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The setting

- In healthcare organizational change is common.
- The Swedish Health and Medical Services Act (1982:763) requests that the most effective evidence-based methods are provided to secure the best quality care, patient safety and cost efficiency.
- Changes to the work practices in line with national guidelines, new care plans etc.
The setting

- However:
  - Two-third of these changes fail (Greenhalgh et al., 2004).
- This is a problem!
  - Patients do not receive the most updated care
  - Managers are overwhelmed and experience that they do not have the right skills and support (Socialstyrelsen, 2012)
  - Employees become frustrated with implementation efforts, loose motivation and the willingness to participate
  - Organizational efficiency is on the line
What is important for implementation?

PARiHS\(^1\)

- Evidence: research, clinical & patient experience, local data
- Context: culture, purpose, role, skills & attributes
- Facilitation: leadership, evaluation

CFIR\(^2\)

- Intervention (unadapted)
- Outer setting
- Adaptable facilitity
- Care components
- Individuals involved
- Inner setting
- Process
- Implementation driver\(^3\)

EPIS\(^4\)

- Adoption Decision
- Exploration Phase
- Preparation Phase
- Implementation Phase
- Sustainment Phase
- Leadership and support for EBP
- EBP quality assurance
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Which kind of leadership is important?

Four literature reviews on leadership in the implementation context


Full range leadership model

Transformational leadership
- Idealized influence
- Inspirational motivation
- Individual consideration
- Intellectual stimulation

Transactional leadership
- Contingent reward
- Management by exception

Laissez Faire leadership
- Laissez faire leadership

Avolio, 2011; Bass & Avolio, 1993
Is general transformational and transactional leadership enough?

- If you are a transformational leader, that does not mean that you support this specific implementation
- Not necessarily related to implementation

- Therefore → domain specific leadership:
  → Specifies leader behavior related to implementation
  → Possibly stronger relations to possible outcomes

- So far this has not been investigated, with an exception for Aarons, G.A., Ehrhart, M.G., & Farahnak, L.R. (2014). The Implementation Leadership Scale (ILS): Development of a Brief Measure of Unit Level Implementation Leadership. Implementation Science, 9:45.
Aim:

- Develop, conduct and evaluate an intervention that increases generic implementation leadership based on the full range leadership model

→ iLead intervention

- Today’s aim: Described the intervention and present some preliminary results on the process data
Recruitment in health care in Stockholm County

Selection criteria:
- Manager position in health care → first & second line
- Stockholm Health Care Services (SLSO)
- A current implementation

Control group: 39 managers

Intervention groups:
- Group 1: individual managers → 21
- Group 2: managers from same division → 31
  - Here senior management also received an adapted intervention
  - Change agents received two seminars as well
Pedagogical idea

- Work with one’s own implementation object throughout the intervention
- Short expert lectures
- Reflection in small groups and individually
- Group work
- Role-play
- Feedback from employees, i.e., 180-degree feedback
- Feedback from fellow participants
- Feedback from workshop leaders
- Concrete work and help with one’s own implementation process, i.e., action plan & sustainability plan
- Work at home between the workshops
- Booster email between the workshops

Content of the iLead intervention

Study protocol for this intervention:

Workshop 1&2
Implementation & leadership & Feedback report

Workshop 3
Behavioral change, communication, action plan

Workshop 4
Handle resistance, action plan

Workshop 5
Sustainability & sustainability plan

Feedback report
Timeline

2015

Baseline survey

Intervention Group 1

WS1 & 2
WS3
WS4
WS5

Intervention Group 2

Baseline survey

WS1 & 2
WS3
WS4
WS5

Control Group

Baseline survey

Follow-up 1 survey

Follow-up 2 survey

Follow-up 1 survey

Follow-up 2 survey

Notes:

WS1 = intervention for line managers
WS1 = intervention for senior management
WS1 = change agents participate

Interviews
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Results

- Was the intervention successful?
- Evaluation based on the model by Kierkpatrick
  - 1. Reactions → Process data*, interviews *
  - 2. Learning → Process data*, pre & post questionnaires *, interviews *
  - 3. Behavior → Process data*, pre & post questionnaires *, interviews *
  - 4. Results → Pre & post questionnaires *, interviews *

Data source:
* Manager
* Manager and their employees

### Manager ratings

**Intervention overall**
- Workshop quality appraisal → 10 opposite adjective pairs (1-10)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>incomprehensible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monotonous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Fridrich et al. 2016
Manager ratings

- Outcome expectancy → 2 items

1. Reaction
2. Learning
3. Behavior
4. Results

Manager ratings

- Perceived implementation leadership knowledge → 6 items

Results for knowledge:
Time → F(3,153) = 6.15, p = .001
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Manager ratings

- Short scale on implementation leadership $\rightarrow$ 6 items

1. Reaction
2. Learning
3. Behavior
4. Results

I behave in a way that displays my commitment to the work with the current implementation
I suggest new ways of doing our jobs in line with the current implementation
I communicate clearly the advantages with the current implementation
I spend time showing my employees how they can work according to the current implementation
I talk about my values and beliefs of the importance of working accordingly with the current implementation
I express satisfaction when my employees perform their job in line with the current implementation

Results for leadership:
Time $\rightarrow$ $F(3,134)=1.64$, $p=.18$

Based on $^1$Randall, Nielsen & Tvedt (2009) $^2$Kelloway, Mullen, Francis (2006)
Differences in the intervention groups

Difference in knowledge depending on the intervention group

Manager ratings

Results for leadership:
- Time: $F(3,134)=1.64$, $p=.18$
- Group: $F(1,134)=23.96$, $p=.001$

Difference in leadership depending on the intervention group

Results for knowledge:
- Time: $F(3,153)=6.15$, $p=.001$
- Group: $F(1,153)=8.38$, $p=.001$
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Discussion

- Effects seem to go in the right direction
- Or? → Decrease in the own ratings of leadership

- Advantages and disadvantages of the two intervention groups
  → More dropout → no support?
  → A lot of organizational challenges → hindering of the organizational context?

- Future:
  → include different process factors in the analysis
  → Investigate the employee ratings
  → have a close look at the interviews
THANK YOU!

Anne.Richter@ki.se

For more detailed information about this intervention:

For more detailed information about our research group:
http://ki.se/en/lime/procome