

**Accountability and Patient Safety:**  
**A Study of Mess and Multiplicities**

Su-yin Hor

Doctor of Philosophy

2011

## **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY**

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Candidate

---

# Acknowledgements

This research would not have been possible without the financial support of the Australian Research Council, who funded my scholarship over the course of this research. I also thank the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences in the University of Technology, Sydney, for their excellent research facilities.

I am indebted to the following people, without whom this thesis would not exist.

To Rick Iedema, for being an excellent supervisor, in giving me the freedom to explore as I wished, and guiding me by sending appropriate ideas and readings my way. Thank you for always taking me seriously, even at my most ignorant, and for your generous faith in my abilities. I have enjoyed our conversations which meander in all kinds of unexpected and fascinating directions, and I look forward to many more.

To my participants, who shall regretfully remain anonymous, I am grateful for your generosity of time and spirit, your patience and kindness, and your sensitive engagement with my research. I remain in awe of the work that you do.

To my dearest friends and mentors Katherine Carroll and Peter Nugus, who not only showed me by example what it means to write a brilliant thesis and be a brilliant researcher, but also what it means to be a wonderful friend. Thank you both for your unyielding support, for your belief in me when I was in doubt, for your enthusiastic and incisive intellectual engagement with my work, and also your generosity in sharing your own ideas and experiences. I am a better researcher because of the both of you.

To Natalya Godbold and Amy Chen, for sharing this remarkable journey with me as fellow research students and truly excellent friends. Thank you Natalya for keeping me sane with our joint insanities, theoretical adventures and afternoon tea extravaganzas. Thank you especially for your careful reading of my chapters at a time when you had many other pressing matters to attend to. This is a much better thesis because of you. Thank you Amy for being such a joy to share an office with, for sharing my enthusiasm for food, and for injecting your sense of beauty and wonder into our otherwise wordy and drab environment. Thank you also for your careful formatting of this thesis, making it much easier on the eye.

To my other friends who have supported me during this journey: Nour Dados, Gloria Chung, Rowena Forsyth, Nadine Hackl, Kerin Robinson, Meher Nigar, Verena Thomas, Susi Woolf, Marie Manidis, Masafumi Monden, Katie Hepworth and Aileen Collier. Thank you for the shared meals, the shared stories, and the shared laughter and good times. Thank you also for your warm encouragement and quiet understanding at more difficult times.

To my mother and father, Lee Kim Yeok and Hor Chook Lam, for their moral and financial support. Thank you for giving me the freedom to pursue my interests in unusual directions. I am truly privileged and grateful to be your daughter.

Finally, and most importantly, to my dear husband, Ian Salmon, who has suffered the most. Thank you for taking care of me this past year especially, for holding my hand, for cooking me dinner, for being my comfort and my strength. Thank you for *everything*. I was only able to do this because of you, and I dedicate this thesis to you.

# Abstract

Over the past decade, patient safety has emerged as a major issue in hospitals, arising from reports of unacceptable levels of harm to patients caused by the process of health care itself rather than any underlying disease. A growing research movement has developed around finding out why so much harm occurs, and what can be done to reduce it. The ever-increasing complexity of health care provision is consistently cited as an underlying factor, and alongside calls for more accountability and transparency, formal systems of accountability such as guidelines and incident reporting have emerged in response, designed to govern frontline activities and to manage complexity through standardisation. As popular as these approaches are however, they are also controversial, and a large subset of patient safety research is focused on identifying and overcoming local ‘barriers’ to their implementation.

In this thesis, I analyse the problematic implementation of this formal accountability and challenge its assumptions. I propose that we insufficiently understand how safety is currently practiced by clinicians, and likewise, how accountability is practiced. My thesis therefore focuses on exploring safety and accountability as *practices*. I describe accountability not only in formal terms, but also as informal and everyday talk and behaviour. Furthermore, I propose that the problems of implementation described above can be reframed instead as tensions *between accountabilities*. In this study therefore, I examine how clinicians negotiate multiple accountabilities in their practices of safety. With a multidisciplinary group of 72 clinicians in a children’s hospital in New South Wales, Australia, I created ethnographic data through observations, field interviews and feedback sessions in two phases of field work, over ten months in total. Following each phase, data were iteratively coded and analysed using a grounded theory approach.

