although various forms of leadership have been introduced to healthcare systems, there is no "one size fits all."

Limitations

In developing themes along a critical realist ontology, the researchers bring their own experience and knowledge to the analysis which, although adding richness and value, could be construed as introducing bias. We have tried to name and present themes as expressed by the interviewees themselves. Debriefing had been performed on a relatively ad hoc basis in our operating theatres, so interviewees had varying degrees of experience. Further research on the experience of operating room workers with regular debriefing would be of value. The study was set in a tertiary paediatric hospital. Subsequent research across a range of hospitals and specialties could provide further insights.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conclusions

In conclusion, this research provides evidence that a structured debrief will be beneficial to psychological safety, breaking down hierarchies to shift ideas of power and promote teamwork among healthcare professionals. The benefits of debriefing outweigh the challenges, of which there are many. Routine debriefing, if well done, will facilitate team learning, reduce errors and improve patient safety.

Acknowledgements

The authors sincerely thank Dr. Haare Williams for his expert advice and support.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Interviewee characteristics.

	n = 40
Gender	
Female	25
Male	15
Profession	
Nursing	14
Anaesthesia	7
Anaesthetic technician	7
Surgeon	12
Surgical specialty	
Paediatric surgery	7
Orthopaedic surgery	2
Cardiac surgery	2
ENT	1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Themes and description of each theme.

Theme	Explanation
One of the most valuable things	The value of debriefing to teamwork, team learning, and quality improvement.
It's a safe space	Debriefing promotes psychological safety and psychological safety is needed in debriefs.
Natural born leader	Who should lead debriefs (e.g. nurses or surgeons) and critical reflections on what constitutes leadership in the operating room.
Space-time	Practicalities on when and where to debrief, the problem of people needing to leave ("one foot out the door"), and critical reflection on the meaning of time.
Doing the basics well	Structure and training, no one is born knowing how to do this, doing the basics well.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Mind map of themes developed from the study.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

Abbott, T. E. F., Ahmad, T., Phull, M. K., Fowler, A. J., Hewson, R., Biccard, B. M., Chew, M. S., Gillies, M., Pearse, R. M., Pearse, R. M., Beattie, S., Clavien, P.-A., Demartines, N., Fleisher, L. A., Grocott, M., Haddow, J., Hoeft, A., Holt, P., Moreno, R., … Wildes, T. (2018). The surgical safety checklist and patient outcomes after surgery: A prospective observational cohort study, systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, *120*(1), 146–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2017.08.002

Adams, S. L., & Anantatmula, V. (2010). Social and Behavioral Influences on Team Process. *Project Management Journal*, *41*(4), 89–98. https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20192

Berenholtz, S. M., Schumacher, K., Hayanga, A. J., Simon, M., Goeschel, C., Pronovost, P. J., Shanley, C. J., & Welsh, R. J. (2009). Implementing standardized operating room briefings and debriefings at a large regional medical center. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, *35*(8), 391–397. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1553-7250(09)35055-2

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021a). To saturate or not to saturate? Questioning data saturation as a useful concept for thematic analysis and sample-size rationales. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *13*(2), 201–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1704846

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021b). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *18*(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Conceptual and design thinking for thematic analysis. *Qualitative Psychology*, *9*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000196

Brennan, P. A., & Davidson, M. (2019). Improving patient safety: We need to reduce hierarchy and empower junior doctors to speak up. *BMJ*, *366*, l4461. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4461

Brindle, M. E., Henrich, N., Foster, A., Marks, S., Rose, M., Welsh, R., & Berry, W. (2018). Implementation of surgical debriefing programs in large health systems: An exploratory

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

qualitative analysis. *BMC Health Services Research*, *18*(1), 210. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3003-3

Crane, P., Bennett, J., Borgvall, A., & Waldeloef, C. (2006). Advancing Fighter Employment Tactics in the Swedish and US Air Forces Using Simulation Environments. In *Transforming Training and Experimentation through Modelling and Simulation* (p. 19.1-19.12). Air Force Research Lab MESA AZ Warfighter Readiness Research Division. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA476573

Dekker, S. (2016). *Just Culture: Balancing Safety and Accountability* (2nd ed.). CRC Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315251271

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Edmondson, A. (2008). *Managing the Risk of Learning: Psychological Safety in Work Teams* (pp. 255–275). https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470696712.ch13

Edmondson, A. C. (2003). Speaking Up in the Operating Room: How Team Leaders Promote Learning in Interdisciplinary Action Teams. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*(6), 1419–1452. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00386

Edmondson, A. C. (2018). *The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth*. Wiley.