With these data, I show how clinicians are enacting safety through their practices of accountability, in contexts complicated by multiple accountabilities and multiple meanings of safety. I show how clinicians inevitably produce accounts that are partial and ‘incomplete’, at risk of becoming problematically disembedded from complexity. I also show how clinicians are re-embedding these partial accounts, by engaging in accountability practices that foreground multiplicity, diversity and reciprocity. I argue that if we wish for practices of accountability to reflect and support clinical practices that we see as complex and interconnected, then we need to embrace more complex and *interconnecting* practices of accountability. Rather than calling for more accountability, we need to practice more *accountabilities* instead, to increase the reciprocal and reflexive engagement of participants with one another in (and beyond) the health care system. In doing so, we would enable care that is ‘safer’ by enabling more people to participate more variously and directly in negotiating the complexity and shifting boundaries of health care delivery.

## Glossary of abbreviations

<b>ANT</b>	Actor-Network Theory
<b>CEC</b>	Clinical Excellent Commission
<b>CNC</b>	Clinical Nurse Consultant
<b>CNE</b>	Clinical Nurse Educator
<b>CNS</b>	Clinical Nurse Specialist
<b>EBM</b>	Evidence-Based Medicine
<b>HA</b>	High Acuity
<b>HD</b>	High Dependency
<b>ICU</b>	Intensive Care Unit
<b>IIMS</b>	Incident Information and Management System
<b>IOM</b>	Institute of Medicine
<b>M&amp;M</b>	Morbidity and Mortality
<b>NSW</b>	New South Wales
<b>NSW Health</b>	New South Wales Department of Health
<b>NUM</b>	Nurse Unit Manager
<b>RCA</b>	Root Cause Analysis
<b>RCT</b>	Randomised Controlled Trial
<b>RN</b>	Registered Nurse
<b>SAC</b>	Severity Assessment Code

## Glossary of key terms

<b>Accountability</b>	A practical and on-going accomplishment, enacted through the creation, exchange and use of accounts that can be representative of practice, as well as explanations or justifications of practice. See below for Informal Accountability and Formal Accountability.
<b>Articulation work</b>	Work that is involved in coordinating action around formalised models of work, that deals with unanticipated contingencies, and is generally invisible in formalised models of work.
<b>Combinability</b>	Combinability allows for accounts to be <i>paired</i> and <i>compared</i> across distances and time, at the risk of estrangement from more local and complex understandings and interpretations.
<b>Directionality / unidirectionality / multidirectionality</b>	Directionality attunes us to consider for whom accounts are created, whose accounts are made visible, and the reciprocity of their exchange. Unidirectionality describes the exchange of accounts in only one direction, lacking reciprocity. Multidirectionality describes a multiplicity of reciprocal interactions between people.
<b>Distance</b>	Not necessarily geographical, it can also refer to hierarchical differences or differences in perceived power, for example.
<b>Dis/embeddedness</b>	The degree to which an enactment of accountability engages with, and adequately represents the complexity of contexts in which multiple meanings of safety may co-exist. Dis/embeddedness has implications for how practices of accountability connect and disconnect practices of safety.
<b>Evidence-based medicine (EBM)</b>	A movement that emphasises the use of scientific evidence in clinical decision making, particularly evidence that meets standards of objectivity and generalisability, epitomised by the randomised controlled trial (RCT).
<b>Formal accountability</b>	An approach designed to act ‘at a distance’ to control or impact upon local frontline activities, in what is imagined to be a unidirectional relationship.
<b>High dependency / High acuity</b>	High Dependency patients are those who are determined by doctors and/or nurses to require increased nursing care, for various reasons. High Acuity patients are a subset of HD



patients, who are determined by doctors to be acutely unwell, and are to be seen by a medical team at least once every shift.

<b>Informal accountability</b>	Accountability that is not formal (see Formal accountability) or otherwise formally prescribed, usually initiated locally and contingently.
<b>Intercontextuality</b>	The re-creation of accounts and/or accountabilities across different contexts such as when past accounts are repeated or reproduced in subsequent account-exchanges, via the clinicians who are also situated within and across these contexts
<b>Mobility</b>	The ability of an account to travel between contexts and across distances.
<b>Multiplicity</b>	The claim that there is more than one way of describing or defining something, as opposed to singularity.
<b>Reciprocity</b>	A relationship describing the continual and mutual exchange of accounts between parties, as opposed to unidirectional accountability.
<b>Resilience</b>	The ability of actors to recover from unexpected change, or other adversity.
<b>Stability</b>	Can be thought to have two facets, namely the durability of the physical/tangible form of an account, and the reliability of its interpretation or meaning. These facets are inseparable, with the interpretation of an account emerging from the interaction between the form of the account and the context of its interpretation, rather than being somehow distinct and independent. Stability therefore is a contingent, relational effect, always in production. It is dependent on the relations generated between contexts by the accounts and accountabilities that flow between them.
<b>Transparency</b>	A relational effect, linked with stability, mobility and visibility, achieved by the interconnectedness of practices and people through the reciprocal flow of accountabilities.
<b>Visibility</b>	The degree to which an account (and the practices represented therein) is able to be ‘seen’ or otherwise attended to by others. Inextricably linked with the mobility and stability of the account.

## Glossary of participant titles

<b>Clinical Nurse Consultant (CNC)</b>	An experienced nurse with expert skills and knowledge in one particular area. The CNC manages the overall care for their group of patients and helps the medical team with clinical decisions. They may also do procedures, provide education and support.
<b>Clinical Nurse Educator (CNE)</b>	An experienced qualified nurse who works with nursing staff to develop their nursing skills and knowledge and develops hospital-wide nursing education.
<b>Clinical Nurse Specialist (CNS) / Specialist nurse</b>	An experienced registered nurse with demonstrated competency in an area of specialisation.
<b>Consultant</b>	The most senior doctors in the team, who have finished their speciality training.
<b>Dietician</b>	An allied health professional who gives parents, nurses and doctors advice on nutrition. This includes assessing patients' needs and devising and managing nutritional care plans for patients.
<b>Fellow</b>	A doctor who is finishing their specialty training. They will usually become a consultant within a year or two. A fellow works under the supervision of a consultant, and is more experienced than a registrar.
<b>Junior doctor</b>	In this thesis, a junior doctor can refer to a fellow, a registrar, or a resident (see relevant entries in this glossary)
<b>Nurse Unit Manager (NUM)</b>	The nurse in charge of managing the ward. They are in charge of staffing, and coordinate admissions, discharges and transfers of patients. They do not care directly for patients.
<b>Play Therapist</b>	Play therapists use play to help children have a positive experience of hospital by encouraging normal appropriate play activities.
<b>Nurse / Registered Nurse (RN)</b>	A trained nurse who cares for patients in the wards.

<b>Registrar</b>	A doctor who is training in a particular medical specialty, such as paediatrics. They rotate placements about every three months. A registrar is more experienced than a resident.
<b>Resident</b>	The most junior doctor on the team, also known as a Resident Medical Officer (RMO). They rotate placements about every three months.
<b>Senior doctor</b>	A consultant (see glossary entry above).
<b>Senior nurse</b>	In this thesis, a senior nurse can refer to a CNC, CNE or CNS (see glossary entries above), or another experienced nurse, such as the shift team leader on the ward.
<b>Social worker</b>	An allied health professional who works with families and health professionals to help with practical and personal issues a child and family may be facing.
<b>Speech therapist</b>	An allied health professional trained to assess and treat people with a communication disability or a problem with eating or swallowing.

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	iii
Glossary of abbreviations .....	v
Glossary of key terms .....	vi
Glossary of participant titles .....	viii
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background and approach .....	1
1.2 An overview of the thesis .....	3
<b>Chapter 2 Patient Safety and Accountability.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	9
2.2 On patient safety .....	9
Summary of patient safety .....	15
2.3 On accountability .....	15
A brief history.....	15
2.4 Systems of accountability .....	17
2.5 Standard setting – Evidence based medicine.....	19
2.6 Guidelines as standards of practice .....	21
Guidelines as challenges to autonomy .....	24
Guidelines as authority .....	28
The applicability of EBM and guidelines.....	30
The applicability of “gold standard” evidence in safety research .....	33
2.7 Summary .....	35
<b>Chapter 3 Accountabilities in Practice .....</b>	<b>37</b>

3.1	Introduction .....	37
3.2	Creating formal accounts: The problem of representation .....	38
	On distance.....	38
	On decontextualisation and disembeddedness .....	39
	On visibility .....	43
3.3	Using formal accounts .....	47
	On transparency.....	47
	On articulation work.....	52
	‘Re-embedding’ the disembedded .....	54
	On formal accountability – A summary .....	58
3.4	Multiple accountabilities .....	60
	Informal accountability .....	61
	Accountabilities in tension .....	63
3.5	Summary .....	66
 <b>Chapter 4 Methodology .....</b>		<b>69</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	69
4.2	Methods of researching patient safety.....	69
	Why ethnography? .....	70
	What kind of ethnography? .....	72
	A reflexive account of a reflexive approach .....	74
4.3	Theoretical perspectives .....	75
4.4	This study .....	83
	Background .....	83
	Research aims and research questions.....	84
	A conceptual framework for analysis .....	85
	The researcher.....	85
	The field site: Locations .....	87
	Participants .....	90
	The field work schedule .....	92
4.5	Data creation .....	93
	Observations .....	93
	Field interviews .....	95
	Feedback sessions .....	96
	Data analysis: A grounded approach.....	98
	Ethics and accountability in practice.....	100
4.6	On limitations and questions of validity and reliability.....	102