Elliott, R., Fischer, C. T., & Rennie, D. L. (1999). Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *38*(3), 215–229. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466599162782

Fanning, R. M., & Gaba, D. M. (2007). The Role of Debriefing in Simulation-Based Learning. *Simulation in Healthcare*, *2*(2), 115–125. https://doi.org/10.1097/SIH.0b013e3180315539

Gamble, E. N., & Christensen, A. L. (2022). Two sides of the same personality coin: An opportunity to refocus (un) ethical analysis. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, *31*(2), 589–600. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12416

Gopal, D. P., Chetty, U., O'Donnell, P., Gajria, C., & Blackadder-Weinstein, J. (2021). Implicit bias in healthcare: Clinical practice, research and decision making. *Future Healthcare Journal*, *8*(1), 40–48. https://doi.org/10.7861/fhj.2020-0233

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Green, B., Oeppen, R. S., Smith, D. W., & Brennan, P. A. (2017). Challenging hierarchy in healthcare teams–ways to flatten gradients to improve teamwork and patient care. *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, *55*(5), 449–453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2017.02.010

Greer, L. L., Van Bunderen, L., & Yu, S. (2017). The dysfunctions of power in teams: A review and emergent conflict perspective. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *37*, 103–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2017.10.005

Haynes, A. B., Weiser, T. G., Berry, W. R., Lipsitz, S. R., Breizat, A.-H. S., Dellinger, E. P., Herbosa, T., Joseph, S., Kibatala, P. L., Lapitan, M. C. M., Merry, A. F., Moorthy, K., Reznick, R. K., Taylor, B., & Gawande, A. A. (2009). A Surgical Safety Checklist to Reduce Morbidity and Mortality in a Global Population. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *360*(5), 491–499. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa0810119

Hughes, A. M., & Salas, E. (2013). Hierarchical Medical Teams and the Science of Teamwork. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, *13*(6), 529–533. https://doi.org/10.1001/virtualmentor.2013.15.6.msoc1-1306

Knight, E. L., & Mehta, P. H. (2017). Hierarchy stability moderates the effect of status on stress and performance in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *114*(1), 78–83. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1609811114

Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2006). Learning styles and learning spaces: A review of the multidisciplinary application of experiential learning theory in higher education. In *Learning styles and learning: A key to meeting the accountability demands in education* (pp. 45–91). Nova Science Publishers New York, NY.

Kolbe, M., Eppich, W., Rudolph, J., Meguerdichian, M., Catena, H., Cripps, A., Grant, V., & Cheng, A. (2020). Managing psychological safety in debriefings: A dynamic balancing act. *BMJ Simulation & Technology Enhanced Learning*, *6*(3), 164–171. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjstel-2019-000470

Landon, L. B., Slack, K. J., & Barrett, J. D. (2018). Teamwork and collaboration in long-duration space missions: Going to extremes. *American Psychologist*, *73*(4), 563–575. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000260

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Leonard, M., Graham, S., & Bonacum, D. (2004). The human factor: The critical importance of effective teamwork and communication in providing safe care. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, *13*(suppl 1), i85–i90. https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2004.010033

Lv, C.-M., & Zhang, L. (2017). How can collective leadership influence the implementation of change in health care? *Chinese Nursing Research*, *4*(4), 182–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cnre.2017.10.005

Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., & Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power. *Qualitative Health Research*, *26*(13), 1753–1760.