<b>Chapter 5 Finding Safety and Accountability in the Field .....</b>	<b>106</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	106
5.2 The ubiquity of safety.....	107
Vignette 5a – Syringe sizes for line flushing .....	108
5.3 Informal checking .....	115
Excerpt 5b – Has the team seen the patient?.....	116
Excerpt 5c – Is the patient High Acuity?.....	117
5.4 Accountabilities in contrast .....	118
Excerpt 5d – Anna in the doctor’s room.....	119
Vignette 5e – High dependency nurse-patient ratios .....	122
5.5 Discussion .....	128
The conceptual framework: describing accountability as practice.....	129
Dis/embeddedness and the multiplicity of safety .....	132
 <b>Chapter 6 Multiple Accountabilities in Incident Reporting .....</b>	 <b>134</b>
6.1 Introduction .....	134
6.2 Incident reporting systems .....	135
Multiple accountabilities in incident reporting.....	135
Intertwining learning and punishment .....	137
The NSW Health IIMS .....	139
6.3 Accountabilities in tension: Reporting as learning and as blame.....	142
Vignette 6a – To report or not to report.....	143
Excerpt 6b – Making trouble .....	145
Vignette 6c – Being blacklisted.....	147
Vignette 6d – Feeling guilty.....	147
Vignette 6e – Determining severity .....	149
6.4 Accountabilities in tension: Incident reporting ‘at a distance’ .....	151
Excerpt 6f – Talking about mistakes .....	151
Vignette 6g – Bypassing personal communication .....	152
Excerpt 6h – Lack of feedback.....	154
6.5 Discussion .....	155
Describing the movement of accounts in practice .....	158
 <b>Chapter 7 Multiple Accountabilities in Confluence .....</b>	 <b>160</b>
7.1 Introduction .....	160
7.2 M&M meetings: A local use of formal accounts .....	161
Excerpt 7a – Managing a wrong drug administration .....	162

	Vignette 7b – Interdepartmental communication .....	163
	Excerpt 7c – Overworked staff.....	166
	Excerpt 7d – Not a team issue .....	167
7.3	Team meetings: Enacting multiplicity and intercontextuality .....	169
	Excerpt 7e – Reusing syringes .....	170
	Excerpt 7f – Arranging an external consult.....	171
	Excerpt 7g – Anxious parents .....	173
	Excerpt 7h – A more complete picture .....	174
	Excerpt 7i – Debating an albumin infusion .....	175
	Excerpt 7j – A mother’s concerns .....	176
	Excerpt 7k – Multidirectional accountability.....	178
7.4	Discussion .....	180
 <b>Chapter 8 Discussion and Conclusion .....</b>		<b>184</b>
8.1	Introduction .....	184
8.2	The literature on accountability and patient safety .....	184
	The problem with formal accountability .....	185
	Safety and accountability as everyday practice .....	186
8.3	On methodology: Accounting for accountability and safety in practice.....	187
	A conceptual framework for analysing accountabilities in practice .....	188
8.4	Finding safety in practice.....	190
	The ubiquity of safety.....	190
	Safety as multiple .....	191
	On interconnectedness through intercontextuality .....	192
	Matching complexity with complexity.....	193
8.5	The problem of disembeddedness .....	195
	Disembedded accountability as transgressive and conflicting .....	196
	Disembedded accountability as distancing and disconnecting .....	198
8.6	Re-thinking accountability .....	199
	Re-thinking stability and form .....	199
	Inclusions and exclusions: the partiality of accountability.....	204
	Engaging with multiplicity and multidirectionality .....	206
8.7	Conclusion.....	208
	Implications for ‘improving’ safety in clinical practice .....	209
 <b>Chapter 9 Reflections and Recommendations .....</b>		<b>211</b>
9.1	Introduction .....	211

9.2	Recommendations for health policy .....	212
9.3	Recommendations for medical education .....	213
9.4	Recommendations for safety research, and research in general .....	215
9.5	Admitted exclusions, and/or proposed future inclusions.....	217

<b>References .....</b>	<b>219</b>
-------------------------	------------

<b>List of Appendices .....</b>	<b>244</b>
---------------------------------	------------

Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form.....	245
---	-----

Appendix B: Research Information Sheet .....	250
--	-----

Appendix C: Severity Assessment Code (SAC) Matrix .....	252
---	-----

Appendix D: Papers and Presentations from this Research.....	254
--	-----