Matheson, A., Walton, M., Gray, R., Wehipeihana, N., & Wistow, J. (2020). Strengthening prevention in communities through systems change: Lessons from the evaluation of Healthy Families NZ. *Health Promotion International*, *35*(5), 947–957. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daz092

Mavin, T. J., Kikkawa, Y., & Billett, S. (2018). Key contributing factors to learning through debriefings: Commercial aviation pilots' perspectives. *International Journal of Training Research*, *16*(2), 122–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/14480220.2018.1501906

McClintock, A. H., & Fainstad, T. (2022). Growth, Engagement, and Belonging in the Clinical Learning Environment: The Role of Psychological Safety and the Work Ahead. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *37*(9), 2291–2296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-022-07493-6

Nelson, J. (2017). Using conceptual depth criteria: Addressing the challenge of reaching saturation in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, *17*(5), 554–570. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794116679873

O'Brien, B. C., Harris, I. B., Beckman, T. J., Reed, D. A., & Cook, D. A. (2014). Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations. *Academic Medicine*, *89*(9), 1245–1251. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388

O'Shea, A., Boaz, A. L., & Chambers, M. (2019). A Hierarchy of Power: The Place of Patient and Public Involvement in Healthcare Service Development. *Frontiers in Sociology*, *4*, 38. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2019.00038

Paull DE, Mazzia LM, Wood SD, Theis MS, Robinson LD, Carney B, Neily J, Mills PD, & Bagian JP. (2010). Briefing guide study: Preoperative briefing and postoperative debriefing

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

checklists in the Veterans Health Administration medical team training program. *American Journal of Surgery*, *200*(5), 620–623. jlh. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2010.07.011

Pilgrim, D. (2014). Some implications of critical realism for mental health research. *Social Theory & Health*, *12*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1057/sth.2013.17

Raemer, D., Anderson, M., Cheng, A., Fanning, R., Nadkarni, V., & Savoldelli, G. (2011). Research Regarding Debriefing as Part of the Learning Process. *Simulation in Healthcare*, *6*(7), S52. https://doi.org/10.1097/SIH.0b013e31822724d0

Rampin, R., & Rampin, V. (2021). Taguette: Open-source qualitative data analysis. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *6*(68), 3522.

Robinson, L. D., Paull, D. E., Mazzia, L. M., Falzetta, L., Hay, J., Neily, J., Mills, P. D., Carney, B., & Bagian, J. P. (2010). The Role of the Operating Room Nurse Manager in the Successful Implementation of Preoperative Briefings and Postoperative Debriefings in the VHA Medical Team Training Program. *Journal of PeriAnesthesia Nursing*, *25*(5), 302–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jopan.2010.07.003

Sammer, C. E., Lykens, K., Singh, K. P., Mains, D. A., & Lackan, N. A. (2010). What is patient safety culture? A review of the literature. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship: An Official Publication of Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing*, *42*(2), 156–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2009.01330.x

Smith, P. O. (2015). Leadership in academic health centers: Transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*, *22*(4), 228–231. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10880-015-9441-8

Trossman, S. (2019). Preventing harm: Reporting, recognition, and just culture can make a difference. *American Nurse Today*, *14*(2), 29–33.

Vanstone, M., & Grierson, L. (2022). Thinking about social power and hierarchy in medical education. *Medical Education*, *56*(1), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14659

Vashdi, D. R., Bamberger, P. A., & Erez, M. (2013). Can Surgical Teams Ever Learn? The Role of Coordination, Complexity, and Transitivity in Action Team Learning. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(4), 945–971. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0501

Vickers, R. (2011). Five steps to safer surgery. *The Annals of The Royal College of Surgeons of England*, *93*(7), 501–503. https://doi.org/10.1308/147870811X599334

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.23.22280268; this version posted September 28, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Waring, J. J. (2005). Beyond blame: Cultural barriers to medical incident reporting. *Social Science & Medicine (1982)*, *60*(9), 1927–1935. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.08.055

West, M. A., Lyubovnikova, J., Eckert, R., & Denis, J.-L. (2014). Collective leadership for cultures of high quality health care. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-07-2014-0039

Yucel, R. (2018). Scientists' Ontological and Epistemological Views about Science from the Perspective of Critical Realism. *Science & Education*, *27*(5), 407–433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-018-9983-x

Zuckerman, S. L., France, D. J., Green, C., Leming-Lee, S., Anders, S., & Mocco, J. (2012). Surgical debriefing: A reliable roadmap to completing the patient safety cycle. *Neurosurgical Focus*, *33*(5), E4. https://doi.org/10.3171/2012.8.FOCUS12248